151
23350
L 96.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTY-FOURTH U.S. CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XXVIII.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1896.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

KF35



SUPT. OF DOCS
LIBRARY
DUPL.

42 803 pfine 2

VOLUME XXVIII, PART II.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

With reference to the first proposition, let me call attention to the fact that while this resolution of ours, or the one reported by the committee, is not termed a protest, yet, as a matter of fact, it is a protest against the negligence of certain nations who are parties to a treaty in allowing the provisions of that treaty to be uncomplied with or unenforced. It is a protest, and I suggest that my resolution is simply a method of intensifying that protest—of giving emphasis to our protest at these murderous outrages. The President is requested, or directed, to act. That is our method of giving additional emphasis, and our resolution is nothing more than an attempt to be emphatic where emphasis is most essential.

Gentlemen have told us—the gentleman from Kentucky told us directly—that the resolutions reported by the committee are absolutely meaningless; that they are not expected to have any effect; that it is only by the "barest possibility," quoting the language of the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG], that beneficial results can come from this effort, in other words, these gentlemen expect this protest, mild and kindly as it is, so diplomatic, so in harmony with all that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been lately accustomed to do, so polite, that these resolutions would not challenge the attention of anybody. Now, what I want to do is to emphasize the protest of the American Congress, and to compel those Governments to think for a moment, or at least to compel the attention of the people of those nations so that there shall be something done in the way of agitation.

If the resolutions pass as the committee have reported them, it will be said, "Nothing will be done; they are meaningless." Gentlemen, advocates in the House of Representatives, have explained that nothing is to come of them; that they are to be barren of results, and so, no action being expected to result, there will not be any occasion in England even for examining them. But if it is understood that we are in earnest, and we are so in earnest that we refuse diplomatic relations with the murderers, that we are so in earnest that we will not recognize as civilized this offending nation, that very fact will challenge attention everywhere, and will challenge discussion everywhere. The enormities will be brought to the knowledge of all mankind, and humanity, revolting against those outrages, will compel silent Governments to speak.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am not sure whether I can answer it.

Mr. ADAMS. If we should break off diplomatic relations with Turkey, who is going to take care of the American citizens there now? If we should dismiss their minister, they would do the same with our minister.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman bases his inquiry on the error that he committed when he announced a moment ago that the adoption of this resolution, or the handing of passports to a minister, was a declaration of war. I deny it. It might be an offense, and such an offense as would justify the nation supposed to be wronged in a declaration of war; but it is not one on our part——

Mr. BOWERS. We sent the English minister home.

Mr. HEPBURN. As the gentleman urged when he made that statement.

Mr. QUIGG. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether this discussion is intended to enlighten the Chair upon the point of order or not?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have not the happy faculty of the gentleman from New York of always being direct and always saying just the thing I want to say in the best possible English, but in my own weak way I am trying to enlighten the Chair, if it is possible for me to do so. [Laughter.]

Again, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is germane, even to the portion of the resolution cited by the gentleman from Kentucky. The gentleman [Mr. MCCREARY] read this:

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

Now, I do not see that it can be claimed that the method I have proposed in this amendment is not one of the methods that the House proposes to pledge itself to sustain the President in. He might, without these resolutions, have adopted this very course. The amendment simply suggests to him, as the sense of the Congress, that this is one of the methods that he ought to pursue looking to the suppression of these outrages.

The SPEAKER. While the matter is not free from doubt, the Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] is recognized.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I have two minutes remaining, and in that time I desire to call the attention of the House to the serious character of the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa. When a man is doing something in his own household which you do not like, there are two ways, and two only, in which you can stop him. One is by asking him not to do it, and the other is by forcing him not to do it. The remedy that I propose, which certainly is suitable in the first instance, is that we shall ask him not to do it. The gentleman from Iowa does not propose the other remedy; what he proposes is that we shall insult him. The question for us is: Who is going to suffer most—Turkey or the United States—by the adoption of the course which the gentleman from Iowa proposes? Turkey will not suffer by our having nothing to do with her here in Washington. It is nothing to Turkey that we send her minister home. We are the ones that will suffer; for when the Turkish minister leaves this capital our minister and nine consuls will leave Constantinople and Asia Minor, and 900 American citizens and all the property of the missionaries that are being held back from slaughter and destruction by the efforts of the American minister and of our consuls will be at the mercy of people whom, in the remoter regions of Asia Minor, we know the Government of Turkey might not under such circumstances be able to control, even if it wanted to control them.

Mr. Speaker, I call for the previous question on the resolutions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him one question.

The SPEAKER. It will require the consent of the House.

Mr. QUIGG. I will answer the gentleman if I have the time. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had sufficient debate on this question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But it has been all on one side.

Mr. COX. I only want to ask the gentleman one question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] asks for the previous question.

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the gentleman from New York to permit me to ask unanimous consent that there be half an hour allowed for further debate on this proposition, fifteen minutes on each side.

Mr. COX. That is all right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The affirmative side of this proposition has occupied nearly the whole time, and gentlemen on that side have even refused to allow us to ask unanimous consent, a thing never before done on this floor.

Mr. DINGLEY. I now ask unanimous consent for both sides.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But there must be a fair division of the time.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection to the time being extended beyond a half an hour if there are gentlemen who desire to speak.

A MEMBER. Make it an hour.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that one hour longer be allowed for debate on the resolutions, and the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, half an hour to be given to each side.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let the division be a little different, Mr. Speaker. Let our side have forty minutes of the hour and the other side twenty minutes. Even then the time will hardly be equalized; advantage will still be with the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Which is "our side"?

Mr. HARDY. Let the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] control the time on his side.

Mr. QUIGG. Let us not depart from the original proposition of the gentleman from Maine. Let the time be divided evenly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Be fair about it. Give us forty minutes.

Mr. QUIGG. All right. Let it be understood, then, that the previous question shall be considered as ordered, and that the vote shall be taken on the resolutions and on the amendment at the end of the hour.

Mr. CANNON. How is the time to be divided—half and half?

Mr. QUIGG. No; the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] wants forty minutes, and so far as I am concerned (assuming that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is in accord with me), I say let us agree that he shall have it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered and a vote be taken one hour from the present time, the intervening time to be spent in debate, forty minutes of which shall be under the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and twenty minutes under the control of the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG].

Mr. BAILEY. Before unanimous consent is given we on this side would like to have some understanding that we shall be fairly treated in the division of the time. With such an understanding from the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York, we shall make no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. My colleague [Mr. TAFT], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, desires to offer an amendment to the pending resolution. I ask that he be allowed to present such an amendment and have it voted on under the operation of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the request for unanimous consent to be agreed to.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not hear the proposition put by the

Chair. I was reading the proposed amendment of my colleague. I think it is no more than fair that he should have an opportunity to offer that amendment, to be voted on under the operation of the previous question.

Mr. QUIGG. I have not yet understood the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. My colleague, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, desires to offer an amendment. I suggest that he be permitted to do so, the amendment to be voted on under the previous question, without any extension of the time already agreed upon, as I understand, for debate. The simple request is that he be given an opportunity to offer this amendment.

Mr. QUIGG. Has consent been given to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

The SPEAKER. Consent has not yet been given, the gentleman from Ohio having presented an additional request.

Mr. QUIGG. I do not know what the amendment is. I should not like to agree to admit the proposition without knowing what it is.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It comes from a member of your own committee.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order. This discussion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered and that the next hour be spent in debate, forty minutes to be under the control of the gentleman from Iowa, and twenty minutes under the control of the gentleman from New York. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The previous question was not ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio that he may offer his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the conscience of humanity fastens upon the six Christian powers above named the responsibility of the continuance of the butchery of Armenian Christians; that the spectacle of these six leading Christian powers permitting the murder of Christians who by treaty stipulations were placed under their special care is humiliating to the last degree and discredits the Christian religion throughout the world.

Resolved, That that one of the signatory powers which first takes action under the Berlin treaty to prevent the further butchery of defenseless Armenian Christians will receive the grateful recognition not only of the American people, but of the entire civilized world.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Ohio offers this as a substitute.

Mr. COX. I should like to have that amendment read again.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this offered as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it is offered as a substitute for the whole resolution.

Mr. TAFT. No, sir; it is simply an amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I should like to understand the purpose of the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. My purpose is this: We are criticising the Turks. Now, it seems to me that the people who ought to be criticised——

Mr. HEPBURN. I wish to know whether the gentleman offers this as an amendment to the original proposition.

Mr. TAFT. I offer it as an amendment to the entire set of resolutions and to your amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then it is an addition?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. All right.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] offers his proposition as an amendment to the resolution of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. TAFT. My purpose was to offer it as an amendment to all the resolutions.

The SPEAKER. As additional?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Then it would not be in order until the other amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield for a moment to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to withdraw my objection to the printing of additional remarks by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that he be allowed to extend his remarks?

Mr. HOWARD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEPBURN) there were—ayes 19, noes 121.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the yeas and nays on this proposition.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I desire to say a few words only on the grave and serious considerations which this resolution suggests.

I was absent from the Hall in another place when this measure came up for consideration, and during the debate which followed. I am, therefore, not aware of all of the incidents which have transpired in respect to it, but I want to express my great gratification and pleasure at the very admirable and conservative tone exhibited by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in his colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa. I may be permitted to express, however, my deepest regret that while he opposes the extreme proposition of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], he has nevertheless given his sanction to the Senate resolution which is now pending before the House.

Our wise forefathers committed our foreign relations and our delicate diplomatic affairs to a confidential channel, in which they are conducted by the President and the Senate. They carefully endeavored to isolate these questions from the temptations and emergencies of party politics, which too often overmaster and dominate us all.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the policy—the constitutional policy—to which I have adverted has been departed from in some degree in this instance. There is, I know, in this country what I may without giving offense call a sort of Christian clamor against the Turkish Government, against which, natural as it is, the best of us are scarcely able to stand.

But it seems to me, sir, that this question presents itself: Is it wise, is it prudent, is it dignified in the high forum of international ethics and comity for us to intrude in this foreign quarrel and in this manner? In addition to this constitutional policy to which I have already adverted, we have also established another great principle of American policy, the converse of that which has been called the Monroe doctrine. We have agreed, following the great precedent established by Washington himself, that we would keep out of entangling alliances on the other side of the ocean; and yet on an occasion arising out of a treaty between European nations—the treaty of Berlin—in which, indeed, sir, we would have declined to participate, we are proposing to intervene in violation of our public policy thus established and ordained from our most ancient times and undertake to declare to the signatories to that great treaty, not only what is the proper construction of it, but the duty of those who entered into it.

In other words, sir, we will not, ourselves, undertake entangling alliances with those countries, but will thrust ourselves into the quarrel and call on them to fulfill our construction of the treaty. We decline the responsibilities which other nations are at liberty to undertake. Shall we presume to advise or direct them in the performance of their mutual duties and covenants? It is a plain violation of the noble advice of the Father of his Country. I say it is an impertinence on our part. It is foreign to the comity which should prevail among the nations of the world, and it ignores conditions prevailing among themselves with which they are far more familiar than we are at this distance. The countries that signed that treaty are themselves Christian powers. Shall we arrogate to ourselves that superiority of Christian grace and sympathy which will entitle us to tell them what their duty is, and how they must do it?

Why, sir, looking further at this matter, let it be remembered that these great powers undertook by that famous treaty to effectuate a pacification of the Eastern nations, which for ages have been engaged in the terrific conflicts between the followers of Christ and those of Mohammed, an international and imperial undertaking which ought to add imperishable fame to Lord Beaconsfield and his illustrious associates in that mighty enterprise of piety, peace, and humanity; and we ought not to forget that the gravest complications growing out of recent wars and their bitter results, jealousies as to the balance of power, and mutual fears in the face of the insatiable militarism which holds Europe in its grasp, embarrass the orderly execution of the compact made at Berlin. The great armies and armaments of Russia; the mighty military establishments of Germany and France, of Austria and England, with the consequent lust of power and dominion, what would they do with Turkey if they were to undertake to subdue that country. They seem, in fact, to be fully occupied just now in watching each other. A spark in the present temper of Europe might kindle a flame which would appall mankind!

Do we regard ourselves as wiser and better than the statesmen who are keeping the peace in Europe?

Will not our interposition under these most extraordinary circumstances be regarded as a rash and unjustifiable intrusion?

The last of these resolutions declares to the world and the Turkish Government that whatever the President may do, whatever step he may take for the protection of American citizens in Armenia shall meet with our sanction and our support. How far, Mr. Speaker, does that resolution fall short of a declaration of war? He might send the American Navy to bombard the whole Turkish coast, to lay Constantinople in ruins, and level it with the waters of the sea. I have no doubt of the wisdom and conservatism of the honorable gentleman who occupies that high position; but I would not, under the conditions which now exist, charge him with such a menace.

Shall we, sir, in the midst of the perils which now beset our path, a very recent incident of which has just vibrated all round the world, load the President and ourselves with new duties and responsibilities outside of this hemisphere? Shall we constitute ourselves universal guardians of mankind? Shall we set the example here, Mr. Speaker, of thrusting the discussion of grave foreign and diplomatic questions into the arena of politics and making them the spoil of a political campaign during this eventful year? We are to make platforms this year, sir. We are to have candidates for the Presidency. We are to settle great questions of domestic interest and policy. Shall we inject into this mighty contention of party the gravest and most solemn questions of peace and war that could concern mankind throughout the world?

Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this occasion to pass without asking gentlemen to pause and reflect before that step is taken. A political campaign is not a proper means by which to settle these great and delicate duties and difficulties among nations. If this step is taken to-day, we will be fighting over it in this country the rest of the year, embroiling our people with all the world. Our great mission is peace. If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I would lay the resolution on the table until there could be more reflection and investigation than we have been able to give to this momentous subject. What grievance, sir, have we as a people against "the Unspeakable Turk," as he has been recently designated? Our State Department has been doing its full duty. We have at the Turkish court a minister whose efficiency and vigilance have received world-wide recognition. He has more influence with the Sultan than any other foreign minister. Not a single American missionary or American citizen has ever been molested or injured by the Kurds.

On the contrary, I am informed that supreme effort has been made by the Turkish Government to jealously guard and protect every American citizen. It is true that some property has there been destroyed—I believe the property of an American college. I will gladly yield for a correction if I am wrong; but I understand that that Government eagerly offers to pay us for the damage, and to reinstate the property. Therefore, so far as our immediate relations to that Government are concerned, we not only have no grievance, but we have to recognize that we are under peculiar obligations to that country for special and particular protection to American citizens and American property. The only question which remains for me to discuss is humane concern for what are called the Armenian Christians. That interest we can safely leave to the executive department in the orderly course of diplomatic intercourse, even resorting to protest and remonstrance if deemed useful or necessary under the laws of nations. Let us take care that we do not endanger our own citizens by inflaming the Kurdish fanatics, nor make still harder the fate of Armenian Christians.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have already addressed the House on the pending resolutions, and I should not again speak but for the importance of the resolutions that are now being considered. I have, Mr. Speaker, the greatest respect for my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER]. I am in the habit of listening to and respecting his views on almost every subject; but I believe the gentleman has unintentionally exaggerated the force and scope of the concurrent resolutions. If I believed that there was any "impertinent intrusion" in these resolutions which have already unanimously, as I am informed, passed the Senate, I should not be in favor of them. These are important times—times when we should be careful—but whenever we are acting in the cause of humanity and justice there is no reason why we should not speak out and announce our views plainly, so that we may be understood not only at home, but also abroad.

We do not in any way criticise what was done when that great treaty of Berlin was adopted, in 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and the nations of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia. We venture simply to say in these resolutions—

That it is an imperative duty in the interest of humanity to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Suppose there was no treaty which this House could ask to have enforced. Then in what way could we make our protest felt by Turkey? In what way could we protest?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. If there was no treaty?

Mr. NORTHWAY. If there was no treaty, how would we protest?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. It seems to me that we have taken the proper course. We have called upon the powers named.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If there was no treaty, could we protest at all as a nation?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. We have called upon the great countries who adopted this treaty to enforce the treaty——

Mr. NORTHWAY. But the gentleman does not answer my inquiry. If there was no such treaty, and such a condition of affairs existed in Turkey as we find now, how could we protest as a nation?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. We probably under those circumstances would protest against the condition of things in Turkey and send our protest to the Sultan.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Why do we not act directly as a nation?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Because the concurrent resolution refers to the Ottoman Empire, as well as Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia; and it is provided in the concurrent resolution that the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, we simply express an earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its effect in such a way as shall stay the hands of fanaticism and lawless violence. I see no objection to a declaration of that kind.

The last resolution declares that the—

Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

I see no objection to that resolution. Information has come to us that an American college, built with the capital of philanthropists who are interested in education and in missionary work in Armenia, has been destroyed. Information comes to us that Americans have had to flee for their lives. Is there any just reason why we should not say, as we have often said, that we would support the President in vigorous action if he should see fit to take it to protect American citizens and American property? I have confidence in the President of the United States. I am sure that he will do nothing imprudent or improper in this connection; and I fail to find in these resolutions anything to alarm representatives in Congress or, as was said by my friend from Georgia, that may jeopardize the interests of our party in the great elections that are to come on this year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it is necessary to make this protest that he speaks of to Turkey, why not make it direct rather than through the countries he enumerates in the resolution? What is the advantage in favor of that course?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. If the gentleman will read the preamble and resolution he will find that only an earnest hope is expressed with regard to the enforcement of the treaty and of our desire to stay the hand of fanaticism and lawlessness; and the treaty referred to was made by the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the question I propounded to the gentleman was, why not make our protest direct to Turkey rather than through these different Governments? What advantage is there in that course?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The supplemental treaty of Berlin, which was adopted in 1878, was made by the Ottoman Empire as well as the other great nations I have named, and all parties to the treaty should be addressed.

Mr. MAHANY. Mr. Speaker, in the speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] I notice that he laid especial stress upon the fact that we are indebted in a marked degree to the Government of Turkey for "special and particular protection to our citizens." I do not apprehend that the people of this Republic are under any especial obligation to the Turkish or to any other Government for not murdering in cold blood citizens of the United States. Nor should we be grateful to any foreign power for refraining from practicing on American citizens such villainies as may be perpetrated on the defenseless subjects of its own sovereignty. This discussion of the Armenian atrocities is not, as I understand it, a religious question, so far as our intervention is concerned. We would take exactly the same stand, did we fulfill

our national duty and our national destiny, whether the victims of these unspeakable and appalling outrages were Jews, or Turks, or devotees of the Hindoo religion, or of any other creed known to men. Our obligation as representatives of this Republic, sitting here in the capital city of a Government which is the representative of civilization and of human progress, instructs us that against these outrages we should protest in the name of general humanity, and not because of any particular class or any particular race or any particular religious profession.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] said that this question, viewed from the standpoint of the signatory powers that participated in the treaty of Berlin, was somewhat in the nature of a contract, in which the obligation concerned only the contracting parties to fulfill or not to fulfill the terms of the agreement; but, if the gentleman from Texas will permit me to observe, there is no contract known to man that will permit either or any of the contracting parties an unlimited license in murder, in brutality, in every conceivable atrocity. [Applause.] International law, in its development, has a tendency to narrow and to crystallize. From time to time great revulsions of human sentiment, great declarations of allegiance to higher principles, sweep aside these crystallizations of outworn conditions and establish new ideas and new phases of thought and action for the government of mankind. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived for us to state squarely and fairly to the Government of Turkey that we, as a civilized nation, in the forefront of human progress and human enlightenment, will not sit idly by and see these outrages perpetrated without at least lifting a manful voice of protest against them.

There is manhood in nations as well as in individuals. If one of you gentlemen sitting in this Hall—if my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] or my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]—were to see a helpless woman or a defenseless child assaulted upon Pennsylvania avenue and did not raise his voice in protest or offer other resistance to prevent the outrage he would be, in the eyes of the law, a participator in the crime; and I say that as the representatives of the United States sitting here in this magnificent Capitol, dedicated to tolerance and to human liberty, we shall be guilty participators in the Armenian outrages and atrocities if we do not lift our voice in protest against the infinite and unspeakable villainies perpetrated by the Turkish Government. My friends who oppose these resolutions have laid great stress upon the view that it is not our duty to interfere in the domestic concerns of foreign nations and that we ought to keep distinctly to ourselves. Well, my friends, if we let these slaughters pass without protest, if we sit here in suppliance, if we sit here in silence and in cowardice while such wrongs shame the eternal heavens, then everything that we stand for among the Governments of earth, all the national mission and destiny to make for truth and freedom which is the just pride of American citizenship, is but the empty phrasing of still emptier words, and that magnificent statue in the harbor of New York which holds up the light of tolerance and of liberty to all the world is a delusion and a lie.

What the distingusihed gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] said is the gist of this whole question. We may with justice and propriety turn aside from the minor considerations of international law and say to the Executive, as the eminent Representative from the State of Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] urges us to say: Give back to the Turkish minister his passports; send him home to the Sublime Porte with the message that the Congress of the freest, the most moral, the most intelligent, and the most tolerant country on earth protests against his outrages on defenseless women and helpless children, and that we want no fraternity with a man or a sovereign whose hands are dripping with the gore of the innocent. [Loud applause.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer, by way of amendment, the resolutions which I will now read:

Resolved, That the conscience of humanity fastens upon the six Christian powers above named the responsibility of the continuance of the butchery of Armenian Christians; that the spectacle of these six leading Christian powers permitting the murder of Christians who by treaty stipulations were placed under their special care is humiliating to the last degree and discredits the Christian religion throughout the world.

Resolved, That the one of the signatory powers which first takes action under the Berlin treaty to prevent the further butchery of defenseless Armenian Christians will receive the grateful recognition not only of the American people but of the entire civilized world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make any remarks upon these amendments at this time. I should adopt everything that has been said by my friend from New York [Mr. QUIGG] and by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] in regard to the necessity of passing these resolutions; but it seems to me that in criticising the Turk we are letting escape the powers that are really responsible for these outrages. For this reason my amendments bring home the responsibility to these powers, and if any one of the signatory powers will take the first step to put a stop to these atrocities that power ought to receive the grateful recognition of our people.

Mr. GROSVENOR was recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). Before the gentleman from Ohio proceeds the Chair will ask his colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who proposes an amendment, to send it up in order that it may be read from the Clerk's desk.

The amendment offered by Mr. TAFT was again read as above.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, we seem to have reached a stage in this debate where we have three lines of opinion before us for consideration; one of them apparently represented by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], protesting, in substance, against all action by this House or by this country; another, the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], in which I most cordially concur, and the third represented by the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to speak a few words on the subject of this report and the particular attitude in which it will put the House if the report should be adopted, as I understand it will be by a very large majority.

What is alleged in this preamble to justify the interference of the United States of America in this matter in any way whatever? I take it that the stream of the resolution will not rise above the source of the preamble, and if that be so, then we put ourselves in one of the most awkward, absurd, and ridiculous positions ever assumed by a legislative body, and we place ourselves there because of a shuddering, shivering cowardice on the part of this legislative body to speak the sentiments of the American people, to speak the sentiments of Christian civilization, and to open our mouths in protest against the unspeakable crimes which have been recited.

If it be true that in all this devastation, in all this storm of murder in which 30,000 lives have been sacrificed, no citizen of the United States has been affected, why should we speak? If the United States or any of its citizens have been affected by some act of Turkey, why not say so? What is there about the Turkish character, the Turkish Government, the Turkish nation, that should demand of the people of the United States silence in the face of the awful reports that come to us, undenied, of the brutality and criminality of that nation as a nation? And yet the committee has reported a series of preambles and asks us to act upon them affirmatively, dodging every question that would offend "the Unspeakable Turk."

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman from Ohio point to a single instance in which any American citizen has been treated improperly or his property treated improperly in that country?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not here on that business. I can not understand the pertinency of that remark. If what the gentleman intimates be true, I am coming to that question, and I am saying that if it shall be true, then we have nothing to do with the subject-matter.

Mr. COX. I am agreeing with the gentleman all along the line.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well; but you will not agree with me after a little while. [Laughter.] We will come to the forks of the road directly.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman point to an instance of any American citizen who has been treated improperly over there?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is not pertinent to my present inquiry.

Mr. COX. I thought it was pertinent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, it is not. It will be later on. I am talking, Mr. Speaker, about the report of the committee. I am challenging that committee to tell us this: If no citizen of the United States has been despoiled in property or limb or life, upon what ground do you place our interference?

Mr. COX. That is my question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The committee have been exceedingly careful; they have been so careful and delicate that they might have traveled into this House with this report stepping on eggs and damaging no property by doing so. We not only find, Mr. Speaker, that no allegation is made against Turkey, but that we are carefully avoiding any indorsement of anything that anybody else has said. The committee have first set out the treaty to which we are not a party, and then have said:

Whereas the extent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers parties thereto having established, under the consent of Turkey, their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres, of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims: Therefore—

Is not that put upon the ground that it is none of our business

whatever; that it is the business of some other people, and we are calling on them to attend to their business—not our business? Now, is not that about as contemptible a position as any great nation on God's earth ever put itself in? We are not ready to say to the people of the world that we have a voice in this matter; we are not willing to say that as a great nation of 70,000,000 people we protest in our name to the criminals. We do not say that; but we say: "Inasmuch as you have undertaken to guarantee the protection of your citizens and inasmuch as your citizens have been interfered with, therefore we call upon you to attend to your business in behalf of protecting the Christian subjects of the Sublime Porte."

Mr. QUIGG. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will, and in doing so, I treat the gentleman more respectfully than he has treated me under like circumstances.

Mr. QUIGG. I accept the gentleman's rebuke and thank him for his kindness. The gentleman misstates, I think, just what this resolution proposes to do. The Christian sovereigns of Europe have engaged not simply to protect their own citizens, which each nation is understood to be able to do for itself, and which we have succeeded in doing for ourselves pretty well, but the question presented by the present situation is as to what is going on in other people's households. Certain nations have undertaken to protect the subjects of the Ottoman Government from the Ottoman Government and from other subjects of the Ottoman Government; and that Government has agreed that this right of supervision shall be exercised. The resolution which we present simply inquires why those nations and the Ottoman Government do not do as they have agreed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the remark of my friend has rendered necessary any change in my line of argument, or that he has met any of the objections I have made. My point is this: Why does not this committee embody in the preamble of this resolution a charge, definitely stating that somebody has been robbed or killed or maltreated in some way? Why attempt now to shield ourselves behind the duty of certain European powers?

My point on this proposition is this: If the outrages committed in Turkey are so great as to call upon us to demand the execution of the provisions of that treaty by the other powers of Europe, why may we not, in a proper manner, protest to Turkey herself, directly, against the outrages she has committed? Why may we not say to Turkey in some sort of diplomatic language, that will mean a little something, "You have murdered 30,000 people for no other reason than that they were Christians and did not belong to the religion of your nationality. We in America protest to you against it as an outrage and protest in the name of Christian civilization." Why should we call upon other nations of Europe to do that which we have a perfect right to do for ourselves?

Mr. MORSE. Give us an amendment like that and we will vote for it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is not all. Why may we not say to a nation that murders 30,000 people in a very few months' time, by a line of atrocities that has stirred the blood of the American people as nothing has ever done heretofore, except it be the recitation of the murders committed in the Wyoming Valley and other scenes in our own country by the Indians under the stimulus of the same nation that stands across the pathway of the protection of Christians in Turkey—why may we not protest, in thunder tones, against such treatment as that, by saying to that sort of a nation, "We do not want anything to do with you." [Applause.]

You will not allow a Chinaman to come to this country; we legislate against it; but, Mr. Speaker, for my own part I would rather have 10,000 Chinamen to come every month than that for one moment my country should stand abashed and cowardly in the presence of the outrages committed by the Turkish Empire. [Applause.]

But the answer to that comes from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG], who made this report. It would not do to protest against an outrage direct to the Turkish Government, because it would insult and offend the Turk. It will not do to withdraw diplomatic relations with that country, because it would offend and insult Turkey; and thereupon comes this most singular argument, and I ask your attention to it: If you assert the manhood of the American people there is danger that Turkey will murder somebody in retaliation. We are told that that is an argument against the course I have suggested.

But, Mr. Speaker, what an argument is that! We are holding diplomatic relations with a country of whom a Representative on this floor says there is imminent danger—and, knowing the character of the animal well, he can estimate it—that if we withdraw all such relationship and show that we do not want anything to do with them—telling them, "you are murderers," "you do not respect your treaties," "you are nothing but a set of bandits and criminals"—then if we do that they tell us that the Turk is such a character that he will at once proceed to murder American citizens, now in Turkey, by way of retaliation. Now, let us apply that argument. Let us examine it for a moment. The ad absurdum of the argument is apparent to every intelligent man who considers it even for a moment. If that be the rule of diplomatic action on the part of a great Government like ours, when will the time come when the American people may assert their rights and dignity? The American citizen is all over the world; he is in all European countries, he is in Asia, in Africa, in Oceanica, in all of the islands of the sea. We are estopped to protest, in our own way, in our own manner, against the character of Turkey's treatment of other people, her outrages against civilization, her murder of 30,000 Christians in a few months' time under circumstances of the utmost atrocity and cruelty, and done apparently by the acquiescence, even the direction, of the Turkish Government itself, and we dare not protest lest our own citizens be murdered in retaliation!

Well, Mr. Speaker, that has not been the course of the United States as she has pursued it hitherto. When Chile insulted our flag and shot some of our sailors we did not wait to see what the effect of a demand for redress would be upon the American residents there. We did not take time to speculate on that problem. We did not ask, will Chile arrest some of our people and punish them? We sent a war ship, two or three of them, down there, and an Administration of this country that respected the flag and understood something of the diplomatic proprieties gave immediate notice that matters should be set right instanter, and if not that he would bombard their principal town. He did not stop and wait and inquire what were the possibilities of injury to American citizens there. He did not stop to inquire whether Americans were to be held as hostages or not.

The argument is now that Turkey has hostages in the person of our representatives abroad. Turkey, we are told, has in her camp some of our prisoners and they will be scalped and burned at the stake. You must not disturb the peace and harmony of the Emperor of Turkey, because they are such a peculiar people, they are such a class of men, they belong to such a peculiar race of people, that if the United States should protest against the outrages already committed they might work destruction, and kill some of our American citizens and burn American property. And so, in the face of this dire threat, the protest comes that we must waive our manhood, we must sink our national independence and make our protest through somebody else who will transmit our language lest the deadly Turk should drive his scimiter, already gory with the blood of 30,000 Christians, into the bodies of some of our own people.

We have in that way on this floor to-day given notice to Turkey how she can protect herself. She needs no ships, she needs no army, she needs nothing but her murderous purpose. She has been informed by distinguished gentlemen, representatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that she has a means of redress in her own hands. They have said, "Go on, Mr. Turk, with your outrages, murder as much as you please, disgrace civilization, kill and burn, and we dare not do anything, for you have hostages in your camp, and we fear you will kill our people; and therefore, in the interest of saving the lives of American people who are to-day in the Ottoman Empire, we will make ourselves contemptible in the sight of the world." That is this whole case in a nutshell, as put by the gentlemen who are advocating the adoption of these resolutions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I adopt the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] who made this report. There is nothing in these resolutions; and when a great nation, when a great power like the United States opens its mouth to say something and says nothing, she has lowered herself in the estimation of all the nations of the world. Let foreign diplomacy take hold of this insignificant paper. Let foreign diplomats analyze the meaning of all this, and what have you got? You have an enunciation, coming from the champion of this resolution, speaking, I take it, by authority of the committee, that they dare not attack Turkey lest Turkey shall retaliate against the United States. I should like to have the gentleman tell me when the time will come that that argument will not be an absolute barrier to an expression of the manly independence of this Government against any nation on the face of the earth?

It is said that Turkey has responded to some of our demands, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] asks me specifically to state some place and time where an American has been murdered. Why, my understanding is that the situation is about this: Numbers of our missionaries have been murdered, their property has been destroyed, the American college in one of the towns, says the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], was burned up. The burden of proof, the onus probandi, is upon the gentlemen who are defending Turkey upon this floor. It is upon the attorneys for Turkey, who are trying to palliate the crime of Turkey, to tell us who it was they paid for. Give us the language

of their apology. Tell us when it was that they paid for an American college destroyed. Tell us when it was that these missionaries were protected. Some of them were from my own State, and they were driven out, fleeing at the point of the bayonet or of the saber. Let these gentlemen tell me when the Turks restored one dollar of that property or made a demand for the protection of one of these people.

Mr. COX. Will my friend yield to me for one moment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. COX. If anything of that kind has occurred to an American citizen, in his person or his property, you can not make your resolution so strong that I will not vote for it——

Mr. GROSVENOR. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs——

Mr. COX. Wait a moment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will wait five.

Mr. COX. But has it not been conceded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG]—I hope I will have the attention of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, the gentleman has my close attention.

Mr. COX. I do not know whether I will entertain the gentleman or not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You always entertain me.

Mr. COX. Has it not been conceded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] that not an American citizen or his property has been disturbed?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not responsible for what the gentleman from New York has said.

Mr. QUIGG. No such thing has been said by me.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not heard any such concession.

Mr. COX. Wait a moment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The strongest statement was made——

Mr. COX. We will take care of ourselves when we come to the point. You will not go further than I in the protection of American citizens. Now, who has been despoiled of his property or his rights?

Mr. QUIGG. I stated to the House the official information conveyed by the Secretary of State, in answer to a Senate resolution, which, of course, is as open to the gentleman from Tennessee as to me——

Mr. COX. Of course.

Mr. QUIGG. And if the gentleman from Tennessee will take the trouble to read that, he will discover that the Secretary of State says that in several instances the property of American citizens has been destroyed.

Mr. COX. Let me ask you one question. Has not that Government offered to repay—to compensate for everything of that kind?

Mr. QUIGG. So the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] has said.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, I ask you.

Mr. QUIGG. I have not heard of any such offer. What I said was that the Turkish Government did not deny the responsibility for losses of property on account of these riots. We have presented our claim in one case and have our claims still to present in other cases, and these claims——

Mr. COX. I am with you in feeling, but——

Mr. SAYERS. Let the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] finish his answer.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should like to have the gentleman finish his statement, of course, but I do not desire to yield possession of the floor.

Mr. HITT. May I answer that question?

Mr. QUIGG. I had nearly finished. The closing sentence which I wished to say was this: We have presented one claim for damages, as I understand the fact to be. We are presenting other claims for damages, and the Government of Turkey has not denied its responsibility.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Nor admitted it.

Mr. COX. I want to know whether that goes in or not.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. The reporter has it.

Mr. COX. Now, hold a minute there.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I decline to be interrupted.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me while I get the point developed?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I desire to be perfectly courteous to the gentleman, but he is making a speech.

Mr. COX. No, I am not. I am trying to get you to the point.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then I decline the assistance of the gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I want to emphasize this point.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If I can not locate the point, I can not be helped by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. COX. You will not do that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What do you want to ask me?

Mr. COX. I want to get at this point: Is there an American citizen that has had any claim against the Government over there that has not been compensated or assured that he would be?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have already said, if the gentleman has not misunderstood me, that it is a matter of public knowledge that American citizens have been despoiled in property, that missionaries from my own State have been murdered, and that the burden of proof is upon the other side to show that Turkey has done anything about it. [Applause.] That is the point I make. Colleges have been burned. I do not care to go into details. But if a single American citizen has been wronged, that is enough to allow this country to demand reparation, and to demand it very quick; to demand it as promptly as we demanded it of Chile; to demand it from a big nation or a small nation, hovered over by the greatest nation on earth, if you please, and send our ships and our demand and come to an issue upon the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. That is all right. I agree with you on that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not believe in apologies to the Turkish Government by this House.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I understand the facts to be as I have alleged them. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the committee, stated to-day, as I understand, the general concession that would be made. He did not refer to the murders that had been made public. He did speak of the despoiling of property, and that the demands were made; and all that the gentlemen who are more fully advised of it than we are able to say is that Turkey has not denied its obligations. That is all. Is not that a beautiful position to put ourselves into? Is that the protection to the American citizen that we are talking about? As a distinguished Senator said the other day with wonderful force, which thrilled the whole United States, "There is but one redeeming feature of the national character of the British Government, and what seems to be more striking about that characteristic is that it has absorbed all that characteristic from the English-speaking people—that is, the characteristic that follows with guns and ships and declarations of war every British subject, in every corner of the earth, and protects him and vindicates him from outrage, oppression, murder, and violation of property."

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me to say "amen"?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well; the gentleman says "amen." There is no "amen" in this thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. All right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not a word of "amen" there; there is not so much as "Lord be merciful to us sinners."

Mr. COX. You are right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I denounce it as a most inefficient, incomplete, and unworthy utterance of the American people. They have asked us for bread, and we are giving them a stone. They have asked us for the fish of a Christian nation's powerful protest, and we have given them the serpent of an abject falling down and apology at the feet of the Turkish Government. I protest that these resolutions are inadequate; and, while I will not put myself in the attitude of saying that we have no right to make a protest, while I do not stand upon the same ground as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], I hope that, in the interest of American manhood, the committee will withdraw this report and give us something that will impress upon the American people the idea that we are not apologists for crime, but are defenders of civilization the world over. [Great applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield three minutes of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania later.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 4690) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

OUTRAGES IN ARMENIA.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, either American citizens have suffered from the outrages in Turkey in common with citizens of other countries as well as of Turkey itself, or they have not. If they have, and the Committee on Foreign Relations has had before it for such a length of time various resolutions upon this subject and has failed to ascertain the true facts, then that committee, and that committee alone, will be responsible for anything that we do upon the subject in this House. The main question presents several delicate considerations. In the first place, it involves the right of this nation, which has always been maintained and I trust always will be maintained, to protect its own citizens in any corner of the globe. It involves, further, the right of this nation to go beyond

that—and this is the real question in the case—our right to go beyond that and listen to the complaints of those who are subjects of the Sultan himself, and who allege that their rights, which are guaranteed by treaties with the great European powers, as well as their natural rights, which all men must recognize, have been and are being constantly violated by the outrages perpetrated on the men and the women of that nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that when a natural right is violated—and when I say a natural right I mean a right that no State can give and no State can take away—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which our own Declaration says is inalienable and which no State has ever given and no State can take away—when these natural rights have been violated and when the invasions of them are continual and habitual, I contend that we, as a civilized nation, have a right to enter such a protest as we see fit, going even to the verge of a declaration of war. I say, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I for one believe that these resolutions are inadequate; inadequate to protect our own citizens when they have suffered from these outrages, inadequate to protect the citizens of any other country too cowardly to protect its own people, inadequate to protect those who are being murdered by the thousands, who are not citizens of any civilized European power, but subjects of Turkey itself, and in whose behalf most of the sympathy has been aroused in this country.

I remember reading in the speeches of Daniel Webster how in times gone by, during the Greek revolution, when we had no representatives in that part of the world, it was proposed to send a special commissioner for the purpose of protecting the people from massacres such as those which have been perpetrated recently upon the Armenians. I did not intend to speak at all upon this question, but I feel impelled to say that in my opinion the resolutions before the House are too tame. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that we should go further. I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs should ascertain and determine what power this country can exercise in the matter, and if we can use any power, either by persuasion or force. I believe that we ought to go to the very limit of its exercise in behalf of the people who are now suffering these terrible persecutions.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Would the gentleman substitute for these resolutions a declaration of war?

Mr. WALSH. I would not substitute a declaration of war unless the proper authorities decided that we could declare war on this account, and unless it appeared that that was the only thing that would stop these outrages. In that case I would. That I regard, however, at present as extreme and unnecessary, but I can imagine circumstances that would justify it.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Who are "the proper authorities"?

Mr. WALSH. I should suppose they were the State Department and the committees of the two Houses of Congress on our foreign relations.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM].

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this whole question should be considered with this object in view: This being a joint resolution it will require the approval of the Executive, and it should be so framed as to receive it.

Mr. DINGLEY. These are concurrent resolutions, and under the practice they need not be signed by the Executive. They are a mere expression of opinion by the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is some dispute about that. I have made inquiry on the subject, and I am going now upon the theory that such resolutions as these do require the approbation of the Executive. At all events, it is plain that without the cooperation of the executive department of the Government a resolution of this kind, if adopted by Congress, would be entirely nugatory—would amount to nothing. The question for us to consider, therefore, in framing the resolutions which we are to adopt is not merely what opinions we desire to express on behalf of the Senate and the House, but what opinions will be approved by the executive arm of the Government with reference to this subject. And here let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that if we had had a James G. Blaine in the State Department no resolutions of this kind would have been brought to either House; nor would they have been necessary. The fault lies in that direction. If these resolutions, or the amendment presented by the gentleman from Iowa, so drastic in its nature, should pass, they would be an absolute nullity, except so far as regards the expression of the sentiment embodied in them.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. The third clause of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution reads:

> Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and, before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or, being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

Mr. BRUMM. So, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that my position is correct as to these resolutions requiring the approval of the Executive. Now, that being the case, ought we not to consider how far we can get the present Executive to go with us in this matter? What is the use of discussing this question here and passing resolutions which we know will not meet the approval of the Executive? It seems to me that we ought to stop all discussion of this character and adopt the resolutions of the Senate as reported to the House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That, I think, is the only practical solution of the question, and whatever good it may do, let it operate to that extent. Anything beyond that is, under the circumstances, mere buncombe and nonsense, because it can not receive the approval of the Executive.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in the treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, we find that the parties were the Ottoman Empire, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Prussia. I am unable to understand how a treaty by those powers can bind the United States. We should at that time, in the interest of humanity and civilization, have demanded, not only as one of the great powers, but as the great power of the world, to be a party to that treaty. England and Russia stand to-day with their eyes upon Armenia. Thirty thousand people have been murdered. Living babes have been torn from the wombs of dead mothers and impaled upon the picks of the Kurds. Thirty thousand more are to be murdered, and then thrice 30,000, and England and Russia will then step in to divide the land. The Christian people on this side of the Atlantic stand appalled when they read of these crimes against the Armenians. England, Russia, and the other nations of the Old World, who are parties to the treaty of 1878, will do nothing until the time shall come when these cruelties have gone so far that the dismemberment of European Turkey shall be demanded by all Christendom, and then England and Russia will occupy and parcel out between each other the land of the once proud but now "Unspeakable Turk."

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution as it comes from the Senate, but will do so under protest. These Armenians are among the oldest Christian people of the earth, and as when a boy at Sunday school I learned with horror of the edict of Herod when the babes of Bethlehem were murdered, so I look with horror to-day upon the murders committed in Armenia, and I believe this great Christian Republic, where the broadest religious liberty is tolerated should protest, not only by words, but by deeds, against the most gigantic and horrible persecutions and murder of these inoffensive Christians, and though the United States was not a party to the treaty, it would be a wise, Christian, humanitarian policy for the great squadron that lazily rides at anchor in Hampton Roads to-day to pass the Dardanelles and make a demonstration upon Constantinople. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe, with Lowell, that—

> Mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,
> Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
> Whether conscious or unconscious, yet humanity's vast frame
> Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame;
> In the gain or loss of one race, all the rest have equal claim.

[Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY].

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Speaker, I should be untrue to my convictions and those of my people if I did not avail myself of this debate to say a single word by way of expressing the sentiments of the people of my district in Connecticut upon this question. During the last four or five weeks—yes, for a longer time—the people of my district and of the city of New Haven have been holding mass meetings upon this question of Armenian outrages. They are fully aroused. Not only have they held meetings, but they have memorialized Congress; they have sent here letters and resolutions asking that we take some steps toward the amelioration of the condition of the Armenians. Not only are my constituents adopting resolutions, not only are they sending petitions to this body, but during the last few weeks they have been passing subscription papers from house to house for the purpose of raising money to send it to these suffering Christians. The people of my district, so far as I understand, are ready to take any step that they can legally, properly, and morally take, which will suppress, or assist in suppressing, the Armenian outrages now practiced by the Turks and Kurds.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOWE].

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would be recreant to the voice of my constituents and recreant to the voice of humanity if I failed to join in expressing my emphatic condemnation of the indignities and outrages which have been inflicted upon innocent people

in Armenia. The Armenians in their sufferings and in their heroism are but typical of the men who have stood in all ages for liberty, for the right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. We have the evidence here that thousands of men, women, and children have been slaughtered without mercy; and a demand comes across the sea bidding us in the name of God to heed the cry of those suffering people and succor them. It is our duty as the representatives of the people to heed that cry and to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that this Government has no grievance. Sir, the civilization of the nineteenth century has a grievance; and its voice should go out with emphasis from this body, speaking not only to the Turks, but to Englishmen and Frenchmen: "Get thee behind; and if necessary let Russia take full possession and divide up this foul spot of iniquity and efface it from the map of the world." [Applause.]

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. TAFT, it was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on agreeing to the Senate resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. I move to refer this Senate resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 55, noes 103.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. I move to commit the Senate concurrent resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to strike out all after the words "concurrent resolution," and report back the matter which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The SPEAKER. The resolution of instructions will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Government of the United States that the Government of Turkey take such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Government of Turkey.

Resolved further, That the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senate concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

Mr. BAILEY. On that resolution, Mr. Speaker, I ask a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that proposition debatable?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, are the instructions amendable?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I move, then, to strike out the last resolution proposed.

Mr. BAILEY. I am content with that modification, and will withdraw the concluding part of the resolution.

Mr. MILES. Let it be read as modified.

The SPEAKER. It will be read as now modified by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Government of the United States that the Government of Turkey take such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them as men and Christians.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. BAILEY. I will detain the House only long enough to say that in my view of the question a treaty stipulation entered into between the Government of Turkey and the other contracting parties is a matter with which the United States has no concern. The Government of the United States could have been a party to that treaty, but in obedience to our traditional policy it declined to do so; and I do not think it now proper to insist upon the enforcement of treaty obligations to which this Government is not a party and in which it declined to take a part.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield to a question for information?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. I wish to ask if the Government of the United States was invited to become a party to that treaty?

Mr. BAILEY. All powers were.

Mr. HITT. Is the gentleman quite sure of that fact?

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution and the motion to commit, as proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I make the point of order that the motion would not be in order, as the gentleman from Texas has the floor.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Texas, as the Chair understood, had yielded the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. I did, and only resumed it to answer an inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. So the Chair understood; and it was after the gentleman had yielded the floor that the Chair recognized the gentleman from New York for his motion.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to commit this matter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the instructions which have been read.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to offer a substitute for the resolution of the gentleman from Texas?

The SPEAKER. It would not, as the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. OWENS. My motion would be to refer it, the idea being not to take it from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but to refer it back to that committee with instructions to embrace the protest directed to the Turkish Government.

The SPEAKER. That motion would not be in order after the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. OWENS. I know; but whatever the House now proposes the committee must report back. My intention was to leave it all to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the gentleman's proposition is not now admissible.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will permit me, the House had already voted down the general motion to recommit, anyway.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] to refer the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the instructions already reported to the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 41, noes 119.

So the motion of Mr. BAILEY was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. QUIGG. That has already been voted on. The question is on the original resolution.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was absent for a moment, and supposed that was still pending. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. TURNER of Georgia,) there were—ayes 143, noes 26.

Accordingly the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. QUIGG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

POST GRADUATE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill S. 650.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, desires to call up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

An act (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That Henry L. E. Johnson, Edmund L. Tompkins, J. Foster Scott, William W. Johnston, Samuel C. Busey, Charles W. Richardson, James Kerr, Middleton F. Cuthbert, Edward M. Parker, G. Wythe Cook, G. Byrd Harrison, Samuel S. Adams, George N. Acker, W. Holland Wilmer, Henry D. Fry, J. Ford Thompson, and Thomas E. McArdle, their associates and successors, physicians, be, and they are hereby, made a corporation by the name of Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia, with all the powers and privileges, and subject to all the duties, liabilities, and restrictions set forth in this act.

SEC. 2. That the said corporation may hold real and personal estate to the amount of $200,000.

SEC. 3. That the said Post Graduate School of Medicine is hereby empowered, from time to time, to make such by-laws, rules, and regulations as they may find necessary, and do and perform such other things as may be requisite for carrying this act into effect, and which may not be repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the said Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia is hereby endowed with all the rights, privileges, and immunities that appertain to other medical schools of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ODELL] who reported the bill.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill has for its object the incorporation of the Post Graduate School of Medicine, to enable graduates of medical colleges and those studying medicine to attain a higher degree of proficiency. It has the approval of the District Commissioners, and is in line with the more advanced ideas prevailing in larger cities. It has no power to grant diplomas. The bill has been considered by the District Committee and meets with their unanimous approval.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ODELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I understand, this bill simply proposes to incorporate this institution. It does not vote any money out of the Treasury?

Mr. ODELL. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not see any objection to the bill. Is the institution authorized to confer medical degrees?

Mr. ODELL. No; it does not issue any diplomas at all.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is a post graduate school of medicine?

Mr. ODELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. For those who have graduated in other colleges?

Mr. ODELL. Yes.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. If this school can grant no diplomas or degrees, what does the last section mean, which confers all the rights, powers, and immunities of other medical schools in the District of Columbia? They all confer degrees.

Mr. ODELL. The institution has the power to grant a certain certificate of attendance.

Mr. BABCOCK. It is a post-graduate course, and has the same authority to confer degrees or diplomas as any medical school would have.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I do not know that that may be an objection to the bill, but certainly the bill does grant to this school of medicine the right to issue diplomas and to confer degrees. Section 4 authorizes it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What objection is there to that?

Mr. MAHON. A post-graduate school ought to confer them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The students at that school are those who have graduated at other colleges?

Mr. ODELL. They are the only ones who are admitted.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If they want two diplomas why should they not have them?

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to say in reference to this measure that it simply provides for a post-graduate medical course. In nearly every city in the United States where there are medical schools this course is provided, but there is no such school in the city of Washington. It proposes a course of bedside training, to fit medical graduates for practice, and it would naturally confer diplomas showing the course that had been taken. This bill passed the Senate on the 10th day of January, and has been fully considered by the committee. The incorporators are representative citizens of the District, and there is no opposition of any kind to the measure; at least none has been developed.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Can this college grant diplomas to any persons except students who take that course?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; nobody except their own graduates.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. One further question, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I observe that this is to be limited to those who have already received a degree of M. D. Will the gentleman point to a provision in this bill where there is any such limitation? It bears the name "post graduate," but there is nothing else in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. They have to be graduates in order to take a post-graduate course.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. But this does not say so.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is covered by it. They have already graduated.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It does not make any difference.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let them have their other degree.

Mr. HULICK. I desire to ask the gentleman a question, and that is whether all the different schools of medicine in the District of Columbia are represented here, and can they have their graduates come into this post-graduate institution, and each of them be respected and have their graduation recognized?

Mr. BABCOCK. The committee understood that this bill received the approval of the entire profession in the city of Washington.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There can not be any danger about having too many colleges, especially where it does not cost anything.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood;

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

FAILURE OF COLONIZATION OF NEGROES IN MEXICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with copies of all correspondence of record, relating to the failure of the scheme for the colonization of negroes in Mexico, necessitating their return to their home in Alabama.

I referred to this matter in my message to Congress at the beginning of the present session, and for the reasons then given I again urge the propriety of making an appropriation to cover the cost of transportation furnished by the railroad companies.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 27, 1896.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a question of order. The message, I suppose, will be ordered printed, and it will be printed in the RECORD. Whether that will include all the correspondence and accompanying papers, or simply the message of the President, ought to be determined now, in order that there may be no such mistake as occurred before, when the message and the accompanying papers were printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to make a report.

The SPEAKER. The correspondence will not be printed in the RECORD. The message will be printed in the RECORD, and the message and accompanying papers will be printed as an executive document.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HULL. Pending that, I would like to get a change of reference of a bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. A parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know if the gentleman will permit me to secure the reference of a special report as to Allegheny River, to have it referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Can not that be done before we adjourn?

The SPEAKER. It can not be made as a matter of right.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will withdraw the motion for one moment, simply for these two purposes.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman withdraws the motion he must withdraw it entirely.

Mr. DINGLEY. I withdraw the motion.

BOARD OF MANAGERS OF SOLDIERS' HOMES.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that that part of the report of the Board of Managers referring to the appropriation, or calling for an appropriation, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and that the administrative portion of the report be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks that the administrative part of the report of the governors of the Soldiers' Homes be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that that part relating to the appropriations be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STEELE. And the same order with reference to the report for the State homes.

The SPEAKER. And that the same order be made with reference to State homes. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I simply ask that the Speaker refer to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors a communication of the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. It has already been referred.

NATIONAL GUARDS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back the bill (H. R. 4250) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to exchange with the National Guards of the respective States Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1884 for Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1873, with instructions that it be referred to the Committee on the Militia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. LACEY. I have just filed the report accompanying the bill (H. R. 3948) to provide for free homes on lands purchased from the Indian tribes. The minority would like to have four or five days in which to file their views.

The SPEAKER. That requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE IN DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire immediate consideration?

Mr. ODELL. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution of January 14, directing the Doorkeeper of the House to employ Willis Bolls as an additional employee in the document room during the Fifty-fourth Congress, to be paid at the rate of $100 per month out of the contingent fund of the House, to prepare the bills of the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses for binding, as provided for in the act of January 12, 1895, beg to report that they have made investigation of the subject, and respectfully submit and recommend the adoption of the following as a substitute for the same:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ some suitable person as an additional employee in the document room to prepare for binding the bills of the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses, as provided for in the act of January 12, 1895, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,000 per annum during the Fifty-fourth Congress, or that portion thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of said act, out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If this motion is voted down, this matter then comes up for consideration, does it not?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then I hope we will vote the motion down.

Mr. CANNON. That is a speech.

Mr. DINGLEY. We want to know the facts.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. You can get the facts in about three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maine that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Division.

The House divided. Pending the count,

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE said: I desire to make another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This matter, as I understand it, will come up in the morning if not acted upon to-night.

The SPEAKER. It is unfinished business.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the House adjourning.

The SPEAKER. The demand for a division is withdrawn; the ayes have it. Pending the announcement, the Chair desires to present the following requests of members:

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRAPER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. DOVENER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUFF, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PENDLETON, for one day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SORG, for one week, on account of important business.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Allegheny River, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Judge-Advocate-General of the Army, transmitting a suggestion for an amendment to a draft of a bill to amend the summary court act—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a bill for employing expert counters to assort and count money in the redemption division of the Treasury Department, and recommending the passage of the same—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, inclosing a copy of a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments asking for an additional clerk—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Auditor for the State and other Departments amending his estimate submitted of salaries—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Capital Traction Company, submitting a report of the receipts and expenditures of the Rock Creek Railway Company from January 1, 1895, to December 31, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to the House resolution of the 22d instant, a copy of the report of Henry W. Elliott (together with all maps and illustrations accompanying said report) on the condition of the fur-seal fisheries—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Natalie Eppstein, administratrix, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mrs. Hattie E. Ladd against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William P. Shelton against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry L. Mitchell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars, as follows:

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4442) to amend the act of June 3, 1878, entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory," as amended by section 2 of the act of August 4, 1892, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 137); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred House bill No. 4073, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 4804) to amend subdivision 10 of section 2238 and to repeal subdivision 12 of section 2238 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, accompanied by a report (No. 138); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 796) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 139); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 790) to aid the public-land States to support schools of mines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 140); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Florida, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 141); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RUSK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred House joint resolution No. 87, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act approved March 2, 1895, accompanied by a report (No. 142); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4142) to protect settlement rights where two or more persons settle upon the same subdivision of agricultural public lands before survey thereof, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report

(No. 144); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STRODE of Nebraska, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war, approved July 27, 1892, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 145); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3948) to provide for free homes on lands purchased from the Indian tribes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 147); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3656) providing for free homesteads on the public lands in Oklahoma Territory for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 148); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The bill (H. R. 3596) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McKenna. (Report No. 131.)

The bill (H. R. 3292) granting an honorable discharge to Seth Porter Church, alias Samuel Church. (Report No. 132.)

The bill (H. R. 2054) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and to grant him an honorable discharge. (Report No. 133.)

By Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to Williamson Durley. (Report No. 135.)

By Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2142) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Werner. (Report No. 134.)

By Mr. DENNY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1741) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company. (Report No. 136.)

By Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 377) for the relief of George W. Harbaugh. (Report No. 143.)

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, adversely reported (Report No. 130) the bill (H. R. 2305) to correct the military record of Kyrhiam Morrissey, of Uniontown, Fayette County, Pa.; and the same was, under the rule, laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4778) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 4780) to establish the Washington Homeopathic Medical College—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4781) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River," approved February 18, 1893—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 4782) to establish a life-saving station at or near Charlevoix, Mich.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4783) to prohibit the further issue of bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) to provide a postal currency, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 4786) to extend the provisions of the act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods to the port of Fall River, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 4787) to establish the port of Conneaut, in the State of Ohio, as a subport of entry in the district of Cuyahoga, in said State of Ohio—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 4788) to retain and admit veterans of the Union Army and Navy to positions in the public service, exempting them from examinations under civil-service regulations therefor, and repealing certain laws—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4789) to regulate internal-revenue assessments and to modify the law so as to leave the matter to a jury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4790) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of New Brunswick, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 4791) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4792) to provide for the revision and consolidation of the statute laws of the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. LEISENRING: A bill (H. R. 4793) for the purchase of ground and the erection of a public building at Wilkesbarre, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4794) for the erection of a public building at Northampton, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) to provide that superintendents of United States armories shall be civilians—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4796) to provide for the reclamation of arid lands, and to amend section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4797) to provide compensation to the reporter of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 4798) to establish an additional navigable channel from a point on the North Branch of the Chicago River to Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4799) to issue silver certificates against the silver bullion now in the Treasury—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4800) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4801) to improve the Missouri River at and near Glasgow, Mo., and for other purposes, and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) to improve the Missouri River at and near Miami, Mo., and for other purposes, and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) to improve the Missouri River at and near Rocheport, Mo., and for other purposes, and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 4805) providing for the establishment of a subtreasury of the United States at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4806) to supply courts for the Indian reservations, and to supplement the act approved February 8, 1887—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 4807) for the erection of a public building at Georgetown, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Building and Grounds.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4808) to increase the efficiency of the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4809) making appropriations, etc., to the Marine Hospital at Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOOKER: (H. R. 4956) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River in line with Massachusetts avenue extended eastward—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4957) to refer certain claims for postage paid to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4958) for the incorporation of the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the diocese of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4959) to repeal section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) relating to the compensation and duties of United States attorneys, clerks, marshals, and other court officials, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 4962) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4963) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims for the use and occupation of church and school buildings and grounds for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials in said class of buildings—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of War to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLUE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 99) to supply the State of Kansas with copies of the muster rolls of the Third and Fourth regiments of Kansas Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 100) for printing a report on wools at the World's Columbian Exposition—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LINTON: A resolution (House Res. No. 135) for the recognition of the Cuban patriots as belligerents by the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A resolution (House Res. No. 136) calling for information from the President relative to the case of Bernard Campbell—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills and petitions; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 549) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Downing—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4365) to place the name of Mary E. Trimble, of Paola, Kans., on the pension roll—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4107) for the relief of Monroe Stephens—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3755) to increase the pension of Mary C. Thompson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1091) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Lieut. Frederick Schwatka, as a recognition of his services in polar and Alaskan explorations—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1048) for the relief of the late Andrew S. Cove—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Gen. Francis L. Hagadon—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3409) granting a pension and for the relief of Dr. Harrison Wagner—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Statement of A. W. Bishop, of Buffalo, N. Y., with reference to bill for relief of W. S. Riggs—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Resolutions of the New Orleans Board of Trade, indorsing the Squire bill for coast defenses—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorial of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 334—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Several resolutions of the Charleston (S. C.) Cotton Exchange, Young Men's Business League of Charleston, S. C., the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., and two copies of resolutions of the city council of Charleston, S. C., severally favoring the passage of the bill to provide fortifications and other seacoast defenses, introduced by Senator SQUIRE—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 4811) granting a pension to James Donovan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) for the relief of Joseph A. Greenwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) to refer the claim of the owners of the brig *Tally-Ho* to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 4814) granting a pension to Howard M. Parker, of Lenexa, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4815) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Felix G. Duvall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 4816) granting an additional pension to Henry Wheeler, of Troy, N. Y., a veteran of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting an additional pension to John Quinn, late a member of Company K, One hundred and sixty-ninth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 4818) to increase the pension of Mrs. Ellen Key Messersmith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 4819) granting a pension to Thomas J. Windsor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4820) for the relief of William M. White, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South at Shellmound, Marion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4822) for the relief of John M. Hart, of Bourbon County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 4823) for the relief of Margaret O'Donnell, nurse, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4824) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of Alfred Benoit—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) for the relief of Emily R. Webster, of Washington City, D. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4827) for the relief of Daniel T. Wathen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles F. F. Rosenthal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4829) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Henry A. Butler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4830) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Stephen M. Golden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) to carry out the findings of the Court

of Claims in the case of Joseph T. Jenkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Bernard T. Norris, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Robert S. Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James C. Brooke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) for the relief of James Lawn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4836) for the relief of James Lawn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4837) for the relief of Helen Larned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of George W. Davis, by removing charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James T. S. Greenfield—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 4840) amending the military record of James G. Howard, deceased, late captain Company E, Forty-ninth Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) granting a pension to Silas Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of T. J. Pitzer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4843) granting a pension to Anna C. Walquist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) to increase the pension of Beverly B. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of Mrs. Andrew Franklin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) for the relief of John W. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 4847) for the relief of John W. Kennedy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 4848) for the relief of Henry Ware—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4849) for the relief of Battelle & Evans and their legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of Ross M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) for the relief of John T. Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4852) granting a pension to Allen Place—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of John Duncan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4854) granting an increase of pension to John P. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) to provide for the carrying out of the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John Campbell, of Oregon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) granting an increase of pension to John Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 4857) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Fudge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4858) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Francis M. Benson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4859) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting a pension to Marcus M. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 4861) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of William G. Holdrege—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah Rumsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4863) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4864) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Benjamin F. Raiff—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 4865) granting an honorable discharge to John Walsh, Company F, Tenth Regiment Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) to amend the record and issue an honorable discharge to James B. Sanderson, Company C, of the One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment of Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 4867) for the relief of K. Battoe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) for relief of the estate of R. R. Morrison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of Charles S. Hamlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) for the relief of C. J. McConnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) for the relief of the legal representatives of D. G. Hurley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 4872) to correct the military record of Homer C. McCuskey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) granting a pension to W. A. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) granting an increase of pension to John Burlew—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) granting a pension to John W. Pogue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Pollard, widow of William Pollard, late second assistant engineer, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4877) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Reen, widow of Col. Charles Reen, late colonel Ninety-eigth Pennsylvania Regiment—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 4878) for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4879) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth P. Layne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) to remove the charge of desertion against William R. Flannery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of W. C. Scholl, of Stanton, Powell County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of John Waldron, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEFEVER: A bill (H. R. 4883) for the relief of Martha S. Carmichael, of Mississippi, for property destroyed by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 4884) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Nicholas Clarkson, formerly a landsman on board the U. S. S. *Alabama* in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 4885) for the relief of Natalie Epstein, administratrix of John B. Epstein, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEISENRING: A bill (H. R. 4886) removing charge of desertion as to George H. Williams, late of Company H, Eleventh Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Sarah G. Ives—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4888) for the relief of George Hager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4889) granting a pension to John J. Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) granting a pension to Mary L. Bunker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) for the relief of Eber Curtis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4892) granting a pension to Rebecca Delhotal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) granting a pension to John G. Bright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILES: A bill (H. R. 4894) for the relief of James A. Beauchamp, of Salisbury, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4895) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) for the relief of Eben Sayre—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of Amos Dyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) to pension William M. Cheuvront for services in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) to pension William J. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4900) for the relief of James Burnett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4901) to pension Richard Wilcoxton for services in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) for the relief of Hiram Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 4903) for the relief of Hattie A. Beach, child of Erastus D. Beach, late a private in Company H, One hundred and forty-third New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4904) for the relief of L. J. Smith, executor of Elbert Gantt, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Mary O. Planché, of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) for relief of the estate of John N. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 4907) for the relief of James Grace—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4908) directing the Secretary of the Interior to place upon the roll of the Osage tribe of Indians the name of Lewis Benjamin Lessert—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REEVES: A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of A. J. Baker, of Streator, Lasalle County, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting a pension to Cyrus Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4911) to preserve Fort Griswold property in Groton, Conn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry L. Snow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 4913) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Wyse, widow of Lieut. Col. F. O. Wyse—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Henry Logan, of Buena Vista, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4915) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Rudolph Pensteel, alias Rudolph Bernstiel (now deceased), late of Battery D, First United States Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4916) granting an additional pension to Ferdinand V. Graves, late a member of Company D, One hundred and seventeenth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4917) for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 4918) for the relief of Mary E. Gray, of Canton, Madison County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A bill (H. R. 4919) for relief of Lieut. William P. Hogarty, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 4920) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Warren Drake, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 4921) to relieve the North Georgia Agricultural College from the payment of $450 for damaged gun—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4922) for the relief of the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Suffolk, Nansemond County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) for the relief of the legal heirs of Lewis Ellison, of Norfolk, Va., deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 4924) granting an increase of pension to George D. Cook, late of Company K, One hundred and tenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) granting an increase of pension to Franklin I. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4926) for the relief of Charles W. Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Elisha Straub—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) granting a pension to Joseph W. Freese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) granting a pension to Mary J. Secor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) granting a pension to Mary Forward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4931) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Xaver Zeltner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) granting a pension to Anderson Weese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) to restore Capt. William S. Johnson to the pension list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thaddeus Snider—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) granting a pension to Polly P. Clark, widow of John H. Clark, and to pay her the pension due her husband at the time of his death—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) for the payment of bounty to James Pebley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting a pension to William W. Correll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) to increase the pension of Mary Wilkins, dependent mother of Ora B. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) for the relief of M. C. Vinton, administrator of estate of Samuel S. Vinton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) for the payment of bounty to W. H. Lyman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4941) to pension Hester A. Bostwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4942) for the relief of Caroline V. English—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 4943) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Patrick Dougherty, Company A, Thirteenth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 4944) granting a pension to James M. Kercheval—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4945) for the relief of James Grace—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4946) to pension Mrs. Mary A. Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) to refer the claim against the United States of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Huntsville, Ala., to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) to remove charge of desertion from record of George Hadley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) for the relief of George Thomas Hastings—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4950) granting a pension to Jacob Geisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) for the relief of H. T. Bragg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting a pension to Jubal Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4953) to grant a pension to John Thurston, Island Pond, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) to grant Mary Chamberlin, of Chelsea, Vt., a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) for the relief of Henry C. La Point, late a first lieutenant in the Second United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 4964) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Francis M. Gaddy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of H. A. Gaddy, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Nathan H. Knight, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Harmon, late private in Company K, Fifth Maine Volunteers, and Company B, Seventh Maine Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 4969) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those who were killed by the explosion of the gun-cotton factory at the United States torpedo station at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Hugh Watt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 4971) granting a pension to William H. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of James A. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STALLINGS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4973) granting a pension to Frances E. Jost, widow of the late Frederick C. Jost, lieutenant, Company F, First Florida Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: Memorial of the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia, in favor of House bill No. 3129, to establish a free public library—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARHAM: Petition of R. L. James, A. S. Heath, James C. Gale, J. D. Rickard, and other citizens of Monterey, Cal., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Two petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Nassau, N. Y., relative to the sale of intoxicants to immigrants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BLUE: Resolutions of Jim Lane Post, No. 34, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, protesting against discrimination in pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition of J. W. Powell and 300 other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., in favor of amending the immigration laws, and for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of U. S. Grant Ferree and other citizens of Chester County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUCK: Petition of John T. Sawyer and others, relative to pending bills for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: Memorial of seamen of Providence, R. I., against the repeal of the act of February 18, 1895, known as the Maguire bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Farragut Association of Naval Veterans, of Providence, R. I., relative to the retirement of regular soldiers and marines—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of Lieutenant-Governor Baensch, of Wisconsin, together with a memorial signed by the governor of Wisconsin, secretary of state, State treasurer, railroad commissioner, and all the assistants of the various departments, the judges of the supreme court, the military department, educational department, ex-Senators John C. Spooner and Philetus Sawyer, ex-Congressmen R. M. Follett, N. P. Haugen, and many other prominent men of the State, favoring an adequate appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COX: Petition of L. E. Abernathy and others, asking for the passage of a bill for the relief of the Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Manufacturers' Club, of Philadelphia, in favor of legislation for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Ebbert Sutton of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting at Churdan, Iowa, protesting against the outrages in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Three petitions, respectively, of John A. Palan and 41 others, voters of Blandville; W. H. Wilson and 13 others, of Roanoke, and A. H. Davis and 23 others, of Parkers, all of West Virginia, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, five petitions, as follows, Isaiah Rush and 17 others, H. R. Hess and 41 others, W. R. Juvall and 86 others, A. J. Holden and 15 others, and F. E. Davis and 35 others, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Memorial and protest of J. M. McDonald, W. H. Burk, and 80 other pilots of the port and harbor of Charleston, S. C., in the matter of pilotage—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Baum Bros., merchants, and other citizens of the county of Kershaw, S. C., in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of John Bratton and other citizens of the county of Fairfield, S. C., in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ERDMAN: Three petitions of Frank W. Hayes, Harvey G. Myers, H. G. Burky, and others, of Reading, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of L. M. Macey and 300 others, of Minneapolis and vicinity, Minnesota, in favor of a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. W. Hyde and 500 others, of St. Paul and vicinity, Minnesota, for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Joseph Hunter, J. D. Russell, and 70 other citizens of Woodward, Okla., asking for the abolishment of town-site boards—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of 1,000 taxpayers in Lincoln County, Okla, praying for the passage of the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Army and Navy, for pension bill granting $8 per month to every man serving not less than ninety days—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Union Veterans' Political Protective Association of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the passage of the bill to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: Memorial and resolutions of citizens of Lyons Farms, N. J., expressing their abhorrence of the atrocities perpetrated upon the Armenians, and calling for such legislation as shall secure protection to our missionaries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Charles V. Hawes and 60 others, of Ocean County, N. J., asking for the passage of House bill No. 5246 of the Fifty-third Congress, known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions in behalf of the Armenians, adopted by a committee of the Christian churches of Ware, Mass.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution in behalf of the Armenians, adopted by a mass meeting of the citizens of Warren, Mass.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of D. W. Snody and 47 other citizens, of Forestville, Mich., praying for such action as will result in speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, recommending the adoption of such measures as shall give ample protection to the seacoast cities of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions passed at the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Peace Society, December 12, 1895, in favor of setting apart for peace purposes 1 per cent of every appropriation for war purposes (the Army or Navy) for a fund for peace, to be drawn by the President for the purpose of settling difficulties by mediation, arbitration, and conciliation—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the abolition of compulsory pilotage on coastwise vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 345, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the inhuman treatment of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the passage of a bill to secure a better grade of immigrants into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the licensing of masters and chief mates of sail vessels of over 700 tons, as provided in Senate bill No. 180—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, protest of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Watsonville Council, No. 376, Junior Order United American Mechanics, praying for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. B. Conaway and other citizens, of York, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Linton bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition and resolutions of the Nebraska Teachers' State Association, praying for the passage of House bill No. 304 to establish a national university—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of 150 citizens of Indiana County, Pa., praying for the passage of a bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 17 citizens of West Lebanon, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Memorial of the National Board of Trade praying for the passage of the McRae bill regarding forest fires and forest preservation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial recommending legislation to protect the inter-

ests of those whose business relations are affected by the management of subsidized railroads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial asking for such change in the rules of practice in Federal courts as shall prevent action against a defendant in a civil suit unless personal service has been had—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial asking legislation to prevent interested parties from being appointed receivers in bankrupt corporations engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the Stockton Grange, No. 70, Patrons of Husbandry, asking for the early completion of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Thomas Johnson and others in regard to the injustice done settlers on the De Los Palos Coloradas grant, California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Brooklyn Presbyterian Church, of Oakland, Cal., concerning the Armenian massacres—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of J. R. Williams, William Duffey, and 9 other citizens, of Higginsport, Ohio, for the erection of dikes at that point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULING: Petition of citizens of Logan County, W. Va., praying for the passage of House bill for relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of J. E. Hutchison and others of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying for 1-cent letter-postage rate—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LAYTON: Memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, protesting against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Toledo (Ohio) Produce Exchange, praying for legislation authorizing the Treasury Department to issue long-time bonds in sums of $50 and less at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of W. D. Burdick and other citizens of Jackson Center, Shelby County, Ohio, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Six petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kingston, South Dover, and Highland, of the State of New York, against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of Harry Springman, Charles C. Persun, Joseph Bordy, Charles McCoy, and other citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., praying for the passage of legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINTON: Resolution of the common council of the city of Saginaw, Mich., asking Congress to abrogate the treaty between the United States and Great Britain prohibiting the construction of naval vessels on the Great Lakes, but not as to the maintenance of the same—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: Petition of owners, underwriters, agents, and masters of vessels in coasting trade along Atlantic coast, for a harbor of refuge near Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the bills for the restriction of immigration (H. R. 9, S. 301)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McDEARMON: Two petitions of Rev. C. D. Hilliard, J. H. Thomas, F. J. Wood, and 23 other citizens of Bells, Tenn., and W. W. Casey, W. F. Collins, W. H. Wilson, and 8 other citizens of Kenton, Tenn., urging the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McEWAN: Petition of L. A. Rochat, Francis A. Veitch, and 28 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Union Republican Club, Jersey City, N. J., favoring the recognition of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of J. F. Shaw and 18 others, voters of Fouke, Miller County, Ark., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of William J. Allen, praying to be granted a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Eben Sayre, with exhibits, to accompany his bill for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of James Burnett, to have the charge of desertion removed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Richard Wilcoxton, praying for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: Memorial of the Tucson city government, Arizona, requesting Congressional authority to issue bonds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: Petition of Henry Conrad, C. F. Hamung, and 300 others, of Virginia City, Nev., favoring the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Remonstrance against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of J. L. Young and other citizens of Buncombe County, N. C., favoring pending bills for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of officers and men of Company M, Fourth Regiment Infantry, Iowa National Guard, in behalf of House bill No. 2294, for the organizing and disciplining of the militia of the several States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of E. L. Gilliland, J. S. Robinson, and 27 citizens of Butler County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition in favor of the oppressed Armenians, passed by the Sunday Patriotic Christian Association, and the other patriotic organizations and churches of New Castle, Pa.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 71 citizens of Brush Creek, Beaver County, Pa., favoring a bill to amend the postal laws and to allow fourth-class postmasters a small salary—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of J. F. McCoy, H. R. Thompson, and 93 other citizens of Butler County, Pa., favoring a bill to amend the postal laws, and allow fourth-class postmasters a small salary—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a resolution in favor of Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal, passed by the select and common council of New Castle, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petitions from chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Mystic, Derby, Waterbury, Southport, Meriden, Middletown, Hartford, and New London, Conn., and from citizens of Hartford and New London, Conn., containing 393 names, and all forwarded through Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Groton and Stonington, Conn., in favor of the acquirement of additional plats of ground contiguous to the Fort Griswold property, in order to preserve and protect that Revolutionary site—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Betsy Snow for the removal of the charge of desertion against Henry L. Snow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of Edward T. Lewis, late private in Company K, Seventy-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, to be relieved of the charge of desertion, to accompany House bill No. 1122—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALLINGS (by request): Petition of the estate of Wade L. Potter, deceased, late of Escambia County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Commercial Club of Superior, Wis., requesting the passage of the bill to extend to the port of Superior, Wis., the privilege of immediate transportation of merchandise in bond, and opposing the attachment of the city of Superior to the Duluth district for any customs purposes whatever—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of W. A. Chaney, W. S. Tarpley, and 30 other voters of Crab Orchard, Ill., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRAIT: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Mrs. Mary J. Secrest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAFT: Memorial of citizens of Cincinnati, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLER: Memorial of citizens of Stark County, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Tod Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Youngstown, Ohio, respecting pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Papers to accompany House Bill No. 3535, to reimburse the city of New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill No. 4670 for the relief of Mrs. Kent—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany a bill for the payment of bounty to James Pebley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to William W. Correll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany a bill for the payment of bounty to W. H. Lyman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, letter of John W. Ross, relating to a bill granting a pension to Anderson Weese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYLER: Petition of citizens of Norfolk and Berkley, Va., favoring the passage of the Stone bill to secure a better class of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Suffolk, Va., for damages to property by Federal troops from 1862 to 1865—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of Rev. S. M. Hosmer, James J. Garrett, W. S. Brown, and 26 others, citizens of Alabama, praying for the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of C. B. Rencher, S. B. Brewer, William A. Walker, and 15 other citizens of Alabama, praying for the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Six petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Niagara County, and York, Livingstone County, N. Y., relating to the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also (by request), petition of Edward Goodwin and other citizens of the town of Alabama, Genesee County, N. Y., in regard to the payment to certain persons for expenses connected with the last illness and death of the parents of Dudley and Bryan Mason, soldiers in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of Margaret Barrett, of Lockport, N. Y., for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Five petitions, as follows: James Whitworth and W. H. Morgan, of Nashville; Dorsey T. Gould and others, of Hustburg; R. A. Cartwright and others, of Goodlettsville; H. M. Turner, bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and others, all of Tennessee, asking the passage of the bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 779, for the relief of William C. Tipton—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 28, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War of the 27th instant requesting that $7,000 of the amount estimated on page 249 of the Book of Estimates for 1897, for "Battle lines and sites for tablets at Antietam," be appropriated for in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate relative to the protection and security of Christians in the Turkish Empire.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota"; and

A bill (H. R. 3886) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood;

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Green;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States, praying for the speedy passage of the emergency revenue bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I present a memorial of the city council of New Orleans, remonstrating against the passage of the bill proposing to extend the limits of the port of New Orleans so as to include the port of Chalmette. Inasmuch as the bill has already been reported from the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and has passed the Senate, I move that the memorial lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. IRBY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Berkeley, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for deepening Winyah Bay Harbor, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SEWELL presented petitions of William H. Ward and 1,894 other citizens of Hanover, of Charles S. Button and 39 other citizens of Brunswick, of William Moorehouse and 19 other citizens of Perth Amboy, and of John V. Emmons and 17 other citizens of Monmouth, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Association of the Silent Army of Deaf Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines of Indianapolis, Ind., signed by Allan G. P. Brown, president, and Wallace Foster, secretary, representing the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the civil war, praying that the rating for total deafness resulting from wounds and disease incurred in the service and in the line of duty be fixed by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. HILL presented the petition of Paulsen & Walter and 103 other citizens of New York, praying that Congress authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PROCTOR. I present a petition from the churches of the District of Columbia. The roll contains the signatures of the pastors and officers of all the Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Friends, United Brethren, and Christian churches in this city; also a part of the Episcopal, Unitarian, Universalist, Presbyterian, and Lutheran churches. Each foot of space represents a church, and each church represents an average of 500 members.

I also present the petition of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of this District, which represents a constituency of more than 1,000 women.

These petitions are in favor of the passage of a bill, which I shall introduce when that order is reached, to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous and intoxicating liquors in this District.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Harrisburg and Steelton, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. QUAY. I present a memorial of the Pennsylvania State board of agriculture, remonstrating against the free distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture. I should be glad, if there is no objection, to have the memorial read, as the question is now pending.

There being no objection, the memorial was read, as follows:

Whereas a resolution is now pending in the Senate of the United States designed to reestablish in the Department of Agriculture the free-seed distribution discontinued by the Secretary of Agriculture on the ground of his inability to find such seeds "as are rare and uncommon in the country," as defined by the law; and

Whereas Secretary Morton arrived at such a conclusion after an experience of three years, during which he has distributed over 27,000,000 packages of seeds free, 21,809,004 packages having been distributed during that time through Congressmen, in spite of which he reports to the Senate committee that the seed distribution has been unsatisfactory and not calculated to promote the general interest of agriculture and horticulture; and

Whereas the said Secretary failed to receive any satisfactory bids in reply to his advertisement for seeds as defined in the law; and

Whereas he further stated to the aforesaid committee of the Senate that over two and a half million dollars had been expended for the distribution of free seed by the Department during the past thirty years, and that he was unable to find evidence in any of the records or reports of the Department citing a single instance in recent years whereby agriculture or horticulture had received any special benefit from this free-seed distribution; and

Whereas in the opinion of this body the desirability of the National Government engaging in this free-seed distribution while apparently and no doubt serving a useful purpose in early days, when the difficulty of securing improved varieties was great and ignorance as to the agricultural capabilities of the country were rife, owing to the rapid opening up of new sections, with new conditions of climate and soil, has, owing to the changed conditions of the present, and the facility with which all the best varieties of different kinds of seed adapted to the wants of the country may be procured through the large and commercial enterprises established throughout the country, ceased to exist: Therefore,

Resolved, That the free distribution of seed by the national Department of Agriculture has heretofore conducted is unnecessary, inexpedient, and expensive, and can not under existing conditions be carried on in strict conformity with the law under which such appropriations are authorized, and that the same is not calculated to promote the interests of agriculture and horticulture; and this body sincerely deprecates any effort or legislative enactment calculated to revive this wasteful and absurd practice.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of Agriculture deserves the thanks and commendation of the agriculturists of the country for his strict construction of this law and his candid and forcible recommendations on the subject.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to inquire who sends the memorial which has just been read? What is the source?

Mr. QUAY. It is a memorial comprising a preamble and resolutions adopted by the State board of agriculture of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I thought perhaps it had come from some seed dealer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. As the joint resolution is pending, the memorial will lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of H. Hunter, jr., and 24 other citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., and the petition of A. W. Carpenter and 64 other citizens of Susquehanna County, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying for a Federal survey of the oyster beds of that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house memorial No. 18 with the original now on file in this office and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House memorial No. 18.

Whereas an accurate survey of the sounds and estuaries of the State of Washington will greatly promote the interests of this State and encourage the oyster industry; and

Whereas a knowledge of the various bodies of water, their temperature and specific gravities, the strength and velocity of the currents, the nature of the bottom, and other physical characteristics are necessary to show the areas fit and unfit for the culture of oysters: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the governor is hereby requested to ask the Federal Government to assist the State by making the proposed survey, as was done by the Federal Government for Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other States, and to detail one or more officers of the United States Navy to make a physical examination of the waters of the State of Washington and prepare a chart, showing in detail the areas suitable and unsuitable for the cultivation of oysters, as well as the natural oyster beds.

Be it resolved further, That our Representatives in the Federal Congress be, and are hereby, requested to take steps in cooperation with the governor to secure the Federal aid for which petition is hereby respectfully made.

Passed the house February 18, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 27, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House memorial No. 18. Praying for a Federal survey of the oyster beds of the State of Washington. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 2, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the immediate passage of a national bankruptcy law without an involuntary clause; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house concurrent resolution No. 10 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

[SEAL.] J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House concurrent resolution No. 10.

Whereas there prevails throughout the country great financial distress:

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to favor the immediate passage by that body of a national bankrupt law without the involuntary clause.

Passed the house February 19, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 25, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House concurrent resolution No. 10. Relief for insolvents and petitioning Congress to pass a national bankrupt law. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Alaska boundary dispute; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house concurrent resolution No. 29 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

[SEAL.] J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House concurrent resolution No. 29.

Whereas it is conceded in the treaty between the United States and Russia under which the Territory of Alaska (formerly Russian America) was purchased by the former from the latter which said treaty was ratified by the United States Senate and proclaimed by President Johnson in the year 1867, that the United States Government is entitled to a strip of territory 10 marine leagues in width parallel with the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude, thereby including within the limits and possession of the United States in said territory, all the harbors, bays, and inlets between the said fifty-sixth degree of north latitude and the said one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude; and

Whereas within the said Territory of Alaska are extensive gold mines and placer gold fields which are attracting thousands of American laborers; also mountains of marble, lime, and iron; extensive coal fields, together with valuable deposits of copper, nickel, and platinum; and

Whereas England, with her usual cupidity and avarice, and pursuant to her time-honored custom of attempting at all hazards to gain control of all new developing sources of wealth in whatsoever country situated and to appropriate to her own benefit present and prospective commerce of the seas, whether rightfully or otherwise, has asserted claim to the harbors, bays, and inlets through which the greater portion of the commerce and trade of and with the said Territory of Alaska must be carried on, and which of right as aforesaid belong to the United States; and

Whereas the United States will be robbed and despoiled of the trade and commerce of a veritable empire and suffer an appreciable diminution of the wealth which nature has endowed said territory if the policy and claims of Great Britain as aforesaid shall prevail: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Washington (the senate concurring), That our Members in Congress be requested and our Senators instructed to use all honorable means and in the proper manner to put forth their best endeavor that the rightful claim of the United States relative to said harbors, bays, and inlets be scrupulously maintained, and that an unequivocal policy on the part of the United States Government in relation thereto be fully carried out; and

Further resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted to each of the Members of Congress and Senators from the State of Washington, and to the President of the United States.

Passed the house March 5, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 9, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House concurrent resolution No. 29. Relative to the Alaska boundary dispute. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 11, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made to improve and render navigable the Okanogan River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house memorial No. 21 with the original now on file in this office and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House memorial No. 21.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the house of representatives and senate of the State of Washington, in legislature assembled, most respectfully represent:

Whereas it has been ascertained by careful inspection that the Okanogan River from its confluence with the Columbia River, near Bridgeport, in Douglas County, State of Washington, to the State line, a distance of about 75 miles, can, with moderate expense, be rendered navigable for boats of about 3-feet draft; and

Whereas the country tributary to the said river is one of vast mineral and agricultural resources, and is now without steam transportation facilities; and

Whereas the cost of freighting by wagon renders all traffic and trade expensive; and

Whereas by rendering the Okanogan River navigable a continuous waterway will be made over the Columbia and Okanogan rivers from Wenatchee, on the Great Northern Railway, to the northern boundary of the State of Washington, a distance of about 160 miles, thereby making possible a much cheaper mode of transporting the machinery, tools, and supplies necessary for the development of the said mineral and agricultural resources into and the product of the mines, farms, and orchards out of the country tributary to the said Okanogan River than is now had: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we, your memorialists, would respectfully urge that immediate action be taken, and that a sufficient amount be included in the next river and harbor appropriation bill for the purpose of making the improvements necessary to open the said river, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House; and thus will your memorialists ever pray.

Passed the house March 9, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 12, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House memorial No. 21. Memorializing Congress to make an appropriation of sufficient money to improve and render navigable the Okanogan River, in the State of Washington. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 14, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lyons Farm, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of William S. Nought and 83 other citizens of Lafayette; of David B. Chamberlin and sundry other citizens of Mercerville; of Edward Cook and 27 other citizens of Newark; of H. Waldron and 13 other citizens of Vail; of M. C. McCain and sundry other citizens of Hope, and of Anson J. Camp and 31 other citizens of Leesburg, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present resolutions adopted by the legislature of the State of Washington, requesting the Representatives and instructing the Senators from that State to put forth their best endeavor to have the rightful claim of the United States to certain harbors, bays, and inlets in the Territory of Alaska scrupulously maintained, and that an unequivocal policy on the part of the Government of the United States be fully carried out in relation to the same. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me ask the Senator from Washington if he presents a memorial or a resolution of the legislature?

Mr. SQUIRE. Yes, sir. It comes within the rule, I believe.

Mr. HARRIS. Clearly.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house concurrent resolution No. 29 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House concurrent resolution No. 29.

Whereas it is conceded in the treaty between the United States and Russia under which the Territory of Alaska (formerly Russian America) was purchased by the former from the latter, which said treaty was ratified by the United States Senate and proclaimed by President Johnson in the year 1867, that the United States Government is entitled to a strip of territory 10 marine leagues in width parallel with the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude, thereby including within the limits and possession of the United States in said territory all the harbors, bays, and inlets between the said fifty-sixth degree of north latitude and the said one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude; and

Whereas within the said Territory of Alaska are extensive gold mines and placer gold fields, which are attracting thousands of American laborers; also mountains of marble, lime, and iron, extensive coal fields, together with valuable deposits of copper, nickel, and platinum; and

Whereas England, with her usual cupidity and avarice, and pursuant to her time-honored custom of attempting at all hazards to gain control of all new developing sources of wealth in whatsoever country situated, and to appropriate to her own benefit present and prospective commerce of the seas, whether rightfully or otherwise, has asserted claim to the harbor, bays, and inlets through which the greater portion of the commerce and trade of and with the said Territory of Alaska must be carried on, and which of right, as aforesaid, belong to the United States; and

Whereas the United States will be robbed and despoiled of the trade and commerce of a veritable empire and suffer an appreciable diminution of the wealth which nature has endowed said Territory, if the policy and claims of Great Britain as aforesaid shall prevail: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Washington (the senate concurring), That our members in Congress be requested and our Senators instructed to use all honorable means and in the proper manner to put forth their best endeavor that the rightful claim of the United States relative to said harbors, bays, and inlets be scrupulously maintained, and that an unequivocal policy on the part of the United States Government in relation thereto be fully carried out; and

Further resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted to each of the members of Congress and Senators from the State of Washington and to the President of the United States.

Passed the house March 5, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 9, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House concurrent resolution No. 29. Relative to the Alaska boundary dispute. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 11, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to place the Government work on the ship railway at The Dalles, on the Columbia River, under contract at the earliest possible date; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the Senate concurrent resolution No. 16 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

Senate concurrent resolution No. 16.

Be it resolved by the senate of the legislature of the State of Washington (the house concurring), That our members in Congress be requested to use all honorable means to place the Government work on the ship railway at The Dalles, on the Columbia River, under contract at the earliest possible date, and that the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of said members.

Passed the senate February 23, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

Passed the house March 7, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

(Indorsed:) Senate concurrent resolution No. 16. Relative to placing Government work on the ship railway at The Dalles under contract. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 8, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation of $150,000 be made for the purpose of constructing locks in the harbor of Olympia; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house memorial No. 23 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, A. D. 1896.

[SEAL.] J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House memorial No. 23.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the city of Olympia, the capital of the State of Washington, is a growing maritime port, advantageously situated on the waters of Puget Sound; and

Whereas the General Government has recognized the advantages of the harbor of said city to trade and commerce on the Pacific coast, and has heretofore appropriated the sum of $75,000 for deepening and widening the channel of said harbor, with the result that to-day it is one of the safest, most accessible land locked harbors in the United States; and

Whereas the said city of Olympia, at its own expense, has thrown a bulkhead across said harbor from shore to shore for the purpose, eventually, of forming a fresh-water harbor of about 3½ miles frontage to the south of said bulkhead; and

Whereas by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum of money locks can be constructed, thereby excluding salt water from the area south of said bulkhead and securing an entirely fresh-water supply from the Deschutes River: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Washington, That the State of Washington respectfully asks the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of constructing locks in the harbor of said city of Olympia; and

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish a certified copy of this memorial to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Secretary of War, and the United States engineer offi-

cer to this department, and that our delegation in Congress be especially requested to exert their influence to obtain the said appropriation. And your memorialists will, in duty bound, ever pray.

Passed the house March 7, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 12, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration for the period of ten years; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house memorial No. 8 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House memorial No. 8. Memorializing Congress to restrict immigration for the period of ten years.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Washington (the senate concurring therein), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use all honorable means to secure the passage of an act by the Congress of the United States of America as will prohibit immigration from any foreign country for the period of ten years; and

Be it further resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Passed the house February 19, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 27, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House memorial No. 8. Memorializing Congress to restrict immigration for the period of ten years. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of the bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house concurrent resolution No. 26 with the original now on file in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House concurrent resolution No. 24.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, most respectfully represent that

Whereas the constantly increasing interests and commerce of the United States in the Pacific Ocean, in which commerce the State of Washington is directly and very largely interested, demand the maintaining of an efficient navy by the United States; and

Whereas the building of the Nicaragua Canal in the near future will further augment the necessity for such efficient navy; and

Whereas the efficiency of a navy depends even more upon the ability and experience of its officers than on the perfection of its material: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, That we indorse House bill No. 8476, Fifty-third Congress, third session, being a bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States, it being the result of mature consideration of the matter by a joint commission appointed from the Naval Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, and as being a practicable way of accomplishing the result sought for, viz, promoting the efficiency of the Navy; and

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish certified copies of this memorial to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington, and also to the chairman of the Naval Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Passed the house March 1, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 9, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House concurrent resolution No. 24. Relating to United States Navy. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 11, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of House joint resolution No. 11, proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to prohibit further appropriations to institutions under ecclesiastical control; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels of over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Thurston County, San Juan County, Kitsap County, King County, Columbia County, Pacific County, Wallawalla County, Jefferson County, Klickitat County, Lewis County, Garfield County, Chehalis County, Asotin County, and Whitman County, all in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 735, to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Lawrence C. Conover and 101 other citizens of New York, praying that the Congress will authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the members of the Baptist Church of Pine Creek, Mo., favoring the resolution recently introduced by Senator HOAR relating to the Armenian persecutions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

OUTRAGES IN ARMENIA.

Mr. TURPIE. I present a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of local churches of Rensselaer, Ind., held in Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church January 19, 1896, expressing sympathy for the suffering people of Armenia and remonstrating against their further oppression. The petitioners respectfully urge our Government to make every possible effort to induce the Governments of Christendom to rouse themselves from their apathy and put an end to this intolerable state of affairs, which threatens with extermination thousands and thousands of our fellow-Christians, and urging also upon our Government to do everything in its power to preserve the fruits of American missionary toil and expressing their ardent sympathy with the unutterable sufferings of this persecuted race; and calling upon all the peoples of Christendom to insist that these unutterable sufferings shall cease.

Mr. President, this petition comes from a very respectable source in Indiana, and I should like to address the Senate very briefly on the subject.

Armenia is an oasis of Christian faith placed in a desert of unbelief. It is the largest body of Christians having any local or racial unity within the limits of the Ottoman Empire. Its inhabitants had been long subject to the Turks before the Sublime Porte was located at Constantinople. They have been faithful subjects of that Empire. They have paid their treasure in its support. They have furnished the blood and life of their sons, their fathers, and their brethren for the defense of the Empire against foreign invasion. They were not charged in the recent calamities which have befallen them with any disloyalty to the Turkish Government. They were charged with no revolt, with no attempt at treason or rebellion. They were charged with no disobedience of any law or ordinance of the Empire. They were charged only with being Christians. They were charged, they were seized, they were condemned, they were executed, under circumstances of indescribable atrocity, as Christians.

Their only crime was that they persisted in exercising that right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, a right, as has been said, guaranteed to them by the treaty of Berlin, but a right given, granted to them and all mankind by a power greater than either of those of the signatories to that instrument—the Divine Creator of the universe.

Sir, I think at this juncture the time approaches when there ought to be express advices, official notifications (if that be the more courtly phrase) given to the Government of Turkey—to the Turkish Government and to the Mohammedan Church—that there has been a great and fatal decadence of that power in the last three centuries. The Turkish Government is recognized and established; but how? By reason of its own strength or merit? Not for a day. It is supported and only maintained by those international jealousies which cluster around the transatlantic segment of the Monroe doctrine, called in all the waters of the Mediterranean the balance of power in Europe, forbidding the acquisition of further territory in Europe by any of the great powers as dangerous to the peace and safety of others. It has long since ceased to be a self-existent and self-supporting monarchy or empire.

The Ottoman Church and the Empire ought both to be notified that they are no longer a power to persecute, that they can no longer proselytize with the sword, that they must erase from the book of discipline and practice of the Mohammedan Church those precepts which make use of arson and murder as means of suppressing the Christian faith.

We have made a notification. I would have with the word already sent the blow to follow it. I would have the message on the wings of lightning sent and the shot to follow it. What a shot that would be crashing into the grand seraglio, traversing the waters of the Golden Horn, to avenge the Christian life and Christian faith of the subjects of that Empire.

I know that this fact of the great decadence of the Ottoman power is as well known to the grand vizier and to the chiefs, the advisers, of the Sublime Porte as it is to any member of this body, but the great bulk of the citizens of that Empire do not know it. The grand vizier is informed of it. I would have the slave of the grand vizier know it and feel it. I would have the teachers in the schools of the Mussulman and in the mosque know it and realize it. I would have the muezzin on the minaret know it and proclaim it to the faithful as they are gathered in the mosques for their devotions.

Six centuries ago the state of the Caliph in Bagdad was very different from that now existing on the Bosphorus. He reigned supreme in all the great countries of southern Asia. His lieutenants ruled with more than regal magnificence Egypt and northern Africa. Spain itself was, as it was said, the second garden of Mohammed, and hundreds of thousands of armed Mussulmans met the united armies of Christian Europe to contend north of the Pyrenees—north of that great mountain range—as to which should have the primacy and supremacy in that quarter of the globe. All this has passed, never to return.

I am not aware, sir, what particular prerogative and privileges are due to national infirmity, to a decaying power, or to a moribund sovereignty, but if there be any such due and owing, and if it be still asked upon our part that we should allow this monstrous, bloody game as the mere play and pastime of the old age and decrepitude of the Ottoman Empire, I for one am in favor of giving the sick man of the Bosphorus a coup de grace and ending his life and existence by dissolution and destruction.

I have read, Mr. President, in some story of these blood-stained relations, of a Kurd or Turk, armed, engaged in the massacre of the Armenian villagers, hearing from the boys and girls who were being slain by his hand, hearing from the wives and mothers who were being hurried to dishonor and death, the same cry, the same supplication, and I have read that this fiend turned to the demons who were his comrades in this work of blood and asked in a tone of derision, "Who is Jesus of Nazareth, that these people pray to Him?"

Sir, it is time that these murderers and assassins should know who He was that was born into the world at Bethlehem and reared at Nazareth; that they and their masters should learn also that when that Divine Ruler returns to vex the reprobateness and wickedness of the world and to punish such wretches as these, He brings with him not peace, but a sword. It may be, sir, that we are destined to reorganize the Crusades of eight and nine centuries ago. It may be that we shall send again around the summons of the fiery cross upon a greatly lengthened circuit. It may be that we shall be called upon to effect the final deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre and of all those who revere its memories in every clime, under every sky. In such a warfare, as in the peace which would follow it, one touch of Christ would make the whole world kin.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table, the resolution to which it refers having been passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1347) for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Gulf of Mexico and tributary waters, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Shubeal Gould, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1276) granting a pension to John L. Britton, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1291) granting an increase of pension to Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Lue R. Brown;

A bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Mary E. Sessions;

A bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley; and

A bill (S. 1149) granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1511) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Stewart Whiting, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 804) granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Carroll Poe, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1215) granting a pension to Ellen Kingsley, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Kimball, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 905) granting a pension to Mary W. Keefe, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Charles Williamson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1617) to grant to the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1579) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. HAWLEY. The joint resolution (S. R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the White Lot and part of the Monument Grounds was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It pertains to the use of public grounds here for the great Christian Endeavor convention. I ask that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee will be discharged, and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in the absence of objection.

Mr. KYLE. On December 19 the bill (S. 1086) to establish a national university was referred by mistake to the Committee on Education and Labor. I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Committee on Education and Labor will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

DAMS AT OUTLETS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. CULLOM on the 21st instant, reported it without amendment, submitting a report thereon, and the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That 500 copies of a report by the Interstate Commerce Committee, to whom was referred Senate bill 1339 and Senate resolution No. 42, be printed for the use of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SMITH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1801) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to contract with the Pneumatic Gun Carriage and Power Company of Washington City, D. C., for a floating battery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1802) granting relief to settlers on certain lots in the town site of Port Angeles, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1803) to repeal section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1804) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

Mr. ROACH introduced a bill (S. 1805) to correct the military record of Cornelius Sullivan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1806) granting a pension to George B.

Custer, late private of Company H, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1807) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous and intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1808) granting an increase of pension to George K. Morgan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1809) granting a pension to Joshua Parker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1810) granting an increase of pension to George W. Craig; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1811) to extend the uses of the mail service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1812) for the relief of Clarence W. Turner and Pleasant Porter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GORMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1813) for the relief of Daniel T. Wathen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1814) to incorporate the Washington Homeopathic Medical College, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1815) for the relief of Caroline V. English, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Thomas C. English, Second United States Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL. I had the honor a few days ago to introduce a bill granting an increase of pension to Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heckman, an ex-soldier of New Jersey, who was in indigent circumstances and unable to earn a living. He has since been called to his last account. I beg leave to introduce a bill for the relief of his widow, granting her a pension of $50 a month. I call the attention of the members of the Committee on Pensions to the fact that she is 65 years of age and needs immediate relief.

The bill (S. 1816) granting a pension to Eliza Craig Heckman, widow of Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heckman, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1817) granting a pension to Caleb M. Wright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1818) for the relief of Antoinette Acken, widow of Samuel Acken, who was in command of the schooner *A. M. Acken* in the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1819) to amend subdivision 2 of section 2275 of the Revised Statutes relating to lien lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1820) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near Point Arguello, California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1821) for the erection of a public building at Menominee, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1822) for the relief of W. A. Austin & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 64) authorizing the appointment of a commission to examine into and report upon the advisability and cost of purchasing the property rights and franchises of certain canal and navigation companies; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 65) to print the annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ELKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RESTRICTION OF BOND ISSUES.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit an amendment, which I ask to have read, printed, and lie on the table.

The amendment was read, and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ALLEN to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Add after the close of section 4 of the committee amendment:

"*Provided*, That after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall be deprived of the power to issue the bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government unless Congress shall first declare the necessity therefor, any act of Congress now in force to the contrary notwithstanding."

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to Thomas P. Morgan, jr., to withdraw his papers from the files of the Senate upon complying with the rule.

PRINTING OF COAST-DEFENSE BILL.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 copies of Senate bill 1159, to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses.

INVESTIGATION OF MAIL BAG REPAIR DIVISION.

Mr. KYLE. I submit a resolution, and I think there can be no objection to its present consideration.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let it be read for information.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the character of the wages, work, discipline, and hours of labor in the mail-bag-repair division of the Government Post-Office Department have been severely condemned by the Washington Times, a reputable newspaper published in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is also alleged by this newspaper that Government mail bags are made by contract convict labor, and that there are also various irregularities in the fulfillment and payments of awards as well as irregularities in other contracts pertaining to the work of this division: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby directed to investigate these charges and report thereon to this body at the earliest practicable moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed and lie over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The resolution will go over under the rule.

CIVIL SERVICE CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a resolution of inquiry. I ask that it may be considered at the present time.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be directed to furnish the Senate with all correspondence respecting the enforcement of the civil-service law between the Public Printer and said Commission between the dates of July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895, with a detailed statement of all matters pertaining thereto, together with the correspondence between certain discharged employees of the Government Printing Office and said Commission between July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. Let the resolution lie over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota" was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3886) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

IMPRISONMENT OF EUGENE V. DEBS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution of the Senator from Florida, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. CALL January 23, 1896:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators shall be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for an alleged contempt of court, who shall report to the Senate and recommend such legislation as may be necessary for the just enforcement of the law and the protection of citizens from arbitrary and offensive exercise of judicial power.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have only to say that this resolution was presented to me by persons connected with the labor associations of the United States, with the request that the investigation asked for should be had, and a report made of such measures as may be necessary for the protection of the people against the arbitrary exercise of judicial authority in this respect. I see

no kind of objection to conceding this to the wishes of so large a portion of the American people.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, ordinarily I have great respect for the wishes of the laboring people of the United States. I am not aware that in any communication addressed to the Senate the laboring people of the United States have asked for this investigation; I am not aware that even any particular labor organization has asked for it. If there has been any petition presented for it, I do not now recall it. On the other hand, I realize that there have been complaints of the manner in which the power of committal for contempt has been exercised by the Federal courts. There has been much criticism, not only by those directly affected, but by many lawyers. But the Senate should have something before it to act upon before it orders an investigation by a special committee.

I understand, Mr. President, that it is rather against the policy of the Senate to appoint special committees where it can reasonably be avoided. Neither do I think it quite wise to mention particular instances requiring investigation or upon the application of any particular person or persons. That there may be occasion for some investigation I am not now disputing; that there may be occasion for some legislation to the end of regulating to some extent the power of committal for contempt said to have been in some cases arbitrarily exercised I am not now antagonizing. I think if the subject is to be gone into at all, upon which I do not now express any opinion, it would be better that one of the standing committees of this body should have charge of such an investigation in order that such legislation may be proposed as shall be deemed necessary. In that view I do not see any special objection to the proceeding, and for that purpose I offer what I send to the desk as a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from Florida.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The substitute submitted by the Senator from New York will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee is hereby directed to investigate the whole subject of contempts of court as enforced by the Federal courts, and report to the Senate whether any additional legislation is necessary for the protection of the rights of citizens.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, if it be the sense of the Senate that all investigation into the case of Eugene V. Debs shall be suppressed, and that the opinion of many thousands of American citizens, who are the skilled laborers of this country and the employees of the great corporations, shall not be heard, and if the Senate choose to make this reference and substitute the amendment of the Senator from New York for my resolution, I have nothing to say; but when in a particular case alleged wrong has occurred, why that case should not be made the subject of investigation the Senator from New York has given no reason, and can give none.

If it be true that there has been an arbitrary exercise of judicial power in the form of an injunction against the leader of a great labor organization of the United States for expressing opinions not entertained by the judge, and an imprisonment of six months following it, why should that not be investigated? When, at the request of men prominently connected with that organization, a respectful investigation is asked, and only legislation which will in the future prevent such abuse of power, I can not see why the Senator from New York should invoke a rule or practice of the Senate that special or select committees should not be raised, or that there should be no mention of a particular case.

Why should there be no mention of a particular case if it has been the occasion of wrong in the exercise of power that ought to be carefully limited and carefully exercised? This resolution expresses no opinion as to the propriety of this judicial action; it does not even imply a censure; but, at the request of a great body of the people of this country, it is asked that this investigation shall be had.

Why should the resolution be referred to a standing committee? For myself, I am opposed to the present system of committee organization and the extent to which it has been carried. Those committees are the sepulchers of the movements of the people of the United States for reform; they are the burial places of every effort to obtain an improved and better condition of things and of inquiry into them. Then, again, they are occupied with the ordinary business of the Senate. In the English Parliament great questions can be brought up and every member of Parliament has the opportunity of action, but with us they are referred to a small portion of this body, who possess a veto, according to the course of the Senate, upon the whole remaining power of the body. Therefore I think that in particular cases, where great public opinion exists, and where there is need of careful examination and report and some action to be taken, the better method is that there should be a selection of Senators in order to make it.

Again, a great portion of this body never has any connection with its important business. The committee organization confines it to a few Senators, and the remaining Senators are effectually disfranchised of their rights and their power in this body. So, for one, I should prefer always that important subjects should be referred to select committees, if it were for no other reason than to give all the Senators who are sent here, equal in power and in rights, an opportunity of being connected with the important business of this body.

I am personally indifferent to the course this resolution may take, but it is the expression of the opinion and desire of many thousands and tens of thousands of citizens of the United States who think that the case of this great leader—and he is unquestionably, whether his views are correct or not, a man of power and a representative man in this country—should have its investigation. In my opinion, it is necessary for the preservation of the judicial power of this country and the respect of the people for it that there should be careful limitation of its power, and that it should be exercised in accordance with the principles of American liberty and of our Constitution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Before the Senator from New York proceeds, will the Chair state what is the precise attitude of the question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] to the resolution of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think the presentation of this resolution requires any discussion upon the question as to the manner in which the committees of the Senate are organized. I am inclined to think that they are fairly distributed, and represent the different sentiments which prevail in this body. For myself I favor the resolution offered originally by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] so far as it relates to the distribution of the appropriation bills, but beyond that the committees are fairly well organized, and I am inclined to think that each Senator has been reasonably well provided for, including the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CALL. There was not a word or suggestion in what I said which related to the manner of the organization or the personnel of the committees—not the slightest allusion to that whatever.

Mr. HILL. What is the precise point of complaint, then?

Mr. CALL. I said committee organization, whether it include the distinguished Senator from New York or other equally great men who may be assigned to committees, confines the power of the body to them and eliminates and leaves out others who may not be so great, but who are equal in power and in privilege and in duty here with him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am not aware of any legislative body in this country, or scarcely in any other, where there are not committees which have charge of the initiation of legislation. The same is true of every legislature of a State, including, I think, the State of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. HILL. They have committees in which legislation is duly and properly considered. I think committees are incident to the transaction of legislation. But whether that be so or not, it is a question which is entirely foreign to the main point involved in the resolution.

Mr. President, I think I express the sentiment of the Senate when I say that, as a general rule, it is not wise to appoint special committees, and it has not been the custom of the Senate to do it. There may be occasions when, by reason of some matter of most supreme importance, it is wise to have a special committee; but those occasions are very few. Therefore, I think the resolution not wise. I believe it is better in all matters, so far as possible, to confine investigation to standing committees. Then it can not be claimed that any influences are brought to bear in the formation of those committees.

This is a judicial question largely. Why should it not be referred to the Judiciary Committee? Not only that, but the very case to which the Senator refers has been in the courts. It has been before the Supreme Court of the United States, and that court has passed upon the rights of Mr. Debs. That court has decided the case. There is no occasion to mention his name in the resolution; there is no occasion to mention the case, because Congress will not assume to pass upon the merits of the controversy. The simple point is, whether legislation is required for the further protection of the citizen. If that be so, then let the Judiciary Committee in a due and orderly way investigate the question and report upon it to the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. While it is true that the Debs case did go before the Supreme Court, it is only true in its nominal sense. It came up on habeas corpus, and the Supreme Court refused to investigate the merits of the case, following the well-established rule that where the court had jurisdiction the writ of habeas corpus would not operate as a writ of error. Therefore, the Supreme Court declined to investigate the merits of the controversy.

Mr. HILL. What does the Senator understand by "the merits of the controversy"? The simple question which the Supreme Court decided was that the imprisonment was legal, was it not?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir. The Supreme Court did not decide anything of the kind. It simply decided that the circuit court had jurisdiction of Mr. Debs on the question of contempt, and that being true, that the writ of habeas corpus could not operate as a writ of error. Therefore, the court declined to investigate the merits. That was a proper decision. But neither the Supreme Court nor any other court, excepting the court of Judge Woods, ever investigated the question of the merits of Mr. Debs's case, or whether he was really guilty of contempt of court or not; and certainly the Senator from New York knows enough about this man Woods, or the circumstances under which he was appointed to the subordinate judiciary, the stain that hung upon him at the time he was appointed as a reward for political trickery, to not give much force to a decision rendered by him.

Mr. HILL. I am not called upon to defend the decision of Judge Woods; neither shall I be led into any criticism of his decision. It is sufficient that in the only way in which Mr. Debs could present his rights, he appealed to the highest court of the United States, and obtained no relief. That is sufficient for my purpose; and it is not contended by anybody but that the Supreme Court made a proper decision upon the questions which were presented.

Mr. ALLEN. As they were presented.

Mr. HILL. As they were presented, then. That does not change the question. Neither shall I be led into any criticism of Mr. Debs himself. I have some respect for his utterances. Some of them have been patriotic. In many of them I concur, but I do not indorse all that he has said since the unfortunate controversy arose in which he took so prominent a part. I have nothing but the kindliest feelings toward Mr. Debs, who is a man of ability, a man of capacity, a man who is trusted by a large number of people in the United States; but when the Senate of the United States undertakes an investigation it should not in its resolution especially mention a particular case. Let me read the resolution and call the attention of the Senate to it. It is as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators shall be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for an alleged contempt of court, who shall report to the Senate and recommend such legislation as may be necessary for the just enforcement of the law and the protection of citizens from arbitrary and oppressive exercise of judicial power.

There is an intimation in that resolution that possibly in this particular case there was an arbitrary and oppressive exercise of judicial power. I do not think it wise to raise a special committee so long as the object can be accomplished in another and more appropriate way, by a general resolution requiring the Judiciary Committee to investigate the whole subject of contempts of court, with such recommendations of legislation as may be necessary. It strikes me that is the better course to pursue. In the end the subject will be duly investigated, and if legislation is needed it will be reported. That, it strikes me, is all that the Senator from Florida ought to ask.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the Senator from New York takes his seat, I should like to put him one question. Does the Senator expect, if his resolution goes to the Judiciary Committee, that it will ever be heard from again?

Mr. HILL. I do; and I think the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska is entirely uncalled for. I think the Judiciary Committee, of which I happen to be a member, will take up this case and decide it and make a report upon it. Will the Senator intimate what reasons he has for thinking that the committee will not report?

Mr. ALLEN. I have not intimated that it will not.

Mr. HILL. I do not know, then, what the Senator meant.

Mr. ALLEN. I do, however, now intimate that that committee will not. I had not said so or suggested so before, although I believed so. I now say that I believe it is the intention in the offering of this substitute to send the resolution to the Judiciary Committee for the express purpose of never hearing from it again.

I have not been here very long, Mr. President—a little over two years—but I have noticed every time that a Senator wants to get rid of a resolution that is objectionable to him he asks the Senate to send it to a standing committee, especially if he happens to be a member of it; and 99 per cent, perhaps not that much, but 95 per cent of all the decent, respectable resolutions that were introduced in the Senate in the last Congress and were sent to the standing committees had never been heard from until the close of the Congress, when they were perfunctorily reported and rejected. That is the reason I make the statement.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator assert that any standing committee of this body, empowered and directed to make an investigation upon a subject like this, has not proceeded to execute the power conferred upon it?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, go into the caverns around this Capitol and see for yourself.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will please answer my question.

Mr. ALLEN. I do.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator name one?

Mr. ALLEN. I can not stand here and recall them. They were introduced here by the dozen and by the hundred. I can not even recall now all the resolutions I have introduced.

Mr. HILL. The Senator said "decent and respectable resolutions."

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly. I meant by that, Mr. President, those resolutions which have merit in them. I say that 95 per cent of them—and they have been introduced here by the basketful—have gone into the dark recesses and caverns of this Capitol and have never been heard from again.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Resolutions proposing investigations, which are referred to a committee, are referred, of course, for the purpose of having the committee determine the question of the propriety of the investigation. They are an entirely different class of resolutions from those which on their face direct an investigation. In this case both the original resolution of the Senator from Florida and the substitute offered by me direct an investigation. It is not proposed to refer the resolution to the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of seeing whether there shall be an investigation, although that might, I think, under the circumstances, be done with propriety; but both the resolution and the substitute contemplate simply an investigation, one by a special committee appointed, mentioning a particular case and a particular name, and the other by simply referring the whole subject to a standing committee of this body, without naming any particular case.

Mr. ALLEN. What is there about that matter that the Judiciary Committee should investigate?

Mr. HILL. It relates to a judicial question.

Mr. ALLEN. It does not relate to a judicial question at all in the sense in which the Judiciary Committee is organized. There is no question about it that the Judiciary Committee should investigate. Does the Senator from New York claim that there are no lawyers in this Chamber outside of the Judiciary Committee, or even Senators who are not lawyers, who are not competent to pass upon the policy of adopting this resolution?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator had introduced a bill relating to the subject of contempts, would he not have recognized the propriety of its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ALLEN. I would not have recognized the propriety. I would have recognized that the rule required it, and that is all.

Mr. HILL. Then perhaps the Senator had better suggest a resolution abolishing all committees.

Mr. ALLEN. I would not abolish all committees, but I would reorganize them, if I had it in my power, so as to do business. I do not go to the extent that my friend from Florida goes. I do not see how it is possible to do business in this Chamber without committee organization.

Mr. CALL. Permanent committees.

Mr. ALLEN. Permanent committees. Yet I can not help but be impressed with this thought, gathered from my little experience here, that this Chamber is organized not to do business. That is the purpose of its organization all the time.

Mr. GORDON. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. GORDON. I do not wish to participate in this discussion, but I would ask the privilege of calling the attention of Senators on this side of the Chamber to an announcement made by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] the other day that he would submit some remarks at this hour and would inquire of the Senators who are participating in this debate whether they would be willing for the pending resolution to lie over?

Mr. HILL. That will be perfectly satisfactory to me, Mr. President.

Mr. CALL. I will consent to that, the resolution retaining its place by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLEN. I did not recall the fact that my colleague had announced that he would address the Senate at this hour. I yield the floor to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the resolution will go over, retaining its place. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I thank Senators upon both sides of the Chamber for the extension of this courtesy.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I thank Senators upon both sides of the Chamber for the extension of this courtesy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions reported by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], from the Committee on Foreign Relations; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions reported by Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, January 20, 1896, as follows:

Concurrent resolution relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That whereas President Monroe, in his message to Congress of December 2, A. D. 1823, deemed it proper to assert as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, were thenceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power; and

Whereas President Monroe further declared in that message that the United States would consider any attempt by the allied powers of Europe to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; that with the existing colonies and dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and should not interfere, but that with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and further reiterated in that message that it is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; and

Whereas the doctrine and policy so proclaimed by President Monroe have since been repeatedly asserted by the United States by Executive declaration and action upon occasions and exigencies similar to the particular occasion and exigency which caused them to be first announced, and have been ever since their promulgation, and now are, the rightful policy of the United States: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the United States of America reaffirms and confirms the doctrine and principles promulgated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, A. D. 1823, and declares that it will assert and maintain that doctrine and those principles, and will regard any infringement thereof, and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continents, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right of sovereignty or dominion in the same in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety by or through force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate, or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American Isthmus, whether under unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes or under any other unfounded pretensions, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and as an interposition which it would be impossible in any form for the United States to regard with indifference.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I have been so lately called from private life to public affairs that it were perhaps more seemly on my part to leave all present discussion of the Monroe doctrine to those whose recognized abilities and long public service enable them most certainly to command the attention of the country. But, sir, I am called upon at the very outset of my official term to assume most grave and unusual responsibilities. The adoption of the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs will present a great international issue which may hold much of menace to the world's peace; an issue which I sincerely hope and profoundly believe will be resolved to the abiding peace and honor and permanency of this Republic, but which, it is useless to deny, might precipitate upon our beloved country all the disasters and horrors and sacrifices which would inevitably follow should the two great English-speaking nations of the globe remit their differences to the arbitrament of arms. I can not assume these responsibilities; I dare not vote for the pending resolution without first submitting to the deliberate judgment of mankind and the dispassionate criticism of posterity some of the reasons which seem to make my path of duty plain.

Were there nothing at stake but a mere adjustment of a boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana, I should hesitate long and seriously before voting to commit this Government to any interference. It is difficult to believe, and impossible to demonstrate, that our honor is involved, our prestige threatened, or our tranquillity disturbed by any disposition which can possibly be made of a distant strip of South American marsh and mountain. But, sir, the present question rises high above any Venezuelan dispute. The British prime minister, the accredited mouthpiece of the strongest empire of Christendom, has seen fit to officially declare, and so advises this Government, that the Monroe doctrine has no place in the law of nations and is not accepted or recognized by the European powers. The challenge thus broadly thrown down by Great Britain must be taken up by this Republic, or the Monroe doctrine is a thing of the past. The world is waiting to know whether that great declaration of American policy is living or dead. The world is waiting to know whether it is to be respected, maintained, and enforced, or abandoned and despised. The people of this country look to the Congress of the United States to make answer in their behalf. They expect that answer to breathe the same spirit of American patriotism as did the answer of Ethan Allen at Ticonderoga; as did the answer of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence; as did the liberty bell of 1776.

Mr. President, the British position, bluntly, almost insolently, stated by Lord Salisbury, has been reasserted from this floor, clothed in such splendid rhetoric and presented with such fervid eloquence as even to win American applause. I unhesitatingly assume that the applause was for the matchless ability of the orator and not for the sentiment of his address. I can not believe that the views of the Senator from Colorado will commend themselves to the deliberate judgment of the American people. They may be satisfactory to the money changers. England can crack the whip for them, but, thank God, the money changers are not the custodians of the national conscience. They may be approved by Wall street, for Wall street represents that powerful foreign syndicate which seeks to dominate the financial and industrial policy of this country, but Wall street can not dictate to the Senate of the United States. If our people ever become so senile and degraded as to be willing to list the honor of the nation on the stock exchange, to go up or down with the market, it will be time to turn the pictured face of Washington to the wall and to cast the sword of Grant into the sea. [Applause in Galleries.]

Mr. President, I have the most profound admiration and respect for the Senator from Colorado. I know how intensely American he is. His patriotism can not be questioned or his sincerity doubted. I know how strong must be the convictions which lead him to lift his voice against the known sentiments of his countrymen. I know how little he cares for the good opinion of those who most applaud his effort. I even know that in his next advocacy of free coinage he will anathematize Great Britain and castigate the gold barons and stock jobbers of New York City. Withal he is so genial and lovable a character that it is positively painful to differ with him on any subject.

I agree with the Senator that this is no time to stir up public passion; to appeal to any prejudice that may exist against England; to fan the flame of any incipient war sentiment. But I must insist that this is a time of all others to call forth the highest expression of loyalty and devotion to American institutions. I must insist that this is the supreme hour for a dignified, positive, and solemn declaration of the American purpose, clearly, calmly, deliberately stated. Sir, the Monroe doctrine was announced by a President of the United States more than seven decades since. For almost three-quarters of a century it has stood as the established policy of the American people. It is our priceless inheritance from the fathers. We have grown to consider it as much a part of our form of government as is the Constitution of the United States. It is held in as great reverence by Americans as is Magna Charta by Englishmen. That it has never been formally approved by Congress is because it has never before been officially challenged by any other nation, nor has its application to the affairs of the Western Hemisphere been directly questioned.

It is not my purpose to treat this subject historically or to review the events which led up to the assertion of this American policy in the message of President Monroe. I could add nothing in that respect to the exhaustive presentation of the Senator from Massachusetts. I have no doubt that the fear of the Holy Alliance and the knowledge of its purposes had much to do with its formulation and declaration; but there is nothing in the language employed by President Monroe which limits the application of the doctrine to resistance of the threatened aggression of the Holy Alliance. It has been universally considered and construed as pledging this country to oppose the extension of monarchical institutions in the Western Hemisphere, and also to protect every foot of American soil from further invasion, aggression, or dominion by any foreign power. If such was not the meaning and purpose of the Monroe doctrine as originally announced, then it is time now for a clear and explicit restatement of the American policy.

Mr. President, it is gravely argued that our country has outgrown the necessity for any further enforcement of the Monroe doctrine. It is urged that the United States has waxed strong and powerful; that we no longer need fear any foreign interference in our affairs; that all our boundary lines have been definitely settled; and that we can not be affected or disturbed by South American controversies. It is, therefore, insisted that we can now afford to let the other American Republics look out for themselves, and that we should stand supinely by while foreign powers overawe and outrage our weak and defenseless neighbors.

Mr. President, ours is the one great nation of this continent; Mother of Republics, her lullaby has been sung over every cradle of liberty in the New World. Under the inspiration of her glorious example, the last throne has disappeared from the Western Hemisphere and the Old World's dominion over American territory and American affairs will not outlast the morning of the twentieth century. [Applause.]

It is contended upon this floor that our neighboring republics are not worthy of our sympathy or assistance because of the instability of their established forms of government and of the ignorant and helpless character of their populations. When has the weakness and helplessness of the child ever justified abandonment by the mother? Unstable and imperfect as may be republican rule on a portion of the American Continent, yet any government that professes to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people" is better than the government of kings. And any country which has shown its ability to rid itself of despotism is worthy of our encouragement and substantial aid in all its struggles and all its efforts to secure for its people a greater measure of liberty, enlightenment, and civilization than they now enjoy.

Mr. President, the God of nations has made our country strong and mighty. She is the only American power able to stand protector for the New World. That same Providence which has blessed us with its gracious favor has placed us in the position of responsibility and guardianship toward the weaker American Republics. We can not shirk our obligations as a nation; we can not absolve ourselves from the performance of those duties which Providence has imposed upon us; and nothing but selfishness or cowardice can induce the people of the United States to desert the post of leadership in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere which it is their manifest destiny to retain.

I am not unmindful of the seriousness and gravity of the present situation. We are calling a halt upon that settled policy of aggression and dominion which has characterized the extension of the British Empire from the hour in which her first adventurous prow turned to unknown seas. The history of the English people is an almost unbroken series of military achievements. Great Britain has cleared her pathway into every corner of the earth with the naked sword; she has acquired and held her vast possessions by force of arms; she has mastered and subjugated the people of every zone; her navies are upon every sea, her armies in every clime. She has not a son who did not suckle inherited valor from his mother's breast. No nation can afford to lightly challenge her purposes or arouse her stubborn pride. But does this furnish any reason why Americans should abandon any settled policy of the United States, or retire from any position which the honor of this Republic and the welfare of America require that we should assume?

Mr. President, our people have been represented as eager for war, and the Senator from Colorado seems to believe that it is necessary to cool their ardor by disparagement of the Monroe doctrine and eulogium of British grandeur. Ours is a mighty nation, but its people are slow to wrath. They believe in the divine doctrine taught by the lowly Nazarine on the shores of Galilee. The fear of God, the love of peace is in their hearts and in their homes. Nothing that can be said, nothing that can be done, will move or incite them to any act of injustice or to any premature preparations for war. But there is no other land in which the honor of the nation is so dear; there is no other land in which the love of country, of liberty, and of justice is so strong; there is no other land whose citizens would sacrifice so much to maintain its institutions or defend its soil.

The people of this country have always been patient and long suffering under wrong. They have never provoked war, and have never taken up arms until driven to it for the preservation of their most sacred rights. War has only been waged by the people of this country four times in one hundred and twenty years of national existence: First, for independence; second, to compel respect for our flag on the high seas; third, to protect our Mexican frontier; and fourth, to preserve the Union. Is there anything in such a history which makes it necessary that the people of the United States should be urged to greater moderation?

Mr. President, I share with the Senator from Colorado in the heritage of English blood. I glory with him in the mighty achievements of the English-speaking race; but I have not forgotten that England, as a nation, compelled my ancestors in 1637 to cross the stormy ocean and take up habitation upon the rocky and inhospitable shores of the New England wilderness, in order that they might enjoy freedom of conscience and the worship of God according to their own beliefs. I have not forgotten that the persecution of Great Britain followed them across the sea; I have not forgotten that she heaped indignities and injustice upon the colonists until they could no longer be borne; I have not forgotten that my grandsires carried muskets, and gave their American blood, that British dominion over American colonies should be forever at an end. I have not forgotten that our sailors and marines were forced to drive England's navy from the main to make the deck of an American ship American soil.

Sir, Great Britain has mistaken the temper of the people of this country in the past as she mistakes it now. The English people profess to believe that they can weaken our purpose and compel us to abandon the Monroe doctrine by threats and demonstrations against American securities and American commercial interests. We solemnly advise them that our foreign policy is not a matter of exchange or barter; and no financial panic can ever induce us for a single moment to lower the standard of our national honor. They also profess to believe that the United States dare not stand by the Monroe doctrine at this time, because, they say, the people of the South would gladly take advantage of a declaration of war to renew the old internal contest.

Standing upon the floor of the American Senate and knowing whereof I speak, I say to the people of Great Britain that the grave issues which have been settled by brave men upon American battlefields can never be reopened. Sir, there is no division of sentiment in the United States. Let but a single drumbeat be heard upon our coast, announcing the approach of a foreign foe, and there will spring to arms in North and South the grandest army the world has ever known, animated by a deathless loyalty to their country's flag and marching on to the mingled and inspiring strains of our two national airs, Dixie and Yankee Doodle. [Manifestations of applause.]

Mr. President, the press of Great Britain has already seized upon the utterances of the Senator from Colorado as an indication that the people of this country are ready to abandon whatever place we now hold of duty and responsibility toward the republics and the affairs of the New World. But when the pending resolution comes on for final passage, I predict that it will be adopted by such a decisive vote as will advise all Christendom of the stand which the people of this country are prepared to make for the maintenance and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Sir, believing that the honor of my country is involved, that the hour calls for the highest expression of loyalty and patriotism, calmly confident of the verdict of posterity, reverently calling God to witness the sincerity of my purpose, I shall vote for the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall vote for it not as an affront to any other nation, but to uphold the dignity of my own. I shall vote for it in this time of profound tranquillity, convinced that peace with honor can be preserved. But, sir, I would vote for it just as surely were we already standing in the awful shadow of declared war. I would vote for it were the navies of all Europe thundering at our harbors. I would vote for it were the shells of British battle ships bursting above the dome of the nation's Capitol. I would vote for it and would maintain it at all hazards and at any cost, with the last dollar, with the last man; yea, though it might presage the coming of a mighty conflict whose conclusion should leave me without a son, as the last great contest left me without a sire. [Applause in the galleries.]

RAILWAY TRAFFIC AGREEMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. PEFFER, directing that the Interstate Commerce Commission inform the Senate whether there has been a custom, rule, regulation, or agreement long time existing among railroad companies and associations engaged in interstate traffic whose lines extend to or through Missouri River points.

Mr. PEFFER. I do not wish to detain the Senate a moment, Mr. President, on this resolution. I wish merely to say that it is one of very great importance, particularly to the people of my State. Recently our railway companies extending southward, carrying corn to Texas and to the Southern ports, have been compelled to raise the price of freight, simply because of the pressure brought upon them by Eastern railways, for the reason, and for the reason only, that it costs more to carry corn from Kansas City and other Missouri River points to New York City than to carry corn from the central points in Kansas to Galveston, the difference being some six or seven hundred miles. For that reason only the Eastern railway companies have brought such a pressure to bear upon our railways that they have been compelled to raise the price for transporting corn. I ask that the resolution may be adopted in order that we may have this investigation.

Mr. HILL. We can not hear what is going on upon this side of the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER on the 27th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether there has been a custom, rule, regulation, or agreement a long time existing among railway companies and associations engaged in interstate traffic whose lines extend to or through Missouri River points, which custom, rule, regulation, or agreement establishes and maintains different rates of charges for carrying passengers and freight east and west from said points, and whether such difference in charges is reasonable and warranted by law.

Second. Whether such agreement affects alike companies running through lines to and beyond said Missouri River points, as well as companies whose lines terminate there, giving the names of roads engaged in interstate traffic to and through such places.

Third. Whether an agreement or traffic arrangement was recently made or entered into by and between any railway companies or associations, naming them, whereby charges for carrying grain and other farm produce from points in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory to points in Texas and Mexico were advanced; whether such advance charges are now in force; what was the reason or purpose of the advance, and whether it is reasonable or unreasonable and in violation of the provisions of the interstate-commerce law.

Fourth. Whether, in case these agreements have been made and these proceedings had, there is, in the opinion of the Commission, any additional legislation required to better protect the public interests.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the resolution ought to go to a committee. We ought not to pass a resolution of this kind making all the inquiries suggested without at least the approval of some committee.

Mr. PEFFER. I did not hear the remark of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce or some other proper committee to see what the investigation involves. We have been too much in the habit recently in the Senate of passing long resolutions of inquiry which entail enormous expense upon the Government without the slightest idea as to what the information is to be used for, or the value of the information when it is obtained. I do not mean to say that this resolution belongs to that class, but it certainly ought to have the approval of some standing committee before it is passed by the Senate.

Mr. PEFFER. Only a few weeks ago I had the honor to offer a resolution of a somewhat similar character, but on a much broader basis, and it was permitted to pass the Senate without any sort of objection at all. It went to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in a few days we had a full and complete answer. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that this resolution calls for information which no other body or tribunal can give so soon, so accurately, and so acceptably to the author of the resolution as the Interstate Commerce Commission. It possesses all the facts, and I do not possess them in such a manner that I can use them advantageously here or elsewhere.

Mr. ALDRICH. It may be very proper that this inquiry should be made, but certainly the resolution should receive the approval of some standing committee. I observe that the last clause of the resolution asks the Interstate Commerce Commission to report to the Senate whether, in their opinion, further legislation is desirable. That is a very great step in a wrong direction, it seems to me. We are responsible to the American people for legislation and for the inception of legislation, and the idea of gravely asking a subordinate commission as to whether they think that some legislation should be adopted appears to me to be very unwise.

Mr. PEFFER. I am perfectly willing that that clause shall be stricken out. What I wanted——

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that he allow the resolution to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It certainly will be reported by that committee very promptly; and if there is anything of value (as I have no doubt there is, from the Senator's statement) in the inquiry to be made, the inquiry will then be made with more force as coming from a standing committee.

Mr. PEFFER. I think that is all true, but my experience in such resolutions has been such as to make me feel intensely the importance of direct action upon matters similar to this one. I once offered a resolution asking for information from the Interstate Commerce Committee of this body. The resolution was referred to that committee and I never heard of it afterwards. While I do not wish in any manner to reflect upon that committee, still I would prefer to have the resolution adopted just as it is.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas to strike out the fourth branch of the resolution——

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly think that would be a very wise amendment to adopt.

Mr. HOAR. And then allow the resolution to pass. While it is quite necessary for the Senate to look with care and scrutiny upon resolutions which are calculated to impose large expense and cost on the Departments in answering them, especially on resolutions which affirm facts before they are investigated, as they sometimes do, this resolution is, I think, within the ordinary custom of the Senate in its respect to individual Senators. If any Senator on this floor desires for his instruction facts such as the Senator from Kansas asks for here, as a matter of course the Senate ought to have the proper inquiry made in his behalf. This is simply an inquiry as to what is the existing custom or rule or regulation of certain transcontinental railroads or railroads dealing with interstate commerce in regard to a very important matter. I suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission would answer it if a private note were addressed to them, but that would not give it the formality of a public document and it would not afford the convenience of having it printed. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will allow the resolution to go through with the final clause stricken out.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Massachusetts must have noticed, as well as I have myself, the very great frequency with which long and elaborate resolutions of inquiry have been adopted by the Senate during the present session. We have adopted resolutions of inquiry of the various Departments since the first Monday of December last which can be safely said within bounds will cost the Government of the United States $100,000 to answer. I remember a single inquiry made of the District Commissioners in regard to which they replied that it would require $20,000 in clerical force to answer the questions.

The Senator from Massachusetts states what everyone in the Senate knows to be perfectly true, that any Senator by writing a note to the Interstate Commerce Commission can get the information, if it is proper information to have, as easily and as well as if the Senate were to adopt the formality of a resolution of that kind. What useful public purpose can be served by the Senate allowing itself to be used—I am not using the word offensively—to make all sorts of inquiries which any man inside of the Senate Chamber or outside of the Senate Chamber desires to have made for any purpose? If this is simply a matter of inquiry, as the Senator from Massachusetts suggests, let it go to the standing committee of this body that has been in the habit of dealing with questions of this kind, and if it is a proper resolution of inquiry they will certainly report it back promptly.

I am not undertaking to make any special objection in this case, but so far as I have any influence over the matter that rule ought to be followed, and it shall be followed in all cases, so that the Government may not be burdened and the various Departments may not be burdened by answering elaborate resolutions of inquiry when in many cases it may be that no great public purpose will be served. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 2904.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for one moment?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that a vote may be had on the pending bill and amendments on Thursday next at, say, 2 o'clock.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I ask what, if any, objection exists to fixing the time for the vote at some hour to-morrow instead of Thursday? I am impelled to make this inquiry by what seems to be a necessity requiring the absence of myself and my colleague on Thursday. Unless some good reason exists for continuing the discussion beyond to-morrow I should be much pleased to see to-morrow named instead of Thursday.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand that some Senators are now absent who expect to be here Thursday. I had previously asked to have a vote on Thursday and had given notice that I would ask the Senate to remain in session Thursday until the bill shall be disposed of. Those Senators being absent now, I presume there would be objection to undertaking to take a vote before their return. Besides there are, to my certain knowledge, a number of Senators who desire to make speeches, all of whom I think will have ample time to do so between now and 2 o'clock on Thursday.

Mr. CARTER. What will be the objection, then, to continuing the discussion until Friday and taking the vote at some hour Friday afternoon?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should be glad to know if there can be consent to any hour on Thursday. I earnestly hope there will be no objection and that there will be no postponement beyond Thursday. The bill has been here some time; I have been as courteous as possible to Senators who desired to have time to prepare for speeches, and I think there ought not to be any further delay.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not intend to object to having a day fixed for disposing of the bill. I think it is desirable that a day should be named for that purpose. I do object, however, to an agreement in the form suggested by the Senator from Arkansas. His proposition is that at 2 o'clock on the day agreed upon the bill and amendments shall then be voted upon. I suppose he means without further debate?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That was my proposition.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator to modify his request so that after a given hour the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the bill and proposed amendments under the five-minute rule as to debate, with an understanding, if the Senate chooses to give it, that the bill shall be completed upon that date. It is objectionable, it seems to me, to shut off all debate on the bill itself and on amendments instantly at a given hour.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I recognize the reasonableness of the Senator's proposition, and I am willing to modify the suggestion in accordance with what he has just stated.

Mr. CHANDLER. That at a given hour the consideration of the bill and amendments shall proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CHANDLER. And with the understanding that the bill shall be completed during that day.

Mr. HARRIS. What shall be the given hour—2 o'clock?

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not want to anticipate that, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee. The day has not yet been agreed upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Concerning this matter, I simply desire to observe that I had intended to submit some observations on the bill, but inasmuch as I am much more anxious that the revenue bill shall come before the Senate for action than any bill involving the free coinage of silver, I will not trouble the Senate to make any remarks concerning the bill now under consideration, and will very gladly agree to a vote on this particular measure at as early a day or hour as is possible.

Mr. HILL. I am advised that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] desires to submit some remarks on the pending measure, and but a very short time ago the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] informed me that he hoped to be able to speak to-morrow, and if not to-morrow, the next day. Under these circumstances it does not seem to be possible for us to now agree upon a time at which the vote shall be taken. I think it very likely that a vote can be had on Thursday next; but at this time I can not consent to such an agreement as is proposed.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from New York will not object to a definite understanding. It is a very material matter. So far as I am concerned, I have endeavored to observe the wishes of Senators. During the three weeks the bill has been here I have not urged any action, and when Senators have come and said to me that they would like time for preparation, I have time after time agreed that the Senate might adjourn, until I feel that I have made myself censurable to some extent for not pressing this measure more vigorously. I now hope the Senator from New York will not interpose any objection, but that we may have an agreement to vote on Thursday. I shall not ask anything as to the particular hour if I can have unanimous consent to vote on that day.

Mr. HILL. I cheerfully bear testimony to the courtesy of the Senator from Arkansas who has charge of the pending bill. He has certainly endeavored to extend to those who desire to speak every possible opportunity. There have been speeches made nearly every day during reasonable hours upon the bill; but, as a number of Senators still desire to speak, I can not, in the present situation, assent to the proposed agreement at this time. I said before, and I repeat now, that I hope we may be able to come to some agreement to take a vote on the bill on Thursday, but I am not prepared now to assent to an agreement.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then, I desire to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to remain in session on Thursday until the pending bill is disposed of; and I hope that the friends of the bill and all other Senators favoring the dispatch of business of the Senate will come on that day with the intention of staying until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to offer at the proper time an amendment as an additional section to the amendment reported by the committee. I ask that it be read, and then ordered to be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill, as section 5, the following:

That after the 1st of July, 1896, all bank notes issued by national banking associations shall be redeemed in coin when presented for redemption to the national banking association issuing the same, and any such national banking association failing to redeem these notes on presentation shall be dissolved.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be ordered to be printed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] for a moment, if I may have it. Referring to the suggestion made by that Senator that on Thursday next he would ask the Senate to remain in session until a vote was reached on the bond bill, I beg to appeal to the Senator not to put the physical test of endurance upon the members of the Senate who would vote for his amendment, or those who would vote against it. I understand perfectly well, as do almost all the Senators in this Chamber, that this hastening of a vote was agreed to by the Senator from Arkansas not alone because of his unflinching and earnest advocacy of the amendment which he has reported, but that he agreed to it as well at the earnest request of Senators on both sides of the Chamber who are opposed to bimetallism, to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and who have from time to time expressed the fear that the friends of free coinage in this body were endeavoring to stifle a vote and to postpone legislation. We have heard again and again that it was the silver people, so called, who were endeavoring to stave off a vote upon this bond question.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] objects to a vote. I have nothing to criticise respecting his utterance, for he is entirely within the line of his duty, but it ought to be understood that it is not the advocates of silver who are objecting to a vote upon the bond bill. We have been told upon this side of the Chamber by Senators from the East, and very properly told, that the country desires some sort of legislation, and that it is necessary that it should be known what position the Senate is going to take. In view of that, as well as because of his advocacy of his amendment, the Senator from Arkansas, I understand, agreed that we should have a speedy vote.

That agreement met a hearty indorsement on this side of the Chamber by the advocates and opponents of free coinage. But any attempt at this session to precipitate a vote by physical force, against the wish of anybody to speak upon the question, would seem to me hardly well taken; and if those Senators from the East who are opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, who are telling us of the great sufferings the country is undergoing because of the procrastinating tactics of the silver people, are willing to assume the responsibility of postponing, day after day and week after week, a vote on this measure, I do not think the friends of silver ought to be called upon to come here nights and help dispose of the measure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to allow me to make a suggestion.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas whether he would not at least make one more effort, by asking unanimous consent that after Thursday—say, at 3 o'clock—the debate shall proceed by ten-minute speeches only. I think if the Senate would give that consent, it would be a great step forward; and if it should turn out that any particular Senator who had made a special study, the result of which he wished to communicate, desired the time extended, undoubtedly he would get the consent of the Senate for additional time; but if we could have a general understanding that there should be a debate limited to ten minutes on the part of each Senator, I think it would probably meet the wishes of Senators on both sides.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should be glad to do anything to satisfy the views of different Senators and to avoid any friction. It is not an unusual thing for the Senate to come here with a general-consent agreement that Senators will stay until a measure in hand is disposed of.

Mr. HOAR. When such understandings are had, it is usual for the Senate to adjourn about 5 o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did not understand the last remark of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I said when the Senate made such an arrangement my experience was that they always, in spite of it, adjourned about 5 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In my experience I never saw a case where they did.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the ten-minute debate commence on Thursday at some hour to be fixed, and that we reach a general understanding that the final vote on the bill and amendments be taken not later than Monday—that the bill shall be disposed of at least by Monday.

Mr. HILL. I do not know exactly who has the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HILL. I ask the consent of the Senator from Wyoming to say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. I do not understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] referred to me when he said that certain Senators from the East charge the so-called free-silver Senators with efforts to delay the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I may interrupt the Senator, certainly not. How could I accuse the Senator of that when he was upon the floor asking for further time? I had no thought of the Senator from New York in what I said. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I recollect that last week there were certain Senators who intimated that the friends of the bill were not ready to vote. There was nothing beyond that said. I think those Senators are not now in their seats. I am not called upon to defend them or say anything in that regard.

So far as the Senator from Arkansas is concerned, he is at liberty to take any course he sees fit. I do not object, so far as I am concerned, to his statement that he wants the friends of the measure to remain here. I repeat, I express the hope that we may be able to come to an agreement whereby some vote may be had on Thursday, but I insist upon it that until we can see the end of the debate—and there are so many Senators who desire to speak that it is difficult to see the end—I can not consent, so far as I am concerned, to the proposed agreement.

I have not yet asked the Senate for the privilege of speaking, and I do not ask the Senator from Colorado for the privilege of speaking upon this bill. If I want to speak upon it I shall speak, and that is all there is of it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Wyoming for just one more moment of time, I will now act on the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and ask unanimous consent that after 3 o'clock on Thursday the debate on the bill and amendments shall be confined to ten minutes to each Senator.

Mr. HILL. I do not see why the Senator from Arkansas is insisting upon that vote. I have stated, and now state again, that I can not consent to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have not before asked that, and I do not understand how the Senator could have objected to it before it was asked for.

Mr. HILL. I object to any agreement being made to take a vote on Thursday, in the present status of affairs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not ask a vote, but I ask for an agreement that the debate after 3 o'clock on Thursday shall be confined to ten-minute speeches, without saying anything as to how long the debate shall continue.

Mr. GRAY. No matter how long the debate may continue. I hope the Senator from New York will not object to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] as entitled to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then, I hope, for the purpose of giving Senators an opportunity to make such speeches as they want, that the Senate will sit late each day from now on, so as to give every Senator who desires an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask what was the result of the request for unanimous consent? Was any agreement arrived at?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection was interposed, and no agreement has been reached. The Senator from Wyoming is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am glad that the matter is definitely settled in some way for the present, and I am glad that I have the opportunity of submitting in a general way only a few remarks on the pending proposition, a proposition not at all political in its nature, but one that equally affects all parties, one that has in effect and in various forms been before our people for many years, one that vitally interests every producer and every consumer in the land, but one which has seemed to arouse ill will and sharp retort only, when it, of all questions, should receive candid discussion and deliberate consideration. When the time shall come that we can discuss the money proposition with the same calm minds with which we approach other matters and questions of national import, then, and not till then, can we hope for a final and just conclusion and determination of the financial problem.

I shall not attempt to discuss the silver question in detail in this Chamber to-day or at any other time—that has been done fully and often by those who are qualified to undertake the task. I will only say that I have tried to arrive at a just and honest conviction in my own mind that should determine how my vote should be cast when in the line of my duty I should be called upon to vote, and after the examination I have made, after investigating as fully as my opportunities and abilities will allow, I can only come to the conclusion that our fathers before 1873 had a juster and better idea as to the financial system that would benefit all classes of our people than their sons have seemed to develop since that time. The American people are beginning to take this silver question seriously and I venture the assertion that twelve months' honest and fair discussion of the proposition with an intelligent and reasonable presentation of both sides of the question in the daily and weekly press, on the farms, at the crossroads, in the counting rooms, and elsewhere, would result in such a turning over of the single-standard people that the day of Pentecost would sink into insignificance as a day of conversion from erroneous ways. We would then awake to the consciousness that the Creator made no mistake when he poured gold and silver side by side into the giant mountains and decreed that they should form the lifeblood of commerce and trade among the peoples of the earth for ages to come; as I say, if this subject could be approached in candor and fairness I believe all would be silver men in twelve months. The difficulty has been that the issue has been clouded with passion and epithet, with foolish words and real or affected distrust.

We who believe in silver have been taunted as fiatists and cranks and dishonest politicians, who for personal ends and political purposes seek to dishonor our currency and depreciate the value of the dollar. Do you believe a word of such vituperation? Do you, my hard-money friend on that or this side of the Chamber, really believe that those who oppose you in your desire to issue gold bonds and thus discredit and depreciate every former obligation of the Government are fiatists? Do you think we want a cheap dollar simply because we demand an honest dollar? Do you really believe that we are less patriotic than you because we advocate a system that gave Great Britain the financial control of the world, and which she only abandoned when the greed of her bankers overshadowed the welfare of her common people, even as she abandoned protection at the demand of the few and at the expense of the many after years of that policy had made her the industrial ruler of the world, a policy to which she must soon return in sheer self-defense? Do you believe that we are less patriotic than you because we advocate a financial system that enabled France with the elasticity of the young gladiator to wipe out in an incredibly short space of time the effects of the most destructive of modern European wars? Are we less patriotic than you because we favor a plan that accords with nature, and which logic and history alike indorse?

The present situation is intensified by the arrogant and hostile bearing assumed by those who make their fortunes and increase their store by trading in the dire extremity of the nation; because a Senator sworn to his duty makes known to the people by his vote directly or indirectly his views upon the silver question, if such views happened to differ from the interests of those who speculate in cold blood upon the unfortunate conditions of our country, and who would add to our miseries by forcing upon us additional indebtedness and interest-bearing burdens, at that moment the metropolitan press, drawing inspiration from the gamblers and speculators of Wall street or "Pinchers alley," open their batteries in libelous denunciation. A campaign of vituperation and abuse is at once begun, and every method known is used to bend the back of Congress to the burden Wall street would impose. Not content to subject individual Senators to the lash for daring to withstand their plans of greed and disaster, discredit is sought to be thrown upon the States they represent, and Eastern bankers and business firms are urged to lessen their credits and withdraw business favors from States represented, or, as they choose to call it, misrepresented by Senators in favor of the currency of the better days of the Republic.

In its issue of December 28 one of the leading dailies of New York puts forth a column and more of personal attack upon 24 "silver Senators," dealing with them without regard to truth or decency. In its wisdom it hits upon what it considers a proper and effective way of dealing with these disturbers of the nation's serenity; it proposes an embargo on the merchants and bankers of the East, it threatens the business men of the West and South with calamity unless they shall muzzle their Senators. The Senator from Georgia read a portion of this article in his speech of yesterday, allow me to read still another portion:

> The New York business men said they believed that the constituents of the 24 Senators who have joined hands with the silver men should either through the legislatures of the States they represent or through the boards of trade and the chambers of commerce in the cities of those States demand of these 24 that they cease misrepresenting them in matters of financial legislation at Washington and come out hearty and strong for sound money. It is declared that some such line of action should be adopted at once in order to bring these 24 Senators to their senses, and it is even said that this must be done if the merchants and others represented by these 24 men are to be well considered in the matter of credits with New York and Eastern merchants generally. The false light in which these 24 Senators have put the business men of their States has deterred Eastern manufacturers and business men from extending lines of credit, even though they are convinced that these Senators do not rightly represent their constituents. It does not matter, it was continued, that some of these Senators are shortly to be retired to private life. They should be called to account at once just the same. Those who are interested in directing the attention of the constituents of these 24 Senators to their conduct at Washington and urging a sharp protest against it point out specifically just how flagrant is the conduct of these Senators.

Then, after castigating each of these 24 Senators by name, the article concludes with the threat that "still there's more to follow."

> The question is being agitated also as to what methods should be used against United States Senators who get to Washington and misrepresent every interest in their States. The complaint of the New York business men and the demand that the constituents of these 24 delinquent United States Senators call on them for an understanding will be heard more of in the future.

Since this publication the same great daily, joined by other New York sheets, has day by day, editorially and otherwise, attacked these Senators by name and in detail, descending to bitter personal abuse, for want of argument, to support the gold position, urging, time and again, withdrawals of credits and business favors from the States represented by these Senators, because they have assumed to differ from the money controllers of the city of New York on the coinage question.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that the gold monometallist hopes to use this sort of argument to convince the people of the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this Chamber? The gentlemen of Wall street are mistaken if for one moment they

fancy that any game of bluff will carry the day with the American people. If this nation is to be finally and completely committed to the gold standard, that has resulted in good and gain only to those already rich, and has worked further unbounded poverty to all besides, the world over, some other argument must be used beyond the "stand and deliver" of the highwayman. I am against the House measure, Mr. President, and with my present light shall be opposed to any like measure coming before this Senate. I favor this substitute or amendment proposed by the Finance Committee because I believe in America and in her ability to care for herself against the world.

The patriotism of this nation has never failed when the final test came, and in my judgment, Mr. President, the day is not far distant when the entire financial system will, through the demand of a long-suffering people, finally adjust itself on thoroughly American lines. As Americans, by force of arms we accomplished political independence and separation from the greatest political power on the earth; by the arts of peace and under the influences of a protective tariff we gained our position of industrial independence of the greatest manufacturing and commercial nation the world has ever known; and I have faith to believe that in the near future, as the American people reflect that the fathers were wise, they will come to the belief that the same great minds that conceived the grand ideas of an American Republic set in motion also a system of finance sufficient for all the needs of that Republic, a system that carried us safely through domestic and foreign wars and was sufficient for all our remarkable commercial growth in times of peace—the people, I say, remembering these things, will demand financial independence as well as political.

Nothing can be added to the arguments advanced on this question during the past ten years. The minds of those who have made the closest and most candid study of the question have been led to the support of the double standard, no matter from what point of view they started; their arguments have been met for ten years by prophecies and predictions only, and by prophecies and predictions that have invariably failed. Their arguments can not be overturned by personal attack in city press nor by threats of the withdrawal of business favor. If met at all they must be met by open argument or historical results; the people will accept no other course.

I hope the time will soon come, Mr. President, when this nation will be freed from the chains forged by syndicates and speculators; when the public credit will not be bandied about by any man or set of men for individual greed; when we as a nation will have the nerve and disposition to regulate our own financial affairs. Surely, Mr. President, if we are strong enough to say to England, "Hands off in Venezuela," we are strong enough to adopt and carry on a coinage system without gaining consent of England to our plan. I say, Mr. President, I hope the day will soon come when this nation will regulate its own affairs without the interposition of any other nation on earth, and when syndicate bond issues with their attendant scandals will be a thing of the past, and I am convinced that the vote of this Chamber in favor of this amendment will hasten that day.

It is true that the people seem to have been chloroformed into a state of monometallism; my gold-money friends have apparently hypnotized them with all the diabolical skill of a Svengali; but if they have suffered, you, like Svengali, have exhausted yourselves with the effort. The mistaken exercise of your power has carried destruction and desolation in its wake. You, my Eastern friends, have succeeded in establishing a single standard in this nation, but you have not escaped its deadly, blighting effect. The railways reaching all over our land are crippled and bankrupt, and your railway stocks go begging in the market and on the exchange, the legitimate prey of the rapacious money changers at whose behest the present financial system was inaugurated. Your policy has depreciated 25 per cent in value every farm in all our land, but at the same time the farm securities in your safes have fallen to a still lower basis. Every producer, mechanic, and laborer is eating his bread in despondency and without hope, but at the same time your capital invested in active industrial enterprise has suffered beyond compare. You can not escape the results of your action in the past. It is not yet too late to stay the devastating tide. If you are sincere, as I know you are, to free our Republic from the grasp of the speculator, the gold gambler, and the foreign syndicate, why not ally yourselves with their foes instead of hobnobbing with their friends. If you are jealous of the credit of our nation, do not trust it to the tender mercies of those whose every movement is an assault upon our Treasury, men without patriotism or love of country, whose sole desire seems to be for sordid gain, and whose rallying banner is not the flag with the stars upon its azure field, but is a standard inscribed only with the bar sinister of the English pound.

And why should we follow England in her financial system? Her thirst for gold is at the seat of all her present troubles. Wherever she is now involved is found the yellow metal; wherever she attempts to push her unjust claims the gold is her objective point; whether she pushes her advances in Venezuela against the young Republic in our southern continent, or seeks our own possessions in Alaska, or quarrels over African lands with her continental kinsmen, the golden fields are at the bottom of every controversy; and pursuing such a course it will, in my poor judgment, require a stronger brain than that of the great Salisbury himself to guide her ship of state clear of the rocks of national humiliation.

The great financiers, clamoring even now for gold bonds, prating in such high-sounding terms about our national credit, and disputing the honesty of purpose and personal integrity of any who may differ from their views or possible interests, outshylock, as it were, the patron saint of usurers himself. Shakspeare's Shylock demanded but the letter of his bond, but these of later days are made of sterner and more unpitying stuff—they demand not only the pound of Christian flesh, but still draw drop by drop the life blood of the nation—for them the people must thirst and hunger and slave, because they, forsooth, are so jealous of our public credit that they deem it would be dishonorable to pay our indebtedness in the same kind of money as is nominated in the bond. Oh, for some Chief Executive or Secretary of the Treasury, Democratic or Republican, with enough nerve and sufficient Americanism to say to these despoilers: "The letter of your bond shall be fulfilled, we will discharge every obligation you present in current coin. More than this you can not honestly demand; more than this we will in no wise grant." If such should be the course pursued, how long would Treasury notes be presented for redemption? The only object for the endless exchange now going on of greenbacks and other obligations for gold is purely speculative, and every Senator knows this to be the fact.

But, Mr. President, I have spoken more than I should, my only object being to define my own position. I am as firm a believer in sound money as any Senator here, but I reject the right of Wall street or Rothschild to force upon my judgment their own definition of what sound money is. I believe in honest money as well as sound money; the two must be identical; and that can not be dishonest money which is used to pay a bond which is the very creator of the bond itself. This is the ground upon which I stand, and no scurrilous attack of metropolitan press, no insinuations of personal interest shall drive me from this position. I am no inflationist, no fiatist, but on this measure I record my hostility to any financial scheme which proposes to issue our governmental obligations to pay current expenses and my opposition to that system which in my judgment has wrought ruin and desolation to the people of our Republic; that can only result in making the rich richer and the poor poorer, and now and here I declare myself without hesitation in favor of the policy that made us great as a nation and prosperous as individuals; that brought us through wars, both foreign and domestic, and which received the approbation and support of the great founders of our Republic.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I rise to-day to indulge in a short talk, rather than for the purpose of making a speech of more elaborate pretensions. We are in the crisis of a financial revolution inaugurated twenty-two years ago for the destruction of silver money and for the overthrow of the Constitution and the laws as they were framed and enacted on that subject by the founders of the Republic. Those who support the coinage and use of silver on the same terms with gold are not the agitators nor the disturbers of the peace of the country. They did not make the present issue. On the contrary, they are simply asking that the policy, the precepts, and the principles of those who made this Government and put it in operation be let alone. That is all.

The friends of silver as one of the money metals are now, and have been for nearly a quarter of a century, in an attitude of vigilant resistance, on guard, as it were, against those who seek to subvert the financial system of the fathers in the interest of corporations, speculating syndicates, and individual avarice. The enemies of silver money, those who plot its destruction, are alone responsible for the panics, the business troubles and depressions of the last twenty years and more, and for the disturbed condition of financial affairs at the present time. They alone have labored in season and out of season, in open fight and by secret, hidden methods, to disturb the harmony of the two precious metals, to destroy their parity, to put them at strife and variance, to break up their fraternal and cooperating relations in the business transactions of the country by discrediting and slandering one and unduly exalting the other.

The men who enacted the law of 1873 for the demonetization of silver were revolutionists with deliberate and premeditated malice against the settled, unbroken, and universally accepted policy of this Government from the beginning. They were wanton and unprovoked aggressors against the peace and welfare of the American people. Nor has their assault on silver then or at any time since had any other incentive or provocation than the desire to make money scarcer in the hands of the people, and thus double its purchasing power and value in the hands of the rich and grasping. Silver has been guilty of no sin against the prosperity of the

country, either of omission or commission. It has never failed in standing at a parity with gold, and was a little better, about 3 per cent better, than gold in 1873. It was the sounder money of the two, if such a comparison is to be made, when the hour of its destruction drew nigh. Am I expected to speak with bated breath and in words of whispered humbleness in resisting to the utmost of my power the persistent self-seeking and unrelenting efforts now made for the extermination of silver money from our currency?

Sir, I appeal to history; I recur to the fountain head of patriotism and wisdom, and I invoke the sanction of the purest and best days of the Republic. With what respect, awe and reverence we look by the light of history into a meeting of Washington's Cabinet in the very beginning of our career. There we behold Washington himself, with his Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, and his Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, in deep consultation over the financial principles required for the strength, progress, safety, and glory of the new Government. It will hardly be contended, I think, that any other such Cabinet has, from that day to this, considered the subject of the finances. I am pointing now to the early part of the year 1792. The Government of the United States was then less than three years old. It was in the fullest sense of the term an infant in its swaddling clothes.

Washington's Cabinet, however, did not ask the cooperation or the permission of any other nation or nations or any international conference or agreement even then that the United States might coin gold and silver and maintain their parity at such ratio and on such conditions as was thought best for the American people. Jefferson and Hamilton were very American in spirit, and Washington intensely so. The act prepared by them, entitled "An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States," which became a law April 2, 1792, was thoroughly American and was born of the spirit of American independence. It stooped to no foreign power, deferred to none, and leaned on none. It boldly proclaimed its own system of coinage without cringing or fear, and fixed the ratio between silver and gold at 15 to 1. Jefferson and Hamilton differed widely in regard to many of the fundamental principles of government, but on the great problem of finance they agreed and stood shoulder to shoulder in support of Washington's Administration. Hamilton, in his famous report to Congress in 1791, said:

> To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation.

And Jefferson, in a letter to Hamilton, written in February, 1792, replied:

> I return you the report on the mint. I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.

With Washington's approval of the act of 1792, embodying these views of Hamilton and Jefferson, the financial policy of this Government was established, and so remained through every vicissitude and trial of American history for a period of eighty-one years. The Constitution of the United States gives to Congress the only power that exists between the heavens above and the earth below to create money for the American people; "to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures." The great act of April 2, 1792, was the first exercise of this transcendent power by the men who had achieved American independence, framed the Constitution, and understood it. The lofty origin of gold and silver money in the United States is an old story, but it can not be too often repeated in plain and simple words, or too deeply impressed on the public mind.

The act of 1792, the immortal charter for the free coinage of gold and silver both, ought to be in the hands of every American. Nor was this act of a temporary character, or devised to meet temporary conditions. As the country grew and waxed strong in population, and in the development of its unparalleled resources the value and necessity of the double standard vindicated the wisdom of its authors, and made it permanent. In peace and in war, in all the great events of American history, the reliance of the people for final safety and deliverance has been upon the two metals as inseparable as the Siamese twins, and never on one metal alone. Within the first twenty-three years of our national existence, England, with deliberate design and premeditated revenge, forced her late American colonies to fight a second war for independence, which was closed by General Jackson, it will be remembered, at New Orleans.

The war with Mexico came thirty years later, with its vast and overwhelming results, and then, after an interval of only fifteen years, the convulsive and gigantic struggle for national life and union broke upon the country in the war of the rebellion. During all these perils and trials of financial strength no one spurned silver money; no one disparaged its use or impugned its honor; no one questioned the wisdom that put it in the Constitution and in the first financial measure enacted under the Constitution. For eighty-one years, from 1792 to 1873, no one talked of gold as the only sound money in existence, thereby stigmatizing the silver money of Washington's Administration as unsound.

The present cry of sound money applied to gold, and gold alone, is a fraud—a cheap, transparent fraud—in the face of every line of American history and in the face of existing facts this hour. It is true that gold is sound money, but so also is silver. No man dares to say in this presence that silver ever faltered or fell short in performing all the functions of money, or that it has ever stood for a single hour in American history at less than a parity with gold. Who has the audacity to assail such a currency as unsound? Even now, with every discrimination in the power of the Government against it, discredited and dishonored as far as possible by hostile legislation, and pursued by incessant and interested slander for more than twenty years past, the silver dollar has not gone to the rear among the business and laboring masses; it still remains the money of the fathers with the people, and whatever can be purchased with gold can be purchased at the same price with silver wherever the American flag flies and American law prevails.

Never before in the history of the world has a currency so persecuted, hunted down, and vilified by concentrated wealth and official sanction maintained such perfect rank and power in financial transactions. The truth is it is embedded in the confidence of the people and will never be dislodged. It is "money current with the merchant" now as it was in the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and has continued so to be in all the ages since. It is full and perfect legal tender to-day with which to meet every outstanding obligation against the Government, to pay every bond that demands payment, and to redeem every species of currency, every Treasury note, and every greenback that seeks redemption. Will it shock sensibilities and excite alarm in certain quarters if I ask why the debts of this Government may not be paid in one kind of lawful money as well as in another, when they are at a parity with each other? It would most effectually protect the hundred million gold reserve against the further premeditated, periodical raids of speculative marauders if the Government should exercise its unquestioned legal right to meet their unpatriotic demands for coin with silver.

The Government of France holds and exercises the option to pay her creditors in silver or in gold, according to the circumstances under which demand for payment is made, and France maintains the strongest and most reliable credit in Europe.

The same option exists by law in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and I do not hesitate to say that it ought to be exercised.

Who asserts that the silver dollar of Jefferson and Hamilton, unimpaired in purchasing power or as standard money, is not good enough in quality to tender to the money sharks and sharpers of the world when they enter the Treasury with hostile and mercenary designs against the gold reserve? There are Senators on this floor to-day who were members of Congress, here and at the other end of the Capitol, during the war for the Union; notably the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], whose absence from the Chamber I regret. That distinguished Senator was more responsible than any other man now living for the deliberate and intentional creation of a depreciated currency at that time. The Government discredited its own currency by refusing to make it a legal tender for customs duties or for interest on the public debt. For the creation and enactment of this policy the Senator from Ohio and those who acted with him were bitterly denounced in my hearing on the floor of the House by the eloquent old Commoner, as he was styled, Thaddeus Stevens, the most effective leader of men I have ever seen in a parliamentary body.

Speaking of the currency act as it passed the Senate in February, 1862, the fiery and veteran leader of his party cried out in tones which I still well remember:

> Instead of being a beneficent and invigorating measure, it is now positively mischievous. It has all the bad qualities which its enemies charged on the original bill and none of its benefits. It now creates a money, and by its very terms declares it a depreciated currency. It makes two classes of money—one for the bankers and brokers, and another for the people. * * * The first purchase of gold by the Government will fix the value of these notes which we issue and declare to be a legal tender. The sale will fix their value at 10, 15, or 25 per cent discount, and then every poor man when he buys his beef, his pork, and his supplies, must submit to this 15 or 25 per cent discount because you have said that shall be the value of the very notes which you have made a legal tender to him but not a legal tender to those who fix the value of these very notes.

This strong appeal against the dishonor of American money went unheeded, however, at that time.

The deed of shame was accomplished; in the interest of cowardly, hoarded gold the greenback was sent forth crippled and maimed. It fell from one grade of discount to another, until its purchasing and debt-paying power was often but one-half that of gold or silver, and yet the Senator from Ohio and his party associates found nothing wrong in compelling the soldier to take this dishonored currency at par in full payment for his life on the field of battle. There was no hysterical cry then for sound money with which to pay the creditors of the Government who,

in long lines of blue and under a four years' hail of lead and iron, saved the Government's existence. The financial legislation of the Senator from Ohio at that time enabled the owner of idle wealth to transmute the greenback at double its value into Government bonds to be paid in gold, while the soldier was forced to stand a discount of 50 cents on the dollar when he bought a barrel of flour or a suit of clothes or any other necessity for his family.

What an appropriate and striking stage setting for the play of "The Honest Dollar," with the Senator from Ohio in the title rôle, was made by the toil-worn, battle-scarred soldier when Republican legislation put him on half pay in front of the enemy, and reduced his pension money 50 per cent in value!

Such a play would have been a reality, pregnant with meaning and full of blessings a generation ago; it is a farce now. Every dollar now in existence is an honest dollar, and equal to every other dollar in the discharge of all the functions for which money was ever created.

This fact is known and appreciated by every Senator in the sound of my voice, and yet the bare suggestion that the Government should use honest silver money, sound silver money, full legal-tender silver money with which to pay the demands of gold gamblers, stock jobbers, and professional usurers from Wall street, New York, and Lombard street, London, will be met in certain quarters with ejaculations of pious horror and loud prayers in behalf of the public credit.

The dishonest features of financial legislation during the war for the Union did not entirely escape observation at the time. I recall with satisfaction, at least to myself, that at the proper time and in the proper place I made all the effort I could to protect the soldier then in the field from the oppressive evils of unsound money. It was true the Government could not pay the soldier in gold, but it is equally true that he could have been paid a sufficient amount of the depreciated currency he was then receiving to have kept the contract price of his enlistment and preserved the public honor. This I proposed to do, but the measure I introduced found a burial place without resurrection in the committee to which it was referred, while I was denounced as an unpatriotic member of a troublesome but helpless minority. The truth is there are hundreds of millions of dollars as honorably and equitably due to-day to the surviving soldiers of the Union Army under their contract of enlistment, and to the widows and children of those who are dead, as if the amount had been ascertained by a paymaster and the Government had issued its bonds for the same.

This just debt was repudiated long ago; it will never be paid, but at the same time it will never be forgotten. The Senator from Ohio in his recent speech on this floor arraigned the Democratic party for incompetency in the administration of the Government. Sir, I commend to his attention the record of his own party, wherein, under his leadership, it broke faith with the most meritorious creditors the Government ever had, paid them for their blood in paper that was purposely depreciated, while guaranteeing double profits in gold on every dollar invested in bonds or other public securities. When that Senator has looked into the records of parties a little more carefully, I hope we may hear from him again on the subject of sound money, and that he may not fail to give us the proper distinctions between sound money for the Wall street operator and the millionaire magnate on the one hand and sound money for the soldier and the citizen on the other. Let him show us, if he can, why it would impair and break down the public credit to pay the gold raiders of the Treasury in standard silver money, when in point of fact the American people, soldiers and citizens alike, during the war, and until 1878, a period of thirteen years after the war, received pay for everything and transacted all business in a depreciated circulating medium.

Sir, I am no advocate of a silver basis any more than a gold basis, nor would I favor the free coinage of silver if experience showed that such free coinage would disturb the parity between gold and silver money. I am in favor of no measure which will beget a single dollar of depreciated currency. By my voice and vote I stand pledged to maintain all our several kinds of currency at par with each other, and in strict uniformity in purchasing and debt-paying power. The accusation, however, against silver that its coinage would destroy the parity between the two metals has been proven to be false by every page of our country's history. The charge that it has ever driven gold out of the country, or that the fear of its coinage is doing so now, is equally false and unfounded.

When in 1878 the attempt was made to check the torrent of bankruptcy and ruin occasioned by the demonetization of silver in 1873, and the consequent contraction of currency which followed, there went up such a wail of dismal prophecy in these Halls over the proposed restoration of silver as will never be forgotten. An inspection now of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date is full of entertainment, and, indeed, of instruction. It will there be seen how able and learned men can grow eloquent in predicting what never comes to pass; how they can disregard the traditions and the Constitution of their fathers, as well as the teachings of all the ages known to human history.

Much indeed may be learned by recourse to the debates of seventeen years ago on this subject. I could occupy the time of the Senate hour after hour in reading the prophetic visions of dire disaster which then appeared to certain distinguished Senators if the Bland-Allison Act remonetizing silver, and providing for its partial coinage, should become a law. One of the first and most certain evils predicted was the hurried departure of gold from beneath the folds of the American flag; that it would take to itself wings and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth in order to escape the contamination of base, ignoble silver.

It is true the two metals had been for four thousand years the twins of the financial world, the gemini of nations, compeers and cofactors in the development, the advancement of the human race; but a new light seemed suddenly to burst upon certain minds to the effect that gold would no longer abide the companionship of its kindred metal, its old-time and long-tried ally. The alarming measure, however, was enacted into law, and the believing disciples of false prophets stood gaping in awful anticipation of coming ruin. What was it that did occur?

The Government proceeded in orderly and constitutional methods to coin $24,000,000 per annum of silver money for the use and benefit of the American people, and continued so to do for the next twelve years, making in all $288,000,000, and during this time the increase—not the decrease, but the increase—of gold in the United States was at the rate of about forty millions a year. At the date of the passage of the Bland-Allison Act the estimate of gold money in this country was $230,000,000, and when coinage ceased under that act it was more than three times that amount; over $700,000,000. And such was the fulfillment of the prophecies inspired by Pluto in 1878, and yet I am expected to believe now that the fair and legitimate coinage of silver, its free coinage upon a properly ascertained and determined ratio, will banish all our gold and put us on a single silver basis.

I must be pardoned for believing nothing of the kind. The shipments of gold which have taken place from this country in the last twelve months must be accounted for, to my mind, in a different way. They were a part of the same plan which has attempted to sack the Treasury of its gold reserve fund, to create distrust, fear, agitation, panic, and a withdrawal, as far as possible, of all money in circulation; and all this to be accompanied by a concerted outcry from terror-stricken business circles and from the whole national banking system that nothing can restore public confidence and save the public credit except the issuance of interest-bearing Government bonds in large amounts.

Sir, forty centuries of human history bear testimony that gold and silver in circulation as money have no natural hostility toward each other, and are never at a disparity unless made so by sinister and improper interests and legislation. When both metals were coined on an equality for more than three-quarters of a century in the United States, no friction or disturbance ever occurred between them, and all went well with the country. Since the demonetization of silver in 1873, we have been saluted with constant financial uproar and confusion, and bombarded by rapidly recurring panics. Earthquakes are frequent and familiar in certain quarters of the globe, owing to physical laws which prevail there; panics in the minds of men on monetary affairs have become a common and an almost every day affair in this country, owing to the bad legislation and attempted legislation of the last twenty-two years.

The attempt to put the business of this vast country, with its gigantic developments in progress everywhere, on a specie basis of gold alone signifies the most frightful contraction of money in circulation ever inflicted on any people beneath the sun. The contraction which followed the overthrow of silver in 1873 filled the country with wreck and calamity on all hands, and laid a train of evils throughout the whole land which have never been eradicated, and which from time to time still explode and shock and shatter the homes and the prosperity of the people. Contraction of the currency so that it will rest on one of the precious metals, instead of resting on both, means the destruction of one-half the money now in use, and to the laboring man it means one dollar where he now gets two for his work; to the farmer it means half price for what he has to sell; while to the money holder, the money lender, the money investor, it means a double power for his money in purchasing the labor and the property of all the productive classes.

The annulment of the silver dollar necessarily results in the shrinkage of the amount of paper in circulation one-half if the specie basis is to be maintained at all and that basis is to be gold alone. Who is ready to embrace such a consequence as this, of silver demonetization? The laboring and business people of this country can stand no more contraction of the currency; they have been compelled to stand too much already. Blood letting was once the cure in the medical profession for all ills of the human

body; the doctors bled George Washington to death for a sore throat; and with equal sense and enlightenment financial quacks and empirics are now prescribing a depletion of the circulating medium, a contraction of the most deadly character, by withdrawing one-half the support which upholds our entire monetary system. Money, sound money, such as silver and gold, and paper resting upon them, is the life blood in the arteries of business, trade, commerce, and national progress, and can not be withdrawn without producing paralysis and death.

By far the greatest need now felt by the great mass of the American people is for an increase of currency on which to do business, for more money to stimulate trade and secure employment and good wages for labor. The volume of money in the hands of our people could reasonably be doubled this hour with indescribable advantages to all meritorious classes and without complaint from any except such as shave notes, buy up judgments on their neighbors, loan money on mortgaged homes, and speculate generally on the misfortunes of their fellow-beings. The human mind has never had conception of greater evils, more horrible miseries, than attend the scarcity of money, falling prices, impoverishment of labor, and the consequent enslavement of men and women by the swollen power of hoarded money in the hands of the few.

Slavery, stubborn, brutal slavery, can be no more effectually established than by doubling the value of debts and securities in the hands of creditors, and by diminishing at the same time and in the same proportion the means whereby debtors are enabled to meet their obligations and redeem themselves and their earnings from bondage. In the year 1816, at the close of the Napoleonic wars, when the laboring people, the taxpayers of Great Britain, found themselves owing a national debt of over four thousand millions of dollars to a comparatively few holders of her securities, Lord Liverpool secured the demonetization of silver, compressed the currency of his country to a gold basis, magnified the value of debts to those who collected them, and multiplied their pains and penalties to those who had them to pay.

In the year 1873, when the laboring people, the taxpayers of the United States, found themselves owing a national debt nearly as great as that of Great Britain to a class of wealth holders and wealth hoarders, who had stayed in the rear and speculated during the war for the Union, a similar movement was made in this country to that of Lord Liverpool in England, and for the same purpose and inspired by the same motives. To enrich creditors by the impoverishment and oppression of debtors was the object on both sides of the ocean. There was not a single commercial reason between the two nations on the subject. England had been on a so-called gold basis fifty-one years before the heavy indebtedness of the American people made it the interest of their creditors to strike down silver, contract the currency, and increase the power of the money that was left. No commercial difficulties had arisen because England was on a single standard of gold and the United States on a double standard of gold and silver.

This condition has lasted a half century, with great prosperity to the two countries, and without a whimper or word of complaint from either in regard to rates of exchange, balances of trade, or anything of that kind. Greedy eyes and avaricious hearts were watching, however, from this side of the Atlantic, and rejoiced in the opportunity presented by an enormous national debt to follow the lead of the aristocracy of England. And now we are told from day to day and from hour to hour that we must imbibe the financial policy of England and conform to her dictation or lose our credit with the nations of the earth. We are incessantly reminded and solemnly warned that we can not maintain the double standard and preserve the parity between gold and silver unless England joins us in an agreement to that effect and lends us the favor of her countenance and assistance.

Sir, I am aware that in certain matters belonging to frivolous society and mercantile matrimony in this country there exists a harmless and very useless class of Anglomaniacs, but the great body of the American people believe intensely in their individual and national independence, and have great self-respect in remembering how, and from whom, and at what cost that independence was won. The Empire of Great Britain can set no example, dictate no fashion, inspire no policy which any patriotic portion of our citizens will feel called upon to follow unless in strict accord with their own interests. The credit of this Government is a creation of its own, resting on its own resources and its own honor. Nor was it ever stronger or firmer in all the four quarters of the world than it is now. It has not shaken nor quivered for a moment, or fallen the breadth of a hair in any market or money center on the face of the earth, notwithstanding the incessant tirade which for several years past has assailed it because silver was one of its elements.

It is within my knowledge upon the most reliable authority that during the past summer Treasury notes of the United States, greenbacks, and silver certificates were received without question or hesitation in trade and in exchange transactions in England, Germany, and France, and in other parts of Europe. Silver money is not a fly in the ointment of our national credit, and has not tainted or impaired it in the least.

Sir, in discussing the policy of this Government on the subject of silver, and the competency and incompetency of parties and persons as manifested in legislation, the celebrated and very ill-omened Sherman Act arises to our view at every step. I speak with habitual respect of the Senator from Ohio, but never before in the history of the world did a member of a parliamentary body find himself compelled to turn, as he did, on his own offspring and assist in putting it to death. It stood openly confessed as an unnatural monster by the very author of its being. It was neither a friend to silver nor to any other form of sound money, and did not even pretend to be. It was a disturber of the financial peace of the country and a standing menace to permanent business prosperity.

I do not cite this act now, however, for the purpose of dwelling upon it at any length, nor to hold it up as an evidence of the wisdom or the unwisdom, the competency or the incompetency, of the Senator from Ohio, or of his superior qualifications to sit as a censor on the mental capacity of other people in matters of financial legislation. I allude to this most discreditable act in our legislative history for the purpose of showing the clear, explicit, and unequivocal position which this Government assumed in regard to the coinage and use of gold and silver both, as standard money, only a little more than two years ago. The act repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act is composed of only three sentences, and two of them read as follows:

> And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

How like the bugle notes of the Constitution and the laws as enacted and interpreted by the fathers of the Republic these utterances salute our ears! The policy here declared received the sanction of both Houses of Congress, and was approved by the Executive on the 1st day of November, 1893. There it stands, and there it will stand forever. The doctrines therein contained have been indorsed and upheld by all the great names in American history from George Washington to Abraham Lincoln. Illustrious leaders of parties have differed on all things else; but on the one great cardinal question of the coinage and use of both the precious metals as standard money no differences have ever existed until since the creation of a vast national debt and the hungry, insatiate demands of a powerful creditor class. Jackson, and Clay, and Adams, and Crawford were all in the field as rivals for the Presidency in 1824, and antagonized each other on every other issue except the greatest of them all—the bimetallic specie basis for all our currency.

On this question no sound of disagreement was heard between them. General Harrison, with the battlefields of Tippecanoe and the Thames behind him, defeated Martin Van Buren in 1840 on a cry of hard times and disordered finances, but there was no note of discord between parties then as to the soundness or unsoundness of either silver or gold. Lincoln and Douglas in their well-known contests debated almost every proposition that could arise under our Constitution, but they never found any disagreement on the subject of the two metals. Webster and Calhoun strained the very existence of the Government itself by their discussions in this body, but they stood united at every step in support of the policy of the United States to continue the coinage and use of both gold and silver as standard money. The giants of other days were all one way on this question, irrespective of party politics, just as the people, the great body of the laboring and business masses, are today, if a fair and direct chance were given them to settle it. Not a single citizen of the United States, of any party, creed, or persuasion, can ever be benefited by the banishment of silver, its degradation and destruction, unless he is the owner and holder of idle money which he desires to invest in cheap labor or property at half its value, or loan at usurious rates of interest.

Sir, there is one other point in the record of parties on this subject which I can not pass over in silence. In the great and successful campaign of 1892 the Democratic party went before the country on a plain and explicit platform of principles. The Chicago convention which nominated the present very able and patriotic Executive, and the American people who supported and elected him, stood on the following declaration of perfect faith in both the precious metals:

> We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal, or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage for

both metals must be of equal intrinsic or exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Who, sir, on this side of the Chamber dissents now from this great landmark of financial truth? I know of no one. From the days of my youth I have marched, and camped, and fought with the Democratic party, and I expect to do so to the end. I found no difficulty in standing on the national platform of my party in 1892, and find none now. We need go no further for harmony, union, and strength than its readoption in 1896. It is broad and explicit enough to insure the coinage and use of both metals as standard money, and on equal terms, while every possible guaranty is given for their parity and for their equal power in the payment of debts. The spirit of concession and compromise also presides over every relation of society and every function of government. It was present every moment during the construction of the Constitution, and has guided the wisest counsels of parties and of the Government ever since. I invoke its benignant presence at this time whenever discord prevails.

As to my own position on the question now before the Senate, I have said nothing to-day that I have not said heretofore.

I am now in the nineteenth year of my service in this body. The leading issue on which I was first chosen to the Senate by the people of Indiana was the repeal of the act of 1873 and the restoration of the free coinage of silver. A popular majority of more than 30,000 was given to the members of the legislature who supported that issue and gave me their votes. Nor has there been any change of position or expression on that question by the party to which I belong in the State which has honored me so many years. My record here on the subject of silver is very familiar to the people I represent, and by them it has never been rebuked. I simply here and now reassert it, and further declare that not for all the honors this Government or this world has to bestow would I be responsible for the ruin and suffering I foresee in the further destruction and contraction of debt-paying money in the hands of the American people.

Whether any one man remains in public life or goes into peaceful retirement matters little to the world, and perhaps less to himself, but all the gold and silver of the earth put together can not compensate him for violating his deep-seated convictions of duty and debauching his never-dying conscience. Without reproach toward others or impeachment of anyone, I shall go forward in behalf of the right as it has been given me to see the right. A great historic character, when environed by perils, once exclaimed:

Unless I be convinced, I neither can nor dare retract anything, for my conscience is a captive to God's word, and it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. There I take my stand. I can do no otherwise.

Deeply important, however, as the question now under discussion is to the American people, yet no one issue has ever constituted the life, nor will it ever cause the death, of any one of the great political parties of the country. The Democratic party has lived for and through all the issues of the past, and it grapples now with every question which affects the present welfare of the people. To abolish tariff taxation for protection; to preserve the sovereignty of home rule in the States; to guarantee free elections without threat or menace from force bills; to secure the people everywhere from the invasive, domiciliary, and sumptuary legislation of centralized power, whether exercised by the Federal or by State governments; to establish and maintain a foreign policy of strength, and fearless, prompt response toward the strong and the arrogant; of forbearance and charity toward the weak, and of justice and honor toward all; these great and vital policies and purposes of government, and others akin to them, have no sure and safe support outside of the party founded by Thomas Jefferson. They are imbued with immortal life, and the Democratic party will live and triumph as their custodian and guardian as long as free government survives on this continent.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, the measure which came from the House providing for an issue of 3 per cent bonds to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to supply a deficit in the gold redemption fund necessary to preserve the parity of the two metals, silver and gold, is by no means all that the situation demands. It ought to seem absurd to the common sense of every man that a bond issued by the Government specifically to obtain gold, for which gold is demanded, should not be allowed to promise gold in return, especially when it is known that the interest charge to the Government would be lessened thereby.

But inasmuch as there is a slight advantage in the form and terms of the bond proposed by the House bill over those of the bond issued under the provisions of the law now in force, I am willing to vote for it. But I would vote for it not because, as is sometimes said on this floor, I consider a bond issue a panacea for all ills, and desirable in itself, or that I do not deprecate the conditions which make it necessary, but because the duty imposed upon the Administration by law can not, in my opinion, otherwise be performed, and because I desire to see the silver currency of the country kept exchangeable with the gold currency and the equal purchasing power of both preserved.

That the financial situation of the Treasury is anomalous and deplorable all seem ready to admit. No other country in the civilized world has so encumbered its fiscal affairs or voluntarily imposed such burdens upon its exchequer. To make bricks without straw was the edict of a cruel taskmaster; but that intelligent representatives of an intelligent people should insist upon exacting from their own Government the task of maintaining a pile of gold in its Treasury which the whole world is invited to draw from by demand notes furnished by itself in compelled perpetual succession, with no possible source of gold income, passes my understanding.

This task no government is equipped to perform, and that financial disaster and distress should follow the attempt is not surprising.

That an unnatural necessity for bond issues exists flows from the unnatural conditions which the legislation of the country has created and permits to continue.

Mr. President, why not pay and permanently retire the demand notes of the United States? Why not relieve your Treasury from this Sisyphean labor? Why longer demand from your governmental agents the tale of bricks without furnishing the straw? What benefits are to be derived from continuing the present condition of financial chaos? Every business interest of the country is in suspense waiting for the outcome of our deliberations. A nascent prosperity has been checked because the future is made uncertain. Long-time contracts are curtailed because none can tell what shall be the measure of their performance. The wings of commerce are clipped by this uncertainty, and the courage of capital for new enterprises is destroyed. Reasonable certainty as to the future is the vital breath of prosperity.

Mr. President, let us, if we can, restore and confine the Treasury of this great country to its natural function of honestly collecting the revenues provided by law and honestly disbursing them pursuant to our appropriations. Divorce the Government from the banking business, which it is not equipped to perform. Provide a measure of value the most stable the civilized world can command, and a currency of both gold and silver, circulating side by side with equal exchangeable value and purchasing power. Leave to the commercial activities and intelligence of the country the furnishing of a credit currency wherewith to supplement the gold and silver, and the creation and healthy operation of these credit devices by which in modern times to an increasing extent the great mass of exchanges are effected. Take away from the business of the country as far as possible the interfering hand of Government, and relegate it to its proper function of keeping the peace while a free people work out their own material salvation, of regulating the conduct of its citizens, and seeing that the exercise of the individual freedom of the citizen shall not infringe on the equal freedom of all others. Leave ungrudgingly to the local self-government of the States all governmental powers not surrendered to the National Government, and keep unimpaired our confidence in the capacity of the people of each to wisely exercise them. These principles lie at the foundation of my political faith, and by them I endeavor to govern my political conduct.

But, Mr. President, to return from these general reflections to the precise question before the Senate. The Committee on Finance has seen fit to return the House bill for the issue of a 3 per cent coin bond, with such small measure of relief as it promised, without its approval, and to recommend as a substitute a bill providing for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. This raises the question, so often presented of late years, whether the United States can alone, without the cooperation of the principal countries of the civilized world, adopt the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and at the same time maintain the parity now existing between gold and silver coin. I know that there is little or nothing new to be said on this question, but inasmuch as the same old arguments in advocacy of free coinage are being repeated, it is necessary to again point out their fallacy. I do not suppose that there are any who contend that the parity now happily existing could be maintained unless, by reason of free coinage or for some other reason, the bullion value of silver should be brought to a parity with that of gold at the ratio of 16 to 1.

I know that it is frequently asserted that such a result would follow free coinage. It has been asserted this afternoon by the eloquent Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], who tells us that he would not advocate the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 unless he believed that the enactment of such a law would at once produce a parity between the two metals. In that, I am sorry to say, he differs from some of his fellow-advocates of free coinage. It has been asserted that although value can not be created by act

of Congress, a change of the coinage laws by creating an increased demand would enhance the value of silver. That this might be so to some slight extent and for a short time is possible. But the exploiters of this assertion stop short with the suggestion. They not only fail entirely to prove that any increased demand that might result from free coinage by the United States alone would fill the gap now existing in the bullion value of the two metals; they do not even produce an argument in favor of the proposition that there would be an increased demand after the first excitement of the change. We have now silver bullion and silver dollars piled up in the Treasury vaults which is not demanded for circulation. All attempts to force a larger circulation of silver have proved abortive. The fact is that we to-day have a redundant circulating medium—gold, silver, greenbacks, Treasury notes, and bank notes, all interchangeable and of equal purchasing power—aggregating somewhere near $1,500,000,000 or $1,600,000,000. I have not the exact figures.

If gold were not displaced by silver there would be no increased demand for silver. And if gold should be so displaced it would be so by reason of the fact that the bullion value of the silver dollar was less than that of the gold dollar. The fact is that the relative demand for silver for all purposes has fallen off in the face of a constantly increasing supply. If, indeed, there should be a parity restored between gold and silver bullion at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the free coinage of silver by the United States, then it would seem that the great benefits to result from higher prices and the payment of debts in cheaper money, so dwelt upon by 16 to 1 advocates, would fail of realization. For no one, I suppose, is so fond as to imagine that gold would be materially displaced the world over by the adoption of free coinage in the United States. No; if silver and gold are to be brought to a parity in this way it must be by an appreciation of silver, which nothing short of the union of all the great nations of the world in free coinage of silver at or near the ratio of 16 to 1 can accomplish. Whether this even could succeed without an effort and a sacrifice, for which the end achieved would not compensate, is doubtful.

Gold is the money metal preferred by the advanced and enterprising nations of the world. As a standard it serves the needs of commerce and trade better than silver, and its increasing production, together with the smaller use of actual money required for the exchanges of the world, render it adequate in quantity for a stable standard. A double standard has never existed in fact. The attempt to create one has resulted in an alternate single standard of either one metal or the other, and that has been discarded as undesirable by the great mass of the civilized world. Gold would be the standard measure of value in all the great marts of the world without any compelling law or regulating statute. Nothing but arbitrary power could establish the so-called double standard in the way desired by the advocates of free coinage at 16 to 1. The great current of human activity in commerce and trade and intellectual enterprise can be obstructed and impeded by legislation, but it can not be created, turned back, or controlled by men, legislative whim, or fiat. The desires and practice of the larger number of civilized and commercial nations is in the line of gold as a standard and as large a use of silver in circulation as is consistent with the preservation of the standard. With silver as a standard, gold disappears from circulation as well as a standard of value, unless silver is brought up to the parity of gold in its bullion and commercial value; while with gold as a standard a large and increasing concurrent circulation of both gold and silver is and can continue to be maintained.

But, Mr. President, I do not know that the belief longer remains to any great extent that free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 will bring about a parity of the two metals. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], in the able and interesting speech which he made the other day, if he does not admit his own want of belief in the possibility of such a legislative feat, at least views with equanimity the possible result of the 16-to-1 policy proposed by the committee amendment, and declares that he prefers to see gold at a premium and used as a commodity and silver as a standard to the present conditions. I have no doubt that in so declaring he fairly represents the greater number of silver advocates.

How is such a policy to be commended to the people? I listened with great attention, as I always do, to the Senator from Arkansas, who reports this amendment from the Finance Committee, to learn from him how it was that the people of this country were to be persuaded that a free-coinage measure for silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was to be for their interests and for the increase of their happiness and prosperity. I found no proposition upon which that persuasion was rested, except one, and that seems to be the underlying proposition of all the arguments which have been presented to the Senate, and, so far as I know, to the people of this country, that were worthy of attention, and that is that in some way or other the so-called demonetization of silver in 1873 by the United States, and within a few years by Germany and France, had worked an appreciation of the gold standard, and had thereby brought about a decline in the prices of commodities and the productions of labor. That, unless I entirely misapprehend the scope and trend of the argument in that behalf, is the foundation stone upon which is erected the whole superstructure of the advocacy of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The decline in prices is, in the first place, declared to be a detriment and a misfortune to the country, and, in the second place, it is asserted that this decline has been brought about by the appreciation of gold since about 1873.

Mr. President, so important are these propositions that they deserve careful consideration, and such examination I shall attempt to give them now.

If prices have not declined by reason of the so-called demonetization of silver, and if, on the other hand, the decline of prices which has admittedly taken place is not a curse but a blessing to the masses of the people of this country, then it seems to me that, the foundation being destroyed, the whole superstructure of the argument falls to the ground.

What evidence has been adduced by a single advocate of this free-coinage measure to show that prices have declined because of the so-called demonetization of silver, and that gold has appreciated, which is the correlative of the decline of prices in gold? None that I have been able to discover, except that the price of silver itself has declined nearly pari passu with that of the staple commodities with which it is compared. If there is no other refuge for the argument of those who advocate this amendment than the bare fact that silver has declined in price as measured by gold, and that the commodities produced by agricultural and other industries have also declined, then I say that there has been a failure to prove the assertion; nay, there has been a failure to prove even the probability that the one is the cause of the other.

On the other hand, I think it can be shown to every candid and fair mind that the decline in price of every staple commodity that has been mentioned in the course of this argument can be accounted for by reasons that are obvious and on the surface, and that have no relation to the decline of silver and do not even suggest an appreciation of the standard of value. And when we show that silver itself has been subjected to the influence of the great price-controlling element that always is so potent, that of increased supply and diminishing demand, then I think we can safely assert that the corner stone of this argument has been destroyed.

Mr. President, the argument that declining prices are due to any condition of things produced by the law of 1873, or the demonetization of silver in Germany, or the cessation of free coinage in France leaves out of sight altogether those great economic influences which are always at work and operating and which can be discovered by the most casual observation. It leaves out of sight all the great improvements which have been made in industrial production. I know that the Senator from Arkansas, with that fairness which is characteristic of him, will admit that a decline in prices not caused by appreciating money, but which not be traced to improved methods and modes of production, is not an undesirable thing, but I want to call his attention, and the attention of the Senate, to the fact that stares us in the face, that meets us at every turn, that the last twenty-five years have been marked by an improvement and an advance in methods of production unequaled in all the past history of the world.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. One moment, if you please. I will yield in a moment.

That argument loses sight of all those great appliances for the transaction of business, the improvements and increase in railroad transportation, steamship navigation, the telegraph, the telephone, and of the numberless devices for dispensing with the use of actual money in making the exchanges of the world.

Mr. President, who, if his attention is called to it in the most casual way, does not recognize that in twenty-five years there has been almost as great a revolution in the transportation facilities of this country as there was when railroads first superseded the old transportation by stage coach? The continent has been spanned; thousands of miles of railroads have penetrated into regions that hitherto were unproductive because remote from the markets of the world; hundreds of thousands of acres of land have been brought into tillage. Increased production of the great food products of the world has been the consequence. Are these to be lost sight of and ignored, and this great and beneficent decline of prices of the great necessities of life to be attributed to a demonetization in 1873, which was not discovered until two or three years after it had been consummated? No, no, Mr. President, we can not close our eyes to the history that is making around us, to the facts that stare us in the face. I hardly need to particularize.

But let me call the attention of the Senate to a conspicuous instance of this great price-reducing movement that mechanical improvement and invention and brain power have brought about. I allude to the Bessemer steel process. This has occurred within the period which we are discussing. Prior to that invention and the

expiration of the patent of the Bessemer-Siemens process for converting iron into steel, steel rails sold for $187 per ton. To-day $25 a ton is the price of the best steel rails. Has that had nothing to do with the cost of railroad building? Has that had nothing to do with that most important factor in the distribution of the products of labor; I mean the cheapness and increased facility of transportation? To-day we convert 20 tons of iron into steel rails in twenty-three minutes. Iron rails are worth about $22 a ton, and steel rails last three times as long as iron rails.

Think of the enormous economy in the one factor of transportation, which enters into the price to-day of every article of common use and common necessity. At the commencement of this period, or a little before, corn was burned as it was taken from the fields over the Western prairies. To-day it is sold for only a little, 6 or 7 cents, less than it is sold on the coast line of the country and at the port of New York.

Mr. ALLEN. It is being burned to-day.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, if that state of things has been brought about by opening up the markets by this cheap transportation to the production of the grain of the great prairies of the West, until they are competing with the farmers of the Atlantic Coast, so that the farmers here are suffering, as they say, and say truthfully, from the competition of those great steam-plowed fields of the West, and has brought your product to the seaboard for exportation in such quantities, and has so increased the production that, as the Senator from Nebraska says, they are burning it again to-day, what has that to do, I ask the Senator from Nebraska, with the price of silver, when I show him, as he must admit, that there are causes adequate to produce this result, and which he knows exist?

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me to answer him?

Mr. GRAY. No, not to answer me now.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I shall take occasion to do so after the Senator concludes his remarks.

Mr. GRAY. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. President, that is one conspicuous example of what invention and improvement and enterprise have done for the cheapening of those staple commodities the consumption of which enter into our daily life and are necessary for the happiness and well-being of the people. Do you want to increase those prices by arbitrary legislation? Dare you go to the teeming populations of your seaboard and the central West, to the toiling millions who buy those products, and tell them that this legislation is meant to make dearer the bread with which they feed themselves and their little ones?

I want to see the silver dollar preserved at its present purchasing power. I want to see it, when translated in the hands of the workingman into clothes and food and shelter, to mean the largest possible amount of all those things; and that is why I feel constrained to oppose the proposition that by cheapening money you are to raise prices without any promise that the wage of labor is to be raised at the same time and by the same measure.

Mr. President, not alone by railroad transportation is the production of food at the command of every part of the world. Steamships made of steel and of enormous and increasing carrying capacity are making common highways of the deep. The grain of America is carried in six to ten days to the markets where you supply the hungry mouths that wait for it and the teeming millions that stand ready to buy it in the Old World. But at the same time, in competition with this grain and food producing power of America, the steamship and the railroad have not been idle in other parts of the world. Russia has been and is being every day more opened up as a source of supply. The cotton fields of Egypt and of India come into competition with the cotton of America. How are you going to remedy that state of things by legislation here in the United States? How, by any such puny measure as this, can you expect to thwart and interfere with and turn back a state of progress like this, produced by causes so powerful as those I have described?

I do not deny that the prices of agricultural products are low, but I have attempted to show—and if I have not, it will be plain, upon the mere suggestion, to every thoughtful mind—that the true cause of the cheapening of agricultural products has not been the act of 1873 or the ceasing of coinage by France or the demonetization of silver by Germany, but it has been because of cheaper and increased production—production that has run ahead of demand, and which has operated, as it always will operate, to influence price and bring down the cost to those who consume.

If this be so, then the Senator from Arkansas, who has already, with the candor I have described, admitted that such a decline of price is not to be objected to, must either reform his argument or in sheer benevolence to the mass of the people whose living he would make a little harder and whose struggle for existence would be made a little more severe vote against the measure he has advocated.

Mr. President, not only have we steamship lines with increasing carrying capacity over the old sailing ships, but the improvements in the steam engine every year have been giving more and more carrying capacity to the hull, and there has been such economy in the use of coal over the old lever engine, in the triple and quadruple expansion of steam, that its consumption has been reduced to something like one-fourth or one-fifth of what it was formerly. The possibility of larger freight space, the greater celerity with which voyages are made, one iron ship of 10,000 tons, with its precious burden, making eight trips where an old sailing ship could only make one—is that to have no effect upon prices? No famine can exist now in any spot upon the earth's surface. Thank God for the beneficence of these civilizing influences of modern inventions and modern enterprise, the whole world is drawn upon, and when there is a scarcity of grain in Russia, as there was a year or two ago, the ships of this country speed across the Atlantic with the surplus product of this country, bought or contributed by warm hearts that are always ready to respond to the cry of distress, no matter how far away it may be sounded. What a contrast is this!

Within the memory of men now living, within the memory of the Senator from Arkansas and myself, the scarcity in one country might destroy thousands of lives because the local food supply had run short. In Ireland in 1848, and in India twenty or thirty years thereafter, famines have almost decimated population. What has made it now, as I have said, an almost impossible thing that that should occur, except these wonderful improvements in the products of the enterprise and the brain and the courage and the capital of the civilized world?

Mr. President, that is not all. The methods of transacting business, the mode in which exchanges are made of commodity for commodity, have all been so wonderfully facilitated by modern methods of business and by modern appliances that there can be no comparison between the new and the old. Within our memory if a cargo of jute or of gunny bags was to be brought from India you had to send the gold across the sea on a two or three months' voyage, with the loss of interest, the risk of destruction of the gold itself, and then the long wait for the return. Now, as I have had occasion to say—I think it was the Senator from Massachusetts who told me a year or two ago—a gentleman in Boston before he left for the train ordered a cargo such as I have mentioned at Bombay, and immediately took the train. When he arrived in Washington there was sent to him a cablegram from his house in Boston that the cargo had been bought, the ship chartered, and commenced loading, and the credit to pay for it transferred, and not one dollar of gold budged from the position that it had occupied hitherto. Is all that, the result of this tremendous improvement and advancement in the methods by which business is transacted, to be lost sight of? Is all that to be ignored as not counting in the decline of prices? Oh, no, Mr. President; causes so obvious as these can not be whistled down the wind; they can not fail to challenge attention. They are sufficient to account for the result, and there is no other sufficient cause which has been, so far as I know, suggested.

I have some notes here, very interesting to me, and I think they would be to the Senate if I had more time, illustrating the mighty truth that the invention and ingenuity of man is working all the time for the betterment of his condition; and that it is only when the process is interfered with, interfered with by arbitrary legislation or thwarted by arbitrary power, that these benign processes do not go on with increasing celerity for the blessing of the world and of mankind.

I have here before me—taking it up at random—this one matter cognate to the one I have been discussing in a general way—the improvement in railroads and in transportation, the matter of freight.

In 1867, at the beginning of the year, the rates of freight by rail from New York City to Chicago for dry goods were from $1.88 to $2.02—the lowest to the highest—for a hundred pounds; for coffee, in bags, $1.70 per 100 pounds, and so on. In 1892, twenty-five years later, dry goods were carried by rail to Chicago from New York for 75 cents for 100 pounds; coffee for 35 cents, and so on. A reduction from $1.27 to $1.13 on the 100 pounds on dry goods is sufficient to cause a reduction of the prices of the goods themselves.

I have here also some memoranda of the actual difference in freight from Chicago to New York for grain. It is interesting to note that in 1845, to go back that far, spring wheat in Chicago was selling for 52 cents per bushel.

Mr. HOAR. At what time?

Mr. GRAY. Fifty years ago. That would be 1845. In New York, the same year, the same quality of spring wheat sold for 90 cents a bushel in October, and in July of that year at $1.05 a bushel—the difference in the cost of transportation, of course, from Chicago to New York. From the official returns of the New York Produce Exchange as to freights, which commenced in the year 1868, we have this: From Chicago to New York, in 1868, the freight in that year by rail was 42.6 cents per bushel; by rail and lake 29 cents a bushel; by lake and canal, all by water, 22.8 cents per bushel. In 1895 the same quality of spring wheat as in 1845 was

65 cents per bushel in New York and 56 cents per bushel in Chicago, the freight from Chicago by lake and rail being 6½ cents per bushel.

Now, Mr. President, there is another thing to be considered. The same causes which produced the decline in the price of commodities that I have mentioned, and many others, of wheat, cotton, iron, dry goods, have operated also in regard to silver, whose decline is so much deplored. Increased production in the face of a yielding demand must have its effect upon that product as well as upon any other.

In 1855 the coin value of silver, the product of the world, was, if I am not mistaken, something like $40,000,000, and that of gold about $130,000,000. I am speaking from memory and would be glad to be corrected if I am wrong. That is where gold was at that time. The annual gold product of the world of that day was about three times that of silver. In 1895 the Secretary of the Treasury puts the gold product of the world at about $180,000,000, I think, speaking in round numbers, and the silver product at about $157,000,000.

Mr. TELLER. More than that.

Mr. GRAY. I would be glad to have the figures if the Senator from Colorado has them.

Mr. TELLER. I say more than $157,000,000.

Mr. GRAY. More than $157,000,000 as against $180,000,000. While there has been this enormous increase in the world's product of gold (which I shall allude to directly as one of the reasons why gold is performing sufficiently the money function of the world) there has been this relative increase in the product of silver—whereas in 1855 the silver product was about one-third that of gold, in 1895 the silver product is nearly equal to that of gold.

Mr. ALLEN. Has there not been a corresponding increased use among the people?

Mr. GRAY. Yes, Mr. President; in one sense there has been a corresponding increase and in another, as civilization and the facility for exchanges have advanced, there has been a relative decreased use of the precious metals as a medium of exchange, and I will come to that presently.

With decreased necessity for the actual presence of the money metals has come an increase in the volume of gold, which, on many accounts that I need not here pause to enumerate, has become the preferred metal among all the commercial and enterprising countries of the globe.

The recent chemical treatment of gold ores has largely increased the product of gold, and poor ores heretofore not rich enough in gold to be worked are now yielding a profit, which, as the processes improve, must open up new fields of gold production and materially increase the supply of gold.

With an increasing supply of gold, the increasing transactions of the world have found themselves accommodated, because year by year there is less and less necessity for counting down the broad gold pieces in order to effect an exchange of commodities, and that is all that trade is at last. The man who makes a coat for sale does not want the gold to keep. He wants to turn it into trade, or into shoes, or hats, or something that will be of use; and that barter and that exchange is facilitated and brought about by the use of money; but every contrivance, every facility by which these great exchanges in large amounts are carried on without the use of metal money is just that much of an unloading of the exchange burden from the function of the money in use.

Mr. President, it is an old story, but by the devices of the clearing houses in the great money centers like New York, Chicago, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Philadelphia every day these exchanges are consummated by the payment of real money of the smallest possible amount—I mean small relatively to the amount of the exchanges themselves. I do not pause now to look for figures; I have them here. I take the amount of one year's transactions in the clearing house in New York. It was thirty-four thousand million dollars, and that was effected by the use of about one thousand million dollars of real money. Nobody wants to wipe out all that. Nobody wants to go back to those mediæval and primitive and less civilized times when you carried all your wealth about you in a leathern girdle and counted down the gold or silver pieces for every transaction you made. Not at all. You give a check for the horse you buy. You give a check for your bill at the grocer's. You buy a farm and you do not see a dollar of money, but a transfer of the credit on some solvent banker's book will effect the exchange.

Mr. ALLEN. There would have to be money to get the check, would there not?

Mr. GRAY. Yes; there will have to be money to pay the check if you go there and demand it; but if you know you could get it you do not want it; and the check is taken to the clearing house and is set off against some other check, and so it goes until at last the result is reached that I have just illustrated by the figures of the New York clearing house; and an infinitesimal sum of money relatively will square up that and hundreds of other similar transactions.

Mr. President, I am not arguing that money is not needed and increasingly needed as civilization advances, but step by step with these advances come these processes, which you can not keep men from resorting to. They are the outgrowth of our times. They are the invention of the ingenuity and the brains of the active people who have made the civilization of the world. They are processes which you may retard, but you can not control and can not turn back any more than you can turn back the Gulf Stream that has flowed in all time on its destined course.

No, no; do not let us deceive ourselves about what we can do and what we can not do by legislation. Do not let us shut our eyes to obvious facts and conditions which enter into the discussion and consideration of the situation with which we are now dealing.

Cotton has declined in price and so has silver, and cotton has gone up in price and silver has gone down. Some commodities have declined enormously whilst others have remained stationary. How are you going to account for it by the decline in the value of silver? Wheat has gone down and so has cotton, but meat products have gone up. Pork per barrel is higher now than it was at the period years back when silver was subjected to its so-called demonetization. Cattle have gone up and gone down in price, while silver has gone steadily down. All have been affected by causes that were ascertainable and that influenced the movement, and could in no way, so far as I can discover, be referred to the depreciation of silver bullion.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question in this connection, which perhaps he would have answered himself without my asking him before he got through. Is it not true that in spite of the enormous increase of the labor-saving machinery and mechanism which compete with and take the place of human labor that human labor itself has increased and not diminished in price the world over in that period?

Mr. GRAY. I was just coming to that. The Senator is right in thinking that I would touch on that matter.

Mr. HOAR. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I thought it a very important view and should receive attention in this connection.

Mr. GRAY. Not at all; I was willing to hear the suggestion.

Now, Mr. President, if we take the prices of cotton and silver, if we are to rely implicitly as an article of our monetary faith upon this nexus between the decline of silver and the decline of commodities, how does it happen that in 1886 silver was worth 99.4 cents an ounce and cotton was worth 9.44 cents a pound, and that January 2, 1896, silver was worth 67 cents and cotton was worth 8.10 cents? If the depreciation of silver bullion is the cause, as is asserted in this Chamber, of the decline in this and other great staples, how do you account for those fluctuations? Why should not the same causes always produce the same effect? If they do not, then the burden rests upon the advocates of this theory to show that exceptional causes have taken such instances as I have named out of the general rule.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas in the speech to which I have referred said, and said truly, that after all the great measure of value is labor. It is very hard to get a standard for a standard. To measure gold by itself is impossible. I agree with him, and I think that most thoughtful men will agree with him, that there is no better criterion of value than human labor. I would ask him and ask Senators who do me the honor of giving me their attention to go with me over some of the statistics that are within the reach of all of us, made by competent hands, I presume, made under the authority of the Senate, and see whether it be true that, in applying this test of human labor, gold has appreciated, or whether the evidence would not be the other way.

There was an investigation made under the supervision of a very expert and experienced statistician—one as competent as anyone I know of in this country, Mr. Carroll D. Wright—in regard to prices generally and the wages of labor in this country through long periods. The results that were published in a document presented to the Senate by the Committee on Finance two or three years ago show some very interesting things in regard to the topic that I am now discussing. We find here a comparison of wages every tenth year from 1840, except 1870, when wages were abnormally high on account of an inflated paper currency, all reduced to the gold standard, and here is the result:

In the building trades, a most important department of human industry, we find, taking 1840, that plasterers got $1.50 in gold a day; in 1850, $1.75 per day in gold; in 1860, $1.75; in 1880, $2, and in 1890, $3.50.

I will not detain the Senate by going through the fifteen or twenty different occupations—carpenters, farmers, laborers, painters, blacksmiths, and so on; but taking the blacksmiths,

we find that they got $1.50 in 1840; $1.50 in 1860; $3 in 1880, and $3 in 1890. The table will speak for itself when printed:

Occupations (per diem).	1840.	1850.	1860.	1880.	1890.
Plasterers	$1.50	$1.75	$1.75	$2.00	$3.50
Roofers and slaters	1.50	1.50	1.25	2.50	3.50
Blacksmiths	1.50	1.50	1.50	3.00	3.00
Blacksmiths' helpers	.83½	.83½	.83½	1.75	1.75
Painters	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.75	2.50
Wheelwrights	1.25	1.25	1.25	2.50	2.50
Card grinders	.80	.92	.92	1.52	1.52
Card strippers	.50	.79	.75	.93	1.02
Carpenters	1.29	1.41	1.52	1.84	1.94
Drawing hands	.41	.45	.50	.67	1.03
Engineers	2.00	2.25	3.00	3.50	4.25
Firemen	1.25	1.37	1.44	1.40	1.65
Laborers	.81	1.04	.99	1.16	1.25
Machinists	1.45	1.55	1.76	2.08	2.19
Overseers	2.00	2.00	2.25	3.00	5.00
Watchmen	1.10	1.06	1.00	1.50	1.55

Railroads (per diem).	1840.	1850.	1860.	1880.	1890.
Baggagemen	$1.53	$1.53	$1.91	$2.10	$2.11
Brakemen, freight	1.00	1.00	1.16	1.75	1.85
Brakemen, passenger	1.15	1.15	1.25	2.00	2.00
Carpenters	1.22	1.33	1.30	1.77	2.00
Conductors, freight	1.66	1.68	1.61	2.58	2.57
Conductors, passenger	2.11	2.30	3.19	3.45	3.84
Engineers, locomotive	2.14	2.15	2.30	3.78	3.79
Firemen, locomotive	1.06	1.15	2.00	2.00	2.00
Foremen, masons	2.50	2.50	2.50	4.00	4.10
Painters	1.50	1.43	1.32	1.87	2.17
Average, according to importance, for all occupations, 1860 being reckoned as 100	87.7	92.7	100	143	168.6

Commenting upon this result, the committee says:

The advance in daily wages which has been here noted has been accompanied by a decrease in the hours of labor. Compared with 1840, hourly wages in 1891 stood at 209, and compared with 1860, at 176.8.

I pause to ask, when this test has been applied to it, what has become of the assertion that gold has appreciated and that declining prices are due to that appreciation. I have shown, I think, conclusively that there were causes adequate to explain the decline in great staple commodities of production and industry, the things that go to make up the necessities of life; and if at the same time I show that measured by this test wages have advanced, what are we to say about the condition of the country that is so deplorable, and about which so much is said here day after day in order to show the absolute necessity of revolutionizing our standard of values and throwing into confusion all the business enterprises of the land? If the laborer gets more in gold than he did twenty or thirty or forty years ago and can buy more per dollar with it, I should like to know who is hurt and why you want to change it.

Oh, say the Senator from Arkansas and others, we want to cheapen the dollar in order that we may stay this decline in prices; that we may restore prices. For whose benefit? I grant you that there has been a decline in agricultural products, but the causes of that decline, I repeat, lie outside of the domain of this discussion as to the demonetization of silver and the appreciation of gold. And if they do, I should like to know on what principle of justice and humanity you are to go to the millions and millions of wage earners in this country, on the farm, in the factory, on the railroad, and in the mine, and tell them that you are by arbitrary fiat of law going to increase the price of the things that they must buy, thereby decreasing the purchasing power of their wages.

Mr. PEFFER. Before the Senator from Delaware leaves that particular part of his subject, I should like to ask him whether in his estimate he takes into account that the efficiency of labor has increased more rapidly than the wages of labor have increased?

Mr. GRAY. I have not lost sight of that. I am aware of it; but I do not think it is pertinent to the line of thought that I am now endeavoring to pursue. With every increase in the efficiency of labor there comes an increase in the wages of labor itself, perhaps not adequate or commensurate with the efficiency, but still an increase. Now, we are told that it is a thing to be desired, that it is a thing to be accomplished by legislation—that the purchasing power of a dollar shall be decreased by raising the prices of commodities. As I have already said, I want the dollar that is earned by the sweat of a man's brow to mean all it does mean and more, too, if possible, of the comforts, necessities, or it may be the luxuries of life. He is entitled to them. He has earned them. It is what he works for, and I shall never by my vote, if I understand it, endeavor to take it away from him.

Mr. President, in order to cheapen the dollar that you say you give to the bondholder of your country, are you willing to cheapen the dollar that you give to the toiling millions of your fellow-citizens? I care nothing for the bondholder; he can take care of himself. But I will not in any paroxysm of passion or resentment so far lose my sense of proportion and of justice that in order to do mischief to the rich bondholder, so called, I will work all this wreck and ruin to the masses of my countrymen.

When we talk about the wages of labor, I mean also agricultural labor. Who are the people who would be benefited by high prices? The man who holds the plow especially? Oh, no. It is the capitalist who owns the farm; it is the man who has invested his money in land. Is he not a capitalist? I am not talking about the man whom he hires; I am talking about the man who owns the land. For the sake of raising the price of the commodities on that land you seem reckless as to the consequences to a far larger number who will suffer by your action. Mr. President, I ask leave to print this table with my remarks:

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY.

Wages in 1860 and in 1885, in dollars and in grains of gold, and percentage of increase, in grains of gold.

Workmen.	Wages (in dollars).		Wages (in grains of gold).		Percentage of increase (in grains of gold).
	1860.	1885.	1860.	1885.	
Factory hands:					
Dyers	$0.62	$1.00	16	25.7	61
Giggers	.62	.82	16	21.1	32
Shearers	.69	1.00	17.8	25.8	45
Plain weavers	.65	.85	16.7	21.8	31
Spinners	1.10	1.26	28.3	32.5	15
Miscellaneous:					
Leather factory beam and yard hands	1.10	1.67	31	43	39
Leather factory whiteners and skivers	1.83	2.75	47.2	70.8	50
Common laborers	1.00	1.50	25.8	38.7	50
Blacksmiths	1.50	2.00	38.7	51.6	33
Blacksmiths' strikers	1.00	1.50	25.8	27	50
Carpenters	1.67	2.00	43	51.6	20
Machinists	1.75	2.25	45.1	57.7	28
Locomotive engineers	2.40	3.20	62	82.4	33
Locomotive firemen	1.20	1.75	31	45.2	46
Average percentage of increase in weight of gold					38

I have another table here in regard to the wages of railroad employees, showing the same thing. With all this, recollect, there has been going on that very beneficent reform, a decrease in the hours of labor. There is larger pay now for the short hours than there was twenty, thirty, or forty years ago for the long hours. We must not forget that fact in estimating the conditions with which we are dealing.

Mr. President, let me, before I leave this subject, call your attention to some facts that I had the honor to lay before this Senate a year and a half ago in a speech which I made, and which I think are so pertinent to the present discussion that I make no apology for reproducing them. Here are some tables of prices agreed upon, taken from this same report, by Messrs. Kingsland & Douglas, successors of Kingsland, Fergeson & Co., Simmons Hardware Company, and Mansur & Tibbetts Implement Company, all of St. Louis, Mo. The price of a one-horse steel plow in money in 1889 was $2.75; in 1873, at the time of this demonetization, it was $6.50. But here is the interesting part. In 1889 it cost in bushels of wheat 3.8, in corn 8.5, and in oats 11.5. In 1873, instead of three bushels, it cost 6.4 bushels of wheat, 19.1 bushels of corn, and 27 bushels of oats.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say to the Senator that his figures are entirely wrong.

Mr. GRAY. They are not my figures.

Mr. TELLER. They are wrong, no matter whose figures they are. Wheat was worth $1.47 a bushel at that time.

Mr. GRAY. I will put this table in my remarks for what it is worth. As I said, these are not my figures. They are figures that were made under the instructions of Mr. Carroll D. Wright. The same can be said about the two-horse steel plow. In 1873 it cost 19.6 bushels of wheat, and in 1889 16.4. Without going through, for it goes through in that proportion, I wish these facts to go for what they are worth to the people of this country, to consider these things, so that hard as the lot of the farmer is, severe as his trials are, and I admit them to be, I want it to be considered that there has been an exaggeration about these general conditions. There has been an overstatement even in regard to the farmer himself, not the farm laborer, which it would be well for him when he comes to consider his political action to take into the account.

Prices agreed upon by Messrs. Kingsland & Douglas, successors of Kingsland, Fergeson & Co., Simmons Hardware Company, and Mansur & Tibbetts Implement Company, all of St. Louis, Mo.:

Implements.	Money in—		1889, in bushels of—			1873, in bushels of—		
	1889.	1873.	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.
1-horse steel plow (wood beam)	$2.75	$6.50	3.8	8.5	11.5	6.4	19.1	27
2-horse steel plow (wood beam)	12.00	20.00	16.4	37.5	50	19.6	58.8	83.3
1-horse iron plow (wood beam)	2.00	5.00	2.7	6.2	8.3	4.9	14.7	20.8
2-horse iron plow (wood beam)	8.00	13.00	10.9	25	33.3	12.7	38.2	54.1
2-horse side-hill or reversible plow	10.00	18.00	13.7	31.2	41.7	17.6	52.9	75
Potato digger	7.50	20.00	10.2	23.4	31.2	19.6	58.8	83.3
Old-fashioned tooth harrow	6.50	15.00	8.9	20.3	27	14.7	44.1	62.5
1-horse cultivator	3.50	7.00	4.7	10.9	14.5	6.8	20.5	29.1
2-horse corn cultivator	15.00	28.00	20.5	46.8	62.5	27.4	82.4	116.6
1-horse mowing machine	45.00	85.00	61.6	140.6	187.5	83.3	250	354.1
2-horse mowing machine	50.00	90.00	68.5	156.2	208.3	88.2	264.7	375
Horserake (sulky)	20.00	30.00	27.4	62.5	83.3	29.4	88.2	125
Common Hunt rake (horse)	3.50	6.50	4.8	10.9	14.5	6.3	19.1	27
Common iron garden rakes (10-tooth, steel), per dozen	3.75	12.00	5.1	11.7	15.6	11.7	35.2	50
1-horse horsepower	25.00	45.00	34.2	78.1	104.1	44.1	132.3	187.5
2-horse horsepower	35.00	65.00						
Reaper	75.00	95.00						
Binder	135.00		189.4	421.8	562.5	[1]277.7	[1]769.2	[1]857.1
Corn sheller (1-hole)	6.00	11.50	8.2	18.7	25	11.2	33.8	47.9
Fanning mill	15.00	25.00	20.5	46.8	62.5	24.5	73.5	104.1
Common hose (cast-steel socket), per dozen	3.50	6.50	4.7	10.9	14.5	6.3	19.1	27
Common rakes (wood), per dozen	2.00	3.00	2.4	6.2	8.3	2.9	8.8	12.5
Scythes (Ames's grass), per dozen	7.50	16.00	10.2	23.4	31.2	15.7	47	66.6
Do	9.50	21.00						
Scythe snaths (patent), per dozen	4.50	11.00	6.1	14	18.7	10.8	32.3	45.8
Shovels (Ames's), per dozen	9.50	18.00	13	29.6	39.5	17.6	52.9	75
Spades (Ames's), per dozen	10.00	18.50	13.7	31.2	41.6	18.1	54.4	27
Crowbars (steel)	.06							
Crowbars (iron)	.05	.10	.06	.15	.2	.09	.29	.46

[1] For 1880.

Mr. President, there is a great outcry, I know, about hard times, and always will be. If you can point me to a time when some of the people of the country did not think the times were hard, I have not yet discovered it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me there?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is passing from the consideration of those figures rather abruptly.

Mr. GRAY. I am going back to them.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Colorado impugns their correctness. I understand they were collected by the gentleman who has charge of such matters. It seems to me if we can not rely upon those figures we had better get another man for the office.

Mr. GRAY. I do not know. There may have been an exceptionally high price for wheat in 1873. I am taking the figures as I find them in the statistics.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that there can be no mistake about the general price of wheat in 1873. It has been presented to the Senate, I suppose, two hundred times. There is certainly an error in that report. I do not know but that everything else in the table may be right.

Mr. GRAY. I have given the Senator my authority, and I do not undertake to do more. I did not make the investigation myself, of course. If these statistics are not reliable I will tell you what I believe is reliable; 1873 or some year thereabouts, perhaps——

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will pardon me a moment on that point—his speech is a very interesting and able one—I suggest whether those figures for 1873 are not placed in greenbacks. Is there any accounting for them on that ground?

Mr. GRAY. They are reduced to gold, I think. I suppose the Senator from Colorado did not understand that I was speaking of the price of these articles in bushels of wheat. I was not speaking of the money prices; I was speaking of the number of bushels of wheat it would take to buy a steel plow in 1873 and how many bushels of wheat it would take to buy it in 1889. The difference was very much in favor of 1889. The table does not give the price of wheat in 1873.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the only point questioned is the one single statement about the price of wheat; that is all. The rest of the table seems to be accurate.

Mr. TELLER. I do not say anything about the price——

Mr. GRAY. Here is another table, which I have quoted before, that was extracted from the Statistical Abstract by Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. He is my authority.

Mr. TELLER. Very good authority.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. WALKER says in this table that he has computed wages in 1860 and in 1885 in dollars, in weight of gold, and in grain. Now, it seems we are getting right down to the thing we are discussing. We are applying the test, which the Senator from Arkansas and, I think, all men as sensible as he will admit is the best test we can employ. The wages of factory hands in 1860 were as follows:

Dyers, 62 cents a day in 1860; in 1885 a dollar. In 1860 they got 16 grains of gold, and in 1885 they got 25.7 grains of gold.

Giggers—whatever they may be—62 cents in 1860, and 82 cents n 1885; 16 grains of gold in 1860, and 21.1 grains of gold in 1885.

Plain weavers, 65 cents a day in 1860, and 85 cents a day in 1885. In 1860 they got 16.7 grains of gold, and in 1885 21.8 grains of gold, and so the table goes through a dozen different occupations in a leather factory, beam and yard hands, blacksmiths, carpenters, etc., and gives the wages in grains of gold; and the difference between 1860 and 1885 is always in favor of 1885.

Mr. President, if there is anything to be gained by the free coinage of silver, if it will, indeed, so regulate prices that the masses of the people will be better off and the struggle for daily bread a little easier, in God's name let us have it. I do not know why I or why you should be excluded from the benefit that is to be diffused by legislation such as is proposed by this amendment. I have nothing not in common with the mass of my fellow-citizens. I have no interests that can be furthered by legislation that will not also redound to their benefit and advantage. I sail in the same boat with them, must encounter the same storms and perils, and am destined for the same haven, and I want no other fortune than to share with all, with each one, the humblest as well as the highest, whatever fate is in store for our common country. God forbid that there should be a difference in lot or in fortune. We differ as to the best mode of promoting these ends, which I acknowledge those who differ with me have in view as well as I, but I ask those who are pursuing honestly these ends to tell me why it is that, measured by this standard of labor, we find that the reward of the toiler has increased in gold in all these years we are speaking of and that the purchasing power has increased in all that time. Why should we seek to disturb it, and why are we not satisfied to let it remain where it is, rather than take the risk, as it seems to me must always obtain where a change in present conditions is proposed? Why take this leap in the dark?

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me one question at that point?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. In 1866, at the close of the war, our bonded indebtedness was $2,800,000,000 in round numbers. It is now practically $1,000,000,000. In 1866, at the close of the war, 2,800,000,000 bushels of wheat would have paid the bonded indebtedness of the United States at the then ruling prices—in fact, would have more than paid it. I want to ask the Senator how it is, if labor has been benefited, as he so eloquently portrayed, that it requires more bushels of wheat to-day, more pounds of cotton, and more of everything that the farm produces to pay the present billion dollars of national bonded indebtedness than it required in 1866, at the close of the war?

Mr. GRAY. Does the Senator ask me that as a serious question?

Mr. ALLEN. I do.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator asks me why it will take more?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. It will take more because those commodities bring a lower price.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator argues that the prices of labor have increased.

Mr. GRAY. Yes; they have.

Mr. ALLEN. And the Senator has cited some statistics which are isolated and disjointed to prove that.

Mr. GRAY. I did not trouble the Senate and the Senator with reciting all the statistics I had. I only took one or two specimen bricks out of the tables to show what I meant. I had a number of tables to show it.

Mr. ALLEN. As what the Senator says will have a very great effect with the country, I wish to ask him if prices have been increased, if the farmer and the laborer have been so benefited, as the Senator says, how does it occur that it will require more products of the farm to-day to pay one-third of the bonded indebtedness of the United States as it existed in 1866 than it would have required to pay the entire indebtedness of almost $3,000,000,000 at that time?

Mr. GRAY. As the Senator seems to be serious enough in that question, I will repeat my answer. It will require more because the prices of those commodities have gone down. I have just been speaking of their decline. Prices, too, were abnormally high in 1865, owing to an inflated paper currency. As regards cotton, there was also the cotton famine of the preceding years to take into the account.

Mr. ALLEN. This is the point to which I wish to attract the Senator's attention. He has been contending that the laboring and producing classes have been benefited in consequence of higher wages, more remunerative wages, and that the reduction of some commodities in life, which he has not enumerated very extensively, has been due to the increased facilities for manufacturing, much as a railroad company when you sue it for damage done by a fire usually undertakes to prove that some mysterious traveler threw a lighted cigar and started the fire. The Senator is not definite in that respect. If it does take more bushels of wheat and of corn and more of all the products of the farm to pay the present one-third of the national bonded indebtedness, does the Senator believe that that redounds to the benefit of the producer?

Mr. GRAY. It seems to me that all those questions of the Senator answer themselves. I have been talking here for an hour, dwelling upon the fact that all these staple commodities have decreased in price. If you attempted to pay the bonded debt of the country, if you compare the bonded debt of the country with these commodities when the price is high, and then again the same bonded debt with those commodities when the price is low, it would take more to pay than when the price is high.

Mr. ALLEN rose.

Mr. GRAY. Wait one moment. Do not interrupt me at this point.

Of course it will; but suppose there was no bonded debt, suppose there was no national debt to compare these products with, does the Senator say that if these commodities had been reduced in price by causes other than the appreciation of gold that it is not a benefit to humanity and not a curse? Will the Senator answer me that question?

Mr. ALLEN. I was not paying strict attention.

Mr. GRAY. I am sorry. The Senator lost something by not paying strict attention. Now, will he let me repeat it?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. I say I have been discussing this question, and if it be admitted, as I think I have proved—but admitting for the sake of argument, if you please—that these commodities, cotton, wheat, corn, and many other staple commodities, have declined in price for reasons which I have been dwelling upon, not connected with the decline in the price of silver, I ask whether that decline was not a blessing to humanity and not a curse?

Mr. ALLEN. Not by any means, Mr. President, under the circumstances.

Mr. GRAY. Well, I have the Senator's answer. If he will pardon me. I should like to go on and finish.

Mr. ALLEN. Permit me one moment further.

Mr. GRAY. I am sorry the Senator preaches the gospel of high prices of the necessities of life.

Mr. ALLEN. I do under those circumstances. Under other circumstances I might preach another gospel.

Mr. HOAR (to Mr. GRAY). Can two gospels inconsistent with each other both be true?

Mr. ALLEN. I did not hear the Senator's remark.

Mr. HOAR. I did not address the Senator from Nebraska, if the Senator will pardon me. I made a suggestion to the Senator from Delaware. What I asked the Senator from Delaware was if two gospels inconsistent with each other could both be true. I repeat it.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly they may both be true, as I shall demonstrate to the Senator at another time.

What I wanted to put to the Senator from Delaware was this question: The Senator now admits, as I understand, that it requires as much of the product of the farm to pay the present national bonded indebtedness as it required in 1866 to pay almost three times that amount.

Mr. GRAY. That question answers itself.

Mr. ALLEN. If that be the case, how can the Senator stand here and contend that with falling prices of products the wages of those who produced those products have gone up?

Mr. GRAY. I only point to the fact. That seems to be a favorite argument, and I thank the Senator for having called my attention to it. It is paraded by Professor Andrews, president of one of the colleges, a most respectable authority, no doubt, and by somebody else, as if that were to settle this question. He exclaims, with a great deal of tragic emphasis, that a certain amount of cotton and wheat would have discharged the entire bonded indebtedness in 1866, and that twenty or twenty-five years afterwards, when more than half of it had been paid, the same amount of cotton and wheat was necessary to discharge the balance. That is about it. If commodities are cheaper, and if the labor which produces them has gone up all the time, who is hurt except the man who owns the land, who would have preferred to have the higher price? But are you going to sacrifice the stability of our country, to throw into confusion all the great transactions of the business of the world, in order to gratify the desire of the gentlemen who are fortunate enough now, as in the time of Horace, to own the soil and produce the crops which feed the multitude of the people? I do not begrudge them the high prices when they come naturally, but I do not want to legislate high prices to them. I do not want to make the flour, the bread, the meat, the wool, the clothes more costly to those who consume them in order that those who have produced them—and I presume made a profit, or they would not have produced them at all—may get a higher price. What is the injustice about that?

The same may be said as to Bessemer steel. It took so many tons of iron rails in 1865 to pay the debt of the United States—the product of the toil of as honest and hard-working men as ever struck an anvil with a hammer or stood in front of a furnace—it took so many tons, produced by their sweat and their toil, to pay the bonded debt of the United States in 1865, and yet twenty-five years afterwards, when half that debt had been paid, it would take just as many tons and more to pay the balance. How does that sound? Is there anything wrong about that? Would you put the iron rails and steel rails back to $187 a ton, and charge every man, woman, and child who rides upon a railroad a certain percentage of the cost, in order that the rail maker and the manufacturer might be able to pay the bonded debt in iron rails?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The trouble with the Senator's argument is that he loses sight constantly of the fact that it does not take one particle less human labor to produce a bale of cotton to-day than it did in 1865. Whether it does in Bessemer steel and other things is another question. Where improved modes have benefited production, it makes a material difference; but where there has been no improvement, where it takes the same amount of human labor—if he assumes that human labor is the proper measure—the Senator can not deny the force of the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska when he speaks of wheat and cotton.

Mr. GRAY. I of course, Mr. President, would speak with great diffidence of the question of cotton raising with the Senator from Arkansas; but I venture to make the assertion that the Senator from Arkansas has in his enthusiasm lost sight of many labor-saving devices which stand between the planting of cotton in 1865 and its sale at Liverpool or Boston in the bale and the processes necessary in 1895. There is a difference in ginning; there is a difference in the gathering, all in favor of the planter. They are commencing, I am told, but do not know, to pick cotton by machinery. But certainly the Senator will not deny that since 1865 in preparing it for market, with hydraulic pressure a bale is compressed into one-third the bulk that it occupied twenty-five or thirty years ago, and there is a great difference in favor of the producer of cheaper cotton. A vessel can be loaded with three times as many bales on account of the reduction of bulk now as could have been loaded in 1865. There is also a difference in the respect that the waste products of cotton are utilized now, which were not then. The net value of the cotton seed produced last year, according to the memorandum which I have here, was about $27,000,000 to the producer, going a long way toward paying the cost of production. That in 1865 was absolutely lost. Should no account be made of this and of the improved fertilizers, the increased production that comes from better cultivation and from the use of phosphates, instead of the old costly and exhaustive guanos which were used to fertilize cotton?

Mr. GEAR. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. GEAR. On the prairies of the Northwest it formerly took seven or eight men to follow a binder and bind grain. To-day one boy drives the team and the harvester binds the grain. Therefore the cost of producing the wheat is reduced.

Mr. GRAY. There is no doubt about that. But then coming to another point of the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas as to the laborer who produces; I do not mean the labor of the land owner; I am not talking now about the capitalist; I am talking about the laborer, the man who goes into the field and plants the cotton, who hoes it, holding onto the handle of the hoe, the man who picks it with his own fingers—I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether that labor was better paid, or as well paid, in 1873 as it is to-day?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It was better paid in 1865 than to-day, decidedly.

Mr. BERRY. It was much better paid in 1865.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Perhaps twice as much.

Mr. GRAY. I am not in a position to contradict the Senator

from Arkansas, but I have only to say that, then, that labor is an exception to all other productive labor in this country, and I believe the Senator from Arkansas, when he examines the question more closely than perhaps he has done now, will find that he is very far from right in stating that that labor was as well paid then as now. I know that the farmers in my State complain—and with good reason—that with lower prices for grain they have to pay as high prices for labor as ever.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have lived on a cotton farm all my life, and if there is anything on the face of the earth I know, it is the condition of cotton farming. I am not mistaken.

Mr. GRAY. Very well. I still think, if the Senator will analyze the elements which go into and the return that comes from the cotton field hand and to the boy who plows and picks the cotton, he will find some reason to modify his statement. But be that as it may, whether it is better or is the same, all I have to say is that, measured by gold, gold has not appreciated. The Senator from Arkansas, who is kind enough to furnish me with his authority with regard to prices in the particular of which he spoke, calls to my attention another matter in which he is concerned, and about which I wish to make a single remark.

There has been a good deal said in the course of silver discussion of late years about the advantage which would accrue to this country if we adopted the silver standard. The Senator from Arkansas does not deprecate the conditions which are to follow from going upon a silver basis; in fact, he rather chants a note of joy at the prospect. He says that conditions will be happier, better, currency more stable, and business enterprises more encouraged. If I thought so I should be with him, of course; but thinking that he is entirely mistaken, and that the adoption of that measure would be fraught with ruin and trouble and disaster to my country, I want to show some of the reasons why it is inexpedient that we should take this leap in the dark at the present time, in order that we may have silver prices in this country, and thereby get the advantage which the Senator and many others say will come to us from trading with silver-standard countries. He says there is a distinct advantage in that; that the minister from Mexico, Mr. Romero, a most distinguished and eminent and estimable gentleman, in a recent article in the North American Review, in speaking of the advantages of silver in stimulating the exports from that country, has said certain things which he has commented upon.

If I understand anything about the process by which this beneficence is to be wrought to the country, it is this: Taking the example of Mexico, for instance, the products that are raised in that country, coffee, for example, as a staple product, will be sold for gold when it is exported, and with that gold you can come home and buy twice its nominal amount in silver money; that if you sell—using our own currency—a thousand dollars' worth of coffee for a thousand dollars' worth of gold you take that gold back to Mexico and get $2,000 in silver. I believe some such process as that is pointed out by which we are to arrive at this very felicitous condition.

Mr. President, think of it! Dislocate the money metals of your country, put yourself out of exchange with all the great gold-standard countries of the world in order that there may be a profit made on the exchange we get for the articles we export. Who makes that money? It is the capitalist, the gambler, and the speculator who makes it. How can anything be made if the cost of production, the wages of labor, are the same or have appreciated in proportion to the price of commodities in silver? If it costs as much in silver to raise the coffee in proportion as it did in gold, then where is the profit? If you pay your labor in the field or in the coffee plantation higher wages because you pay him in silver, if you pay for transportation larger rates because you pay in silver, if you pay the commission merchant higher commissions because you pay in silver, if all these things have gone up together, then where is the profit? No, Mr. President; the profit is to the capitalist; the profit is to the man who owns the land and sells for gold the thing that he has raised and produced by paying gold wages or nearly gold wages in silver—I mean nominally in silver. That is confessed in the very article quoted by the Senator from Arkansas from Mr. Romero. Says Mr. Romero in the article read by the Senator from Arkansas:

> We have more stability of prices, wages, rents, etc.
>
> Those things concern the capitalist—
>
> Although our wages are low——

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Read the remainder.

Mr. GRAY. The article continues:

> Although our wages are low, there has been in recent years a marked tendency to their increase.

Is there anything about increasing wages up to a gold standard? Not a word. If he receives 50 cents a day in silver, he receives it whether he sells for gold or no, and there is where the profit comes in, and the only way in which it will work an advantage by being on the silver basis and making it out of the exchange.

He says on page 707 of the magazine containing that article:

> While the fall of silver and free coinage in Mexico have not given to the Mexican silver coins, when converted into foreign exchange or sold for gold, any value other than that of the silver bullion contained in the same, nevertheless the purchasing power of the silver dollar is now, on the whole, as great in Mexico as it ever was.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the Mexican silver dollar to which he alludes.

Mr. GRAY. I know it is the Mexican silver dollar. The Senator from Arkansas said further in his speech:

> England's great wealth is the result of her commerce, and perhaps her most profitable customers are the silver-using countries. How her trade with these nations is handicapped we see forcibly set out by Mr. Romero in what has just been quoted. These drawbacks greatly embarrass British merchants in their dealings, and they would gladly rid themselves of them; but other interests in Great Britain, the bankers, for instance, in London, intent upon their own gains, by reason of the increase in the value of gold, are unwilling to heed the complaints of the merchants about the difficulties they are compelled to endure.

Yet the Senator from Colorado the other day in his speech read a very interesting article from the Statist to show that the last year of commerce in Great Britain with all the countries of the world had been the most productive and the most profitable in the history of that great country.

Mr. TELLER. Simply because of low prices.

Mr. GRAY. Simply because of low prices. I am only showing the difference between the statement of the Senator from Arkansas and that made on the authority of the Statist by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for calling my attention to this number of the North American Review and to that interesting article by Mr. Mulhall, a very distinguished and well-known statistician. He quotes from him to show that the United States of America in the year 1895 is, in all the elements that go to make up the wealth of a nation, the greatest, the strongest that the world has ever seen; and that the productive power and the intelligence and economic forces that in this country are at work for the blessing of mankind have had no parallel in the past history of the world. That is all true; and yet with that statement, indorsed by the distinguished authority of the Senator from Arkansas, we have these lamentations over the condition of the country which only this extreme and desperate remedy of the free coinage of silver can be relied upon to cure. Mr. Mulhall does say a great deal more. He says:

> It is not merely that European nations are deprived of the labor, skill, and exertions of 4,000,000 men in the prime of life; they have also to set apart 1,000,000 workers of the agricultural and industrial classes to feed and clothe the standing armies and defray the cost of artillery, war vessels, etc. Thus the average of productive energy in France, Germany, England, etc., is much less than appears in the above statement. Again, if we consider the labor-saving appliances in the United States, we see the perfection of agricultural and other machinery. Take, for example, the reaping machine commonly used in the Western States, which will cut and bind grain at the rate of 45 minutes per acre. On this point it may be well to compare the production of grain and meat in various countries with the number of hands employed in agriculture in 1890:

Countries.	Hands employed.	Grain.	Meat.	Product per hand.	
				Grain.	Meat.
		Tons.	*Tons.*	*Bushels.*	*Pounds.*
United States	8,760,000	76,600,000	4,830,000	350	1,230
United Kingdom	2,469,000	7,330,000	1,140,000	119	1,090
France	6,910,000	16,900,000	1,200,000	98	350
Germany	8,120,000	15,100,000	1,370,000	75	380
Austria	10,680,000	17,100,000	1,080,000	64	230
Italy	5,400,000	5,300,000	360,000	39	150

> An ordinary farm hand in the United States raises as much grain as three in England, four in France, five in Germany, or six in Austria, which shows what an enormous waste of labor occurs in Europe, because farmers are not possessed of the same mechanical appliances as in the United States. In order to make the comparison of labor more exact, I may be permitted to reduce all farm products to common denominator of grain by supposing 10 pounds of meat or 2 gallons of wine to be equal to a bushel, and then the account will stand thus:
>
> *Bushels of grain per hand.*
>
United States	475	Germany	118
United Kingdom	228	Italy	115
France	188	Austria	97
>
> While the above is the general result for the United States, as compared with other countries.

That is, in the United States there are produced 475 bushe s of grain per head of those employed in the production; in the United Kingdom, 228 bushels; in France, 188 bushels; in Germany, 118 bushels; in Italy, 115 bushels; and in Austria, 97 bushels. He says:

> Mr. Atkinson, in his book on the Distribution of Products, shows that in some of the Western States the labor of one man during three hundred days in the year is equivalent to the production of 4,500 bushels of wheat, while the cutting, thrashing, milling, and conveyance to market represent the annual labor of three other men. Thus four men can produce and deliver to the bakers as much flour as will feed a thousand persons, at 12 ounces of bread daily, for a whole year. In other words, one man can feed 250, whereas in Europe one man feeds only 30 persons.

Mr. Mulhall says something else that is interesting. There is a good deal said about the distress of this country, that the poor are

growing poorer, while the rich are growing richer, and that certain sections of this country are suffering the blight of despair and want which nothing but this extreme remedy will cure. This statistician, indorsed by the Senator from Arkansas, has given us some interesting figures obtained from the census of the United States. He gives the wealth of the United States, which he says is the greatest of any country in the world, dividing it into groups. The wealth of the New England States in 1850 was $1,129,000,000; in 1870 it was $3,237,000,000; in 1890 it was $5,233,000,000, a large increase, but a little less than 100 per cent for New England in 1890 over 1870.

For the second group of States I omit 1870, right after the war and before there had been any recovery from its devastations. Taking 1880, $6,448,000,000 is the wealth put down for that group of States, whereas in 1890 it was $9,928,000,000, or as the French say, nine milliards nine hundred and twenty-eight millions, an increase of 330 per cent over 1880.

I know that there is much yet to be done. I know that there are want and suffering everywhere. I know that the ravages of war have not yet all been completely mended and restored. There is much yet for a brave and intelligent people to do, and the necessity for doing it will continue; but, Mr. President, it is gratifying to know by these sources of information that after all there is this remarkable and pleasing increase in the wealth of that fair section of our country; that her sons and daughters have turned to building up the waste places of the war and that they are succeeding. And it is no friend, as I conceive it, who tells them that in place of availing themselves of all that invention, all that improvement and science and enterprise have done to ameliorate the condition of human labor, they are to destroy and dislocate the money of the country, throw away the stability which obtains with the standard which we now have in gold, drive out of circulation one-half of our metal money, and relegate us to the silver basis in order that the prices, the nominal prices only, of cotton or wheat may be enhanced.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I have been detained from the Senate by indisposition and I do not exactly understand the Senator's position. I should like to know it.

Mr. GRAY. I am too tired to explain it over.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know if the Senator is entirely content with the present arrangement in the United States as between the two metals—gold and silver—as currency for the people.

Mr. GRAY. I am not entirely content by any means with the present financial condition of the United States so far as the Government has relations to it.

Mr. GEORGE. I confine my question simply to gold and silver.

Mr. GRAY. I think the relation now existing between gold and silver in the United States, I will say in answer to the Senator from Mississippi, is the best possible that can be obtained. I do not believe that there would be any difficulty in maintaining the equal purchasing power and equal circulation and parity of the gold and silver now coined in the United States if the disturbing forces which exist, and to which I alluded in the earlier part of my remarks, were removed.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I understand the Senator not to be in favor of an increased use of silver by an international agreement?

Mr. GRAY. The Senator will excuse me and relieve me from going into international bimetallism. That is aside from the purpose of my remarks, and I have already fatigued the Senate as well as myself by the length at which I have spoken.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator unwilling to answer that question?

Mr. GRAY. Oh, no; but I hope the Senator will relieve me from further interruption. I have told him what I think about it.

Mr. GEORGE. I should be very glad to know, if the Senator is willing to tell me.

Mr. GRAY. As I have stated, I think if we could relieve the Treasury from this unnatural, abnormal banking function; if we could retire the greenbacks and restore the Treasury to its natural and old-time function of honestly collecting and honestly disbursing the public revenue, and leave to the commercial activities of the country the creation of credit money and of those credit devices which modern business and modern methods have made necessary for accomplishing the exchanges of commerce and modern life——

Mr. GEORGE rose.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator must pardon me. That is what I think should be done; and I think that then the greatest possible amount of silver that could ever be made to circulate in parity with gold would be made to circulate in the United States of America just as it circulates in France to-day, and it will continue to circulate here if only the disturbing causes that I have mentioned were removed. But, Mr. President, that reminds me to say that the only way in which we can have bimetallism, the only way in which these two metals coined can circulate at a parity, it seems to me, is by a gold standard with such limited and regulated use of silver as we have now in existence in this country of ours. But, if we are relegated to a silver standard we can not maintain a gold circulation in connection with silver, but we shall have an absolutely monometallic standard, and that of silver instead of gold.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator allow me to say that he has not answered my question?

Mr. GRAY. I do not expect to answer it any further, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator has been enjoying a nap while I have been talking, and he has come in at the end of my speech and expects me to repeat the argument for his benefit or amusement, I do not know which, and certainly I am not equal to that task.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want any argument. It can be settled by saying yes or no, without making any argument.

Mr. GRAY. But I want to get through. Mr. President, I have wearied the Senate overlong I know, and I have been more desultory than I intended to be or would wish to be, but I can not close without referring to the very interesting and able discussion that this question received yesterday from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. He admits frankly, for I think he has come down as close to the real question as anyone who has discussed it, as follows:

> The question of the restoration of the coinage of silver upon terms of exact equality with gold, when reduced to its last analysis, is whether the basis of the money of final payment shall be narrowed to the possible supply of gold coin, or whether it shall be broadened so as to include the available supply of both gold and silver for coinage as primary standard money.
>
> The resultant of this last analysis must embrace both the gold and the silver coin, each with equal current interchangeable value with the other. For otherwise there would necessarily be practically either gold monometallism or silver monometallism.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that unless there is absolute interchangeable value between the two metals resulting from the passage of a 16 to 1 coinage measure, then necessarily there will be either gold monometallism or silver monometallism, and that is what no one desires, so far as I can learn from what has been said on this floor in this connection. It seems to me unless you can show that the free coinage of silver will produce, by the increased demand or whatever other reason may be alleged, an exact equivalent between 16 ounces of silver and 1 ounce of gold, then you have failed to show that the change that is proposed is either safe or desirable. The Senator from Georgia admits it. I think the Senator from Arkansas admits it.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the Senator whether he would be satisfied with that sort of interchangeableness of value which occurred and existed for eighty-one years in the United States, from the foundation of the Government to 1873?

Mr. GRAY. I do not know that I should be perfectly satisfied with it. From 1853 until gold and silver both went out we were practically on a gold monometallic basis. Silver was more valuable than gold, and disappeared from circulation. We were then just where the Senator from Georgia said we would be, that we would be sure to be on one or the other. We were on a gold monometallic basis and we got along very well. Nobody suffered very much.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the Senator assert that we were on a gold monometallic basis from 1792 down to 1873?

Mr. GRAY. No; a part of the time we were on a silver monometallic basis, thereby confirming the proposition of the Senator from Georgia as a sound proposition of monetary economics, that unless you have a parity between the 16 ounces of silver and the 1 ounce of gold you are to have either a monometallism of gold or of silver, as the case may be.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me to make a suggestion just there?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Bimetallism does not consist in having both forms of money always circulating at the same time. It consists in giving an opportunity to everyone to circulate them if he chooses.

Mr. GRAY. That is a new phase. I do not mean that I never heard it before.

Mr. TELLER. It is not a new phase. It is a phase that everyone who studies this question will admit. If the Senator will allow me a moment further, I will say the assertion that because one of the metals for a time disappears you have not bimetallism is not recognized, I think, in the best circles of economic thought.

Mr. GRAY. I did not mean to say that it was necessarily new to me. I have seen such a statement, and I can understand the Senator from Colorado when he repeats it here; but so far as the arguments that are treated here and we are considering to-day it is a new phase of the question. The Senator from Georgia, and I think the Senator from Arkansas—certainly the Senator from Georgia—stated what I believe to be accurately true, and he ad-

dressed himself to the very point of the controversy. As a good lawyer he sought a distinct issue and addressed himself to it, and that was as I have read. Further on he says:

This is the basic, fundamental proposition in favor of bimetallism. Is this proposition true? If it is——

Mr. BACON. The Senator is reading that in connection with another proposition altogether.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, I thought it explained itself. I will read back, although I wanted to abbreviate the time I was taking.

The strength of the argument in favor of bimetallism is based on the fact that the use of both metals is necessary to supply the amount of money of final payment required to do the business of the world—

That is right—

for the reason that all the gold in the world available for coinage is, taken by itself, insufficient for this purpose; and that all the silver in the world available for coinage, taken by itself, is likewise insufficient for this purpose.

This is the basic, fundamental proposition in favor of bimetallism. Is this proposition true? If it is, then the restoration of bimetallism with the use of both gold and silver as the money of final payment can not be overestimated, and there can be no higher obligation on the statesmanship of the country than to find a speedy way for its accomplishment. If it is not true, but if on the contrary it is a fact that there is enough of gold available for coinage to answer all the needs of the world as the money of final payment, then for myself I am ready to admit that the question of bimetallism, and the question which it involves of the restoration of silver as primary money, except so far as they concern debts previously contracted, are comparatively unimportant questions.

The Senator from Georgia did not think that I intended to misrepresent him?

Mr. BACON. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. GRAY. I saw that the latter part of the proposition I commenced to read explained what I was discussing.

Mr. BACON. I understand that, of course, Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BACON. I simply wish to have the statement go on record that it was an inadvertency.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to it. I would not misrepresent him or any other man for the world, but you will see the latter part of the proposition I commenced to read will explain what I was reading. That with the increase in the production of gold, with the enormous improvement in the appliances for mining, with the increased annual output that the last three years has seen of the world's production, there is not enough gold, the Senator says is the basic proposition, and he stands upon it.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will recognize that an increased production in an agricultural article, for instance, wheat, which doubles the farm production necessarily doubles the world's supply.

Mr. GRAY. I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. BACON. But the production of a precious metal is something which relates to the accumulation of a thousand years.

Mr. GRAY. I understand.

Mr. BACON. I know you understand it, but I want to state it.

Mr. GRAY. But the Senator is stating it in my time. I am perfectly willing to answer a question.

Mr. BACON. I simply want to call your attention to the difference. The Senator is talking about a largely increased production. If the increased production were double what it is now, it would not amount to one-fortieth of the supply now on hand, and it would take a large number of years to bring the supply of the standard money of final payment up to what was the former supply, represented by the aggregate of both gold and silver.

Mr. GRAY. Now, that is all true, but it does not at all affect what I was saying. Though that is true, it is also true that the world's product of gold is increasing, and from all the accounts we have it is likely to increase in the future. So it is estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury that in place of the enormous output of $180,000,000 during the last year the next returns will show over $200,000,000. Whether that increase be a large or small increment, as compared with the stock of gold, nevertheless the fact remains that it is an increasing amount and not a decreasing amount, and that with all the world's appliances for a diminished use of hard money in the exchanges of life, that accumulated supply, such as it is, is proving itself sufficient, for I have shown, I think, by what I have stated in regard to the value of labor measured in grains of gold, that gold has not appreciated in the years composing the period with which we are concerned.

If it has not appreciated, then it seems to me the inference is necessary and absolute that there is a sufficient supply to perform the money functions of the world; and if that be so, why should we give up the stability and certainty that such a standard makes for the business of the world and relegate ourselves to a cheaper money and one in which we will constantly be going through the calculation of the money changers in order to put ourselves in touch with the great gold standard and consuming countries of the globe? We ought not to undertake such difficulties. We ought not to bring upon ourselves such burdens unless there is a necessity for it, which I contend has not been shown by any advocate of this amendment from the committee.

Mr. President, I must apologize to the Senate for having taken so much of its time, and if Senators will give me their consent to include in my printed remarks some of the tables which I did not read in full, I will thank them for the attention they have given me and not detain them longer.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend at this hour of the day to enter into a discussion of this question. I did not like to interrupt the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] because I saw he did not care to be interrupted, but his concluding statement has waived the necessity of any inquiry. He denies emphatically that gold has appreciated. I want to say that the most distinguished representative of the gold monometallic system in the world, the great statistician of Great Britain, Dr. Giffen, has on sundry occasions frankly admitted the appreciation of gold to the full extent of any claim made by the silver men. I wish to say to the Senator, also, that the Statist, a leading financial paper of the world, published at London, has admitted that in its columns for the last two years without controversy. I will say to the Senator, further, that there are not more than two men in Europe who have an international reputation as political economists who are to-day denying the appreciation of gold to the extent of nearly 40 per cent. One of those statisticians is an Englishman and the other is a Frenchman. They are both quoted in the public press of the country at different times in defense of the gold monometallic system, and they deny it. Practically all the rest of the men who contend for the gold standard in Europe admit it. I will take occasion to talk about this matter at some other time, but not to-night

I wish to say that when the Senator from Delaware compares the present purchasing power of gold with labor, and then takes the day laborer, he ought to bear in mind that the labor organizations of this country have maintained, in spite of all other influences, aided and assisted by a system of tariff, the wages for the men who work for day's wages, and undoubtedly the statement is true that they are in better condition now than they have ever been.

Mr. HILL. Under the Wilson tariff?

Mr. TELLER. That is, they have been until recently. The Senator from Delaware seems to address himself in his inquiry, and his interest is only manifestly to, the men who hire out by the day. Does not the Senator know that there are multitudes of people in the United States who do not work for day's wages? Does he not know that the great productive agencies of this country are carried on by the men who take part and share in the profit. Does he not know more, that the labor organizations of this country have been at war with the capital of this country to maintain their wages, and does he not remember that two years ago he saw, as I saw, the United States Army called out to prevent the labor organizations of this country from waging war to maintain wages? Does he think that this is a condition that the country can continue in?

I will not interfere with Senators who have given notice, but some other day, if not upon this bill upon ome other, I shall undertake to show from the best authorities in the world that the consenus of opinion, no matter what a man believes about gold or silver, is that there has been an appreciation of gold from 30 to 40 per cent, and it is a late hour to come in here and contend that that is not to-day an admitted fact, because the Senator can find one or two articles in the great catalogue of production that may not have fallen as silver has fallen with the general range of products. Locke said when one product had fallen it might be presumed that the vice was in that product, but he said when all things fall the vice must be in the money.

Mr. CALL. I desire to give notice that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to-morrow morning, I shall submit a few observations upon the pending bill.

DEATH OF HON. FREDERICK REMANN.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Frederick Remann, late a member-elect of the House from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions of the House of Representatives were read by the Secretary, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 28, 1896.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frederick Remann, late a member-elect of the House from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, the resolutions announce the death of a highly valued friend both of my colleague and myself. At some time after the return of my colleague I trust the Senate

will indulge us with an hour in which to express our feelings at the great loss our State and the country have sustained. For the present I offer for adoption the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Frederick Remann, late a member-elect of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 28, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say as to the message of the President referred yesterday to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that he finds on examination it should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and if there is no objection, the reference will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

BRAINERD AND NORTHERN MINNESOTA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, and to its assigns, the right of way for the extension of its railroad, with necessary side tracks and switch tracks, and for a telegraph and telephone line, through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation, commencing at a point in the south line of said Indian reservation and extending northwesterly through section 11, of township 141, range 31, to a point in the west line of said reservation in section 2; also through the Chippewa Indian Reservation, in said State, commencing at a point in the south line of said Indian reservation and extending northwesterly through sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36, in township 143, range 32, sections 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, and 32, in township 143, range 31; section 1, in township 142, range 32, and sections 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9, in township 142, range 31, to a point in the west line of said reservation, with the right to load logs on said railroad at the points in said reservation where the same may run adjacent or contiguous to the waters of Leech Lake. Such right of way shall be 50 feet in width on each side of the central line of said railroad, and said company shall also have the right to take from the lands adjacent to the line of said road material, stone, and earth necessary for the construction of said railroad; also grounds adjacent to such right of way for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, not to exceed in amount 200 feet in width and 3,000 feet in length for each station, and to an extent not exceeding one station within the limits of said reservation: *Provided*, That no part of such lands herein granted shall be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as are necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad line, and when any portion thereof shall cease to be used such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall be taken.

SEC. 2. That before said railroad shall be constructed through any land, claim, or improvement held by individual occupants according to any treaties or laws of the United States, compensation shall be made such occupant or claimant for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of such railroad. In case of failure to make satisfactory settlement with any such claimant, the United States district court at St. Paul or Duluth, Minn., shall have jurisdiction, upon petition of either party, to determine such just compensation in accordance with the laws of Minnesota provided for determining the damage when property is taken for railroad purposes; and the amount of damages resulting to the tribe or tribes of Indians pertaining to said reservation in their tribal capacity, by reason of the construction of said railroad through such lands of the reservation as are not occupied in severalty shall be ascertained and determined in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, and be subject to his final approval: *Provided, however*, That said railroad company may file with the Secretary of the Interior a bond, in such amount and with such sureties as the Secretary shall approve, conditioned for the payment of just compensation for said right of way to said individual occupants and to said tribe or tribes, as hereinbefore provided, and said company may thereupon proceed to construct and operate its railroad across said reservation.

SEC. 3. That said company shall cause maps, showing the route of its line through said reservation, and including the grounds for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior before constructing any portion of said railroad.

SEC. 4. That said company is hereby authorized to enter upon said reservation for the purpose of surveying and locating its line of railroad: *Provided*, That said railroad shall be located and constructed with due regard to the rights of the Indians and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of he Interior shall prescribe.

SEC. 5. That the right herein granted shall be forfeited by said company unless the road shall be constructed through the said reservation within three years after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. EDDY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3009) entitled "A bill granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota," hereby report the same back to the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that section 1 of said bill be amended as follows, to wit:

First. By striking out all of line 15, after the word "Reservation," and all of lines 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and the word "thirty-one," in line 33, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in township 142 north, of range 31 west, and extending in a northwesterly direction from the terminus of the line as now constructed along the most feasible and practicable route through said township, and through townships 143 north, of ranges 31 and 32 west."

Second. After the word "buildings," in line 32 of said section 1, by striking out all the remainder of the line, and the words "water stations," in line 33.

Third. After the word "said," in line 36 of said section 1, and before the word "Reservation," inserting the word "Chippewa."

And that as thus amended the bill do pass.

The amendments offered to this bill are in conformity with the request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whose letter is hereto attached and made a part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, January 18, 1896.

SIR: I am in receipt of a communication from W. M. Griffith, esq., clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives, dated the 8th instant, with which he submits for the views of this office several bills, among them H. R. 3009, "A bill granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota." Mr. Griffith states that by resolution of the Committee on Indian Affairs the bills were referred to this office for report.

The bill grants the company a right of way through section 11, in township 141 north, of range 31 west, within the Leech Lake Reservation, and through certain sections in townships 142 and 143 north, of ranges 31 and 32 west, within the Chippewa Reservation, with the right to load logs on said railroad at the points in said reservations where the same may run adjacent to the waters of Leech Lake, such right of way to be 50 feet in width on each side of the central line of the road; also ground adjacent to the right of way for station purposes, to the extent of one station within the limits of the Chippewa Reservation.

In reporting upon the bill I desire, in the first place, to invite your attention to the fact that by act of Congress approved July 6, 1894 (28 Stat. L., 99), the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company was granted right of way through sections 13, 12, 1, and 2, in township 141 north, of range 31 west, within the Leech Lake Reservation. When the company came to make its survey for the line of definite location, on account of the topography of the country it found it necessary to pass through section 11 of said township and range also. This the said act did not give it a right to do; so it now seeks a right of way through said section, in the nature of an amendment to said act, giving it a right to go through sections 13, 12, 1, and 2. I am informally advised by Mr. FLETCHER, member of Congress from Minnesota, who introduced the bill, that the road is already constructed and in operation through the Leech Lake Reservation.

After constructing through the Leech Lake Reservation the company now finds it desirable to construct through a portion of the Chippewa Reservation; so instead of merely asking for an amendment to the old act permitting it to pass through said section 11, in the Leech Lake Reservation, it seeks also a right of way from the present terminus of its line in a northwesterly direction through a portion of the Chippewa Reservation. To secure this object the company has deemed it necessary to introduce a new bill.

The bill in question, after a description of the lands through which the company desires to pass, is substantially identical with the former act of Congress granting the company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation.

In office letter of December 21, 1894, in reporting upon House bill 54, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, a bill granting the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company a right of way through certain Indian reservations in Minnesota, and in office letter of the 15th instant, in reporting upon Senate bill 1035, a bill granting the Sioux City and Omaha Railway Company a right of way through the Omaha and Winnebago reservations, this office invited attention to certain veto messages of the President last year returning certain bills without his approval granting railroad companies rights of way through Indian reservations. These veto messages took exception to the liberality that has recently been manifested in granting companies rights of way through Indian lands. The President, judging from these messages, seems to think that companies should not receive such liberal grants as to side tracks, switches, turn-outs, and water stations, and as to station privileges generally; that the consent of the Indians should be obtained, and that Indians should not be compelled to seek redress in controversies with the company in courts that are located long distances from their reservations.

As regards the bill in question, I think by slight amendments the objections which the President has raised to such bills can be obviated. As regards obtaining the consent of the Indians, I do not think it important in this instance, as the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, under the provisions of the act of Congress of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 642), have ceded all their right, title, and interest in and to said reservation lands not allotted to them in severalty under the provisions of said act. So far as this office is aware, the line of road as proposed would not interfere with any of the allotted lands; but for fear it should, I deem it important that it should provide for this contingency. This it already does.

In an informal conference with Mr. FLETCHER, he suggested that an amendment be made in the description of the line of route of the road through the Chippewa Reservation. I accordingly respectfully recommend that section 1 of the bill be amended as follows: Strike out all of line 15, after the word "Reservation," all of lines 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and the word "thirty-one" in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the words: "In township 142 north, of range 31 west, and extending in a northwesterly direction from the terminus of the line as now constructed along the most feasible and practicable route, through said township and through townships 143 north, of ranges 31 and 32 west."

After the word "buildings," in line 32 of said section 1, strike out all the remainder of the line, and the words "water stations" in line 38.

After the word "said," in line 36 of said section 1, and before the word "Reservation," insert the word "Chippewa."

Were it not that the company already has a right of way through a portion of the Leech Lake Reservation, as has been explained, I would suggest an amendment to section 2 of the bill regarding the method of determining the amount of compensation that shall be paid the Indians.

If the amendments herein suggested shall be made, this office will interpose no objections to the passage of the bill.

The copy of the bill submitted by Mr. Griffith and a copy of this report are inclosed herewith.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

D. M. BROWNING, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The amendments recommended in the report were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLETCHER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BADGE OF SONS OF VETERANS.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 102) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States of America, upon all occasions of ceremony.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States of America, may be worn, in their own right, upon all public occasions of ceremony, by officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy of the United States who are members of said organization.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. POWERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE IN DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up now the report of the Committee on Accounts which was under consideration last evening.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution of January 14, directing the Doorkeeper of the House to employ Willis Bolls as an additional employee in the document room during the Fifty-fourth Congress, to be paid at the rate of $100 per month out of the contingent fund of the House, to prepare the bills of the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses for binding, as provided for in the act of January 12, 1895, beg to report that they have made investigation of the subject, and respectfully submit and recommend the adoption of the following as a substitute for the same:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ some suitable person as an additional employee in the document room to prepare for binding the bills of the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses, as provided for in the act of January 12, 1895, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,000 per annum during the Fifty-fourth Congress, or that portion thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of said act, out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute recommended by the committee.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of this resolution what increase over the force carried during the last fiscal year has been already made at this session?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. None whatever.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am not sure that my question has been understood.

What I desire to know is what, if this resolution shall be adopted, will be the total increase of force made at this session over that which was carried under the law of last year.

Mr. ODELL. One man.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is the gentleman quite sure that he is correct about that?

Mr. ODELL. One man in the House document room is all the increase that this resolution provides for.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman is correct as to the House document room, but that was not the subject of my inquiry. What I desire to know is, what is the total increase of force made in this House over the force carried during the third session of the last Congress?

Mr. ODELL. That is a question that I can not answer offhand.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman's statement is correct so far as the House document room is concerned, but I desire now to call attention to the increases already made in this Congress over the force carried in the last Congress. These increases have been made by special resolutions. Up to this time there has been an increase of three clerks in the document room, two clerks to Committees on Elections, three assistant clerks—one to the Committee on Military Affairs, one to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and one to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; one press-gallery messenger, one special messenger, and two assistant clerks to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, making a total increase of twelve clerks, at an annual compensation of $15,876. These are independent of the four employees allowed to the minority.

Now, if we deduct from these twelve additional employees the three assistants in the document room (who prior to the third session of the last Congress were carried in the legislative bill) and the two additional clerks to the Committees on Elections, made necessary by the organization of the additional committees, or rather by the subdivision of the Committee on Elections into three parts, we find a net increase, if I remember aright, of the force up to the present time of seven employees with salaries amounting to about $10,000.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman please state now how many men were carried on the rolls in the last session of Congress that are not now on the force, having been employed especially for that session?

Mr. DOCKERY. The statement which I have just read includes all the information I have at this moment.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. Were there not three more clerks employed in the post-office in the last Congress than are employed there now?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that a statement, including the information he calls for, was prepared by a gentleman who never makes mistakes, and I had it in my possession, but, being compelled to leave before the holidays, I turned it over to a distinguished gentleman on the other side of the House, who has mislaid it, so that I can not at this time furnish the gentleman the special information he desires. The statement I have here was prepared hurriedly, but, as I have said, by a gentleman who never makes mistakes——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Who is he? I would like to know that man's name. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. And that gentleman assures me that the increase is just as I have stated it here.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri allow me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. ODELL. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri to make an explanation in regard to the special messenger to whom he has referred. I have no knowledge of any such special messenger.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is a gentleman by the name of Coombs, formerly Department messenger.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. He was created an officer at the special instance and request of the gentleman's side of the House. If those gentlemen do not want him, we shall be very glad to relieve them of him.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am dealing now, Mr. Speaker, with facts. The facts, I am quite sure, are as I have stated them. I have given the items, and, as I believe, with accuracy. There has been, if I am not mistaken, a net increase of seven employees, at a cost of about $10,000.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I should like to examine into this "net increase" of which the gentleman speaks. In the first place, it is not an increase so far as the force in the document room is concerned.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is conceded. There has been an increase in the number of clerks to several important committees. As the Speaker and members of the House will remember, this House created at this session three Committees on Elections instead of one, as heretofore. This step was made necessary by the unusual number of election contests. To create a committee on elections without creating a clerk would be a ridiculous piece of business. It became necessary, therefore, to create two additional clerks. That was done.

Mr. DOCKERY. I have so stated.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Very well, sir; you have not deducted those. The special employees on our side of the House have not been increased in the least. I wish to examine the statement to which the gentleman has referred; and I wish he would give us the name of this gentleman who "never makes any mistakes."

Mr. DOCKERY. I will assume that responsibility myself. I will admit that I am subject to that impeachment. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. While the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] is examining that statement, I should like to be heard a moment or two. If he will yield the floor he can have it again in a few moments.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I gladly yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to oppose the adoption of this resolution; that is to say, I oppose its adoption upon the ground on which it is based. If it is necessary to create a new office, as contemplated in this resolution, let it be created; but I am opposed to its creation on the premises stated. What does the resolution say:

That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ some suitable person as an additional employee in the document room to prepare for binding the bills of the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses, as provided for in the act of January 12, 1895, at the rate of $1,000 a year.

The act here referred to—the act of January 12, 1895—is what is known as "the printing law." Now, I say it is as unreasonable to lay upon that law the necessity for the creation of this office as it is to lay upon it other things, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has undertaken to do on former occasions. I will read the section of the printing law which, as I understand, it is claimed makes this officer necessary. I understand the section referred to to be section 82. That is the section of the act of January 12, 1895, which it is said makes it necessary that we should have a new officer at a salary of $1,000 a year for the whole term of this Congress, unless otherwise ordered. That section reads as follows:

That the Public Printer shall bind four sets of Senate and House of Representatives bills, joint and concurrent resolutions, of each Congress, two for

the Senate and two for the House, to be furnished him from the files of the Senate and House document room, the volumes, when bound, to be kept there for reference.

Mr. ODELL. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. ODELL. Does the gentleman from Tennessee know that those bills have been bound up to and including the Forty-fourth Congress, but from the Forty-fifth Congress down to the present time they are unbound, scattered around loose in the document room?

Mr. RICHARDSON. My friend says that, beginning with the Forty-fifth Congress down to and including the Fifty-third, these bills have not been bound; that may be true; and it may be very desirable to bind them. I am not antagonizing that proposition. But the assumption is that the act of January 12, 1895, authorized this binding.

Mr. ODELL. It certainly did so far as the past Congress was concerned.

Mr. SAYERS. May I be allowed a question in this connection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYERS. Does this resolution contemplate increasing the force in the document room?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly. It contemplates increasing the force in the Clerk's document room by the addition of one man—to do what? To furnish to the Public Printer two copies of the bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the House; and I suppose if this be adopted it will be assumed to be necessary for the Senate to increase its force by the addition of one man, at $1,000 a year, to furnish to the Public Printer two copies of all Senate bills, concurrent and joint resolutions.

Now, what I want to say in conclusion is that the printing act, to which reference has been made, never contemplated the employment of an extra clerk to hand two copies of these bills over to the Public Printer to be bound.

Mr. SAYERS. Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the urgent deficiency bill contained an appropriation to retain an employee whose time had expired and whose appointment was not made at the organization of this House; so that you have the regular employee and will have also this other employee in addition.

Mr. ODELL. I beg to differ with the gentleman from Texas. I have investigated the matter, having been the subcommittee appointed for that purpose. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I understand from Mr. Grayson, who has been doing this work and has been employed here for many years, that it is absolutely necessary that this appointment should be made.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Grayson is provided for independently of the regular organization of the House.

Mr. ODELL. This does not provide for Mr. Grayson.

Mr. SAYERS. But provision has already been made for him.

Mr. ODELL. It is not included in this resolution.

Mr. SAYERS. Why is it necessary to have another man if the House has already provided for the employment of Mr. Grayson in the urgent deficiency bill? That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. ODELL. Because there are many thousands of these bills still unbound, and which must be taken care of.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to resume the floor for a moment. I wish to say only this in conclusion, that if it is necessary that there shall be an extra clerk appointed to compile these bills of former Congresses, let the Committee on Accounts bring in their proposition and assume the responsibility for creating that appointment.

Mr. ODELL. We do assume it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But let them not say that the act of January 12, 1895, requires it. That provision in the printing bill, it is true, did not say "hereafter," but only that there should be two copies furnished of each bill to the Public Printer to be bound, which means hereafter. We did not undertake to go back to the Forty-fifth Congress, but provided simply that there should be furnished to the Public Printer two copies of each bill for the purpose contemplated; and it was not designed that we should create an office and appoint an officer whose duties would take him back to that Congress to do the work. And I repeat, if it is desired to do so, you ought to put it into your own bill. We did not create the office in the act in question and did not provide for any such appointment in that act; for under that bill the appointment is not necessary.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Now, if the gentleman from New York will yield to me for a few moments——

Mr. ODELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for this appointment, or rather the law which makes this appointment necessary, grows out of the printing bill of last year, and is in this language:

> The Public Printer shall bind four sets of Senate and House of Representative bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of each Congress, two for the Senate and two for the House, to be furnished him from the files of the Senate and House document room, the volumes when bound to be kept there for reference.

Up to and including the Forty-fifth Congress the bills were all bound. Here is a copy I hold in my hand, which the members can all see, of the mode in which these bills were bound heretofore up to the date I have mentioned. Since the Forty-fifth Congress none of them have been bound, and this law imposes the duty upon the Public Printer to have them bound. There is no provision, however, for any force of employees to do the work; and this resolution simply requires and directs the employment of a man to compile them in pursuance of the law which was passed by the Fifty-third Congress. It is necessary and essential that is shall be done.

Now, a word in response to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. SAYERS. Before that, let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what he has to say in reference to the appointment of Mr. Grayson independent of the regular force?

Mr. ODELL. Not for this particular service.

Mr. SAYERS. He goes to the bill room.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But that is another service altogether.

Mr. SAYERS. What other service?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is to take care of the bills of this Congress.

Mr. SAYERS. But what has the gentleman who was appointed regularly by the majority of this House for the purpose of taking care of the bills to do, then?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Why, he is employed to take care of them.

Mr. SAYERS. But there are two of them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But only one has been appointed.

Mr. SAYERS. Grayson has been appointed to assist him.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not at all. His duty is to arrange and compile the bills of each Congress—the bills that have accumulated and piled up in all of these years; and there is nobody else to do the work. It became so pressing that the last Congress made it peremptory to have it done.

Mr. MILES. I desire, with the permission of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MILES. I understood you to say a while ago that Mr. C. W. Coombs, Department messenger, was appointed at the instance of this side of the House. Do you adhere to that statement?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. MILES. Was not Mr. Coombs appointed by virtue of a report made by the Committee on Accounts on January 7?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Was he not one of the four men that were accorded to your side?

Mr. MILES. No; he was appointed under a special report from the Committee on Accounts, made January 7.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What place does he fill?

Mr. MILES. He is now called special messenger. He is really doing those duties which he has done for this House since long prior to the Fifty-first Congress. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the other side of the House, I desire to read to the gentleman what was said by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] in the debate which followed the introduction of the report from the Committee on Accounts. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] said:

> In the Fifty-first Congress there was a united voice for his retention—
>
> Referring to Mr. Coombs—
>
> Why? To answer that question let me go into detail. There are certain public documents put to the credit of members for distribution among their constituents: but those of us who have served in this body know that there are a large number of calls for documents constantly coming to us that are never placed to our credit; and, for one, I was baffled in meeting these requests from my district until I learned there was such an office as that of "Department messenger" filled by Colonel Coombs. Since then, when I get a request for documents outside of those put to my credit in the folding room, I refer it indorsed "Respectfully referred to C. W. Coombs, Department messenger." He will find that document if it is in this Capitol. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Has the gentleman concluded his question?

Mr. MILES. One moment. Let me read a little further:

> A MEMBER. Would not the other man do so, too?
>
> Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir; I do not care what member of Congress was appointed to take that place it would take him years to learn to perform the duties. He goes into the archives of this Government. He knows every nook and corner where these documents are concealed and hidden, and I never felt a keener regret than when I learned he had been removed.

Now, I read these remarks simply for the purpose of showing to gentlemen on the other side that this messenger was appointed—and I am glad he was appointed, Mr. Speaker—because of a special report made to this House by the Committee on Accounts, and that the action of that committee was defended, and ably defended, by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] and other gentlemen on the other side of the House, and that no member on this side of the House participated in that debate.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAYERS. I want to read something to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No; not now. I will in a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that while it is true that my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] spoke in a very complimentary manner of Mr. Coombs, yet, nevertheless, he belongs to the other side of the House and is retained, partly out of courtesy to that side of the House and partly owing to the fact that he is an efficient, competent man and discharges his duties with the greatest fidelity and satisfaction.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman permit me for one moment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If it is on this matter.

Mr. MILES. Were we not at the organization of this House conceded four men for this side of the House?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MILES. In addition to Mr. Coombs. And were not those four men given to us as this courtesy to which you refer long before the appointment of Mr. Coombs, who was at first removed from office by the other side and afterwards named as special messenger by a report from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then you disclaim all interest in Mr. Coombs, do you?

Mr. MILES. No; on the contrary, I claim that same interest in Mr. Coombs which every other member of this House must feel because of his efficiency, and we have the testimony of your side of the House that you can not fill his place by any new man.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, if you will give us time we will try to. I regard him as a very efficient man, but I am sorry indeed to have it thrown in our face that we are expending public money in retaining men who were put into office by that side of the House. I do not think we ought to endure that charge, and I think we ought to be relieved of it, and we will see if it is possible to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] desires to ask me a question I will yield to him.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to a clause in the urgent deficiency bill which passed this House about the 21st of this month. The clause is:

To pay to Joel Grayson, for services in the document room, from January 1 to June 30, 1896, inclusive, at $125 per month, $750.

Now, Joel Grayson will be employed, if this bill becomes a law, in addition to the regular appointee on the force of the House, so that in place of one man you have two men there.

Now, why can not the regular appointee, Mr. Grayson, perform the duties suggested by this resolution?

Mr. ODELL. Because it would be impossible.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Grayson's name was inserted in the resolution by the Committee on Accounts because he has been in the service of the House for several years; he is a very efficient man, he performs a special work, and this work will require a man to give it his whole time and attention. It is nothing to me one way or another. The Committee on Accounts, who have investigated the matter, have reported it as a necessity, and it does seem to me that they ought to know what they are about. That committee is not noted, Mr. Speaker, for recommending resolutions for employees of this House very numerously. This is one of the instances in which they report for the employment of an extra man out of the many resolutions that have been sent to them by members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say one word in reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. When this whole matter is simmered down to the bottom facts it is discovered that there are only six men on the rolls of this House who are not on the rolls of the last House, and they are extra clerks to committees—made necessary in the judgment of the chairmen of those committees—assistant clerks, one each to the Committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at $6 per day. That is three clerks. They were employed by resolution of the House, at the request of the chairmen of those committees. The other extra man was a press-gallery messenger, employed at the instance of the press gallery, reported favorably upon by the Committee on Accounts. The other two are assistant clerks to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I do not know of any persons more competent to judge of the necessity for extra employees than the House itself, on the recommendation of the chairmen of those committees. Not one man has been put upon the rolls of this House more than were on the rolls of the last House except as additional clerks to committees. This matter is entirely separate and distinct from all of those others, and grows out of the accumulation for years of these unbound bills.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention not so much to the specific proposition under discussion as to the general proposition asserted here that this House has increased the force. I call attention to the debate that occurred on February 8, in the last Congress, last February, where it appears that the House then, against the protest of large numbers on this side, reduced the force of clerks to the number of nine: and while those gentlemen are talking about an increase of clerks, we are merely getting back to what the last House had. I desire to ask the attention especially of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. The legislative bill was under discussion, and this occurred:

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill how many less clerks are provided for committees than heretofore.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is impossible to hear what is going on, on account of the confusion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is not order in the House.

Mr. PICKLER (reading):

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill how many less clerks are provided for committees than heretofore.

Mr. DOCKERY. There are 9 less, including 5 assistant clerks. They are usually provided for by resolution at the first session of each Congress.

Mr. PICKLER. How many less does the gentleman say are provided for?

Mr. DOCKERY. Nine less.

Mr. DINGLEY. The annual clerks are just the same. In the paragraph following the reduction of session clerks is made.

Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to say that the annual clerks which are provided for in this bill are precisely as they stand in the current law. There has been an application made to the Committee on Appropriations to give an annual clerk to the Committee on Banking and Currency. but the committee did not feel authorized to make any recommendation for that, the House not having acted upon it. Therefore the annual clerks stand precisely as in the current law. There is a reduction in the next paragraph in the number of session clerks—5 clerks and 4 assistant clerks.

The Clerk read as follows:

"For 14 clerks to committees, at $6 each per day during the session, $17,808."

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out the last word.

Now, as I understand the gentleman in charge of the bill, there are 8 less assistant per diem clerks provided for here.

Mr. DINGLEY. Nine less.

Mr. DOCKERY. Nine less are provided for under this paragraph.

Mr. PICKLER. Are these the clerks that heretofore have been used as assistant clerks to committees?

Mr. DOCKERY. They are usually provided for by resolution, to be paid out of the contingent fund, at the first session of each Congress. When it desires to furnish the committees with additional assistance Congress passes a resolution providing for their payment out of the contingent fund; and then at the second session the salaries for those assistant clerks to committees are provided for in the legislative bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Then, if this reduction is made, it will take away that many assistants from these committees.

Mr. DOCKERY. It does for the time. But the practice is that each Congress determines for itself what number of assistant clerks it desires.

Mr. PICKLER. As I understand, when members were provided with individual clerks, quite a large number of these committees were deprived of clerks. It was considered that the member's clerk could take care of them.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is right; and instead of these 9 assistants we give 9 additional clerks to members.

Mr. PICKLER. I think the members ought to have annual clerks, just like the Senate.

A MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is not the issue here.

Mr. PICKLER. But we might adopt that issue. There are a number of these committees that can not get along without clerks, and it is a saving to the Government for a member of a committee to have an individual clerk. The Agricultural Department has lessened its expense quite largely, as I understand, because members are now provided with clerks, and that Department is not required to do the work that they had done heretofore.

Mr. DOCKERY. We have simply provided for 14 clerks to the committees, and that does not interfere at all with the annual clerkships.

Mr. PICKLER. I am interested in this. Being a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I know we need clerical assistance. My point is, whether in the next Congress members will have to get along without that assistance.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is left for each Congress to determine what clerical assistance it wants.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not understand—it may be my inability—where this reduction is to be made.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will illustrate: Suppose, which is not altogether unlikely, that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] should be chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in the next House. He would doubtless offer a resolution providing that the committee be allowed one or two additional clerks, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. That resolution would be reported by the Committee on Accounts and would doubtless be agreed to, as such resolutions generally are, and the committee would have its assistant clerks, as it has had in the past.

Mr. PICKLER. But why should we not provide on this bill now for annual clerks for members and be done with it?

Mr. DOCKERY. Because the custom has always been to allow each House to determine for itself what additional clerical service it needs.

The point is, gentlemen, that these nine assistants were cut off that had been provided in the legislative appropriation bills heretofore. This is a new departure; and as shown in this debate, this committee cut off nine of these assistants; and the gentleman from Missouri in charge of the bill assured us, of course, that we would be allowed these clerks, as we supposed, without controversy in this House. Now, so far as the Committee on Invalid Pensions is concerned, we are only back to where all other Congresses have been with the addition of one assistant; and there are not two additional assistants to that committee. I merely desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that this whole proposition that this House was largely increasing the force of clerks is not true. We are simply getting back to the point where former Congresses were, before they cut off these nine assistants, as shown in this debate at the end of their Congress.

Mr. DOCKERY. I simply desire to say that the gentleman is entirely correct, and I stand by every word of the RECORD.

Mr. PICKLER. I just stated what the gentleman from Missouri has said, and he ought to coincide with us.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to state that a practice prevails in the Senate now of binding all these bills, as contemplated by this resolution. It is their uniform practice; they have kept it up in all preceding Congresses, and they are doing it by the use of their present clerical force, as I am informed. I think these bills ought to be bound. I agree that they ought to be bound. It is a valuable volume, and it ought to be preserved; and the only way it can be preserved is by having the bills bound.

They will get lost if left separate; but I do not think we ought to lay the necessity for this work upon the Printing Bureau. We ought simply to say that these documents ought to be bound and that we will pass a resolution authorizing the Public Printer to bind them, and that, if it is necessary to have additional force for that purpose, we will authorize it. The employment need only be temporary, for, in my opinion, the handling of those bills in preparing them for the printer ought not to take more than a month or six weeks. They ought to be arranged and bound in that time, and when the work is done they will be found a valuable contribution to our collection of documents.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, the substitute I have reported provides that this employee shall be employed only for such time as is necessary to perform the work.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in reply to the remarks submitted by my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON], who, I believe, had the honor to be chairman of the Printing Committee in the last Congress. I insist that it is the work of the Joint Committee on Printing which makes necessary the appointment of this additional employee. My colleague takes the position that the printing bill, so called, does not require that the bills of the Congresses from the Forty-fifth up to the present shall be bound. In reply to that I desire to read a provision contained in that bill:

That the Public Printer shall bind four sets of Senate and House of Representatives bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of each Congress, two for the Senate and two for the House, to be furnished him from the files of the Senate and the House document rooms, the volumes when bound to be kept there, etc.

Now, that means that all of these bills that have not already been bound shall be bound, or it means nothing; and if it is contemplated by the provision I have read that these bills shall be bound, then somebody must be employed to prepare them for binding.

Through an investigation made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Accounts it has been ascertained that there is no man in the document room who can give his time and attention to assorting and preparing for the printer the bills that have accumulated from the Forty-fifth Congress down to the present time. Hence this resolution has been reported to the House in this modified form. While I have been and am persistently opposed to the creation of additional offices unless they are absolutely necessary for the conduct of the public business, I have felt constrained by the report of this Subcommittee on Accounts to believe that this office is necessary and that without it this work can not be done. I want to repeat, in conclusion, what I said a while ago to my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], that I am informed that the rolls of this House carry fewer employees than were carried during the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the substitute.

The question being taken on the demand for the previous question, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ODELL. I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 84, noes 33; so the substitute was adopted.

On motion of Mr. ODELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was adopted was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask for the correction of the references of four bills, erroneously referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which should have gone to the Committee on Appropriations. They are House bills Nos. 4691, 3197, 4403, and 3228.

The SPEAKER (after examining the bills). Three of these are public bills and one is a private bill, as to which the correction should be made under the rules. Without objection, the other corrections will be made as requested.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS TO THE COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The report was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the persons to employ whom authority was given the Committee on Invalid Pensions by resolution of the House adopted January 23, 1896, one an experienced typewriter and stenographer, the other experienced in the examination of pension cases, laws, and reports, and capable of reporting intelligently thereon to the committee; be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, the only object of this resolution is to supplement the one already passed, authorizing this employment, by correcting an error that was inadvertently made in that resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is this intended to repeal the former resolution, or as a substitute for it?

Mr. TRACEY. It is not intended to repeal the original resolution, but simply to correct it in one particular. The original resolution failed to indicate a source from which the pay of these employees was to come, and this resolution provides that it shall come from the contingent fund of the House, as was originally intended, though, by inadvertence, that provision was not embodied in the original resolution.

Mr. PICKLER. This is intended to correct a mere clerical error.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear some explanation from the gentleman presenting this report.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to make an explanation. The original resolution as presented by the Committee on Accounts contained all that is contained in this resolution, with a single exception. One clause was inadvertently omitted from the original, the words "to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House," and this is simply intended to supply that omission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of this resolution how many clerks the Committee on Invalid Pensions will be provided with if this resolution shall pass?

Mr. TRACEY. No additional clerks.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How many will it have altogether?

Mr. PICKLER. One clerk and three assistants.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That committee has four clerks, then?

Mr. TRACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Some committees of the House do not have any clerk.

Mr. TRACEY. The proposition to allow the Committee on Invalid Pensions these clerks has already been adopted by the House, and this resolution is merely intended to provide for their compensation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How many members of that committee are there?

Mr. PICKLER. Fifteen.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then each member has his own private clerk and part of another.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to have anything to say about this matter. The resolution which the House adopted the other day providing for two assistant clerks for the Committee on Invalid Pensions omitted to provide from what fund those clerks should be paid. This resolution simply provides that they shall be paid from the contingent fund. That is all there is in it.

In reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], I wish to say that in previous Congresses the Committee on Invalid Pensions has had one clerk and two assistants. At this session we have a large increase of business. When the resolution to which I have just referred was, upon the unanimous request of our committee, introduced and referred to the Committee on Accounts, that committee would not act upon it favorably until they had appointed a subcommittee of three members to investigate the matter and to confer with our clerks. That investigation having been made, the subcommittee realized the large amount of business before our committee, and taking into consideration also the urgent requests of large numbers of members for the consideration of bills in which they felt particular interest, reported favorably to the full Committee on Accounts, by whom the resolution was unanimously recommended to the House. It simply provides one assistant clerk in addition to the number this committee has had in previous Congresses; and I will say that I doubt whether our committee, even with this assistance, will be able to give proper attention to the mass of business coming before it. But I trust that we shall.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not make any complaint about the number of clerks given to the Committee on Invalid Pensions; but I want occasionally to point out to the House the extreme fairness of the Committee on Accounts, a committee that gives five or six committee clerks to the State of the chairman and provides especially for the Committee on Militia, but refuses, for the first time in many years, to allow to the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, although the only chairmanship given to the State which I in part represent—the Committee on Accounts refuses to give us a committee clerk or anything else to run the committee with. That is all I desire to say.

The question being taken on the resolution, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TRACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. PAYNE. I am directed by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to present the resolution which I send to the desk and to ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be authorized to have printed and bound such documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. MILES. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York whether this committee has had this authority heretofore?

Mr. PAYNE. The committee has had such authority in some former Congresses. I am not able to state whether it has had it uniformly or not. But I will say to the gentleman that our committee has had a number of important hearings, and it seems to be necessary that a report of those hearings should be printed for the use of members of the committee and for the information of the House.

Mr. MILES. What extra cost will this entail?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not able to state what the extra cost will be. It will not be very large.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution, and it was adopted.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HITT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. BRUMM. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] will permit me, before that motion is made, to offer a resolution. It is a matter that is very important.

Mr. HITT. Do I understand that this will take but a moment?

Mr. BRUMM. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution.

Mr. HITT. Is it a resolution for an assistant clerk?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRUMM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That an assistant clerk be allowed the Committee on Claims during the sessions of the Fifty-fourth Congress, at a compensation of $6 per day, to be paid from January 1, 1896, out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. This should go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. BRUMM. I hope the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will not object.

Mr. DINGLEY. The matter ought to be inquired into by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] objects.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT. I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first formal reading of the bill. There may be some brief explanation necessary, and after that we can proceed to consider the bill in detail by paragraphs.

It is substantially a reenactment of the existing law, there being some variations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois to dispense with the first reading of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HITT. I will now inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] as to whether his side of the House requires time, or can we agree on the limit for general debate?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill is almost exactly the same as the bill passed last year, with a few necessary additions, and, as at present informed, I do not think we wish any general debate on this side.

Mr. HITT. Then I move to limit all general debate on the bill to ten minutes. I will occupy that time in explaining the provisions of the bill, after which we will proceed to consider it by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to closing the general debate in ten minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates the money to pay the persons employed in the diplomatic and consular service of the United States, and to meet other necessities of that service, all of which are contemplated by statutes now in force.

The change from the expenditures now authorized by law for the current year ending June 30, 1896, amount to an increase of about $58,000. This increase is largely apparent, however, rather than real. For example, there is an amount of $16,500 which is simply to provide compensation in salaries for consuls in nine places where fees have heretofore been allowed; and while there is an apparent increase to that extent, as a matter of fact the payment of these officers by salaries instead of fees is a reduction of expense rather than an increase. It lessens the charge upon the Treasury, as the salaries amount to less than the fees. There is also a provision for an additional secretary of legation in the city of Mexico, owing to the largely increased business with that country and the importance of the mission, as well as the propriety of putting it on a par with other missions of a similar grade, but which are not in fact so important as this one.

There is an increase of $10,000 in the allowance for chargés d'affaires ad interim, raised from $20,000 to $30,000. That provision is simply a frank and truthful way of meeting the necessary expenses required by existing law instead of not providing adequately for them in time, and afterwards when it is found that not enough has been allowed leaving the matter to the Committee on Appropriations to be put into the deficiency bill, as has been the custom for some years past. The expenditure in this case is determined by the necessities of the service and by the existing law. During the years 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, and 1894 the deficiency appropriation bill carried a provision for this service, not always of the same amount, but ranging from $2,000 to about $13,000. In only one year, 1892, has this expenditure risen above the sum of $30,000; and we thought it, therefore, reasonable to allow that sum, out of which the amount necessary will be expended, and if more shall be required then they can call on the Committee on Appropriations, as has been done heretofore, to make it up in a deficiency bill.

There is a provision for the payment of $4,000 rent for the legation building at Tokyo, Japan. This is a possible rather than a real expenditure, as it will be remembered that a bill passed the House a few days ago, and will probably pass the Senate—an urgent deficiency bill—providing for the purchase of a legation at Tokyo for $16,000; and if that bill shall become a law, and the legation building is purchased, it will leave only a ground rent of about $200 per annum to be paid instead of $4,000. So that appropriation, while it is $4,000 in terms, will probably prove to be only $200 in fact.

There is a slight increase in the appropriation for the enforcement of the neutrality laws provided for by section 291 of the Revised Statutes, and $15,000 for the completion and publication of the Intercontinental Railway Commission's reports. We have already spent vast sums in that project. The surveys have been practically completed along the route proposed through these different countries, from Mexico to Bolivia, by the three surveying parties; the reports are all here. We have already expended on them $25,000, that being the last appropriation for this purpose, which completed about two-thirds of the reports. The cost of the survey has amounted to an enormous sum, and in order to make that valuable work available to engineers, projectors, investors, and others who desire to look into the matter we propose to print the entire work and make it accessible to our people.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. HITT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What has been done with the publications that have been completed up to this time?

Mr. HITT. They are given out by the Commission in charge of the work to those specially interested. Whenever a member of Congress writes for one of these books, for a specific purpose, I think it will be always sent to him; but it is not granted to a man who sends for a copy for a constituent, in the ordinary way in which documents are scattered about; because this is a technical and very expensive work and should be paid for by those interested in it. If the gentleman has a half hour that he desires to spend pleasantly, I do not know that he can spend it to better advantage than by going into the Commission quarters in the building at the corner of Fourteenth street and New York avenue and examining the splendid work that is going on there.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Can any member of Congress secure a copy?

Mr. HITT. Any member will be able to secure a copy when it is all out, I have no doubt, and more than one copy. In fact, there is no strict and specific limit upon the way they are given out, except that inasmuch as the work has been so costly and there has

been such a vast labor in its preparation, care is used in distributing copies, so that they shall not be thrown away.

There is a small sum of $400 to carry out our obligations in consequence of an international agreement for a bureau to repress the slave trade.

Three thousand dollars is given to establish a consulate in the far interior of China, at a place called Chung King. There are many missionaries there, and they have been greatly exposed. We have had to resort to British protection and force for the safety of American life in that quarter, and at the recommendation of the State Department the committee have inserted this consulate.

There is a change of another consulate from Ningpo to Chefoo, because Chefoo is a far more suitable place for the office of the consul.

A number of consulates which are now paid by fees, and which under a statute of the United States of July 16, 1892, are required to be reported to the House by the Secretary of State and estimated for as salaried, that they may be changed to salaried posts, if deemed wise, have been reported in this bill, but in every case where the change has been made, except Hull, the fees that are now being paid to the consul are greater than the salary that is allowed him in the bill, so that there is no charge on the Treasury by this change, and it is not an increase of expenditure, save in one, the case of Hull. They are as follows:

France:	
Limoges, commercial agent, fees in 1894, $1,664.50; to be salaried at	$1,500
Germany:	
Freiburg, commercial agent, fees in 1894, $1,737.50; to be salaried at	1,500
Glauchau, commercial agent, fees in 1894, $2,808.25; to be salaried at	2,000
Weimar, commercial agent, fees in 1894, $2,382.50; to be salaried at	2,000
Great Britain:	
Hull, consul, fees in 1894, $951.09; to be salaried at	1,500
St. Johns, Newfoundland, consul, fees in 1894, $1,569.20; to be salaried at	1,500
Swansea, commercial agent, fees in 1894, $4,676; to be salaried at	2,500
Trinidad, consul, fees in 1894, $2,269.13; to be salaried at	2,000
Netherlands:	
Curaçoa, consul, fees in 1894, $2,445.60; to be salaried at	2,000
Total	16,500

The total amount of the salaries of the officers thus changed from feed to salaried offices is $16,500, and this bill is increased by that amount, whereas the fees to be accounted hereafter to the Treasury amount to $29,503.77.

In the case of Hull alone the salary proposed, $1,500, is larger than the amount of fees collected, $951.09.

For years past the Department has submitted this estimate and urged the change at that post to enable a worthy man to live there and remove him from the line of trade. It is one of the great refitting seaports of England, largely resorted to by American vessels. Experience has shown that there is serious need of this change at Hull. A feed consul at that post is under our laws authorized to engage in trade, and the most profitable trade there is in supplying materials for refitting ships or boarding or relieving destitute American seamen. There is, therefore, an inducement to him to associate himself with persons engaged in those lines of trade. By the shipping act fees for services required by masters and seamen are no longer paid by the vessel or the seamen, but by the Government, and it is plainly the interest of the consul to have vouchers in the largest amounts possible. This office ought to be salaried.

We have not given the $2,500 recommended by the Department, but have given $1,500.

The salary at Barbados, a place which has of late been much frequented by our countrymen, has been increased $500, on account of the importance of its trade, and on account of the fact that it is a resort for our ships and citizens.

At Sonneberg, the amount appropriated for clerk hire has been found insufficient. It is necessary, in a consulate of such large, varied, and important business, where there are 5,000 invoices every year, that a larger sum should be allowed, and there has been an increase of $200 in that item.

There are specific appropriations for a large number of consulates enumerated in the bill, giving each an allowance for clerk hire. This bill always grants a lump sum at the end of those items, to be distributed by the Department to such posts in the great body of the consulates as are not specifically provided for. That sum was $20,000. It has been found insufficient, so we have raised it to $25,000. The $20,000 heretofore allowed has been distributed among 43 posts in the whole service, which leaves 193 consulates unprovided for. With this $5,000 additional 30 of the most important posts can be provided with clerk hire.

We have also provided for a jail and a jailer at Madagascar, where there has been trouble and expense for want of such provision.

These are the changes in this appropriation bill, as compared with that of last year. There is a single item which touches more general legislation. The trust funds in the custody of the State Department have heretofore, by the officer having them in charge, been deposited where he pleased, deposited generally in banks. The Secretary of State has suggested, and the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department of the House of Representatives have presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the draft of an amendment to the existing law. By it we have provided that these funds shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury and paid out on certificates of the Secretary of State; a reform which I think will meet the approval of every member of the House.

I have no further explanations to offer.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], the chairman of the committee, is so full and so correct that I can add but very little to it. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in preparing the appropriation bill this year were entirely unanimous. There was no disagreement whatever among them either in the subcommittee that prepared the bill or in the full committee, and I am gratified that we were able to be so harmonious.

This bill appropriates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, the sum of $1,637,058.76. The appropriation bill of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, the present year, amounted to $1,538,458.76. There is a net increase in this bill of $98,600.

Mr. HITT. If the gentleman will permit me, Mr. Chairman, there is one erroneous addition, which makes the footing wrong.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I am reading from the report presented by the chairman, which accompanies the bill.

Mr. HITT. The report is not quite correct in its addition. There are two consulates by mistake put into the total of $1,637,000, and the amount, if correctly stated, would be $1,630,000.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I was reading from the report. The amount of increase is, as stated by the chairman of the committee, about $90,000.

Mr. HITT. About $90,000—some of it only apparent increase of expenditure.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Ninety thousand dollars. I only wish to say that this increase, Mr. Chairman, is made necessary by the addition to last year's appropriation bill which the Committee on Foreign Affairs believes is necessary. To illustrate, as is well known by the older members of the House, we have been making appropriations for the intercontinental railway survey and for the publication of the reports connected with it. We found that $15,000 additional was necessary to complete the valuable reports, maps, etc., connected with it. We also found that under the act of July 16, 1892, which requires the estimates to include the salaries for the higher feed consular offices, that we would be compelled under the law to put in a number of consulates which were heretofore known as feed consulates and to make them salaried consulates, which has added $16,500 to the bill. I believe that every change in the bill, and there are but few changes, is absolutely necessary; and I hope the bill will pass as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for general debate is closed.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman will pardon me for a moment, before debate is closed. I understand him to say that the increase over last year is $90,000.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. About $90,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to say that all of these increases he regarded as necessary for the public service?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate has been closed and the bill will be read by sections.

Mr. DOCKERY. The first paragraph can be read, and then I will move to strike out the last word.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, severally appropriated, in full compensation for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of submitting an inquiry to the chairman of the committee. I notice in the report of the Auditor of the State and other Departments for the last fiscal year a recommendation found on page 4. The Auditor says:

Among the appropriations for the Department of State is one for the relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries. I respectfully recommend that this appropriation be made in the future to apply to American seamen who may be shipwrecked on the coast of Alaska. Most of that territory is remote from other parts of the United States, and it has a very extensive and sparsely settled coast line, with few ports, but little local shipping, and only rare opportunities are offered seamen to reship. Claims have frequently been presented from Alaska for the relief and transportation of seamen, wherein it was a peculiar hardship to the claimants not to be reimbursed the expenses, but there has been no appropriation available for that purpose.

Mr. HITT. On what page is that?

Mr. DOCKERY. It is on page 4 of the report of the Auditor of the State and other Departments.

Now, then, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, in view of that recommendation, and in view of the further fact that it has been specially called to my attention by officials connected with that Bureau, whether or not the Committee on Foreign Affairs has given that recommendation any consideration in the preparation of this bill?

Mr. HITT. It has not; but there is a provision referred to by

the Auditor, which is found on page 25 of the bill in hand, appropriating $50,000 for the relief and protection of American seamen; and if the gentleman from Missouri will move an amendment to include those shipwrecked on the coast of Alaska, that will cover the point exactly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, as I am compelled to be absent from the Hall in connection with business pending before the Committee on Appropriations, I will leave an amendment with the chairman of the committee, and if in his judgment it is wise I will be glad if he will offer it when that point is reached in the consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of consuls, vice-consuls, and commercial agents, $426,000, as follows, namely.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "six," in line 6, and insert "one." That computation is not correct. It should be $421,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consuls at Nagasaki, Osaka, and Hiogo.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, line 16 is not punctuated correctly. There are but two posts. One is at Nagasaki and the other is a joint post at Osaka and Hiogo. The comma should be stricken out after the word Nagasaki and the word "and" inserted, and the comma should be stricken out after the word "Osaka."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consul at Ningpo.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, in line 10 there is a misprint in the bill. It should be Chefoo instead of Ningpo.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consuls at Rotterdam and Curao a.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I call attention of the chairman to the twelfth line on page 17, where there is a misprint.

Mr. HITT. The letter "ç" is omitted in "Curaçoa."

The CHAIRMAN. The correction will be made.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of relieving the Clerk a moment, and I also desire, in this connection, to return my thanks to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the very wise administrative provision in relation to trust funds found on page 11. This will relieve a very embarrassing situation in the Department of State, which has caused some loss to the Government. Having had some knowledge of the question, I again desire to recognize the wisdom of the committee in reporting this provision, and especially are we indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries, or so much thereof as may be necessary, $50,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this paragraph by inserting after the word "countries," in line 11, the words "and also on the coast of Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commercial Bureau of American Republics, $28,000: *Provided*, That any moneys received from sale of the Bureau publications, from rents, or other sources may be paid into the Treasury as a credit in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the Secretary of State for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Bureau.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of this bill to the provision that "any moneys received from sale of the Bureau publications, from rents, or other sources, may be paid into the Treasury," etc. Should not the word "may" be "shall"?

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, the Director of this Bureau explained this matter very fully to the committee last year, and my friend from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] drew the paragraph then in the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. The provision as it stands is simply permissive.

Mr. HITT. It is. The object was to avoid locking up these funds in the Treasury so that they could not be drawn upon for necessary expenses of the Bureau without waiting for an appropriation.

Mr. DINGLEY. But, as a matter of protection to the Treasury, should not all receipts from the sale of these publications, rents, etc., be paid into the Treasury? Without such a provision what protection is there for the Government?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the provision to which the gentleman calls attention was inserted in the bill at the last session of Congress. At that time there were some special expenses which caused us to use the word "may." No previous appropriation bill had contained just such a provision.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I can understand how the word "may" in the phrase "may be drawn" is unobjectionable, but in the second line I think the word "may" should be "shall," so that the clause will read, "shall be paid."

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I see no objection to the change which the gentleman suggests being made in the second line, but I think the word "may" should stand in the third line.

Mr. DINGLEY. I see no objection to that.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I think the objection made by the Director of the Bureau to being required to pay all moneys into the Treasury was that there were current expenditures as well as current receipts; he was selling documents and making certain necessary expenditures, and what he desired was to be permitted to keep an account, and to pay the balance into the Treasury at stated times, instead of paying in all his receipts.

Mr. DINGLEY. I make this suggestion because it is in line with the policy pursued in all of our appropriation bills to require that incidental receipts of this character shall all be paid into the Treasury, and then if money is required for expenses that it shall be drawn from the Treasury. Without some such provision there can be no protection for the Government in this respect. With the permission of the gentleman in charge of the bill, I will move that the word "may" in line 2, in the phrase "may be paid," be stricken out and the word "shall" substituted.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I see there is an appropriation of $28,000 made here for the International Bureau of American Republics. I would like to inquire what that Bureau is doing and what becomes of its publications. Are they available for free public distribution?

Mr. HITT. The Bureau of American Republics is a bureau in this city which is constantly collecting information, and in doing so it is compelled to expend a good deal of money. Its publications are sold. A limited number of them are distributed gratuitously, but the gratis list is much smaller than it was formerly. The price of the publications, however, is down to cost.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On what basis are these publications distributed free to the public?

Mr. HITT. They are not distributed free. The greater part of them are not suitable for distribution to the general reader or of interest as general literature. They are largely technical and are intended for merchants who are willing to pay for them and who do pay for them. By the sale of these publications the Bureau itself supplies the greater part of the money that is required to maintain it.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I may add, Mr. Chairman, that this Bureau was agreed upon when the Pan-American Congress was in session, and under the arrangement then made all the countries south of our own, including Mexico, the Republics of Central America and of South America, except, I believe, Chile, all agreed to pay a certain portion of the expense, and we make this appropriation in accordance with that agreement.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to ask also, while I am up, what becomes of these consular reports? I have heard complaint that when requests are made for them for distribution they are no longer in print.

Mr. HITT. They are not sent, as of course, to all members; but on application by a member he receives a certain number, I think 13. Some of us do not seem to get any.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have never had any difficulty in getting them upon making application at the State Department.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is that true also of the publications of the Bureau of American Republics?

Mr. HITT. No; you can get them in limited numbers, on application, or in numbers not strictly limited for any specific purpose, for instance, where the persons desiring them are pursuing some special study, or discharging a special public duty.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Or for libraries?

Mr. HITT. I think so. But they are not sent free to merchants, because the merchant wants them to make money out of them and he ought to pay for them and does pay for them cheerfully.

A MEMBER. They are also distributed free to the press.

Mr. HITT. I think so.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill and amendments to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the amendments, though numerous, are generally unimportant, and I ask consent that a vote be taken upon them all at once.

There was no objection. The amendments were adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RECONVENING OF DELEGATES TO MARINE CONFERENCE OF 1889.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889. This bill has been favorably considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the Washington International Marine Conference of 1889, whenever in his judgment it is expedient, for the further consideration of rules to prevent collisions at sea and in the waters of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for necessary expenses incurred under this act.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress a detailed statement of expenditures incurred under this act.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, pending the request for unanimous consent, I trust I may be allowed to state that the bill just read is identical with House bill No. 3827, which was favorably reported some days ago by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Senate bill was reported by that committee this morning, and the report upon the Senate bill refers to the report previously made on the House bill. As the latter report is brief, I ask that it be read for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The report (by Mr. PAYNE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3827) entitled "A bill to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889," having had the same under consideration, submit the following report:

Chapter 593, of the laws of 1888, creating the International Marine Conference, provided that the powers and authority conferred on the delegates of the United States should terminate on January 1, 1890. This bill bestows upon the Secretary of State the power to reconvene the seven American delegates at a cost not exceeding $2,000, if public interests render such a meeting desirable.

Such a meeting will probably prove desirable during the spring or early summer for two reasons:

First. In 1894 an understanding was reached by the principal maritime powers that the revised international rules to prevent collisions at sea (the chief work of the International Marine Conference at Washington) should go into effect on March 1, 1895. This understanding was broken by a change of position by the British Government, which in January, 1895, notified the United States that until Parliament had been consulted it could not agree to the date fixed. Several other nations also withdrew their assents, and by act of Congress (February 23, 1895) the date was postponed. In the interval Germany had suggested tentatively a few changes in the proposed Washington rules. It is expected that the final views of the British Government as fixed by Parliament, which meets in February, will be received in March or April. The question whether changes, if any are proposed, should be accepted or rejected should first be presented to those who represented the United States at the conference and acted for this country in framing the proposed rules before being submitted to Congress. This result can be most expeditiously and satisfactorily achieved by granting authority, which does not now exist, to reconvene the delegates of the United States to examine and report on such matters as may be submitted to them.

Second. It is also desirable that these delegates consider the report upon measures to bring our inland and harbor rules into closer accord with the international rules when the form of the latter becomes finally determined.

This matter is a very important one, as the report of the conference which was adopted as above stated covered all the rules and regulations for the safety of lives and property carried by vessels navigating the high seas. There is no doubt but that the result of the work of the commission was a great advance over the rules now in force. Whatever amendments are now proposed should be submitted promptly to the able experts who were the delegates of the United States to the conference, and who are familiar with the work of the conference, and are able to give to Congress promptly reliable information upon any amendments which may be offered by any other Government. Congress should respond quickly and intelligently to any proposed change in the rules of the conference, in order that the new rules may go into force as speedily as possible.

The bill limits the cost to $2,000, and appropriates that sum, or so much of it as may be necessary. Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House bill No. 3827, identical in its provisions with the Senate bill just passed, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EDUCATION OF DEAF MUTES.

Mr. GROW. I ask consent to have read, without printing in the RECORD, what I send to the Clerk's desk. I wish it read for the information of the House.

There was no objection; and the Clerk read a bill to aid in establishing homes in the States and Territories for teaching articulate speech and vocal language to deaf children before they are of school age.

Mr. GROW. Before this bill is referred, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement which will occupy perhaps a minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, thanking the House for its indulgence, I wish to state my only reason for departing from the regular course in the presentation of this bill. This measure, it will be observed, has reference to a new system of education, first started by Mary S. Garrett, the lady named in the bill as principal of the school referred to—a system by which children born deaf are, through the aid of the eye, taught to speak in the same way as if they could hear. This lady insists that there is no child born deaf (unless it be a perfect imbecile) that has not the vocal organs as all other children have, and that deaf children can be taught in infancy, through the aid of the eye, to speak just as well as those who hear. This she has demonstrated in her school and by public exhibitions at the World's Fair in Chicago, and also at the Atlanta Exposition. In these exhibitions she has shown that children born deaf can, by proper education, be brought to converse so well that the person conversing with them would not know of their deafness. According to this lady's statistics, about one child in every fifteen hundred is born deaf. She insists that if the mothers of deaf children would talk to them in the same way as if they could hear, those children would grow up to speak the same as other children.

I have taken this method of calling the attention of the House to this matter before it comes up regularly for consideration. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education.

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 4990 was read twice, referred to the Committee on Education, and ordered to be printed.

DEATH OF HON. FREDERICK REMANN.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my painful duty to convey to this House in an official way intelligence of the death of my predecessor, the Hon. Frederick Remann, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois. His death occurred at his home in Vandalia on the 14th of July of last year. I shall detain the House at this time with only a single word of tribute. Born and reared in the county which was his home at the time of his death, he had the esteem of everyone who knew him, and was most highly esteemed by those who knew him best. Frequently called to fill important public positions in his neighborhood and State, he always brought to the discharge of his duties a wonderful fidelity to the interests of those he undertook to serve. At the early age of 17 he enlisted as a private in the Union Army and served his country gallantly. In 1894 he was elected to a membership in this House by a majority both flattering to himself and creditable to the people of his district, who by his untimely death have been deprived of his valuable services. In a word, he was a good soldier, a steadfast friend, a public-spirited and patriotic citizen, and a beloved husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolutions which I now send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frederick Remann, late a member-elect of this House from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted; and in accordance therewith (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for horses for cavalry—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of George H. Johnson, administrator of Elisha Johnson, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of James McPeters, administrator of Lemuel Corum, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact filed in the case of Mary E. Layton, administratrix of John M. Layton, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred House bill No. 2280, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims, accompanied by a report (No. 152); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill No. 3775, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5092) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, accompanied by a report (No. 153); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1980) to provide a life-saving station at or near Point Bonita, at the Golden Gate, in the State of California, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 154); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at mouth of Siuslaw River, in Lane County, Oreg., and for a crew thereat, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 155); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEFEVER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4146) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 156); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 157); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 234) to provide a life-saving station at or near Green Hill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 158); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. TRACEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 951) to amend the military record of Dan S. Place, first lieutenant, Eighteenth Indiana Volunteers. (Report No. 151.)

By Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 104) for the relief of the Newberry College. (Report No. 159.)

The bill (H. R. 4435) for the relief of Stewart College (now the Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn. (Report No. 160.)

The bill (H. R. 124) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church of Helena, Phillips County, Ark. (Report No. 166.)

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased. (Report No. 161.)

By Mr. TRACEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 1836) granting an honorable discharge to Wilson Kale. (Report No. 162.)

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 2966) for the relief of John Rhodes and wife. (Report No. 163.)

By Mr. NEILL, from the Committee on War Claims: House resolution No. 151, in lieu of House bill No. 1054. (Report No. 164.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan. (Report No. 165.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 4974) for the relief of settlers on the Northern Pacific Railroad indemnity lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 4975) to change the place of holding terms of circuit and district courts in the northern district of the State of Texas from Graham to Abilene—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4976) for the relief of the acting (volunteer) officers in the United States Navy in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4977) to repeal section 4716, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 4978) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station on or near Hog Island Shoal, Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 4979) to amend sections 140 and 145 and repealing sections 143 and 144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to Presidential elections—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4980) donating condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to Judson Kilpatrick Post, No. 36, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, at Newton, Kans.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) donating condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to Eggleston Post, No. 244, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, at Wichita, Kans.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 4982) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for the settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain railroads, and to secure to the United States payment of all indebtedness of certain companies therein mentioned—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4983) to prohibit the issuance of bonds without express authority of Congress—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4984) to provide for the securing to the State of Colorado full title to all mineral lands, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Colorado, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4986) to exclude political influence in the appointment of postmasters—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4987) providing an appropriation for the improvement of the Yamhill River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the allotment of lands in the Indian Territory heretofore occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4989) establishing gas buoys in the St. Lawrence River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 4990) to aid in establishing homes in the States and Territories for teaching articulate speech and vocal language to deaf children before they are of school age—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4992) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate four pieces of condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the city of Reedsburg, Wis.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 4993) allowing actual settlers upon lands within the Mille Lacs Indian Reservation to perfect title to lands in said reservation under the general land laws of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A resolution (House Res. No. 135) relative to pay of clerks of committees for month of December, 1895—to the Committee on Accounts.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 3409) granting a pension to and for the relief of Dr. Harrison Wagner—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4250) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to exchange with the National Guard of the respective States Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1884 for Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1873—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Militia.

The bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Gen. Francis L. Hagadorn—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1048) for the relief of the late Andrew S. Core—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Mrs. Anna R. Widmayer for the killing of her husband on or about the 3d day of September, 1872—Committee on the District of Columbia discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 4995) removing the charge of desertion from the record of W. V. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) granting a pension to Louis M. Ellison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of Ira Davis, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of George S. Walker, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 4999) for the relief of Thomas Collins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 5000) granting a pension to James F. Barham, of California—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 5001) for the relief of John H. Walters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5002) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph Dunlap—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Edward Morgan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5004) granting an honorable discharge to W. G. Neeley, of Canyon City, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) granting a pension to Michael Devine, of La Junta, Colo., late of Company L, Second New York Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) granting an honorable discharge to Andrew J. Branson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) granting a pension to Charles F. Holly, of Pueblo, Colo., late captain of Company H, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) for the relief of George F. McReynolds, late of Company B, Tenth Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) for the relief of Gerald Russell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) for pension to Joseph N. Nash, late corporal Company A, Thirty-seventh Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) granting an increase of pension to Alvin F. Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas B. Hanoum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of D. H. Dickason—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) granting an honorable discharge to Harrison S. Crites—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) granting a pension to T. R. Le Tellier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. John Fay, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd Beall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) for the relief of Barbary Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5019) for relief of Enoch H. Stone, of White County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) for relief of Col. Nat Witt, of Rhea County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) for relief of John T. Masoner, heir to Isaac Masoner, of Meigs County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) for relief of the legal representative of P. M. Lea, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) for relief of M. A. Lewis, of Marion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 5024) for the relief of Joseph Gerrold, of Silver City, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5025) for the relief of W. R. Austin & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5026) granting a pension to Mrs. S. T. Emery, widow of Obadiah German—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 5027) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Ambers Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5028) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of George W. Griffith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5029) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Pleasant Longacre, administrator of Richard Longacre, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5030) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of David Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5031) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Wiley Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5032) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Andrew Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5033) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of David Belcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5034) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Archibald C. Legg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5035) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thomas W. Campbell, assignee of Miles Kelly, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 5036) for the relief of James H. Smith, of Manchester, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) for the relief of John McNaughton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) for the relief of David Stewart, of Seman, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 5039) to pension William F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 5040) to correct the military record of David K. Selzer, a member of Company D, Ninety-third Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, of Wellsville, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 5041) to pension Ella F. Sydnor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 5042) granting a pension to Henry Bultemeier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of John M. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota (by request): A bill (H. R. 5044) for the relief of James Gilfillan and John A. Rollings—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 5045) for the relief of James M. Bullock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Henry Craig—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 5047) granting a pension to Marvin J. Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5048) granting an increase of pension to Manon Van Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 5049) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Isaac K. James—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5050) for the benefit of and granting a pension to Ransom C. Hazelip, late a private soldier of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Infantry Volunteers, and first lieutenant of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of the heirs of Edward O. Watkins, deceased, late of the State of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5052) for the relief of Mary Walker, a Wyandotte Indian—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5053) to pension Allan C. Vickars—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) for the relief of F. F. Morris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) to pay John Foster, of Elizabeth, W. Va., for ferrying United States soldiers during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5056) for the relief of William Seicks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5057) to pension Violet Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) for the relief of B. J. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) for the relief of John M. Hamm, of McNairy County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) for relief of Hiram B. Crowell and William H. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) to pension Ira Powers, of Henderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 5062) to reimburse D. D. Brennan for expenses incurred in travel from Yokohama, Japan, to Haverstraw, N. Y., after his summary discharge as paymaster's clerk in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 5063) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of David McKinney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Jackson Willhite, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of George Black, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) granting a pension to Pinkney Huddleston, late private Company I, of the First Battalion Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteers, Indian war, mustered into service of the United States October 31, 1836, and discharged at Fort Gibson April 12, 1837—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel Corday, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: A bill (H. R. 5068) to grant pension to Jane Cunningham, widow of James Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5069) granting a pension to Susan E. Peckham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of George W. Bowen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of James W. Long, late a captain in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) for the relief of Adam D. Shriner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) granting a pension to Charles C. Epley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) granting a pension to Charles H. Van Etten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) for the relief of Rodman Hart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) for the relief of Persons T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) granting a pension to Phœbe B. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAFT: A bill (H. R. 5079) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John J. Shipman against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of Van Ransler R. Hughnin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 5084) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, deceased, for $8,000 due him for judicial services—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, deceased, late consul-general of the United States in Egypt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5086) for the relief of Francis A. Monholland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of William S. Laney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5088) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Richard L. Kirby, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of George W. Yuckley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 5090) to correct and amend the military record of Capt. Alexander McDonald, of Company I, Seventeenth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of Bridget Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5093) granting an honorable discharge to N. B. Grayson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of citizens of Lancaster, Dallas County, Tex., asking for the passage of the bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of citizens of Brownsville, Washington County, Pa., praying for free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of D. E. Holter and others, of Howard, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of railway postal clerks, in favor of the passage of bill providing for the reclassification of such clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Petition of Bruce E. Watkins and others, of Pueblo, Colo., favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of C. F. Kennedy and 18 others, of Garwin, Tama County, Iowa, in regard to Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Resolutions of the Topeka (Kans.) Philosophical Society, in behalf of the Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of western Pennsylvania, in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring various reductions in postal rates and the exclusion from second-class rates of such publications as are not strictly of such class—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, recommending the establishment of a navigating naval reserve—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring a sound and stable monetary system, and, in case of failure to agree upon such a system, the appointment of a nonpartisan monetary commission—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, urging the fortification of the east end of Long Island Sound—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Three petitions of C. S. McCall and other citizens of Marlboro County; Mr. Levi and others of Clarendon County; T. L. Jandon and others of Berkeley County, S. C., in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOWLER: Two memorials of the Second Presbyterian

Church of Rahway, N. J., and a union meeting of the Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal churches of Cranford, N. J., protesting against the persecutions and atrocities perpetrated upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 180, for the licensing of masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, deprecating the Government ownership of railroad lines, but favoring a close supervision of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, recommending that provision be made for the protection of all trains, boats, or vehicles carrying the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring a ship canal from Lake Erie to tide water—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring liberal appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring a strict enforcement of the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition and papers accompanying bill for the relief of James S. Crawford, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER: Ten petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chautauqua, Ceres, Angelica, Fillmore, and Friendship, N. Y., to prohibit the sale of beer at Bedloe's Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Henry J. Rice, J. A. Putnam, and others, of Fredonia, N. Y., for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of 450 citizens of the Third Congressional district of New Jersey, for the passage of the Stone bill for restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULING: Petition and papers of Ella F. Sydnor, of Washington, D. C., praying to be granted a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of 76 citizens of Dawes County, Nebr., asking for some Congressional action to prevent the atrocities in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of W. B. Reynolds and 13 others, of Nebraska, asking for the reclassification of the mail service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of Charles H. Newhard and others, of Natalie, Pa., and vicinity, in support of the William A. Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the American Humane Education Society, asking Congress to request Great Britain to appoint a commission similar to our own to consider the Venezuelan difficulty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the American Local Option League, praying for the abolishment of the liquor traffic, internal revenue from spirits, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the abolition of compulsory pilotage on coastwise vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the licensing of masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons, as provided in Senate bill No. 180—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Two petitions of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of New Paltz, Ulster County, N. Y., urging the prohibition of the sale of beer to immigrants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition of the board of directors of the Saginaw Board of Trade, asking for the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: Paper to accompany House bill No. 4884, to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Nicholas Clarkson, of New York, landsman U. S. S. *Alabama*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Park Street Club of Boston, Mass, favoring the passage of the bills (H. R. 9 and S. 301) restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: Petition of Violet Carr, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., asking to be restored to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Paper to accompany House bill No. 4218, for the relief of Richard H. Marshall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: Petition of Mrs. Susan Waller, asking for action by Congress for the release of her husband, John L. Waller, now imprisoned in France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the managing board of the Boston Evangelical Alliance, praying that Congress will make to the Sultan of Turkey a most emphatic protest against the atrocities and massacres perpetrated upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: Petition of George A. Tywell, W. T. Hanford, and others, of Carson City, Nev., to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NOONAN: Petition of Nathan Mitchell, of Texas, for a pension for services rendered as an officer in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petitions and resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the following States, asking for protection of the Christians in Armenia: Alabama, Connecticut, Michigan, West Virginia, Arkansas, Oklahoma Territory, Kansas, Wyoming, Indian Territory, South Dakota, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Virginia, Ohio, North Carolina, Maine, Iowa, and Maryland—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. M. Brady and 105 others, praying that the ceded lands within the Cross Creek Indian Reservation be subject to settlement without payment to the Government—to the Committtee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the State board of agriculture of Pennsylvania, relating to the distribution of seeds, etc., by the Secretary of Agriculture, believing it to be inexpedient to distribute the same, and tendering the thanks of the board for the action of the Secretary of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Resolutions adopted by members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Calumet, Mich., indorsing the Senate bill regarding the Armenian persecution—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: Papers to accompany the claim of Thomas H. Coates—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition and papers to accompany bill for the relief of Frances A. Monholland, of Charles City, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Worcester, Mass., asking for the adoption of international system of weights—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Henry L. Search, J. D. Brinkerhoff, David Palmer, and 30 other citizens of Lizette, Bucks County, Pa., for the passage of an act granting compensation to fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of John C. Hunter and 55 other citizens of Abington, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: Petition of the Methodist Preachers' Meeting, Columbus, Ohio, Rev. S. J. Hawk, secretary, asking for the passage of a bill favoring industrial arbitration and investigation—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Columbus Methodist Preachers' Meeting, asking for the passage of an act raising the age of consent in the District of Columbia, and for improved divorce laws in the Territories—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Columbus Methodist Preachers' Meeting, representing 25 pastors and 1,000 members, asking for Sunday rest and compulsory education in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Griffin Roberts and many others, of Hilliard, Ohio, and vicinity, asking for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 29, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GEORGETOWN DOCK, BARGE, ELEVATOR AND RAILROAD COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Dock, Barge, Elevator and Railroad Company of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Buffalo Merchants' Exchange, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to permanently retire and cancel all United States notes, called greenbacks, and Treasury notes, called Sherman notes, in order to prevent disaster to business and to preserve the honor of our country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KYLE presented sundry memorials of citizens of South Dakota, remonstrating against the issuance of interest-bearing bonds and praying for the free coinage of silver; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Kingsbury County, S. Dak., remonstrating against the cruel and inhuman treatment of Armenian Christians by the Turkish Government, and praying for immediate action by Congress in the matter; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of Noah V. Chapman and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for consular inspection of immigrants before embarkation; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SMITH presented the petition of Daniel S. Cooper and 55 other citizens of Oxford, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FRYE presented sundry petitions of the officers of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing the State unions of Alabama, Connecticut, Michigan, West Virginia, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Wyoming, Indian Territory, South Dakota, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Virginia, Ohio, North Carolina, and Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Armenia; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the First Baptist Church of Lawrence, Mass., praying Congress to join with other nations in measures to prevent the further oppression and slaughter of Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEFFER presented a petition of the Philosophical Association of Topeka, Kans., praying for recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cubans; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Kern County, Cal., and a petition of the board of supervisors of Alameda County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the mining interests of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. CAMERON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Pittsburg and New Florence, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition of the United Congregation of the Baptist and Congregational churches of Claremont, N. H., representing a membership of about six hundred persons, in reference to Armenian atrocities. These churches conclude their petition in these words:

> That you, by personal efforts, inspired of your constituency and your fellowmen, do move for such reasonable action in this case as will assure the admiration and cooperation of good people everywhere, amongst all nationalities; as will meet the approval of generations to come; as will, above all, effect the obtuse Ottoman Government immediately and forever in the matter of her treatment of Christian Armenian subjects in her Empire.

This was passed by the unanimous vote of the two churches named. I move that the petition lie on the table, a resolution having been reported and passed on this subject.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the mayor, clergy, and sundry other citizens of Burlington, Vt., praying for protection to the Armenian Christians and American citizens in Turkey; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRICE presented a petition of the city council of Warren, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a ship canal connecting the Great Lakes with the Ohio River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. GRAY presented the affidavit of Cyrus Cort, of Delaware, and the affidavit of William T. Watson, speaker of the senate of the State of Delaware, in the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the United States Senate; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1447) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6) for the relief of P. S. Corbett, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5) referring to the Treasury Department the claims of sundry persons for examination, adjustment, and report to Congress, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He, also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1650) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1469) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 516) for the relief of M. D. Crow, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. MORGAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back a number of petitions on the subject of recognizing the belligerent rights of Cuba; also, a joint resolution offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], Senate joint resolution 4, declaring that a state of public war exists in Cuba, and that belligerent rights be accorded to the Cuban government.

I report back as a substitute two resolutions, which I will read, accompanied by a written report. The report is brief, and explains the attitude of the committee toward these questions. I will read it:

> The Congress of the United States, deeply regretting the unhappy state of hostilities existing in Cuba, which has again been the result of the demand of a large number of the native population of that island for its independence, in a spirit of respect and regard for the welfare of both countries, earnestly desires that the security of life and property and the establishment of permanent peace and of a government that is satisfactory to the people of Cuba should be accomplished.
>
> And to the extent that the people of Cuba are seeking the rights of local self-government for domestic purposes, the Congress of the United States expresses its earnest sympathy with them. The Congress would also welcome with satisfaction the concession by Spain of complete sovereignty to the people of that island, and would cheerfully give to such a voluntary concession the cordial support of the United States. The near proximity of Cuba to the frontier of the United States, and the fact that it is universally regarded as a part of the continental system of America, identifies that island so closely with the political and commercial welfare of our people that Congress can not be indifferent to the fact that civil war is flagrant among the people of Cuba.
>
> Nor can we longer overlook the fact that the destructive character of this war is doing serious harm to the rights and interests of our people on the island, and to our lawful commerce, the protection and freedom of which is safeguarded by treaty obligations. In the recent past and in former years, when internal wars have been waged for long periods and with results that were disastrous to Cuba and injurious to Spain, the Government of the United States has always observed, with perfect faith, all of its duties toward the belligerents.
>
> It was a difficult task thus forced upon the United States, but it was performed with vigor, impartiality, and justice, in the hope that Spain would so ameliorate the condition of the Cuban people as to give them peace, contentment, and prosperity. This desirable result has not been accomplished. Its failure has not resulted from any interference on the part of our people or Government with the people or government of Cuba.
>
> The hospitality which our treaties, the laws of nations, and the laws of Christianity have extended to Cuban refugees in the United States has caused distrust on the part of the Spanish Government as to the fidelity of our Government to its obligations of neutrality in the frequent insurrections of the people of Cuba against Spanish authority. This distrust has often become a source of serious annoyance to our people, and has led to a spirit of retaliation toward Spanish authority in Cuba, thus giving rise to frequent controversies between the two countries. The absence of responsible government in Cuba, with powers adequate to deal directly with questions between the people of the United States and the people and political authorities of the island, has been a frequently recurring cause of delay, protracted imprisonment, confiscations of property, and the detention of our people and their ships, often upon groundless charges, which has been a serious grievance.
>
> When insurrections have occurred on the Island of Cuba the temptation to unlawful invasion by reckless persons has given to our Government anxiety, trouble, and much expense in the enforcement of our laws and treaty

obligations of neutrality, and these occasions have been so frequent as to make these duties unreasonably onerous upon the Government of the United States.

The devastation of Cuba in the war that is now being waged, both with fire and sword, is an anxious and disturbing cause of unrest among the people of the United States, which creates strong grounds of protests against the continuance of the struggle for power between Cuba and Spain, which is rapidly changing the issue to one of existence on the part of a great number of the native population.

It is neither just to the relations that exist between Cuba and the United States, nor is it in keeping with the spirit of the age or the rights of humanity that this struggle should be protracted until one party or the other should become exhausted in the resources of men and money, thereby weakening both until they may fall a prey to some stronger power, or until the stress of human sympathy or the resentments engendered by long and bloody conflict should draw into the strife the unruly elements of neighboring countries.

This civil war, though it is great in its proportions, and is conducted by armies that are in complete organization and directed and controlled by supreme military authority, has not the safeguard of a cartel for the treatment of wounded soldiers or prisoners of war.

In this feature of the warfare it becomes a duty of humanity that the civilized powers should insist upon the application of the laws of war recognized among civilized nations to both armies. As our own people are drawn into this struggle on both sides, and enter either army without the consent of our Government and in violation of our laws, their treatment when they may be wounded or captured, although it is not regulated by treaty and ceases to be a positive care of our Government, should not be left to the revengeful retaliations which expose them to the fate of pirates or other felons.

The inability of Spain to subdue the revolutionists by the measures and within the time that would be reasonable when applied to occasions of ordinary civil disturbance is a misfortune that can not be justly visited upon citizens of the United States, nor can it be considered that a state of open civil war does not exist, but that the movement is a mere insurrection and its supporters a mob of criminal violators of the law, when it is seen that it requires an army of 100,000 men and all the naval and military power of a great kingdom even to hold the alleged rebellion in check.

It is due to the situation of affairs in Cuba that Spain should recognize the existence of a state of war in the island, and should voluntarily accord to the armies opposed to her authority the rights of belligerents under the laws of nations.

The Congress of the United States, recognizing the fact that the matters herein referred to are properly within the control of the Chief Executive until, within the principles of our Constitution, it becomes the duty of Congress to define the final attitude of the Government of the United States toward Spain, presents these considerations to the President in support of the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the present deplorable war in the Island of Cuba has reached a magnitude that concerns all civilized nations to the extent that it should be conducted, if unhappily it is longer to continue, on those principles and laws of warfare that are acknowledged to be obligatory upon civilized nations when engaged in open hostilities, including the treatment of captives who are enlisted in either army; due respect to cartels for exchange of prisoners and for other military purposes; truces and flags of truce, the provision of proper hospitals and hospital supplies, and services to the sick and wounded of either army.

"*Resolved further*, That this representation of the views and opinions of Congress be sent to the President; and if he concurs therein that he will, in a friendly spirit, use the good offices of this Government to the end that Spain shall be requested to accord to the armies with which it is engaged in war the rights of belligerents, as the same are recognized under the laws of nations."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CAMERON. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I present the views of the minority, accompanied by a resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the views of the minority and the resolution may be read.

Mr. PLATT. I wish the Secretary, before he reads the views of the minority, would read the resolutions reported by the majority of the committee. They were not, I think, heard as read by the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions reported by the majority of the committee will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions appended to the report of the majority of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Pennsylvania has no objection, before the views of the minority are read I should like to hear the resolution which is proposed by the minority as a substitute.

Mr. CAMERON. That will be found at the end of the views of the minority.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution reported by the minority will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to interpose his friendly offices with the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Mr. PLATT. Now, let the whole minority report be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The views of the minority will be read.

The Secretary read the views of the minority, as follows:

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

After the cessation of our civil war we were called upon to take notice of the struggle in Cuba against Spanish rule which broke out in October, 1868. It is said that early in the year 1869 a proclamation was actually signed by President Grant recognizing the Cubans as belligerents, although the fact was known to very few persons. This proclamation was not promulgated, owing to the opposition of Secretary Fish. In December, 1869, President Grant, in his first annual message, called the attention of Congress to this struggle. He said:

"For more than a year a valuable province of Spain, and a near neighbor of ours, in whom all our people can not but feel a deep interest, has been struggling for independence and freedom. The people and Government of the United States entertain these same warm feelings and sympathies for the people of Cuba in their pending struggle that they manifested throughout the previous struggles between Spain and her former colonies in behalf of the latter. But the contest has at no time assumed the conditions which amount to a war in the sense of international law, or which would show the existence of a de facto political organization of the insurgents sufficient to justify a recognition of belligerence. The principle is maintained, however, that this nation is its own judge when to accord the rights of belligerency, either to a people struggling to free themselves from a government they believe to be oppressive, or to independent nations at war with each other."

He concluded that in due time Spain must find it for its interest to establish its dependency as an independent power which could then exercise its right of choice as regarded its future relations with other powers.

The Cuban war which broke out in 1868 had been in existence for only nine months when our Government felt the necessity of interference. Mr. Sickles was appointed our minister to Madrid in 1869, and instructions were given to him to submit propositions on the part of our Government, in order to bring to a close the "civil conflict" raging in Cuba. The part taken by our Government at that time in Cuban affairs is full of interest, not only as regards the engagement into which the authorities were willing to enter, but also as respects the status which the instructions gave to the Cuban conflict. Our minister was directed to impress upon the Spanish mind "the advancing growth of that sentiment which claims for every part of the American hemisphere the right of self-government and freedom from transatlantic dependence." The good offices of the United States were offered to the cabinet at Madrid for the purpose of bringing to a close "the civil war now ravaging the Island of Cuba." The bases of settlement were:

1. The independence of Cuba to be acknowledged by Spain.
2. Cuba to pay Spain an indemnity for her relinquishment of all her rights in the island.
3. The abolition of slavery.
4. An armistice pending negotiations of settlement.

Our minister was also authorized to state that if Spain insisted, our Government might guarantee the payment of the indemnity by Cuba.

His attention was called particularly to the expression used in the instructions, "the civil war now ravaging the island."

While this expression is not designed to grant any public recognition of belligerent rights to the insurgents, it is nevertheless used advisably and in recognition of a state and condition of the contest which may not justify a much longer withholding of the concession to the revolutionary party of the recognized rights of belligerents. Should the expression, therefore, be commented upon you will admit what is above stated with reference to it, and may add, in case of a protracted discussion, or the prospect of a refusal by Spain to accept the proposed offer of the United States, that an early recognition of belligerent rights is the logical deduction from the present proposal, and will probably be deemed a necessity on the part of the United States unless the condition of the parties to the contest shall have changed very materially.

Negotiations were at once entered upon by our minister with the Spanish Government, and the proposition of the United States was submitted to General Prim, the president of the council of state, who was then at the head of Spanish affairs, and practically dictator in Spain. Prim asked how much Cuba would give, and it was suggested that $125,000,000 might be arranged. Prim intimated that autonomy to Cuba would be conceded as soon as hostilities ceased, but that Spain could not entertain the question of the independence of Cuba as long as the Cubans were in arms against the Government. He also declined to consider the Cubans as parties to be consulted in the negotiation.

He was willing to assure Cuban independence if, after laying down their arms, the Cubans should vote for a separation, although he would not insist upon the necessity of such a vote. That for his part, if he alone were consulted, he would say to the Cubans, "Go, if you will; make good the treasure you have cost us, and let us bring home our army in peace, and consolidate the liberties and resources of Spain." He added that he had no doubt that whatever might be the result of the conflict, Cuba would eventually be free; that he recognized without hesitation the manifest course of events on the American Continent, and the inevitable termination of all colonial relations in their autonomy as soon as they were prepared for independence; but he repeated, that no consideration would reconcile Spain to such a concession until hostilities ceased. His language was:

"I do not flatter myself that Spain will retain possession of the island. I consider that the period of colonial autonomy has virtually arrived. However the present contest may end, whether in the suppression of the insurrection or in the better way of an amicable arrangement through the assistance of the United States, it is equally clear to me that the time has come for Cuba to govern herself; and if we succeed in putting down the insurrection to-morrow, I shall regard the subject in the same light, that the child has attained its majority and should be allowed to direct its own affairs. We want nothing more than to get out of Cuba, but it must be done in a dignified and honorable manner."

Our Government saw the futility of accepting the conditions suggested by Spain. They recognized that nothing could be effected by a plebiscite, and that the Cubans could not be induced to lay down their arms and trust the Spaniards to carry out their promises. Moreover, while the negotiations were in progress the public became informed of them. Immediately a great excitement arose, communicated by the press, which disinclined the Spanish administration to pursue the matter, and our Government, finding itself unable to effect any good purpose, withdrew its offer of mediation.

Mr. Sickles wrote Mr. Fish that Spain deprecated the expression of the sympathy of the Government and people of the United States for the cause of the revolutionists, as well as the President's declaration of the right of the Government of the United States to determine when it may rightfully proclaim its neutrality in the conflict between a colony struggling for independence and the parent state. It is remarkable, was the comment of Mr. Sickles, that in all these discussions the fact is overlooked that Spain conceded the rights of belligerents to the Confederates without waiting for the outbreak of hostilities.

"The Queen's proclamation of June, 1861, is forgotten; and the large and profitable commerce carried on between Habana and the blockaded ports of the South in enemies' ships, which changed their flags in Cuban waters is quite ignored."

On the failure of negotiations, the logical result of our action was to recognize the Cubans as belligerents engaged in a "civil war." As was said by Secretary Fish, the mere offer on our part to mediate as between the contending forces was in itself a concession of belligerency and a recognition of that condition. But for various reasons this argument was not pressed by our Government. Although from month to month the aggressiveness of the revolutionists increased and their power extended, our Government, speaking through the State Department and the President, continued to inform the country that the Cubans had not reached such a condition as entitled them to be recognized as belligerents, although the Administration had already in instructions to our own minister to Spain recognized that condition at a time when the revolution had hardly attained any headway.

One of the reasons for this inconsistency was the expectation felt by our Government that Spain would voluntarily concede to the Cubans much that they were struggling for. Liberal ministries succeeded one another in Spain each of which was more liberal than its predecessor in promises of reform

and recognition of the rights of the Cubans. Civil war broke out in Spain, and its Government became involved in such difficulties that ours was loath to press the subject of Cuba or to insist upon a speedy solution of the question. Mr. Fish was irritated by the operation of the Cuban junta in this country, which at times infringed our neutrality laws. He thought they should have confined their activity to sending to the insurgents arms and munitions of war, which he says they might have done "consistently with our own statutes and with the law of nations." At home the Federal Administration had to deal with the pressing question of the reconstruction of the South. The negro problem in this country was of such importance that the Administration had no desire to add difficulties by undertaking to settle the negro question in Cuba.

The action of our Government was in striking contrast to that of Spain in recognizing the Confederates as belligerents. Mr. Fish refers to this in a letter to Señor Roberts, the Spanish minister, in 1869:

"The civil war in Cuba has continued for a year; battle after battle has been fought: thousands of lives have been sacrificed, and the result is still in suspense. But the United States have hitherto resisted the considerations which in 1861 controlled the action of Spain and determined her to act upon the occurrence of a single bloodless conflict of arms and within sixty days from its date."

Six years later, in 1875, this Government was again on the point of intervening. In a dispatch from Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Cushing, then minister to Spain, the Secretary said that the condition of Cuba was the one great cause of perpetual solicitude in the foreign relations of the United States. He informed the minister that the President did not meditate the annexation of Cuba to the United States, but its elevation as an independent republic—

"The desire of independence [the Secretary says] on the part of the Cubans is a natural and legitimate aspiration of theirs, because they are Americans. That the ultimate issue of events in Cuba will be its independence, however that issue may be produced, whether by means of negotiation, or as the result of military operations, or of one of those unexpected incidents which so frequently determine the fate of nations, it is impossible to doubt. If there be one lesson in history more cogent in its teachings than any other, it is that no part of America large enough to constitute a self-sustaining state can be permanently held in forced colonial subjection to Europe. Complete separation between the metropolis and its colony may be postponed by the former conceding to the latter a greater or less degree of local autonomy, nearly approaching to independence. But in all cases where a positive antagonism has come to exist between the mother country and its colonial subjects, where the sense of oppression is strongly felt by the latter, and especially where years of relentless warfare have alienated the parties one from another more widely than they are sundered by the ocean itself, their political separation is inevitable. It is one of those conclusions which have been aptly called the inexorable logic of events."

Thus we have shown that already, in 1869, when the revolution of the preceding year had attained but inconsiderable proportions, President Grant expressed his firm conviction that the ultimate result of the struggle for independence would be to break the bonds which attached Cuba as a colony to Spain. President Grant announced the determination of our Government to intervene if the struggle in Cuba was not speedily terminated. It was pointed out that while the Spanish authorities insisted that a state of war did not exist in Cuba, and that no rights as belligerents should be accorded to the revolutionists, they at the same time demanded for themselves all the rights and privileges which flowed from actual and acknowledged war. That Cuba exhibited a chronic condition of turbulence and rebellion was due to the system pursued by Spain and the want of harmony between the inhabitants of the island and the governing class. That should it become necessary for this Government to intervene it would be moved by the necessity for a proper regard to its own protection and its own interests and the interests of humanity.

The inhuman manner in which the war was waged and the shocking executions of natives and citizens of this country made an impression of horror on the world.

The nicest sense of international requirements can not fail to perceive that provocation from Spain was overlooked by our Government for a longer period and with greater patience than any other Government of equal power would have tolerated. A writer in the London Times, in 1875, reflecting upon the possibility of Spain's overcoming the then insurrection, and on the prospect of our interference, said:

"Were Cuba as near to Cornwall as it is to Florida we should certainly look more sharply to matters of fact than to the niceties of international law. But everything, we repeat, depends upon these matters of fact. If Spain can suppress the insurrection and prevent Cuba from becoming a permanent source of mischief to neighboring countries, she has the fullest right to keep it. But she is on her trial, and that trial can not be long. When she is made to clearly understand that the tenure of her rule over Cuba depends upon her ability to make that rule a reality, she will not be slow to show what she can do, and the limits of her power will be the limits of her right."

In 1869 Gen. Martinez Campos, the greatest soldier Spain possessed, was sent to Cuba to make a final effort to bring hostilities there to a termination. He was not only a great soldier, but was believed to be a great administrator, and had the respect of all parties on account of his patriotism and integrity. He was afforded all the aid in the way of men and money which Spain could furnish. In 1878 he succeeded in the so-called pacification, for which service he was raised to the highest pinnacle in Spain and made prime minister. He did not conquer the insurgents, but induced them to lay down their arms on conditions of peace which, as the Spanish administrator, he undertook for his Government should be faithfully carried out.

A treaty of peace was negotiated with the leaders of the revolution. In 1879 General Campos wrote a long dispatch to his Government from the seat of his triumph, which at this day is extremely interesting, owing to the fact that the present war owes its origin to the same circumstances as caused the former outbreak. In this dispatch, stating the particulars of the pacification, General Campos gave an extended review of the situation in Cuba and of the terms of the treaty of peace and the negotiations which led thereto. This recital shows that General Campos believed, as was afterwards said by our minister, James Russell Lowell, that the reforms he stipulated were necessary if Cuba was to be retained as a dependency of Spain, and, Mr. Lowell remarked, all intelligent Spaniards admitted that the country could not afford another war. As a reason for according conditions to the Cubans General Campos sketched the motives of his policy:

"Since the year 1869, when I landed on this island with the first reenforcements, I was preoccupied with the idea that the insurrection here, though acknowledging as its cause the hatred of Spain, yet this hatred was due to the causes that have separated our colonies from the mother country, augmented in the present case by the promises made to the Antillas at different times (1812, 1837, and 1845), promises which not only have not been fulfilled, but, as I understand, have not been permitted to be so by the Cortes when at different times their execution had been begun.

"While the island had no great development, its aspirations were confined by love of nationality and respect for authority; but when one day after another passed without hopes being satisfied, but, on the contrary, the greater freedom permitted now and then by a governor was more than canceled by his successor; when they were convinced that the colony went on in the same way; when bad officials and a worse administration of justice more and more aggravated difficulties; when the provincial governorships, continually growing worse, fell at last into the hands of men without training or education, petty tyrants who could practice their thefts and sometimes their oppressions because of the distance at which they resided from the supreme authority, public opinion, until then restrained, began vehemently to desire those liberties which, if they bring much good, contain also some evil. * * * The 10th of October, 1868, came to open men's eyes; the eruption of the volcano in which so many passions, so many hatreds, just and unjust, had been heaped up was terrible, and almost at the outset the independence of Cuba was proclaimed."

He showed the gains speedily made by the insurgents and the advantages they had by reason of the familiarity with the country, so that "they defeated large columns with hardly a battalion of men. They almost put us on the defensive, and as we had to guard an immense property the mission of the army became very difficult." He recounted his efforts to reestablish the principle of authority, but said that he had against him a "public spirit without life. Nobody had higher aspirations than to save his crop of sugar. In official regions the enemy was thought inferior, but the commanders generally believed it unsafe to operate with less than three battalions; there was no venturing beyond the highways."

He said little was gained by beating the enemy. What he needed was to exterminate them, and that he could not do. That had his responsibility been free of the Cortes and the Government he would in the beginning have ventured everything to secure peace—the disembargo of estates, a general pardon, the assimilation of Cuba with Spain, orders to treat prisoners well—and to show that this was not weakness, but strength, there was "the argument of his 100,000 bayonets." He finally related the terms by which he induced the Cubans to lay down their arms. All desired reforms were promised. Municipal law, the law of provincial assemblies, and representation in the Cortes should be established; the jurisdiction of the courts defined, tax laws settled, the form of contribution and assessments determined, schools established, the people to be consulted through their representative as to all these reforms and others, and they were not to be left to the will of the captain-general or the head of a department. This summary is sufficient to indicate what was stipulated between the parties. Said General Campos:

"I do not wish to make a momentary peace; I desire that this peace be the beginning of a bond of common interest between Spain and her Cuban provinces, and that this bond be drawn closer by the identity of aspirations and the good faith of both. Let not the Cubans be considered as pariahs or children, but put on an equality with other Spaniards in everything not inconsistent with their present condition. Perhaps [he concluded] the insurgents would have accepted promises less liberal and more vague than those set forth in this condition; but even had this been done, it would have been but a brief postponement, because those liberties are destined to come for the reasons already given, with the difference that Spain now shows herself magnanimous, satisfying just aspirations which she might deny, and a little later, probably very soon, would have been obliged to grant them, compelled by the force of ideas and of the age. Moreover, she has promised over and over again to enter on the path of assimilation, and if the promise were more vague, even though the fulfillment of this promise were begun, these people would have a right to doubt our good faith, and to show a distrust unfortunately warranted by the failings of human nature itself. The not adding another 100,000 to the 100,000 families that mourn their sons slain in this pitiless war, and the cry of peace that will resound in the hearts of the 80,000 mothers who have sons in Cuba or liable to conscription, would be a full equivalent for the payment of a debt of justice."

This debt of justice has not yet been paid.

The highest Spanish authorities have been obliged to confess that the grievances of the Cubans are just and their aspirations for liberty legitimate.

Marshal Serrano, in his official report to the Spanish Government of the 10th of May, 1867, said:

"We are forced to acknowledge that in the last years the treasury of Cuba has been used abusively, which is partly the cause of the crisis the islands go through now and of the exhaustion of its resources."

Castelar, in 1873, while President, endeavored to convince Spain of the necessity of making reforms demanded alike by "humanity and civilization," and he deplored making Cuba a "transatlantic Poland." In 1874 our minister to Spain informed our Government that the entire unwillingness of Spain to do anything toward the amelioration of Cuba was shown by the fact that all the governments since the breaking out of the revolution in 1868 had promised to reform the administration, but that the situation of the island was worse than ever. And Secretary Fish informed the Spanish Government that most of the evils of which Cuba was the scene were the necessary results of harsh treatment and of the maladministration of the colonial government.

In 1875 Mr. Cushing, then minister to Madrid, communicated to our Government a large amount of evidence from Spanish sources showing the demoralization existing in the administration in Cuba. The Spanish journals of that date openly informed the central government that war in Cuba could never be ended until the vices of the ultramarine administration were corrected and its moral tone raised. Spain was exhorted to make one supreme effort for the pacification of Cuba and its moralization.

"The journals of all shades of opinion speak of the official corruption," said Mr. Cushing, "and peculations of the public employees in Cuba as a feature of the situation not less calamitous than the insurrection." He remarked that the burden of taxation had become intolerable, aggravated as it was by the frauds and wastes committed by almost everybody connected with the collection or expenditure of the public moneys; that the abuses of administration, of which so much was being said at that time, were old, chronic, deep-rooted, and impossible of eradication under the colonial régime. "It would seem that each of the ephemeral parties on attaining power, with a crowd of eager partisans behind it like troops of howling wolves, shakes off as many as it can upon Cuba."

Notwithstanding that the public press did not cease to advise the Government that the immorality of the public administration of the island offered a vast field to censure, nothing was done to improve its condition. It was thought by the central government that it was only necessary by force to save Cuba to Spain. It was common remark, however, that the Government ought to sustain two campaigns in Cuba—one against insurrection and the other against corruption. Said Mr. Cushing:

"So merely mercenary and so regardless of duty and the public weal are many of the public officers who go out to the island as to cause the saying to become current that on embarking they leave all sense of shame behind them in Cadiz."

And he observed that all testimony was unanimous as to the corruptions and the embezzlements of the administrations of Cuba.

The testimony of Mr. Cushing is of the most convincing character, as he has never been accused of being unfriendly to Spain. That he did not draw a too highly colored picture of Spanish misrule is shown by the declaration of the minister of transmarine affairs at Madrid in an official paper quoted by Mr. Fish in 1874:

"A deplorable and pertinacious tradition of despotism which, if it could ever be justified, is without a shadow of reason at the present time, intrusted the direction and management of our colonial establishment to the agents of

the metropolis, destroying, by their dominant and exclusive authority, the vital energies of the country and the creative and productive activity of free individuals. And although the system may now have improved in some of its details, the domineering action of the authorities being less felt, it still appears full of the original error, which is upheld by the force of tradition and the necessary influence of interests created under their protection. A change of system, political as well as administrative, is therefore imperatively demanded."

It is needless to say no such change has been made.

The Spanish Government to-day in Cuba is of the same character as it was when Richard Henry Dana visited the island in 1854, "an armed monarchy encamped in the midst of a disarmed and disfranchised people; an unmixed despotism of one nation over another." Dana warned the public against the testimony of Americans and other foreigners engaged in business in Cuba as to the condition of affairs there:

"Of all classes of persons I know of none whose situation is more unfavorable to the growth and development of sentiments of patriotism and philanthropy and of interest in the future of a race than foreigners temporarily resident, for purposes of money-making only, in a country with which they have nothing in common in the future or the past. This class is often called impartial. I do not agree to the use of that term. They are indeed free from the bias of feeling or sentiment, but they are subject to the attractions of interest. It is for their immediate advantage to preserve peace and the existing order of things."

That the condition of Cuba had not improved prior to the present war is shown by a report of our consul-general at Habana to the State Department in 1885. This stated that the entire population, with the exception of the official class, was living under a tyranny unparalleled at this day on the globe.

"There is a system of oppression and torture which enters into every phase of life, eats into the soul of every Cuban, mortifies, injures, and insults him every hour, impoverishes him and his family from day to day, threatens the rich man with bankruptcy and the poor man with beggary. The exactions of the Spanish Government and the illegal outrages of its officers are in fact intolerable. They have reduced the island to despondency and ruin. * * * The Government at Madrid is directly answerable for the misery of Cuba and for the rapacity and venality of its subordinates. * * * No well-informed Spaniard imagines that Cuba will long continue to submit to this tyranny, or at least that she will long be able to yield this harvest to her oppressors. Spain cares nothing whatever for the interests, the prosperity, or the sufferings of her colony. The Government does almost nothing to ameliorate any of the evils of the country. The police are everywhere insufficient and inefficient. The roads are no roads at all. Every interest which might enrich and improve the island is looked upon by the officials as one more mine to exploit. * * * Cuba is held solely for the benefit of Spain and Spanish interests, for the sake of Spanish adventurers. Against this all rebel in thought and feeling if not yet in fact and deed. * * * They wish protection from the grasping rapacity of Spain and see no way to attain it except by our aid."

He concluded that from the general misery war must ensue of such a savage character that the world would be shocked and the United States would be compelled from sheer humanity to interfere and save a country which Spain would be unable either to control or to preserve. He had learned from many quarters that in any future attempt to change the condition of affairs all the inhabitants would go hand in hand; "it is generally understood that the permanent white population is of one mind."

While some of the reforms stipulated for by the Cubans and engaged to be carried out by General Campos in 1879 were nominally granted, they were all substantially withheld. The central government did not feel itself bound after the cessation of hostilities was secured to perform the conditions by which that result was brought about. Our consul-general reported (1885) "that the island is worse governed than at any previous period of its history."

"Cuba, it was determined, must pay the entire cost of the war. At the time when the fostering care of the Government was most needed to heal the wounds inflicted by the war, when every interest was prostrate and every business suffering, new and enormous taxes were imposed. * * * A war tax of the most exaggerated character was laid. Every business, trade, art, or profession is taxed in the proportion of from 25 to 33½ per cent of its net income. * * * All ordinary mercantile business and all the petty trades and employments of the country are separately suffering. All participate in the common distress."

He stated that the absolute legal tax imposed on the island was only a part of what the wretched and impoverished inhabitants were compelled to pay.

"It is a matter of notoriety that illegal charges are constantly made and then taken off for a bribe. The hordes of officials who batten like hungry beasts on the vitals of Cuba make no pretense of honesty except on paper. The highest officers, when they chance to be better than their subordinates, admit the character of their inferiors; more often they share it. * * * The present state of things can not continue. Some change amounting almost to revolution is inevitable. What with governmental oppression and illegal tyranny, emancipation, brigandage, low prices for sugar and high taxes on everything, the ruin of the island is already almost consummated. She is absolutely incapacitated for rendering the revenue demanded or supporting the army of officials who keep her prostrate in her agony."

Shortly after Mr. Blaine became Secretary of State, in the Administration of President Harrison, it was the subject of consideration whether Spain could be induced to acknowledge Cuba as independent should the United States agree to guarantee the sum to be paid by Cuba for the relinquishment of all Spanish rights in the island. This movement was made by the sugar planters, and it was thought that the entire sugar interest would support it. Mr. Blaine announced himself warmly in favor of the project, but after long conferences it was ascertained that the consent of Spain could not be obtained.

In truth, the pacification effected by Martinez Campos in 1878 was hardly efficient even as a truce. The reports of our consular agents, the testimony of travelers, the avowals made in the Spanish press, and the constant evidence almost daily recurring in the Cuban press, show that between 1878 and 1895 Cuba enjoyed little peace or repose. Brigandage, which was merely one form of public discontent, never ceased. Only the presence of a very large Spanish army prevented organized war.

The danger and the scandal of the Cuban situation have been such as can be compared with nothing but the condition of Armenia. So serious did they become, and so imminent was the peril, that in 1894-95 the Spanish Government at last adopted measures looking to the partial satisfaction of Cuban demands. These measures we need not discuss. They were held by the old insurgent party to be illusory and deceptive. Another attempt at independence was decided upon, and in February, 1895, the present "sanguinary and fiercely conducted war" broke out, "in some respects more active than the last preceding revolt." In thus characterizing the situation in Cuba as a state of war, President Cleveland, like Secretary Fish, has cleared the subject of all preliminary doubts. A state of war exists in Cuba. With that, and with that alone, we have to deal.

The precedents are clear, and if our action were to be decided by precedent alone, we should not be able to hesitate. The last great precedent was that of the civil war which broke out in the United States in the spring of 1861. In that instance, without waiting for the outbreak of actual hostilities, further than the bloodless attack on Fort Sumter and its surrender April 13, 1861, the British Government issued its proclamation of neutrality on the 13th of May following, before it had received official information that war existed, except as a blockade of certain insurgent ports. The French Government acted in concert with Great Britain, but delayed the official announcement until June. The Spanish Government issued its proclamation of belligerency June 17; and the first battle of our war was not fought until July 21, or known at Madrid until August.

In this great instance the outbreak of insurrection and the recognition of belligerency were simultaneous. The United States protested against the precipitancy of the act, and have never admitted its justice or legality. Neither in 1869 nor in 1895 did the President enforce the precedent against Spain in regard to the insurrection in Cuba. Not even in 1875, when the insurgents held possession of a great part of the island and seacoast, with no restraint but the blockade, did the United States recognize their belligerency.

Yet belligerency is a question of fact, and if declared at all it should be declared whenever the true character of neutrality requires it or the exigencies of law need it. The nature of such action may be political or legal, or both. As a political act, impartiality requires that belligerency should be recognized whenever, existing in fact, its denial is equivalent to taking part with one of the belligerents against the other. In such cases the unrecognized belligerent has just ground for complaint. The moral support of the neutral government is given wholly to its opponent. That the Cuban insurgents were belligerents in fact as early as 1869 was expressly stated by Mr. Fish when he explained the meaning he attached to his phrase regarding "the civil war now ravaging the island." The word "war" in such conditions necessarily implies the fact of belligerency. President Cleveland, in his annual message of last month, informs us that the present war is more active than the preceding one.

Nevertheless, our Government has still refrained from what Mr. Fish called "any public recognition of belligerent rights to the insurgents." No legal necessity arose to require it, and the political exigency was not absolute. Yet, after the victory of Bayamo, in the month of July last, when the insurgents defeated and nearly captured the captain-general, Martinez Campos, and gained military possession of the whole eastern half of the island, the fact of their belligerency was established, and if further evidence was needed it was fully given by the subsequent victory at Coliseo, on the 24th of December, when the insurgents drove the captain-general back to Havana and gained military control of the western provinces.

If the Government of the United States still refrained from recognizing the belligerency of the insurgents after this conclusive proof of the fact, the reason doubtless was that in the absence of any legal complications the question became wholly political, and that its true solution must lie not in a recognition of belligerency, but in a recognition of independence.

In 1875, when the situation was very far from being as serious as it is now, President Grant, after long consideration of the difficulties involved in public action, decided against the recognition of belligerency as an act which might be delusive to the insurgents and would certainly be regarded as unfriendly by Spain. He decided upon a middle course. The documents above quoted show that he proposed to the Spanish Government a sort of intervention which should establish the independence of Cuba by a friendly agreement. In doing so he not only necessarily recognized both parties to the conflict as on an equal plane, but he also warned Spain that if such mediation should not be accepted, direct intervention would probably be deemed a necessity on the part of the United States.

Spain preferred to promise to the insurgents terms so favorable as to cause for a time the cessation of hostilities. Since then twenty years have passed. The insurrection, far from having ceased, has taken the proportions of a war almost as destructive to our own citizens as to the contending parties. The independence of Cuba was then regarded by the President of the United States as the object of his intervention, and has now become far more inevitable than it was then. Evidently the Government of the United States can do no less than to take up the subject precisely where President Grant left it, and to resume the friendly mediation which he actually began, with all the consequences which necessarily would follow its rejection.

Confident that no other action than this accords with our friendly relations with Spain, our just sympathy with the people of Cuba, and with our own dignity and consistency, I recommend the following resolution to the consideration of the Senate:

"*Resolved*, That the President is hereby requested to interpose his friendly offices with the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba."

Mr. ALLEN. What order was made concerning the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations with reference to Cuba?

Mr. MORGAN. It goes to the Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN. And will be printed?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed, as well as the views of the minority.

ARREST OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN CUBA.

Mr. GRAY. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] on the 21st instant, relating to the arrest of certain American citizens in Cuba, to report it with an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to inquire into the arrest and forcible removal of Mark E. Rodriguez, a citizen of the United States, on board the United States mail steamer *Olivette* in the harbor of Habana on Wednesday, the 15th instant; also into the arrest of Luis Someillan and his son, citizens of the United States, in the city of Habana; and, if no just cause for such arrest exists, to demand their immediate release.

The amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, in line 8, after the word "Habana," to strike out the remainder of the resolution in the following words:

And, if no just cause for such arrest exists, to demand their immediate release.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1823) to amend an act approved July 15, 1882, entitled "An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes"; which was

read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1824) for the relief of Louise Stewart, widow of George B. Stewart, late of Anne Arundel County, State of Maryland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1825) to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1826) authorizing the Attorney-General to allow in the accounts of John W. Arnold, United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois, the amounts paid by him to Andrew Blaes and Alfred Bullen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1827) to increase and limit the appropriation for a public building at Portland, Oreg., and to designate its uses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1828) to authorize the Auditor for the Interior Department to settle and adjust the accounts of E. C. Chirouse, Indian agent at the Tulalip Agency, Wash.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1829) granting a pension to John McMannomy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1830) providing for the construction of a military road from Fort Washakie, Wyo., to the mouth of the Buffalo Fork of the Snake River, near Jacksons Lake, in Uinta County, Wyo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1831) for the relief of William J. Bryan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1832) to define the rights of purchasers under mortgages authorized by an act of Congress approved April 20, 1871; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1833) to amend the act of March 1, 1895, and other acts relating to the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1834) for the relief of the executor of William Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1835) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John J. Shipman against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1836) to provide for licenses to certain officers of seagoing passenger steam vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Ellen Ewing, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Ewing; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1838) to increase the efficiency of the Marine Corps, and to equalize the grades of officers therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1839) to create a special commission on highways, and to make appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1840) granting a pension to Margaret A. Luthy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1841) granting a pension to Mary C. Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

FLORIDA SHIP CANAL.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be authorized and directed to inquire into and report upon the practicability and utility of the construction of the Florida, Ocean and Gulf Ship Canal across the State of Florida, from its eastern shore on the Atlantic Ocean to its western shore on the Gulf of Mexico, as now authorized by a charter from the State of Florida; and said committee is also further directed to make a report of the probable expenses of a Government survey of said route, and for the foregoing purposes it shall have power to send for persons and papers, grant hearings, and administer oaths if found necessary.

CONDUITS, PIPES, AND UNDERGROUND WAYS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to give to the Senate full information of the number of miles of conduits, pipes, or underground ways in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, specifying the miles in each, owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, the city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, and the number of chambers in such conduits, pipes, and underground ways; also the number of chambers of said conduits, pipes, or underground ways occupied by telegraph or telephone wires, and the names of the companies or persons, respectively, whose wires occupy the same, if any, and the number of said chambers reserved, if any, and the extent of said reservation, and to whom, in miles and feet; and whether any such telegraph or telephone company, or person, as the case may be, pays the city of Washington, the District of Columbia, or the Government of the United States rent or compensation for the use thereof; and if so, the amount thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference, 1889.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota;

A bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 102) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States Army, upon all occasions of ceremony.

IMPRISONMENT OF EUGENE V. DEBS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. CALL, by request, that a committee of seven Senators be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for an alleged contempt of court.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. I ask that the substitute which I offered in place of the resolution be read.

Mr. CALL. There are several Senators interested in this matter who desire that the resolution shall go over, if it can be done by unanimous consent, without losing its place, until the next meeting of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he ask that the resolution lie upon the table subject to call, so that the Chair will not be compelled to lay it before the Senate every morning.

Mr. CALL. I have no objection to that, the resolution not losing its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to know exactly what is the proposed order. I was looking at the RECORD when the Chair asked for consent. I presumed there would be no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is that the resolution with the proposed substitute shall go to the table subject to call. That was the request of the Senator from Florida as modified on the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HOAR. Does that mean that it is in order for a Senator to call it up at any time, or that it is simply subject to a motion to take it up at any time?

Mr. CALL. I will state that I understand it is subject to be called up at any time, it having gone over without losing its place of preference on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts that under the agreement just made at the request of a Senator the resolution will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. To-morrow; in one day?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Yes, at any time in the morning hour after the conclusion of routine business.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Florida, as evidently no one will want to call up the resolution to-morrow or the next day (which are probably the last days of the debate on the pending bill), whether he had not better let the resolution and the sub-

stitute go to the Committee on the Judiciary, simply referring it. I think I am not presumptuous (though, of course, I can only speak for one) in assuring the Senator that the committee will deal with the subject at its first meeting, which will be next Monday. If they do not, the Senator will then have it in his power to introduce another resolution and get exactly the same right to consideration that he now has for this one. He will not lose anything in his control of the matter. Would it not be better, therefore, as nobody would expect to take it up to-morrow or the next day, to let the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary? I think the committee will report upon it promptly; and if it does not, I repeat to the Senator that he has absolute control of the matter, as he can introduce another resolution.

Mr. CALL. I am disposed to accede to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have no doubt that that committee will act promptly if the reference is made, and I will therefore agree to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 28th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the appointment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.

INVESTIGATION OF MAIL BAG REPAIR DIVISION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. KYLE was read, as follows:

Whereas the character of the wages, work, discipline, and hours of labor in the mail bag repair division of the Government Post-Office Department have been severely condemned by the Washington Times, a reputable newspaper published in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is also alleged by this newspaper that Government mail bags are made by contract convict labor, and that there are also various irregularities in the fulfillment and payments of awards as well as irregularities in other contracts pertaining to the work of this division: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby directed to investigate these charges and report thereon to this body at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, I wish this resolution might be adopted this morning without debate, as it is very simple and in accordance with the direct action of the Senate in such matters. It is not for the appointment of a select committee, as requested yesterday by the Senator from Florida, but an investigation to be made by one of the standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The matter as set forth is in but three lines:

That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby directed to investigate these charges and report thereon to this body at the earliest practicable moment.

That is all there is of it.

The reason for this investigation is set forth in the preamble, where it is stated that—

The character of the wages, work, discipline, and hours of labor in the mail bag repair division of the Government Post-Office Department have been severely condemned by the Washington Times, a reputable newspaper published in the District of Columbia; and whereas it is also alleged by this newspaper that Government mail bags are made by contract convict labor, and that there are also various irregularities in the fulfillment and payments of awards as well as irregularities in other contracts pertaining to the work of this division.

Mr. President, I submit that these are very serious charges against a prominent officer of this Government. I have not had the pleasure of consulting with the Postmaster-General or with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Neilson, but I take it upon myself to say that they would demand an investigation were they present here to-day.

The charge is made in the Times of this city, and is set forth most clearly in a leaded-type editorial of the 21st of January, this year, which I shall read:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE GOVERNMENT GUILLOTINE.

It has been clearly demonstrated by the Times investigation of the department of mail-bag repairs that Uncle Sam is proprietor of a sweat shop almost as objectionable and horrifying in its details as those of New York City. The character of the work is even more repulsive, as it embraces the mending of old sacks impregnated with nauseating smells, and the pay of the employees is based on the sweat-shop system of piecework, and is so low that they must either slave or starve.

Recently the managers of this slave-driving den saw fit to cut down the pay of women employees without interfering with the wages of the men. This injustice illustrates but one of the wrongs to which women must submit who are unfortunate enough to be compelled to work in that place, and as the postal authorities refuse to act on the appeals of these much-abused employees it is time Congress took steps to make an investigation of this lamentable condition of affairs.

The people of the United States do not want Uncle Sam to employ women at the low wages of from 40 to 60 cents a day, especially at work that is as trying and laborious as mending rotten and filthy mail sacks. Nor do they desire to have to allow them to be subjected to the indignities of which some of these poor women complain, and should that information be telegraphed throughout the country there would be a general demand for the discharge of the officials responsible for such outrages.

The miserable excuse of the authorities that "if the women do not care to work at the low wages paid they need not do so, as there are plenty of others in the city who would be glad of the opportunity," is the same apology made by the New York sweat-shop keepers. It is that of a heartless taskmaster who rejoices in the sufferings of those under his supervision; and in this instance, when a reduction of wages puts nothing into the pockets of the Government sweat-shop managers, it illustrates a species of inexcusable cruelty. Let Congress use the Government guillotine on these offending managers. Their official heads should be made to pay the penalty of their misconduct.

Mr. President, I have before me copies of the Times for the past ten or twelve days. The investigation has been made by one of the Times reporters. The wages paid in former days and those paid at the present time are given, and I suppose most members of this body who have read the Times have seen them.

As to work in the mail bag repair division, I wish to say that in former days those engaged in repairing the sacks made from $1.50 to $1.75 per day. Since the piecework plan has been adopted those repairing mail sacks have been cut down to 3¾ cents a sack for mending, one-fourth of a cent being deducted for the use of the machines, thereby necessitating the cutting of their wages to 3 cents for the repair of sacks by the use of the machines. These employees are able by this means, as stated by the Times reporter, to make only about 97½ cents a day.

There is another class of employees—the darners. The darners are those who patch small holes in the mail sacks. They are able to darn from 30 to 50 sacks a day, and for this they get the enormous sum of 1 cent per sack. These employees earn from 50 to 75 cents a day. They are under, let me say, the most rigid inspection that can be made.

More than this, it is learned that these girls are docked when late to their work. Here is the Times' statement:

It is stated that when the women are late at their work, by reason of delayed trains or otherwise, they are fined to the extent of a quarter of a day. A woman who makes 50 cents a day will be paid for that day only 37½ cents.

I might say a word right here, Mr. President, in regard to the character of this work. It is work that is disgusting to a degree. It is work that is sometimes nauseating. After introducing the resolution here yesterday some person in this city saw fit to send me a sample sack by mail, which I received last night. One could smell it across the room, and my secretary directed some one to immediately remove it from his presence.

It is stated by the Times that the old sacks are resurrected from the corners of the basements of buildings, where they have been beds, for instance, of dogs and of cats; and it is stated by employees here that dead cats and dead dogs have been found in the mail sacks that are sent into the Government shop for repair. The women working by the piecemeal method are compelled to stitch, stich, hour by hour, in sweat-shop fashion, upon these sacks, and for the mere pittance of from 50 to 97 cents a day.

I shall not take the time, Mr. President, to read what I have here, namely, a letter from one of the ladies who has worked in this shop of the Post-Office Department and who states the facts exactly as they are. It might be well to place it in the RECORD, and as a part of my remarks.

THEY ALL THANK THE TIMES.

"We are all indebted to the Times for the manner in which it has called this case to the attention of the public," said a woman who as an expert mail-bag repairer gets $1.25 a day as a maximum payment.

"Our next wish is that Congress will speedily take hold of the matter and, in addition to granting us living wages, will put us in better quarters or improve the ones we are now in.

"If all the things were told that could be related about this sweat shop they would make a tale that would change Hood's 'Song of the Shirt' into prophecy. I could recite a dozen instances where weary fingers, worn away at the ends, have plied the needle and thread while tears moistened the cloth the operator was sewing. Often, too, the tears have so dimmed the eyes that I have seen poor women have to get up and leave the room for a while in order to calm their feelings.

"One who has never been in the repair shop has no idea of the filth and dirt there is about the mail bags sent there for repair. Frequently they come in with the holes in them stuffed with every conceivable thing, from paper and wisps of straw to a potato or an onion."

BAD ONIONS AND DEAD DOGS.

"In the big post-offices, where the bags are thrown away in a corner, it is not uncommon that a kitten climbs in the top or through a hole in the side and goes to sleep. Other bags are thrown on top of this sack and the kitten is smothered. Then the whole assortment of bags is sent off here to the repair shop, possibly three months later, and the dead kitten is found for the first time.

"Such things as that are no fairy tales, I assure you, and on an occasion not very long ago I saw three of the girls in the shop faint when a little dead dog was taken from a mail sack.

"One of the most weird, ghastly, and unpleasant tasks falls on our hands when the sacks from a mail car that has been in a railroad wreck are sent to the shop. It is not an infrequent occurrence that the unfortunate mail clerk is killed and his mangled body is thrown among the sacks. I have seen them come to the girls for repair when they were covered with blood, and with here and there a fragment of flesh sticking to them.

"Why these bags can not be cleansed before they come to the women, or be permitted to go through men's hands first, so that some of the most objectionable things may be removed from them, I don't know. I simply know they are sent directly to us, and we have to handle them and inhale all the dust and filthy odors that arise from them."

What is the excuse given by the superintendent of this department, Mr. Neilson, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, as to why these things are tolerated, and as to why these women are compelled to work for starvation wages? When a Times reporter

went to him and made a statement of the case he merely replied, "Well, what are you going to do about it?" In view of these conditions, Mr. President, I believe it is time for Congress to do something about it. Here is what the Times of January 21 said:

The practical position of General Neilson as published in the Evening Times, "Yes, that is all true, but what are you going to do about it?" was, to say the least, unexpected. There was some hope that he had declined to act in favor of the employees for the reason that he was not familiar with the facts. On the contrary, he knows it, he knew it, and justifies it. The excuse of the highest authority on the subject appears to be that if the women could be made to work for less it would be a better thing for the Government. There is only one conclusion for General Neilson's remarks, viz, that there will be another reduction in wages as soon as the women grow strong enough to do more work for less pay. Why not have it done by the Chinese?

This is the burden of all the numerous clippings I have from the Times, of this city. I wish to ask the members of this body whether they are willing now to inaugurate sweat-shop practices in the conduct of governmental business? We are all familiar with the policy of the sweat shop. Investigations have been made by this body and by committees of the legislatures of various States which show that many manufacturers of clothing are in the habit of farming out their goods piecemeal, to be manufactured by "subs," who again sublet the work to other persons, until finally the garments are made in garrets by women at starvation wages. Women in New York City to-day are making shirts for 30 cents a dozen. This system has been inveighed against not only by nearly every State legislature and by Congress, but by every great labor organization and by all fair-minded citizens everywhere. Are we to-day willing to inaugurate sweat-shop practices in a Government establishment under the control of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General? It is protested against by the labor organizations. Last night, at a meeting of the Federation of Labor of this District, comprising more than forty bodies of organized labor, this question was introduced, and the following resolutions adopted unanimously:

Whereas it is the object of the Federation of Labor to use its endeavor to ameliorate the condition of the toiling masses who earn their daily bread from the oft grudging hands of capital; and

Whereas it is openly charged by a reliable and competent authority that there exists in that branch of the Post-Office Department known as the "mail bag repair department" a determined and apparently unscrupulous effort to crush its employees, and especially the female portion, into a state of abject servitude, under a system of work that renders it impossible for even the best operator to earn sufficient for the barest necessities of life; and

Whereas it is also charged that the supply of mail bags is procured by contract with an employer of convict labor, and that such bags are made by such convict labor: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia hereby testifies to its sympathies with the unfortunate employees of said department, and hereby gives its hearty indorsement to the resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator KYLE, and urges its prompt passage, expressing the hope that similar action be taken in the other House, and also that the legislative committee of this federation be, and hereby is, directed to memorialize Congress to that effect and urge thorough investigation of both the charge of maladministration and the employment of convict labor.

That brings up another point, Mr. President, in regard to the mail bag repair division. I had supposed that the Government of the United States certainly did not indulge in the practice of hiring convict labor in the manufacture of its goods, but we have it charged by the Times in its editorial of January 24, and there is a telegram, printed in large type, with leaded lines, from a reputable gentleman in Brooklyn, N. Y., who says:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 23, 1896.*

EDITOR WASHINGTON TIMES,
Washington, D. C.

All the labor in making bags under McNulty's contract is done in Kings County Penitentiary, for which he pays 3¼ cents apiece, making complete.

JAMES TAYLOR.

The Times' editorial of the same day states:

STOP THE PURCHASE OF PRISON-MADE GOODS.

Once again the Times calls on Congress to enact a law prohibiting Executive Departments of the Government from spending public funds to purchase the products of convict labor. Every article in Government use can be had direct from the hands of free labor, and it is not only outraging common decency to deprive honest working people of employment by patronizing jail birds, but there is no necessity for such an objectionable practice. Our exposé of the mail bag repair sweat shop has developed the information that the postal authorities are purchasing mail bags manufactured in the Brooklyn Penitentiary, and it is more than likely that other departments of the Government are also using public money to promote the convict-labor system.

No member of Congress would dare canvass for reelection if it were known that he approved of such a use of public funds. Sentiment throughout the country is too strongly opposed to the employment of convict labor to warrant such a risk, and it is generally understood that the candidate who takes the stump in favor of prison labor is practically as good as defeated. For that reason, if not from a humanitarian standpoint, members of Congress should support a measure to prohibit the further purchase of prison-made goods by any officer or agent of the Government.

On the other hand, it is the duty of Congress to protect free labor. Every article manufactured by convicts not only displaces the product of honest people in our markets, but also cheapens their wages. As a rule, convict labor is hired out to contractors at from 20 to 30 cents a day, and with the assistance of improved machinery jail birds are compelled to turn out about as much work as honest wage earners could produce in the same length of time. It is necessary to state that convict-made goods are sold in the same markets with the products of free labor, and that this competition is one of the causes of our low rate of wages. That fact is too well known to need elaboration, and it constitutes the main reason why Congress should stop the purchase of prison-made goods for the Government service.

This, Mr. President, is a clear statement of the case and a perfectly just arraignment of the practice of hiring convict labor, when thousands of honest American citizens are walking the streets in search of work, and when their wives and children at home are starving for bread.

I think it behooves the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to make an investigation as to whether the mail bags of the United States are manufactured in the penitentiaries of the United States.

There is another matter in regard to this question, and that is the sale of the old, worn-out mail bags. I see it is charged in the Times—and that is a very serious charge—that the person who has control of the old and worn-out mail bags which are beyond repair sells them to the highest bidder in the market. The charge is further made that he has not always turned the checks into the Treasury Department, and that very frequently those checks are returned to the makers of them without having passed through the hands of the proper officials of the Treasury Department. This is a charge serious enough of itself to cause an investigation upon the part of the committee.

Mr. President, I hope that there will be no objection to the passage of this resolution. As I said at the beginning, there is no demand for a special committee; there is no demand for a cent of expenditure. The persons and the papers necessary to be examined are right here in the city of Washington, and an investigation can be made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads without a particle of trouble.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the duty which the Senator from South Dakota would impose upon the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is very serious, and it strikes me, at this stage of the proceedings, as a very unnecessary step.

If the Senator from South Dakota had taken the pains, or would now take the pains and the time, to call at the corner of Seventh and E streets and ask the Postmaster-General, or any one of the Assistant Postmasters-General—any of whom would be quick to see the Senator from South Dakota, if he should present himself in person or by his secretary at their offices—as to whether or not the mail bags are made by convict labor, as to whether or not the people who repair them are people who are poorly and insufficiently paid, as to whether or not the people who repair them are compelled to do such menial and unwholesome work that their health is endangered, he would receive a prompt and courteous and full answer.

Of course, the Senator comes here fortified by the statement which frightens every Senator, that the Federation of Labor, representing 40,000 different organizations, I believe, met last night and indorsed this resolution, which is, of course, an appalling and overwhelming statement, and makes one hesitate to stand for a moment and interpose even the slightest objection to any resolution backed by such an important body of intelligent citizens.

The Senator, however, states that he relies entirely upon a letter in the Washington Times. I understood the Senator to disclaim any sort of personal information on the subject. The Senator from South Dakota is one individual; he is overworked, it is true, but he must sacrifice his life in the public service. If he would only go to the office of the Washington Times and find out what authority they have for their statement, he could then come here armed with some kind of knowledge that would be better than an anonymous editorial. He might inquire who James Taylor of Brooklyn, is, who, I have not the slightest doubt, has made an entirely false statement as to the use of convict labor in the making of Government mail bags. If the Senator would take an hour or a half hour any morning, and go, first, to the office of the Washington Times, and then to the Postmaster-General, he could come here and throw a flood of light on the subject that would make more happy and more intelligent this entire body; but, instead of that, the Senator from South Dakota asks that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads—which really is a serious committee and a committee which has much work to do and which has got work piled up for it for the coming session, more than it can well attend to—sit as a committee of investigation, send for persons and papers, and swear witnesses upon the strength of some anonymous charges in a newspaper published here in Washington.

I speak without any sort of feeling of resentment or hostility to the Senator from South Dakota, or to the manner of the resolution, or to the manner of the investigation, but I do not think it is a fair thing for the Senator to ask that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, consisting of 11 Senators, shall sit under the absolute direction of this body to investigate charges made anonymously, the truth or falsity of which could be ascertained in ten minutes at the Post-Office Department. If we are called upon to do that, it will mean the expenditure of a great deal of money; it will mean the sending for and swearing of witnesses; it will mean the employment of stenographers; it will mean the printing of a report; and then, a thousand to one, it will amount to nothing whatever when you come to the end of it but a tissue of charges that will not stand investigation.

I know that the Washington Times is honestly and fearlessly and intelligently conducting an important investigation, but it may be misinformed; and I know the Senator from South Dakota is earnestly desirous of lifting up labor and its interests, but the

Senator from South Dakota must see that it goes almost to the verge of impropriety upon an anonymous charge to ask 11 Senators to sit week after week to investigate charges of this kind. If the anonymous statements contained in every newspaper in the country were brought to Congress and made the basis of requests that the standing committees of the Senate should investigate them, we should be able to do nothing else but conduct such investigations.

I suggest that the Senator from South Dakota, most important to the other side of the Chamber, should investigate the alleged misconduct of a Democratic Postmaster-General, and if he finds these gross charges to be true—which I do not for a moment believe—that he withdraw his countenance and support from the other side of the Chamber, which he seems willingly to have recently lent.

Mr. KYLE. I wish to say that the Senator from Colorado is beating on the wrong track when he says the Senator from South Dakota is not informed in regard to what he is talking about.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did not the Senator disclaim any knowledge except that received from a newspaper article?

Mr. KYLE. I did not intend to do so if I made the remark. The attention of the Senator from South Dakota was first called to the subject by an editorial in the Washington Times, but I wish to say that the editorials in the Times are not anonymous communications. They are the editorials of a man the equal of the Senator from Colorado, who occupied a position of prominence as a member of the House of Representatives only a year or two ago—Mr. Conn, who has a bank account sufficient to substantiate the statements he makes if charges are brought against him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if the editor has a bank account he is superior to the Senator from Colorado. [Laughter.]

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, if any charges are brought against the gentleman I am sure he will be able to take care of them.

In regard to this subject I wish to state that it is not merely a question of hearsay upon the part of the Times. It is a question which has been agitated among the employees of this institution now for a number of weeks. Scores of the poor women employed there have gone to Mr. Neilson, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and have implored him to take the matter into consideration and put them back again upon work by the day.

In reply to the Senator's suggestion about my going to the Postmaster-General and asking him for information upon the question, let me say if the Postmaster-General were here to-day he would also have demanded an investigation by the Post-Office Committee. It is right that the Second Assistant Postmaster-General should also demand an investigation.

As to Mr. James Taylor, who has been referred to, I will say that he is a perfectly reputable man in the city of Brooklyn, and I have not a particle of doubt as to the authenticity of the telegram or as to the facts communicated in it. If the Senator from Colorado has any doubt as to the facts stated in the telegram he should be one of the very first of the members of the committee to demand an investigation, and let us know if there is any doubt as to the mail sacks being made by convict labor.

There is not a single point made by the Senator from Colorado, so far as I can see, which is worthy of an answer. The Senator from Colorado, I believe, is a member of the Post-Office Committee.

Mr. FAULKNER. He is chairman of that committee.

Mr. KYLE. The Senator from Colorado, I am now informed, is the chairman of the Post-Office Committee. I did not know that before.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will state to the Senator from South Dakota that it was because I am chairman of the committee that I called attention to the matter.

Mr. KYLE. Perhaps the Senator does not like to work. Perhaps that may be the reason for his objection to the resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that because I was chairman of the committee I called the attention of the Senate to the character of his resolution, and I will say to the Senator that I do not like this kind of work, because it seems to be entirely unnecessary and uncalled for, not alone for myself, but for my ten associates on the committee. That was the reason of my objection.

Mr. KYLE. I think the Senator from Colorado ought to be all the more willing to vindicate the Postmaster-General and the Second Assistant Postmaster-General if he is at the head of that committee.

Mr. President, I do not think that Senators should raise any objection to the passage of the resolution. It merely asks, in the first place, that the committee shall investigate the facts so as to determine whether these women are working for the Government upon starvation wages, and whether sweat-shop practices are being introduced in the Government service; and, if the charges are found to be true, to make recommendation by bill or otherwise that these women be placed back upon the old pay allowance of $1.50 or $1.75 a day.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I wish to say in relation to the information which the Senator has regarding the contract system to which he refers, under which it is alleged the mail bags of the Post-Office Department have been made under contract by convict labor, that that is a matter which can not in any way be controlled by the Department. As I understand, there is no law prohibiting such contracts; but there is a law which requires that all bids shall be made after public advertisement and that the contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. So, if the fact is as has been suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, it would be beyond the power of the Postmaster-General to control it under the law as it exists to-day.

As to the other charges which have been made, I admit that they are serious in character. They are formidable as presented and read here from the Washington Times by the Senator from South Dakota. They are so serious that, after having those editorials and communications by the reporters of that paper read, I feel, bearing the relations I do to the Postmaster-General, that it would be but fair to him, fair to the Senate, and fair to myself that the Senator from South Dakota should allow the resolution to go over until to-morrow, not losing its place, so that I can make some investigation, and so that whatever goes before the committee to-morrow may go before it with the facts stated from official sources. I appeal, therefore, to the Senator to yield to that suggestion.

Mr. KYLE. I will state that it is now just about 2 o'clock, when the morning hour will cease, and I shall be very glad indeed to have the resolution go over, without losing its place, so that it may be taken up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota, was read twice by its title, and, on motion of Mr. NELSON, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 102) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States Army, upon all occasions of ceremony, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CIVIL-SERVICE CORRESPONDENCE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE January 28, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be directed to furnish the Senate with all correspondence respecting the enforcement of the civil-service law between the Public Printer and said Commission between the dates of July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895, with a detailed statement of all matters pertaining thereto, together with the correspondence between certain discharged employees of the Government Printing Office and said Commission between July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 2904.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I shall make no apology for doing what is my right here, to exercise the functions of a Senator and discuss the issues presented to the Senate. I know, sir, that custom has made it a rule that new members of this body should listen rather than be heard, and my brief experience—and while in the city I have been very attentive upon the sessions of the Senate—has shown me that the custom is a wise one, because new men who come in here, especially those who, like myself, have had little, in fact no legislative experience, realize very soon that what they do not know about the affairs of this great Government is far more than they do know or can hope to learn without much labor.

My experience has been in a different arena. I am a farmer, pure and simple, with no collateral occupation. The speeches that I have made have been upon the hustings, out in the open air

under the trees, before the common masses of the country, where men are allowed, if they feel disposed, to applaud the utterances of the orator. I find here that the Senate considers it beneath its dignity to applaud anybody, and the galleries are reprimanded severely if they break over the rule and indicate that they approve something that has been said. I find further that no matter how well pleased men are with what is being said—I mean Senators, for I look upon those in the galleries as muzzled automatons merely, you know—the rule is to Gorgonize the speaker with a Senatorial stare, and turn him into stone almost. What has been the result? I find that men eminent in our history, whose speeches are read all over the country, get up here like schoolboys and read essays in a monotone to empty chairs, when the Senate of the United States, supposed to be in session, has gone to the cloakrooms or somewhere else.

Now, sir, this could not have been the purpose and the idea of the creators of the Senate, the fathers who framed the Constitution. This grand deliberative assemblage, the grandest in the world, must have been designed by those who framed the Constitution to be a deliberative body where the ablest men of the country, representing sovereign States, would meet together in council and listen to each other's arguments and the presentation of facts and base their action thereon. But what are we? The mere servants of party, bound hand and foot by the feeling that we must obey the behest of party conventions; and those who speak at all—and God knows there is enough speaking or reading—speak merely for home consumption and to have their constituents read what they have said and what Uncle Sam sends out free through the mails under the frank of the Honorable This or the Honorable That.

Tako any able speech that has been made here—and there have been many made since I have been here—who reads it? Speeches do not get into the newspapers except in a garbled shape. A Senator sends them home to his State. If a speech is eloquent, very cogent, his fellow-Senators subscribe for a few hundred or a few thousand copies, which they send out, and the eloquence and the logic and the argument which it has taken the Senator months to prepare are buried in the records in our archives. His words do not reach the citizens of other States; especially do they not reach the citizens of the party to which he does not belong.

How much of this, Mr. President, is due to self-complacency, to the feeling among you—I hardly feel prepared yet to say among us—that you are the Senate? How much of this so-called Senatorial dignity of which we hear so much and see so much is worthy of preservation? It hangs over this Chamber like a wet blanket; it smothers down independent action; it obliterates the man, and we are here the puppets, the cogs in the wheel of party, to do the bidding of the manipulators of the party machines. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. TILLMAN. Speeches here change no votes. There is not a man on this floor who on any question affecting his party has ever been budged one inch from his position by a speech from a man on the other side. Even though his reason was convinced he felt that he must obey the behest of the party to which he belonged.

Now, sir, while I in part represent South Carolina on this floor, I have a higher conception of my duty than to feel or believe that South Carolina's interests only are in my keeping. I am an American Senator. I have one vote out of ninety which deal with the lives and liberties and property of the people of this country, and unless I discharge my duty in a conscientious manner and from a broad and patriotic standpoint, rising above local prejudices and interests to consider the interests of the entire country, I am unworthy of a seat here.

So far as I know I am the only farmer, pure and simple, in this august body. Yet out of the 70,000,000 people in this country, 35,000,000 are engaged in agricultural pursuits alone. If, tnen, one farmer has broken down the barriers and forced his way here, upon his head rests the responsibility of giving utterance to the feelings, the aspirations of his fellows, and of giving utterance to the sense of wrong which they have. Therefore, Mr. President, I feel constrained to-day to raise my voice to speak, and before I get through you will realize the fact that I speak plainly and bluntly and use Anglo-Saxon, the vernacular, the language of the common people; for I am one of them and I expect to tell you how they feel, and what they think, and what they want.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] said the other day that the question of the free coinage of silver is old straw, that it has been thrashed and thrashed and thrashed; that there is nothing new in it. It has been thrashed, sir, by lawyers; it has been thrashed by railroad magnates; it has been thrashed by the president of this corporation and the attorney of that corporation. It has not been handled on the pitchfork of a farmer. I am here to see if I can not get a few grains more wheat—of truth—in the handling of the question. Farmers use a pitchfork in handling straw, therefore the simile is good if the statement is good. They also use pitchforks to handle manure, and perhaps I shall find some of that in my pathway before I get through.

Of course, the novelty of a farmer pretending to talk finance or to understand the question is so great that most of my colleagues are doing me the honor, I believe for the first time this session, to sit here and listen to me. I thank you, gentlemen, that you have not adjourned and gone off. Whether I shall repay your curiosity or not I can not say. Two things, though, I can promise you: First, that I will try to tell the truth as I see it; and the other is that when I get through, I shall stop. That is not a virtue of many of those who have spoken here, because they have run around a circle, traveling like a kitten following its tail, and have simply tired their fellows out, and they had to leave for self-protection. [Laughter.]

The wise man said long ago that "there is nothing new under the sun," and, of course, those who have been here for years, who have heard these old questions of the tariff and finances talked over and spoken about for months and months and years, feel so tired and worn out and disgusted that the mere names of finance and tariff give them a tired feeling.

What is the position of the Republican party as set forth by its acknowledged leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]? I am sorry he is not here. How did he set it forth in his speech on the 3d of January? What did he propose to do? He said that the present trouble with the finances of the country arise from a deficit in the revenues, and the remedy is to issue more bonds and tax the people. That is all—increase the tariff in order to increase the revenues and issue bonds to pay the deficit and get the gold reserve straight, and we will all be happy. That is the Republican policy. They do not propose any other scheme of relief at this time.

What is the policy outlined by the leader, as you say, on this side, the man who lives at the other end of the Avenue? His policy is more bonds, no increase of revenue—he has enough revenue just now—retire all the greenbacks, all the silver certificates, and perhaps the national banks may graciously come in and fill the void by issuing notes.

In what respect do they differ? Mr. SHERMAN wants coin bonds; Mr. Cleveland wants gold bonds. Mr. SHERMAN wants a higher tariff; Mr. Cleveland wants the present tariff. Mr. SHERMAN, as a means of relief to stop the endless chain—which is a patent contrivance, with thieves at one end and dishonest officials at the other, to rob the American people—wants to keep the redeemed greenbacks in the Treasury, so no one can get them to raid the Treasury, while the President says that the only refuge he sees is to redeem, to blot out, and issue bonds in place of every solitary piece of paper that circulates without interest. And both of them mean contraction, lower prices, harder times.

Neither of them tell us what is to bring relief. Mr. SHERMAN—I will read from his speech presently—does give what he considers a comprehensive, a good scheme for future use; mind you, not now. The whole idea appears to be that a promise of this Government which is a mortgage on the labor of this country for thirty years to come is better than a promise of this Government without interest, which circulates as money in the everyday affairs of the people. Now, I ask any man here who has a scintilla of honesty in his heart or in his brain to tell me the difference between the promises of this Government; and if one of them, which would relieve the people, is good, being to-day at a premium, in the name of fairness and honesty, why should they wish to retire greenbacks and put out another promise that will bear interest? In whose interest is such a scheme brought here but that of the moneyed classes, who are to-day rolling in wealth? The idea is to sink deeper in the bog of pauperism and poverty the sweating, toiling masses, the farmers, and other laborers, who are to pay the interest and redeem the bonds at some future time, possibly.

I saw in the Arena the article which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] quoted in his speech, but deeming it too long for my purposes, and also fearing that the figures might be wrong, I obtained the official documents and prepared a table showing just what this system has cost us. In 1866 the national debt was $2,636,000,000 in round numbers. At that time cotton was worth 43 cents a pound, and it would have taken 12,940,000 bales to pay the entire debt. Wheat was $2.36 a bushel, and it would have taken 1,116,000,000 bushels to have paid the national debt. It may be said that that is not fair, because the inflation just after the war, the unsettled condition, the impoverished and war-wounded condition of the South caused cotton to be abnormally high. Then come down to 1873, when silver was demonetized. The public debt had been reduced to $2,105,000,000; cotton was worth 20 cents, and notwithstanding the reduction of $500,000,000 in the debt it would have taken 22,000,000 bales of cotton to pay it, nearly double what it would have taken at the end of the war. Wheat was worth $1.56, and it would have taken 1,349,000,000 bushels of wheat to pay the debt—upward of 200,000,000 bushels more, notwithstanding the reduction.

Come to 1879, when specie payments were resumed. Cotton was then worth 10 cents, and the debt was $1,996,000,000. It would

have taken 39,000,000 bales of cotton to pay it. Wheat was worth $1.21, and it would have taken 1,649,000,000 bushels to pay it, notwithstanding the reduction. Come down to 1894 and add in the last infamous issue of $162,000,000 of bonds; put that on top of the debt. The public debt was $889,000,000; cotton was worth 7 cents, and it would have taken in 1894, 25,000,000 bales of cotton to pay the debt, more than double the amount it would have taken at the close of the war. Wheat was worth 61 cents, and it would have taken 1,474,000,000 bushels to pay it.

We have struggled, we have delved and plowed—and we furnish nearly all of your exports—during the entire time we have paid in interest and principal on the national debt $3,914,000,000, at an average of 12 cents a pound for cotton, 63,000,000 bales; at an average of $1.25 for wheat, 3,131,000,000 bushels of wheat, and to-day, after all these payments, in the words of the poet, we "drag at each remove a lengthening chain," with a ball at the end of it or a bondholder straddle of it; and to-day it will take more of the products of the farm to liquidate the national debt than it would have taken when the war closed.

I will insert a table giving the figures in detail:

Year.	Debt, interest-bearing and noninterest-bearing, less cash in Treasury.	Debt could have been paid in bales of cotton of 500 pounds each.	Average price of cotton.	Debt could have been paid in bushels of wheat.	Average price of wheat.
1866	$2,636,036,164	12,940,020	$0.43	1,116,922,103	$2.36
1873	2,105,462,062	22,035,118	.20	1,349,719,333	1.56
1879	1,996,414,905	39,928,298	.10	1,649,929,673	1.21
1894	889,313,380	25,916,812	.0694	1,474,284,229	.61
Paid in principal and interest since 1866	3,914,424,855	65,240,414	.12	3,131,539,884	1.25

Sir, in 1861, when the unfortunate civil war broke out, the people of this entire country numbered 31,000,000. Their aggregate wealth was $16,000,000,000. Nearly one-third of our people were in insurrection, endeavoring to break up the Union, leaving, say, twenty-one or twenty-two millions in the North. Gold was hidden: it disappeared from circulation. The greenback was the only stand-by and support of the Union, and no honest man here will deny the fact that the greenback alone enabled the North to conquer the South. To-day we number somewhere between sixty-five and seventy million people. Our aggregate wealth, according to the census, is $65,000,000,000. We are at peace. We are beginning to fraternize in business and in social life, and the anger of the war is passing away, thank God! And yet the same insatiate cormorants, the shylocks, are here prating about the credit of the country and asking you to formulate a scheme and to enact it into law to complete what has been partially accomplished, to put the country on the basis of gold alone, doubling, as they acknowledge it will double, if it has not already done so in a large degree, the debts of every debtor. For whose benefit?

A well-informed man on the Naval Committee told me a day or two ago that by actual computation there were 4,000 millionaires in America, whose aggregate wealth averages $6,000,000 apiece. That is $24,000,000,000 owned by 4,000 people. He said it was going to cause trouble. I think his head is level. It is going to cause trouble, and a deal of trouble, because they have stolen it, most of them. It was obtained by iniquitous laws in favor of classes and corporations, and against the masses, and there has got to be a reckoning some day.

Now, after criticising others for reading essays, I know you will laugh at me, but I got just a little bit frightened, and to keep from saying hard things in an unparliamentary way I took the precaution to prepare a little essay of my own. I hope that you will patiently listen while I endeavor to read it.

It is not saying too much, and I feel warranted in charging that the derangement in our finances and all this cry about sound money and maintaining the credit and honor of the United States, are all part and parcel of a damnable scheme of robbery, which had for its object, first, the utter destruction of silver as a money metal; second, the increase of the public debt by the issue of bonds payable in gold; and third, the surrender to corporations of the power to issue all paper money and give them a monopoly of that function.

After the enactment of the Sherman law in 1890 it was supposed that the price of silver would rise and the ratio between the two metals, as bullion, would be approximately restored to the legal ratio. That law has been defined by the Senator from Ohio as a "makeshift to keep down free coinage." The Democratic platform denounced it as a "makeshift" for free coinage; and the silver Republicans—mind you, instead of this Senate being divided up and down that way [indicating], it is getting divided across this way [indicating]; thank God, for we of the South on this side have been down below, under the heels of oppression, and we are glad to find that west of the Mississippi the "galled jade winces," and that the collar of servitude which has been fastened around our necks and has been there for thirty years is beginning to make your shoulders raw—the silver Republicans, who had been bamboozled into accepting it as a compromise, hoping that it would provide for the absorption of the entire American silver product, found themselves overreached and deceived. It can not be denied that the object of the law was to increase the price of silver and restore its parity, and this must be borne in mind when we come to discuss its provisions. While the struggle was going on in Congress between the silver and anti-silver forces, and it was thought probable that the free-coinage bill would pass, silver steadily rose in the markets of the world, and it did not begin to decline until a month after the passage of the bill, at which time it was 117—within 12 cents of the ratio of 16 to 1.

I desire to call especial attention to this fact as an answer to the assertion, so freely made and so often repeated by gold-bug papers and orators, that legislation does not affect the price of silver, and that we would sink to a silver basis alongside of Mexico, China, and Japan, and have only 50-cent dollars, if silver were restored to its place alongside of gold. That is a stock argument. We have heard it this week right here in this Chamber. It will come in here next week. It will come in here whenever anybody gets up to speak on the other side.

But when it was seen that this country was still controlled by monometallists the price of silver began to drop, and went down, down, down, below even the price which ruled before the enactment of the Sherman law. There was still discrimination against the white metal; it did not have free coinage as gold, but it was a commodity, not a money. It was discriminated against by legislative enactment, and hence the fall. The silver Republicans of the West, who had deserted the silver Democrats of the South and accepted the compromise offered by Senator SHERMAN, may take warning as to what faith or trust they can put in any utterances or actions of the Senator from Ohio as to legislation in regard to our finances. If they are honest in their assertions that they feel the welfare of their States and the welfare of the masses of the people depend upon the restoration of silver to equality with gold, they should be prepared to cross the Rubicon and fight this battle to a finish, under whatever banner shall promise victory and relief. Partisan political affiliations and sectional feeling no doubt largely influenced their action in 1890. The time for another Presidential election approaches. They must understand that the election of any man to the Presidency who would veto a free-coinage bill means defeat. It means more; it means continued disaster to our industries and increased poverty to the masses of our people.

But let me return to the question of the conspiracy. An examination of the tables in the report of the Treasurer giving the net gold in the Treasury will show that under the Sherman law there was a diminution of the amount of free gold in a gradually decreasing scale, but not enough to cause any alarm. During the entire year of 1891 and entire year of 1892 there was approximately as much gold as there was during the years 1884 and 1885. The exact figures are as follows:

Average for the twelve months of 1884, $135,951,036.
Average for the twelve months of 1885, $129,554,162.
Average for the twelve months of 1891, $133,824,344.
Average for the twelve months of 1892, $117,472,893.

There existed then no just cause for uneasiness concerning the credit of the United States at the time of the last Presidential election.

If the secret history of the year 1892 shall ever be written, it will disclose the fact, which can not be proven now, but of which I have not the slightest doubt, that the gold ring of New York, which embraces nearly all the bankers in the Eastern and Middle States and the stock gamblers of Wall street, controlled the Presidential nominations of both the Democratic and Republican parties and had an understanding with the managers, or with both the candidates themselves, in regard to what policy should be pursued toward our finances. They contributed money for the booming of Mr. Cleveland as the only available Democratic candidate, and they abused and ridiculed every other Democratic aspirant. Anyone who was present during the Democratic convention at Chicago could see that there was a large band of organized boomers in the lobby of the Palmer House, where they kept up such a noise and racket that one would have thought that pandemonium had broken loose and all the demons of hell had collected in one group to shout for "Grover." Mr. Cleveland was undoubtedly very strong with the mass of the people, and his patriotic and sympathetic utterances, during his first Administration, in behalf of the agricultural classes gave him great strength; but there is no doubt that money was used lavishly, and that there were pledges made in regard to the distribution of patronage as a means of controlling delegates and securing votes.

There was plain evidence to show that the President himself

had weakened on the question of tariff reform, and the financial plank was cunningly drafted so as to satisfy both gold and silver men, with the intention that it should be interpreted, if Cleveland was elected, as meaning the cessation of silver coinage and the forcing of a gold standard upon the people. Interpreted according to the plain use and meaning of English words, the platform means bimetallism, but there are conditions and ambiguous phrases which have afforded an excuse to the elastic conscience of the bull-headed and self-idolatrous man who holds the reins of power to pursue the policy he has. Whether the scheme was agreed to by the President in person or not and whether he bound himself in plain terms or not will, perhaps, never be known. His course has been unswerving in the absolute contradiction of his public professions and letter of acceptance. The expectations and interests of the people have been forgotten and ignored. The party which elected him has been betrayed, and its banners which floated so triumphantly in the breezes of 1892 now trail in the dust of disgrace and defeat. The practical destruction of the party has been accomplished. As a proof of it, while the national convention is only six months off, there is no one prominently mentioned as its candidate for the Presidency. No one seems willing to offer himself as a vicarious sacrifice on the altar of a disgraced and dishonored party. The Republicans, who had been defeated by such an overwhelming vote at the last Presidential election, are now in possession of the other branch of Congress by a majority unknown to our history, except during and immediately after the war. They are there not because there has been an increase in the Republican vote, but because hundreds of thousands of disgusted Democrats have stayed at home and let the election go by default.

There was no trouble with the gold reserve and no hint of any loss of confidence in the national credit until about the time of the Presidential election. While the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Foster, was contemplating the probabilities of a deficit in the revenue, the raiding of the Treasury by withdrawing gold did not begin until after Cleveland's election.

There were withdrawals of gold in the regular order of business, but the endless chain had not begun to work.

We then, for the first time, got a glimpse of the conspiracy of which I have spoken. Mr. Foster gave the holders of greenbacks and Treasury notes the option of having Government paper cashed in gold or silver, and as they all demanded gold, the gold in the Treasury rapidly ran down. The financial papers took up the cry of the country going to a silver basis, and the first premonitory breezes of the panic of 1893 swept over the land. While there were no reasonable causes to produce distrust, the conspirators fomented it by every means possible and set in motion the machinery of the newspapers which they control, to terrorize the business interests of the country and make ready for the "object lesson" which Mr. Cleveland told us was coming. It was expected by the confiding Democracy that the installation of the new Administration would witness a change of policy. The trust in the President was very great, and, remembering how he had shipwrecked the party in 1888 by his Quixotic tariff message and the emphatic indorsement which he had given to the platform adopted at Chicago, the silver Democrats had reason to expect that he had learned some wisdom and that the Government would exercise its option to pay its obligations in coin, either gold or silver, for its own protection.

The Republicans have stressed the fact in their arguments on this floor that the gold reserve never fell below a hundred millions until after Harrison vacated the Executive office; but it must not be forgotten that they had set the example, had broken the slender prop which had started the avalanche, and, instead of endeavoring to stem the tide of ruin and redeem the pledges of the Democratic party to give the people relief, President Cleveland lent aid and comfort to the conspirators by his utterances and official actions in continuing the policy of his predecessor.

The people by their votes had demanded a change from the Republican policy. A Democratic President gave them a change for the worse by encouraging his moneyed friends, who controlled the newspapers and thus directed the current of public opinion, to hurry up their operations of robbery by means of the panic and to accelerate the downward progress of the country.

We had fondly hoped for relief and every Democrat was supremely happy.

I came up here as governor of my State and stood out in the cold around here on East Capitol street for four hours, nearly frozen to death, to be present at the jollification and glorification upon the inauguration of a Democratic President, with a Democratic Senate and Democratic House, and God forgive me for being such a fool! [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Chair would admonish the galleries that under the rules of the Senate manifestations of applause or dissent are not permitted, and if it recurs the Chair will be under the necessity of enforcing the rules.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senate suspend its rules, and you, of course, must enforce them; but if you will just let me down into the bog and quagmire of Senatorial dignity gently—of nobody saying anything when I speak—I will get used to it after a while, I hope.

We, I say, we Democrats, had fondly hoped for relief. We elected a President to give the people bread and he gave them only stones. While it is familiar to every Senator, I must ask your indulgence while I quote the financial plank of the Chicago platform. But I suppose you have all heard it a hundred and fifty times here and know it by heart, and, therefore, I shall not read it, but just incorporate it in my remarks:

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman Act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal. We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, to be adjusted through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Now, here is an extract from the address of Mr. Cleveland in response to the committee of notification:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN: The message you deliver from the national Democracy arouses within me emotions which would be well-nigh overwhelming if I did not recognize here assembled the representatives of a great party who must share with me the responsibility your mission invites. I find much relief in the reflection that I have been selected merely—

Merely—

to stand for the principles and purposes to which my party is pledged, and for the enforcement and supremacy of which all who have any right to claim Democratic fellowship must constantly and persistently labor.

Again, in the same speech, he said:

I shall not attempt to specify at this time other objects and aims of Democratic endeavor which add inspiration to our mission. True to its history and its creed, our party will respond to the wants of the people within safe lines and guided by enlightened statesmanship. To the troubled and impatient within our membership—

I was one of them. Thank God, I did all I could to keep him from being nominated, but like a royal and true servant of the party, after he had got the nomination, fairly or unfairly, I went home and restrained those who were eager to join the Populists, and South Carolina polled only 2,400 votes for Weaver. I went in the ditch at Chicago with Tammany. Where now is the chieftain of Tammany? I know he has a keen blade, and I do not intend to challenge him to get up here and swipe my head off. I have seen him unhorse and penetrate the armor of so many since I have been here that I dread any encounter with him. Therefore you may consider that withdrawn. It is not in the manuscript of my remarks. [Laughter.]

I go back to Mr. Cleveland. He said:

To the troubled and imatient within our membership we commend continued, unswerving allegiance to the party whose principles in all times past have been found sufficient for them, and whose aggregate wisdom and patriotism, their experience teaches, can always be trusted.

In a tone of partisanship which befits the occasion, let me say to you, as equal partners in the campaign upon which we to-day enter, that the personal fortunes of those to whom you have intrusted your banners are only important as they are related to the fate of the principles they represent and to the party which they lead.

I watched for these utterances, because if he had evinced or shown any purpose of treachery I would have tried to deliver the vote of South Carolina to some other man. Therefore, feeling a personal grievance in the man's action, I am here to-day to arraign him before the American people for his misdeeds, and before the party for his treachery, and to ask for a verdict.

There is not one word here which would warrant one to expect that the leader of the Democratic party, its head and guide, would ignore the platform and treat with contempt the trusted lieutenants whom the people had sent to the national capital to assist in shaping the party's policy. The language would lead us to expect the very reverse. How many of these reasonable expectations have been met? How many of you, men grown old and gray in the service of the party and of the nation, men who were its trusted leaders before this man from Buffalo was ever heard of, how many, I say, have been called into his councils? Speak, if there be any here; I shall be glad to hear them. Where has this man sunk his personality? Whom has he consulted? Whom has he recognized? Whose advice has he followed? None but that of the bootlicks and sycophants, who have crawled on their knees for the crumbs of patronage and betrayed their constituents for the offices in his gift.

In the entire history of this country the high office of President has never been so prostituted, and never has the appointing power been so abused. Claiming to be the apostle of civil-service reform, he has debauched the civil service by making appointments only of those whose sponsors would surrender their manhood, and, with bated breath, walk with submissive head in his presence. With relentless purpose he has ignored his oath of office to up-

hold and obey the law, and has paid out gold instead of coin and issued bonds to buy more gold, by both actions overriding the law, and giving no heed to the interests of any but his moneyed friends—I might say his owners or partners.

Whatever claim of legality may be put forward for the redemption of Treasury notes in gold, there can be none as to the redemption of greenbacks in anything but coin; and the option was given him to redeem the Treasury notes in either gold or silver. While to this besotted tyrant coin has come to mean gold alone, he can not by his mere "ipse dixit" change the law of this land and pervert the plain meaning of the English language. He has sold bonds to buy gold with which to redeem greenbacks when there was a large quantity of silver in the Treasury which, according to law, should have been used, and the law only authorized the sale of bonds for coin. His Republican predecessors and allies who set the unrighteous and unlawful example which he has so persistently followed, and encouraged him in it and still encourage him to the utmost extent, can not escape the condemnation of the honest, working, business men of the country as equal partners in his guilt.

The repeal of the Sherman law, which was the first point of attack of this unholy alliance, was only accomplished through the aid and in conjunction with a majority of the Republican Senators, and this Democratic President so-called, accomplished what was not possible for any Republican Executive under the circumstances to have brought about. A change of the party in power had left a large number of offices in his gift with which to buy votes. Harrison would have had no such advantage. The Democratic party had demanded a repeal of the entire Sherman law as a makeshift for free coinage. But that would have cut this so-called endless chain. The parity clause was absolutely necessary to give excuse and color to a demand for the retirement of the greenbacks as a means of stopping the "issue of unending bonds." So they repealed only so much of it as suited their purposes.

But let us consider what the honest meaning of "parity" in the Sherman law was and is. What is the meaning of "parity" as given in the dictionary? The language is:

To maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law.

Now, if I should lie down on this floor, my head and feet would be on a parity so far as the floor is concerned. If I stand up, my body is still on the floor, but my head is up here and my feet down there. The head in this instance represents gold, the feet silver, and that is the parity which this paragon of Presidents has given us.

It did not say the parity of coin, mind you, meaning the coined dollar. It said the parity of the metals, the ratio of 16 to 1. The words could not mean that upon one metal was to be imposed the duty of holding up the other and of redeeming by itself the paper dollars based on both or on silver alone.

The object was to have them assist each other; to hold silver up by holding gold down, and an honest Secretary of the Treasury, who should have resigned his office rather than submit to the dictation of a besotted chief, would have paid out silver to protect the Treasury from the gold gamblers and bond grabbers, as the law and his oath of office required. But, alas! the old breed of Southern statesmen like Calhoun, who, after a life spent in the public service, had to be buried at public expense and his debts paid by the State of South Carolina, appear to be passing away. No wonder the Senator from Massachusetts feels warranted in twitting us with the decay of Southern statesmanship and charging us with dishonesty.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator will pardon me. Does he allude to what I said the other day?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. I made no such intimation. Another Southern Senator seemed to have understood me in the same way.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish I had the Senator's words here. I did have them, but I did not imagine that anybody could misunderstand their plain and palpable meaning. If you will let me get through, perhaps you will be satisfied with what I am going to say.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to put myself right in this matter, because I said——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly; I do not want to do any Senator injustice.

Mr. HOAR. I have not before me the exact language I used, but I said in substance, speaking wholly of the change of opinion, "What has become of the old Southern statesmen who were the especial champions of hard money?"

Mr. TILLMAN. Wait a minute.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. TILLMAN. Which is the harder of the two, silver or gold?

Mr. HOAR. That is another proposition. I wish to state what I said. I had not the remotest idea of intimating that there was any degeneracy or inferiority in the present Southern statesmen as compared with the past. I referred only to the change of opinion.

Mr. TILLMAN. If any Senator has the RECORD of January 3, will he please turn to the Senator's remarks for me, and I will read them.

Mr. HOAR. I will find it for the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, sir, I want to do you exact justice.

Mr. HOAR. Go on. I will find it for you.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I will stop right now. [A page placed a glass of water on his desk.] I never wet my whistle when I am talking, because I can not run a windmill on water. [Laughter.] I will wait. [A pause.]

Mr. HOAR. I have the extract here, and I will read it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well.

Mr. HOAR. I said:

What has become of the old Democratic party? What has become of the old statesmanship of the South? Whatever else we may have to charge against the people of that section in times past, if we have anything, one thing until lately it always stood for, freedom from debt, economy of expenditure, and sound and honest money, gold and silver. Now, I am sorry to say, with some honorable exceptions, the statesmanship of that part of the country seems to have abandoned all three.

Mr. TILLMAN. "Honest money!" You have chunked us with that infernal phrase until we have got raw under it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. If the honorable Senator from South Carolina will pardon me, what I rose to correct him in was not whether I used the phrase "honest money" accurately or not. That is another question. The charge that I imputed something of degeneracy or dishonor to the present representatives of the South on this floor, as compared with their predecessors, I absolutely deny. I have read the language, which will stand.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am very glad indeed to have the Senator withdraw any such imputation.

Mr. HOAR. I do not withdraw any; I never made any.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is a question of the interpretation of your language, and I interpreted in the way I have, and felt called upon to answer it in the way I did.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I propose to put my own interpretation on my own language, and I suppose the honorable Senator from South Carolina will accept my assurance of what I myself meant by it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do. I exonerate the Senator from any intended insult to the Southern people, but we want to put our interpretation on the English language as to what "honest" means. The word "honesty," if you will pardon me, as applied to money nowadays means that those of us who favor silver are dishonest. We deny it. The country has had silver since its birth as a part of its constitutional money up to 1873. Since the days of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob the two metals have been money until within the last twenty-five years.

I will go on, and I hope I will not tread on my aged friend's toes any more. [Laughter.] It seems impossible for South Carolina to get into this Chamber without Massachusetts getting hold of her. This time South Carolina got hold of Massachusetts, it seems. [Laughter.]

He charges dishonesty, however, in another connection—as the aider and abettor of this Judas from Kentucky, who, after a brilliant career of twenty years and more as leader and champion of the silver forces, has, in his old age, come to this pitiful pass. And then to think that the indictment thus brought against a whole section should have so much color of truth and of fact to back it up, in the apostacy from their principles of the two other Secretaries from the South in the Cabinet of a President who has so disgraced the name of Democracy!

The South bows its head in shame at this exhibition of moral cowardice and despises the renegades; but I must remind the Senator from Massachusetts that there is as yet only moral turpitude and treachery to be charged against these men. I would not have said this if the Senator had chosen his language more carefully. It is here, however, and in it must go. The Southern Congressmen and Senators who came here poor, are still poor. They have not become millionaires like some of their Northern brethren; and there is no Credit Mobilier steal, or Colfax scandal, or Belknap bribery chargeable to any Southern men. Let him remember these things and keep back his sneers and taunts.

So, if the Senator wants to charge the Southern people, through their representatives here, with being dishonest, or if he does not want to charge them with it and chooses to withdraw the imputation to-day, let him remember these facts before he again makes such a statement.

Mr. President, if there has been one idea more persistently and prominently presented to the American people by President Cleveland than any other, it has been the iniquities of the tariff and the demand for its revision. In season and out of season, with "damnable iteration," he has sung this siren song in the ears of the farmers. Listen to this paragraph from his message of 1888:

A century has passed. Our cities are the abiding places of wealth and luxury; our manufactories yield fortunes never dreamed of by the fathers of

the Republic; our business men are madly striving in the race for riches, and immense aggregations of capital outrun the imagination in the magnitude of their undertakings.

We view with pride and satisfaction this bright picture of our country's growth and prosperity, while only a closer scrutiny develops a somber shading. Upon more careful inspection we find the wealth and luxury of our cities mingled with poverty and wretchedness and unremunerative toil. A crowded and constantly increasing urban population suggests the impoverishment of rural sections and discontent with agricultural pursuits. The farmer's son, not satisfied with his father's simple and laborious life, joins the eager chase for easily acquired wealth.

We discover that the fortunes realized by our manufacturers are no longer solely the reward of sturdy industry and enlightened foresight, but that they result from the discriminating favor of the Government, and are largely built upon undue exactions from the masses of our people. The gulf between employers and the employed is constantly widening, and classes are rapidly forming, one comprising the very rich and powerful, while in another are found the toiling poor.

As we view the achievements of aggregated capital, we discover the existence of trusts, combinations, and monopolies, while the citizen is struggling far in the rear, or is trampled to death beneath an iron heel. Corporations, which should be carefully restrained creatures of the law and the servants of the people, are fast becoming the people's masters.

Here I pause to interpolate again the assertion of my belief that during the four years that he was President, from 1885 to 1889, and since he came in again in 1893, he has never had by the hand a simple, square, straight, honest toiler in the field. He knows nothing about farmers, and, more's the pity, he cares nothing about them.

And listen to this:

Our farmers, long suffering and patient, struggling in the race of life with hardest and most unremitting toil, will not fail to see, in spite of misrepresentations and misleading fallacies, that they are obliged to accept such prices for their products as are fixed in foreign markets, where they compete with the farmers of the world; that their lands are declining in value while their debts increase; and that, without compensating favor, they are forced by the action of the Government to pay, for the benefit of others, such enhanced prices for things that they need that the scanty returns of their labor fail to furnish their support or leave no margin for accumulation.

I will pause for a minute here to change the phraseology of the above paragraph, so that it will illustrate with telling emphasis the argument I will use. Let it read as follows:

They, the farmers, are forced by the action of the Government to receive, for the benefit of others, such low prices for the things they sell that the scanty returns of their labor fail to furnish their support or leave no margin for accumulation.

They are burning our candle at both ends, crushing us on one hand with the tariff and robbing us on the other hand with the gold standard, and they have asked us, like beasts of burden, like dumb driven cattle, to bear these things and say nothing, but to vote the party ticket.

The gold standard is responsible for it, and no honest or sane man can deny it.

We can bear any reasonable tariff and prosper under a double standard; and the community of interest between manufacturing and agriculture was never more clearly shown. We want no addition to the producers of wheat, cotton, and other farm products. We want a market for these products, at a fair price, which would enable us to start the factories to running and give work to the hundreds of thousands of idle men and women. Now we can not buy of them because we have no money left to buy with.

To return to Mr. Cleveland. In reading these eloquent and truthful words we farmers were lost in admiration of this man's honesty and courage, for they were true and doubtless honest when uttered. And listen to this from his message of 1887:

In the present state of legislation the only pretense of any existing Executive power to restore, at this time, any part of our surplus revenues to the people by its expenditure, consists in the supposition that the Secretary of the Treasury may enter the market and purchase bonds of the Government not yet due, at a rate of premium to be agreed upon. The only provision of law from which such a power could be derived is found in an appropriation bill passed a number of years ago; and it is subject to the suspicion that it was intended as temporary and limiting in its application, instead of conferring a continuing discretion and authority. No condition ought to exist which would justify the grant of power to a single official, upon his judgment of its necessity, to withhold from or release to the business of the people, in an unusual manner, money held in the Treasury, and thus affect, at his will, the financial condition of the country; and if it is deemed wise to lodge in the Secretary of the Treasury the authority in the present juncture to purchase bonds, it should be plainly vested, and provided, as far as possible, with such checks and limitations as will define this official's right and discretion and at the same time relieve him from undue responsibility.

I quote it for the purpose of pointing out the evolution of a tyrant and of showing the transition from a conscientious law-abiding Chief Magistrate to an arrogant and obstinate ruler who ignores the law and issues bonds at will, and issues them under a statute that is "subject to the suspicion that it was intended to be temporary and limited in its application instead of conferring a discretionary authority." He not only issues them, but does it secretly, with his law partner as a witness to the contract, and has created the suspicion in the minds of millions of his countrymen that a President of the United States can use his high office for private gain.

The suspicion, like a "damned spot," has been burned into the brains of the people, and will no more "out" than Duncan's blood could be washed from the lily hands of the demented Lady Macbeth. And here let me remark, in passing, that this last of the Democratic Presidents (for, mark my prophecy, he is the last that party, as now organized, will ever elect) will go down in history and his two Administrations will be chiefly remarkable; the first as having to deal with a large and unwieldy surplus, which entailed the necessity, as he contended, for the purchase of undue bonds at an exorbitant premium, while his last has been signalized, after a peristent adherence to his pet schemes of finance and taxation, by a deficit, by the issue of bonds, contrary to the law, to pay the current expenses of the Government, and an infamous attempt to increase the bonded debt of the country more than $500,000,000 and the surrender to those same corporations which he so abused of the absolute control of our paper currency.

The Democratic party elected him and reelected him, and would have no other leader. It must bear the odium of his official misdeeds, his utter lack of statesmanship. He has never been a Democrat, measured by the standard of Jefferson and Jackson. His opinions and policy on finance have been those of SHERMAN, who is not a Republican, measured by the standard of Lincoln. He differs from the Republican party only in the one particular of the tariff, and on that he has blown hot and cold as his pet hobby, and will go down in history as the most gigantic failure of any man who ever occupied the White House, all because of his vanity and obstinacy.

Now, to make good this charge, I will recall the fact that when he came to power in March, 1893, and could have called the Senate and House together (Democratic for the first time since the war) to carry his policy into effect, what did he do? Did he call an extra session to give tariff reform to the people—the overburdened and downtrodden people whose wants and woes he had depicted in so many speeches and messages? Oh, no. The policy of gold monometallism, of more bonds, of the substitution of national-bank currency for greenbacks and silver certificates, the scheme which was nearest his heart, first enlisted his care and energetic action. He called Congress together to stop the coinage of silver, and here is his explanation of the trouble and the remedy proposed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress, to the end that, through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty with which they solely are charged, present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

Our unfortunate financial plight is not the result of untoward events nor of conditions related to our natural resources; nor is it traceable to any of the afflictions which frequently check national growth and prosperity. With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distrust and fear have sprung up on every side. Numerous moneyed institutions have suspended because abundant assets were not immediately available to meet the demands of frightened depositors. Surviving corporations and individuals are content to keep in hand the money they are usually anxious to loan, and those engaged in legitimate business are surprised to find that the securities they offer for loans, though heretofore satisfactory, are no longer accepted. Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural, and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

I believe these things are principally chargeable to Congressional legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the General Government.

This legislation is embodied in a statute passed on the 14th day of July, 1890, which was the culmination of much agitation on the subject involved, and which may be considered a truce, after a long struggle, between the advocates of free silver coinage and those intending to be more conservative.

Undoubtedly the monthly purchases by the Government of 4,500,000 ounces of silver, enforced under that statute, were regarded by those interested in silver production as a certain guaranty of its increase in price. The result, however, has been entirely different, for immediately following a spasmodic and slight rise the price of silver began to fall after the passage of the act and has since reached the lowest point ever known. This disappointing result has led to renewed and persistent effort in the direction of free silver coinage.

Meanwhile not only are the evil effects of the operation of the present law constantly accumulating, but the result to which its execution must inevitably lead is becoming palpable to all who give the least heed to financial subjects.

This law provides that in payment for the 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion which the Secretary of the Treasury is commanded to purchase monthly there shall be issued Treasury notes redeemable on demand in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that said notes may be reissued. It is, however, declared in the act to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law." This declaration so controls the action of the Secretary of the Treasury as to prevent his exercising the discretion nominally vested in him, if by such action the parity between gold and silver may be disturbed. Manifestly a refusal by the Secretary to pay these Treasury notes in gold, if demanded, would necessarily result in their discredit and depreciation as obligations payable only in silver, and would destroy the parity between the two metals by establishing a discrimination in favor of gold.

Up to the 15th day of July, 1893, these notes had been issued in payment of silver bullion purchases to the amount of more than $147,000,000. While all but a very small quantity of this bullion remains uncoined and without usefulness in the Treasury, many of the notes given in its purchase have been paid in gold. This is illustrated by the statement that between the 1st of May, 1892, and the 15th day of July, 1893, the notes of this kind issued in payment for silver bullion amounted to a little more than $54,000,000, and that during the same period about $49,000,000 were paid by the Treasury in gold for the redemption of such notes.

The policy necessarily adopted of paying these notes in gold has not spared the gold reserve of $100,000,000 long ago set aside by the Government for the redemption of other notes, for this fund has already been subjected to the payment of new obligations amounting to about $150,000,000.

Here was the dread alternative if the Sherman law was not repealed:

Unless Government bonds are to be constantly issued and sold to replenish our exhausted gold, only to be again exhausted, it is apparent that the operation of the silver-purchase law now in force leads in the direction of the entire substitution of silver for the gold in the Government Treasury, and that this must be followed by the payment of all Government obligations in depreciated silver.

If the alternative was that if we did not repeal the Sherman law we must issue bonds, there was an implied promise or prophecy that if we did repeal it we should not have to issue any bonds.

The cry was, "Stop the purchase of silver, stop diluting our currency, and confidence will be restored." He had waited until the "object lesson," the panic manufactured to order by his fellow-conspirators, had swept like a cyclone over the country, prostrating all business enterprise and industries, and the newspapers had howled in chorus in the ears of the people that the coinage of silver was the cause of the monetary crisis. In the meantime active agents had been at work arranging for the control and manipulation of the Democrats in the House and Senate when Congress should assemble. Congress met, and so well timed had been the date of its assemblage and so cogent the arguments brought to bear that the so-called representatives of the people were swift to obey orders. The party platform and its pledges were thrown to the dogs. Democrats pledged to the rehabilitation of silver surrendered their manhood and their principles at the behest of the money power and its representative, the President, and the purchasing clause of the Sherman law was repealed by the House with indecent haste. Democrats and Republicans vied with each other in the furtherance of the policy which had been formulated and steadily pursued by the Senator from Ohio. If he were here I would take off my hat to him, if I had it on my head, and I do it now typically, as the victor of victors in this financial struggle of a quarter of a century. He has the proud satisfaction of knowing that he has brought the party which he so hates to its knees, and has lived to see many of his old antagonists enlisted under his banner of monopoly and class privileges. They sit at his feet and acknowledge his leadership.

When the Senate met there was an acknowledged majority of men open and outspoken in their determination to stand by the white metal, and who were elected on that issue. But the process of debauchery began. "Vote according to my will or you will have no offices." "Vote according to my will, and if your people do not like it I will take care of you." The newspapers raved and abused the Senate. Bankers telegraphed and wrote. Chambers of commerce passed resolutions, and slowly the Senate yielded. In ninety days the deed was done, and the chains were riveted on the wrists of the toiling millions. Did the raid on the Treasury stop? Was confidence restored? Did prices rise? Did prosperity return? All these things had been promised by this prophet, yet none of them came to pass.

Congress convened in regular session and the farce of tariff reform began. The demoralized and dispirited House, under the whip and spur of the Executive, passed a tariff bill, and hoping to lay a pontoon bridge by which to pass back to their outraged constituents, they passed a bill providing for the coinage of the seigniorage. They wanted to bamboozle the dear farmers by saying, "While we repealed the Sherman law, we coined $50,000,000 of silver," but the President would none of it; and while he attempted to bulldoze the Senate into accepting the tariff measure without amendment, in spite of his simulated vehemence and indignation, the tariff bill was modified in many particulars. It passed finally, and we have had an experience with this measure of tariff reform a la Cleveland.

It is true he did not sign it and allowed it to become a law without approval. But here again we have a spectacle of charlatanry and a hypocritical assumption of superiority to his party which has always marked his career. The tariff law which he repudiated as unworthy, involving "party perfidy and party dishonor," is the sheet anchor to which he now clings.

It is not what the President champion would have given us (so he says); but when we recollect that his managers at Chicago, who controlled the convention and the committee on platform, presented a tariff plank which the convention indignantly refused to indorse, because it was, in the language of Henry Watterson, a "disgraceful straddle," we are forced to conclude that all the hurrah and eloquence emanating from the President on this question have been a blind, used in a Pickwickian sense, so to speak, and that there have been hypocrisy and double dealing in his treatment of this question. If he was honest at the start (and I am willing to grant that much) his associations with Wall street and his connection with wealthy men have debauched his conscience and destroyed all sympathy with the masses. He would not sign the bill, and lectured the Senate as recreant; but if his scheme, carried out only in part, has caused so large a deficit in three years and required the issue of bonds to meet current expenses, what would have been the result had he had his way? He and his Republican allies refused persistently to see that all the trouble was caused by the warfare on silver and the mismanagement of our finances, and that the remedies proposed would only aggravate the disease preying on the body politic.

The fall in prices of all farm products, which are our principal articles of export, has brought disaster and ruin on the producing classes who farm—one-half of our entire population. The impoverishment of the farmers has destroyed their ability to purchase on the one hand, while the decreased price of their products of export in European markets has left our debts for imports and interest on our obligations abroad unpaid. Hence the export of gold to meet those obligations. The boasted "home market" for which the protectionists clamor can no longer purchase the products of our home factories except in largely decreased quantities. The basis of all wealth, agriculture, being depressed and pauperized, all other interests resting upon it are depressed and injured. The Englishman chuckles, as shown by the Senator from Colorado, at the cheapness of the exports which we send him. I will take the liberty, with the Senator's permission, to insert as an appendix the figures furnished from that English paper the other day in regard to the profit of one year's purchase of cotton and wheat, as showing the cause of this deficit requiring the export of gold.

Then mark the result. With the gold being exported to meet our foreign obligations, and the public credit attacked by the gold gamblers with the encouragement and connivance of the President, Rothschild and his American agents graciously condescend to come to the help of the United States Treasury in maintaining the gold standard which has wrought the ruin and only charge a small commission of ten millions or so on one little transaction.

Great God! that this proud Government, the richest and strongest on the face of the globe, should have been brought to so low a pass that a London Jew should have been appointed its receiver, to have charge of the Treasury, with an option on any additional issue of bonds, and presumes to patronize us and promises to take care of our great country! Is there a man here who can think of it without blushing?

I ask in this connection the right to insert as an appendix this infamous contract, with Stetson as witness. I wish to insert also a rehearsal from the Democratic campaign book of 1888, setting forth the history of the purchase of bonds with that surplus which used to keep this man awake at nights. Let me read a headline: "Giving small holders a chance." He did not call for a syndicate to sell him bonds. He said, "Anybody who wants to take money in place of bonds bring them in at any premium you have a mind to charge—125 or 130, along there." They were undue, and he spent a hundred million dollars or so—I do not know the exact amount—in buying those bonds. I have it here. It must be authentic, as it comes from the Democratic campaign committee. [Laughter.] I wish to put the two cheek by jowl—in juxtaposition.

In this connection, before I leave the subject of greenbacks and bonds, I wish to read just a brief paragraph from that campaign speech, that keynote speech of the 3d of January, delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], when he thrashed the old straw over again:

I believe that under existing law the aggregate sum of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890, amounting to about $460,000,000, can be easily maintained at par with coin if the two amendments I have mentioned are adopted by Congress. These notes are a legal tender for all debts, public or private. They are a debt of the United States without interest and without other material cost to the Government than the interest on the cost of the coin or bullion held in the Treasury to redeem them. They are preferred by the people to any other form of paper money that has been devised. They have all the sanctions of law and all the security that has been or can be given to our bonds. They have the pledge of the public faith that they will be redeemed in coin. The substitution of these notes for State-bank paper money was one of the greatest benefits that has resulted from the civil war. These notes have all the sanction, protection, and security that has been or can be given to our national-bank notes, with the added benefit that the large saving derived from them inures to the people of the United States instead of to the bankers.

I left this out a while ago, intending to put it in the opening part of my speech, when I was discussing the relative value and desirability of greenbacks and bonds. One, a promise of the Government bearing no interest, the other also a promise, the difference being that it bears interest and is a mortgage on the people. Here we have the apostle of Republican finance, the apostle of gold, the one before whom you Republicans all bow down and worship as the keenest, shrewdest manipulator in behalf of class privileges and monometallism that ever lived, or that ever will live, I suspect—here are his words in testimony as to the substantial nature of those notes and their value. Now the trouble is that the country is already drying up, is atrophied, palsied in its extremities for want of blood, the circulating medium, money. The brain at Boston and the heart at New York are congested, and they say "We have plenty of money; we do not want any more money." And yet you stand committed to the proposition that those extremities shall dry up and die, rot, be pauperized, and you will not give any relief. Your scheme is not different from that of the President.

I have an interesting book here, and ask the Secretary to read some extracts from it, being excerpts from letters from JOHN SHERMAN during and just after the war, commencing at page 150. There are five of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as indicated.

The SECRETARY. From a letter dated Senate Chamber, Washington, May 19, 1862:

Even under terrible financial pressure and drain of active war, the country is flourishing. Our bonds are above par, trade is active, and produce bears a good price. Much of this may be induced by the inflation of paper money, but gold is abundant, foreign importations active, and foreigners are making investments here heavily. In my experience in public affairs I have never known times more easy.

From a letter dated Mansfield, Ohio, May 7, 1863:

One tendency I noticed—nearly every man in debt is paying off his debts. The inflation of the currency and the rise of property make this easy. Unluckily for me, most of my means is or was "in bills receivable." These are paid, or will be, and so I find myself with plenty of money, but can not buy anything at reasonable prices. This is the general rule of creditors, and perhaps it is better so for the community, as the creditor class can more easily bear the loss of inflation.

From a letter dated Mansfield, Ohio, November 14, 1863:

The wonderful prosperity of all classes, especially of laborers, has a tendency to secure acquiesence in all measures demanded to carry on the war. We are only another example of a people growing rich in a great war. And this is not shown simply by inflated prices but by increased production, new manufacturing establishments, new railroads, houses, etc. Indeed, every branch of business is active and hopeful. This is not a mere temporary inflation caused by paper money, but is a steady progress and almost entirely upon actual capital. The people are prospering and show their readiness to push on the war. Taxes are paid cheerfully.

From a letter dated United States Senate, January 29, 1864:

The currency is awfully inflated, and our ability to borrow and to pay interest has a limit. If the war continues two years longer we shall be terribly embarrassed. Still we have the sure foundation of public credit, a great country, and a large and active population.

From a letter dated United States Senate Chamber, Washington, November 10, 1865:

The truth is, the close of the war with our resources unimpared gives an elevation, a scope, to the ideas of leading capitalists far higher than anything ever undertaken in this country before. They talk of millions as confidently as formerly of thousands. No doubt the contraction that must soon come will explode mere visionary schemes, but many vast undertakings will be executed. Among them will be the Pacific Railroad and extensive iron works like some in England.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, again I regret the absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], because if he were present I should ask him this question, and if he deems it worth while he can answer it hereafter: If, as I have said, with only 22,000,000 people at that time floating the enormous amount of currency issued to carry on the war, with 1,000,000 men or more withdrawn from productive industries to be marshaled under the Stars and Stripes for the maintenance of the Union, the country was so prosperous, with industries thriving, no tramps, no beggars, what did it? Enough money; perhaps too much money, but still enough.

If in 1878, I believe it was, when Congress in obedience to the orders of the people declared that those greenbacks should not be retired, but should be reissued, we could float that much paper money before we had any gold or any silver basis, in the name of common sense and the idea of prosperity, which seems to have departed from this legislative assembly, why can we not now put out six or eight hundred million dollars of greenbacks? Give us the double standard, and we can float that many greenbacks at par with gold and silver any day in the year, and there will be no more talk of the public credit and of the honor of the nation. The struggle, and the only struggle, is whether we shall have all Government paper or all national-bank paper; and if under the behests of the gold ring we are to go to a monometallic standard and to national-bank notes alone, I ask some man to answer why the Government's primary notes are not as good as its secondary notes? The reason is you have your 4,000 millionaires; you want a few thousand more, with about 60,000,000 paupers.

And what are the people going to do about it? Why are these iniquities permitted, and the outrageous and unlawful actions of the Executive unchecked? No man here denies the assertion that it is unlawful to issue bonds to pay the current expenses of the Government, and yet it has been done. There has been a lame explanation attempted, that redeemed greenbacks had to go into the general fund and be reissued, but if they were received for the gold for which the bonds have been issued and they were not used to pay current expenses, where are they? The responsibility of providing revenues and looking after the solvency of the Treasury, which rests with Congress, has been usurped by the President.

Now comes the crucial question for the Republican party. Why have you not impeached him? You have nearly a three-fourths majority at the other end of the Capitol, which alone can formulate articles of impeachment. Why have you not impeached him?

Mr. HAWLEY. How was it with the last Congress? The last Congress was Democratic.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have already paid my respects to the last Congress, and I hoped to have been able to say better things of the one the people have just sent here, but they are both of a kind, a majority of them cowards and tools of monopolies. Why is he not impeached? Because he is carrying out Republican policies, and the majority in the House of Representatives feel safe, the Senators over here feel safe, and you all believe that the Republican party is certain to elect the next President and obtain control of the Government.

You are willing to load down the "incompetent or dishonest Democracy"—I use the words of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and I put it incompetent *and* dishonest Democracy—you are willing to load them down with the odium of the misgovernment, to lend your help by acquiescence in wrongdoing. The policy is to do nothing—"to preserve a masterly inactivity"—and only obstruct where relief could be given. But there is many a slip betwixt the cup and the lip, and in this dark and dismal hour the words of Lincoln, the great and noble martyr—Lincoln, whose Republicanism was Democracy of the purest type compared with that of Cleveland—come like a promise from the grave. This greatest American of the nineteenth century said: "You can fool all of the people part of the time, and you can fool part of the people all of the time; but you can never fool all of the people all of the time." Unless that grand inspired pledge to which he consecrated his auditors at Gettysburg is to be forgotten and come to naught, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth," the people must shake off their lethargy and arouse themselves.

The money changers are in the temple of our liberties and have bought the sentinels on guard. It may be too late. God grant it be not so; but this great Republic can only be saved from the miseries of revolution and internecine strife in the near future by its citizens casting aside blind allegiance to party and marshaling themselves under the banner of Jefferson's Democracy and Lincoln's Republicanism, determined to restore the Republic to the form in which it was left to us by the fathers, and since consecrated by the blood of brothers, shed in civil war, engendered and brought about by just such statesmanship as we have here. The encroachments of the Federal judiciary, and the supineness and venality—corruption, I may say—of the representative branches of the Government are causes of deep concern to all thinking and patriotic men. We are fast drifting into government by injunction in the interest of monopolies and corporations, and the Supreme Court, by one corrupt vote, annuls an act of Congress looking to the taxation of the rich.

Sir, the struggle from 1861 to 1865, which drenched this fair land in blood, was to emancipate 4,000,000 black slaves. We are fast approaching a condition which will place the collar of industrial bondage around the necks of ten times that many white slaves. I would not predict revolution or war if I did not feel that relief must come either by the ballot or that an effort will be made in a few years to obtain it by bullets. You may look upon me as an enthusiast, as an alarmist, or an anarchist, but with the sober convictions of common sense I tell you that the teaching of all history is belied and we must surrender the belief that like causes produce like effects if men expect that the millions now out of employment and the other millions who are working out a hopeless existence of toil year in and year out, the women "stitching in poverty, hunger, and dirt," depicted this morning by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], the men bearing their hopeless burdens of debt, all directly traceable to bad government, will not some day have a reckoning.

You all remember Macaulay's prediction that some day a government would be put in charge of this country by the commune. When that time comes, God have mercy on you millionaires who have stolen so much of the people's money.

I listened the other day to the impassioned eloquence of the Senator from Maine as he appealed for sympathy for the unfortunate Christians who are being butchered by the Turks in Armenia. As he portrayed the ruthless murders and infamies perpetrated on those defenseless people, and called on us to extend the strong arm of the United States to give help, I could but think that he stands here as an ardent supporter of that English policy of finance which has brought untold misery and means absolute pauperism for the masses of our people. And I recalled an incident which I read long since in the Life of John Randolph of Roanoke. It was during the Greek revolution, when the sympathy of all civilized peoples went out to the struggling descendants of the glorious old Greeks who were trying to throw off the Turkish yoke. In many parts of this country efforts were made to raise money to send to the Greeks to help them in their fight for freedom. A lady who lived near Randolph was deeply interested, and had a subscription list which she presented to Mr. Randolph one day as he was mounting his horse after a friendly call. She depicted with glowing eloquence the claims of the struggling Greeks for aid. As on all large Southern plantations at that time, there were a number of negro children around the house. I have seen them in my boyhood; I have got up on the fence with them. They gathered in a row in their scant clothing—one little cotton garment in the summer—on the roadside near by to look at the strange man. After hearing what their mistress had to say, the

eccentric Virginian, with a wave of his hand in the direction of the little negroes, remarked, "Madam, the Greeks are at your door," and with a deep bow he rode off.

I say to the Senator from Maine and to the other Senators who stand here as exponents of the creed which would enslave the American people by the consummation of the scheme to which they are committed: The Armenians are here at your doors. In every city and hamlet and county of these United States they can be found, and I warn you they will not be held down for all time by the Turks who now oppress them. A day of reckoning will come, unless there is no longer a just God in heaven, and when it does come, woe be unto those who have been among the oppressors of the people. The present struggle is unfortunately too like that which preceded the late civil war, inasmuch as it is sectional. The creditor and the manufacturing States of the North and East, those which have grown inordinately wealthy at the expense of the producing classes of the South and West, are urging this policy with the besotted blindness of Belshazzar. The old slaveholders of the South were not more arrogant or more determined. "The sordid despotism of wealth," to use the apt phrase of Justice Brown, is already felt throughout the land.

The Representatives in Congress from those States, without regard to party affiliations, are solidly arrayed under the banner of monopoly and the gold standard. Greed and self-interest seem alone to actuate them. Self-preservation and patriotism should bind the South and West in equally strong bonds of union. We can not afford to longer put party above country.

You have already been told in glowing language by the eloquent Senator from Missouri that the conflict is "irrepressible," and it is easy to see from the temper and feeling of the equally distinguished Senator from Colorado and other Western Senators that the struggle for the new emancipation has begun. And the new Mason and Dixon's line which is drawn, not by the surveyor, but by the denial of the natural and inalienable "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to a large majority of citizens, will sooner or later bring together in the bonds of union the toiling and now downtrodden masses of the cities and the equally desperate masses of the country; agrarianism and communism will join hands. There are millions now on the march, and they tramp, tramp, tramp; tramp the sidewalks hunting work and tramp the highways begging bread. Unless relief comes they will some day take a notion to tramp to Washington with rifles in their hands to regain the liberties which have been stolen from them or which their representatives have sold; and the hitherto conservative force of the Republic, the well-to-do agricultural class, will lift no hand to stay the march, but join it. God grant that our country may be spared the enactment of such scenes as were witnessed in Paris in 1789. But the fair flower of liberty planted by Jefferson in the immortal Declaration of the 4th of July, 1776, watered by the blood of our Revolutionary sires under Washington, can not be uprooted or smothered by the noxious weeds of monopoly and class privilege without bloodshed; and a cataclysm which will give us a military despotism or leave the Republic redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled is just as sure to come as yonder sun shines in the heavens, unless we do our duty here and take the hands of these conspirators off the people's throats and give them an opportunity to breathe, to work, to live.

APPENDIX A.

CONTRACT.

This agreement entered into this 8th day of February, 1895, between the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, of the first part, and Messrs. August Belmont & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, of London, England, and themselves, and Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co., of London, and themselves, parties of the second part.

Witnesseth: Whereas it is provided by the Revised Statutes of the United States (section 3700) that the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase coin with any of the bonds or notes of the United States authorized by law, at such rates and upon such terms as he may deem most advantageous to the public interests; and the Secretary of the Treasury now deems that an emergency exists in which the public interests require that, as hereinafter provided, coin shall be purchased with the bonds of the United States, of the description hereinafter mentioned, authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, being bonds of the United States described in an act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt."

Now, therefore, the said parties of the second part hereby agree to sell and deliver to the United States 3,500,000 ounces of standard gold coin of the United States, at the rate of $17.80441 per ounce, payable in United States 4 per cent thirty-year coupon or registered bonds, said bonds to be dated February 1, 1895, and payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from date, issued under the acts of Congress of July 14, 1870, January 20, 1871, and January 14, 1875, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, payable quarterly.

First. Such purchase and sale of gold coin being made on following conditions:

(1) At least one-half of all coin deliverable hereinunder shall be obtained in and shipped from Europe, but the shipments shall not be required to exceed 300,000 ounces per month, unless the parties of the second part shall consent thereto.

(2) All deliveries shall be made at any of the subtreasuries or at any other legal depository of the United States.

(3) All gold coins delivered shall be received on the basis of 25.8 grains of standard gold per dollar, if within limits of tolerance.

(4) Bonds delivered under this contract are to be delivered free of accrued interest, which is to be assumed and paid by the parties of the second part at the time of their delivery to them.

Second. Should the Secretary of the Treasury desire to offer or sell any bonds of the United States on or before the 1st day of October, 1895, he shall first offer the same to the parties of the second part; but thereafter he shall be free from every such obligation to the parties of the second part.

Third. The Secretary of the Treasury hereby reserves the right, within ten days from the date hereof, in case he shall receive authority from Congress therefor, to substitute any bonds of the United States bearing 3 per cent interest, of which the principal and interest shall be specifically payable in United States gold coin of the present weight and fineness, for the bonds herein alluded to, such 3 per cent bonds to be accepted by the parties of the second part at par, i. e., at $18.60465 per ounce of standard gold.

Fourth. No bonds shall be delivered to the parties of the second part, or either of them, except in payment for coin from time to time received hereunder; whereupon the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall and will deliver the bonds as herein provided, at such places as shall be designated by the parties of the second part. Any expense of delivery out of the United States shall be assumed and paid by the parties of the second part.

Fifth. In consideration of the purchase of such coin, the parties of the second part, and their associates hereunder, assume and will bear all the expense and inevitable loss of bringing gold from Europe hereunder; and, as far as lies in their power, will exert all financial influence and will make all legitimate efforts to protect the Treasury of the United States against the withdrawals of gold pending the complete performance of this contract.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands in five parts this 8th day of February, 1895.

J. G. CARLISLE,
Secretary of the Treasury.
AUGUST BELMONT & CO.,
On behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, London, and themselves.
J. P. MORGAN & CO.,
On behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co., London, and themselves.

Attest:
W. E. CURTIS,
FRANCIS LYNDE STETSON.

APPENDIX B.

[From the Democratic campaign book, 1888.]

BUYING BONDS FOR THE SINKING FUND—EFFORTS TO REDUCE THE SURPLUS BY RELEASING PUBLIC MONEY TO THE COUNTRY FOR THE PURPOSES OF BUSINESS.

In the matter of the management of the national finances, a brief review of some of the difficulties which had to be encountered and of the dangers which threatened the country, and of the manner in which they have been avoided and averted, will satisfy every candid and impartial mind that this branch of the public service was never more ably or more faithfully administered.

On the 30th of June, 1887, the surplus in the Treasury, according to the Treasurer's statement of assets and liabilities, was $45,698,594.15. The expenditures, actual and estimated, including the sinking fund, for the fiscal year 1888 were $316,817,785.48, and the revenues of the Government for the same period under existing tariff and revenue laws were estimated to be approximately $383,000,000. Thus an addition to the surplus during the fiscal year of $66,182,214.52 was expected, making the total surplus on the 30th of June, 1888, $111,880,808.67. This was the situation as it appeared one year ago. It will be seen from what follows that the estimate was far below the reality.

Early in August, 1887, it became apparent that the rapid accumulation of money in the Treasury, which had already created a feeling of great anxiety and uneasiness in business centers, would soon cause severe stringency in the money markets. The time was approaching when the annual shipments of money to the West for the purpose of moving the crops would deplete the reserves in the great cities. This depletion, which in good years is always great enough to increase the loaning rate to 7 per cent and upward, threatened to be so great as to cripple the movement of money so necessary to the welfare of the country, particularly of the great grain-raising sections of the West, and the constantly increasing surplus in the Treasury was daily adding to the gravity of the situation.

At this juncture the Secretary of the Treasury wisely determined that instead of distributing the purchases for the sinking fund over the whole fiscal year, as he would do in ordinary circumstances, he would invest the entire amount, nearly $28,000,000, at once or as rapidly as possible, hoping thereby to so far relieve the impending distress as to tide over the period of moving the crops, and so prevent business disturbances during that critical time. To this end he published the circular of August, 1887, and later the circular of September, 1887, for the purchase of bonds for the sinking fund. The first circular proposed to receive offers weekly at prices to be named by the owners, and when all which were offered at fair prices had been obtained by that method the second circular was published fixing a price at which they would be received.

Under these two circulars the Secretary purchased $24,844,650 of bonds at a cost of $27,842,237.10. No comment is needed to emphasize the importance and vast benefit of this operation. The Secretary placed in the hands of the people nearly $28,000,000 of money with which to carry on the most important business transactions of the year. The wisdom and success of this measure is best shown by the fact that throughout the period when the greatest trouble has heretofore occurred not the slightest disturbance of business was recorded, and the average rate paid for money on call in New York, the great banking center of the country, was never lowered.

Upon completing the purchase of bonds for the sinking fund the question of disposing of the further additions to the surplus was carefully considered. The authority to purchase bonds in addition to the sinking-fund requirements was not considered to be so clear and unequivocal as to justify the Secretary in making purchases.

DISTRIBUTING GOVERNMENT MONEY THROUGH THE BANKS.

The authority to do this, such as it was, was contained in a paragraph in the legislative appropriation bill approved March 3, 1881, and after a careful survey of all the circumstances it was decided that doubt existed, and that all other lawful means should first be exhausted before resorting to other purchases. The only resource left appeared to be in the Secretary's authority to use national banks as depositories of public money. Prior to this time the deposits in national banks had been somewhat restricted by the unprofitable nature of the sums offered to the banks. They were limited to a deposit of 90 per cent of the par value of the bonds deposited by them as security, so that from 18 to 36 per cent of the value of the bonds was practically locked up. In view of the high premium which these bonds commanded as an investment, it was decided to allow a deposit of the par value of 4½ per cent bonds held at maturity and a deposit of 110 per cent against 4 per cent bonds held. The result is best shown by the following statement:

On the 1st of July, 1885, there were 141 national banks whose designations as depositories were in force, and the deposits of public moneys in their hands amounted to $12,928,264.47. On the 1st of July, 1888, there were 294 banks holding public deposits of $59,979,039.63. This is an increase of 153 banks, and an increase of deposits in their hands of $47,050,775.16. In other words, there are more than twice as many banks now acting as depositories as there were three years ago, and they hold nearly five times as much public money as they did three years ago. The great sum of $47,000,000 is now in the hands of the

people as the result of the wise and liberal policy of the Secretary, instead of remaining locked up in the Treasury, as it would have remained under the policy formerly in operation; and the security held for the safe return to the Treasury of the money deposited was ample, for the 4½ per cent bonds held by the Treasury have at all times been worth at least 7 per cent more than the deposits and the 4 per cent bonds at least 15 per cent more. Either class of bonds can be sold at a day's notice, so that no possible contingency could result in loss to the Government.

BUYING BONDS UPON OFFERS FROM THE PUBLIC.

The efforts of the Secretary to keep down the surplus in the Treasury were effectual during the fall and early winter, but the time soon came when something more must be done, for the surplus continued to grow and the measures which had been so effective early in the fiscal year were now inoperative, which were clearly foreseen, and to which the present Secretary and his able predecessor, Mr. Manning, had repeatedly called the attention of Congress without avail. The absorption of public moneys by the depository banks had reached its limit, and the sinking-fund requirements had been supplied, so that nothing remained to be done but to await the action of Congress. There had been discussion of the subject in both Houses, but no material progress toward the settlement of the question had been made. In April, however, the House passed a resolution declaratory of its judgment that the clause in the appropriation bill of March 3, 1881, was still in force, and a similar resolution was passed a few days later in the Senate.

The sanction of Congress having thus been practically given to the policy of purchasing unmatured obligations at a premium, the Secretary promptly, on the day after the passage of the Senate resolution, published a circular, dated April 17, 1888, inviting daily offerings of bonds to the Government. This circular, like those which preceded it in August and September, 1887, invited the people to deal directly with the Government in selling their bonds, being a marked departure from the policy of former Administrations in this respect. All previous purchases had been made through the subtreasury in New York, and a deposit as a guarantee of good faith was required. This restriction placed the business of selling bonds to the Government exclusively in the hands of the professional dealers in securities, and consequently placed individual holders at their mercy. Under the present system the humblest citizen of the United States, owner of a bond for $50, can deal directly with the Government, and his proposal for the sale of his bond receives from the Secretary the same consideration and, if his bond is accepted, the same prompt payment as that accorded the dealer who sells his millions at a time.

THE EFFECTS OF BOND PURCHASES.

Under this circular of April 17, 1888, the Secretary had purchased up to June 30, 1888, $18,383,800 4 per cent bonds, at a cost of $23,347,744.20, and $8,393,050 4½ per cents, at a cost of $9,039,056.20, making a total disbursement on account of purchase $32,386,800.40.

The bonds so purchased, it should be remembered, were not redeemable, the 4½ per cents being payable after September, 1891, and the 4 per cents not until after July 1, 1907. The amount, therefore, which the Government would pay in interest and principal on the bonds if outstanding till maturity would be for the 4½ per cents $9,705,158.31 and for the 4 per cents $32,539,326, making a total of $42,244,484.31.

The difference between this amount and the amount actually paid results in a direct saving to the Government of $9,857,683.91, which, added to savings in 1887 of $4,832,668.62, makes a total saving of $14,790,352.53, so that at the same time that the Secretary of the Treasury was relieving the people by disbursing the money they so badly needed he was saving to them nearly $15,000,000, and making possible a still further reduction of taxation to that amount.

Notwithstanding the utmost endeavors of the Secretary to diminish the surplus, statements published at the close of the fiscal year 1888 show that it is larger than at the commencement of the purchases in August, 1887. According to the statements of assets and liabilities for August 1, 1887, the surplus was then $45,698,594.15, and on July 1, 1888, it was $103,220,464.71, which is an increase of $57,521,870.56, notwithstanding the purchase during the interval of United States bonds costing over $32,000,000, in addition to those purchased in August for the sinking fund, and which were included in the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year.

It has already been shown that the estimates made on June 20, 1887, for the ensuing fiscal year indicated a probable surplus of $111,880,808.67 during the year. The actual surplus was $135,607,265.11, consisting of $103,220,464.71 still in the Treasury and $32,386,800.40 paid for bonds purchased. This is an increase over the estimate of $23,726,456.44.

GIVING SMALL HOLDERS A CHANCE.

When the circular of April 17, 1888, was published, inviting proposals for the sale of bonds to the Government, public notice was given to the country through the press that the names of the persons offering bonds to the Government would not be published. This action was taken in consequence of the unwillingness of the owners of bonds to have their private affairs made public. It was thought that this course would encourage the owners to deal directly with the Department, thereby saving the commissions and profits which dealers would acquire if the bonds should get into their hands, and at the same time increase the amounts offered and sold to the Government. The wisdom of this course was apparent from the outset. Notwithstanding the scarcity of bonds for sale, and the fact that the Government declined to encourage any strong advance in the price, the Secretary succeeded, up to June 13, 1888, in purchasing $15,471,350 of 4 percents and $7,647,750 4½ percents, at a total cost of $27,859,888.15.

At this point, however, a serious obstacle to further successful operation presented itself in the shape of a resolution from the United States Senate, calling on the Secretary for a full statement of his purchases, including names of owners, amounts, and prices. This resolution was introduced by a Republican Senator, who affected to believe that questionable transactions had taken place in connection with these purchases. It was made clear to the Senate during debate that the passage of the resolution would restrict and perhaps entirely prevent further purchases, but by a party vote the resolution was carried, and in obedience thereto the Secretary furnished the information called for, which was promptly printed by order of the Senate and so made public.

An examination of the published statement showed that there was not the slightest basis for the insinuations so freely thrown out during the Senate debate on the resolution, but the attack on the policy of the Administration, which was probably the real motive for the resolution, proved, as had been feared, very effective. Prior to the passage of the resolution the purchases had amounted to $26,119,100, an average of $502,300 daily. Since that time they have been $3,886,900, an average of only $125,350 daily.

A distinctive feature of the purchases of bonds during the fiscal year is the relatively large number of small holders who have offered their bonds to the Government. Heretofore when purchases were made through the Assistant Treasurer at New York the bonds were offered by regular dealers in large amounts, but the offerings up to July 17 under the circular of April 17, 1888, numbered 733, involving a total amount of $107,367,100, and 428 of these offers were in sums of less than $50,000, separated as follows: 61 of less than $1,000, 113 of less than $5,000, 70 of less than $10,000, and 184 of less than $50,000. These figures show the widespread popularity of the Secretary's plan of purchasing bonds.

APPENDIX C.

[From the Statist, London, January 11, 1896.]

OUR FOREIGN TRADE—THE EFFECT OF LOW PRICES.

Our foreign trade in 1895 has been the most profitable in the history of the country, and very much more profitable than it was in 1890, when superficially it appeared to be extremely prosperous. Reckoned by its cash value, our foreign trade has been slightly better in 1895 than in 1894, and much worse than in 1890. In 1890 our imports amounted to £420,692,000. In 1894 they were £408,345,000, and in 1895 they have been £416,618,000. That is to say, our imports have been £8,342,000 greater in 1895 than in 1894, and £4,000,000 smaller than in 1890. As regards the cash value of our exports, an increase of £10,000,000 has occurred in 1895 compared with 1894, and a decline of as much as £37,400,000 compared with 1890, exports in 1890 having been valued at £263,530,000, in 1894 at £216,194,000, and in 1895 at £226,169,000.

The course of our foreign trade as reflected in the cash value of our imports and exports will be seen from the following contrast of our imports, exports, reexports, and total foreign trade in 1895 with those of the ten previous years:

Total trade of Great Britain, 1885 to 1895.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.	Reexports.	Total.
1895	£416,688,000	£226,169,000	£59,971,000	£702,828,000
1894	408,344,000	215,824,000	57,961,000	682,129,000
1893	405,068,000	218,496,000	58,935,000	682,499,000
1892	423,793,000	227,077,000	64,563,000	715,433,000
1891	435,441,000	247,235,000	61,878,000	744,555,000
1890	420,692,000	263,530,000	64,721,000	748,944,000
1889	427,637,000	248,935,000	66,658,000	743,230,000
1888	387,636,000	234,535,000	64,042,000	686,213,000
1887	362,227,000	221,914,000	59,349,000	643,490,000
1886	349,863,000	212,725,000	56,234,000	618,823,000
1885	370,968,000	213,115,000	58,539,000	642,442,000

The cash value of our foreign trade is, however, no guide to its real value or its profitableness. The United Kingdom is a consuming country, and it imports the greater portion of its food supplies, as well as nearly the whole of its raw materials for textile manufactures. These food stuffs and raw materials are sent here in payment for purchases of British manufactured goods, for interest and profits upon capital due to Great Britain from producing nations, and for transport and other services rendered. Consequently, the lower the prices for food stuffs and raw materials the greater will be the quantity required to be sent to this country to meet interest and other obligations and to pay for other services rendered. Further, should prices of British manufactured goods not fall to an extent corresponding to the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce, the profit on the sale of British goods to foreign countries and our colonies would be enhanced.

The conditions of 1895, compared with both 1894 and 1890, have been that prices of foreign and colonial produce have been extremely low, and that, consequently, a great deal more produce has had to be sent to this country in order to meet interest and other obligations. Further, prices of British manufactures exported have not fallen to an extent corresponding to the decline in prices of foreign and colonial produce imported, and consequently the cash proceeds of our exports have purchased a relatively larger quantity of British and foreign produce.

A year ago we drew attention to the effect on our trade of the enormous fall in prices, and showed that whereas in 1894 our imports were valued at £408,500,000, we had for this sum been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce which, had we had to pay the prices of 1890, would have cost us £477,500,000. On the other hand, we showed that in 1894 our exports were valued at £216,194,000, whereas at the prices current in 1890 they would have fetched £246,000,000. On balance, therefore, there was a greater profit upon our foreign trade in 1894 than in 1890 of about £39,000,000.

In 1895 this country has been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce even more cheaply than in 1894.

We have calculated what all the chief articles would have cost had we had to pay and had received similar prices in 1895 to those current in 1894. It is impossible to estimate the prices of a great many articles in either year, but, having analyzed the prices of commodities comprising 60 per cent of our total imports and exports, we have estimated the movement of prices of the remaining 40 per cent on the same basis.

In 1894 the cash value of our imports was £408,345,000, and in 1895 £416,687,000. Had we paid the same prices in 1895 as in 1894, our imports in 1895 would have cost us about £433,800,000. Hence we have benefited from a further fall in prices of foreign produce to the extent of about £17,000,000. On the other hand, the cash value of our exports in 1894 was £215,824,000, and in 1895 it amounted to £226,169,000. Had we been able to obtain the same price in 1895 as in 1894, the cash value would have been £234,800,000. The fall in prices of our manufactures exported in 1895 compared with 1894 thus entailed a loss of $8,600,000, as against the profit of £17,000,000 from the fall in prices of commodities imported. There has thus been a further profit in 1895 compared with 1894 of some £8,500,000.

The cash value of our imports in 1895 was £416,687,000, but at the 1890 level of prices the value would have been no less than £507,100,000. The benefit to this country, therefore, from the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce in 1895 compared with 1890 thus amounted to the enormous sum of £90,400,000. On the other hand, our exports in 1895 were of the cash value of only £226,169,000, whereas at the prices of 1890 the value would have been £267,600,000, thus entailing a loss of £41,500,000, due to the fall in prices. On balance, therefore, the fall in prices in 1895 compared with 1890 gave a profit to this country amounting to about £49,000,000.

We compare below the actual cash value of our imports in 1895 with what the value would have been at the prices current in 1894 and 1890:

Value of imports, 1895.

At prices of 1895	£416,687,000
At prices of 1894	433,851,000
At prices of 1890	507,096,000

Below we give the value of our exports in 1895 compared with what the value would have been at prices current in 1894 and 1890:

Value of exports, 1895.

At prices of 1895	£226,169,000
At prices of 1894	234,802,000
At prices of 1890	267,638,000

In 1895 we purchased 15,688,000 hundredweight of raw cotton, against 16,013,000 hundredweight in 1890, a diminution of 345,000 hundredweight, or 2 per cent; but we paid for our raw cotton supplies £12,327,000 less in 1895 than in 1890. Had we purchased the same quantity in both years the benefit to this country from the fall in price of cotton would have been £11,500,000. In 1895

we purchased 100,118,000 hundredweight of wheat and flour, as against 76,247,000 hundredweight in 1890, an increase of 23,871,000, or 31 per cent, while we have actually paid about £2,451,000 less in 1895 than in 1890, the value of our wheat and flour imports in 1895 having been £30,207,000, against £32,651,000 in 1890. In other words, at the 1890 level of prices we should have paid £42,880,000 for our wheat and flour supplies in 1895, whereas we have actually paid only £30,207,000, a benefit from the lower price of no less than £12,600,000. Our imports of wool for 1895 exceeded those of 1890 by 142,000,000 pounds, or 22 per cent; but in 1895 we actually paid £830,000 less than we did in 1890—that is to say, we have paid £26,321,000 for wool in 1895 which at the 1890 level of prices would have cost us £33,100,000, a benefit of about £6,800,000. In 1895 we imported 31,157,000 hundredweight of sugar, as against 25,693,000 hundredweight in 1890, an increase of 5,464,000, or 21 per cent, and with this enormous increase in quantity we have actually paid £390,000 less in cash, the cash value of our sugar imports in 1895 having been £17,685,000, as agalnst £18,075,000 ie 1890. At the 1890 level of prices we should have paid for sugar imported in 1895, £21,870,000, as against the actual cost of £17,685,000, a benefit from thn fall in price of over £4,000,000.

Below we contrast the values of our principal imports in 1895 with those of 1894, and with their estimated value in 1895, had prices maintained the level of the average in 1894:

Imports, 1894 and 1895.

Articles.	1894.	1895.	1895.*
Cotton	£32,944,000	£30,429,000	£32,426,000
Wheat and flour	26,755,000	30,205,000	29,542,000
Wool	24,791,000	26,031,000	27,277,000
Sugar	19,172,000	17,685,000	20,903,000
Wood	16,086,000	14,917,000	15,140,000
Butter	13,456,000	14,245,000	14,766,000
Tea	9,764,000	10,278,000	10,178,000
Leather	7,094,000	8,051,000	7,880,000
Maize	7,952,000	7,809,000	7,630,000
Bacon	8,084,000	7,936,000	8,902,000
Oxen	8,225,000	7,150,000	7,195,000
Barley	7,090,000	5,538,000	5,354,000
Woolen stuffs	5,665,000	6,472,300	6,765,000
Wine	5,018,000	5,412,000	5,490,000
Cheese	5,475,000	4,674,000	5,156,000
Copper	4,624,000	4,639,000	4,903,000
Mutton	4,341,000	4,593,000	4,935,000
Jute	4,622,000	4,358,000	5,343,000
Beef	4,213,000	4,275,000	4,384,000
Eggs	3,786,000	4,003,000	4,054,000
Caoutchouc	3,272,000	3,760,000	3,693,000
Oats	3,900,000	3,723,000	4,042,000
Iron ore	2,979,000	2,978,000	3,003,000
Petroleum	2,485,000	3,308,000	2,701,000
Flax	2,525,000	3,270,000	3,611,000
Hides	2,231,000	2,804,000	2,732,000
Margarin	3,045,000	2,557,000	2,579,000
Meat	1,490,000	2,040,000	2,302,000
Sheep	805,000	1,782,000	1,769,000
Miscellaneous	20,638,000	21,874,000	23,134,000
Total analyzed	262,527,000	266,856,000	277,849,000
Miscellaneous	145,818,000	149,831,000	156,002,000
Total	408,345,000	416,687,000	433,851,000

* On basis of prices current in 1894.

Below we contrast the values of our principal exports in 1895 with those of 1894 and with their estimated value in 1895 had prices maintained the level of the average quotations obtained in 1894:

Exports, 1894 and 1895.

Articles.	1894.	1895.	1895.*
Cotton:			
Piece goods	£50,219,000	£46,780,000	£47,577,000
Yarn and twist	9,285,000	9,292,000	9,915,000
Total cotton	59,504,000	56,072,000	57,492,000
Woolen and worsted tissues	11,234,000	16,444,000	16,331,000
Woolen and worsted yarn	4,718,000	5,374,000	5,446,000
Iron and steel	14,350,000	15,450,000	15,525,000
Coal	17,371,000	15,443,000	17,383,000
Linen, yarn and piece	4,401,000	5,047,000	5,539,000
Tin plates	4,339,000	4,245,000	4,487,000
Copper	2,365,000	2,825,000	2,785,000
Jute, yarn and piece	2,425,000	2,527,000	2,608,000
Manure, chemical	2,329,000	1,952,000	2,164,000
Boots and shoes	1,614,000	1,582,000	1,629,000
Alkali	1,631,000	1,560,000	1,706,000
Beer and ale	1,463,000	1,524,000	1,532,000
Miscellaneous	7,478,000	8,178,000	8,905,000
Total analyzed	135,222,000	138,223,000	143,532,000
Miscellaneous	80,602,000	87,946,000	†91,270,000
Total exports	215,824,000	226,169,000	234,802,000

* On basis of prices current in 1894.

†Estimated by supposing that shrinkage of prices in 1895 compared with 1894 has been at the same rate as the decline in prices of articles whose values have been analyzed.

Mr. BAKER. The Senate having under consideration the so-called silver bill, I offer an amendment to section 1, and ask to have it read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by adding at the end of section 1 the following provisos:

Provided, That the use of gold and silver as standard money shall be continued on an equality and parity, and in order to obtain such equal and exact result the same legal-tender quality is hereby given to silver as is now possessed by gold under existing laws of the United States, and that the mints of the United States shall be open alike to the coinage of both metals on an equality and parity; that is, the ratio shall be 23$\frac{22}{100}$ grains of fine gold to 371$\frac{1}{4}$ grains of fine silver, and that from this time forward the coinage of gold and silver shall be equal at the above ratio, and any person, firm, corporation, or agency desiring to coin gold into money shall at the same time, and as part of the same transaction, produce an equal amount of silver for coinage purposes and coin the same at the above ratio, and any person, firm, corporation, or agency desiring to coin silver into money shall at the same time, and as part of the same transaction, produce an equal amount of gold for coinage purposes and coin the same at the above ratio. And the mints shall be kept open for such purposes; and upon the production of gold and silver at the mints for such coinage purposes as here specified the same shall be forthwith coined without unnecessary delay, and without cost or expense to the person, firm, corporation, or agency so producing the same for such purposes.

Provided further, That such person, firm, corporation, or agency so producing the gold and silver at the ratio herein specified for coinage purposes may, instead of having the same coined into actual money, deposit the same with and in the Treasury of the United States, and thereupon there shall be delivered in lieu thereof bimetallic certificates similar in form and substance to the present silver certificates, which certificates shall be in denominations or bills of one, two, five, ten, or twenty dollars. One-half such deposit shall be payable in grains of gold and the other one-half thereof in grains of silver until the same shall be coined:

And provided further, That the gold and silver, when so coined as aforesaid into money, may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and in lieu thereof bimetallic certificates may be issued as hereinbefore specified, one-half thereof payable in gold and the other one-half thereof in silver.

The intent and object of this amendment being to put behind each silver dollar coined a gold dollar and behind each gold dollar coined a silver dollar, both on an equality and parity in coinage purposes, legal-tender qualities, and in purchasing and debt-paying power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas will be printed.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CALL. I had given notice that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from South Carolina I would address the Senate, but if it be desirable to have an executive session I am content to take the floor and proceed to-morrow morning.

Mr. GORMAN. Of course if the Senator from Florida desires to proceed this evening I withdraw the motion.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As I stated to the Senate yesterday, I am exceedingly anxious to have some time agreed upon when a vote can be had on the regular order. There seems to be a general desire on both sides of the Chamber that the bill shall be disposed of at the earliest possible moment, and I should be glad to have some agreement as to the time when a vote shall be had on the bill and amendments. I shall be glad to have the views of Senators or any suggestions. So far as I am concerned, I hope that some hour to-morrow can be agreed on as the time for the vote. The matter has been postponed from time to time and no agreement made until now, when I presume there might be some understanding.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator that, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, he request that the time may be fixed when we shall proceed to consider the bill and amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I had intended to make that request in accordance with the Senator's suggestion on yesterday. For the purpose of ascertaining the feeling of the Senate on this question, I ask for an agreement that at 2 o'clock to-morrow the Senate shall continue the consideration of the regular order and amendments thereto under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MORRILL. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that he had better make that request to-morrow morning, when the Senate is full. There are very few members here now, and those who are not here might not feel themselves bound by such an agreement.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think there are quite as many Senators here as there will be to-morrow morning. However, if the Senator from Vermont objects, of course I can do nothing more than——

Mr. MORRILL. I merely made a suggestion to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the request of the Senator from Arkansas to the Senate. It is that to-morrow at 2 o'clock the unfinished business be proceeded with under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MORRILL. I understand that there are four or five Senators yet to be heard on this question. I do not wish to make any objection myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. I can not consent to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Would the Senator from New York be willing to suggest any time at which he thinks it would be agreeable to the Senate or which would satisfy him to have a vote?

Mr. HILL. Just as soon as the Senators who desire to speak have made their speeches, then I have no objection to a vote upon the bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think we could get along more rapidly if some time were fixed for the close of the debate, and I should be glad to have that done if it is agreeable to Senators. Of course I do not want to press it in any unreasonable way, but if we could agree to a vote on Friday I am sure that the time intervening would be quite enough to allow Senators to make the speeches that they desire to make.

Mr. HILL. The speeches are very interesting and they are somewhat lengthy. There are gentlemen giving notice of speeches, and some are speaking who have not given notice. Some have spoken to me who are now absent and who desire to speak, and do not wish their time to be cut off. Without going into further details, and unnecessary here, I simply say I can not consent at present to the arrangement.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator is not willing, then, to consent to fix any day?

Mr. HILL. Any day in the future.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He is not willing to indicate any day now?

Mr. HILL. I should propose the 6th day of February, if the Senator wants me to fix a date. Beyond that I can not at present state.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of course I can not consent to that. This delay has been brought about certainly without any agency of mine. I have endeavored to meet the wishes of Senators as to the time for making speeches. I shall ask the Senate to-morrow to remain in session until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CALL. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I had intended to submit some remarks on the pending bill, but I have delayed, in the hope that a vote might be reached without any further extended debate. I would waive my right, as well as my desire, to speak on the bill if an agreement could be reached to vote to-morrow at 2 o'clock, or at least to proceed to the consideration of the bill at that time under the five-minute rule. If such an agreement can not be had, and others persist in extending the debate with speeches, then I give notice that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Florida I shall desire to take the floor for the purpose of submitting some remarks to-morrow morning.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. I simply desire to say that I chance to know what the Senator from Arkansas is himself unwilling to state, that it is a matter of great importance, if not of absolute necessity to that Senator to be absent himself from this city in the next two or three days. Being in charge of the bill it is very embarrassing to him to go away while it is pending. In view of the fact that it is necessary for him to leave very soon I hope that Senators will forego their desire to discuss at great length and with the consumption of much time the pending bill, when there are resolutions on the table just as pertinent to which speeches may be made. In the interest of the Senator from Arkansas I should be delighted if some agreement to take a vote upon this particular measure at an early day may be made in order that he may be relieved from the embarrassment that now hangs over him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is entitled to the floor and will proceed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Unless the Senator from Florida insists upon going on this afternoon, I propose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator will not make that motion, and that that will not be done. With these delays and with the statement made here to-day that the bill must continue under consideration until a number of speeches are made, I must ask that the Senate shall remain longer in session in the consideration of the bill than two hours a day. We have spent only two hours and fifteen minutes to-day in the consideration of the bill, and if we propose to dispatch public business at all we must stay here until a later hour. I hope the Senate is now determined to remain in session this afternoon until a much later hour than the present before an adjournment.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Arkansas insists upon our going on this afternoon, I am willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will proceed.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the question of the free coinage of silver upon equal terms with gold is a question which ought not to be regarded as a party measure nor treated as a subject of political division. Parties are divided upon the question, and public opinion throughout the country is more or less divided. I have voted upon every occasion in the seventeen years of my service here for the free coinage on equal terms of both gold and silver. I have not done so, however, for the reasons that are given by writers or by advocates upon this subject.

I do not believe that if gold and silver were to disappear from the face of the earth civilization and commerce and the arts would disappear. I do not believe that it is impossible for the ingenuity of man to devise some other method of exchange and of representing value. But I think that the importance, and paramount importance, of this question arises from its connection with other public policies, with the condition of the country and with the natural qualities of these two mediums of exchange.

In order that we may consider in the light of abstract reason this proposition, and not in the light of fancy or of exaggerated and enthusiastic opinion, we ought to consider that the primacy of the two metals which have been termed precious metals in the commerce of all ages is due not to their natural qualities but to the exercise of power.

How is that? How is it that gold and silver have possessed a power of exchange in the use of the world that nothing else possessed? How is it that when a man sells a house for $10,000 and has in his hands the gold or the silver, or both, that that represents the value of that house? Why is that so? These are the considerations which are to be determined in deciding whether or not there shall be free coinage of these metals.

Mr. President, the arguments from analogy, the arguments from the happening of events coeval with one another have no direct point and bearing upon this question. Why is it that the $10,000 in gold or silver received in exchange for a house possesses to the person receiving it the value of that house? It can not be used for any of the purposes of life. He can not use it for subsistence, nor for clothing, nor for the uses which the other metals possess. Neither can any other person use it for any of these useful and necessary objects.

Let us consider attentively that proposition and ascertain why it is that the power to transfer and represent the value of that house is vested in this gold or this silver. The answer is obvious. It is because every man has a use for it, and will exchange for it anything he has, and need for it, and this need is compulsory and can not be avoided, and why is that so? It is because power somewhere has provided the compulsory use of this gold and this silver. The power of government has said that you shall pay the exactions of government upon you, you shall pay your debts, and you shall pay in gold or in silver, or in one to the exclusion of the other. Hence it is apparent that this universal use and demand, coextensive with the power of government, which has the power of confiscation of life, of property, and of all a country's earnings, is created by the power of government making it compulsory for the payment of debts and for the payment of taxes and government exactions. The universal necessity for its use, created by power in all the ages of the world, is that alone which has given to any money the power of representing and transferring values, not of being a standard, not of being a measure of value, for these ideas are foreign to the argument, they have no true relation to it. Money is not a standard; it is not a measure of value; it is a representative of value, and transfers value from one person to another, and it is a representative of value because the power of government has created a compulsory use for it.

This will appear from the consideration of the question. What is the office the $10,000 performs in the transaction? It transfers the value of the house from one person to another. How is the value ascertained, and why should the man say that $10,000 will represent its value to him? It is because other and similar houses can be exchanged for $10,000; that is, the house is measured by the value of other houses, but it still remains to be seen why it is that $10,000 should represent the value of other houses. That is because the $10,000 being of universal and necessary use and demand, persons who possess the $10,000 find those who have land or personal property, or services, and who have the same compulsory needs, are competing with those who own houses for his $10,000. Thus it is that the competition for its use and the relative value of houses, lands, and services fixes the value of the house, and the $10,000 represents expresses, and transfers it.

The owner of the $10,000 says, "I have no need for this money. I have paid all taxes and government exactions, but some one needs it." A person owning personal property says, "I require $10,000 to pay my taxes and my debts; I will exchange my personal property for it." What quantity of personal property? Just that quantity which others will give. What quantity is that? It is the quantity which another man offering services or some other kind of property will take for his services or other property in exchange for the house. For the $10,000 is of no use to the man who has exchanged his home for it, except it be to exchange it for some other house, or property, or services, or to hire it to some other person for their purposes; and the exchangeable value of other houses, property, or services is determined by their relations to each other, and only through this value has it any relation to that thing which, by law, is required for this exchange.

In brief, it is the competition between the uses and needs for money that determines its value in exchange for property and the value of property in exchange for it.

In the days of the Roman Empire, when failure to pay a debt was punished by the slavery of the debtor, when the creditor could take possession of the debtor as a slave, and had the power of life and death over him and his family, the compulsory use of whatever the government prescribed as the means of discharging debt was intensified over the necessity in our day. Still, now as then, the use, the power of representing, the power of transferring value is the creation of that power alone which can create a compulsory use. And as the pressure or necessity of this compulsory use increases, so increases the value of the thing required to discharge it, and the sacrifice of property, labor, and services to obtain it.

If we propose to reason upon this subject we must consider the function of money separated from the thing to which it is attached. What is the office and function of money? It is to represent and to transfer values. How was it created? By a compulsory use. What compulsory use? A compulsory use to meet the exactions of government. What are the exactions of government? They are coextensive with all service, with a man's life in time of war, with his debts of every kind and description, with the taxes imposed by government, and the innumerable and oppressive taxes collected by corporations; and it is this quality of compulsory use, created by government and attached to some visible transferable thing, which constitutes money.

Mr. ALLEN. Fiat.

Mr. CALL. Call it what you please, there is the power, whether it be from use or from the exercise of positive legislation. These uses are apparently to the eye of reason more extensive than any and all others. They include the meeting of taxes imposed by government, the meeting of legal-tender obligations, or the obligations of private debt which may be discharged by legal tender, and innumerable taxes levied through franchise of different kinds on all labor, all service, and all consumption.

We have to start out, Mr. President, not by investigating what writers think was the cause of the revival of business after the discovery of the New World by Columbus, not by analogies drawn from the obscure records and the history of the Roman Empire, not by propositions that money is a measure of value like the yardstick in England, not that it is a standard which has a fixity of value, for there is no fixity of value in money. Money, like everything else, has a purchasing power to-day of one amount and to-morrow of another; it varies of necessity with the varying values of commodities of every kind. To-day your house will buy so much gold or so much silver, or so much of both. To-morrow it will buy so much less, be they legal-tender or not. So it is in its debt-paying power. This varies with the value of commodities. When the bonds proposed to be issued shall mature, the value of property, of commodities in their relation with each other, will determine the value of the gold or the silver which they may buy at that time, with which the bonds must be paid.

So in the argument on this subject in reference to the advisability of creating a legal-tender function and office in either gold or silver or both, the proposition must depend not upon the idea of fixity of value in relation to commodities, not upon the idea of its being a measure of value, not upon the question of the relative value of gold bullion to silver or silver bullion to gold—for that has nothing whatever to do with the question—not with the value of the original bullion of silver or of gold because the bullion gold or silver has not the function and office of money, its legal-tender quality. It matters not, therefore, what may be the relation between the value of gold bullion or silver bullion, because the law creates legal tenders and fixes the relation of that which it creates or destroys. There is no place in the argument and discussion of this subject; there is not, and can never be, any fixed relative value but that which the Government prescribes for a compulsory use, be it gold or be it silver. It is within the power which prescribes the compulsory use to say what and how it shall be discharged, whether by services rendered in the Army, the Navy, or in the civil Departments, or by the payment of so much gold, or so much silver, or so many Treasury notes.

What is the proposition upon which what is called the double ratio or the alternative right of payment of gold or silver rests? What is the idea upon which the theory and philosophy of what is called a double standard or the alternative use of either kind of money rests? What reason can we give in abstract and positive reasoning for the proposition that gold or silver in fixed proportions shall be the method of discharging debts, taxes, private and public obligations? Let us see. It is not because these two metals have a fixed value of themselves in relation to other things, for they have not; it is not because they have natural relations of value. These may be inducements for a preference for them or either of them over other things to attach the money function to them, but manifestly do not create it. It is that no policy of government, no system of monopolies, no restrictions of trade, no combinations shall be able to control the legal-tender money function and office. It is to protect the money of the country, whatever it be, whether gold or silver, iron or copper, or Treasury notes, from combinations which will gather and accumulate it in the hands of a few persons. That is the theory, whether it be true or false, upon which the double use, the alternative use, the optional right to use either gold or silver must rest.

Is it true or is it not? The experience of mankind has sanctioned it. Is it true that the Government may prescribe a compulsory use of gold or of silver, or of both, or of iron or of any other substance, and that that compulsory use is the necessity of paying the exactions of the Government? And are the exactions of the Government now and heretofore coextensive with all the demands and uses of life?

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me that I may move an adjournment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CALL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. With the permission of the Senator from Florida, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 30, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 29, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DONATION OF CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5108) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish eight pieces of condemned cannon to the Veteran Brigade, Grand Army of the Republic, Rochester, N. Y., and also four pieces of condemned cannon to the Brockport Soldiers' Monument Association, Brockport, N. Y.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish to the Veteran Brigade, Grand Army of the Republic, Rochester, N. Y., eight pieces of condemned cannon for the purpose of decorating the burial lot in Mount Hope Cemetery and in the Holy Sepulcher Cemetery set apart for the exclusive use of the veteran soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion; also four pieces of condemned cannon for the Brockport Soldiers' Monument Association, an incorporated body at Brockport, N. Y., for the decoration of the soldiers and sailors' monument recently erected in that village: *Provided*, That the same can be spared without detriment to the service and that no expense is thereby incurred by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I care to interpose objection, but I would like to ask my friend from New York a question for information. I notice that eight pieces of condemned cannon are asked for one organization and four for the other, making twelve in all. I wish to inquire of him how he is to dispose of eight pieces?

Now, the condemned cannon that are available for this purpose, I understand, are limited in number, and the rest of us want a chance at them. Four is the number that is usually granted by bills of this character; and it strikes me that the gentleman from New York is perhaps a little liberal in his demand.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, this request from the united organization of the Grand Army of the Republic in Monroe County, N. Y., is to mark the lines of these two cemetery lots—one in the Mount Hope Cemetery, a Protestant association, and the other in the Holy Sepulcher Cemetery, which is a Catholic institution. In each case 10,000 square feet of ground have been donated by the cemetery authorities to be used solely as a burial place for the soldiers of the war of the rebellion. Each lot is proposed to be marked by placing a cannon at each of the four corners.

The companies and regiments represented in what is called the Veteran Brigade are composed of some of the bravest men who went to the front during the war of the rebellion. The old Thirteenth Regiment was among the first who went to the front, and did service at the battle of Bull Run. The One hundred and

eighth Regiment of New York Volunteers was at Antietam and was badly cut up in that engagement. The One hundred and fortieth started to the front immediately upon the receipt of the news of the battle of Antietam. There are other brave and valiant regiments represented as well in the organization.

I believe this is the only case in which my district has asked for such a donation, and I hope it will not be refused.

The other part of the bill asking four condemned cannon for the village of Brockport is of a similar nature. It is a thriving village of 2,500 inhabitants, and has a large number of veterans in the village and neighborhood.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the resolution which he asks to have adopted now has been reported by any committee of the House?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, sir; it has not.

Mr. DALZELL. How many cannon are you asking for?

Mr. BREWSTER. Twelve in all. There are three cemeteries to be marked.

Mr. PICKLER. Do you think these cannon will go around among us all if this rate of distribution is maintained?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that if every organization of this country is as worthy to have a donation of this kind as the one for which I am now asking, we can well afford to manufacture condemned cannon expressly for that purpose, and enough to go around. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the immediate consideration of the resolution, simply for the reason that I believe the gentleman from New York is asking too much.

We have in the State and city in which I reside a part of our large cemetery set aside for the burial of the members of the Grand Army of the Republic, of which I am a member myself. The cemeteries all through the State of Michigan, in the different towns and cities, you will find in the same condition; and if you give twelve condemned cannon to each separate village in one State, the rest of us are not going to be able to get anything for ours. I think it is altogether too much to ask, and I shall certainly object to it.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the gentleman will withdraw the objection to the present consideration of the bill, I will consent to have it cut down to eight.

Mr. MILNES. Cut it down to four, and then I will withdraw the objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 360) for the relief of Northrup & Chick;

A bill (S. 361) for the relief of Silas P. Keller; and

A bill (S. 818) for the relief of Halvor K. Omlie, Homen, N. Dak.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Frederick Remann, late a member-elect of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 360) for the relief of Northrup & Chick—to the Committee on Claims;

A bill (S. 361) for the relief of Silas P. Keller—to the Committee on Claims; and

A bill (S. 818) for the relief of Halvor K. Omlie, of Homen, N. Dak.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to make a change of reference of a bill. On the 27th instant I introduced a bill to incorporate the National University of the District of Columbia. By inadvertence, I think, it was referred to the Committee on Education. It has been usual to refer such bills to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask that the Committee on Education be discharged from the further consideration of that bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. This is a proposition for a national university, is it not?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is the name of it, but it is purely a local institution in the District of Columbia. It does not apply outside of the District. It simply takes that name within the District, and the bill limits it to the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

PRESUMPTION OF DEATH IN PENSION CASES.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 162) amending section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relative to invalid pensions.

The bill was read at length. It provides for an amendment of the act of June 27, 1890, that in considering claims filed the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing his continued absence for a period of at least seven years, during which no intelligence of his existence shall have been received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill which has just been read?

Mr. ERDMAN. I object.

CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BREWSTER] has consented to reduce the number of cannon asked for in his bill to four. In view of that fact I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. I consent to the reduction of the number to four cannon for the Veteran Brigade.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the consideration of the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 14 the words "two pieces of condemned cannon to the John C. Campbell Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Harrison, Ohio, for the use of its cemetery."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROUT. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

And four condemned cannon for the use of the Soldiers' Home, at Bennington, Vt.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the amendment?

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to discuss the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I have for a long time been voting for these resolutions, sending these pieces of artillery over the country to different institutions. I believe the time has come when we should all have our share; and it seems to me that instead of dealing out these condemned cannon to this post and that post of the Grand Army of the Republic, preceding that, we ought to have six pieces at least for the department of the Grand Army of the Republic in each State and Territory, for the department, as a department, to use. Then, if there are other cannon still remaining, these separate posts might come in. It seems to me that it is more equitable that each department of the Grand Army of the Republic, in each State and Territory where it is organized—and I think it is organized everywhere—shall have six pieces of condemned cannon. I offer that as an amendment. That will distribute these cannon over the country, and not collect them in a few places. It seems to me that should be done preceding the giving of cannon to special posts.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move that as a substitute?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes; I move that as a substitute.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota——

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to donate to each department of the Grand Army of the Republic of each State and Territory six pieces of condemned cannon for the use of those organizations.

Mr. FLYNN. I have an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is the proposition which has just been read?

The SPEAKER. It is a substitute for the entire bill. That being so, the word "provided" should be stricken out.

Mr. PICKLER. Let that be stricken out.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The House must be in order. The gentleman from Ohio will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is stating a point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Speaker has disposed of the point of order by obtaining silence. Now I desire to make a motion to commit this resolution and pending amendment.

The SPEAKER. To what committee?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to commit this resolution and pending amendments to the Committee on Military Affairs; and I would like to have just one minute to say that I fully agree with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER,] that there ought not to be an indiscriminate reaching out for this material. The committee will then have an opportunity to hear every one upon that subject and properly dispose of the question.

Mr. PICKLER. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the bill, with the pending amendments, be committed to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PICKLER. Is that debatable?

Mr. DINGLEY (to Mr. GROSVENOR). It should go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GROSVENOR. At the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], as I did not understand what arm of the service these cannon had to come from, I change it to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the pending bill, with the amendments, be committed to the Committee on Naval Affairs. That is the question now before the House.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the proposition should include the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War. I have consulted both Secretaries, and they have told me that they both have some cannon of this description.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PICKLER. I want cannon that will shoot. [Laughter.] Some of these gentlemen want cannon only for decoration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there might be some difficulty as to what committee to send it to if both branches of the service were included.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I desire to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question.

Mr. PICKLER. I only desire to say in connection with this resolution that if the committee should see proper to recommend the bill, the purpose of which would be to turn them over to the department of the Grand Army of your State, they could do what they liked with your artillery. They could put them up before the State encampment, or they could locate them as they chose. It seems to me that there would be no objection at all to that kind of a distribution. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that this proposition to allow each State department six condemned cannon may work injustice to many States that have large departments, while others only have small departments. If you are going to divide these condemned cannon, it should be done proportionately and equitably among the representatives of the Grand Army of the country; there ought to be some different division than the radical six to each State department. I would like to make some suggestion or amendment by which the committee having charge of this resolution should first ascertain how many condemned cannon there are available for this purpose.

Mr. PICKLER. They will do that naturally.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not know. This resolution presumes that there are at least 400 or 500 condemned cannon existing, when there is no information before the House that there is any condemned cannon.

Mr. BOWERS. There are 500 or 600 pieces, I want to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, lying at Mare Island Navy-Yard, Cal. I went through them with an officer——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. They must have been very small bore then. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BOWERS. They were of small bore and of large bore; some were columbiads and some were rifled cannon that will shoot. There are 500 or 600 of them. I want to say that they are pretty nearly all of large bore. I went over that yard where these cannon are piled up, and many of these cannon are new. I asked the officer what they intended to do with these cannon. He said they would be sold by auction. I asked him how much they would bring? He answered, "Nothing, probably;" that it would cost more for dynamite to blow them to pieces so that they could be used for something else than they would realize. Now, there are hundreds of cannon lying there that may be disposed of just as well as not.

Mr. PICKLER. Even enough for Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all right, if there are plenty of them of sufficient caliber to permit the gentleman to go through.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House is being led to do an unfair thing. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BREWSTER], asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, after modifying it to meet every objection, so that it should give four condemned cannon to a Grand Army post in his district. Then the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] was recognized to offer an amendment to donate four cannon to his district. Then the gentleman from South Dakota comes in with a general amendment, and a motion is made to refer the whole subject to the Committee on Naval Affairs or Military Affairs, or to some other committee.

Now, the gentleman from South Dakota can reach his object by simply sitting down and introducing a bill and having it referred to a committee. I submit to his sense of fairness that he ought not to come in now with such an amendment, in order to defeat this bill, that is offered by my colleague after he has obtained unanimous consent of the House for its present consideration. I hope that he will withdraw his amendment, and that the gentleman from Ohio will withdraw his motion to send it to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that the gentleman from South Dakota will introduce a bill on the general subject, and refer it to a committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to make an explanation. I have no objection to the passage of this bill or of the amendment. I am in favor of it; but the House will see what sort of a condition we are going to get into. I have an amendment here that I want to offer. There are probably twenty-five or thirty other amendments that gentlemen desire to offer. My purpose is to send this bill to the Naval Committee, and then it will have the whole subject before it. It can then ascertain the number of cannon there are that can yet be donated; they will ascertain who have already obtained those cannon; and then they will be in a position to adjust the whole matter equitably and fairly.

Mr. PAYNE. I submit to the gentleman that he ought to introduce his bill separately and send it to the committee, and not seek to deprive my colleague of the benefit of his superior diligence in getting action at this time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from New York knows that if that measure is pressed for hearing now, these amendments will be piled upon it one after another and they will all be adopted, and we shall have a promiscuous distribution of these cannon without anybody knowing just what we are doing.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, there has been a "promiscuous distribution" for many years, and my colleague desires now to have the privilege of a small distribution for his district, and I think we ought to let him have it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not debatable.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, according to my understanding of the case, there will be a large number of these cannon left after you have made the distribution that I ask for of six to each State and Territory, and then I am in favor of the proposition that the committee shall take the whole subject into consideration, shall inquire where these cannon have been granted for the last three or four years, and then, after this equitable distribution to each State and Territory is made, let the committee report to the House how many cannon there are remaining, with any recommendations they choose to make. Now, as to this particular case the gentleman from New York asks for four, and how many does the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] desire?

Mr. GROUT. I desire four for the soldiers' monument at Bennington.

Mr. PICKLER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken on granting those eight cannon.

Several members objected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion of Mr. GROSVENOR was adopted, and the bill, with the pending amendments, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman withdraw that demand for a moment?

Mr. CRISP. We have never had the regular order at this session of Congress, and we would like to see what it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. I ask the gentleman to withdraw the demand, and let me present a resolution.

Mr. CRISP. I withdraw it.

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE JUSTICE CLIFFORD.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford now in the Department of Justice.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney-General of the United States is hereby authorized to transfer to William Henry Clifford, of Portland, Me., a certain portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, painted by Charles Cole, now in the building of the Department of Justice.

Mr. DALZELL. One word in explanation of this resolution. There are now in the building of the Department of Justice two oil portraits of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, of the Supreme Court of the United States. One of them was presented to the Department by Justice Clifford himself. The other is a copy which he had made for his family and which he intended to remove from the Department, but which he failed to remove before his death. I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. Olney when he was Attorney-General, and also a letter written by the present Attorney-General, approving of the passage of this resolution. It means simply the return to the family of the late Justice Clifford of property which belongs to them.

Mr. CRISP. I understand the gentleman to say that the portrait to be returned is a duplicate.

Mr. DALZELL. It is a duplicate.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for the morning hour.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees in their order.

When the Committee on the Public Lands was called,

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 189, which is on the House Calendar. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, we are confined to the House Calendar upon this call.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, is this bill in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it is not in Committee of the Whole. It is on the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report on this bill be read.

The report (by Mr. UNDERWOOD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 189) to amend an act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands, approved March 3, 1883, have had the same under consideration, and report it back with the recommendation that it pass.

Early in 1879 all the lands embraced in a large belt of territory in the State of Alabama were temporarily withheld from sale and disposal upon the report of a special agent of the Land Department that they were valuable for coal. The reservation of this body of lands led to the passage of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. L., 487), providing—

"That within the State of Alabama all public lands, whether mineral or otherwise, shall be subject to disposal only as agricultural lands: *Provided, however*, That all lands which have heretofore been reported to the General Land Office as containing coal and iron shall first be offered at public sale."

It was supposed that by such offering the lands valuable for coal in said district would be purchased at public sale, and thus segregated from agricultural lands.

A considerable quantity of the lands within this territory are purely agricultural in character, and it is apparent that the act of March 3, 1883, has tended to delay the disposal of such lands to meritorious settlers whose claims can not be perfected until a public offering.

The committee thinks that such lands should be subject to entry as agricultural lands under the same conditions as to proof of the nonmineral character that is provided for by the homestead laws.

A similar bill (H. R. 195) had the approval of the Interior Department during the last Congress, and passed the House.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the report fully explains the purpose of the bill, which has been unanimously recommended by the committee and has the full approval of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SETTLERS UPON THE YANKTON RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, State of South Dakota.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That all settlers who made settlement under the homestead laws upon lands in the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, during the year 1895 are hereby granted leave of absence from such homestead for one year from and after the date of this act, and that by such absence such homestead settler shall not lose nor forfeit any right whatever.

SEC. 2. That any such homestead settler may avail himself of the benefits of this act by filing a notice with the local land office describing his land and date of settlement thereon, which notice shall be signed by the settler and attested by the register of the land office.

The report (by Mr. DOWNING) is as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota, have had the same under consideration, and report it back with the recommendation that it pass with the following amendments:

Strike out the preamble.

Add the following proviso to the first section:

"*Provided*, That the settler shall not receive credit upon the period of actual residence required by law for the time he is absent hereunder."

The necessity for this legislation is clearly stated in the annexed communications from the Interior Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does this bill refer to the public lands or to Indian lands?

Mr. LACEY. It refers to public lands. There is only one question involved in it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does it affect the Treasury in any way?

Mr. LACEY. It does not affect the Treasury. It simply grants leave of absence to the settlers on lands in this reservation. Their settlement was made too late in the season for them to plant a crop that year. Under the law, if they had planted a crop and it had failed they could have had leave of absence; but there is no provision of existing law applicable to a case where the settlers go upon the land too late to plant a crop for that year. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office both recommend that the leave of absence be granted, but that the period of absence shall not be computed as part of the five years.

Mr. PICKLER. These parties were late in making their entries on account of the lateness of the President's proclamation.

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir; the proclamation was issued somewhat late, so that the entries made by these persons were too late to enable them to make a crop that season.

The question being taken on the amendment recommended in the report of the committee, it was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AFFIDAVITS IN LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. LACEY. I call up the bill (H. R. 1199) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in initiating a claim to public land under any of the laws of the United States, the applicant may make the preliminary affidavits required before the register or the receiver, or some officer having a seal and authorized to administer oaths, in the land district in which the land is located, such affidavits to be filed with, or transmitted to, the register and receiver, with the fee and commissions, or other payments, required by law.

SEC. 2. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. LACEY. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], that he may explain this bill.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I think the report of the committee sufficiently explains the bill. Its object is simply to facilitate business in the land office and to accommodate settlers who desire to initiate entries, by allowing them to make preliminary affidavits before any officer authorized to administer oaths. A bill similar in its terms to this was passed by the House in the last Congress. This measure has been repeatedly recommended by the Department, and, I think, under more than one Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask whether under the present rules our committee can call up under this order a bill which has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. That can not be done.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask, then, whether it would be proper to ask unanimous consent for that purpose at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. MCRAE. Do I understand the Chair to state that the rules have been so changed as not to allow consideration during this hour of any bill which is in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The language of the rule, unless the Chair is mistaken, is that bills entitled to be called up during this hour must have been reported on a previous day and must be on the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY. We have exhausted the bills of our committee on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER proceeded with the call of committees.

PENSIONS.

Mr. POOLE (when the Committee on Invalid Pensions was called). I call up the bill (H. R. 162) amending section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," passed June 27, 1890, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"*And provided further*, That in considering claims filed under this act the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the continued absence of such enlisted man or officer from his home and family for a period of at least seven years, during which period no intelligence of his existence shall have been received."

Mr. POOLE. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to know how this bill comes before the House?

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair it is properly before the House. As the Chair understands, it comes under the provisions of Rule XXIV, which, under the head of "Order of business," provides that—

Each committee when called may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Does this bill come up for consideration now?

The SPEAKER. It does, if it fulfills the requirements of the rule. The Chair understands it has been heretofore reported and is now on the House Calendar.

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The bill is in order.

Mr. POOLE. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the bill:

"But no widow shall be entitled to the benefit of this proviso where it is shown that the disappearance or absence of her husband was caused by her criminal or unchaste conduct, or where the husband has left home in consequence of a criminal charge or under circumstances from which a desire to return could not be inferred or presumed. And any pension granted under this proviso shall cease upon proof that such officer or enlisted man is still living."

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill changes the existing law in but a single respect. Under the present law a woman can not obtain a pension as a soldier's widow until she has absolutely proved the death of her husband. Experience has shown that in many cases it is impossible to make absolute proof of death. The common law as it prevails, I think, in every State of the Union with reference to the presumption of death after absence for seven years is not followed by the Pension Office. Although the life insurance companies accept as proof of death the fact of seven years' absence, it sometimes happens in the settlement of claims in the Pension Office that a woman claiming as a soldier's widow has been unable to obtain the little pension of $8 a month, although her husband has been absent and unheard of for fifteen, twenty, or even thirty years.

This bill simply provides that in the administration of the pension laws the death of the soldier shall be accepted by the Commissioner of Pensions as proved if he has satisfactory evidence that the soldier has been absent from home for seven years, during which time no tidings have been received from him. The amendment which I have offered appears to provide carefully for cases where the absence of the husband may have been on account of the fault of the wife. One provision of the amendment is that if the wife has been guilty of any unchaste or immoral conduct which may have been the cause of the husband's absence, the pension shall not be allowed. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment covers all possible claim that should be made against the bill; and I do not know that it is necessary for me to detain the House with any further explanation of its provisions.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask what the pending substitute is?

Mr. POOLE. There is no substitute; simply an amendment which I have offered.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask consent that the amendment be again reported.

There being no objection, the amendment was again read.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not think that in the consideration of these pension questions this is the proper mode of legislating. If it be the desire of gentlemen on the other side of the House to amend the dependent act of June 27, 1890, then bring in a bill containing all the amendments sought to be incorporated upon that law; but do not bring in on separate occasions and on various mornings, without notice, these salient and important amendments to the existing statutes.

I am well aware, even while opposing these important alterations demanded by gentlemen or deemed advisable to the existing pension laws, that such opposition will be futile and that I shall be promptly voted down. But I should like to hear some argument adduced as to why the rule of evidence with reference to the presumption of death which has obtained for so many years—from time immemorial—should in reference to pension cases be abrogated and changed in this manner. The rule of evidence, as I understand it, that has been followed and observed by the Commissioner of Pensions in reference to the allowance of a pension is precisely the same rule as to the presumption of death which has obtained and has found favor in our courts and which has been laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. That rule is that there shall be no reasonable doubt as to the death of the decedent.

Now, I appeal to you as lawyers whether that be not the true rule. It leaves it to the discretion of the court. It leaves it for the judge to determine, upon all the evidence which shall be adduced in the particular case before him, whether there be or be not reasonable doubt as to the death of the party through whom the claim is set up.

The objections, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to this change, or proposed change, in the rule of evidence, is that you open the door wide to possible fraud. The rule which was laid down by our highest Federal court is a safe and a salutary one. It can be made to apply justly to every condition of affairs. The change advocated, however, in the pending bill opens the door to fraud, as I have stated, because by collusion or by intentional fraud you can well imagine that it may be made to appear that a party is dead when, as a matter of fact, he is living, though possibly concealed. Such cases come up daily. They are reported in the daily journals every week.

For these reasons I submit that we should not, without due consideration and without debate, without the bringing forward of a single reason that can appeal to a lawyer or to a layman—we should not arbitrarily change a rule of evidence which has prevailed for so long a time and which has proved so salutary in our court practice.

Mr. GRAFF. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Certainly.

Mr. GRAFF. Does the gentleman think that it is the rule at common law, applied to a general case tried at common law, that it is incumbent on the party seeking to prove the death of an absent person to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the absence does establish the death of the party? Is it not the rule of evidence, on the contrary, whenever the absence is proven to exist under circumstances which tend to show the possibility of death, that that is sufficient in all cases, outside of a construction of the pension law, to establish the death of the party after a period of seven years?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, I do not think so. I think that the statement of the common law just made by the gentleman is erroneous. I understand the rule of evidence is that laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States, that there must be no reasonable doubt as to the death of the decedent, because that is a jurisdictional fact. It is a condition precedent, and there must be no doubt as to the existence of that fact.

Mr. GRAFF. Is there any different rule applying to jurisdictional questions that does not apply to any other question; and is it not true that in New York administration is had upon the estate on proof that the decedent had been absent for a period of seven years under such circumstances as to show the probable death of the decedent, this probability established or decided by the preponderance of evidence?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to give instruction to the gentleman as to the various rulings of the courts or upon the law in general. The only question which I am considering this morning is the proposed amendment to the dependent pension act of June 27, 1890. I have heard no good reason given why the amendment should find favor. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if this amendment grows out of the recent ruling of the Interior Department in regard to Melinda L. Crider? In this instance it seems that the Secretary of the Interior rules that she must prove the death of her husband beyond a question of doubt, not allowing the common-law presumption of seven years' absence. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report of the committee upon this bill be read.

The SPEAKER. It may be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 162) to amend section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions, report as follows:

In the administration of the pension laws there seems to have been a lack of uniformity in the decisions upon the question of what evidence is required to prove the fact of death of the person through whom the title to pension obtains. In some cases the common-law presumption of death after an absence of seven years has been recognized, while in other cases this presumption has been substantially ignored.

In the comparatively recent case of Melinda L. Crider, the Secretary of the Interior laid down the following rule:

"Independent of absence for any period of time, it must be held in pension cases that the facts attending the absence must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the party is dead."—*Decisions of Department of Interior in Pension Cases*, Volume VII, page 462.

Under this decision, which is now recognized as binding by the officers of the Pension Bureau, many otherwise meritorious claims of widows and minor children under the act of June 27, 1890, have been rejected, and the claimants have either abandoned their claims or have applied to Congress for relief by private bill. The number of these private bills is constantly increasing and the time of the committees of Congress largely taken up by their consideration. It is believed that the bill under consideration and herewith reported will settle the practice in this class of pension cases without injustice to worthy claimants and at the same time relieve Congress of the burden of their consideration. The interests of the General Government seem to have been fully protected in the bill.

Your committee therefore unanimously recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The purpose I had was to draw out the fact that this amendment was to meet this ruling by the Interior Department. I must confess that I think this ruling is a severe one, and it does not meet with my approbation.

I yield the time back to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. ERDMAN. This bill as it is now amended is, I think, entirely proper. I do not recognize the authority of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] to be the expounder of pension doctrine for all on this side. This bill practically conforms to the common-law rule, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], who objects to it, will examine it I think he will find that is the case. That is what we want and what we are willing to support.

Mr. BRUMM. I should like to ask whether an amendment to the amendment would be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order.

Mr. BRUMM. In reading the amendment I find that it is very ambiguous, and there is a section in it which I can not understand. I have shown it to one or two other gentlemen, and they are unable to understand it. After the clause which reads—

Or where the husband has left home in consequence of a criminal charge—

the following has been inserted in pencil—

or under circumstances from which a desire to return could not be inferred or presumed.

It seems to me that is very ambiguous, and to me it is meaningless. I move, as an amendment to the amendment, the striking out of the last clause which I have read. I do that for the purpose of making the provision intelligible.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Has any amendment to the printed bill been adopted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then is the question open for discussion?

The SPEAKER. The question is open for an amendment to the amendment. An amendment has been offered which is now pending, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] proposes to offer an amendment to the amendment, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. STEELE. I hope all amendments will be voted down.

Mr. GIBSON. The amendment striking out that last clause should be adopted.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should like to say just this much. I shall detain the House only a few moments. There is no need of any amendment to this bill as it comes from the committee. It presents the simple rule of the common law. One of the presumptions of the common law, as I understand it, from which the adjudications in most of the States have grown up, is that the unexplained absence from home of an individual for seven years raises the presumption of his death, and that is exactly what ought to be the rule in these cases. We ought not to encumber this bill with any explanatory or defamatory amendments.

I want to give the House an illustration of the operation of the rule of the Pension Office. Let it be understood that I am not criticising any Administration. I do not know under what Administration the rule grew up. It has been enforced under more than one Administration. A case like this occurred in my own Congressional district. A gentleman who had held a high position in the Army, as high at least as that of lieutenant-colonel of a regiment, a man of spotless character, went to Baltimore in 1867 with two carloads of stock which he had bought on credit from his neighbors in large part.

He sold the stock at a profit; he drew his money, and said to his friends there, the stockmen, that he should take the Baltimore and Ohio train for home the next morning. He has never been heard of since. Something like eight years afterwards administration was granted in Ohio. The debts were settled as well as they could be. The entire estate was swept away. The widow's dower probably was apportioned to her, and an entire closing or settlement of his estate was made, and yet to-day his widow, helpless and dependent, is met constantly with the requirement: When, where, and under what circumstances did your husband die?

Mr. STEELE. And the pension not allowed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The pension has been rejected. Now, there is another fact I want to mention here. We have lived in the other States and seen that in the administration of estates this presumption of common law has grown up, and there is no necessity for any amendment. We will find the administration of the law itself thus settled will stand under this provision. One of these amendments gives an opportunity to any designing person to send out a drag net all through a man's life, for twenty or twenty-five years, to get some rumor that there was something connected with his disappearance that perhaps would explain his absence. There is no necessity for that, and the bill ought not to be loaded down with amendments of that character.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of this bill and the committee to what seems to me to be a faulty expression in the bill itself. I presume the purpose of the bill is to fix the limit of seven years' absence as all that is necessary to establish the fact of death sufficiently for the granting of a pension. The way the bill reads that will not be accomplished. It says:

That in considering claims filed under this act, the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the continued absence of such enlisted man or officer from his home and family for a period of at least seven years.

With these words "at least" in, this act could only establish a minimum limit and not a maximum, and there would be nothing in it to prevent the Commissioner of Pensions from requiring fourteen or twenty-one years. If the purpose be to establish a seven-year limit, the words "at least" should be taken out.

Mr. MILES. The committee accepts your suggestion to take out the words "at least," and consents that they be stricken out and the report of the committee be taken as without those words.

Mr. POOLE. I will accept that.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. With these words out, I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read a letter I have just this moment received in regard to this matter from my distinguished predecessor on this floor, ex-Governor John D. Long, giving a case just in point.

Mr. MILES. Can that letter be read without unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It can be read as a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MILES. Very well, if it be so understood.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOSTON, *January 28, 1896.*

DEAR MORSE: In Mrs. Quigley's case, in which I take a very earnest interest for the poor woman, it is evident that the only way is to get a correction of the war records where he is recorded as a deserter, when the fact is he was killed in the Seven Days' fight in August, 1862. Colonel Parsons, our State pension agent, says that you had better see Ainsworth, who is the War Department clerk in charge of those records, and lay before him the inclosed affidavits. I know both the affiants. They are neighbors of mine and entirely credible and worthy. I feel quite confident that you can get the record amended. It is one of the cruelest cases I know. A poor woman, in need, growing old, and refused a pension although her husband was killed, simply because his body was not found. How could it be found when our Army was defeated and driven back? He has never been heard of from that day to this, and how idle to call him a deserter. I have no interest in this except as a neighbor and townsman, and of course make no charge for services. I take pleasure in giving freely anything I can do. Please do see the thing righted on the records. If you can't do it there, get a bill through Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. LONG.

Hon. E. A. MORSE, *Washington, D. C.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read in my time an affidavit in connection with that letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Affidavit.]

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, *County of Suffolk, ss:*

In the matter of the claim for widow's pension No. 271881 of Susan H. Quigley, widow of Thomas F. Quigley, alias Francis W. Howard, of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteers.

Personally came before me, a notary public in and for aforesaid county and State, Susan H. Quigley, resident of Hingham, in the county of Plymouth, State of Massachusetts, who being duly sworn, declares in relation to the aforesaid claim as follows:

"I was married to the soldier in 1856. My late husband was killed in the army during the retreat from Fair Oaks battlefield in August, 1862. In July, 1864, I went to Albany, and called on Michael H. Donovan, captain of Company F, who kept a store on Washington street, in Albany, N. Y. I was informed by him that my husband was killed at Gaines Mills on Hampton

roads, August 21, 1862. He also told me that it was useless for me to look for my late husband, as he was a dead man.

"He was a good husband, and always sent me his monthly pay for the use of myself and little boy, and I had many letters from him up to August, 1862.

"I believe the statement of Captain Donovan, and am satisfied it was the truth. The relations between myself and husband were such that had he lived I know he would have returned to his family.

"The above testimony was written at my dictation in the Massachusetts State pension office, and was not prompted by any written, printed, or verbal statement relating thereto.

"SUSAN H. QUIGLEY,
"*Hersey St., Hingham.*"

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant, Susan H. Quigley, and I certify that I read said affidavit to said affiant, and acquainted her with its contents before she executed the same.

I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said claim nor am I concerned in its prosecution.

Witness my hand and official seal this 21st day of January, 1896.

J. B. PARSONS, *Notary Publie.*

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I wish to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Is not this affidavit that you have produced based on hearsay?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. This lady says that she saw Captain Donovan. Now, why do you not produce Captain Donovan's affidavit——

Mr. MORSE. I have several other affidavits.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York (continuing): Of the death of the man on the battlefield. If the man was killed in battle and Captain Donovan saw him, that would be all that would be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this is a distressing case, and undoubtedly it is only one of thousands. This soldier died in battle and was buried like a soldier, but we can not prove it beyond the circumstantial evidence. I have myself seen a package of letters which this soldier wrote to his wife from the army. They were affectionate letters, showing that he loved his wife and child, and that his home was dear to him. The letters stopped, and she has not heard a word from him since for more than thirty years; yet the Commissioner of Pensions says that does not prove his death beyond a reasonable doubt. Nevertheless, there is not the slightest doubt that the man is dead, or that he was killed in battle. Captain Donovan himself is now dead, I believe, and that is the reason that an affidavit from him is not produced; but I have a second affidavit here by another witness who was present when this conversation took place between Captain Donovan and the widow, and she swears to the same thing, that Captain Donovan told the widow that her husband was dead, and it was idle for her to look for him any further.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will ask the gentleman whether it is not conceivable that parties might fabricate such statements? If this soldier was killed in battle, why was not that fact shown by affidavit before the death of Captain Donovan?

Mr. MORSE. I can not answer that question. I can simply say that there is no sort of doubt that the man is dead. My predecessor here, Governor Long, who is well known to all the older members of the House, is a neighbor of this widow. He knew the soldier and he knows the widow. The House has heard the Governor's letter which has been read from the Clerk's desk, and that distinguished gentleman certainly needs no introduction to this House or to the country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment, which I send up now to have read for information.

The amendment was read, as follows:

And provided further, That the same rule shall be applied to widows' applications under the general pension laws other than said act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know but that the committee have in view some other legislation which will obviate the necessity of this amendment, and that therefore they have limited the bill now before the House to widows' applications under the act of 1890; but if they have not some other such proposition in view, it seems to me that we ought now to amend this bill so as to include widows applying under the other pension laws. The widows of Mexican soldiers and the widows of soldiers of the Indian wars have just the same difficulties in proving the death of their husbands as widows applying under the act of 1890, and I think there should be no discrimination as against widows claiming under other acts. In the last Congress we had this same general question before us in certain cases, and it was frequently met by the passage of private bills, but I think it ought to be covered by some general provision of law. I therefore suggest this amendment, and I trust it will meet the approval of the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the gentleman's amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. LACEY. I propose to amend the pending bill so as to include the cases of widows claiming pensions under other pension laws than the act of 1890.

Mr. PICKLER. The present bill, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE], who presents it here, was considered early by the committee and reported favorably. Since that time they had under consideration, in connection with the general subject of pension legislation, some bills making this provison apply to widows' pensions under all the existing pension laws. This bill, however, relates only to the act of 1890, and the committee believe that it is a good bill, and they do not see any reason why it should not be passed at this time.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I merely suggest an amendment to the bill, providing that it shall apply to the claims of widows under other acts than that of 1890. If we adopt this amendment, and then amend the title of the bill, we shall have the whole ground covered and there will be no need to "make two bites of a cherry."

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, under the bill as introduced by me, and as we propose to amend it, any woman who is entitled to a pension can obtain it by complying with the requirements of the act of 1890. No matter when her husband disappeared, nor no matter what the circumstances were, if she can show dependence and merely can not prove the absolute death of the soldier, she will be entitled to a pension. It seems to me that the bill covers all desirable points. The fact is that in the adjudication of pensions in the Bureau a good many cases of this character have come up where the woman could not prove absolutely the death of the soldier.

In this Congress we have had cases of that kind before the committee. We had one case where the soldier had been absent for nearly or quite thirty years. He had been discharged from the army for heart disease and he disappeared early in the spring of 1866. It was proved to the satisfaction of the committee that he and his wife had lived in amicable relations and had never had any quarrel, and also that since his disappearance his wife had been living continuously with her husband's relatives, thus showing no feeling on their part toward her but one of kindness. Now, in that case, the widow proving these facts and also showing that she was about 60 years of age and that she was absolutely dependent upon her own efforts for her support, her claim was yet rejected by the Commissioner of Pensions, simply upon the ground that, under the existing law, there is no rule by which the office can allow a pension in such a case. This bill seeks to avoid that difficulty and to give this poor woman and others like her who have waited all these years whatever relief the act of 1890 may afford them. That is all there is to the bill. It has been carefully prepared. It has been drawn in such a way, with the amendment, that if any woman has been guilty of immoral conduct she shall not receive the benefit of the act, and it also provides that where the soldier himself was guilty of some criminal act and left home in order to avoid punishment therefor his widow shall not receive a pension. The bill simply provides that absence for seven years without any knowledge by the widow of the soldier's whereabouts shall be held to be sufficient to justify the office in granting her pension when the other conditions of the law are complied with.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has my friend explained his amendment?

Mr. POOLE. I have not the amendment here. It is at the Clerk's desk, and I should like to have it read again.

The SPEAKER. Is the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] pending? The Chair did not understand the gentleman to offer the amendment, but only to intimate his intention to offer it.

Mr. BRUMM. I offered it, Mr. Speaker, and it certainly is pending. I have not withdrawn it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like to have the Clerk read the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE], and also that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM].

Mr. BRUMM. My amendment is simply to strike out a part of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move as a substitute for the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment, to insert in the thirteenth line of the second page, before the word "absence," the word "unexplained," in lieu of the word "continued."

Mr. Speaker, if this substitute be adopted, it will bring the rule of the Pension Office in these cases into harmony with that of the common law, which is to the effect that unexplained absence for a period of seven years creates the presumption of death. This will cover fully the ground sought to be covered by the amendment of the gentleman from New York and that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If it is true in any case that the soldier has absented himself on account of some criminal charge, that explains his absence—the absence is not unexplained. Or, if his absence is owing to unchaste conduct on the part of his wife, or domestic or business difficulties, his absence is not unexplained. I am satisfied if this substitute be adopted the common-law rule now generally prevailing will be correctly stated.

Mr. STEELE. Is there not some danger that under this amend-

ment the War Department may hold that the absence of the soldier is explained by assuming that he was a deserter?

Mr. WOOD. There is always danger of an unfriendly construction of any law——

Mr. STEELE. And unfriendly construction now obtains.

Mr. WOOD. Whatever may be the words used in the law, there is the same danger of unfriendly construction.

Mr. STEELE. Let me illustrate such cases as I have in my mind. When the roll is called immediately after a battle it shows the absence of Smith or Jones or other soldiers carried on the roll; and they are necessarily marked as "absent," because the officers coming out of battle and leaving the field are unable to account positively for the absence of the men who do not answer to the roll call. Now, when the regiment is mustered out, that word "absent" may stand opposite the name of a soldier who has not been heard of since a certain battle. Under the construction of the War Department every man who is marked "absent" when his record is made up is regarded as a deserter, although the commanding officer of the soldier may never have intended so to mark him, because if he had so intended he would have inserted in the report that Smith or Jones had deserted. The officer in returning the soldier as "absent" does not pretend to account for his absence, because he can not do so. In his own mind he may feel sure that the soldier was killed in battle, notwithstanding the fact that no one is able to say that he saw him killed.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not the fact that soldiers who can not be accounted for after a battle are marked "missing," and that no one is marked by an officer "absent" unless he is absent without leave?

Mr. STEELE. It makes no difference whether the man is marked "missing" or "absent," he is still regarded as a deserter.

Mr. MAHON. Not when he is marked "missing."

Mr. STEELE. Yes, as I am informed, he is regarded as a deserter whether he is marked "missing" or "absent."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I understand, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] is an amendment to the substitute. There was an amendment, then an amendment to the amendment, and then a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD] proposes a substitute for the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But that was before the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STEELE. "The gentleman from Indiana" has offered no amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. We are not proceeding in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WOOD. I believe the gentleman from Indiana was asking me a question, not offering an amendment.

Mr. STEELE. That was all.

Mr. WOOD. In answer to that question, I merely desire to say it is true that men have been reported as "absent" or "missing" when in point of fact they have been killed.

Mr. MORSE. I know that there are such cases.

Mr. WOOD. It is also true that under this amendment the unexplained absence of such a person for seven years would raise the presumption that he was dead. It is also true to my own personal knowledge that men have been reported "killed in action" by mistake, who afterwards appeared; and now the question arises, should the same rule of evidence apply in the consideration of pension cases that applies in the consideration of other cases before our courts? The rule of evidence now in force in the Pension Office is to require the proof of death beyond a reasonable doubt, thereby departing from the rule at common law. The rule at common law—perhaps I do not state it perfectly accurate, but sufficiently so—is that the unexplained absence for a period of seven years of the party raises the presumption of death. I think it ought to be satisfactory to leave the construction of the pension law and the matter of evidence under it, in all questions of death, where it is left in the settlement of estates, where often many greater interests, in point of dollars and cents, are involved than in the mere matter of a pension.

Mr. BROSIUS. Will the gentleman allow me to interject in his remarks a brief statement of the actual decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon this very point?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BROSIUS. I read from the case of Davy *vs.* Brooks (97 United States Reports):

A person who for seven years has not been heard of by those who, had he been living, would naturally have heard of him, is presumed to be dead.

Mr. WOOD. I understand that to be substantially "unexplained absence." If a person had been heard of during the seven years there is no "unexplained absence." It is impossible, as the gentleman knows, in any law, to state in exact language as used in opinions of the Supreme Court just the construction which should be given to it; and I believe that one single word—and that the word "unexplained"—will cover the amendment and the substitute, and correct what is an injustice in the rule of evidence in proving death in pension cases, as the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior hold the rule to be.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD], and for quite an important reason.

The rule, I will state, in the absence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], who explained to me what the rule was in response to my interrogatory—but in his absence we are compelled to resort to a less authentic or competent authority—I refer to Greenleaf on Evidence—— [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. "The gentleman from New York" is here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAFF. I read from section 278, on page 275 of Volume II of Greenleaf on Evidence:

But however this may be—

He is referring now to the presumption of life, treated of in the preceding paragraph—

But however this may be, as a mere presumption of law, the rule is now settled for most judicial purposes that the presumption of life, with respect to persons of whom no account can be given, ends at the expiration of seven years from the time they were last known to be living—

And this last clause, to which I will now call your attention, is, in my judgment, the important feature—

after which the burden of proof is devolved on the party asserting the life of the individual in question.

And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD] throws the burden of proof not on the pensioner, but on the person attacking the right of the widow to a pension after she has sufficiently established the unexplained absence of the husband for a period of seven years. Thus by the adoption of this amendment to the bill the widow is not bound to go further than the simple proof of the unexplained absence, leaving the burden on the party attacking the pension to show circumstances which would rebut that presumption. That is the reason I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

I believe that the right position in regard to the pension laws, as coming from this side of the House, should be on the line, and we should defend our position on that line, that we are simply bringing the soldier back to his rights under the common law, and permitting his rights under the pension laws of the United States to be weighed by the same principles and by the same doctrines that have been established for the settlement or determination of human rights in every other forum. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I think it would be perhaps advisable that we should fully understand the actual situation and what the amendments and substitute mean. As I understand it, and I have taken some pains to inquire, the bill is entirely satisfactory without the amendment of the gentleman from New York, which has been read, and without the amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as well as the substitute for both offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD]. In other words, as I have said, the bill seems to be entirely satisfactory as it came from the committee.

The amendment first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE] is as follows:

But no widow shall be entitled to the benefit of this proviso where it is shown that the disappearance or absence of her husband was caused by her criminal or unchaste conduct, and so forth.

It seems to me that amendment ought not to prevail. In any case of that kind the courts are open for redress to the husband, and this gives an opportunity to prevent a woman getting a pension, perhaps, who might be entirely innocent of any charge, or crime, or suspicion of that character; but somebody in the Pension Office might think, from some letter received, or some gossip, that possibly reasons might exist which would bar the woman from a pension. I am not willing, for one, to subject the women of this country to that sort of reflection. I do not think the amendment ought to be adopted. I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE] is not pressing it, but that he is willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. POOLE. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I understand my colleague [Mr. BRUMM] is willing to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BRUMM. Certainly.

Mr. POOLE. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD] is a good one.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. These two amendments being withdrawn, the matter of the substitute might come in as an amendment, I think, without much objection. The bill would then read, if the substitute was agreed to, as an amendment:

And provided further, That in considering claims filed under this act the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the unexplained

absence of such enlisted man or officer from his home and family for a period of seven years, during which period no intelligence of his existence shall have been received.

I think that is very proper, and I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE] to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. POOLE. I am willing to withdraw it if I have the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE] and the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] to be withdrawn. The question, then, is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the word "continued" in line 13, and substitute the word "unexplained," and to strike out the words "at least" in line 15.

Mr. GROW. Will the Clerk read the amendment now pending or the bill as it would read if amended?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania requests that the section be read as it will stand if the amendment is agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That in considering claims filed under this act the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the unexplained absence of such enlisted man or officer from his home and family for a period of seven years, during which period no intelligence of his existence shall have been received.

Mr. LACEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

And also provided further, That the same rule shall be applied to widows' applications under the general pension laws other than said act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. POOLE. I think the Committee on Invalid Pensions will accept that.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is on another subject. This is a bill to amend the act of 1890, and if you adopt the amendment in this form you will have a very complicated law.

Mr. GROW. I will make the motion I made in the first place, that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Then I trust the committee will report a bill without any amendments which can be promptly passed.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I understand the matter, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD] was adopted.

The SPEAKER. It was not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then the bill is before the House without any amendments having been adopted. What amendment is now pending?

The SPEAKER. The amendment is the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD] to strike out the word "continued" and substitute the word "unexplained" in line 13, and to strike out the words "at least" in line 15.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is that the question upon which the House comes to a vote?

The SPEAKER. That was the question on which the House was dividing when the gentleman from Iowa proposed an amendment.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] moves to recommit to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which motion is in order, and is now pending before the House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. One further inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is it in order for me to move the previous question?

The SPEAKER. It is in order to move the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move the previous question upon the bill and pending amendments.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 5.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point that there is no quorum present. [After a count.] One hundred and twenty-seven gentlemen are present; not a quorum.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as it is very evident that there will be difficulty in obtaining a quorum, a number of gentlemen having gone home, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State relating to an appropriation to reimburse Messrs. A. Watt and E. A. Mitchell, of New Castle, New South Wales—to the Committee of Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney-General in support of a claim of R. D. Benedict for professional services—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Georgetown Dock, Barge, Elevator and Railway Company, transmitting the annual report of the said company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 172); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 225) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 173); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Francis E. Hoover. (Report No. 167.)

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr. (Report No. 168.)

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3689) increasing the pension of Jefferson Fueston, of Company M, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry. (Report No. 169.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to Caroline D. Mowatt. (Report No. 170.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3993) granting a pension to Joseph Porter. (Report No. 171.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 144) for the relief of C. B. Bryan & Co. (Report No. 174.)

By Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 422) for the relief of Brig. Gen. William P. Carlin, retired. (Report No. 175.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 70) for the relief of William H. Quinn. (Report No. 176.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 5094) relating to pensions, prescribing rules for the government of the Pension Bureau in granting, refusing, rejecting, or suspending the same, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 5095) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Spokane, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5096) to grant two condemned cannon and two pyramids of cannon balls to the Indiana Soldiers' Home, at Lafayette, Ind.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5097) to provide for the continuance in office and compensation of officers under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department until successors have been appointed and qualified—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 5098) for survey, preparation of plan, and estimate of cost of improvement of Homochitto River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) for establishment of beacons at Horn Island Pass and Northwest Spit of Round Island, Mississippi Sound, Mississippi—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) for dredging and improving Horn Island Pass, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) for the improvement of Dog and Pascagoula rivers and channel at mouth of Pascagoula River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) for improvement of Leaf, Chickasawha, Pascagoula, and Pearl rivers, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) for dredging and improving channel at mouth of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5104) to allow the qualified electors of the United States to vote on certain questions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5105) to abolish days of grace on promissory notes, drafts, etc., in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 5106) to amend section 4426, Title LII, Revised Statutes United States, requiring ferryboats, canal boats, yachts, and other small craft of like character propelled by gasoline, gas fluid, naphtha, or motor power, to be inspected under the provisions of this title—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5107) to amend the act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ended June 30, 1892, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5109) to amend paragraph No. 2 of chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 5110) to amend the act of March 1, 1895, and other acts relating to the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 5111) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5112) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned cannon and a stand of arms to Appomattox Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Minn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5113) to authorize money-order post-offices to receive money on deposit—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5114) to secure adequate compensation for the right to construct, use, or extend and operate street railroads in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A joint resolution (H. Res. 104) authorizing the construction of six new battle ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of South Carolina in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 3409) granting a pension and for the relief of Dr. Harrison Wagner—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1820) granting a pension to Neil McNeil—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1818) granting an increase of pension to John Shannon—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1817) granting a pension of $50 a month to C. L. Alden—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Hitchcock—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Memorial of the legislature of the State of Michigan for the relief of Michael Sheehy—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Resolution of W. H. Lytle Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Buell Post, No. 178, Department of Ohio, protesting against the passage of any more legislation relieving soldiers from penalty of desertion—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petition of Catharine C. Smith, praying for an appropriation of $1,200 on account of services of her brother in the late war—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of Mary Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5116) for relief of James P. Shaw, of Calhoun, McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 5117) for the relief of James N. Curry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 5118) to provide for the statement and settlement of the accounts of Fayette Hungerford, deceased, late of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of the estate of Fayette Hungerford—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting a pension to Ellen Miles Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of Henry Hoover—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5122) granting a pension to John C. Henry, of Brockwayville, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5123) granting a pension to Thomas Early—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5124) granting a pension to Ann M. Harwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) granting a pension to Catherine Mundie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) granting a pension to Mary Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5127) for the relief of Abraham O. Waucop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 5128) to increase the pension of Jere Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5129) to grant an honorable discharge and remove the charge of desertion against John Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) to grant an honorable discharge and remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Hardin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) for the relief of George H. Preddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) for the relief of J. C. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 5133) for the relief of William J. Landram's estate—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5134) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Adalina T. Blick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 5135) granting an additional pension to Henry Van Gelder, of Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) granting a pension to Abraham C. Merritt, of Jersey City, N. J., a veteran of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) granting a pension to Charles F. Holmes, of Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5138) for the relief of Mrs. Marian W. Pollard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILES: A bill (H. R. 5139) for the relief of James G. James and William J. Thomas, surviving executors of Edward Thomas, of Dorchester County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of Michael H. J. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5141) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Isaac Newell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) to pension John W. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 5143) granting a pension to John Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 5144) to increase the pension of Charles W. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5145) granting a pension to William H. Pierre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) to correct the military record of William T. Rominger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) to increase the pension of Gavin Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) to increase the pension of David Matlock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) granting a pension to Anna V. Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) to correct the military record of William R. Avery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 5151) for the relief of John Doyle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5152) for the relief of Joseph C. Hogan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5153) granting a pension to Joseph H. Shepley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5154) granting a pension to William H. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting a pension to Joseph Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 5156) to increase the pension of Amelia A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 5157) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry C. Gilkey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5158) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William H. Woodward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) authorizing the sale of title of the United States to certain tracts of land in the District of Columbia to Margaret Shugrue and Caroline Lochboehler—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5160) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Galtney, deceased, late of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Resolutions adopted by the Pennsylvania State board of agriculture, concerning the free distribution of seeds by the United States Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: Petition of George J. Crandall and others, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in relation to the sale of intoxicants on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of F. J. Green, W. P. Green, and 34 others, of Berlin, N. Y., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition of George A. Keller and 100 others, of Leavenworth, Kans., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BULL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 928, being an affidavit of William P. Dawley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARDY: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3141, to correct army record and grant a pension to George W. Dunning, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2330, to correct army record and grant a pension to John H. James—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John Coombs, of Hopkinsville, Ky., for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4604, granting a pension to Jane Fisher, of Madisonville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 1502, for the relief of J. C. Rudd, of Kentucky—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3140, for bounty and pension of Samuel B. Younglove, of Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of State board of agriculture of Pennsylvania, against the free distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture of the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of Shadwick Riley and other citizens of Georgetown County, S. C., in behalf of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of a mass meeting of St. Paul (Minn.) citizens, protesting against the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of Ralph P. Griffith and 55 others, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, asking favorable action on the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: Resolutions of the Congregational Club of Crete, Nebr., praying for Congressional action to safeguard American citizens and their property in Armenia, to secure reparation for damages already sustained, and for the passage of resolutions expressive of the sentiments of the American people respecting outrages in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Memorial of the city council of the city of Bozeman, Mont., favoring the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of pastors and other officials of the various churches in the city of Opelika, Ala., praying for the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 690 citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of S. Smith, C. Bell, William J. Powers, L. L. Beachy, and 175 others, citizens of Salisbury, Elk Lick, and other parts of Somerset County, Pa., praying for the enactment of laws restricting immigration, and especially the enactment of the bill known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, in relation to the persecution of Armenian Christians by the Turks—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the First Presbyterian Church of Manasquan, N. J., January 22, 1896, on the Armenian question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the Armenians of New York City at a mass meeting in Calvary Chapel Hall, January 25, 1896, indorsing the recent action of Congress on the Armenian question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the members of the First Congregational Church of Rockford, Ill., January 19, 1896, urging Congress to adopt resolutions protesting against the outrages on the Armenian Christians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolutions of St. Paul (Minn.) citizens, against the Turkish atrocities in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: Memorial of the First Baptist Church of Lawrence, Mass., in reference to the outrages in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: Letter from R. J. Smith, of Loganville, Ohio, in regard to House bill No. 1172, for the relief of John Boone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Cincinnati Daily Newspaper Association, protesting against any increase in the rates for second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted at a State convention of citizens of California, held at San Francisco, January 18, 1896, protesting against the passage of any refunding of the debt owed by the Pacific railroads to the United States Government—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of 30 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Millbrook, Dutchess County, N. Y., asking for the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of beer and liquors at Ellis Island; also petition of the same organization for the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of beer or liquors at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LESTER: Petition of the heirs of Christopher C. Riesser, deceased, late of Effingham County, Ga., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of John W. Gillespie praying for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of members of the Union Congregational Church, of East Bridgewater, Mass., praying Congress to take action in regard to the Armenian butcheries and outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOZLEY: Petition of 91 citizens of Butler County, Mo., asking that a pension of $72 per month be granted to John Block—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of M. L. Gillett and 15 other ex-soldiers of Ashtabula County, Ohio, praying that a service pension be granted all honorably discharged soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: Fourteen petitions, praying Congress to enact the Pickler bill for the relief of settlers upon the public domain, signed by the following: R. L. Scouten and 42 others; C. H. Lieu and 39 others; Fred. Evander and 98 others; Adolph K. Eggen and 105 others; George Bretthaner and 69 others; H. S. Meorris and 36 others; Thomas Olson and 33 others; John E. Lund and 100 others; Helen Oliver and 115 others; Andrew John-

son and 76 others; John E. Kringen and 120 others; G. W. Budd and 58 others; Max Pomrenke and 26 others; John A. Hawkins and 76 others—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Benjamin T. Lorinson and others, asking Congress to act on bill for the reduction of price of lands to settlers on the Great Sioux Reservation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of J. D. Hilger & Co. and 70 others, asking Congress to enact the Chicago bill for the relief of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POWERS: Resolutions of citizens of Burlington, Vt., relating to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Seven petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sauquoit, North Ilion, Lansingburg, and Poland, N. Y., in relation to the sale of intoxicants on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5071, for the relief of James W. Long—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5072, for the relief of Adam D. Shriner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5073, for a pension to Charles C. Epley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5075, for the relief of Rodman Hart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5076, for the relief of Parsons T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5077, for the relief of Elizabeth Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petitions of citizens of Susquehanna County, Allegheny County, Butler County, Allegheny City, and Mount Pleasant and vicinity, all of the State of Pennsylvania, for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of George W. Huff, J. F. Miller, and 81 other citizens of Amherst and Campbell counties, Va., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODARD (by request): Petition of the heirs of William Grissom, deceased, late of New Hanover County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George R. French, secretary of the Seaman's Friend Society of Wilmington, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the estate of Charles Wynn, deceased, late of Wayne County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 30, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State of the 28th instant, submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay the salary account of Mr. Matt W. Ransom, United States minister to Mexico, from July 1 to August 28, 1895, amounting to $2,805.70; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made to improve and render navigable the Okanogan River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house memorial No. 21 with the original now on file in this office and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 21st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

House memorial No. 21.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the house of representatives and senate of the State of Washington, in legislature assembled, most respectfully represent:

Whereas it has been ascertained by careful inspection that the Okanogan River from its confluence with the Columbia River, near Bridgeport, in Douglas County, State of Washington, to the State line, a distance of about 75 miles, can, with moderate expense, be rendered navigable for boats of about 3 feet draft; and

Whereas the country tributary to the said river is one of vast mineral and agricultural resources, and is now without steam transportation facilities; and

Whereas the cost of freighting by wagon renders all traffic and trade expensive; and

Whereas by rendering the Okanogan River navigable a continuous waterway will be made over the Columbia and Okanogan rivers from Wenatchee, on the Great Northern Railway, to the northern boundary of the State of Washington, a distance of about 160 miles, thereby making possible a much cheaper mode of transporting the machinery, tools, and supplies necessary for the development of the said mineral and agricultural resources into and the product of the mines, farms, and orchards out of the country tributary to the said Okanogan River than is now had: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we, your memorialists, would respectfully urge that immediate action be taken, and that a sufficient amount be included in the next river and harbor appropriation bill for the purpose of making the improvements necessary to open the said river, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House; and thus will your memorialists ever pray.

Passed the house March 9, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON, *Speaker of the House.*

Passed the senate March 12, 1895.

F. H. LUCE, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed:) House memorial No. 21. Memorializing Congress to make an appropriation of sufficient money to improve and render navigable the Okanogan River, in the State of Washington. Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 14, 1895. J. H. Price, secretary of state.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., praying for the speedy completion of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation reducing the rate of letter postage to 1 cent; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Franklin Dill and 52 other citizens of Mount Holly, N. J., and the petition of Eph. L. Newcomb and 32 other citizens of Cedarville, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BAKER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, praying that the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, be extended so as to include all the officers and privates of Col. Thomas Kimball's regiment; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON presented petitions of the city council of Hoquiam; of the city council of Ballard; of the town council of Kalama, and of the city council of Centralia, all in the State of Washington, praying for the speedy completion of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. IRBY presented sundry petitions of citizens of Orangeburg, Williamsburg, and Marion, all in the State of South Carolina, praying that an appropriation be made for deepening Winyah Bay bar in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the town council of Kalama, Wash., and a petition of the town council of Hamilton, Wash., representing the desirability of the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of our Government, for the benefit of the whole country, under such conditions as will secure low tolls without discrimination and free from the abuses which have attended franchises granted to inland transportation companies. I move that the petitions be referred to the Select Committee on Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition signed by hundreds of citizens of the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington. Many of these citizens are personally known to me. They represent that the prices fixed upon the town lots near the head of Port Angeles Bay, in the State of Washington, were very much greater than the actual values of the lots, the prices having been fixed by Government appraisers. It is represented that the settlers on these lots occupied the same for many years, for months in some instances, prior to the appraisements, and in the meantime made quite a number of improvements, all assuming that the prices of the lots would be reasonable. It is now ascertained that the

prices are too great, and the settlers have made due proof before the proper officers of their residence and as to their improvements, and none of them can really afford to pay the prices at which the lots are held, and they ask that the prices of the lots be reduced. I have introduced a bill for the purpose. I believe the petition is worthy of attention and that these settlers are entitled to relief. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. GRAY presented the affidavit of Samuel Alrichs, of Delaware, in the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the United States Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back with amendments and with an accompanying report the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes. I ask that the report and bill as proposed to be amended be printed, and give notice that probably to-morrow morning I shall ask the Senate to consider the bill. It is important that it shall be passed this week.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Meanwhile the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1570) for the relief of Joseph Schwarz, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the bill (S. 1779) to relieve John Hughes from the charge of desertion, and the bill (S. 1244) to relieve James Messer from the charge of desertion, to ask to be discharged from their further consideration and that they be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The bills pertain to the desertion of sailors, and were by inadvertence sent to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report an amendment intended to be proposed to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which will come up soon. The proposed amendment relates to monuments, memorials, etc., to be erected at Chickamauga Park. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1667) for the relief of Nancy Rose, light-house keeper, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 835) making an appropriation to survey the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it with a favorable recommendation, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 24) for the return to the State of New Hampshire of the flag of the Eleventh Regiment of New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PASCO. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 824) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PASCO. I am directed by the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 935) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842, to report it adversely and request its indefinite postponement, this bill having the same purpose in view as the one just reported favorably.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1424) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4178, Revised Statutes, in relation to the marking of vessels' names at bow and stern, and also to provide for marking the draft," approved February 21, 1891, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 183) concerning tonnage tax, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 560) granting an honorable discharge to William Pierce, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

POSTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF 1893.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, reported it without amendment, submitting a report thereon; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 20, 1896.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PRINTING.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I report back without amendment the joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years. I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It proposes to extend the provisions of section 79 of the act named to the monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey which were published during the year 1894, and to those which have been published since that year, and to those which may be published in the future. But nothing therein contained shall be construed to interfere with the distribution of memoirs and reports, so far as the same is provided for by the joint resolution "To distribute copies of special memoirs and reports of the United States Geological Survey," approved March 3, 1887.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the report which accompanies the joint resolution may be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed under the rule.

CHAPLAIN AT MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, to report it with amendments, and an amendment to the title to indicate the purpose of the bill. The bill provides a chaplain for the Military Academy, and as there is a vacancy now, and all concerned desire very much to have some changes made before the new chaplain shall be appointed, the committee said I might ask the Senate to consider the bill immediately. I do so.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments of the Committee on Military Affairs were, in line 10, after the word "clergyman," to strike out the words "from civil life"; in lines 10 and 11 to strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert "President"; and in line 14, at the end of the bill, to strike out "captain mounted" and insert "professor"; so as to make the bill read:

That so much of section 1309 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as provides for the appointment at the United States Military Academy at West Point of "one chaplain, who shall also be professor of history, geography, and ethics, and one assistant professor of the same," is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the duties of chaplain at the Military Academy shall hereafter be performed by a clergyman to be appointed by the President for a term of four years, and the said chaplain shall be eligible for reappointment for an additional term or terms, and shall, while so serving, receive the same pay and allowances as are now allowed to a professor.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. It is always difficult to understand how a bill reads after some amendments have been made. Is there still left in the bill the provision that the chaplain is to be appointed for four years?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; that was considered desirable by the Academy. One amendment strikes out the provision that he shall be appointed from civil life, because that would have barred out all chaplains in the Army. Let them take their own chances with other citizens for appointment. Another strikes out, which is a mere formal amendment, the provision which authorizes the appointment by the Secretary of War, for of course it should be made by the President.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, providing a chaplain for the Military Academy.

Mr. HAWLEY. That there may be speedy final action upon the bill, I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SEWELL, and Mr. WALTHALL were appointed.

ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS WITH TENNESSEE.

Mr. HAWLEY. In behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask an order to print certain testimony needed in an important matter before that committee concerning the settlement between the United States and the State of Tennessee in regard to some railroads.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Committee on Military Affairs, 300 copies of the papers transmitted by the Secretary of War in response to the Senate resolution of December 11, 1895, regarding the claims and counter-claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and the State of Tennessee against the United States, in respect to the indebtedness of the Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville, the Edgefield and Kentucky, the McMinnville and Manchester, and the Winchester and Alabama railroad companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUBOIS in the chair). The Chair understands that the resolution will have to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask to have it considered now. I have had an estimate made of the cost. We have had the testimony reduced 270 pages, cutting it down to the smallest figure. It is to be printed for the use of the committee. The cost, as near as I can estimate it, will be about $380. I had an estimate made by the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HARRIS. It is only where the cost exceeds $500 that a resolution to print must necessarily go to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1842) granting a pension to Hannah Carrigan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1843) to relieve Albert Locke, alias Albert Shipley, from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Cora I. Dexter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1845) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion against James Day, of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment New York Cavalry, and to grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1846) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon to Custer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Leavenworth, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1847) granting a pension to Capt. John C. Heazlitt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1848) to prohibit the purchase and use by the Government of the United States of prison-made wares, and for other purposes; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask that the bill be read at length and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act the Government of the United States shall not purchase or use or be directly or indirectly concerned in purchasing or using any wares manufactured in any penitentiary, workhouse, or other prison, or by convict labor.

SEC. 2. That any officer or agent of the Government of the United States who shall, as such officer or agent, purchase or use for the Government of the United States, or be concerned directly or indirectly as such officer or agent in the purchase or use of any such wares, or who shall, in his own name or in the name of another, purchase any such wares or sell or rent the same to the Government of the United States, or cause or permit the same to be used in the service of the Government of the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on the conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not more than $1,000 and be imprisoned not less than three months, and be adjudged to pay the costs of prosecution.

SEC. 3. All acts or parts of acts in any manner conflicting with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1849) to authorize the pensioning of persons who, having served in the army or navy of the Confederate States of America, afterwards served in the Army or Navy of the United States, and were honorably discharged; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1850) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain, Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1851) to establish a military post at or near the city of Grand Forks, in Grand Forks County, in the State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In this connection, I will state that the same bill was introduced by me at the opening of the session, and by some inadvertence it was reported back from the Committee on Military Affairs unfavorably, instead of having been referred to the Secretary of War, as is usual in such cases. I reintroduce the bill on that account. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1852) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Little; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1853) for the relief of Edward Rice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1854) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Thomas Collins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1855) for increase of pension to George Hayes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1856) for the relief of the heirs at law of John Schwartzenburg, deceased, of Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 1857) granting a pension to Nathan Mitchell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. VILAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Ambrose Simpson, introduced in the Fifty-third Congress, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

THE COMMITTEE ON PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. GEAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Railroads be, and is hereby, authorized in the course of the inquiries which are being made to employ a stenographer and messenger, and that the expenses of the same be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL BANK OF PHILADELPHIA.

Mr. QUAY. At this point I desire to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to call up the bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa. It is merely intended to supply the want of a lost check, destroyed or lost in the mail last May. It is recommended by the Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to instruct V. McNally, ordnance officer, United States Army, to issue a duplicate of the original check described in the preamble to the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., under such regulations in regard to its issue and payment as have been prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the issue of duplicate checks under the provisions of section 3646, Revised Statutes of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

SALARY BALANCE OF THE LATE JUSTICE MILLER.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died. I wish to state that Judge Miller died and left his widow a house, and only a house. It is on Massachusetts avenue, and upon it there is a mortgage of $10,000. The annual tax is $300. She really has not means outside of this payment to pay for her board or clothing. I think there will be no objection to the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, the sum of $7,419, being equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 189) to repeal an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883; and

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent to call up for consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for information.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that several Senators are prepared to go on and discuss the joint resolution, and I hope the Senate will consent to consider it at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PEFFER. What is the request, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires the attention of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] desires to make some further remarks on the resolution, as does also the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I will ask if either of the Senators is ready to proceed this morning?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair submits the request of the Senator from North Dakota for the present consideration of the joint resolution which has been read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to make an explanation of the attitude of this case, so that the real merits of the controversy may be fully understood by the Senate. There has been a great misapprehension as to the exact legal condition of this case and as to the legal duties of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture has been arraigned here rather bitterly, I think, by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], for an alleged failure to carry out the law of Congress, and in undertaking to make that charge good he quoted some acts of Congress; but he failed to quote another act which very materially modifies the provisions of the act which he quoted.

I want to state to the Senate, as it may have passed out of their recollection, that the purchase and distribution of seeds by the Agricultural Department does not stand on the basis of a merely eleemosynary institution, that is, a purchase by the Government of seeds of any kind to be distributed gratuitously among the people of the United States as they may be selected by Senators and Representatives. That is the attitude of the law in reference to the purchase of seeds. That there may be no mistake about that, I will read to the Senate, so that everybody may understand it, the law which governs this case, being section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which is as follows:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country—

I hope the Senate will note that up to that point in the statute no seed which is not rare and uncommon shall be purchased. Then, there is another description of seeds which may be purchased, to which I call the attention of the Senate—

or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another.

The Secretary of Agriculture has no right under the law to purchase any seed unless it be embraced within one or the other of those descriptions—it must be "rare and uncommon," or it must be of that kind which "can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another."

The other day, when I had the honor to submit to the Senate some remarks on this subject, I asked the Senator from North Dakota to specify a single seed which was rare and uncommon which had not already been purchased by the Agricultural Department and distributed. He failed to answer; and so will every Senator who undertakes to make any criticism upon the action of the Secretary of Agriculture fail to make answer.

Now we come to the other provision:

Or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another.

Here I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the very important fact that the language of the statute is not to purchase "such seeds as may become more profitable by change from one part of the country to another," but "by frequent changes."

Let us see if that is the meaning of the statute; that is, the Secretary of Agriculture must find a seed which, for illustration, I will say, would become more profitable if frequently changed between the State of Florida and the State of Maine, that is, changed from the State of Florida to the State of Maine and back to the State of Maine from the State of Florida and back from the State of Florida to the State of Maine, and so on, until we arrive at the number of changes which would authorize us to call them "frequent." That is the language of the statute.

Now, I ask any Senator if he can point out any seed which, by frequent change from North to South or from East to West, from Florida to Maine, or from Kentucky to Ohio, or from Louisiana to North Dakota, and back again, will become more profitable? He can not find any, and that is all the kind of seed the Secretary is authorized to purchase. The language of the statute is:

The Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seed.

Mr. President, that is the direction of the statute to him. Who is to be the judge of the kind of seeds that are to be purchased under this statute? When you give the power to an officer to make a purchase of certain things which have in the judgment of men a particular value you necessarily confer upon that officer the power to determine that fact. It must be determined by somebody, and who is to determine it? I want to call the attention of the Senate to that. Is it the Senate of the United States, or is it the sworn officer of the Government whose duty it is to purchase? I suppose nobody can answer that.

We come now to the last act, and there is inserted another word not embraced in section 527. Section 527 confines the Secretary of Agriculture to rare and uncommon seeds, which can be made more profitable by frequent changes. If that stood alone it would be in the power of a Secretary of Agriculture who did not care how he disbursed the public money to purchase seeds utterly valueless to the community at large, provided only they were rare and uncommon.

Now we come to the acts which it is said the Secretary has not carried into effect. I read from the last appropriation act that clause which makes the appropriation:

For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law—

That is, by section 527—

of valuable seeds.

There is another term. So, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, they must be not only either "rare and uncommon" or "such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," but they must possess another character, they must be "valuable." Valuable in what sense? Valuable to the agricultural and horticultural interests of the country.

Coming back to a suggestion made by the Senator who sits before me [Mr. ALLEN] to me sotto voce, who is to judge of the value? Is it the Senator from North Dakota, or a Senator from any other State, or is it the Senate of the United States? I take it there can be no controversy about where the power and the duty to judge is vested. I think now the Senate understands the kind of seed to which the Secretary of Agriculture is confined, and I think the Senate also understands that he is the judge of whether the seeds offered come up to this standard or not. I will,

however, read, without comment, one more clause from the appropriation act of last year, which fortifies what I have said:

And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of improved and valuable seeds, etc.

So there is another restriction repeated in the very act of appropriation.

The Senator from North Dakota arraigns the Secretary of Agriculture for not complying with the law when he had made advertisement and found no bids which he ought to have accepted. The Senator said that the law compelled the Secretary of Agriculture to readvertise; and, to sustain that view, he read from the act of January 27, 1894, providing for advertisements, the last clause of which is:

And if any or all of such proposals shall be rejected, advertisements for proposals shall again be invited and proceeded with in the same manner.

And the Senator arraigned the Secretary of Agriculture because, having advertised, having received proposals, and none of them being satisfactory, all were rejected, he did not comply with the statute I have just read and which the Senator read the other day.

The Senator overlooked another statute passed at the same session of Congress, in April, when the first statute was passed in January. I now call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota and the Senate generally to the provisions of that statute:

SEC. 2. That the act entitled "An act to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington—

That is the statute I have just read and commented on, and upon which the Senator relied—

approved January 27, 1894, be, and the same is hereby, so amended that the provisions thereof shall apply only to advertisements for proposals for fuel, ice, stationery, and other miscellaneous supplies to be purchased at Washington for the use of the Executive Departments and other Government establishments therein named.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir; I shall be glad to yield right here.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Does the Senator from Mississippi hold that it is good sense to compel one Executive Department to readvertise for proposals and to allow another not to do so?

Mr. GEORGE. Is that the question?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is the question.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not here to answer as to the good sense of any provision of any statute. I am here simply to state to the Senate what the statute is, and the statute is as I have read it. If it be nonsense, as the Senator from North Dakota seems to think it is, nevertheless it is the law of the land, and I have yet to learn that any officer or any individual or anybody, organized or otherwise, has a right to annul a plain provision of a statute because that person, that officer, or that body may in his or its superior wisdom to the Legislature, the Congress of the United States, consider the provision nonsensical. That is my answer to the question propounded by the Senator.

So, now, we have it that the Secretary of Agriculture did, in accordance with law, section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, make his advertisement; had a board selected to pass upon the proposals; and, upon the unanimous judgment of that board, every single bid that was made was rejected, and then we have—and I want that understood—no provision of law which required the Secretary to readvertise.

Now, what is the complaint? The complaint is founded upon a misconstruction of the statute. That ought, it seems to me, to end this controversy. There is, however, one provision of the appropriation act to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate, to show that it is not now in the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the act which this joint resolution proposes to make him carry out.

It is unnecessary for me to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that our country is a very large one, extending over many degrees of latitude, almost from the tropics to, I believe, about the forty-ninth parallel of north latitude. We have fruits, seeds, trees, and shrubs adapted to one section of the country which are not adapted to another. We have, in addition to that, the beginning of the seasons for planting much earlier in one section of the country than in another. For instance, in Florida and the lower part of Louisiana gardening has already commenced; so in the lower part of Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia, while in North Dakota the ground is probably covered by 2 or 3 feet of snow, and frozen. Congress recognized that, and so it provided what I am going to read now from the appropriation act of 1895:

Provided also, That the seeds allotted to the Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter.

Congress there, recognizing this difference in latitude, this difference in the forwardness of the seasons between the South and the North, took the latitude of 32° as the dividing line, and said as to those south of that line that the Department should have the seed for them ready for distribution by the 10th day of January. This is the 30th of January. Suppose you pass this resolution, and suppose—which I think is hardly a supposable case, as I shall call the attention of the Senate to a provision of the Constitution directly—that the President of the United States so far forgot his duty to support, protect, and defend the Constitution as to approve it—suppose all that, then the purchases are to be made. It is now the 30th of January. Then, when the purchases are made, a long time, many weeks, must intervene, as shown by the Secretary in his statement, before the seed can be properly assorted, packed, and distributed, which would bring us probably to the 1st of March. Then what becomes of the "fair distribution" of the seed intended to be accomplished under this act of Congress? It would be too late for all the Southern part of our country. We have, then, what? We have a partial, unfair, unequal distribution, contrary to the statute, which this joint resolution falsely alleges it is designed to have carried into effect. I think the Senator will not take any such position as that.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the Senator from Mississippi is now making a legal argument. Does the Senator from Mississippi claim that there is any rule of law by which an officer charged with the discharge of a public duty failing to discharge the duty within the time provided by the statute is thereafter as to that law discharged?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; but I do say that if the statute is framed so that the act required to be done in order to be effectual must be done by a certain day, then no power on earth, neither the officer nor anybody else, can make it be performed afterwards.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose there is time enough, however, I suggest to the Senator, by which the officer can partially execute the law, although there may not be sufficient time to execute it in its entirety, would the Senator from Mississippi, under such circumstances, claim that the officer would be exempt from its partial execution?

Mr. GEORGE. The answer to that question is contained in the statute. If a policy is indicated in the statute, not for partial distribution, but for perfect and whole distribution in order to be equal and just and fair, then I say that this partial distribution, which is against the positive provisions of the statute and the policy of the statute, as being unequal and unfair, should not be made.

Mr. President, we have arrived at this point so far in the argument, first, that the Secretary of Agriculture has no right to buy anything except the peculiar kinds of seed mentioned in the statute—in other words, the statute says that he shall be confined to those purchases; second, by the law he is made the judge of whether the seeds offered are the kinds mentioned. That is a fact. Third, that there was a misconception, a gross misconception, on the part of the prosecutors in this case as to the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture after having made his advertisement. They proceeded under a statute which in the same session of Congress was repealed or so modified as not to apply to him, the statute which they rely upon applying only to the purchase of ice, fuel, stationery, and other miscellaneous supplies in the city of Washington. Under this act he purchases neither seed, nor ice, nor fuel, nor any miscellaneous supplies in the city of Washington, but he purchases them under advertisement throughout the country.

There is one other provision to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate in aid of the argument I made the other day. I do not intend to elaborate it for the reason that I have good reason to know, or at least to believe, that a Senator who is much more competent to argue that proposition than I am will do so before this debate is over, but I want to read, lest the Senate may forget and may not read it or have their attention called to it, the extraordinary language used in this joint resolution:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896.

I say that is an unparalleled, unprecedented provision in a law, except where there has been a prior suspension of the law by an act of Congress. For instance, if this law had been suspended by act of Congress, as is done sometimes in about these words: "*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled so and so be, and the same is hereby, suspended until the further action of Congress"—when that is done, then it is competent for Congress to take up a suspension, and in taking up that suspension may use the language here used, but in no other case. What is that but a usurpation on the part of the Congress of the United States of a constitutional duty which is imposed on the President of the United States? I will read that part of the Constitution to the Senate. Article II, section 3, of the Constitution, in enumerating the various powers and duties of the President, says:

He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

If Senators who argue in favor of this joint resolution will show me anything in it except an attempt upon the part of Congress to

take care that this law be faithfully executed, I shall be very much obliged to them.

Mr. ALLEN rose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to speak?

Mr. ALLEN. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator. I was going to reply briefly to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall occupy the floor only a few minutes.

Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of this measure. It seemed to me that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] made a very frank and plain declaration of the facts involved in the proposed legislation. I have followed as attentively as I could the able legal argument of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], and I have to confess at the outset that, being a layman, I am probably not qualified to estimate the argument of the Senator from Mississippi as I should wish to do. The Senator never speaks on a question of law without enlightening the Senate. I take it for granted that the abstruse legal propositions which he has laid down are possibly founded in fact; and yet, Mr. President, in behalf of the farmers of this country, I am willing to take a little chance on matters of strict legal construction, yes, even on constitutional questions, if it becomes necessary to do so to give the men who are toiling, as the farmers of this country are toiling to-day, under adverse conditions, to obtain a living from the soil, the benefit of every possible doubt.

Mr. President, I am sorry to say our legislation is largely in the interest of the population of our cities and the wealthy men of our country. I am not one of those who decry or berate men simply because they have wealth, and I do not propose to do so now; but when we look around we discover the fact that Congress has not hesitated in former years, and when the Treasury is replenished probably will not hesitate in the years to come, to grant large sums of money to construct expensive public buildings in our cities. They are an ornament and a credit to the cities and an evidence of the liberality of Congress, but they are not for the benefit of the farmers of the country. We find that very large appropriations, millions upon millions of dollars, are made in every Congress for the improvement of harbors in our great cities, indirectly perhaps a benefit to the farmers, but more directly a benefit to the men engaged in business and commercial enterprises. Again, the Government expends large sums of money for the free delivery of letters to the urban population, while in the country the farmers have to reach the post-office after trials and tribulations, over hills and through valleys and snowdrifts, it may be, to get their letters. They are discriminated against in that respect, but I do not apprehend that we can pass any legislation which will give them relief in that regard.

In times past we have done this one little thing for the farmers. We have spent a small amount of money to enable them to procure from their Congressmen some seeds which otherwise they would not have had. It has been a burden, it seems, to some Congressmen to send the seed out; sometimes when I have been very busy with other matters it has been a burden to me, but it has nevertheless been a labor of love, as I believed it was a proper and just recognition of the farming interests of our country. It is said that the farmers can write to seed dealers and obtain the same seeds, and yet those of us who know something about farmers, and I claim to be something of a farmer myself, are aware of the fact that the farmer is not in a position, he has not the information always at hand, to enable him to do as it is said he could very readily do.

My own judgment leads me to the opinion, and I express it without qualification, that the seeds which have been sent from Washington to the farming communities of this country have given the population of our country towns a large variety of seeds, which has resulted in greatly improving the productions of their gardens and farms, and thus enabling the farmers to enjoy some of the luxuries which the rich man in the city finds no difficulty in obtaining at a store in the immediate vicinity of his home. I think it has been a wise, a judicious, and a sensible expenditure of money, and I am extremely anxious, not because the farmers in my State are clamorous to have this practice continued, but because I think it is just, that this small annual appropriation shall be continued for the benefit of the population in our country towns scattered throughout this great country.

That is all I care to say, Mr. President, on the question beyond calling attention to the fact that there is a proposed amendment to the joint resolution which it seems to me utterly emasculates it, and which I trust when the vote is taken will not be adopted. The original joint resolution provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should continue to administer the law as it has been administered in the past by men holding that high and exalted position, but the committee in their wisdom, or unwisdom, as I think, have added the following proviso to the joint resolution:

That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them: *And provided further*, That he shall not be required to expend all the appropriation available for said purchase, but only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects named in said act.

The first part of the proviso is of little consequence and it ought not to be in a joint resolution or a bill passed by the honorable Senate of the United States. It simply provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall honestly expend the money. That is what we expect the Secretary of Agriculture to do, and I have heard no suggestion from any Senator that any Secretary of Agriculture has misappropriated funds which have been placed in his hands for this very laudable purpose.

The second proviso is of more consequence, inasmuch as it gives to the Secretary the discretion to use all of this money, one-half of this money, one-fourth of this money, or one dollar of it, and not any more than one dollar of it, in any given year for this purpose. I do not think we want to legislate in that way. Let us do one of two things. Let us either say to the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the judgment of the Senate of the United States that he shall execute the law, or let us repeal the law and get rid of the matter entirely. I shall vote to reject the amendment proposed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and then if, by the aid of my associates, I accomplish that result I shall vote for the joint resolution, believing it to be an act of simple justice to a large class of people whom we are bound to protect, so far as we can, in all matters of legislation.

The farmers of this country, Mr. President, are very heavily taxed. Every dollar's worth of property they have is visible. The taxgatherer finds it, and they are compelled to pay taxes upon it. But when we come to the cities, a very large proportion of the property held by the rich man and the moderately rich man of the country is hidden from the taxgatherer, and they pay no taxes whatever upon it. While the rich man thus escapes, the man who is laboring for his daily bread, the farmer who is struggling, under adverse conditions, to earn a living from the soil, has to pay taxes upon every dollar's worth of property he has in the world.

In view of these considerations, so hurriedly and crudely expressed, I wish to be considered as a Senator who in a matter of this kind deems it his right and his duty to do what he can to give relief, even though it be in a very small way, to the farmers of this great country, and that, too, without stopping to split legal hairs or to indulge in ponderous discussion of the constitutionality of an act which has never heretofore been questioned. Let this resolution be passed, and then we will see whether the Secretary of Agriculture will dare take the responsibility to further ignore or refuse to carry out the plainly expressed wishes of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to renew my faith in the great capacity and the great integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture, as expressed in this Chamber a few days ago. It does not follow necessarily that because I may differ from the Secretary of Agriculture I am willing to hear anything against him, he being a citizen of my State, which will either impugn his motives or involve his character. I shall vote for the joint resolution at the proper time because I believe it to be right legally, and because I believe it to be in the line of proper policy.

I desire briefly to answer some of the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE]. It may look like presumption for a young man like me to differ with so venerable a jurist as the Senator from Mississippi, and yet it occurs to me that the questions of law involved are so simple that there can scarcely be any question as to the construction to be placed upon the statute referred to by him.

The Senator read from section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which is in this language:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

The Senator from Mississippi asked whether any Senator can point out any seeds which are rare and uncommon to the country that the Secretary of Agriculture has not purchased. I do not myself profess to know what the Secretary of Agriculture has done in this line. I have not been in communication with him on the subject, nor do I suppose that it is claimed or can be claimed by any lawyer that unless the seeds are rare and uncommon, such, perhaps, as are not indigenous to this country, the Secretary of Agriculture would be expected or could be required to carry out the first provision of the act.

Now, what is his duty with reference to the second provision, couched in this language:

Or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

If there are any seeds or plants which can be made more profitable by being transferred from one section of the country to another and cultivated, cultivated with profit, perhaps, then no man would doubt that it is the duty, the plain, the bounden duty, of

the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the act and purchase and distribute those seeds.

The honorable Senator from Mississippi says it would be necessary under those circumstances, by way of illustration, to take a seed grown in Florida and send it to Maine, then return it and ship it again until it is demonstrated in the language of the statute that it "can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another." I do not concur in the view of the Senator from Mississippi in this respect. The very policy of this statute is that seeds grown in one section of the country shall be transferred to another section of the country and there experimented with, and if after proper experiment it is demonstrated that they can be grown profitably there, the spirit and the letter of the law are both complied with by their distribution.

Now, I did suggest to the Senator when on his feet the thought that this statute invested the sole power in the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether the seeds were such as "can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another"; and if that were the only statute on the subject and the Secretary of Agriculture had exercised his discretion, I would, as a mere matter of law, be compelled to vote against the joint resolution and sustain him. There can not be the slightest doubt that where a statute vests a discretion in a public officer, or in an individual, for that matter, if that discretion is honestly executed it is not within the power of a court or of a coordinate department to control it. Even though the Secretary of Agriculture were an ordinary officer or agent and the honorable Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] should apply for a writ of mandamus to compel him to execute the law, there is no judge upon the face of the earth, in my judgment, who understands the construction of a statute who would grant a writ of mandamus under those circumstances, for by the language of the statute itself and from its very purpose and policy he is invested with the sole power to determine whether or not the seeds "can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another."

But I call the attention of the honorable Senator from Mississippi to a question which he overlooked in his discussion. Statutes that are pari materia must be construed together. You can not take this section of the Revised Statutes and construe it one way and then take some other statute bearing upon the same subject and give it some other construction. All the statutes bearing upon the purchase and distribution of seeds must be construed together. In other words, from this legislation the plain purpose of the legislature must be deduced.

If this were the only statute upon the subject, I would reach precisely the same conclusion that has been reached by the honorable Senator form Mississippi, but it is not. The Senator from Mississippi entirely destroyed his argument upon this proposition when he referred to the appropriation act of 1895, quoting from page 733, volume 28, United States Statutes at Large, Fifty-third Congress. I read:

For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, $180,000.

Then the section goes on and provides how the distribution is to be made. I have no doubt in my own mind that the part of the statute which I have just read and a portion of it which I have not read take from the Secretary of Agriculture entirely the question of discretion; that is, it robs the Secretary of Agriculture of the discretion invested in him by section 527. Clearly it is within the power of Congress to take that discretion from him. Congress gave him the power by section 527 of the Revised Statutes, and Congress can take the power from him. Congress determined by the passage of the appropriation bill in 1895 that the law imposed upon the Secretary of Agriculture the duty to distribute seeds under section 527, and when Congress took that power from him it was his duty to execute the provisions of the appropriation act.

The Senator from Mississippi lays down another singular proposition of law. It may be entirely sound; I will not say that it is not, but certainly it sounds strange to me. He says that we have no power to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to execute the law as it now exists. We have power to direct every officer of this Government to execute the law if he fails to do so. We may not have the power to compel him to execute the law, but we have power and ample right to direct him to execute it. The Secretary of Agriculture is at the head of one of the important branches of the executive department of the Government. His very office was created by statute. It is not a constitutional office. It was erected and built up by statute passed within the last ten years, perhaps within the last seven years. Can we not direct the execution of the law by an officer whose office we create? It would be a singular Government, possessing three coordinate departments, as we sometimes speak of it, but as a matter of fact we have but one department, that of the judiciary, if Congress, invested by the Constitution with plenary power over legislation, having created an office and advised and consented to the appointment of the officer filling it, can not direct the officer occupying that position in the discharge of his duty. With all due respect for my honorable friend, the Senator from Mississippi, I deny that there is any rule for the construction of a statute recognized in this country which prohibits us in the slightest degree from directing him in the discharge of his duty.

Mark you, Mr. President, I do not doubt the disposition of the Secretary of Agriculture to discharge his duty when the statute is plain to him. If the statutes are ambiguous, as it seems to be the ambition of Congress sometimes to make them, clearly it is within our power to pass a statute that is not ambiguous directing him to discharge his duty under the appropriation act of 1895. But upon what does the Senator from Mississippi base his objection to this conclusion? Upon the ground that the power to see that the laws are enforced and executed rests with the Chief Executive. The negative implication from the position of the Senator from Mississippi would be that every officer of the Government of the United States has it within his power to ignore statutes and to ignore the fundamental law, simply because the Constitution, out of an abundance of caution, charges the Chief Executive with the duty of seeing that the laws are faithfully executed.

The Chief Executive being at the head of the executive department of the Government was required by the Constitutional Convention that framed our Constitution to watch over his subordinate officers and to see that they execute their duties which were plainly and legibly written in the statutes of the United States. Would any Senator claim that, because the Constitution, out of an abundance of caution, has charged this duty upon the Chief Executive, therefore the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary of Agriculture, or the head of any other Department or any subordinate officer could ignore the statutes of the United States and could not be controlled by Congress in their execution?

The position of the Senator from Mississippi is unsound. It is unsound because Congress, in the first place, has taken from the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion invested in him by section 527 of the Revised Statutes and has assumed that power itself. When, by the appropriation act of 1895, Congress directed the Secretary of Agriculture to expend the sum of money appropriated by that act for the purchase of seeds, it was, in my judgment, his bounden duty to carry out the provisions of the act without questioning it in the slightest degree.

Mr. President, just a moment upon the question of the policy of this law. If the Secretary of Agriculture does not agree with the policy of the act, it furnishes no reason why he should not observe it. I believe in the policy of the act of distributing seeds. It is the only thing that makes many a citizen of this country feel that he is akin to his Government. The little package of seeds sent 3,000 miles across the continent to some humble citizen in the State of California makes him believe that his great Government at Washington is mindful of him, that it knows and recognizes him. It is a mere pittance to the farmers and the gardeners of this country. A great Government with money to throw away upon corporations by the millions and hundreds of millions ought not to complain or protest against the execution of this law. It was enacted for a wise and beneficent purpose, and I believe it ought to be executed in the fullness of its spirit, that it ought to be maintained. By these means great good can be done to the farmers and producers of the country, while the character of the seeds that are distributed from one end of the country to another are developed to the benefit of our people.

Mr. PALMER obtained the floor.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. On behalf of the committee, I wish to move an amendment to the joint resolution and at the same time to modify the amendment reported by the committee. This may somewhat simplify the discussion. In lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 I move to strike out the words:

Directed to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds;

And insert:

Authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years;

So as to read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years.

Then I wish to modify the amendment of the committee by striking out, in line 14, after "objects," the words "named in said act" and inserting "of this joint resolution"; so as to read:

But only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects of this joint resolution.

I shall also move to further amend the joint resolution by striking out, in lines 14 and 15, the words "and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins."

There was a misprint, I will state, in the joint resolution as reprinted. The amendment of the committee, beginning in line 7, after the words "valuable seeds," should have followed at the end of the joint resolution. I move, in behalf of the committee, the amendments I have stated.

While I am on my feet, although I do not wish to take up any time in this discussion, I will state that it seems to me this is a very simple matter indeed. Section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which has been referred to, specifies what seeds may be purchased. The Attorney-General in his opinion, which is entirely correct, as the real point was not involved in the question submitted to him, decided that the purchase must be made in accordance with that act. That, of course, we all admit. But Congress has interpreted the act year after year by making the appropriation for the purchase of seeds. The seeds have been purchased and distributed. We have taken them and sent them to our constituents, and if the law has been violated in the purchase certainly we have been participants in the violation.

I think the motives of the Secretary of Agriculture in the action he has taken were good. He saw, as we all see, that there had been abuses under this statute, but I think he made a mistake in the method of correcting them. Instead of failing to carry out the evident purpose of Congress, I think proper representation should have been made to the Committee on Appropriations, and then either the appropriation should have been withheld or the abuse corrected by some provision of law.

Under the amendments now proposed I think there can be no objection to the joint resolution. The Secretary is prevented from paying an unfair price for any of the seeds, and if on account of the lateness of the season the appropriation can not be properly expended he has a discretion in the matter. I have no fear that he will use that discretion improperly. He will plainly see from the discussion and the action upon the joint resolution, if adopted, that the purpose of Congress is that the appropriation shall be carried out in its spirit. I have no doubt he will comply with it. I hope the amendments will be adopted. I believe the pending question is upon the adoption of the amendments, and then I trust that the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I have the highest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, not only for his views with regard to economy, but upon many other subjects. After listening to the very careful and lawyer-like analysis of the pending joint resolution by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I doubt whether we have any mandatory authority or that our mere request or order or direction to him to obey the law would have any binding force. I am not quite sure that the joint resolution will have any effect whatever.

In differing as I do from the Secretary of Agriculture as to the policy of his interpretation of the law, I think proper to protect myself in whatever I may hereafter do by expressing a most emphatic and distinct dissent from his practical interpretation of the statute. I think I know better in regard to the operation of the law than the Secretary of Agriculture does or can know. I think my acquaintance is much more extensive with the people I represent than his acquaintance possibly can be with the people of the United States. I know that in the distribution of seeds immense good has been accomplished. I do not deny, indeed I frankly admit, that many of the seeds distributed by me were valueless. I know, too, that many of the seeds reached hands that did not appreciate them. But I think I can speak on this subject with more confidence than most Senators from my intimate acquaintance with the people of central Illinois, where I have lived for fifty years. I know the suggestive value of the distribution of seeds, and that it has been productive of immense good.

As I said, I have lived in the central part of Illinois for fifty years. I am therefore extensively acquainted with the people, with men of all ages. In the distribution of these seeds I had but two objects in view. One was to furnish them to intelligent and experienced horticulturists and agriculturists, who would be most likely to demonstrate their value, if they had value; but I sent them to a large number of young men just beginning life, and, as I said, their suggestive value in hundreds of instances has been exceedingly great, indeed. I know that in very many instances young men, and young women, too, for that matter, to whom I sent a class of seeds that were appropriate to their sex and employment, who had no taste or had no opportunity to indulge or cultivate their tastes for horticulture and agriculture, have been bettered and improved by the seeds furnished them. Some of them, I know, were merely the plants and grains and grasses with which we are familiar, but there were many new seeds, of plant and grasses and cereals, that went into the hands of young men and incited in them a spirit of inquiry and anxiety for improvement that has done immense good.

I think, therefore, the Secretary of Agriculture has underrated the importance of seed distribution. The educational value is much greater, as I believe, than in any other respect, and they have made agriculturists and horticulturists; they have stimulated the taste and fancy of that class of persons, and some have manifested an extreme anxiety not only in procuring seeds from the seed stores, but have expressed great anxiety in regard to the seeds distributed by members of Congress.

I may say further that under the analysis of this joint resolution by the Senator from Mississippi, I am not sure that it ought to be passed by the Senate, but that I might place myself in the emphatic position of disagreeing with the Secretary of Agriculture in his interpretation of the law and the effect of his decision, I felt bound to make these remarks.

Mr. VEST. I ask that the joint resolution may go over. It is now nearly 2 o'clock. I desire to address the Senate upon it, and I dislike to commence and then be taken off the floor by the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PEFFER. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request is that the pending joint resolution may go over without losing its place.

Mr. PEFFER. Without prejudice?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without prejudice. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 189) to repeal an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883; and

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, as it is within a few minutes of the time when it would be laid before the Senate as the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. BUTLER to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the observations I was endeavoring to make yesterday evening I was investigating the proposition whether the power of government alone could prescribe the money functions. If that be true, and it is demonstrably true, many important consequences result from it. The question of the parity of the metals is at once disposed of, because it is obvious that the power that creates parity makes it a subject of law. If it declares that gold and silver shall be equal in fixed proportions for the discharge of government obligations and private debts, for that purpose its parity is absolutely certain and can not be destroyed by any possible contingency. For the purpose for which the law creates the equality the equality must remain, irrespective of whether one or the other metal is of any value except that which is given to it by the law.

Now, the question to consider in reason is, What are the uses which Government can prescribe for money? What is its great power which is within the control of Government? The exactions of Government are equal to all the property of the country, to all the services of the country. It demands the life of its citizens or its subjects. It imposes taxes without limit. From time to time great public enterprises are conceived and entered upon. For these purposes exactions are made. It may prescribe that which will discharge the debts of every man, and that is what we call legal tender. These debts are infinite in variety and immeasurable. With what reason, then, do we enter into these protracted discussions as to the value of that thing to which this function is attached when without the office or function of paying public and private debts it is of little or no value? Manifestly that kind of reasoning should have no place in the argument.

The power of government is that of sacrificing life and property, of demanding services. What, then, is the force of this argument as to the natural value, one or the other, of the things to which the money function may be imparted? As I observed yesterday, in the days of the Roman Empire the creditor had the right upon the nonpayment of his debt to make a slave of the debtor and of his family. To what extent would these sacrifices of property and of labor or service be made by a man to preserve the liberty of himself and his family? So, the law now says you shall pay your debts, pay your taxes, in gold or in silver or Treasury notes. Is not that which the law prescribes as the compulsory use that which will determine its absolute competency for that purpose,

and the absolute and indestructible parity or equality of each of the things required to be used?

Mr. President, these are the considerations upon which we must enter for the determination of this question. Suppose we look further and ask why it is that one thing, or two things, or three things should be made the money of a country. This is a tribunal where we ought to consider this subject and determine it in the light of reason and experience. Why shall there be one thing only which has the money function attached to it? In the answer to that question depends the reasonable determination of this whole subject. It is because in all periods of time, the Government's power being unlimited in the interests of the great mass of the people, it was necessary that some privilege should be afforded the debtor in the choice of that which would enable him to discharge his debts.

It was and it is the duty of Government to protect that to which it imparted the power and confined the power of satisfying public and private obligations. It was and is the duty of those who hold power over the people to see that there could be no monopoly, no confinement of the control of the money function to a few, for that would create a privileged class that destroy free government; that would build up imperial power and create an aristocracy.

The control of this function of representing and transferring values, of making something a legal tender for public and private obligations by individuals, by corporations, or banks is to give them power over government, whether it be an autocratic or a democratic government. It creates inevitably a privileged class, and sooner or later an enfeebled and degenerate aristocracy resting on industrial slavery and military power.

Hence we find that in all the reasoning upon this subject this power of the Government to create the money function and attach to it that which was most convenient in its natural qualities has been recognized and has been used. The fact that gold and silver metals are the most convenient in their qualities for that use is an entirely different consideration from the money function itself, the power which may be so exercised as to give to some one thing which is in the possession of a few the right to put their hand into every man's pocket and into every household and take from them their legitimate earnings and the profits of their own domestic and personal economy.

Let us see if this be not true. This idea, which in this discussion has had so small a part, dominates in the reason of a great part of the intelligent and capable men who have administered governments and are administering them now, and is a theory and an opinion powerful in the economies of our day. If we will look into this subject we will find that to-day in the colossal money power of England, with its five thousand millions of dollars of money and credits which usurp or take the place of money in the London and branch banks, the power of Government, the credit of the Government of Great Britain is at the foundation of every note of the Bank of England; that the debt which the Government owes to the Bank of England, created as a matter of public policy, is the chief security of every pound of the notes of the Bank of England.

I have here a book from which I will read some extracts in relation to the former conditions of law and power in prescribing the money functions by the different governments of the world. A recent article headed "Horace White's money and banking" in the February number of Gunton's Magazine, in commenting on the recent works on money issued, by Mr. Horace White, the editor of the Evening Post, and Mr. Alexander Delmar, who in 1865 was appointed Director of the Bureau of Statistics by Secretary Chase, says:

> Thus it may be said that Mr. Delmar, writing up the history, through thirty centuries of "gold" itself, comes to the conclusion that what is blindly taken to be its commodity value has at all times sprung mainly through its coinage use; this, in turn, has been dominated by a subtle connection anciently with imperial and sacerdotal "flatism," and at present with commercial monopoly and financial centralization of power. Mr. Delmar sees in the Rothschilds and the Bank of England the lineal successors to the Cæsars, Tamerlanes, and Ghengis Khans. Mr. White, on the other hand, writing the history of a country and period in which "flatism" has been the almost exclusive rule, and gold the exception, has embraced the conviction that gold is the Ark of the Covenant, the sacred dwelling of "the Host," and that "flatism" is a heresy to be smitten hip and thigh, like the Hivites, Hittites, Perizzites, and Jebusites, who hinder the progress of the Lord's anointed into the promised land.
>
> Mr. Delmar expresses his faith thus (page 307): "And let it be remarked that I am not here advocating a policy, but chronicling a historical fact; all the great enfranchisements of societies have been accomplished with the aid of fiduciary money. The Spartans won their liberty with iron disks of Lycurgus; the Athenians, before the Alexandrian period, rehabilitated the republic with 'nomisma,' a highly overvalued copper issue; the Romans overthrew their kings with the aid of overvalued 'nummi,' whose emissions were controlled and regulated by the State, ex senatus consulto.
>
> "The earliest republic in Europe which had the courage to defy the moribund hierarchy of Cæsar was that of Novgorod, whose money was impressed upon leather and doubtless issued by the State; the money of the Scandinavian revolution was the 'klippings' of Gustavus Vasa, which were issued by the State; the money by the aid of which Gustavus Adolphus saved the Protestant religion from being stamped out by Ferdinand, the Catholic, was overvalued copper 'rundstyks' issued by the State; the money of the Dutch revolution was the pasteboard 'dollars' issued by the city of Leyden; of the American Revolution, the paper notes issued by the colonial governments; of the French revolution, the 'assignats' and 'mandats' issued by the National Assembly; and of the antislavery war in the United States, 'greenbacks.'
>
> All these moneys were issued and the emissions were controlled by the State. They were not individual notes nor private bank notes, but essentially State notes.

So to-day we have in our country nearly $3,000,000,000 of different kinds of credits, with only some $600,000,000 or $700,000,000 of actual money, according to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury, in the national banks of this country. There is $5,000,000,000 in England of credit money resting largely upon the credit of the Government, and $4,000,000,000 in our country of different forms of credit resting upon credit of the Government of the United States in the shape of its bonds.

Mr. President, no proposition can be more clear than that the money function is created by the Government in this, that that which it prescribes as the necessary thing for the payment of Government exactions and private debts is money and is in demand by every man and every subject of its power. The law says to him, "You shall pay the Government exactions." Upon what penalty? Upon the penalty of confiscation and sale of your property. The law says to him, "You shall pay your debts; you shall pay them in gold or in silver at certain proportions."

What is it that can change this prescription of the law? You may say that if the law unwisely prescribes something which is of no value, that it is a confiscation of the debt. So it is, and it would be unwise to do so. So, also, you may say that if the law prescribes that which is in the power or is easily accumulated in the possession and control of a few persons, it is an unwise exercise of power, and so it is. But this question derives its importance to-day from the proposition not of what would be an unwise exercise of the power of attaching the office or function of money to something unfavorable to the creditor class or the privileged class, but from its connection with the economies which threaten the destruction of our Government and the ruin of our people. How is this question of money, of the exercise of the power to attach the money function to paper or to gold or to silver, or to all three, connected with these economies?

Instances are not wanting in which the exercise of the taxing power in the past ages has produced, in connection with other economies, a condition of absolute ruin amongst the people, in which it has created revolution.

The terrible revolution in France was produced by economies which created a power of taxation in the hands of private individuals. The celebrated statesman, Vauban, of France, writing of the condition of things at his time, in the seventeenth century, preceding the French Revolution by not a great period, said:

> The populations are impoverished by the excess of taxes, to the privation of the nutriments necessary to sustain life. Numbers, thrown into despair, desert their country or perish from want. These evils exist at the time I write this, and are even constantly increasing. They are much greater than is usually supposed, and may lead to most disastrous consequences for the body politic. They are of a gangrenous nature, and corrupt by degrees all the parts of the body till they reach the heart. This comparison ought to be well considered. It gives room to deep reflection.
>
> The highways and byways are filled with beggars driven from home by hunger and the loss of all they possess. They are the tenth part of the population, and it is out of the power of half of the rest to give them alms, because it is reduced to nearly the same condition.

He says this condition is greatly aggravated by the power of taxation given under different franchises to private individuals.

Suppose we consider that question ourselves. We have a vast army of unemployed. I have here before me a book which is entitled The Coming Revolution—the coming revolution because of the poverty of the great mass of the people, because of the great army of unemployed, because of the power of taxation in innumerable franchises levied upon the people, because of the exactions of corporate power.

I have some statistics upon that subject relating to my own State. I am not an extremist. I am not here to disparage the proper use and influence of corporate power nor to attack with vehement declamation those who may entertain different opinions, nor to decry the large accumulation of wealth, but I am here to say that, notwithstanding the profound indifference upon this subject, this question of money derives its importance from the power of taxation granted to individuals in the different franchises which our modern system of economy has created. I am here to say that the evidence presents itself conclusively and demands the consideration of this body in every possible form of investigation. The evidence is conclusive of the fact that the great mass of our people are being ground into absolute poverty and want by unnecessary, unreasonable exactions imposed by the different corporate franchises, State and Federal, which have been granted.

Now, let us suppose that there is a community in which the charters of incorporation have been granted franchises upon heat, and light, and transportation, and locomotion, corporations, syndicates, and trusts for the control of every article of necessity, of consumption, and of production. Let us suppose that in that community the money function is prescribed by the State to that which is alone possessed by the owners of these franchises, what is the condition of the country? How will they exercise this great power? Can they be relied upon, with the avarice and desire for accumulation which is common to all of us, to exercise it of their own volition so lightly as to promote the common happiness and the comfort and the prosperity of the great mass and body of the people? Is it to be without restraint, and are not we the responsi-

ble parties who, either from fear or some other reason, fail to adopt proper measures for the restraint and the proper exercise of this corporate power? And is it not the owners of these franchises who now demand gold money, so that they may monopolize it?

It is not a question of party; it is not a question of political division; but it is one which should address itself to all representatives. Is it true—and, if not true, let the fact be demonstrated—that in this great country of ours the hand of power, created by legislative franchises, is impoverishing every man and family? Transportation is far above its proper and necessary cost. Fortunes are accumulated, as a French statistician has recently said, and he has called the attention of the people of the world to the advantages of despotic government, of arbitrary government, over republican government, by citing the control of power over these franchises in the absolute and monarchical countries of the world. In that article he states from the census of the United States that fortunes such as the world has never seen, and in comparison with which that of the nobility of Europe pale, are accumulated in the hands of individuals in our country through the power of taxation granted in legislative franchises. He avers from our census that 70 people in this country own $3,000,000,000 of property in taxable values, created by law-imposing taxation two, three, four, and five times for the same transportation above the cost in Europe, and above its reasonable and proper cost, and yet in our Government here we have no attention or notice paid to it.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] spoke the other day of the advantages of these economies. Surely so, but what of the advantage of exercising their power ruthlessly and to the destruction of the people? What of imposing charges upon fictitious capitalization three, four, and five times above its necessary and reasonable cost? What of the public policy, which should demand the attention of every statesman, to reduce the cost to labor and to the people of these extravagant and arbitrary charges? What of the failure even to examine in behalf of the people the question, or to see whether or not the nobility, the untitled nobility, who exercise and own this power, have accumulated these vast fortunes of one, two, and three hundred millions of dollars by virtue of the power to tax the people alone? How of that statesmanship which fails even to investigate this subject and ascertain whether it be true or not?

Mr. President, if this be true, this monopoly of money, caused by the confinement of the function of legal tender to one metal, to gold alone, is intensified a thousand times by this requirement. It is the same as if by legislation the law gave to these few men by name—they who own all the banks, they who own all the railroads in connection with their European associates, and they who own as private property a power of taxation coextensive with the entire production and consumption of the country, resting upon every act of transportation of either person or property—it is the same as if by law and by name this great power of taxation had been conferred upon them. No inquiry, no investigation, no attempt to control this power exerted by the men in whom the people have confided their safety and their protection.

So this question can not be confused by attributing some magical properties to gold or silver, or by refusing that option which has existed always to the debtor for his protection, to the end that monopoly, or the power of taxation or exaction, shall not in the hands of a few persons gather into their possession that which alone will discharge the public tax and the private debt, and that the law shall not with one hand compel payment out of the labor of the poor man and out of the labor of every man, and with the other reduce the value and price of his labor, as compared with the thing which is required to pay it, and which is in the possession of a few persons only.

These propositions result demonstrably and logically by an inevitable conclusion from the fact, if true, that the function of money, and the things to which it is attached, are separable and distinct in reason, and that the power of attaching the function of money or legal tender is in government, and in government alone.

This fact is recognized in our Constitution, which says that no State shall "make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts"—debts public and private. So in all ages and in all times, in the days of the Roman Empire, when provinces were conquered and tribute levied without limit and without reason, it had to be paid in that which the government prescribed. Julius Cæsar prescribed gold or silver in the proportions of one part to eleven, and for two thousand years this option, this alternative power has existed, not because of any value of the metals as commodities, for that has nothing to do with it. The power of government might have prescribed that it should be copper or iron, as has been done sometimes.

It is true that copper and iron would not answer the purposes of exchange and commerce so well; but so far as power was concerned, so far as paying private debts was concerned, so far as paying public obligations was concerned, the copper or the iron, if demanded by the power of government, would have answered that purpose, and so within the terms, the prescription of law, no matter what silver or gold may be worth, for the purpose of paying debts, public and private, the obligation of the law makes the parity absolute. No human power can disturb it so long as the law prescribes it.

But it is said that there is such a thing as difference in exchange, that there is use in one country for a particular kind of coin and in another for the bullion value of the metal; that one country will prohibit the use or not endow anything with the use of the money function except one thing, and that, therefore, there will be a demand. Admit that to be true, of what avail in the argument is that, except that wherever there is a demand for one thing made greater than another it will go there, if there be convenience of transportation and accessibility? Of what importance is that fact to the great mass of transactions, to the debtor class of the country, who are ever its support, who fight its battles, who furnish its brains? It is not the rich, it is not the owners of our great franchises, who sustain the Government; it is the brain of the poor men and poor women and their children who grow up to defend the country in war, to become its great scholars, its great judges, its great ministers and lawyers.

So, under every government, be it autocratic or democratic, a wise ruler provides for the elevation of the masses, the comfort of the homes, the better support of the toilers of the world; and he is a poor governor or a poor emperor or a poor representative of the people in Congress or in a republican government who does not look closely to these considerations as the determining point of public policies.

Mr. President, we have this question before us. We have the question of determining whether or not the mints of this country shall be opened to the free coinage of silver and to its use as a money function upon equal terms and fixed proportions with gold. I have endeavored to show that the scarcity or the abundance of these metals has no part or figure in this discussion in the real argument of the subject; I have endeavored to show that parity is not a matter of consideration. It is true that if silver or gold were as abundant as the air or the water or the earth that unlimited quantity would affect the argument and make it unwise to provide that the debts and obligations of the people should be paid in that which was common and universal, and to which there was no limitation. But is there any reason in the proposition that there is no limitation to the coinage? Can it not be suspended in an hour? Can we not anticipate the future, finding money becoming a drug? Is it so now? And is it not true that it is too scarce and difficult to be obtained?

In every part of this country, away from the great centers, money can be had upon no terms except those of absolute confiscation. In the State which I represent in part, in the late calamity, when the severe cold destroyed $20,000,000 worth of property in a single night and left men, women, and children to the necessity of cultivating the ground without knowledge of the subject, money could not be had to rehabilitate their farms, to assist them in regaining a comfortable subsistence. Children are withheld from school, the sick are provided with insufficient attentions, and want exists in many households. Why? Because there is no distribution of the money which is in the country, because it is gathered in the great cities; because the great monopolies of transportation day by day gather all the money in the country and send it, as fast as the railway trains can speed it, to the great centers of commerce, leaving the people entirely without the means of exchanging products or borrowing to supply the necessities of life. This is the condition of our country.

The wise statesman, in my judgment, whether he be of one party or the other, upon this side of the Chamber or the other, will look into these conditions and to the connection of the exercise of the power of prescribing a money function with special reference to whether or not we have a concentrated money power, resting upon franchises created by law, imposing taxes without limitation, without the consent or the representation of the people, into whose hands, unless we guard it carefully, the money function will be committed entirely.

It is not to the interest of those who wish the preservation of property, it is not to the interest of those who, like myself, discourage extreme ideas or fanatical opinions or anarchical ideas, it is not for the interests of property, it is not for the interests of this Republic or republican government or of any political party, that we should shut our eyes to that condition of public economy which, by franchises created by law, produces fortunes of three or four hundred million dollars in single individuals and poverty in the mass of the people, a condition of things which, according to the statements of the book before me, and largely supported by statements in the public press, gives to 30,000 people more than half of all the products of the labor of 70,000,000 of the American people.

Is that true, or is it not? Let us investigate it; let us ascertain if the fact be so, and if it be not true, in vindication of the owners of these franchises let the fact be demonstrated to the people of the country. If it be true that these franchises are every day gathering the entire money of the country and carrying it to these

great centers; if it be true that the 70 men own this $3,000,000,000 by virtue of laws which we have either created or permitted to exist, let us enact some legislation which will prevent it; let us see above all things that the power of prescribing a money function shall not be exercised by this Government and this Congress to attach it to anything which is peculiarly susceptible of control by combinations and trusts.

That, Mr. President, is the great danger. As I have said, in my own State the people believe that these powers are exercised to their ruin, to their impoverishment. They know that they have no money; they know that they have to pay extraordinary rates of interest; they know that no money is to be had except by a supply from the great cities of the country.

As a matter of sound economy and statesmanship, ought there to be public policies which concentrate the entire money of the country in the possession of a few persons, which impose heavy burdens upon production and transportation? Are these wise economies? In my judgment they are not. We should call a halt. The policy advocated in the great financial centers of the country by so many men of large ability connected with great enterprises is absolutely destructive of themselves, of their order, and dangerous to the just accumulation of property.

The Bank of England has $5,000,000,000 of capital in connection with branch banks. That great capital rests upon the indebtedness of the Government of Great Britain to the Bank of England. We are told that it means a solidarity of money, a mobilization of capital. We are told that in the United States the banks concentrate and hold $4,000,000,000 of credits and assets of different descriptions, with cash or money in possession of only $700,000,000 of the $1,600,000,000 stated to be in the country, and that their business exceeds the total money of the country by the difference between $1,600,000,000 and three or four thousand million dollars of transactions.

We perceive, then, that in the Bank of England and in the banks of our country nearly the entire money of the world at this date is represented and controlled; we perceive that these banks are owned by a few hundred men at home and abroad, and that the men who own the great systems of transportation, the great lines of steamships, the great combinations of capital which control great enterprises, are the men who own all the money of the world, and in connection with it in our own country, the richest of all—exceeding the wealth of Great Britain by more than $2,000,000,000, and according to the estimates of the French statistician to whom I have referred—we have 70 of the richest people that the sun has ever shone upon; rich not in the competition of legitimate trade, rich not in commercial enterprises, rich not by virtue of their superiority of brain to the poor people of the country, but rich by a power of law creating public franchises, and which we fear to expose and to restrain.

Mr. President, shall we add to that power, the power to own and prescribe the things which shall control the legal tender, the money which shall perform the function of representing and transferring values, and shall we argue from day to day as to the effects of natural law upon the original bullion value of this or that metal, and disguise and cover up under these vain and fictitious ideas the fact that this is a question alone as to whether the Government shall create a great privileged class, a class having power, if without titles of nobility, having that which is far more powerful, the power to appropriate the labor of the people without their consent, the power to make times hard and make money scarce and services of little purchasing power, to prevent all enterprises which they do not own and control, and to create a great army of unemployed people, vainly striving to obtain work?

Mr. President, I do not share in the condemnation of those who differ in opinion from me. I acknowledge that the reverse of these opinions are entertained by men of great ability, and, as I believe, of patriotism. I do not share in the severe criticisms which have been passed upon the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury for want of personal fidelity and patriotism. With a record of seventeen years' service, in which I have never given a vote for a bond, in which I have never given a vote in favor of the extension of corporate franchises, in which I have voted ever for their restraint and for their complete and absolute control by the representatives of the people—with these opinions, and with such a record, I am not afraid to do justice to those who differ in opinion with me, and to say that there are honest differences of opinion.

But in my judgment there is but one real side. That side is that money shall be abundant, whether it be paper money which the Government prescribes shall be equal to silver and gold for the payment of public dues; whether it be gold in 1 part to 16 parts of silver, according to tradition, which, next to law, is powerful, or whether it be some new and entirely different system. It must be abundant and within the reach of the people, and we know of no other method than that which for thousands of years has been the only method—the free coinage of gold and silver in a fixed proportion. If you take up the arguments one by one which endeavor to meet this proposition, you find them utterly untenable. Yet in some of these examinations there is some degree of force to be attached to this question. In Gunton's Magazine, which I have been reading and of which I spoke awhile ago, there are some considerations which are worthy of attention. They are as follows:

Writing of Mr. White's book on money, the writer says:

> In confining it [money] to the function of swapping one piece of goods for another by measuring the value of the effort expended on each, he avoids much subtlety and appears to have attained to special simplicity of treatment. This is necessarily at the cost of overlooking and underestimating the dynamic power of monetary facts and events upon the intellectual progress and social development. Hence Mr. White never presents to us money in its tides and currents as a comprehensive whole. He generally contradicts or denies the existence of all that class of phenomena which Hume, Adam Smith, Hamilton, Carey, Alison, and others have dwelt upon as arising out of its volume or scarcity, its abundance or lack. He takes no note of the effect of a credit currency of a higher or more satisfactory kind, like the greenback note in 1862, to retire a credit currency previously in vogue of book accounts and commercial time paper, thus stimulating production by substituting cash payments for slow trusts of private solvency.

It seems, then, that here is another idea, and a very correct idea, that there is a dynamic force pervading society everywhere, resulting from the monetary condition of a country. It is true, and if that dynamic force be concentrated in the hands of the Bank of England and a few bankers in our country to control our national system, and if it be powerful enough to suppress inquiry, to discourage and daunt public men, if it be powerful enough to control the elections of States and place this Government and all its powers in the hands of seventy men with three thousand millions of property, it means, Mr. President, great ruin, great civil disorder, and great danger to republican institutions.

I insist that these are not questions of party division. I insist that they appeal to every statesman for at least calm inquiry and discussion. The idea that we hear discussed in this Chamber is that prices are dependent upon the scarcity of gold or the abundance of silver. Prices are dependent upon the depressive and repressive power of monopoly—monopoly of money, monopoly of transportation, upon privilege over right, which oppresses the great mass of producers, which creates trusts, combinations, syndicates, corporations controlling every article of production, every article of consumption. To attempt to arrive at a solution of this question without considering the cost of rents, without considering the cost of all the thousands of the minutiæ of life, is an argument destitute of the elements of reason, and, in my judgment, it does not require consideration, except that consideration which will point out the prices of labor, the prices of human services, which constitute the great mass of the wealth of the country.

The rent of land, the rent of houses, the taxation imposed through the different franchises, the increased cost of living, or the decreased cost of living—these thousands of particulars created, as was said by Vauban in the time of France, by the power given to privileged classes to impose taxes outside of the requirements of the State, are the things to be looked into, one by one, before we can arrive at any just conclusion. Are the markets the property of individuals? Are the highways the property of private individuals? Are houses and lands within the control of a few? Are the public policies such as to prevent the toiler from owning his own household? Are the economies of insurance, of protection to life, such that they are prescribed by a limited class of people?

Look at our condition here in the city of Washington. Look at the corporations here. See what amount they contribute to the general fund of the people. See the enormous tax upon light. Who pays it? Who pays the capitalization and the watered stock? It is the poor man, the poor woman, the child with limited education. Would we preserve those franchises? Then let us see that the cost they impose upon the people is reduced to the lowest degree. Let us make money abundant. Let us forbid that it shall be a monopoly; and how else can we do that except in this first step by making silver the equal of gold in fixed proportions prescribed by law and in supplementing it, when monopolies shall perchance hoard both, with the power of the Government to issue its credit notes, without interest or with interest, as may be necessary, to supply, in temporary exigencies, that which the combinations destroy by hoarding the money.

Mr. President, I have no hesitation in saying that the troubles of the Treasury are imaginary; that the Government has but to exercise an option—the option of paying in gold or silver or Treasury notes—that we have but to provide that the public debt shall be paid in either, at the discretion of the Treasury. Then there will be and can be demonstrably no depreciation of our credit, our bonds, or our securities. All Europe would be glad to-day to exchange every dollar of their public credit for the noninterest-bearing obligations of the people of the United States. And why? Logically so. You would do it and I would do it.

Great Britain is not moribund, it is true, because the British Empire is the great power of the world, the home of art and science. Whatever we may say upon the subject, and I to-day would declare war as soon as another to protect the autonomy of the American Republics or to free the people of Cuba from the horri-

ble atrocities that are being perpetrated upon them, yet I recognize the fact that Great Britain is the home of freedom, of religion, of the arts, and her people have been foremost in every time and in every period of the world in standing forth as the very pillars of civilization and truth.

But that is not the question. Europe has 4,000,000 armed men, with a drain upon its resources which impoverishes its people, with an increasing army of unemployed people. At a low estimate there are 20,000,000 people in Europe at the point of starvation—strong men with their families dying of hunger and seeking employment which they can not find. Such is the testimony of the commander of the Salvation Army, an enlightened man, a true man, a self-sacrificing man. Such are the statistics of John Bright and other Englishmen who have given their lives to this question. Such are the statements of philanthropic Frenchmen. There are 4,000,000 armed men facing each other with the most terrible instruments of destruction and with a war imminent at any time which would wipe out the credit of those countries and their securities and destroy their national debt.

Then look at this country, richer than the richest of them, with seas around it, 3,000 miles away from any possible danger; with 70,000,000 free men, many of them enlightened, intelligent, capable of controlling the Government, who in time will wake up and see what is true and act upon it in public policies, whether I am right or whether I am wrong. That the credit of this great country and this great people, foremost in civilization, should be less than that of these moribund countries is a proposition that can not for a moment be entertained.

No, our credit can be sustained, our notes paid, our obligations met by the judicious issue of the credit notes of this Government receivable for all public dues and for all private debts. If it were not so, what individual here could not in the administration of his own private affairs, if of equal magnitude to those of the United States, by the judicious payment of gold or silver when needed, and by refusing it when combinations were made to destroy his credit, sustain it?

While I entertain these views, I concede the integrity of those who have different opinions. I concede their ability and patriotism; but to me it seems to be clear that we are upon the line where starvation divides the great mass of the people from a few who are enormously rich. We are upon the line of serious civil disturbance. We are upon the point where something more than the old words of party distinction and party difference must be used; where principles of public policy looking to the masses can and must hereafter be the dividing line; where policies must be instituted which will not permit the accumulation by individuals, through public franchises, of hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars. We must see that the stern hand of the power and majesty of the American people is placed upon taxation levied through franchises created by law. By this public policy and this alone can the Republic be preserved and fulfill its mission of greater happiness to all the people.

INDEPENDENT BIMETALLISM AND PROTECTIVE TARIFF THE REMEDIES DEMANDED BY PRESENT CONDITIONS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, the alternative presented for the consideration and vote of the Senate by the pending bill is this: Shall we determine and vote, as required by the bill as it came from the House, that a further issue of the bonded indebtedness of this Government is, under existing conditions and circumstances, necessary, and to authorize such issue; or shall we, as proposed by the committee, deny such necessity and refuse to authorize a further issue of bonds, and instead thereof so legislate as to utilize silver, thus restoring it to the place assigned it by the Constitution of our country as one of the money metals, and thus rehabilitate it, as commanded by the Constitution, with all the legal-tender functions of primary money? In other words, shall we insist on perpetuating the single gold standard in this country and, in order to do so, authorize an unlimited amount of interest-bearing bonds to be sold for gold; or, denying that we favor the single gold standard and insisting that we favor bimetallism or the double standard, shall we, in the language of the last national Republican platform, declare that "the American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism," and that, in the words of that platform, "we demand the use of both gold *and* silver as *standard money*," and not the single gold standard?

For one I deny the necessity for further bond issues. I deny the necessity for a further increase of the interest-bearing national indebtedness. I deny that the interest or welfare either of the Government or the people of this country requires the perpetuation of the single gold standard. I protest that the continued and persistent effort to destroy bimetallism in this country, and thus reduce the aggregate value of our entire property to a sum measured by our gold alone, is not only a fatal stab at the best material interests of all our people, save and except the few who control the gold of this country, but is, moreover, a dangerous and oppressive encroachment upon their constitutional liberties.

Believing this, I shall, without any hesitation, but with great pleasure, vote in favor of the committee amendment and against the bill as it came from the House.

GOLD AND SILVER ARE THE MONEY METALS OF THE CONSTITUTION, NOT GOLD ALONE.

The great convention which framed the Constitution of our country, in authorizing Congress to coin money, incorporated into that instrument no discriminating distinction between gold and silver.

The Congress shall have power—

Says the Constitution—

to coin money—

Not gold alone, but money, that which was known as money in this country at the date of the adoption of the Constitution, namely, gold and silver coins, and furthermore—

to regulate the value thereof and of foreign coins.

And while inhibiting the several States from coining money of any kind, and in determining to what extent they should go in declaring what should or should not be a legal tender, it was provided in express terms that:

No State shall * * * coin money—

Or—

make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

In view of these constitutional provisions conferring upon Congress the power to coin money, both gold and silver, which is the equivalent of a *command* to coin for the use of the people both gold *and* silver, and inhibiting the States respectively from coining money and from making anything but gold and silver a legal tender in the payment of debts, is it not clear beyond the power of successful disputation that any discrimination in our legislation upon the part of Congress against silver and in favor of gold is an encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the citizen?

That great lawyer, Daniel Webster, in discussing from a constitutional standpoint this very important question, said:

I am clearly of the opinion that neither Congress nor any other authority can legally demonetize either silver or gold. If one coin can be dethroned as money then the other one can be, and thus the Constitution can be disregarded, yes, overthrown. The *command* to Congress is to *coin money*, not to *destroy* it, to create legal-tender money for the use of the people, and the grant of authority to create money can not be construed to mean authority to destroy money.

But no less clear and conclusive upon this constitutional question were the well-timed and able remarks in this Chamber on the 15th of August, 1893, of Webster's worthy successor, Senator HOAR. On that occasion that eminent Senator said:

You may drive out nature with your legislative fork, but again and again she comes running back. This doctrine is recognized in the Constitution. "No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender." "No State shall coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

That the words "money" and "gold and silver" were regarded as equivalents in constitutional meaning is shown by the fact that the Constitution makes a separate provision as to bills of credit and does not include them in the sentence which applies to money. It is not gold or silver that a State may make a legal tender, but gold and silver, the legal value of which, by another clause of the Constitution, is to be determined by Congress.

Chief Justice Ellsworth and his associate, who represented Connecticut in the Constitutional Convention, in their report to their constituents of the proceedings of the convention, say that the new Constitution provides that no State "shall make anything but money a legal tender for the payment of debts," showing that, in their judgment, the word "money" and the words "gold and silver" are identical or equivalents.

Alexander Hamilton considered this question in his great report on the mint and the coinage. He gave fullest weight to the arguments of the monometallists. He admitted that the money unit had up to that time virtually attached to gold rather than to silver. But, with the fullest concurrence of President Washington and the statesmen of his time, he declared for the principle of bimetallism. His arguments have not lost their original force. They have not been answered in any discussion. The people of the United States, when the tempest has passed, will settle down and be reconciled to the solution of this great problem in which Washington and his Cabinet joined. They never will be permanently reconciled to any other.

"To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation."—*Hamilton's Report, Lodge's Edition*, page 243.

Daniel Webster declared more than once, and with great emphasis, that the Constitution requires the coinage of both metals; and it would be a disobedience to our constitutional duty were Congress to discard either.

Mr. President, all our great financial authorities of both parties, from the framers of the Constitution, from Alexander Hamilton, and Jefferson, and Webster, and Calhoun, and Benton, and Chase, and Fessenden, Federalists and Republicans, Whigs and Democrats, down to the disturbed period which followed the war, have agreed upon this policy. There were differences which divided political parties. Whether Congress should authorize a paper currency, under careful safeguards, redeemable in coin, or should leave that to State discretion, or to private enterprise, was a question which divided parties and made and unmade Presidents and administrations. But down to the year 1863—

And I call attention to the language of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—

down to the year 1863 it never was heard in this country that the legal tender and the standard of value should be anything but gold and silver; nor was it ever claimed until 1873 that both gold and silver could not be relied upon to perform this service.

THE CAUSES OF THE INCREASE IN OUR FOREIGN INDEBTEDNESS.

Let those who proclaim loudest against bimetallism and in favor of the single gold standard and in opposition to the restoration of

silver to its constitutional place as one of the money metals of the country contrast for a moment the condition of our country and its Government and people in a few important respects for a period of, say, a quarter of a century prior to 1873, when silver was demonetized, and that for the twenty-five years since. Compare, for instance, the amount of our foreign indebtedness from 1845 to 1873 with that from 1873 to 1895.

First, glance at the state of our trade, its balances from 1845 to 1860, fifteen years prior to the breaking out of the war of the rebellion, when we had no single gold standard and when we had the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present ratio of 16 to 1. During these fifteen years the net balance of our foreign trade in our favor was $33,712,009. Thus, so far from creating any foreign interest-bearing debt during this period, the result was a balance in our favor of $33,712,009.

Furthermore, it will be borne in mind that for these fifteen years our total net exports of gold and silver amounted to an annual average of but $27,412,220. At the commencement of the war, therefore, our foreign indebtedness was a mere bagatelle—substantially nothing.

Then came the war, bearing in its train, of course, a large deficit each year up to 1869, at which time our foreign indebtedness, as estimated by David A. Wells, had reached the enormous sum of $1,465,500,000. Much of this vast increase of course is justly chargeable to the state of war in which our country was engaged from 1861 to 1865.

During the nine years 1861–1869 the value of imports in excess of the value of our exports reached the enormous sum of $732,219,547, or an average annual excess for these nine years of $81,357,727. During this same period we exported more gold and silver than we imported to the aggregate amount of $439,678,760, or an average annual excess of gold and silver of $48,853,195. So, the balance against us for these nine years, covering the period of the war and four years after its close, growing alone out of our imports and exports of merchandise, gold, and silver was $292,540,787, or an annual average excess during this period of $32,504,532.

But this is but one item, and a comparatively insignificant one at that, in making up our estimated foreign debt by Mr. Wells in 1869. To this must be added an estimated loss of from $200,000,000 to $225,000,000, being cost of transportation of our carrying trade in foreign vessels, amount expended by Americans in traveling abroad of an equally large sum, to say nothing of accumulated interest and discounts on stock and bonds and real-estate mortgages taken by our European creditors at an average of not more than two-thirds of their value on our indebtedness. These various items of our indebtedness, accumulated in this brief period of nine years, make up the estimated aggregate of Mr. Wells of $1,465,500,000.

But, notwithstanding this increase in our foreign indebtedness during the nine years ended December 31, 1869, and the great bulk of which must be properly attributed to the fact that our country was involved in a terrible and prolonged internecine war, it was as nothing compared with the increase in the twenty-five years since that date, during twenty-three years of which time silver has been demonetized, real bimetallism strangled and destroyed, and our Government engaged in a constant and embarrassingly strained effort to maintain and perpetuate the single gold standard. While our foreign indebtedness was virtually nothing at the beginning of the war in 1860, while on January 1, 1870, it was, according to recognized national statisticians, $1,465,000,000, it is to-day, after nearly a quarter of a century of the single gold standard, estimated by these same statisticians at all the way from four to five times the latter amount, or from $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000, or an increase in our foreign indebtedness since 1870, after allowing all credits, of from $3,535,000,000 to $5,535,000,000. The first-named amount is a conservative estimate, and in all probability not very far wrong.

How is it this vast sum of debt has within the past twenty-five years been placed as a mortgage in favor of foreign creditors, nearly all of whom are citizens of Great Britian, on the labor, the efforts, the resources, the homes—yes; I might add the liberties—of the American people?

In what manner, for what cause or causes, by operation of what occult or other description of means, have the very lifeblood and liberties of the American people been thus manacled in the interest of foreign masters by this vast aggregation of individual foreign indebtedness? That it is the result wholly of any one cause no sensible man will for a moment contend. That it is the result of and the cooperation of several causes all will readily concede, but that of all causes which contribute to it more or less, no one cause, nay, all other causes taken together, were so potential a factor in this fearful work of riveting upon the necks of the American people the foreign chains of industrial, commercial, and monetary slavery as is the single one of the effort to destroy bimetallism and sustain, uphold, and perpetuate, in the interest of Great Britain, the single gold standard.

For the twenty-five years from June 30, 1870, to June 30, 1895, the aggregate value of our imports was in round figures about $16,000,000,000, while that of our exports was in round figures perhaps about $17,763,500,000, or an excess of merchandise exports over like imports of $1,763,500,000.

During this same period our net gold exports were $271,190,721, while our excess of exports of silver over imports of silver was $386,311,625. These figures show undoubtedly at first glance and on their face, other considerations for the moment lost sight of, an apparent balance in our favor, and due in the main to the operation of our system of a protective tariff, of $2,421,014,262. Hence the inquiry naturally arises, why is it, if during these twenty-five years there has been in our exports and imports of merchandise and gold and silver a balance in our favor of nearly $2,500,000,000, or nearly $100,000,000 annually, our foreign indebtedness has increased from $1,465,000,000 to over $5,000,000,000, and why is it, if there has been this vast annual increase in our foreign indebtedness, notwithstanding the balance of trade has been in our favor, that we have not been able to meet it, or, in other words, to prevent its gradual and immense accumulation?

The answer is apparent to all who have given the matter careful consideration.

Although we in these twenty-five years have sent to foreigners $657,502,346 more gold and silver than they have sent to us in the same time, and in addition have sent to them merchandise valued at $1,763,511,916 more than the value of the merchandise they have sent to us, making a total of merchandise, gold, and silver we have sent abroad in this period in excess of the value of these articles received by us of $2,421,014,262, or an excess of over $96,000,000 annually; and yet, notwithstanding all this, our indebtedness to foreigners increased in this same period to more than $3,500,000,000, showing clearly had the balance of trade on our exports of merchandise, gold, and silver been against us, or had our trade in these respects been evenly balanced, the increase in our foreign indebtedness in these twenty-five years ending with 1895, instead of being $3,500,000,000, would have been more than $5,900,000,000.

What is the cause of all this, and what is the remedy?

The cause is, this vast balance of trade in our favor during this period in merchandise, gold, and silver has gone to foreign lands, mostly to Europe, to meet the expenses of freight charges in our carrying trade, to pay interest on our foreign indebtedness, and the expenses of travel of Americans in Europe. This is the manner the debt has been created and is constantly accumulating, and we are unable to meet the interest, much less the principal, for the simple reason of the great depression in the value of our exports since 1873.

That is the sum and substance of the whole business. If our exports since 1873 could have commanded the same prices they did command in 1873, to-day the American people, instead of having a mortgage approaching perhaps five thousand million dollars upon their property, their homes, their very liberties, would be owing nothing.

There are, in my judgment, two remedies to be applied:

First, our shipping laws must be amended, our merchant marine must be encouraged and built up, and we must become our own carriers; and

Secondly, we must legislate to increase the value of our export commodities, so as to enable us to meet, reduce, and, if possible, wipe out the debt which to-day makes the people of this country virtually slaves to the money lenders of Great Britain. We must reduce our expenses, and instead of issuing new bonds stop incurring obligations abroad and increase, if possible, the value of our commodities, including silver, with which to meet this indebtedness.

But—

Says one—

silver can not be utilized in paying our foreign debts.

To this I reply that the records of this Government show that between June 30, 1870, and June 30, 1895, we paid on this foreign account and canceled our indebtedness to that extent by preventing its increase, by payments in silver to the amount and value of $386,311,625, that being the excess in the value of our exports of silver during that period over our imports of silver.

As a matter of course that alone, amounting to nearly $400,000,000, was applied in the reduction of our indebtedness abroad and preventing its increase.

The enormous amounts paid by us annually to foreign shipowners is one of the great causes of the rapid increase of our foreign indebtedness. Less than 20 per cent of our imports—only about 13 per cent—are carried in American vessels, while about 87 per cent in foreign. The average cost of freightage is estimated at 8 per cent of the value of imports.

During the twenty-five years ended June 30, 1895, our aggregate imports were valued at $16,000,000,000. Assuming that but 87 per cent of this amount was carried in foreign vessels, the money paid to foreign shipowners during this period would average

annually about $55,000,000 and would in the aggregate amount in this period to $1,392,000,000. If credit is given for, say, $175,000,000 as freight received by our own people for the small proportion of our exports carried by American shipping, there is still a balance against us for this period on the single item of freights of more than $1,200,000,000, or an average of $48,000,000 per annum.

THE FEARFUL EFFECTS OF THE BOND-ISSUING POLICY—IT CONTRACTS OUR CIRCULATING MEDIUM, DEPRESSES PRICES, PARALYZES BUSINESS, AND INCREASES THE PUBLIC DEBT.

But another, among the many evils which attach to a policy of borrowing millions every few months and issuing interest-bearing bonds in order to maintain the single gold standard, and the one to which I am about to attract attention, operates with especial hardship when the gold is obtained from our own people, is its effect in the contraction of our circulating medium. The contraction of the circulating medium of the country can not but depress prices, not only of commodities, but of labor as well, thus creating a stringency in the markets, lessening the ability of the banks to accommodate their customers with loans, and compelling a forced collection of loans already in existence, thus harassing, oppressing, and ruining debtors.

In a country where the total gold circulation is perhaps less than $250,000,000 what must be the effect of the sudden absorption of $100,000,000 of that amount? And so it is, while thus contracting the circulating medium of the country to this enormous extent, entailing in its operation all these evil results, it at the same time increases the strain upon the reserve of the country, constantly rendering the supply less capable of performing the function required of standard money, of money of ultimate redemption, for money that is in and of itself, not redemption money, and which itself must be redeemed, is not money at all, but simply a token, a note of demand, or a promise to pay, whether it be in the form of silver, or gold, or paper, or brass, or any other material.

As bearing upon this phase of the effect of bond issues when the bonds are expected to be taken by the people of our own country, I beg attention to the following extract from a very valuable communication published in the New York Sun in its issue of January 19, 1896:

Considerable apprehension is noticeable in financial circles at the prospect of the monetary stringency which, it is beginning to be understood, must follow the absorption by the Treasury of the $100,000,000 and more which it is going to receive for the new bonds. The modification of the terms of payment, making the installments of it smaller and spreading them over a longer period of time, is intended to allay this feeling, but its palliating effect will not be great. Wall street has a habit of discounting the future, and a result which is certain to take place at the end of four months has the same influence on the money market now that it would have if it were going to happen to-morrow. Already, as their successive weekly statements show, our banks are contracting their loans and increasing their reserves, in anticipation of the demands which will be made upon them when the first installment of $20,000,000 upon the bonds will fall due, and they are evidently putting themselves in a position to meet the calls for the remaining 80 per cent.

It will be interesting to observe how business men, especially that portion of them in this region who have been clamoring for the retirement and cancellation of the legal-tender notes, will take the contraction both of the currency and of bank credits which the successful placing of the new loan will entail. Allowing a probable disbursement for current expenses the next four months of $20,000,000 out of the $100,000,000 and upward of the proceeds of the loan, there will be a locking up in the Treasury of $80,000,000 at least. This will not only diminish the volume of money in circulation by over $80,000,000, but it will by something like four times its amount reduce the ability of the banks to accommodate borrowers. The vacuum may be filled, and ought to be filled to some extent, by gold imported from Europe, but it is an indispensable condition of this importation that the interest of money here should for a sufficiently long period remain high enough to attract hither foreign capital. Not the least of the blunders which have been made in regard to the new bond issue has been the dissemination of the fallacy that the Treasury reserve can be replenished and the maintenance of gold payments assured without reducing the volume of bank loans. Neither refusing payment in legal tenders, nor importation of gold to be exported again as soon as it has served its temporary purpose, nor extending the period of payment for the bonds, nor the enlargement of bank circulation, will avail to prevent it. It will be a bitter but a beneficial dose to swallow, and we must take it without making wry faces.

The historic literature of the world is replete with evidence tending to illustrate the fact that the single gold standard is fatal to the prosperity of the great masses of the people in any country where it is enforced. That the special few who, by reason of their wealth, their position, or their influence, control the gold of a country may be benefited, all will agree, but this is at the expense and sacrifice of the best interests of the many.

The doctrine of "the greatest good to the greatest number" finds no lodgment in a policy which upholds the single gold standard and rejects the policy of true bimetallism. The logic of the ablest economists who have ever written upon the subject, whatever may have been their final conclusions as to the best policy to be pursued, leads to this result. But among all the celebrated economic writers, both ancient and modern, upon this subject, none has brought to its consideration such unanswerable logic as Mr. Brooks Adams in his recent essay under the name of The Law of Civilization and Decay; and perhaps no better idea of this wonderful work may be obtained than by quoting the following reference to it in the columns of the New York Sun, a single gold standard paper, in its issue of January 12, 1896. It reads:

HISTORY SURVEYED FROM A NEW VIEW POINT.

It is a remarkable essay which Mr. Brooks Adams has written under the name of The Law of Civilization and Decay (Macmillan). It is remarkable alike for its researches and its deductions, and while perhaps few men will accept all of the author's conclusions, none will fail to be impressed by some of them. It is not needful to assent to his ultimate assertion that the adoption of the single gold standard is fatal to the prosperity of a community in order to appreciate the singular acumen of his comments on certain critical conjunctures in the story of the past. What he has done is to examine from the view point of political economy the rise and fall of the Romans, the earlier Middle Ages, the first two Crusades and the capture of Constantinople by the Latins, the suppression of the Order of the Templars, the English Reformation, and the suppression of the convents, the eviction of the yeomen in England, and the relations of Spain and India to eighteenth-century civilization. It is only in the final chapter, devoted to modern centralization, in which the expressions of opinion occur to which exception will generally be taken. Up to this point the author's essay is surprisingly full of penetration and illumination, and we do not hesitate to say that in respect of knowledge and of insight it deserves to rank in the class which is headed by the works of Montesquieu.

To indicate in one short paragraph the significance of this book, the author sums up the drift of European history during the seven hundred years which preceded the close of the Napoleonic wars. From the Crusades to Waterloo the producers dominated Europe, the money lenders often faring hardly, as is proved by the treatment of the Jews. From the highest to the lowest, all had wares to sell; the farmer his crop, the weaver his cloth, the grocer his goods, and all were interested in maintaining the value of their commodities relatively to coin, for they lost when selling on a falling market. By degrees, as competition sharpened, after the Reformation a type was developed which our author would call that of the merchant adventurer, men like Child and Boulton, energetic and audacious. Gradually energy vented itself more and more freely through these merchants, until they became the ruling power in England, their government lasting from 1688 to 1815. At length they fell through the very brilliancy of their genius. The wealth they had amassed so rapidly accumulated until it prevailed over all other forms of force, and by so doing raised another variety of man to power. These last were the modern bankers. With the advent of the bankers a profound change came over civilization, for contraction began. Self-interest had from the outset taught the producers that to prosper they should deal in wares which tended rather to rise than fall in value relatively to coin. The opposite instinct possessed the usurer. He found that he grew rich when money appreciated or when the borrower had to part with more property to pay his debt when it fell due than the cash lent him would have brought on the day the obligation was contracted. Inasmuch as toward the close of the eighteenth century the great hoards of London passed into the possession of men of the latter type, the third and most redoubtable variety of the economic intellect rose to prominence, a variety of which perhaps the most conspicuous example is the family of Rothschild.

Even conceding for the moment that the single gold standard is a good thing and ought to be maintained, which I most emphatically deny, the policy of our Government in paying gold to all comers, whether required for export or otherwise, and when the power to pay in either silver or gold is guaranteed to the Secretary of the Treasury by the very law creating the obligation, is not only not necessary to the preservation of the single gold standard, but is not in accordance with the policy of any single gold standard country in the world, and can but lead in the end to one result—national bankruptcy.

The relation existing between the banks of England, France, and Germany and private bankers, merchants, and exporters of those countries in reference to the redemption of their paper obligations is precisely similar to that existing between the Treasury and subtreasuries of the United States and our private bankers, merchants, and exporters in reference to the redemption in coin of our national obligations. No one of these great gold-standard Governments, Great Britain, Germany, and France, if the last may be called a gold-standard country, considers it necessary, in order to maintain the gold standard, to pay out gold coin on every demand and on all occasions, and thus be compelled to purchase it back in order to replenish its treasury at advanced rates and great cost.

Whenever the Bank of England detects the existence of an effort to draw gold for export it immediately raises its rate of discount, and continues to raise it and maintain it until it becomes to the interest of the exporter to pause in his effort and leave the gold in the bank. Frequently has the Bank of England raised the rate of discount to 4, 5, and 6 per cent, and it has occasionally gone as high as 10 per cent, but not recently. At the Barings crash in 1889 the Bank of England advanced its rate to 6 per cent, and it was held at that rate for fifty-two consecutive days—from December 30, 1889, to February 20, 1890—while between 1882 and 1890 the rate of 5 per cent was reached on twelve different occasions, and at one time this rate was maintained continuously for one hundred and twenty-seven consecutive days.

So, too, the Bank of France invariably exercises the option when a demand is made on it for gold for export, and it is furnished or not as its directors determine.

So, too, with the Bank of Germany.

It is true the United States Government can not protect its reserves by this process; it can not raise the rate of discount, as it does not discount commercial paper; but it does possess a more direct and efficient power conferred upon it by the sovereign power of the State, and that is, when a demand is made for gold to export, by the presentation of either legal-tender or Treasury notes, to refuse to pay in gold alone, and tender any other legal-

tender coin it may have, as none of these obligations are payable in gold coin, but expressly in *coin*—that is either gold *or* silver—and no requirement for the maintenance of the gold standard renders it imperative upon the part of the Government to redeem in gold coin an obligation made expressly redeemable in either gold or silver coin. By refusing to exercise his legitimate prerogative our Secretary of the Treasury "out-Herods Herod," and enforces a gold policy far in advance of any ever entertained or practiced by any gold-standard government on earth.

I was pleased to see that in a recent interview Hon. George H. Williams, of Oregon, late Senator and Attorney-General of the United States, if correctly reported, said:

Had I been Secretary of the Treasury I would have exercised my prerogative of redeeming the Treasury notes in silver when presented. That would have put an immediate quietus on this scheme of robbery.

So say I, Mr. President. Had the Secretary of the Treasury followed the policy of the law and the words of the law, had he protected the gold of the country in the Treasury by the payment of silver when he did not have gold to spare, a quietus would have been put upon the raids on the Treasury by the gold ring. Very few legal-tender notes or Treasury notes would have been presented if that kind of policy had been adopted, instead of the policy of attempting to redeem all the $346,000,000 of legal-tender notes and the $150,000,000 of Sherman Treasury notes in gold coin instead of in coin, and we should not have had to borrow in less than two years, as has been done, $162,000,000, and there would have been no necessity for another issue of $100,000,000 of bonds, which it is expected will soon be issued.

THE DANGERS TO AMERICAN INDUSTRIES AND AMERICAN LABOR FROM AN INVASION OF ORIENTAL PRODUCTS AS A RESULT OF DIFFERENCE OF EXCHANGE AND MONEY STANDARDS.

It is incredible that the people and all the people of this country, irrespective of party, baptized as they have been during the past few years with the blighting mildew of financial and industrial ruin, can not comprehend that they are, by reason of the destruction of bimetallism and the operation of the single gold standard, coupled with a free-trade tariff, gradually but surely being made the slaves of the money lenders and bondholders of the world. But not only so. This is not all, but only one-half of the fearful story.

It is still more incredible that they can not be made to realize the great, transparent fact, so absolutely apparent, that the effect of the operation of the single gold standard is to bring our laborers, our manufacturers, our artisans, and our farmers as well, into direct and ruinous competition with the laborers, the manufacturers, the artisans, and the farmers of every silver-standard, silver-using country in the world.

We have as a nation proclaimed loudly and properly and legislated vigorously and wisely against Chinese immigration, but we are threatened to-day, and especially is this so with reference to the Pacific Coast States and Territories, with an industrial foe, a mighty, desolating army, in comparison with which Chinese immigration is an evil Lilliputian in character; and this state of things is not only made possible by the destruction of bimetallism in this country and by the practical operation of the single gold standard, but is actually generated, warmed into life, promoted, encouraged, and sustained by the monometallic gold policy.

But why—

Says the honest advocate of the single gold standard—

is this so?

This is a pertinent and proper question and one susceptible of a direct and conclusive answer, which, when stated, must be apparent to every candid mind. The purchasing power of silver in all silver-using countries has not depreciated. It is as great to-day as ever before. The purchasing power of silver bullion even in this country is as great now as ever at any time in the past. Their standard of value is silver. The silver yen of Japan and the tael of China go just as far in paying wages, in tilling the ground, in the manufacture of and in operating machinery, in herding sheep, in growing cattle, in manufacturing cloth, as ever they did at any time heretofore, whereas gold in the single gold standard, gold-using countries has appreciated, as measured in silver, 100 per cent. Their products, their goods, therefore, are prepared for the market, even were there no difference in the cost of labor in the two countries arising out of diverse national and climatic conditions, at just one-half what it costs to produce the same articles in the gold-standard, gold-using countries; and what is the result? They, the Chinese and Japanese, the people of South and Central America, can afford, without trenching on their profits, to sell the produce of their farms, of their shops, of their factories, to the people of a gold-standard, gold-using country for just one-half the price in gold they would have been compelled to sell for if bimetallism had been maintained and the destruction of the parity of value between the two moneys had not been brought about by silver demonetization; hence as a consequence they can sell for just one-half that the farmers, the artisans, the manufacturers of the single gold standard and gold-using country can afford to and make any profit at all. I would ask my friends on the other side to make answer to this when they come to speak in favor of sustaining the single gold standard.

Here, then, the American farmer and manufacturer are brought into direct and deadly competition with the almost countless millions of Asia—a competition that would be sufficiently paralyzing by reason of the difference of conditions growing out of the difference of nationality, of climate, and of civilization, even when the difference in the purchasing power of gold and silver did not exist, but rendered absolutely ruinous and completely and disastrously destructive in every sense of the term when aggravated by the disparity in the purchasing and debt-paying power of gold and silver brought about by the enforcement of a monetary policy that makes gold, and gold alone, in our country the measure of value.

Here, then, is a threatened industrial invasion which no tariff, however high its rates, can protect against. Who does not realize that the people of China and Japan are rapidly forging ahead, moving rapidly to the front in every department of invention, of manufacture, and of industrial life? Go into any city or town or hamlet of the Pacific States; go into many of the great cities of the East—New York, Philadelphia, Boston—and there you see innumerable evidences in a great variety of stores and shops of the industry, the ingenuity, the inventive genius of the Chinese and Japanese laborers, artisans, and manufacturers who came to this country prior to the passage of our exclusion laws. But all this, and it is not by any means insignificant in the Pacific States and Territories, is but a mere bagatelle compared with the mighty avalanche of Asiatic products of farm and shop and factory which is clearly gradually making its way toward our shores, steadily, but ever onward, like the imperceptible movement of a mighty and destructive glacier, to ultimately overwhelm the people of this country, and especially of the Pacific Coast, and thus destroy its industries, ruin its people, and cast a deadly blight on its civilization.

The progress made by Japan in recent years in manufactures has no parallel in any other country in the same length of time. A dozen years ago a spindle in Japan was a novelty; to-day there are 59 cotton mills, representing 838,000 of the 86,000,000 spindles of the world, now engaged in whirling the raw cotton into manufactures of all kinds, and it is estimated the present enterprises under way will in less than a year result in placing in operation 700,000 additional spindles. Every vessel now leaving California ports for the Orient is laden with raw cotton to meet the demand of the Japanese manufacturers, but the price is weighed down to less than living rates by cargoes from the cotton-producing fields of cheap labor in India, with which our cotton producers of the South are brought in competition, and which, with the inevitable increase in the growth of cotton in China, will soon shut out the American product entirely, and these same ships return with large cargoes of manufactured goods to compete with the American laborer and the American manufacturer, to reduce their profits and ruin their trade.

It is said the match trade alone of this country is already ruined. Cargoes of Japanese matches are sold in our markets at prices against which our people can not compete, thus closing our match factories and throwing thousands of our people out of employment.

The same will soon be true of the trade in bicycles, which are now being imported into this country by the thousand at rates that will crush out the American manufacturers.

It is a fact that must be apparent to the mind of every candid and intelligent person who has investigated the subject that just so long as silver remains the money standard of the principal competitors for our commodities, our staple products, just so long will the producers of this country be compelled to contend and compete with cheap labor and cheap money, and the loss to the United States in the price of our cereals, due to the depreciation of silver as measured in gold in the silver-standard nations, will be infinitely greater than the loss to this nation by the contraction of our primary money or by the closing of our silver mines and the decrease in business of other industries resultant from cessation of operation in special industries.

THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF JAPAN.

Japan has a population of 7,000,000 more than one-half our own population, more than 4,000,000 more than Great Britain.

She is forging ahead in the building up of a great merchant marine. She has in the past two years doubled the number of her seagoing vessels, and in that same brief period nearly trebled the number of tons of aggregate displacement of her vessels.

A nation which enforces compulsory primary education, which fosters vast numbers of normal schools and other institutions for the advancement of literary and scientific knowledge, and which supports nearly 2,000 educational institutions for the purpose of dispensing professional learning; which has within the past few years constructed more than 2,000 miles of railroad, established great steamship lines, connecting her ports with Hongkong, Shanghai, Calcutta, and other Chinese and East Indian ports;

which is projecting further and still more important transoceanic lines to Australia, European, and American ports; a nation which, moreover, has in the past two years, by the terrible process of war on sea and land, conquered the Chinese Empire, with its more than 400,000,000 population—*such* a nation must not be omitted in the enumeration or estimates of powerful and influential factors which operate in defining and measuring the progress and advancement of nations, and the development of the civilization of the age.

Japan is rich in natural resources—gold, silver, iron, copper, coal, and valuable stone of various kinds—not the least of which among her mineral resources are her precious metals. The Portuguese, history tells us, during the eighty-nine years they occupied Japan—from 1550 to 1639—exported fifty-nine and a half million pounds sterling, or nearly $300,000,000, or about $3,300,000 annually in gold; and from 1649 to 1671 the Dutch exported from Japan large quantities of gold, also silver and copper; and it is recorded that the total value of gold and silver alone sent out of Japan during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exceeded £103,000,000.

Already Japan excels in decorative art, in pottery and porcelain, their lacquer ware, their medals and bronzes, their cloisonné, their champlevé and repoussé work, their carving, their textile fabrics, and their embroidery, to say nothing of their products of cotton and wool, and the day is not far distant—it is even here now—when all these products of the cheap skilled labor of the Orient, with the additional advantages which accrue to them by reason of the difference in money standards between their country and ours, are coming, and will continue to come, upon us by the shipload, to compete with the manufacturers of like articles in this country, and to the displacement of the American laborer, the American artisan, and the American manufacturer.

Coal mining in Japan, which some years ago was practically abandoned has, by reason of the advancement in the silver price of coal resulting from the difference between the standards of silver-using and gold-using countries, been resumed on an extensive scale, and to-day the great ports on all sides of the Pacific Ocean are supplied from Japan, while the coal-mining industry of the Pacific States of our own country is being seriously threatened by large importations of Japanese coal.

Although Australia abounds in valuable coal fields, she is now virtually excluded from the Pacific Coast markets for the sole reasons—

First. Because, being on the gold basis, the difference of cost is 50 per cent against her; and

Second. Because her European laborers can not and do not work on a scale of labor rates that those of China and Japan do.

A recent report of our consul-general in Japan, in speaking of the cotton industry of that country, says:

The rapid progress of the industry is indicated by the fact that there are in operation and in course of construction 48 factories, aggregating 1,819,115 spindles.

The following, from a recent consular report of the industries of Kobe, Japan, will illustrate the healthy condition and prosperity of manufacturing industries in that silver-using country, and I do not refer to this at this time for the purpose of endeavoring to prove that it is a good thing to be on a silver basis, but rather for the purpose of demonstrating beyond the possibility of refutation the great advantage the manufacturers of Japan have over the gold-standard countries as a necessary result of the difference in standards and exchange between the gold and silver standard countries.

The quotation is as follows:

In the consular report on trade at Kobe, for 1892, a return is given of the dividends paid during the preceding twelve months by 21 mills in Osaka. The average dividend was 18 per cent, the highest being 28 per cent and the lowest 8 per cent. The dividends for 1893, as reported from time to time in the Japan newspapers, appear to have been equally good or better. According to a recent number of the Japan Gazette, 11 mills, whose names are given, paid an average dividend of 16 per cent for the first six months of 1894, as compared with 12 per cent for the corresponding period of 1893.

Why is that, Mr. President? Not alone because that country is on a silver standard, but it is because of the fact that it has an advantage by being able to sell its products in a gold-standard country, whether in Europe or America, for just one-half what the American or the European product can be sold for and a profit made upon it.

The British consul-general, Jamieson, at Shanghai, whose essay in the recent bimetallic prize contest took the prize, in referring to the foregoing report, contrasted the prosperous condition of the manufacturers in Kobe, Japan, with the cotton manufacturers in England, and said:

Compare this with the account of the cotton trade in England, as given in the Economist of February 17 of this year. I can not afford room to quote passages, but, briefly, the balance sheets of 93 spinning companies in Oldham show a net total loss of £72,768 in 1893, against a like net loss of £104,664 in 1892. At the end of 1890 only 8 of these companies had adverse balances, and these amounted to only £8,412; at the close of 1891, 49 companies had adverse balances, amounting to £142,767; and at the close of 1893, 63 companies had realized a total loss of £366,800 on their working account.

Surely there is something seriously alarming in these figures. Have our manufacturers, with all their accumulated wealth of experience, become so effete that they allow themselves to be beaten at their own trade by amateur spinners in Japan? Or is it not that there is some enormous difference in the economic conditions of the two countries which enables the Eastern manufacturer to win without effort while the Western is struggling his hardest to get even a place in the race?

It has not unfrequently been said that it is some consolation to us, in the midst of all our depression of trade, to find that other countries, such as Germany and the United States, are in an equally bad condition. But I would venture to suggest that this exactly emphasizes the present contention, viz, that the countries that are suffering by reason of the fall in silver are the gold-standard countries, and those that are reaping the benefit are the silver countries.

But while Japan is perhaps not well adapted to the production of cotton, it has been demonstrated that large areas in China are, and a quality equal to that of our own American production can be and is being produced there. Already there are three mills in operation in Shanghai, running 66,200 spindles; three more are about ready to start, with 49,000 additional spindles, and still three more are projected, and the British consul-general there says it will be but a brief time until in that single city there will be nine mills in operation, with a spinning capacity of 265,200 spindles.

As bearing upon this general subject, I ask to incorporate in my remarks the following extract from the Item, of Philadelphia, Pa., of December 14 last, and which has been quoted heretofore in this debate:

[From the Item, Philadelphia, Pa., December 14, 1895.]

The Japanese consul-general at New York says that he thinks Japan is on the eve of building up a large trade of Japanese products in the United States. He says Japan has an ample supply of low-cost coal and is buying and making the best machinery for a large export trade.

He adds that hemp and cotton carpets, wall paper, copper and bronze ware, crystal ware, silk handkerchiefs, raw silk, pongee, umbrellas, rags, beer, tobacco, coal, and matches are among the leaders.

Besides these, Japanese agents are now offering bicycles at $12.50; sashes, doors, and blinds, and wool carpets at astonishingly low prices; in fact, no line is now drawn limiting what that country proposes to do in selling to the United States as well as to all gold-basis countries so long as silver continues depreciated.

Take the above bicycle as an example for all the other goods. It is claimed equal to the best in this country, and at the price mentioned is delivered duty and freight free in San Francisco.

The $12.50 received for each bicycle is in gold. This is sold for silver, equaling $20 to the Japanese manufacturer. He pays $15 of his silver dollars for making, freight, duties, etc., and clears a net profit of $5 in silver.

This same method of profit is available to the Japanese for everything they are able to produce, as well as selling coal in the San Francisco market.

The consul-general says that coal would be so sold now if the ships had a return cargo.

As further bearing upon this menace from Japan to labor, I beg attention to the following article recently published in the Chicago Evening Post:

JAPAN'S MENACE TO LABOR.

[From the Chicago Evening Post.]

When Japan entered the sisterhood of civilized nations no power gave her a warmer welcome than the American Republic. We extolled her energy, her ingenuity, and her enterprise, and hailed her as the "United States of the East."

To-day we are face to face with the hard fact that this young-old Empire—old in years and young with the vigor of a new civilization—is already proving a formidable rival to us in the markets of the world and at our own doors. The conditions of Japanese labor are a standing menace to American labor and trade. The gravity of this danger was illustrated yesterday in a report presented to the National Association of Manufacturers at Central Music Hall. It was pointed out by the chairman of the committee on Oriental industries that articles of Japanese manufacture now appear in our Eastern cities, rivaling and underselling American articles suitable for similar purposes. Japanese matting is now crowding out cheaper kinds of Philadelphia carpets.

Japanese rugs made in imitation of American patterns are sold in large quantities in preference to American rugs of higher value. Brushes are sold at retail in Eastern cities for about the American value of the unmanufactured bristles. American watch-case makers are selling to Japan cases for excellent movements made there for this market. There are 46 cotton mills in Japan, with about 600,000 spindles. New mills are being erected and Japan threatens to become a bold and large competitor for the trade of the world in cotton fabrics. The Japanese use the latest improved American and European machinery in this and other industries established by them. They begin with mechanical appliances that are superior to those found in some American mills.

There is no use blinking the facts. Some of our manufacturing industries are gravely menaced by this rivalry of a country where skilled labor may be had at the cost of 10 cents or 15 cents a day, or less than one-tenth of the cost of such labor in our own country. To-day tens of thousands of our laborers are idle. Our markets are invaded and the American workman, like the American manufacturer, is the victim of an Oriental competitor in whom rare skill and fine taste are joined with a simplicity of domestic habits which enables him to support life in comfort upon a tenth of what it costs to do this in the United States.

This competition will grow keener and keener. Japan will not confine herself to her present efforts. Her people are introducing a great variety of manufacturing industries, all using improved machinery, and they are imitating the patterns and inventions of the Western nations with impunity, because there is no protection for either the patents or trade-marks of foreigners in Japan. The importance of this condition of things can not be overestimated.

THE GREAT WANT OF THE PACIFIC COAST STATES AND TERRITORIES IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

The great want of the people of the Pacific Coast is the development and the building up of manufactures. Heretofore all their surplus moneys have been exported East, to Europe, the Sandwich Islands, and elsewhere, to pay for manufactured articles, every one of which can be and should be manufactured at home, thus accomplishing the double purpose of retaining our money, building up our industries, working up our raw material, which is

abundant, and giving lucrative employment to our people. These industries are in their infancy on that coast. For a time they were seriously threatened with cooly labor from China; now, Chinese immigration having been in a great measure stopped by Congressional legislation, a new and more dangerous element threatens to strangle our infant manufactures in that region, and retard their expansion and growth.

As bearing upon this question, I beg to quote from a recent communication, dated November 30, 1895, from William M. Bunker, the editor in chief of the Daily Report of San Francisco:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *November 30, 1895.*

The Daily Report of November 23 gave details of a Japanese invasion of the American markets. Articles of Japanese manufacture since the close of their war are being received of equal quality with American manufactured goods, and at prices so low that our manufactories of these articles must close unless relieved by Congressional action. Report stated that H. E. Reynell, of Kobe, Japan, established an agency in San Francisco, in the Crocker Building, Mr. Edward O. Burns being their agent, for the sale of Japanese manufactured goods for the purpose of underselling American products. Similar agencies are being established East and West now by representatives of Japanese houses. The agency here is now selling the best parlor matches in tin-lined box, in box and case lots of 50 gross in a case, delivered to the merchant freight and duty paid, at 30 cents per gross. He also sells doors, sashes, blinds, and all articles of wooden ware, cooperage stock, etc., of Japanese manufacture at from 30 to 50 per cent less than they can be manufactured for in this country, with all freight and duty paid by the Japanese importers; also clocks, watches, bicycles, boots, shoes, clothing, hats, caps, gloves, fancy goods, and notions on similar terms. Their agents are buying cotton-mill machinery and shipping to Japan and will take our cotton from here to Japan and send it back manufactured for less than it can possibly be manufactured in this country. They also take cargoes of Pacific Coast lumber, manufacture the same in Japan into wooden ware, etc., and return same here manufactured at 50 per cent less than our manufacturers' wholesale prices.

A meeting has been called in San Francisco for the Chamber of Commerce, Board of Trade, and Manufacturers' Association to memorialize Congress for relief. The appraiser of the port of San Francisco, in an interview with the editor of the Report, speaks of largely increased importations of Japanese goods of all kinds. He also notes a change in silk goods. They were formerly all white, but are now colored to beat the coloring of France or America.

The slight temporary benefit which may accrue to our people from an enlargement of our lumber and cotton market in Japan will hardly compensate for the incalculable damage that must ultimately and inevitably come to every class of our people, including our producers of lumber and cotton, and especially to our farmers and wage workers and artisans, by being compelled to enter a competitive race on our own shores with the manufactured products and the raw materials as well of the cheap labor of China and Japan, coupled with the additional advantages those countries possess by reason of the difference in money standards and the resulting difference in exchange.

A fair illustration of the manner in which our country suffers in competition with Great Britain in trade in the West Indies by paying gold for silver-made goods is found in the following article in a recent issue of the American Economist:

PAYING GOLD FOR SILVER-MADE GOODS.

The neighboring British possessions in the West Indies and Guiana are not very lucrative to the United States as far as trade is concerned. During the last five years we have bought to the extent of $67,556,530 from the British West Indies, selling them only $42,230,435 worth of our American products. From British Guiana, in the five years, we bought $21,021,262, selling only $9,913,067. The balance of trade was $36,435,000 against us in these two instances, so that John Bull is not losing everything in his transactions with us.

Again, looking at our trade with British India and the British East Indies, we find that where we sold to them to the extent of $18,410,214 in the last five years, we have bought as much as $110,194,324 of the products of Lascar labor, this balance of trade being against us to the extent of $91,784,110. But this is not the only gain to the British Empire. These Indian goods were made by Lascar labor, which was paid in silver coin, and the material of which they are constructed was paid for in silver. John Bull, however, won't take silver payment from us for them. We have to foot his bills with gold coin, and a pretty little profit he makes by the transaction.

Should this country persist in rejecting bimetallism, in repudiating the double standard, and insist on perpetuating the single gold standard, the time will soon come when the manufacturers of New England, as well as those of the Pacific Coast, not only of cotton and of wool, but of almost every character of manufactured product, will be brought to a full realization of the disadvantages under which they labor in being brought into direct competition at home as well as abroad with the manufactured products of like character imported from the Orient. They will, furthermore, be brought to realize the great fact that the advantages of the Oriental silver-using countries are such, by reason of the difference of standard and of exchange, that no tariff, however high the rates, can erect a wall sufficiently high to protect the manufacturers and people of this country against the invasion of their products. Two remedies, coupled together, alone will suffice—

First. The abandonment of the single gold standard by this country and the adoption of the double standard and of true bimetallism; and

Second. A protective tariff.

THE INCREASE OF THE PUBLIC DEBT IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE SINGLE GOLD STANDARD.

I decline to give further authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue additional bonds in time of peace—

First. Because I deny the necessity for any such additional issue;

Second. Because I am unalterably opposed to a further increase of our interest-bearing public debt;

Third. Because in encouraging additional bond issues at any rate of interest I believe we are, instead of sustaining the public credit, but hastening the rapid approach of national bankruptcy; and

Fourth. Because I am a Republican, and every Republican convention of every State in the Union which has convened in the last year has condemned in emphatic terms the present Administration for issuing bonds, and thus increasing the national indebtedness.

I am unwilling under any plea of necessity to aid the party to which I belong in doing that which as a party it has most emphatically condemned in others.

Think for one moment of the magnitude of the increase of our public debt in the last two years. The interest alone on this increase, to say nothing of the principal, will amount at the maturity of the bonds to $120,000,000. This interest account will be increased over $70,000,000 by the further issue of $100,000,000 bonds now about to be made, and bids for which have been called, thus making a total increase in the principal of the public debt in less than two years of $262,602,245.67, with an aggregate of interest to be paid on this amount of the enormous sum of $190,000,000, thus making a sum total to be paid by the people of $452,602,245.67, as the result of the policy of borrowing money to sustain the single gold standard; and notwithstanding all this, we have less gold in the Treasury, or, at least, not more than a fraction more now than we had two years ago; I do not know that we have as much, exactly; I do not precisely know how that is. And still further, during all this period there has been a constant excess of expenditures over receipts amounting for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894, to $69,803,260.58; for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, to $42,805,223, and for the six months prior to December 1, 1895, to $17,613,539.24, aggregating in all to December 1 last a deficit of $130,221,023; and still the deficit continues; it goes on and increases.

As bearing upon the attitude of the Republican party upon the propriety and necessity for further increasing the bonded indebtedness of the country, I attract attention to the following resolutions in the platforms of several of the Republican State conventions held within the past year, and heretofore quoted elsewhere in this debate:

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTIONS CONDEMN BOND ISSUES.

[Massachusetts Republican, October 5, 1895.]

The last Congress provided a revenue shamefully inadequate, and by the issue of bonds shifted onto succeeding Administrations the burden of their outlay.

[New York Republican, September 17, 1895.]

We denounce the Democratic Administration for its gross mismanagement of the finances of the nation. It already has added more than $165,000,000 to the national debt and the burdens of the people, and there is every evidence that this increase is to be continued.

[Kentucky Republican League Clubs, May 1, 1895.]

We believe in the doctrine of protection to American labor, American industries, and American homes; and we attribute the unparalleled business depression of the country to the utter failure of the Democratic Administration in its management of both foreign and domestic affairs, which has created national distrust and general paralysis, has driven capital from the factories and labor into the streets, reduced the revenues of the Government, and increased its bonded indebtedness.

[Ohio Republican, May 28, 1895.]

We denounce the present Democratic Administration, whose vicious and vacillating course has brought us distress at home and humiliation abroad. It has inaugurated a policy looking toward ultimate free trade, which has deranged business, crippled our industries, distressed our homes, and dealt labor a serious blow. With deplorable incompetency it has failed to raise revenue enough to run the Government and has had to borrow, in less than two years, $162,000,000 mainly to pay ordinary running expenses, selling in secret to favored foreign syndicates the bonds of the Government at prices far below their actual value.

[Pennsylvania Republican, August 28, 1895.]

Charges upon the Democratic party the fault for a constantly growing deficit in receipts, as compared with expenditures, thus compelling the borrowing of money in large amounts at exorbitant premiums in time of peace to maintain the credit of the Government. For the failure of the Democratic Administration to provide sufficient revenue to meet the wants of the Government "its responsibility is absolute, and it has exhibited to the world such inability and faithlessness in the discharge of the high trust committed to its care that its history continues to excite the contempt and distrust of all thoughtful citizens."

[Utah Republican, 1895.]

The first State Republican convention of Utah was held at Salt Lake City August 28, 1895. The platform adopted was as follows:

"We condemn the action of the present National Administration for issuing Government bonds in time of peace to meet a deficit caused by unwise and un-American legislation, and for its unprecedented and unpatriotic coalition with a syndicate of foreign money lenders to procure the sale of Government bonds adversely to the interests of the people."

Do the people of this country, do the Republicans who were so clamorous for the repeal of the Sherman Act, fail to remember the loud and almost universal prediction that was drummed in the ears of those of us who opposed that repeal to the effect that the repeal of that legislation was all that was required to stop the export of gold, stay the dark shadows of panic and depression, and

bring prosperity to the country? Well, the Sherman law was repealed in the fall of 1893, and what was the result?

Contrast the conditions of the movement of the export of gold for a period shortly prior to the passage of the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890, to the date of its repeal with the period that has passed since the date of its repeal; and further contrast the condition and prosperity of our country and people during these two periods; and then it will be seen how well founded were the predictions of those who so confidently and dogmatically asserted that all that was needed to bring prosperity and stay the flow of gold from this country was the repeal of that act.

The following extract from a recent able speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] delivered in this Chamber on the 3d of the present month will most conclusively show how erroneous were all these predictions, and furthermore that the condition of the country is not chargeable to the existence of legislation in the interest of silver. The extract is as follows:

I have a graphic map attached to the Secretary's report of 1894, which shows the amount of gold in the Treasury from 1879 to July 1, 1894. It steadily and almost continuously increased from $140,000,000 on the 1st of January, 1879, to $300,000,000 on the 1st of January, 1891. It then steadily decreased to the 1st of July, 1894, when it was reduced to $125,000,000, and, though replenished by the large sale of bonds, it was reduced December 31, 1895, to the sum of $64,204,651.

During the first term of Mr. Cleveland, when he was powerless to affect our currency and tariff policy, the Senate being Republican, the gold increased from $240,000,000 on the 1st of April, 1885, to $320,000,000 on the 1st of April, 1889. This gold came into the Treasury without cost in exchange for United States notes or gold certificates.

It is just to Mr. Carlisle to say that he attributes the withdrawal of gold to silver legislation, yet the Bland-Allison Act was in force from 1878 to 1890, when the accumulation of gold occurred, *and the great body of gold was withdrawn after the act of July 14, 1890, was repealed.*

Yet the Senator from Ohio was foremost among Senators and others who insisted that all that was necessary to stop the flow of gold from this country and to bring prosperity was to repeal the Sherman Act. It was repealed, not by my vote; I admit that; but it was repealed nevertheless. Now the distinguished Senator from Ohio comes into the Senate and tells us that the great body of the $300,000,000 of gold that vanished from this country was withdrawn after the act of July 14, 1890, was repealed. So even the best of those with whom we associate can be mistaken sometimes as to the probable effect of legislation.

From this statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, which is accurate, it is shown that from the period shortly prior to the passage of the act of 1890, generally known as the Sherman Act, till a period shortly prior to its repeal, the gold in the Treasury constantly increased from $140,000,000 to $300,000,000, and since that period, in the language of the distinguished Senator, "the great body of gold being withdrawn after the act of July 14, 1890, was repealed," although replenished by borrowing $162,000,000 in gold, there was in the Treasury on December 31, 1895, but $64,204,651 in gold, and to-day, January 30, 1896, but $49,733,691.47.

Commencing with March 1, 1889, but sixteen and one-half months prior to the passage of the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890, until March 7, 1893, seven months prior to its repeal, our Government reduced the public indebtedness to the amount of $236,527,666.10, whereas since the date of its repeal it has been increased $162,602,245.27, with every prospect of a further increase in the next ten days of another $100,000,000.

THE SINGLE GOLD STANDARD AND A FREE-TRADE TARIFF BREED FAILURES AND DISTRESS.

The effect of the maintenance and enforcement of the single gold standard and a free-trade tariff for the past two years is plainly exemplified in the number and extent of business failures in this country during this time.

The figures are as follows:

Section.	Number of failures—		Liabilities—	
	1894.	1895.	1894.	1895.
Eastern	1,784	1,686	$18,790,018	$19,914,153
Middle	3,018	3,082	51,493,787	51,239,432
Western	2,885	3,218	30,168,654	32,727,634
Northwestern	1,247	1,324	15,201,215	19,216,225
Southern	2,202	2,185	21,285,698	24,811,939
Pacific	1,182	1,180	10,608,257	9,211,208
Territories	403	338	2,077,805	1,721,854
United States	12,721	13,013	149,595,434	158,842,445

From this it will be seen, notwithstanding the assertion of business improvement in this country, there have been in these two years 25,734 failures, with liabilities amounting in the aggregate to $308,437,879. But not only so. There have been 292 more failures during the year 1895 than in 1894, with liabilities in excess of those of 1894 of $9,247,011.

DEPRESSION IN VALUES THE RESULT MAINLY OF THE EFFORT TO MAINTAIN THE SINGLE GOLD STANDARD.

The price of every product of the farm for the past few years and at present is such that it will not, as a general rule, meet the cost of production, to say nothing of any compensation for the farmer's labor—to say nothing of profit—and as a result, although crops are abundant, farmers are unable to pay their taxes. Why is this? It is insisted by many it is the result of overproduction, improvement in machinery, and like causes. In my judgment, after careful study, I believe it to be attributable, more than to all other causes combined, to the attempted destruction of bimetallism in the world and the effort to erect and enforce the single gold standard, thus measuring all values by gold alone, instead of by gold and silver. And on this question I will quote the opinion of an eminent gold standard advocate, who, as statistician, is in the employ of the London Board of Trade.

Mr. Giffen, this great English statistician, although an advocate of the single gold standard, in his Essays on Finance, in speaking on this subject, says:

But the answer clearly is that in the period between 1850 and 1865 and down to 1873 the increase of banking facilities and similar economies was as great relatively to the arrangements existing just before as anything that has taken place since. The same reply may also be made to the suggestion that the multiplication of commodities accounts for the entire change that has occurred. There is no reason to suppose that the multiplication of commodities relatively to the previous production has proceeded at a greater rate since 1873 than in the twenty years before that, yet before 1873 prices were rising notwithstanding the multiplication of commodities, and since that date the tendency has been to decline. The one thing which has changed, therefore, appears to be the supply of gold and the demands upon it; and to that cause largely we must accordingly ascribe the change in the course of prices which has occurred.

Mr. Giffen further says:

The question then arises on these figures whether the depression at a time like the present may not be largely due to some permanent cause which has lately begun to operate. Two causes only have been suggested. One is a great multiplication of commodities and diminution of the cost of production due to the progress of invention, improved facilities of communication, lower freights, international telegraphy, and the like circumstances. The other is that the precious metal used for standard money, viz, gold, has become relatively scarcer than it was, its production being diminished on the one hand and demands for it on the other hand increased. The former of these causes was discussed quite lately by Mr. Fowler in the Contemporary Review, and a greater weight assigned to it than to the latter cause. I am disposed to give the greater weight to the latter.

That is to say, Mr. Giffen ascribes the great depression in prices to the fact that standard money, namely, gold, has become *relatively* scarcer than it was, by reason, first, of its diminished production on the one hand, and secondly, the demands for it on the other hand having increased, and this is the cause of the great depression in values of all commodities.

BORROWED MONEY CAN NOT CREATE PERMANENT PROSPERITY.

This country can never be made rich or prosperous by continuing in time of peace a policy of borrowing money. Money can only be retained in a country when it is money that comes to it as the result of a balance of trade—when the value of exports exceeds the value of imports—when it is money earned. Money borrowed or money obtained by makeshift or artifice is in no sense wealth, nor will it remain in a country, nor can the wit of man invent any system that will prevent its export. Its withdrawal is inevitable, passing into other and foreign channels with greater alacrity than it was received, and when it thus takes its departure a country is in a far more embarrassed condition than before it commenced to put forth efforts to secure it by the issuance of notes or bonds. It can at most only create a shadowy, illusive, and transitory prosperity.

This country can not long continue itself upon a gold basis by borrowing money by driblets or even by the hundreds of millions, neither can prosperity be restored or maintained by issuing bonds to be sold ostensibly at public outcry, but eventually to be taken by a syndicate in New York or London, nor the national credit be maintained by transferring the duty of protecting it to the care of a few gentlemen in the city of New York, whose patriotism is circumscribed by the selfish rules of cent-per-cent, and whose heroism in the cause of the amelioration of poverty and human suffering, and national credit, and national prosperity, is manifest in a keen desire to coin a golden profit out of the necessities and misfortunes of their country.

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERMS "SOUND MONEY"?

Much is said these later times about "sound money." The terms are iterated and reiterated in message, in document, in newspaper, and in public speech. And what does it mean?

If it means that the gold dollar and its multiple can only be rightfully denominated sound money, then I most emphatically deny the proposition. If it means to imply that either a silver dollar or a legal-tender dollar, whose purchasing and debt-paying power is equal to the gold dollar, is *not* sound money, then I deny that. If it means, furthermore, that a gold dollar, which has appreciated from 30 to 50 per cent, and to that extent has reduced the price of farm products and every other commodity, is a better dollar, a sounder dollar, or even as good a dollar or as sound a dollar as is the nondepreciated silver dollar which passes at par in every part of the Union, or a legal-tender dollar, which is kept at par and redeemable on presentation in coin, then I deny that.

If, moreover, by the terms "sound money" is only meant that

kind of money that passes in coinage form as money in all the single gold standard countries of the world, then I deny that the terms are properly applied, as I believe a great nation like ours, with its vast territory, its 70,000,000 people, its immeasurable resources, its internal commerce, and its almost unlimited amount of business, is not only capable of having, but in the interest of all concerned, in my judgment, should have a domestic money of its own, kept at par and good as a home-purchasing and debt-paying medium in every State and Territory in the Union, and upon every foot of American soil. With such a domestic circulating medium, in sufficient but not in redundant or inflated quantity, coupled with a protective tariff, the industries of this country would no longer languish, the wheels of its factories would be put in motion, labor would find profitable employment, our home market would be enlarged, and our farmers would receive a fair price for their products, and thus be enabled to pay their taxes, something they are unable to do now.

If, furthermore, by the terms "sound money" the impression is intended to be conveyed that all values must be measured by a single gold standard, and only this is sound money, and that the principle of bimetallism—or the double standard, as it is sometimes erroneously, as I think, called—is wrong and should be repudiated as unsound, then I deny that, and I protest that such a doctrine was never yet declared by any of the great parties of this country in any national platform during or since the days of Washington, and it is, moreover, in flagrant conflict with the policy enunciated in every national platform of every party heretofore adopted in this country, and particularly that of the Republican party, which is pledged unalterably to the policy of bimetallism and against the single gold standard—to the policy of the use of both gold *and* silver as *standard* money.

If, however, by the terms "sound money" is meant simply that any dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, which can not be and is not kept in this country in debt-paying and purchasing power the equal of every other dollar, then I might be willing to admit their proper application if the terms "sound money" mean anything at all, and for one I do not believe they do, or that they are more than a meaningless catch phrase, coined and used for the purpose of humbugging and deceiving the people.

For one I believe in making and keeping every dollar of our circulating medium, whether gold, silver, or paper, equal with every other dollar in purchasing and debt-paying power. I am unalterably opposed to a depreciated circulating medium, but I am still more opposed to an abnormally appreciated dollar, which will abnormally depress the price of all commodities.

NO HOPE FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AGREEMENT.

All seem to agree that bimetallism would be a good thing if it could be brought about by international agreement; but there is not a Senator in this Chamber who has thoroughly studied this subject, and who fully understands the history of the several international monetary conferences that we have had in the last thirty years, that does not know that such a consummation is just as impossible—that is to say, one that will include Great Britain, and so long as that power stands back, neither Germany, nor France, nor Russia, nor any other of the great powers will come in—as it is to expect that we will secure, either now or hereafter, railroad connection between here and the planet Mars.

Most certainly so long as the United States defers, as we are now doing, to the wishes, the interests, and the dictates of Great Britain there is no possible show. If any one thing will tend to aid in bringing about such international agreement, it will be, in my judgment, a bold, aggressive, independent monetary, as well as commercial, policy upon our part. We must cease to concede that, for any reason or for all reasons combined, London must forever be the clearing house of the world. Our policy should cease to be one of dependence for any purpose or to any extent either upon Great Britain or any other power on earth. Our country is resourceful enough in all that tends to constitute commercial and monetary power and nationality in the highest, most enlarged, and best sense of the term to justify a vigorous, uncompromising, and independent monetary, as well as commercial, policy. For these reasons, briefly stated, I am not in favor of waiting longer on Great Britain, but am in favor of a vigorous, aggressive policy of *independent bimetallism*, coupled with a *protective tariff*.

I have no disposition to quarrel with those who differ with me on these great questions. I am willing to accord and do accord honesty of purpose to all. I am not of those, moreover, who believe that any cause can be advanced or strengthened or in any manner helped by the application of terms of ridicule, reproach, or abuse. Neither the cry of "crazy silverite" nor "Wall-street gold bug" can be regarded as argument, or should they have any influence in the determination of these great questions, nor do I believe that either cause will be in any manner advanced by the application of epithets to those with whom we disagree.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the great remedies to be applied to present conditions in this country are—

First. Independent bimetallism;

Second. A protective tariff; and

Third. Legislation in the interest of our merchant marine that will tend to bring to us a greater proportion of our carrying trade.

What should be avoided in the future, in my judgment, is a further issuance of bonds, any increase of our national indebtedness, or further attempts to carry on the business of this great country on the basis of the single gold standard.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, Mr. President, is it not about time this great nation, these United States of America, should assert its monetary, as well as its commercial, independence? Are we, with our vast territory, our immeasurable resources, our model government, our 70,000,000 of brave, intelligent, aggressive, independent people, to forever acknowledge our dependence on Great Britain, or any other power on earth, in either a monetary or any other sense? Must we, while denying the right of any government on the globe, republican or monarchical, liberal or despotic, to dictate to us as to the character of our legislation upon any or all of the great questions touching our industrial and commercial interests, questions involving the right of expatriation, the character of people we shall admit to our shores, the encroachment of alien systems, even to limits far beyond our national borders, but upon the hemisphere upon which we live, questions involving our national honor, and every conceivable subject pertaining to our present and future welfare, and the promotion and progress of our civilization, save and except *one*—that relating to our monetary system—and as to that one must we be forever subservient to the will, and the wish, and the dictation of Great Britain?

Has the more than century of our national life, with all the prestige, and influence, and power, and glory that have come to us in our unparalleled progress as a nation, and in the development of a civilization than which none so grand has ever existed since the creation of man, still left us a poor, weak dependent of the British Crown? Because England, since 1816, has adhered to the single gold standard in the interest of the gold brokers of Lombard street, are we to forever bend the supple knee, acknowledge our impotency as a nation, and surrender the prerogatives that ought rightfully to attach to a free and independent people? In my judgment, the United States as a nation, in whatever aspect considered—whether nationally, intellectually, scientifically, commercially, or financially—stands, or at least should stand, in the very vanguard of nations, preeminent in every element of greatness, in every aspect of grandeur, in every attribute of glory, and in every essential of sovereign power. Resourceful in physical elements of every conceivable character, in a measure, and to an extent unparalleled by any country on the globe, if she will but assert herself as becomes her as the proud, aggressive, independent leader of nations, New York, and not London, will become the clearing house of the world, and our country, preeminent over all, will no longer be the slave, either in a commercial or monetary sense, but the distinctive and primal sovereign, the imperial master and dictator, financially as well as commercially, among all the nations of the world.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, at this late hour I have no desire to trespass upon the Senate more than a few minutes, and this I do more in the way of an explanation of the vote I shall cast upon the pending measure than an attempt to make any extended remarks.

My views were well known both before and after my election. I should have contented myself by remaining silent and casting my vote in favor of this measure had it not been for the peculiar attitude taken by one of the great metropolitan journals of the country, wherein it charged in its editorial columns and reiterated the charge day after day that the Senators upon this floor from a number of States in the Union, especially from States in the South and West, were misrepresenting their constituents; that those whom they had honored by sending them here to represent them were misrepresenting them upon this floor. Among the States thus named was California, which I have the honor in part to represent in this body. The names of my distinguished colleague and myself were mentioned as misrepresenting our people. It was stated that the sentiment of California was in favor of the single standard of gold and not in favor of the free coinage of silver, and therefore if we advocated and voted for this measure we would violate our trust and the confidence placed in us.

If this charge is correct, it is a most heinous offense; one that should justly subject us to the criticism of that great journal and condemn us to the censure of every law-abiding and patriotic citizen. I know of no crime more offensive than that of dishonor, and there can be no act more dishonorable than willfully and knowingly to misrepresent the people who have honored a man by selecting him as one of their representatives.

But how are we to know what is the public sentiment upon this question? The Republican party in California met in convention over a year ago. It was the largest convention in numbers that had been held in California for many years. Every voting precinct in every county of that State was represented in that con-

vention, and in the platform adopted there was embodied a plank which pledged their representatives in the legislature which was to select the Senators to vote for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. That platform went before the people and every one upon the ticket was elected except the governor, who was defeated by local causes. A majority of the members of that legislature were Republicans, and I owe the honor of holding this position to their votes. While that legislature was in session it passed the following joint resolution, which I presented here some time since and will now read again, with your permission:

California assembly joint resolution No. 13.

Introduced by committee on Federal relations February 6, 1895. Read, adopted, and transmitted to senate (and by them concurred in).

Assembly substitute for senate joint resolution No. 2, relative to the free coinage of silver.

Whereas we recognize the fact that by the demonetization of silver, and by refusal to give it equal standing in the coinage system of the United States, the material interest of the nation is dangerously impaired; and

Whereas it is recognized to be a fact that the opposition to silver coinage emanates from speculative syndicates and moneyed classes, who seek to embarrass the people of the nation for the advancement of their own selfish ends; and

Whereas we entertain the firm belief that the full measure of national prosperity will never be restored until the coinage of silver is resumed in accordance with the true intent and spirit of the Constitution of the United States, and having unbounded faith in the power and ability of this nation to restore and maintain silver in its proper position alongside of gold; and

Whereas we believe that the issue of United States bonds for the purpose of maintaining a single gold standard, or any standard that does not contemplate the free and unlimited coinage of silver, is a practice fraught with the greatest danger to the stability of our institutions and the maintenance of national credit: Therefore

Be it resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to earnestly and urgently advocate the immediate enactment of such laws as may be necessary to provide for the immediate resumption of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1; and

Be it further resolved, That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives be requested to actively advocate the enactment of such laws as may be necessary to prevent the issue of United States bonds for the sole purpose of maintaining a single gold standard of money; and

Be it further resolved, That the governor be requested to immediately transmit a copy of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, that was the last expression on this question by the legislature of California. I am a member of the State Board of Trade, of the Manufacturers' Association, the Chamber of Commerce, of agricultural and horticultural societies, and various other organizations, which number among their membership tens of thousands of people in our State—merchants, manufacturers, farmers, artisans, and workingmen—and since I have been here I have yet to receive a single official communication from any one of those organizations that would indicate that there has been a change in the sentiment of our people upon this question; and I think my colleague will bear the same testimony. Neither have I received a single letter which indicates that my associates in business, my associates socially, or otherwise, have changed their views, nor has the public press of our State in the cities, the towns, and the rural districts given expression to any sentiment contrary to that which has been promulgated in the years and months gone by upon this question.

The people of our State are a cosmopolitan people. They are made up from every State and Territory of the Union. They are intelligent, scholarly, thoughtful people; and when they make up their minds upon a certain political policy they want to carry out that policy before changing their minds upon it. They want to see if it has any merit in it; they want to give it a trial. They have discussed this question pro and con; they have duly considered it; and they believe that the demonetization, the retirement, so to speak, of half of the money of this country, was not in the interest of the people; that it was not in the interest of the progress of this country. My own particular views, perhaps, are more conservative, but I am here to carry out the instructions of the people whose good opinion I so much desire. I am here to reflect the wishes of the people to whom I owe so much. If the charges in the paper to which I have referred were true, to the effect that I am knowingly misrepresenting them upon this floor, my resignation would be placed at their disposal. But it is not true that my colleague and myself are not representing their wishes upon this floor, unless that great journal has some information that our people know nothing about.

As I was proceeding to say, my own personal views are conservative upon this question. If I could enact a law I would do that which was embodied in my amendment at the last Congress, when we had under consideration the repeal of the Sherman Act. It was the free and unlimited coinage of American silver, the withdrawal from circulation of all bills under $10, and to cease the coinage of all gold under $5. It was to let the American miner take the product of our American silver mines to the mint, and there have it coined into silver dollars or the denominational part thereof, I believed that such a policy would be productive of more good than to open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver that came from Mexico, where skilled miners received but 50 cents a day, and the ordinary laborer but 25 cents a day.

I believe in first fostering the silver of our own country, opening our own mines, giving employment to our own miners, finding work for the American mechanics who would build the machines, and the pumps, and the machinery to run those mines, furnishing a home market for the product of the farmer, stimulating American industry, and carrying out on that line what I believe to be true Republicanism; that is, first to take care of our own country before sending missionaries to the South Sea Islands. I never did have any patience, even at home, with those good people who sew and make clothing and send supplies to the heathen while their neighbor's children are going barefoot and half clad. So I would have this American policy, if I had my way, on the silver question.

Some say that such a policy is not practicable, because they would smuggle in foreign silver; that they would set up a mint in Mexico and there coin our American dollars and half dollars, not putting in less silver, but putting in the same silver we now have, weighing just as many grains, and bring them in and scatter them among our people. Well, people now smuggle into this country; men now violate the law, both State and national; and once in a while we have an opportunity of making an example of them and letting them feel the penalty of the law.

But there are two sides to this question. No one can deny it who has sat in this Chamber as we have done for the last month and listened to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and then turning to the other side has listened to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], then the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], and then the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], all men of great learning, men who have devoted their lives to the study of political economy. Many of them have been on this floor for a generation, for a period longer than the lives of some who now occupy seats here. Yet they are a long way apart. Both sides can not be right. They are like two parallel lines; if they continue on that course they will never meet. It seems to me that each side should concede something; that there should be some compromise measure. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], shakes his head. He says "no compromise." He is like the old woman in the story when talking to her friends in the church—everybody was wrong except herself, and she did not understand how it could be. Mr. President, there are two sides to every question.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. Every time we have traded with the other fellows we have got cheated. They called it a compromise, but they got the whole thing. They will not keep faith, and there is no use to try it again. I am for no more compromises with the enemy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, two wrongs never made a right. There is not to-day upon our statute book a law that is not a measure of compromise. It is the highest attribute of the American that a citizen of this great Republic can have an opportunity to discuss this proposition and that proposition and after discussion to agree.

Mr. STEWART. Would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly not.

Mr. STEWART. Was the act of 1873 or the act repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law and adopting the gold standard, with a view of immediate prosperity, a compromise?

Mr. PERKINS. My friend, the Senator from Nevada, was here at the time and I was not. He can answer that question better than I.

Mr. STEWART. You have read the law. Was that a compromise?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator permitted it to pass.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is said he voted for it.

Mr. STEWART. That I voted for what measure?

Mr. PERKINS. I did not say so. Some of your friends here say so.

Mr. STEWART. I did not; and no man honestly believes that I would vote for either of those acts.

Mr. PERKINS. At all events, the law was repealed. If it could have been continued I believe there would not have been now the great divergence between the two metals. I believe in bimetallism. I believe in the use of both gold and silver. I think we ought to have some compromise. Here is our new Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who has offered two amendments. One before me closes up with a doxology which sounds splendidly. He puts back of every gold dollar a silver dollar, and back of every silver dollar a gold dollar.

Mr. PEFFER. Is not that right?

Mr. PERKINS. If that could be done it certainly seems to me to be worthy of consideration. He has also proposed the coinage of American silver. We are now producing about 60,000,000

ounces of silver per annum in the United States. Let us withdraw from circulation all one, two, and five dollar bills, and the silver would then go out in change among our people. There is no germ of disease in the silver dollar or the silver half dollar, but when you take a currency bill that has been in the pocket of some thrifty immigrant for three months it ought to be fumigated before being taken into the family and given to the children to play with.

I believe, Mr. President, that there can be some compromise measure agreed upon. I believe, in the true spirit of statesmanship, we should take up the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas and consider them in a spirit of fairness, in a spirit of justice, in a spirit of patriotism, for after all we all have in view the same object. We want a good government; we want wise laws; we want to do that which will make our people contented and happy and prosperous. What is the object of a government unless it has that in view? What does this great Congress mean, if we come here month after month and year after year and discuss this proposition and that proposition and no one will concede to the other that he is half right, and the other side will not concede to this side that it is half right? Mr. President, that is not the spirit which should animate us. Let us come together on these propositions and out of it crystallize something that will benefit our people. The times are sadly out of joint. I do not believe it is all because our mints are not open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. I believe there are other great wrongs that should be remedied.

Mr. STEWART. Will I interrupt the Senator if I ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at all.

Mr. STEWART. Is the Senator in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the United States, acting independently of any other nation?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall vote for that measure, because before the Senator came upon the floor I said that the people I in part represent here instructed me to do so; but I very much question if it is the wisest policy for us to pursue at this time. I want to reiterate what I have said. Understanding the wishes of my people, I should be false to them if I pursued any other course. There is no question in my mind but that my path of duty is as clear as the midday sun. But I am discussing the other proposition, one to which my distinguished friend has given much thought. He is a student of political economy, and he knows as well as I do that when we open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver the wages of the miners in the mines in Mexico, that are being worked to-day by miners for 50 cents a day in silver, and who live upon food that costs them not to exceed 10 cents, will go up to American wages or the mine owner will profit by it. I said before the Senator came in that I believe in first taking care of our own people.

Mr. STEWART. Does not the Senator know that our mines are pretty much all closed down?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, and I want to open them.

Mr. STEWART. Would you keep them closed for fear somebody else will be benefited? Why not close the gold mines, why not demonetize the gold, because the people of the world who are engaged in that business are benefited by having our gold?

Mr. PERKINS. My friend misunderstands me. It is my belief that it is wise statesmanship to open the mints of the United States to the production of silver from American mines. That would set to work all your mines in Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, and elsewhere. It would find a market for the products of the farm; it would give employment to the mechanic who builds the machinery, to the quartz mills, and the engines that are used in running the mines; it would give employment to the teamster and to a hundred grades of artisans connected with mining.

Mr. STEWART. Would that limited use of silver have any effect upon the four thousand million dollars of silver now in existence?

Mr. PERKINS. It would be taking one step. We would commence the reform at home. It would be notice to the world——

Mr. STEWART. Would that limited use of it be any different from buying silver?

Mr. PERKINS. I think it would.

Mr. STEWART. Would it rehabilitate silver so as to relieve the prices?

Mr. PERKINS. It would do so in the United States.

Mr. STEWART. But our difficulty is that we have to sell our farm products in competition with the millions of producers in Asia, and on account of the low price of silver they have an advantage of 100 per cent, while our farmers are ruined. Does not the Senator see that the policy of coining the American product would be the same as the policy of buying? It does not remonetize silver and does not help the farmer by furnishing more money for his farm products.

Mr. PERKINS. Without discussing that proposition in detail, I will say that it is hardly clear to me how it would benefit us by opening our mints to the coinage of Mexican silver; while if we open our mints to the coinage of American silver it would be notice to the world that we had taken one step in advance and that perhaps later on we would open our mints to the product of the world.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know of a single gold man in this Chamber who is willing to do that? Has he made one convert? Is it not a fact that when President Harrison made his swing around the circle through Utah and the Western part of the country immediately in his wake a large number of our silver men said they were going to accept that as a compromise? I told them before they accepted it as a compromise to find the gold man in the East who would offer to compromise. Before we compromise would it not be well to find one regular gold man in the United States who is willing to compromise?

Mr. PERKINS. Even Cromwell made no converts to his faith by going with a Bible in one hand and a sword in the other. It is much better to take the olive branch.

Mr. STEWART. Did you ever know a Christian to make any progress in compromising with the devil? It is just as absurd to talk about an honest silver man compromising with the gold bugs.

Mr. PERKINS. I know a great many Christians, but I am not acquainted with any of the other class.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think they would be hard to find?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not know; I have been keeping good company in Washington.

Mr. President, as I was saying, something is certainly wrong in our financial affairs. During the three years the present Administration has been in control we have run behind $262,000,000, or we will have done so on the 5th of February, when the next bond bid is opened; and this, too, in a time of peace, when there have been no great internal improvements, no great harbor and river improvements, no fortifications on either the Atlantic or the Pacific; and while there has been some addition in our Navy, nothing like there should have been. We have been running behind to this extent, which means to the people, at 4 per cent, $10,480,000 a year, $840,000 per month in interest money, which they must pay out because by our poor business management we have not had sufficient income to pay the running expenses of the Government. I do not echo the sentiment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] that this has been brought about by dishonesty, but I do know that it has been brought about by mismanagement, by bad business judgment, and we ought to right this wrong in some way.

The measure that came from the House of Representatives and went to the Committee on Finance, known as the bond bill, has now been amended and returned to the Senate, and that is under consideration. I rose for the purpose of saying that I shall vote for the amendment. After I have done that I will have discharged my duty so far as it is possible for me to do so upon this question. I do not think it would be patriotic on my part or in the interests of the people of this country to vote for amendments that are only calculated to obstruct legislation when proposed to other measures, like the tariff bill. I believe it our patriotic duty to provide a revenue for the support of the Government, and the revenue bill presented to us by the House of Representatives seems the most expedient plan now left for us to adopt. I know of no other measure to increase the revenue unless we amend the tariff bill so as to add to the amount it will bring in per annum. It is said by those who have made a careful estimate that the bill as passed by the other House will bring in $40,000,000 per annum in addition to the present tariff act known as the Wilson-Gorman bill. If it does it will help bridge over our affairs until there is some change in the business management of the Government.

The bond bill would, perhaps, have received favorable action at the hands of the Finance Committee had it not been that before they were called upon to consider it a call was made for the sale of $100,000,000 4 per cent bonds under the existing law. It has been charged, and not successfully denied, that a syndicate had been formed for the purpose of taking the full issue, and that there was an agreement or tacit understanding that the bonds would be placed on the same terms and price as those previously sold. We must, however, accept the declaration of the Administration and the letter of the manager, if not of the original author, of the syndicate that it was formed from purely patriotic motives.

While I do not for a moment question their purely patriotic motives, and do not wish to be understood as questioning the personal patriotism of those who were interested in the syndicate, I claim that it is an unusual occurrence when in times of peace shrewd and prudent business men form a gigantic syndicate controlling $100,000,000 without some assurance that it will be required and used for their mutual benefit. That a syndicate was formed, or it could not have been dissolved, all admit. I am willing to concede that the syndicate was dissolved because its members saw no opportunity of adding any luster to their patriotic laurels at this time.

There are not many kind words said in behalf of the Adminis-

tration now, but I want to commend it in passing, in a measure only, for making the bond sale a popular one, so to speak. It was done in answer to an almost universal demand of popular sentiment. It demonstrates in a way that can not be mistaken that there is no man in this country who can raise himself above the popular will of the people. It is popular sentiment which governs. No man in this country is big enough or great enough to wrap around himself the robes of his own self-righteousness and self-knowledge and say, "I am the people." No, it is the whole people, and the people only, who rule in this Government; and when the time comes that they do not rule, when the time comes that public sentiment does not govern this land and bring those in the highest position down to representing the views of the people, then a republican form of government will have become a failure.

But it seems to me, while it was made a popular loan or a popular bond offer to our people, the way would have been to fix a definite price for the bonds, so that thay would pay the purchaser the equivalent of, say, 3 per cent per annum, first giving the proposals to the different States in the order in which the Constitution provides for direct taxation, and after this had been done to distribute the remainder in the order of the applications; or the call should provide that on the deposit of the gold at any post-office or subtreasury for transmission to the Treasury a receipt should be given stating the amount of bonds to be delivered in the denominations the depositor desired.

There is one other proposition of this bond call which has rested very unpleasantly upon my mind and which I have been unable to understand; that is, why, as to all cities west of the Missouri River, there is no provision made where these bonds can be taken, except in San Francisco, and in San Francisco the subscribers must pay the cost of exchange on New York. In Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and Boston they can go to the subtreasurer's office, deposit their gold, and receive the bonds, but the people of no city in any other State west of the Missouri River can deposit their gold in any of the post-offices or subtreasuries of the Government without paying the difference of exchange between San Francisco and New York. It is a matter of fact that this Government is paying out thousands and thousands of dollars annually for the transportation of coin from the Pacific Coast to New York every year. Why should this discrimination be made against us in the West? Can it be that it is desired to punish California because she has been so loyal and patriotic in the past, because she has produced so much gold and poured it into the Treasury of this Government, because she has collected so much of custom-house and excise duties? Is it to punish her for doing this that they are discriminating against us poor orphans on the western shore of this great continent?

Let me tell you what we have done in the way of producing the gold for which we are now receiving our punishment. We produced in 1895 $15,600,000. I am not jealous of any State of the Union only to emulate it; but Colorado did a little better than that this last year. She could not, however, buy bonds with that gold, unless she took the money by express to Chicago or to St. Louis or to San Francisco, and there paid the cost of exchange between San Francisco and New York.

California has produced since 1848 in gold $1,354,566,000. Last year the San Francisco mint coined $25,547,610. California has also paid to the United States for the thirty-three years ending June 30, 1895, in customs duties the enormous sum of $217,631,836.73, and in internal-revenue collections for the thirty-three years ending June 30, 1895, she paid $88,214,905.64, making a total collected in thirty-three years of $305,846,742.37.

This is indeed a splendid financial showing. Her people have ever been true and loyal to this country. We have a State pride, which is commendable in every one. We glory in her magnificent hills, clad in the emerald verdure which seems to almost support the blue arch of heaven. We glory in her magnificent valleys, which produce wheat sufficient to load a half dozen ships a day during the year. We are proud of her magnificent institutions of learning, proud of her people, who, as I have said, for their loyalty and devotion to this country are second to those of no other State in the Union. But, above all, we are loyal to the Central Government, because it is a representative Government.

This Senate and this Capitol of the nation reflect the patriotism of the country, and we shall not be true to ourselves and not true to the people unless we honestly and faithfully represent them. Therefore I believe I am doing right when I charge that this Government has not treated us fairly or justly by making a discrimination against us, especially as she is paying out this money to express companies to transport this coin from the Pacific Coast to New York.

Our people in California are proud of their commercial honor as merchants. During the war, while we had the specific contract act providing for gold payments, and though three-fourths of them could have been paid in the currency of the country, there was scarcely an exception throughout that State where men who discharged their indebtedness did not do so in gold, which was understood to be the contract at the time the debt was incurred. But notwithstanding this discrimination against us, notwithstanding these bonds have been offered in such a way that our people will not respond as they otherwise would have done, I believe when the bids are opened on next Wednesday, the 5th of February, that applications will be on file to take every bond at a much higher premium than 4½ per cent, and all that the Government gets above that 4½ per cent will be saved to the people of this country.

All that this Government receives for those bonds in advance of that, we may assume without doing violence to our conscience, it could have got one year ago last February, had the same appeal been made to our people, and there would not have been one word of adverse criticism against this Administration if a call had first been made inviting the people to take these bonds. If they had failed to do so, any contract which would have been made would have been ratified by the people. The people want no representative in Congress, in the Executive chair, or any other place who will not take the people into his confidence.

We all have one great common object in view—the happiness, the success, and the prosperity of this great nation. Let each of us take this lesson home to himself—not what my neighbor does, not what my neighbor should do, but what is it my duty to do under the circumstances? Let us act, then, conscientiously, honestly, patriotically, for the best interests of the people. We shall then have the satisfaction of the approval of our own consciences, and if we make a mistake the people will know it is an error of judgment and will never blame us for it.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, perhaps at this late hour of the day it would hardly be proper to go on with the discussion, but I will take the floor with the expectation of proceeding to-morrow, and will now yield for an executive session, if any Senator desires to make the motion.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have given notice that I would ask the Senate to remain in session to-day until this bill was disposed of, but being satisfied from conferences with many Senators that there will be no difficulty in getting a vote on the bill in the very near future, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, as he abandons his plan with reference to this bill, I wish to ask what is his purpose—what is his request of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have made no request of the Senate except that I have moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I will state frankly to the Senator, however, that I hope the Senate will take a recess at the end of the executive session until 12 o'clock to-morrow, and that we may be able to remain in session to-morrow until practically the debate on the bill shall be disposed of.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator why he proposes to take a recess, instead of adjourning in the usual way, until 12 o'clock to-morrow?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. So that the regular order will come up for consideration immediately after the assembling of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. To the exclusion of the morning business?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator expect to finish the bill to-morrow?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope so; but if it is not disposed of then, I hope to have it disposed of early the following day.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will that be agreeable to the Senator from New York, I should like to ask him?

Mr. HILL. I am not making any objection, and I prefer not to be polled. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. I only ask these questions with a view of expediting the object which the Senator from Arkansas wishes to accomplish. Of course, we all desire to hear the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], and it may possibly result in changing votes on this question. For one I am ready to agree to have the bill considered under the five-minute rule whenever the Senator from Arkansas succeeds in securing the assent of other Senators to that agreement. I only wished to know whether he had abandoned the hope of passing the bill shortly, or whether he expected to go on with its consideration to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. So far from abandoning the bill, my present motion is the result of my conviction that it is the easiest way to dispose of the bill in the near future.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I wish to say that while I have not heretofore had much expectation of making any remarks upon the bill, yet I should like to occupy, say on Saturday at the earliest possible time, somewhere from forty to sixty minutes on the subject; and as I understand the floor will be occupied to-morrow by other speakers, I shall ask an opportunity to be heard on Saturday at as early an hour as I can have.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have not a doubt that there will be

unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may take the floor at any time on Saturday he chooses and that he may occupy it as long as he desires.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the Senator does not expect to finish the bill to-morrow?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I had hoped to do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. But the Senator from Vermont has the same right to convince the Senators upon this floor how they should vote as has the Senator from Wisconsin, and certainly it is not intended to put the Senator from Vermont in the attitude of speaking after the bill has been disposed of.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of course not. Since the Senator from Vermont has indicated his desire, of course I shall defer to him.

Mr. STEWART. I will suggest to the Senator having charge of the bill that it is perfectly apparent that no vote can be taken on it this week, and that he postpone the time for taking the final vote.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. STEWART. There are only two days of this week left. I am very certain a vote can be had earlier by getting an agreement that it be taken early next week.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Unless the Senator from Nevada proposes to delay action on the bill, I am very certain that a vote can be had not later than Saturday.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to submit this suggestion: I think it would be wise for us to take a recess this evening until 10, 11, or 12 o'clock to-morrow, so that the unfinished business will be proceeded with as soon as the Journal shall be read after we assemble to-morrow. If we do that, and then on to-morrow evening take a recess—say, until 10 or 11 o'clock on Saturday—it will give ample time, in my opinion, for every Senator who desires to speak to be fully heard within that time. If that be true, we may come to a vote by, say, 12 o'clock on Saturday.

I feel a very deep interest in the matter for one reason only. The Senator from Arkansas is in charge of the bill, and can not very well leave here until it is disposed of; and I chance to know that it is a matter of importance to him to leave here at least on Saturday afternoon. I for one would subject myself to any amount of personal inconvenience in order to oblige that Senator or any other Senator on this floor who might be similarly situated. I hope that we may come to some such agreement as I have suggested.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am as willing to endure and suffer for the convenience of the Senator from Arkansas as is the Senator from Tennessee. The point that I was endeavoring to elucidate was whether we should advance this bill by the agreement proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. I do not think that we shall advance it at all by taking a recess instead of an adjournment. I do not myself wish to be put in the attitude of hastening the passage of such a pernicious amendment as that which the Senator from Arkansas has reported to a very wise and important bill. On the other hand, I do not wish to delay the action of the Senate, or to cause any inconvenience to the Senator from Arkansas, whose interests in his own State need his presence there at this time. For the purpose, therefore, of solving the difficulty, and with a desire to accommodate the Senator from Arkansas and to join in the spirit of accommodation manifested by the Senator from Tennessee, with the permission of the Senator from New York, I will ask consent that this bill may be considered under the five-minute rule on Saturday, beginning at 11 o'clock and that it be finished before adjournment.

Mr. MORRILL. I shall have to object to that proposition, under the notice I have given.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg pardon. I will add to my proposition, "With the exception of any remarks the Senator from Vermont may choose to submit."

Mr. STEWART. In the suggestion I made I had no intention of delaying the passage of the bill. I should like to see it disposed of at the earliest possible moment, and do not intend to make any remarks upon it further than what I shall say now with regard to it.

I do not think the bill of any importance, certainly not to those interested in the silver question, because everybody knows that it is not to become a law.

Mr. CHANDLER. The amendment or the bill?

Mr. STEWART. The amendment. There is no test about it. Those who desire to do so can make a silver record on that without hurting anybody. It is a perfectly harmless bill; it is mere dress parade, and I shall not make any speech on it. The real bill upon which the amendment reported by the committee would be germane is the tariff bill, because there is already practically a tariff against us on the part of the silver-standard countries of 100 per cent, and when you consider the question of tariff, you must deal with that difference of exchange, or you accomplish nothing; for it is impossible to build a tariff wall high enough around this country to have any practical effect while this difference of exchange exists. Inasmuch as the amendment is germane to the tariff bill, when that bill comes up I propose to submit some remarks. The consideration of that bill will not be mere dress parade. So far as the pending bill is concerned, I am desirous of having it disposed of as early as possible. All I propose to do is to vote. I will vote on dress parade with the rest of the Senate, but I want to see how Senators will meet the real test, and show whether they are silver men or not. I want to see how many will place silver above tariff, or tariff above silver, because silver has become tariff now. That is my position, and I rose to apologize for what I said. I do not want to interfere or to delay in any way the passage of the pending bill. I want to have it passed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will wait I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator why he calls this mere dress parade. Here is an amendment for the free coinage of silver for the United States alone. The Senator is very much in favor of that and he is now endeavoring to show that he is not opposing or delaying the passage of the amendment. Why does he say that it is mere dress parade to pass the pending proposition? If it is mere dress parade why should we not abandon the dress parade and go on with a bill that will fill the Treasury of the United States with money which is needed by the Treasury—that would not be dress parade—and put the money in the Treasury so as to be able to pay our debts? When the Senator says it is dress parade to pass this amendment, why not order off the troops that are on dress parade and go on with the business of the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. That is what I should be very glad to do. The Senator and everybody else knows very well that this bill was passed through the House to indorse the principle of issuing bonds to buy gold and to have Republican indorsement of the bond issue.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. STEWART. I hope the Senator will wait until I get through.

Mr. CHANDLER. When the Senator says I know a thing I prefer to speak for myself.

Mr. STEWART. I hope I shall be pardoned for presuming that the Senator has any knowledge of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. I suppose the Senator imagines that he has absorbed all the knowledge on the subject.

Mr. STEWART. I have apologized to the Senator for presuming that he had any knowledge on the subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. STEWART. Not now.

The passing of the bill through the House of Representatives, providing for the issuing of bonds, was an indorsement of the issuance of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace. So there is no difference between the two parties, between Mr. Cleveland——

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, may I ask a question?

Mr. STEWART. No, no.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me ask one question?

Mr. STEWART. I hope the Senator will not get so nervous. I decline to yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. There is no difference between Mr. Cleveland's policy and the policy of the Republican party, except as to the kind of bonds and how they shall be issued. It is agreed on all hands that this bill was passed for that purpose, to show the agreement on the part of the Republican party to the policy of issuing interest-bearing bonds in time of peace to accumulate gold.

Now the Senator says let us abandon this dress parade and pass a bill to put money into the Treasury. I suppose by that he means the tariff bill. The President, having had his policy of selling bonds indorsed, has proposed to sell $100,000,000 and put the money in the Treasury. He has already got about $180,000,000 of cash balance there; and it is proposed to put another $100,000,000 there, and it is suggested that $100,000,000 additional shall be placed there, making $200,000,000. By the time that is done pretty much all the money the people depend upon with which to do business will be in the Treasury. What they complain of is this mode of impounding the money of the country by the sale of bonds. We do not care whether it is done by a Republican bond bill or by Mr. Cleveland without law. We are opposed to the policy of impounding the money.

The tariff bill, if it brings any money into the Treasury, will only aggravate the disease. What are people going to do during the next year if you have $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 locked up in the Treasury? There ought to be some way of getting the money out of the Treasury, so that the people can have it.

There is no excuse for a tariff bill. What is the good of a tariff bill which will last for a year? Nobody can go into business on that. It is styled an emergency tariff bill. Whoever heard of an

emergency tariff bill? We have heard on the stump from time immemorial the plea that the tariff should be fixed, so that business might be regulated accordingly and the tariff should not disturb business; but here is a regular business disturber. What for? If it is to put more money into the Treasury, it is to aggravate the evil of locking up the people's money. For what purpose is it? It is certainly for the purpose of manufacturing a false issue. It is certainly for the purpose of having tariff agitation without tariff legislation. That is all that is wanted—tariff agitation without tariff legislation. What good will a temporary bill of this kind do? If it does anything it will bring more money into the Treasury, and that will aggravate the evil of contraction. If as a permanent law it would benefit business, as a temporary measure it will disturb business. Why do you want to keep business unsettled by temporary expedients of this kind?

But if you put on the tariff bill a free-coinage measure such as is reported by the committee to the pending bill, you will relieve us from Asiatic competition with a hundred per cent advantage in the difference of exchange. Then you do some good for the people. You may have as many tariff bills as you please; but while the difference in exchange remains where it is everything produced in this country that comes into competition with Asia will have to continue to go down. Under Asiatic competition your wheat and your cotton have gone down below the cost of production. Your wool has gone down in the same way, because the wool-producing countries are all on the silver standard. You may put on as many tariffs as you will; but the prices of all articles that are in competition with Asiatic productions will have to go down.

It has come to a point where the prices of manufactured articles have to go down. They came last because it took some time to establish manufactories in the Orient, but they are being established now on a most gigantic scale, so much so that it makes a boom in all Europe to manufacture machinery for them. The Europeans have to manufacture only one machine of a given kind for one city, and after that the Asiatics can duplicate the machines without limit.

Now I say that so far as the tariff bill is concerned it is simply maneuvering for an issue. So far as the pending bill is concerned, it is the same thing. It is simply to give the assent of a Republican Congress to the issue of interest-bearing bonds to increase the public debt in time of peace. That is all it amounts to. Everybody knew it before the bill was introduced. Before the bill was introduced arrangements were made for the sale of the kind of bonds that the syndicate wants. Four per cent bonds suit them better.

If 4 per cent bonds can be sold so as to yield the same rate of interest, what difference does it make how the country is loaded with debt and the currency is taken up and impounded from the people? Whether done under one system or the other, let it be known that both of the old parties are in favor of the issuance of bonds for the purpose of buying gold on which the Administration is to-day paying a premium of 20 per cent. The Government has come in and is paying a premium of 20 per cent on gold. How is that?

Before Mr. Cleveland commenced to improve the public credit a 4 per cent bond running eighteen years sold at from 25 to 27 per cent premium. After he had been at work a little over a year the same character of bonds, 4 per cent bonds running thirty years, sold for 4½, a difference of over 20 per cent. The President told us in his message that if we would provide for the sale of gold bonds he could save $16,000,000 on the $62,000,000 of bonds; that the same syndicate would give $16,000,000 more for them if they were gold bonds. He sold the bonds and they were not gold bonds, and in that sale he paid a premium of more than 20 per cent, according to his own showing, because they were not gold bonds. Now, the Government is maintaining the gold standard and is paying a premium of at least 20 per cent; and that premium will grow as time goes on. How long shall we stand buying gold and paying a premium on it? The price of property has to go down in competition with the price of bonds which the Government sells to buy gold.

I am opposed in toto to the policy of incurring a debt in time of peace in order to buy gold for gold gamblers when the law allows us and makes it our duty to pay them, according to contract, in silver. I am opposed to it first, last, and all the time. Nobody expects the bond bill to become a law if it passes this body. It is not the kind of a bill that the Rothschilds want. Four per cent thirty-year bonds are just the kind of bonds that suit them best, and if the policy of selling out the country is to go on I would as lief they would sell that class of bonds as any other, because if we maintain the gold standard for the sale of bonds the country will be loaded down until the ship sinks; it can not go any further. The idea of a perpetual increase of the public debt, buying gold at a premium to give gold gamblers an opportunity to make money, when you have not contracted to do it! Why should not the United States avail herself of the option the same as France and Germany do and pay silver, according to contract, and not pay a premium on gold?

I am opposed to the whole policy; but if we are to have tariff legislation let us have effective tariff legislation. Let us remove the advantage that the Asiatics have over us. Let our farmers compete with Asiatics on equal terms. Our farmers sell their cotton and wheat in competition with the Asiatics with the disadvantage that the difference in exchange causes, which is now a hundred per cent. You do not propose to remedy that at all, and you do not even propose to take care of your manufacturers. The time has come when this competition is going to reach you; in fact, it is reaching you now, and in a few short years you will share the same fate that the farmers have met. When the millions of Asiatics get their manufacturing establishments in full operation they will manufacture for the world, with the difference of exchange in their favor, as they are now producing wheat and cotton for the world.

If there is to be any good-faith tariff legislation, let us have it. Let a free-coinage amendment be put upon the tariff bill. That would be the test of good faith as to whether or not you are in favor of taking care of American industries. That would be the test whether or not you are silver men. The bond bill will never become a law; it will never be voted on in the other House. It will be buried in the committee; it will be treated with contempt.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Senator from Nevada says this is simply dress parade; and he proposes to link the silver question with the tariff. In arguing the question, he says everybody knows that the pending bill can not become a law. I desire to ask the Senator whether he thinks the tariff bill with a silver amendment can become a law?

Mr. STEWART. Of course it can not become a law, with or without a silver amendment, and everybody knows it. There is no intention that it shall become a law. It will be vetoed at the other end of the Avenue. It is simply to make an issue; it is merely to have Mr. Cleveland veto it and be fighting about nothing. The object is to have an issue in order to bury the silver question. I do not want it buried under any such sham issue. It would be bad enough to bury it under a real tariff controversy, but to bury it under a sham issue, a buncombe issue made on purpose to be vetoed by Mr. Cleveland, so that they can have that——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question.

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to ask the Senator whether, if it is his view that a free-coinage measure should be added to the tariff bill, he will not join with us in voting down the amendment which is proposed to the pending bill?

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator from New Hampshire want to make me step out of the ranks on dress parade?

Mr. CHANDLER. The question is a fair one, and the Senator is in a frame of mind to answer it lucidly, if not at length.

Mr. STEWART. My frame of mind——

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is now advocating the amendment proposed to the pending bill, and he has gone on to advocate such an amendment to another bill, the tariff bill, which is to come by and by.

Mr. STEWART. Now put your question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator whether he will not consent to vote down the amendment reported to this bill and confine his efforts to putting such an amendment on the tariff bill? In other words—I will put the question in another form—is the Senator from Nevada in favor of putting a free-coinage amendment upon every bill that is proposed in the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. I am certainly in favor of putting such an amendment on every buncombe bill that you propose. To every bill that is for pure buncombe I would propose a free-coinage amendment. We know we can not secure the enactment of a free-coinage law; that the President will veto such a measure. So to let you play buncombe while I keep quiet, it seems to me, is turkey on your side all the time.

Mr. CHANDLER. When does the Senator from Nevada keep quiet?

Mr. STEWART. I have very little time to do anything but keep quiet when there are so many other Senators talking.

Mr. HILL and others. Question!

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask for a vote on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall the Chair state the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; but I desire to say a few words. I withdraw the request with the understanding that Saturday an effort is to be made not only by the friends of the amendment, but by its opponents, to secure action upon the amendment and the bill before the Senate adjourns on that day. I think the public interests will be subserved by disposing of the bill at the earliest

possible moment, although I am utterly opposed to the amendment the Senator from Arkansas advocates with such earnestness and infelicity.

Mr. FAULKNER and others. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, when, on motion of Mr. JONES of Arkansas, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 31, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1896.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John M. Lenihan, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa, in place of William G. Sweeney, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

J. Kearney Rice, of New Jersey, to be attorney of the United States for the district of New Jersey, vice John W. Beekman, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William T. Swinburne, to be a commander in the Navy from the 28th of December, 1895, vice Commander John C. Rich, deceased.

Lieut. Arthur B. Speyers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Lieut. Commander William T. Swinburne, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Gibson, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th of December, 1895, vice Lieut. Arthur B. Speyers, promoted.

Ensign Humes H. Whittlesey, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Gibson, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William H. Emory, to be a commander in the Navy from the 29th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Commander Francis M. Barber, retired.

Lieut. Ebenezer S. Prime, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 29th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Emory, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John A. Bell, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 29th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Lieut. Ebenezer S. Prime, promoted.

Ensign Albert C. Dieffenbach, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th of December, 1895, subject to the examinations required by law, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) John A. Bell, promoted.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Daniel W. Andrew, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Plymouth, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Herbert Morissey, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

John H. Brocklesby, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, to succeed Ezra B. Bailey, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

John H. Puck, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for the district of Miami, in the State of Ohio, to succeed David R. Austin, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

POSTMASTERS.

J. H. Hertz, to be postmaster at Macon, in the county of Bibb and State of Georgia, in the place of Sylvester B. Price, resigned.

Martha Brown, to be postmaster at Fort Valley, in the county of Houston and State of Georgia, her commission having expired January 6, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William H. O. Hay, of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Charles H. Foote, of Pennsylvania, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

William L. Maxwell, of California, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

POSTMASTERS.

John Casey, to be postmaster at Conshohocken, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

S. Gibson Barr, to be postmaster at Hollidaysburg, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania.

J. Allen Butler, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

William J. Hunter, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware.

Joseph M. Fronefield, jr., to be postmaster at Wayne, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania.

Edward C. Bersie, to be postmaster at Adams, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Nathan Robins, to be postmaster at Metuchen, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey.

Miles A. Hanchett, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

William K. Roy, to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York.

Lewis W. Y. McCroskery, to be postmaster at Newburg, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Milo B. Gregory, to be postmaster at Unadilla, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

W. G. Marlin, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas.

E. H. Ellis, to be postmaster at Green Bay, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

Adolph J. Burg, to be postmaster at Kenosha, in the county of Kenosha and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 30, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported the bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to reserve all points of order.

Mr. DINGLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, whether it is necessary, on an appropriation bill, when the report is presented, to reserve all points of order, and whether such points can not be made as to new legislation in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be willing to hear argument; but the impression of the Chair is that if the House commits a bill to the committee without points of order being reserved, the effect will be that the committee can not disregard the orders of the House to consider that bill in its entirety; but when points of order are reserved, then advantage can be taken of them in the Committee of the Whole.

KANSAS CITY, PITTSBURG AND GULF RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2285) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. The Clerk is reading the original bill. The committee reported the Senate bill as a substitute, and I ask that the Senate bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the substitute.

Senate bill No. 1046, on the same subject, was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on giving unanimous consent. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Is it for unanimous consent to consider a Senate bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands it.

Mr. CANNON. Is there any House report?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir; there is a House report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to cut off consideration if the committee in charge is ready for consideration; but it seems to me it is that class of a bill that ought to be considered, and I suppose it could be done, in Committee of the Whole, where there can be amendment and full explanation.

Mr. LITTLE. The bill is not an extensive bill. It only provides for the construction of a branch road about 25 miles in length, on the Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad, in the Indian country. This is a unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs. The bill has passed the Senate and we report the Senate bill as a substitute.

Mr. CANNON. I think it is subject to the point of order that it should be considered in the Committee of the Whole House, not having been considered.

Mr. GROUT. Are the bills identical?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir. I have reported the Senate bill. There is no objection on the part of the Interior Department.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. I object.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—DAVIS VS. CULBERSON.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3, presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The report was read, as follows:

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Elections No. 3, to which was referred the contested election case of J. H. Davis against D. B. Culberson, from the Fourth Congressional district of the State of Texas, respectfully submits the following report:

The record in this case consists of the notice of contest, the answer and affidavit of David B. Culberson, all of which were filed by the contestee. Since the filing of the notice of contest, the contestant appears to have done nothing in prosecuting his claim to the seat. He has not produced any testimony, and, although twice notified by letter directed to his place of residence, he has not appeared before the committee.

The committee does not believe that in view of these facts the right of the sitting member to his seat should longer remain in question, and therefore recommends to the House the adoption of the following resolutions, to wit:

Resolved, That J. H. Davis was not elected a Representative from the Fourth Congressional district of the State of Texas to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is not entitled to the seat.

Resolved, That David B. Culberson was duly elected a Representative from the Fourth Congressional district of the State of Texas to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is entitled to the seat.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the adoption of the resolutions read to the House.

The resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—ROSENTHAL VS. CROWLEY.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a report from the Committee on Elections No. 3 in the case of Rosenthal *vs.* Crowley, and I give notice that I will call up the case to-morrow morning for consideration. I ask that the report be printed. Inasmuch as the report is unanimous, the contestant has asked the committee to request a favor of the House, and I ask that Mr. Rosenthal, the contestant, be allowed one hour to-morrow morning to present his views of the case to the House. That is his request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, presents a report in the contested-election case of Rosenthal *vs.* Crowley, gives notice that he will ask for the consideration of it to-morrow morning, and asks consent that the contestant, Mr. Rosenthal, be heard for one hour by the House. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, is the party who asks to be heard the one in whose favor the report is made, or the other?

The SPEAKER. He is the gentleman against whom the report is made. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, presented the following report:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at his earliest convenience, the report of the board of engineers appointed by him to investigate and report upon the route and other subjects connected with the Nicaragua Canal.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the foregoing resolution, report that the full committee have had under consideration the resolution, to wit: That the President of the United States be requested, and he is hereby requested, to furnish the House of Representatives at his earliest convenience the report of the board of engineers appointed by him to investigate and report upon the route and other subjects connected with the Nicaraguan Canal, and it is unanimously recommended by said committee that said resolution do pass.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Not unless there is objection to the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DOOLITTLE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

FORT OMAHA MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, which I send to the desk, to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed, when Fort Crook, near the city of Omaha, Nebr., is ready for occupancy by the troops of the Army of the United States, to transfer and turn over to the State of Nebraska the Fort Omaha Military Reservation, containing about 80 acres, with all the buildings, appurtenances, and improvements thereof; the said reservation being the same tracts and parcels of land heretofore donated to the United States by the citizens of Omaha, Nebr. The purpose of said transfer is that the said Fort Omaha Military Reservation shall be used by the said State of Nebraska as a place of rendezvous and school of instruction for the National Guard of said State of Nebraska and is made conditional upon its use for that purpose, and that the adjutant-general of said State shall annually report to the Secretary of War in detail the uses of said reservation. The said State of Nebraska is privileged to establish on said reservation a State military school, with not less than two military instructors.

SEC. 2. That the said reservation, while used for the purposes aforesaid, to be maintained without expense to the United States, and at any time that, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, the military necessities of the United States shall require such action, he shall take possession of said military reservation for the use of the Government.

Amendments were recommended by the committee, as follows:

Section 1, line 7, insert "possession of" before "Fort Omaha Military Reservation."

Section 2, line 4, strike out "military necessities" and insert "interests."

Section 2, line 7, after "Government," insert "together with all the buildings, appurtenances, and improvements thereon."

Add the following as "Section 3":

"SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the said State of Nebraska while in the possession of such military reservation to keep all permanent buildings and improvements on such reservation in as good condition and repair as at the date it shall enter into the possession thereof, and the same shall be inspected at least once in each year by an officer of the Army, who shall report the condition of such improvements to the Secretary of War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska for the immediate consideration of this bill?

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether it grants anything more than the use of the reservation, whether it passes any title?

Mr. MERCER. It does not pass any title, for the reason that the title, as I understand it, is in such condition that we could not word a bill to that effect with safety. This reservation was donated to the United States Government by citizens of Omaha in years gone by, but now the Government proposes to vacate the reservation as a military post, and this bill is so worded that the United States retains its title and merely allows to the State of Nebraska the use of the reservation.

Mr. PERKINS. Without expense to the Government?

Mr. MERCER. Without expense to the Government.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I will say that it goes further than that; it requires the State to keep the buildings in good repair and reserves to the General Government the right to resume possession at any time.

Mr. MERCER. The chairman of the committee is correct in that statement.

Mr. CANNON. Whereabouts is this military reservation with reference to the city of Omaha?

Mr. MERCER. It is within the limits of the city.

Mr. CANNON. How does it happen that the Government has no use for it?

Mr. MERCER. Because the Government intends vacating it next spring, as the Secretary of War states in his report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. HOWARD. I object. [After a pause.] I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is House bill No. 162, relating to pensions.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Alabama has withdrawn his objection.

PENSIONS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has called for the regular order, which is a renewal of his objection. The previous question having been ordered upon the pending bill, the question before the House is on the motion to recommit it to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the previous question be considered as vacated.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment that I offered on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The first thing to be withdrawn, or otherwise disposed of, is the motion to recommit.

Mr. PICKLER. I object to that being withdrawn.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the bill.

The SPEAKER. It can not be offered while a motion to recommit is pending. That motion must first be voted down.

The question being taken on the motion to recommit, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. I ask for a division.

The question was again taken; and there were—ayes 14, noes 79.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the point that there is no quorum present?

Mr. ERDMAN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER (after counting). There are 193 gentlemen present, a quorum. The noes have it, and the motion to recommit is lost.

Mr. POOLE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute, which I send to the desk, for the pending bill and amendments.

The proposed substitute was read, as follows:

A bill amending the pension laws.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in considering claims filed under the pension laws the death of an enlisted man or officer shall be considered as sufficiently proved if satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the continued and unexplained absence of such enlisted man or officer from his home and family for a period of seven years, during which period no intelligence of his existence shall have been received, and any pension granted under this proviso shall cease upon proof that such officer or enlisted man is still living.

Mr. POOLE. I ask the previous question on the amendment, the substitute, and the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The question being first taken on the amendment, it was agreed to.

The question then recurring on the substitute, the question was taken; and there were—ayes 122, noes 4.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the point that no quorum is present?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, sir; that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER (having made a count). One hundred and eighty-seven members are present—a quorum. The ayes have it, and the substitute is agreed to.

The bill as amended by the adoption of the substitute was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. POOLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Subsequently,

The SPEAKER said: The changes which were made in the bill (H. R. 162) which was passed this morning, render the title inapplicable, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] desires that the title be corrected so as to read: "A bill regulating proof of death in pension cases." Without objection, the amendment will be considered as made.

There was no objection.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HITT. I ask consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized and allowed to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is this a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not privileged. The Chair has put the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I shall not object, as the chairman of our committee desires the adoption of the resolution.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution, which was adopted.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MARTHA BROOKS.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent to make an amended report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon the bill (H. R. 2800) to pension Martha Brooks. The reason for this request is that since the filing of the report we have come into the possession of some material facts.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman explain to the House the nature of the proposed change in the report?

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. This is a bill granting a pension to Martha Brooks. There is a material fact which we failed to state in the report as already filed—a fact bearing upon the merits of the case. I ask unanimous consent to amend the report by additional statements of fact.

Mr. MILES. I hope the gentleman will explain to the House what additional facts have come to his knowledge since he filed his report. I think the House ought to know those additional facts which the gentleman deems important.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. In the report as already made, it is not stated that the son of this lady was an unmarried man; but I have come into possession of evidence that such was the fact, and that she was dependent, and had a right to depend on him for support.

Mr. MILES. You find now that the son was not a married man?

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Yes, sir; we find that he was not a married man and that he contributed to the support of his mother.

Mr. MILES. I make no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is found, as I understand, that this lady depended on her son for support.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Yes, sir.

Several MEMBERS. That is all right.

There being no objection, the request of Mr. BAKER of Kansas was granted.

ASSISTANT CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. BRUMM. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution which, when it was presented the other day, my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] objected to. Upon explanation he has withdrawn his objection; and I shall be glad to make the same explanation to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That an assistant clerk be allowed the Committee on Claims during the sessions of the Fifty-fourth Congress at a compensation of $6 a day, to be paid from January 1, 1896, out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. BRUMM. Then I will ask for the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be so referred.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. QUIGG. I desire to present a favorable report from the Committee on the Library on House bill No. 3553, and to ask that the bill be immediately considered.

The bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mary Park Foster (Mrs. John W. Foster), of Indiana; Mary Virginia Ellet Cabell (Mrs. William D. Cabell), of Virginia; Helen Mason Boynton (Mrs. Henry V. Boynton), of Ohio; Henrietta Greely (Mrs. A. W. Greely), of Washington, D. C.; Lelie Dent St. Clair (Mrs. F. O. St. Clair), of Maryland; Regina M. Knott (Mrs. A. Leo Knott), of Maryland; Sara Agnes Rice Pryor (Mrs. Roger A. Pryor), of New York; Sarah Ford Judd Goode (Mrs. G. Brown Goode), of Washington, D. C.; Mary Desha, of Kentucky; Sue Virginia Field (Mrs. Stephen J. Field), of California; Sallie Kennedy Alexander (Mrs. Thomas Alexander), of Washington, D. C.; Rosa Wright Smith, of Washington, D. C.; Sarah C. J. Hagan (Mrs. Hugh Hagan), of Georgia; Mary Stiner Putnam (Mrs. John Risley Putnam), of New York; Mary Leighton Shields (Mrs. George H. Shields), of Missouri; Ellen Hardin Walworth, of New York; Mary E. MacDonald (Mrs. Marshall MacDonald), of Virginia; Eugenia Washington, of Virginia; Alice M. Clarke (Mrs. A. Howard Clarke), of Massachusetts; Clara Barton, of Washington, D. C.; Mary S. Lockwood, of Washington, D. C.; Frances B. Hamlin (Mrs. Teunis S. Hamlin), of Washington, D. C.; Martha C. B. Clarke (Mrs. Arthur E. Clarke), of New Hampshire; Lucia E. Blount (Mrs. Henry Blount), of Indiana; Jennie A. O. Keim (Mrs. Randolph De B. Keim), of Connecticut; Louise Ward McAllister, of New York; Effie Ream Osborne (Mrs. Frank Stuart Osborne), of Illinois; Marie E. Devereux, of Washington, D. C.; Belinda O. Wilbour (Mrs. Joshua Wilbour), of Rhode Island; Georgina E. Shippen (Mrs. W. W. Shippen), of New Jersey; Julia K. Hogg (Mrs. N. B. Hogg), of Pennsylvania; Katherine C. Breckenridge (Mrs. Clifton R. Breckenridge), of Arkansas; Sara Isabella Hubbard (Mrs. Adolphus S. Hubbard), of California; Mary L. D. Putnam (Mrs. Charles E. Putnam), of Iowa; Delia Clayborne Buckner (Mrs. Simon B. Buckner), of Kentucky; Emily Marshall Eliot (Mrs. Samuel Eliot), of Massachusetts; Lucy Grey Henry (Mrs. William Wirt Henry), of Virginia; Elizabeth Blair Lee, of Maryland, and their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate and politic, by the name of The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for patriotic, historical, and educational purposes, to perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence, by the acquisition and protection of historical spots and the erection of monuments; by the encouragement of historical research in relation to the Revolution and the publication of its results; by the preservation of documents and relics, and of the records of the individual services of Revolutionary soldiers and patriots, and by the promotion of celebrations of all patriotic anniversaries; to carry out the injunction of Washington, in his Farewell Address to the American people, "to promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge," thus developing an enlightened public opinion and affording to young and old such advantages as shall develop in them the largest capacity for performing the duties of American citizens; to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty.

SEC. 2. That said society is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the United States, so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends, to an amount not exceeding $500,000, and may adopt a constitution and make by-laws not inconsistent with law, and may adopt a seal. Said society shall have its headquarters or principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That said society shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings, and said Secretary shall communicate to Congress said reports or such portions thereof as he may see fit. The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said national society to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum, at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.

Mr. QUIGG. I ask that the report may be read.

Mr. BAILEY. Before the report is read I wish to state that if the gentleman will consent that this be made a corporation in the District of Columbia, I shall have no objection; but I shall object to the present consideration of the bill if it proposes to create a national corporation. The practice has been in incorporating benevolent and fraternal societies and orders, such as the Knights of Pythias and the Masonic fraternity, to limit the act of incorporation to the District of Columbia. If the gentleman will agree to an amendment limiting this corporation to the District of Columbia, I have no objection to the consideration and passage of the bill.

Mr. QUIGG. The trouble is that these ladies have their organizations throughout the Union——

Mr. BAILEY. So have the Masons.

Mr. QUIGG. And they have their conventions throughout the Union——

Mr. BAILEY. So have the Masons and so have the Knights of Pythias.

Mr. QUIGG. This bill, Mr. Speaker, has been drawn with careful regard to the objects sought to be accomplished by this association. It is not in any sense of the word, if the gentleman will permit me, a selfish organization; it has absolutely no selfish motives or purposes, and does not intend to make any money or do anything in the way of business that will produce revenue.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will permit me, in order to save time, it is utterly impossible to convince me that Congress can create a national corporation of this character. I would have no objection, however, if the gentleman will agree to amend so as to make it a body politic or corporate in the District of Columbia.

Mr. QUIGG. Very well; I will accept the gentleman's suggestion, if he will draw up an amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I will prepare the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York desire the report to be read?

Mr. QUIGG. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Library, to whom was referred H. R. 3553, report as follows:

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution is composed of women, descendants from participants in the American Revolution. They founded a society in this capital, with branches throughout the Union, nearly six years ago, for patriotic, historical, and educational purposes, and the bill reported herewith supplies them with a charter.

The objects of the society are purely patriotic, unselfish, and ennobling, and its accomplishments have already been numerous and in the public interest.

The committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 4, page 3, insert, after the words "a body corporate and politic," the words "in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. QUIGG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FORT OMAHA MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOWARD] has kindly agreed to withdraw the point of order against the bill I called up recently, or rather withdraws his demand for the regular order; and I desire now to submit a request for unanimous consent that the House proceed to the consideration of that bill. It was read at length a few moments ago, but I send a copy of it to the desk, that it may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the bill should be again reported.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I recollect the bill very well, and in order to save time I will state to the gentleman that I have no objection to its consideration, provided it can be considered in the Committee of the Whole. If the gentleman will modify his request so as to let it be so considered, I shall not interpose any objection to its consideration at this time.

Mr. MERCER. Very well, Mr. Speaker; I accept the last suggestion, and ask consent that we proceed to consider this bill in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska to consider the bill in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, in order that the members may thoroughly understand the purpose and object of the bill, I wish to say briefly that it does not involve the expenditure on the part of the Government of a single cent of money, but simply provides for the transfer of the military reservation situated in the city of Omaha to the State of Nebraska for the purposes set forth in the bill. This reservation will be abandoned in the spring. It was originally donated to the General Government by citizens of Omaha some years ago, and donated in such way, as I understand it, that the reservation should always be used for military purposes. I understand that the title is in such condition that if the reservation is not used for military purposes the original donors are in a position to make claim for the land or part of it.

As shown by the communications appended to the report, Fort Crook, near Omaha, has been recently constructed; and but for the fact that some of the buildings there were not entirely finished this reservation in Omaha would already be abandoned. But at all events it will be entirely abandoned in the spring. This fact is established by the communication from the Secretary of War appended to the report. The Government has no further use for the reservation when it is abandoned as a military post.

I do not think it necessary to detain the committee with a more extended statement unless some gentleman has an inquiry he desires to make in reference to it.

Mr. MCRAE. What is the area of this reservation?

Mr. MERCER. About 80 acres.

Mr. MCRAE. And what is the value?

Mr. MERCER. I should think in the neighborhood of $70,000.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, I do not know anything about this matter, but I would like to ask when this grant was made to the General Government?

Mr. MERCER. More than twenty years ago.

Mr. CANNON. How does it happen that the Government is through with it?

Mr. MERCER. The Government will soon have done with this reservation because Fort Crook has been established near Omaha, and that post will hereafter be used for the military purposes, the Government then having no further use for Fort Omaha.

Mr. CANNON. What is the value of the improvements placed upon this property by the Government?

Mr. MERCER. As to that I could not say. There are several buildings, some of them frame and some of them brick, which can be very nicely utilized by the National Guard for a school of instruction. This bill provides, as amended, that the State shall keep these buildings in as good repair as they are now, and the Government can take this property whenever it sees fit.

Mr. CANNON. Does the report show a copy of the conveyance to the Government.

Mr. MERCER. It does not. This bill was drawn by ex-Senator Manderson, of Nebraska, and protects the title so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman ever examined the conveyance to the Government?

Mr. MERCER. I have not personally examined it.

Mr. CANNON. Then the gentleman is not aware of the conditions in the conveyance?

Mr. MERCER. No, not personally; only from the statements of others.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman think it would be well that we should know from the report, or from an examination of the conveyance, just the kind of a title the Government has to this reservation?

Mr. MERCER. The Government has the same title now that it will have after this bill has passed, virtually. It only conveys to the State the use of this property.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I understand, but the gentleman stated—and I merely want to get at the facts—that the conveyance to the United States was for occupation of this property for a post.

Mr. MERCER. For military purposes.

Mr. CANNON. For military purposes by the United States, and that if the United States should cease to occupy it for military purposes it would revert?

Mr. MERCER. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. What would become of it?

Mr. MERCER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS], of the Committee on Military Affairs, desires to make a suggestion.

Mr. CANNON. It would not revert to the donor?

Mr. MERCER. It would not under the circumstances stated by the gentleman of Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill was before the Committee on Military Affairs, and a statement was made showing this state of facts: That this reservation was presented to the Government of the United States for military purposes. The Government has used it and will continue to occupy it until next spring, when the Government proposes to abandon it. It is not the object of this bill to transfer the title of this property, but simply the use of it during the time that the Government

does not wish to occupy it as a fort or reservation. The proposed transfer will not in any way involve the Government in a controversy with the donors of this land or subject the Government to expense. It relieves the Government from the care of the buildings and from the keeping of a small detachment of soldiers there. The relationship of the National Guard of the several States to the Federal Government, to which Guard the Government is making annual appropriations, renders it proper to turn over the use of this reservation temporarily for such purposes as the State Guards may require in conducting a school of instruction, and in the opinion of the committee this action will in no way conflict with the interests of the United States, or subject the Government to any embarrassment.

Mr. CANNON. Was the conveyance of this property to the Government absolute?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I am not able to answer that question further than to say, from the report made to the committee, which they were prepared to believe, the conveyance was such as to give power to the Federal Government to make the transfer asked for in respect to use, but not in respect to title, and it was for that reason that the amendment was adopted by the committee. Let my friend understand that the bill did not go through the committee hastily or without due consideration.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, the object of my inquiry is to get at the very facts——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I do.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). It is to get at this very fact. It would seem that the committee is not even informed certainly about that—that the United States owns 80 acres of land in the corporate limits of the city of Omaha called Fort Omaha; that the Government of the United States has improved it.

Mr. STEELE. Will you allow me to have a statute read?

Mr. CANNON. In a minute. It has improved it. How much it has expended, whether a quarter of a million, half a million, or a million dollars, I do not know. Now, then, if the title of the United States in this 80 acres of property in the city of Omaha is absolute, and the United States has a post near by that it is expending money upon, then the question arises, is it not the duty of the United States to sell this property and reimburse the Treasury for the money expended? Now, on the contrary, if this property was deeded to the United States by one or more persons for use as a military post, and was to revert to the grantors if the United States should cease to occupy it, if we cease to occupy it by the United States, then I ask the question, is it not a fraud upon the grantors to grant it to some other use, or for the United States to substitute it for another purpose? Now, it seems to me that the House ought to have full information in the premises before it legislates. Now I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, or rather I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STEELE. I was merely going to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if there has been an attempt to dispose of this property?

Mr. MERCER. There never has.

Mr. STEELE. Then I would like to have the Clerk read the statute.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. STEELE. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I thought you were through.

Mr. MERCER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to sell the military reservation known as Fort Omaha, near the city of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, and such of the buildings and improvements thereon as can not be economically removed to the new site herein provided for. In disposing of said property the Secretary of War shall cause the grounds to be platted in blocks, streets, and alleys, if in his judgment it would inure to the benefit of the Government in making sale of said site, having due reference to the requirements of the houses and buildings located on said grounds, in such cases as they may be sold with the ground. The Secretary of War shall also cause the lots, lands, and buildings to be appraised and sold at public or private sale, at not less than the appraised value, having first been offered at public sale. The expense of advertising, appraisement, survey, and sale shall be paid out of the proceeds of said sale, and the balance paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. What is the title of that act?

Mr. STEELE. That is an act preliminary to an act to purchase a site near Fort Omaha.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act to provide for the sale of the site at Fort Omaha, Nebr., the sale or removal of the improvements thereof, and for a new site and the construction of suitable buildings thereon.

Mr. DALZELL. What is the date of that act?

The Clerk read as follows:

July 23, 1888.

Mr. CANNON. Is it an appropriation act?

Mr. STEELE. It was an appropriation act of $200,000, I think it was, for the establishment of another post within 10 miles of the city of Omaha. They had argued all the time that this property was too limited; that they needed a greater extent of ground for a cavalry post; and that by the sale of this property it would nearly reimburse the Government for the expenditure to be made. Now, why this ground has not been sold in accordance with the terms of the act I do not know, but I should suppose if the title was perfect it would certainly be no time now to put it on the market.

Mr. DALZELL. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Has the attention of the Secretary of War been called to this proposed legislation?

Mr. MERCER. Yes, sir. And the Secretary of War has made a report on it, as is shown in the report made from the Committee on Military Affairs. He simply says that the Government has no further use for this property.

Mr. DALZELL. He does not recommend the sale of the property or the gift of the property?

Mr. MERCER. He does not make any recommendation of the sale of it, either.

Mr. DALZELL. He does not recommend the gift of it, or disposition of it in accordance with this proposed legislation?

Mr. MERCER. No, sir; he makes no recommendation. He simply states that the Government has no further use for the post.

Mr. HENDERSON. If there is no further use for the property, why not realize on it?

Mr. MERCER. In reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa, Senator Manderson in his correspondence with me has shown that there may be some question as to the title, and I quote what he says to me in reference thereto:

The bill can be so worded as to grant the use of Fort Omaha to the State of Nebraska in perpetuity, with the condition that the Government may, at any time it believes it advantageous for military purposes, retake possession of the land. There is a little question as to whether the complete abandonment of the reservation would not cause it to revert to the original donors, and this could be guarded against in the bill by having the General Government hold a string to the fort.

I have often heard citizens of Omaha express a doubt as to whether the General Government really held this reservation in fee simple, and I believe that if this bill fails of passage and the land in question is platted and offered for sale some of the donors—and I believe most of them still reside in Omaha—might take steps not only to prevent such platting and sale, but to regain ownership. I received a letter yesterday from a citizen of Omaha hinting that such a course need not be unexpected.

Mr. STEELE. Then the gentleman from Nebraska did not understand me when I asked him if there had been any question about the title to the ground?

Mr. MERCER. I must have misunderstood the gentleman's question.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is not a bill to sell the property?

Mr. MERCER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the purpose is to make this a State military institution for the benefit of the State National Guard of Nebraska, and the legislature of the State at its last session passed a joint resolution asking that this step be taken, and intimating to the General Government that the State of Nebraska would take charge of such an institution and would take pleasure in continuing it as a State military institution under the supervision of the War Department.

Mr. MILES. In addition to that, your bill provides that the adjutant-general of the State shall make an annual report to the Secretary of War.

Mr. MERCER. Yes; and in addition to that the bill provides that a Regular Army officer shall make an examination of this educational institution every year and report to the Secretary of War.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the object of this bill seems to be that the Fort Omaha Military Reservation shall be used by the State of Nebraska for a school of instruction for the State National Guard?

Mr. MERCER. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is that institution to be maintained at the expense of the United States or at the expense of the State of Nebraska?

Mr. MERCER. At the expense of the State of Nebraska entirely.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Does the State of Nebraska agree to keep up the buildings and to make all necessary improvements, and return the property in its present condition whenever the United States requires it to be returned?

Mr. MERCER. Well, I take it that the legislature of Nebraska indicated as much when it passed a joint resolution asking for the passage by Congress of a bill of this character.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. One more question. What is the limit of time? When is this grant to end?

Mr. MERCER. Whenever the General Government shall see fit to resume possession.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is that expressed in the bill?

Mr. MERCER. It is expressed in the bill.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like to hear that part of the bill read.

Mr. MERCER. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, desires to make a brief statement about the provisions of the bill, as he is familiar with them.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the bill is so guarded that the Government can resume control of the property at any time, in the discretion of the Secretary of War. That is provided in the bill, and not only that, but the bill as amended by the committee provides that the State of Nebraska must keep all the buildings in good repair and must hold them subject to the inspection of the War Department. The bill simply gives the State of Nebraska the use of the property so long as the General Government may not desire to use it. Heretofore, in other cases, we have given these abandoned military reservations to cities near which they were located, to be used for park purposes. In the last session we gave to Newport, Ky., an abandoned military reservation to be used as a park, and we have made similar gifts to other cities—absolute donations; but in this case the United States reserves all of its interest in this property and can resume possession at any time, as is absolutely expressed in the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. At that point will the gentleman please tell us what the interest of the Government is in this property?

Mr. HULL. The property was donated to the Government for military purposes. It is a military reservation which the Secretary of War reports that the Department has no longer any use for.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was it given to the Government in fee?

Mr. HULL. It was given in fee. We have the absolute title to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. But I understood the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] to state a while ago that some party claimed to have an interest in it or some control over it.

Mr. HULL. I think we have the absolute title to the property; but the Secretary reports that unless there is something done with this reservation, it will, under the general law, be taken out of the class of military reservations.

Mr. STEELE. Has the gentleman any information as to why the act providing for the platting and sale of this property has not been complied with by the Secretary of War?

Mr. HULL. I have no information on that point. That question was not before us.

Mr. DALZELL. Is it not the fact that there is a military post within 10 miles of Omaha?

Mr. MERCER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DALZELL. Is it not a further fact that that post was purchased subsequent to the passage of the act of July 23, 1888?

Mr. MERCER. I am not certain about that.

Mr. DALZELL. Is it not a fact that the act of July 23, 1888, provided first for the sale of this Omaha Military Reservation, and in its second section provided for the purchase of the other property?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman has the act before him and can answer his own question; but I would like to ask the gentleman if the same is not true in regard to the military post at Newport, Ky., yet Congress considered that it was better to let the city have that old reservation for a park, and gave it to Newport absolutely?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know about that. I know that I made an effort to have certain military property situated in my district and useless for military purposes turned over to the State of Pennsylvania, and the Secretary of War, under Administrations representing two different parties, opposed it and insisted that the only proper thing to do under the circumstances was to sell the property and put the money into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MERCER. I yield to my colleague [Mr. HAINER].

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, some confusion seems to have arisen in the minds of members with respect to this bill. It is a matter of very general information in our State that this tract of 80 acres was conveyed by the citizens of Omaha to the Government for military purposes only. In the event there is a general and permanent abandonment of this property for military purposes, it will of course revert to the donors. The property has been made valuable by the growth of Omaha. The proximity to business centers in that city gives it its main value. It is now no longer needed by the General Government. This bill proposes that the possession simply, not the title—I am following the language of the bill as contained in the seventh line of the first section—that the possession simply shall be turned over to the State for military purposes, thus carrying out the plain intention of the original donors.

Gentlemen will understand that since the General Government has no use for this property, it can transfer its possession to the State of Nebraska to be used by the State for military purposes. The passage of this bill will therefore really strengthen the title of the United States. That title, I understand, is not such that the property can be conveyed absolutely, because the conveyance to the Government was for specific purposes alone. The Government may have need for this property in the future; and it should so conduct itself in respect to the property that it may at any time retake possession of it. It is provided by the bill that the State shall take care of and maintain the property in its present state of repair. The State will doubtless make additional improvements, rendering it more and more valuable for the Government in the event that it should be necessary for it to retake the property. Now, I submit, it is only fair and reasonable, and is indeed the only reasonable use that can be made of this property, to turn over its possession to the State.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman examined the conveyance of this property to the Government?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have not made that examination personally; but I know that most excellent lawyers of Omaha have done so, and it is believed the title is in the condition I have represented.

Mr. CANNON. If the United States should cease to occupy this property for military purposes it would revert to the grantors?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Yes, sir; when the Government abandons it permanently.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend think it is proper in morals for the Government of the United States to cease substantially to occupy the property for military purposes and still retain the title, complying with the letter of the gift, but sacrificing the substance, and thereby cutting out the original grantors from their real equities in this matter?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I by no means admit the gentleman's premises. I hope the morals of this House will allow this property to be used for the purposes intended by the original donors; that is, for military purposes. I apprehend the essential point is the use to which the property is put—not the party that may nominally occupy it for that purpose. Besides, contingencies may arise in the future, and doubtless will, when the Government will find a necessity arising for occupying this place as a garrison.

Mr. CANNON. The act of 1888, which provided for the purchase of a new post, and under which a new post has been purchased, provided absolutely for the platting and sale of this property by the Government. Now, the gentleman says that he has never seen the conveyance to the Government, and the report of the committee is silent as to that conveyance. I desire to know from some authoritative source what the title of the Government is.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I will say, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that I think there is absolutely no question—although I can not give him information based upon my personal examination—that the title of the Government to this land gives it the use of the land for military purposes only, and the very fact that there has been no absolute sale or disposition of the property under the statute to which attention has been called by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] would certainly give color to the proposition for which I contend.

Mr. DINGLEY. I remember very well what was said in 1888 in reference to this matter. It was then stated that the Government owned these 80 acres in Omaha, and that by establishing a new post 10 miles out of the city and selling these 80 acres the Government would obtain means enough not only to pay for the land which would be required outside for the new post, but also to pay for the buildings. It was not suggested at that time that the Government did not own this property in fee. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether a copy of the deed of conveyance has been laid before the Committee on Military Affairs, so as to show clearly what the title of the Government is. We should understand the precise facts before we act in this matter.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I submit to the gentleman from Maine that the mere fact that this limitation on the title was not suggested in 1888 is absolutely no evidence that it did not exist.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is true. Nevertheless, the House in 1888 acted on the supposition and representation that the Government owned this property in fee; that it had the right to sell it and cover the proceeds into the Treasury or to use them to pay for the new post. If we were deceived in 1888, we ought to know now where we stand in reference to this matter. I should like to know whether the Government has a title in fee to this property or whether the title is conditional.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I will say in response to the gentleman from Maine, as I have already said, that I have no personal knowledge on that point. This, however, I can say to him, that if, in the future, the Government of the United States shall desire to take possession of this property for any purpose it can do so under the provisions of this bill, and if it chooses, and deems that it has the title, it can sell the property. If an opportunity arises, therefore, for the sale of the property, it can do so to-morrow, the next day, or at any future time that it shall see proper. It is in no sense of the word prevented by the operation of this bill. The Government is not deprived of the power to dispose of the property in any way it sees fit; in fact, that is expressly reserved by the terms of the bill. All that the bill seeks to do is to give temporary possession of this property in the city of Omaha, during the pleasure of the United States Government, to the State of Nebraska. It transfers it temporarily to the State of Nebraska for the purposes contemplated in the bill, and it can be reclaimed at any other time for any purpose the National Government desires.

I ask my friend, and in all candor appeal even to the conscience of the gentleman from Illinois, if there is anything more than right and justice and fairness in the proposition?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no use in disguising the fact from ourselves that when we make transfers like this of the use of Government property for such purposes it is practically a giving away by the Government of all right to it, for we never get it back. I would as lief give it to the State of Nebraska in fee as to transfer it to the State for temporary purposes, as the bill proposes, if we had the title to it.

But what troubles me—and I am not saying that I would not be willing to give in fee to the State—but what troubles me is as to the question of title. We ought to understand exactly what we are doing. We ought to act understandingly. If the Government owns the fee of the lands, that fact ought to appear in some shape or other before the bill is passed, and then we can determine what to do.

We legislated in 1880 on the presumption that the Government did own the fee to this property, and we directed its sale for the purpose of the construction of another military post at some distance from Omaha. It is now claimed that we did not own the fee to it. We ought to have some light upon the question.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It makes absolutely no difference, let me state to the gentleman from Maine, whether the Government owns the title to the property in fee or not. It has a title whether it be a contingent, a conditional, or an absolute title; but whatever the title of the Government is, it is all retained by the terms of this bill. There is absolutely no conveyance of any kind but the temporary possession. For myself I hope it may turn out the Government has the absolute title to the property, and would have the magnanimity to do what justice requires it to do; that is, to convey it absolutely to the State of Nebraska, now that it no longer has need for it and proposes to abandon it. By so doing it would simply return the gift to the State. I do not believe in the practice of making merchandise of gifts.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do you know that the Government has not a title in fee?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I do not, of my own personal knowledge; but that is the impression which has been conveyed to me by reliable lawyers in the city of Omaha who have examined the question. They claim that the Government has no title except the title that I have suggested.

Mr. DINGLEY. I heard the debate here in 1888, and I remember the House acted under the impression that we had a title in fee. Otherwise, if we did not have such a title, we could not have provided for the sale of the property.

Mr. HULL. Is not that true with reference to other cases; for instance, Newport, Ky.?

Mr. DINGLEY. Well, I am only meeting these cases as they arise. I would like to know something definite about this matter and where the title is.

In what part of the city is it located, and what is its probable value?

Mr. MERCER. This reservation is in the northern part of the city.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the value?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I am advised about $70,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. You say that it is in the city?

Mr. MERCER. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do you mean to tell me that this property in the city of Omaha is worth less than $1,000 per acre.

Mr. MERCER. Oh, well; we are a good deal like Chicago, a large city covering many acres; and land can be within the city limits without being in the business center.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, this property is not far from the business center of the city.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska, a question, with his consent.

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. When were the 80 acres granted to the United States; how long ago?

Mr. MERCER. I think over twenty years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are any of the original grantors living?

Mr. MERCER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. HENDERSON. Have they filed a statement or request with the committee in respect to this new deal?

Mr. MERCER. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. HENDERSON. They stand by silently, and let it go on without protest!

Mr. MERCER. They have not communicated with the committee or me directly on this subject.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, in the Military Committee we considered this bill very carefully. We did not consider the question whether the United States owned the property absolutely or whether it only had a permit to make a military reservation of it, because we considered that in these days when the Government is buying so many parks, it was not good policy permanently to divert any military reservation from the use of the Government if it needed it.

We all know that occasionally it is absolutely necessary for the Government to use lands near our great cities, especially in time of war, and we determined in this case that it was the proper thing to give a permit for other use while it was not being occupied by the Government, on condition that it should be maintained by the other parties, and we provided that it could be taken back by the Government at any time when it pleased.

Now, I want to say one other thing. Use by a State for a military school is regarded by us as use for military purposes of the United States, for the militia of the United States are a part of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. MERCER. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that as amended it do pass.

The motion of Mr. MERCER was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 225) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska, and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole. Without objection, they will be voted upon in gross, including the committee amendments.

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MERCER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CONSULAR REPORTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States, which the Clerk will report.

The message was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, accompanying the reports of the consuls of the United States on trade and commerce. In view of the evident value of this compilation to our business interests, I indorse the recommendation of the Secretary that Congress authorize the printing of a special edition of 10,000 copies of the General Summary of the Commerce of the World, for distribution by the Department of State, and of 2,500 copies of Commercial Relations (including this summary) to enable the Department to meet the increasing demand for commercial information.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 30, 1896.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The Speaker announced the following committee appointments:

To the Committee on Labor, Mr. WELLINGTON.

To the Committee on Railways and Canals, Mr. BELKNAP.

CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT, ALASKA.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the customs collection district of Alaska be, and the same is hereby, reorganized and established to comprise the Territory of Alaska, in which Sitka shall be the port of entry.

SEC. 2. That such other places as may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, as the interests of commerce may require, shall be subports of entry or delivery, or both; and customs officers shall be stationed at such subports, with authority to enter and clear vessels, receive duties, fees, and other moneys, and perform such other services and receive such compensation as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury the exigencies of commerce may require.

SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is unanimously recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, and is also approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The necessity for the passage of the bill grows out of the peculiar condition of the district of Alaska. Under existing law there is but one port of entry in the district of Alaska. It is proposed by this bill to give to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to establish such ports of entry and delivery as the interests of the Government and of commerce may require. It must be remembered that the coast line of Alaska is about 2,600 miles long, and that the number of square miles in the Territory is over half a million. It is necessary, therefore, that this discretion should be given to the Secre-

tary of the Treasury—a discretion given in only peculiar cases—to establish such ports of entry as the circumstances may require. The district of Alaska is at present increasing in population to a considerable extent, and its trade is increasing. This arises not only from the salmon fisheries, but also from the discovery of very valuable gold fields on the Yukon River. Therefore, in accordance with the request of the Treasury Department, and in accordance with the indorsement of the Committee on Ways and Means, we ask that this bill may pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia may be considered as reported to-day. It is not quite ready, but as I understand we may adjourn soon, I ask that it may be considered as reported, so that it may be printed and ready for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be granted permission to report the bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia to-day, for convenience of printing. Without objection, that permission will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. And that all points of order on the same be reserved.

The SPEAKER. All points of order will be considered as reserved.

FOREST RESERVATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The title of the bill was reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the request?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I would ask that the title be again read, unless consent has already been given.

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the Clerk had better report the whole bill, as unanimous consent is asked. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the forest reservations in the State of Colorado, known as the Pikes Peak Forest Reserve, the Plum Creek Forest Reserve, and the South Platte Forest Reserve, established by Executive proclamations dated, respectively, March 18, 1892, June 23, 1892, and December 9, 1892, in the State of Colorado, in accordance with section 24 of the act of March 3, 1891, from and after the passage of this act, shall be open to the location of mining claims thereon for gold, silver, and cinnabar, and that title to such mining claims may be acquired in the same manner as it may be acquired to mining claims upon the other mineral lands of the United States for such purposes: *Provided*, That all locations of mining claims heretofore made in good faith within said reservations, and which have been held and worked in the same manner as mining claims are held and worked under existing law upon the public domain, are validated by this act.

SEC. 2. That owners of valid mining locations made and held in good faith under the terms of this act shall be, and are hereby, authorized and permitted to fell and remove from such mining claims any timber growing thereon for actual mining purposes in connection with the particular claim from which the timber is felled or removed, but no other timber shall be felled or removed from any other portions of said reservations by private parties for any purpose whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does this bill in any way prevent any man who wants to have a ranch or little farming place there from having it?

Mr. SHAFROTH. This land is not open to homestead entry now. This bill purposes to open these forest reservations for the location of mining claims only. It is thought the amount that will be taken up by mining claims will be a very small fraction, and consequently that the purpose of forest reservations will be preserved, notwithstanding the location of mining claims thereon.

Mr. TERRY. It does not deprive any homesteader or proposed homesteader of any rights that he has now?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. And it only applies to the reservations that are spoken of here?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does it include Cripple Creek?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is near Cripple Creek. It is supposed to be near one end and extends over some distance. I will state that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has approved a bill really extending it to all reservations in the State of Colorado, and the Secretary of the Interior has also not only approved this bill, but has framed this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and accordingly the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4991.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill H. R. 4991, which the Clerk will report.

The title of the bill was again reported.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to have the report of the Committee on Public Lands on this bill read.

The report (by Mr. SHAFROTH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2280) "to open the forest reservations of the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims," has had the same under consideration and report it back with recommendation that it be laid on the table and that the accompanying substitute therefor be passed.

The particular reservations referred to in the substitute bill are in the mountains of Colorado, at such an altitude that only small timber will grow thereon. They were created not to preserve timber for the use of the Government, nor to serve any purpose of the Government itself. They were created by proclamation, upon the petition of the citizens of the State of Colorado, for the purpose of preventing the destruction of shade trees and underbrush in the high mountains, so as to preserve the snows from melting until midsummer, when the water would be most needed for irrigation in the valleys and plains below. Your committee is informed that the people of the State of Colorado would never have petitioned for these reservations if it had been understood that the miner thereby would be excluded from making mining locations thereon.

Extensive gold discoveries have been made on parts of these reservations, and it is important that mining locations be permitted thereon as upon all the other mineral lands of the United States.

In one part of these reservations a large number of mining claims have been located, and by reason of the impossibility of obtaining title under the present laws a chaotic condition of affairs exists there. Mining claims there are held by the uncertain right of possession only, which causes an unsettled condition of society and greatly retards the development of the mines in the district.

These forest reservations cover a great many square miles, and, in the opinion of your committee, if they are opened to the location of mining claims only, the area covered by such claims will be so small compared to the total area of the reservations that the purposes and uses of the same will remain practically unimpaired.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office has made a report upon this matter, suggesting a substitute bill to open all the forest reservations of the State of Colorado to the location of mining claims, with certain restrictions as to cutting timber thereon. The Secretary of the Interior in his report to this committee made further restrictions as to the character of the mining claims that could be located thereon and reported a substitute bill, which is the bill recommended by this committee for passage.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this bill, I desire to say that the timber which grows on the reservations referred to in the bill is very small. These reservations are located from 8,000 to 11,000 feet above the level of the sea. Part of the reservations are above the timber line, and only small timber grows at that elevation. Valuable gold discoveries have been made in these reservations, and it is important that they should be opened for the location of mining claims. About 4,000 people are now located at one point in these reservations. They hold possession of these claims only by sufferance. That causes an uneasy feeling. The result is that they are now in a chaotic condition, and it is important that that condition of affairs should be relieved.

The Government has no object of its own to serve in these reservations. They were not created for any governmental purpose. They were intended to serve no use of the Government. The only purpose for which these reservations were created was to preserve the snow from melting in the mountains until the summer, when the water was most needed for irrigation in the valleys and plains below. This bill, or a bill somewhat similar to this, was favorably reported upon by the Commissioner of the General Land Office. It was further reported on by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior framed this bill which has been recommended as a substitute for the original bill. I will gladly answer any question that may be asked concerning it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill covers any other land than that within the limits of the State of Colorado?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It does not cover all the reservations that are in the State of Colorado. The limitation is simply to those reservations in the State of Colorado upon which gold discoveries have been made.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am satisfied.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If no one desires to discuss the question, I move that the committee rise and report the bill favorably to the House.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I make no objection to this bill. I do not as a general thing approve of this character of special legislation. I prefer when we can to make general laws. I believe we ought to adopt some rational system of dealing with the forest reservations. They were made for a wise purpose, although under a law ill considered and very imperfect. The efforts to pass such a general law as a number of us would like to have has not been successful, and I fear will fail. We have not been able to get it out of the Committee on Public Lands in this Congress, and were not able to get an agreement between the two Houses in the last Congress; but as there seems to be a pressing necessity for permitting mining locations in a part of the State of Colorado, at least upon these three reservations, I have consented to a report

on this bill, but I do not want to be understood as favoring such a policy for other reservations.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I endeavored to have a general bill passed, and it met with the approval of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, but the Secretary of the Interior insisted that a general bill was not proper and that these reservations ought to be opened to the location of mining claims only as gold was found on them.

I now move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHAFROTH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CASH ENTRIES OF OFFERED LANDS.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not appear to be of sufficient importance to require consideration in Committee of the Whole, and I suggest to the gentleman that he ask consent for its present consideration in the House.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestion, and ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all private cash entries of public land subject to sale in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas as offered lands, made between the dates of the approval of the joint resolution of May 14, 1888, and its promulgation, May 29, 1888, in cases in which all requirements of law have been complied with, be, and the same are hereby, confirmed, and all such entries made between said dates which have been canceled for which the purchase money has not been refunded shall be reinstated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office upon the application of the purchaser or purchasers or their legal representatives or assigns: *Provided*, That no adverse claim has attached or shall attach prior to such application for reinstatement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BISHOP, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, leave of absence was granted, by unanimous consent, as follows:

To Mr. TYLER, for three days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BELL of Texas, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. PENDLETON, for four days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HUBBARD, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BEACH, for ten days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. RUSK, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of A. W. Bradford, Forty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. A resolution presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRISWOLD] in relation to the levels of the Great Lakes was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He now asks, with the consent of that committee and of the committee to which he desires to have it referred, that the resolution be transferred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and, without objection, the change will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The motion of Mr. DINGLEY was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an appropriation for two composite sailing vessels for the United States Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Clarion River, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 188); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4698) to provide an American register for the steamer *Matteawan*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 187); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 189); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks. (Report No. 181.)

By Mr. COFFIN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4182) granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, dependent mother of Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, late surgeon, United States Army. (Report No. 182.)

By Mr. HALTERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mary Ann Tracy. (Report No. 183.)

By Mr. HOWE, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1050) to grant an increase of pension to Elizabeth Deshler Whiting, widow of Lieut. Henry Whiting. (Report No. 184.)

By Mr. CROWTHER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John Dalton. (Report No. 186.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5162) making appropriations for necessary repairs in the harbor of Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 5163) for the erection of a public building in Reno, Nev.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 5164) to provide for the construction of a harbor of refuge for deep-draft vessels near the mouth of Delaware Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 5165) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Woodland, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5166) to incorporate the Mount Pleasant and Zoo Gravity Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5167) to provide for the construction and maintenance of two day schools among the Iowa tribe of Indians of Kansas and Nebraska, and the per

capita distribution of the trust funds of said Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for recognition of long and faithful service in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5169) granting post of Fort Supply (now abandoned) and certain lands to the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 5170) to open the Yellowstone Park Timber Reserve for the location of mining claims—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5171) to amend an act approved July 15, 1882, entitled "An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5172) to require the employment of American citizens in responsible positions under the Government of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 5173) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to their lands and allowing the same to be alienated under certain circumstances—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5174) to amend section 41 of the act of October 1, 1890, regulating the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5205) imposing a tax on all produce imported from east of the Cape of Good Hope, except when shipped on through bill of lading—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5206) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate 1 condemned cannon and 15 cannon balls to McDowell Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Enid, Okla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) granting to soldiers and sailors of the late war additional homestead rights—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5208) for the construction of a harbor of refuge for the United States Navy and the merchant marine at or near the mouth of Delaware Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5209) providing for the establishment of a subtreasury of the United States at Minneapolis, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT: A resolution (House Res. No. 143) to amend the rules—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUMM: A resolution (House Res. No. 144) asking for additional clerk to Committee on Claims—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. McRAE: Memorial of the general assembly of the State of Arkansas, approving the compromise agreed to between the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the governor of Arkansas in relation to certain swamp-land grants and certain bonds issued by said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5175) granting a pension to Nancy Gentry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5176) for the relief of Timothy Meaher, administrator of J. M. Meaher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) for the relief of Timothy Meaher, administrator of J. M. Meaher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 5178) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Daniel P. Belcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5179) for the relief of Jacob Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) for the relief of Robert E. Newman, late a second lieutenant in the Ninth Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 5181) for the relief of John E. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5182) for the relief of Charles A. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to Wesley A. Pletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5184) to increase the pension of Capt. John S. Bratton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5185) for the relief of the estate of Samuel F. Engs, deceased, late of New York City, and Enoch M. Marshall, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) for the relief of the heirs of Tilghman Weaver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5188) for the relief of Francis Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5189) for the relief of Thomas Matheny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 5190) granting a pension to Oliver Masters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Lissette Berner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 5192) for the relief of Henry E. Rhoades—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 5193) granting increase of pension to Emma Thurston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 5194) for the relief of Moses Pendergrass, of Missouri—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 5195) for the relief of Charles T. Brant—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5196) for relief of Tony Jenkins, of Chapel Hill, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 5197) to complete the record of John T. Nagle, late assistant surgeon of the One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to Edward Margeson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting a pension to Mary J. Storms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 5200) for the relief of D. W. and Minna H. Glassie and Joseph C. Nash—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5201) to increase the pension of Elijah N. Wines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) to increase the pension of C. W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5203) for the relief of Mrs. Susan Davis, of Mississippi—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of Capt. George W. Goethals—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 50 citizens of Brownsville, Pa., praying for the removal of toll tax off the commerce of the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAKER of Maryland: Petition of citizens of Baltimore, Md., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COFFIN: Petition of William A. Meloy, Arthur S. Browne, and Blair Lee, asking incorporation of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Mound City Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, memorializing Congress to pass a bill for service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Petition of Iowa Academy of Sciences, for the passage of House bill No. 119, or a similar measure which will yet more stringently guard our forests from destruction—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Garrett H. Wilber, of Paton, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of J. D. Woodruff and 15 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., asking for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of settlers in Oklahoma Territory, praying for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Three petitions of citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDRICK: Petition of Rev. H. Wilt and 325 others, for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: Two petitions, viz, of the board of supervisors of Kern County, and of Alameda County, Cal., asking for measures of relief for the mining industry—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Union Veterans' Political Protective Association of Chicago, Ill., January 18, 1896, praying for the passage of House bill No. 884, mak-

ing it unlawful "for any person to print, stamp, or impress any words, figures, or designs upon the flag of the United States, or any representation thereof"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the members of the Congregational Church at Stillman Valley, Ill., January 26, 1896, protesting against the persecutions of the Armenian Christians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of the State Anti-Débris Association of California, protesting against the passage of any bill by Congress aiding or attempting to aid in the resumption of hydraulic mining in that State—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the American Pharmaceutical Association, asking for the passage of certain bills therein referred to, to improve the status of pharmacists in the service of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Buffalo (N. Y.) Merchants' Exchange, praying for the enactment of such laws as may be necessary to cancel all so-called greenbacks and Treasury notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., requesting Congress to adopt measures for the protection of the seacoast cities of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Three petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Putnam and Stamford, N. Y., against the selling of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Seven petitions of citizens of Cedarville and Ocean City, N. J., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of the Congregational Club of Crete, Nebr., in behalf of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers accompanying the claim of William Sullivan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of William Bryant, J. E. Newell, and 50 others, of Buffalo, Wyo., and vicinity, favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5148, to increase the pension of David Matlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5146, to correct the military record of William T. Rominger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5150, to correct the military record of William R. Avery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5149, to grant a pension to Anna V. Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5147, to grant an increase of pension to Gavin Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2255, for the relief of Susan Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY: Three petitions, viz, Herbert C. Wright and 15 others, F. T. Atwood and 15 others, Philip J. Zapp and 25 others, all citizens of Warren County, N. J., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of W. P. Bowers, G. G. Rink, and 33 others, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of laws regulating immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the purchase by the United States of canals and making their use free—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of C. A. Sheafe, C. B. Harrison, and Flemmon Hall, late officers of the United States Army, citizens of Rutherford County, Tenn., asking for payment of claim of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Martin Sindall, D. P. Williams, and 19 others, of Verona Mills, Oneida County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of D. W. Snody and 47 other citizens of Forestville, Sanilac County, Mich., praying for the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Three petitions, viz, of 91 citizens of East Prospect, Windsor, and East Windsor townships; 48 citizens of New Freedom, York County, and 21 citizens of Cumberland County, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Three petitions, viz, H. H. Stolle and 17 other citizens of Prentice, Wis.; J. F. Shaw and 16 other citizens of Medford, Wis.; Paul Brown and 51 other citizens of Rhinelander, Wis., requesting further improvement of the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: Petition and papers of Tony Jenkins, for the payment of a claim of $100 for four months' services at Fort Delaware, from July 8, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLER: Petition of citizens of Mahoning County, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5156, for increase of pension to Amelia A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 4935, giving the service record of John H. Clark, and in support of bill granting a pension to Polly P. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4936, giving the service record of James Pebley, with claim for bounty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, service record of Capt. William S. Johnson, to support House bill No. 4933, to restore him to the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of J. H. Hale, of Waukon, Iowa, for additional pension for deafness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of L. A. Darsey, Anson West, and other citizens of Decatur, Morgan County, Ala., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 31, 1896.*

[*Continuation of legislative proceedings of Thursday, January 30, 1896.*]

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., at the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of Grand Harbor, No. 36, American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, of Savannah, Ga., remonstrating against the abolishment of compulsory pilotage; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the Missouri Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kansas City, Mo., praying that an appropriation be made for the relief of suffering in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Missouri Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the bill to establish a bureau of military education and to promote the adoption of uniform military drill in the public schools and the several States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Le Grand Byington, of Iowa City, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing relief for the disordered financial condition of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1858) granting the right to personally inspect and have attested copies of all evidence and reports filed or used in proceedings to obtain a pension, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask leave to introduce a bill.

Mr. HOAR. I call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order, which is House bill 2904, is demanded.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the Senator permit me to introduce a bill?

Mr. HOAR. I shall not object to the introduction of the Senator's bill, but I call for the regular order after that is done.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1859) for the relief of the estate of Alfred W. Green, late of Carroll Parish, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1199) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford now in the Department of Justice.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the want of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Chandler,	Irby,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Davis,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,
Bacon,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Quay,
Baker,	Faulkner,	Mantle,	Teller,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Turpie,
Berry,	Gear,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Brown,	Gray,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	Wetmore,
Call,	Harris,	Perkins,	White.
Cameron,	Hill,	Pettigrew,	
Carter,	Hoar,	Platt,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, upon which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, it will, perhaps, never be necessary to discuss this bill as it came from the other House. But it may be said, it deserved its fate—strangled by silver. It was but the fraudulent pretext of response to the exigency which it professed to meet, and to the reasonable suggestions of the President, which it denied, while it avowed their wisdom. With the exception of provision for emergency certificates—which ought to stand in the permanent statutes—the House bill contained nothing commendable; everything else was but mockery of the legislation demanded by our fiscal condition. And so again, as a year ago, partisanship or imbecility, or both, has stricken Congress with paralysis, and the rescue of business prosperity from its recurring peril has been thrown upon the Executive. It is almost as fortuitous as fortunate that an old statute has remained untouched during our financial madness which can again serve the turn; and, although in a clumsy way, when considered with reference to existing conditions and suitable measures of relief, yet it shows God's pity and mercy are not wholly withdrawn from us.

If any trusted agents in private affairs should so deny duty and abuse trust as Congress did a year ago, and now again repeats, no judgment would be too severe in their condemnation. Over sixteen millions in the public debt were then thrown away in the reckless rage of partisanship; and the injury that must now be sustained by the people for the same reason is probably no less, although the exact measure of it is not so clear. Then the Republican management was able to show pretense that but for the Populists and free silverites there might have been relief. It was not true then; and this bill has now unmasked the fact by denying under Republican dictation the only remedy available to the menaced mischief.

This bond bill as it came from the House was a mere sham. It merits to be consigned to the hecatombs of folly's progeny, where the financial deeds of Congress for many years seem to belong. It is with no lamentation for the destruction of the primal stem that I turn to the graft which the Finance Committee has sprouted on it. It was a bad stock, though it has been budded with a worse scion. The best hope is that both will shrivel and die in the air of the Senate.

Mr. President, in this "august body" the story of Midas is the horror of horrors; everything turns to silver. The old proverb is, at least, one-half true, "Speech is silver," whatever silence. Hoping for action, in this assembly where words are chevaux de frise to entangle it, I have hitherto left the free-coinage question to be debated according to its ratio of 16 for to 1 against; sometimes impatient even of the delay the one could not but interpose to the progress of relief.

But it has come to pass that some say among the people, "Why do not they who oppose free coinage justify their faith in debate? Its champions are always ready. Why are its opponents slow of speech?" And perhaps, sir, it is a duty. At least, the time is not inopportune; and I am not unwilling to try the subject by the democratic principle which is the common sense of constitutional liberty, not less applicable to fiscal intermeddling than other paternalism.

But let me say, sir, at the outset, and once for all, that however warmly I may oppose them, I mean no impeachment of the good faith of any man's opinions on this subject. We have history enough behind us to know how devotedly men have stood to opposite sides of many a question of religion, and how manfully and gloriously they have maintained in flames of torment tenets which now the world derides. Let us therefore be tolerant of our mutual folly as adversaries on questions of finance—next to religion, the world's greatest breeder of errant fanaticism—and try by patient argument to exhibit to the tribunal of public opinion where the folly lies. One side or the other is egregiously mistaken. And it is of the highest moment to the people of this country to locate the error. They can not go on much farther without proving it on one side or the other, and most bitterly if the choice be wrong.

I believe, sir, that the financial distress and public misery of the past three years are the direct product of the efforts to force silver upon the country, and our course to relief is a return to sound principles.

Especially, sir, I believe that every step of the fatal progress in error has been opposed to the cardinal doctrines on which the Democratic party is based, and by which it must abide or sink in recreancy while the spirit flees from our institutions of liberty.

Just and equal laws, conservatively careful of the rights of all; relentless opposition to every form of class legislation; the largest liberty and the least possible interference by government in all individual affairs; are not these Laurentian strata on which must be builded the democratic world; and, in particular, when and how did the democratic principle come to tolerate under our Constitution the transformation of the Treasury into a bank of issue, or give authority to government to make other money than by honest coinage of gold and silver?

Yet, sir, not one of these familiar doctrines but has been trampled in the dirt by Congress in the course it has pursued in dealing with silver, and none is more flagrantly offensive to them than the measure proposed in this substitute.

The direct proposition now put before us is that the Government shall coin into silver dollars and other coin, at its own expense, all the silver which every owner of it, citizen or alien, may bring to our mints, thus giving substantially two coined legal-tender dollars for one dollar's worth of silver; that it shall then issue paper bills called silver certificates for the coined dollars, so as to relieve the holder of its inconvenience in weight and bulk, while the Government will store it for him without charge; and finally, that it shall maintain, at whatever cost to the people of the United States, the parity in value of these 50-cent dollars and silver bills with a gold dollar worth 100 cents. If this measure now gravely proposed by the Finance Committee shall be enacted, such will be the law of the United States.

Mr. President, there are three classes of people who urge this legislation, and it serves to develop its undemocratic nature to consider them by way of introduction to argument.

Those of the first class are at least under no sort of hallucination or delusion in respect to their purpose. They desire by this means to raise the price of silver in the market, either because they are producing it or might profitably work their lean or refractory ore if the price were higher, or because they are so connected in trade or community with the mine owners they think their pecuniary interests will thus be subserved. Comparatively few in number, yet this class is wonderfully potential. With them the silver agitation had its inception and has found its incessantly driving impulse. For them this is a measure of so-called protection, like a high tariff on home manufactures. Of course argument avails nothing with them, no more than with the money-gathering favorites of the tariff, or with the daughters of the horse-leech. Their only cry is more, more.

The second class might deserve sympathy, if they did not shock it. They are those who, owing heavy debts, wish to secure their discharge by one-half the amount of them; or by whatever less the silver dollar may be worth than the dollar they owe. The number of these is vastly less than the number of debtors. It might be thought there could be few such, and doubtless few there are who plainly avow it. The avowal is, however, not infrequently made, sometimes accompanied with sophistries of argument in attempted self-exculpation. I have heard persons privately maintain it, with brutal frankness; rarely in public.

For, Mr. President, let it be recorded to the good name of our country, it is not from either of these that this demand for free coinage derives its dangerous and menacing strength. Its power comes from the remaining class—the many—of whom some are profoundly convinced, and some have persuaded themselves into real belief, of the excellence of "bimetallism" for mankind; that the only road to it lies through free coinage, and that its ultimate benefits will compensate the misery and injustice through which it must be attained; or, perhaps, in some instances, that the injuries to immediately ensue will not prove so serious as they are represented. Enrolled among these are found characters of the

highest grade, who command admiration and esteem, advocates of splendid powers to charm an audience and win favor. They are here, as we all know; and that they are constitutes with the people of this country the principal stay of this menacing agitation. "There's the respect that makes calamity of so long life." It is because of them and their advocacy that the duty arises to enter upon the patient and thorough discussion, with the hope that in the end error shall give way to sound understanding.

A fourth body of sometime silverites, the mere politicians, who are simply catering to the opinions of others, without other care than to make them helpful to their own ends, we may discard from the survey, numerous and noisy as they are; for they will drop the subject when men of fixed purposes no longer pursue it.

Sir, let me next invite attention to some interesting facts concerning the origin and course of the silver agitation in this country which, it seems to me, strikingly illustrate the relation to it of these different groups and develop to some degree the features which appear so especially abhorrent to Democratic principles as well as financial common sense. I hope to state none which can be fairly disputed, and all dispassionately.

The silver-producing country of the United States lies chiefly in the Western mountains of the continent, and among the mines the large producers are the property of no very great number of men, and generally held in corporate ownership. They are mainly worked by hired laborers, and the profits are realized by the stockholders or various owners, similarly to other great industries, whether of mining, manufacturing, or transportation. And although much is wasted in prospecting and experimenting, and many who seek fail to discover paying ore, yet the profits of successful mines are often enormous and many mine owners have won princely wealth. The mining establishments are often great in their immediate machinery, their operations upon and beneath the ground, and in the number of men employed; and intimately connected with them, though at some distance, are other branches of dependent business, as smelting, merchandising, transportation, and banking; so that, as is usual in regions where extensive enterprises are carried on, the basic business, as it underlies, also dominates the entire industrial community. Thus in a natural way—I am not speaking of it accusingly—there came to pass a unity, a solidarity of interest, of opinion, and of cooperation among the silver producers in the Rocky Mountain States, which embraced and governed not only those directly or cognately concerned in silver mining, but the far greater number, the interests of whose neighborhood, comprehending wide regions even, were more or less dependently affected. Newspapers reflect and feed the common sentiment, professional men share it, and politicians rise or fall with it. The keenest and best trained intellects, the most untiring zeal and fidelity, learning, science, invention, and skill, have been and are enlisted in the service of the silver industry, whose rich rewards incite emulating energy to the intensest effort.

Thus there stands, and for many years has stood, a solid body in our country, with great strength of numbers and riches, powerful in intelligence, learning and skill, keenly perceptive of its special interest, hardy and resolute to seek it. And that special interest—overruling, dominating, untiring, exacting, instant in season and out of season—has been and is to win and uphold the best market and highest possible price for silver. This solidarity has been not only of a class of people, but of a section of country. It substantially embraces the States of Nevada, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, the western half of South Dakota, as if they were but one political community, all classes apparently ruled by the dominant and controlling business; while the potency of this influence extends with lessening effect to several adjoining States, reaching, indeed, individuals far removed from the scene.

Such a wealth-getting and labor-employing business would be a powerful mover of public opinion, if aggressively asserted, in any State, as in some we see the manufacturers move church and state, with but rare revolt. In these Rocky Mountain States the task is far easier, because the population which is not gathered in mining towns or cities directly affected is too scattered, dependent, and incoherent to offer opposition. The veriest despot of story, the Grand Khan of Tartary, the Great Mogul, never had more submissive subjects than the Silver King of the Rockies; nor was ever tyrant more pitilessly exacting. No independence of thought or speech is tolerated there. No party, no creed, almost no business, can thrive which dares to doubt in the realm of that monarch the law of finance as it is in silver. The business man finds it prudent to say nothing and wisest to learn nothing antagonistic to his majesty's policy; and for the political representative who dares to flaunt his independence, woe betide him! Let him be anathema! Republican he may be, Democrat, or Populist, but always bend the knee in this presence; no teaching, no belief can stand against the supremacy of silver. Where is that sturdy Senator, the brave, unbending Carey, whose physical majesty was but the type of manhood it enshrined? Where is Dolph, the strong, able, and indefatigable, who never rested when his State or people had an interest in his charge? Look on the bloody Moloch of Silver to learn their fate.

Mr. President, for a generation we have heard the alarum of the "solid South," while partisanship bound a stricken people with iron hoops of political persecution, now at last, with devout thankfulness be it said, struck off forever. But even while they were so compressed in closest union, never was that solidarity comparable to the welding of all interests throughout the provinces of silver in one uncompromising, aggressive, intolerant phalanx to uphold and upraise the price of that metallic product.

The political arrangement of this country has happened to give this compacted interest—especially in this Chamber—an excessively disproportionate share of political power as contrasted with the rest of the Union, whether measured by territorial area, by population, by value of product, or importance in any other sense. Let me observe here that the seven States I mention, having here 14 votes out of 90, represent a population of about one-fourth in amount of the State of New York, with all its great interests as the metropolitan State of the Union, with only 2 votes.

And I need not say here, sir, where best their abilities and winning ways are known, that in no one particular has the shrewd sagacity of the silver-producing region been made more manifest than in the choice of Senators, and I may well add of Representatives in the other House, to represent and conduct its interests in national legislation. Their untiring industry, their indefatigable research into the history and finance of other nations to gather seeming argument, or to mystify it, their skill, their eloquence, vigilance, tact, and zeal have so signally distinguished their advocacy and management of the cause committed to their hands as to have won universal acknowledgment, and ought to gain them the plaudits of the constituency they serve so faithfully.

The extraordinary success which has been hitherto achieved in molding national legislation to the ends of the silver-producing interests, and the methods of its attainment, will ever be an interesting study to the student of affairs who turns his inquiries to the courses by which public opinion may be formed and led.

I can not presume to unfold the story, having no access to the counsels which have guided the campaign with such wisdom. But there are some public and unquestionable facts by which the ruling spirit that during so many years has never lost perception of its object may be traced.

Briefly note some of the features of this nature. Thus may I point out to those of our countrymen who are grounded on Democratic doctrine that the purpose of employing governmental power to foster the interest of a particular, a comparatively small and generally a wealthy, class has at least been the overruling and mastering purpose of the vanguard of the silver agitation, of the most solid, powerful, effective single force that has driven it forward on its rampant career. And to this add, as with equal clearness may be done, that up to the present time the only benefits which have resulted from all the legislation hitherto secured, the only gains it has yielded among all the losses of these years of agitation, have been the temporary enhancement or support of the market price of silver! I shall not now pause to deny what may perhaps be suggested, that even if all be so, yet it proffers no argument against the beneficent excellence to mankind of bimetallism, which is, after all, the supreme consideration. Let that pass for the time. Sufficient is it to my immediate purpose to set forth how both the originating, the steadily propelling, motive of one powerful interest, and the only resultant from all our legislation, have been extension of the vicious and wicked theory of protection to another kind of production, the fostering at enormous public cost of another special class of producing favorites. That it has been in design of and accomplishment for its most efficient promoters only another baneful species of federalistic Republicanism, against which, from its earliest origin, the Democratic party has stood uncompromisingly opposed in principle.

Mr. President, with this point in view, let me now recall somewhat from the turmoil of twenty years; which all must recognize.

Until about the time of the civil war there had never been any production of silver in the United States worth mentioning for quantity nor any mines of silver developed. Discoveries just made led, however, to some development during the sixties, but not to such extent as to affect the market. Silver, indeed, even after the act of 1873, was worth more than the $1.29 per ounce which makes the silver dollar equal in value to the gold. But in 1873, for purely public reasons, as seems to me proven by the evidence beyond all doubt, that law was enacted to revise our statutes relating to the mints and coinage by which the silver dollar was dropped from the system for the reason that its coinage and use had long been practically abandoned.

There was at the time no body of silver producers such as has since arisen; there was no silver interest which was conscious of any peril in that law. No one seems to have foreseen the future fall of silver in the market, or then to have dreamed that the act of 1873 could have effect upon it. Afterwards, some years after-

wards, it became the policy of the silver agitation to arraign that law as the origin of the fall in price, and now to denounce the "crime of 1873" is as essential to the silver faith as a hell to Calvinism.

For, sir, the contest for silver was not set on foot until after increase of its production had become vast in this country and its price had necessarily begun to fall. Then it was, and not before, that the act of 1873 came to be so upbraided. I will not delay to inquire whether that act had any influence, or whether increasing production and the world's action outside of us were more effective of the decline, for it is now immaterial. But it has been proven to reasonable satisfaction that there was nothing unusual in its promotion or passage, that its entirely public purposes were abundantly declared in public debates and in public reports while it was under consideration by Congress for nearly three full years before adoption, and no fact or circumstance justifies the imputation of stealth or fraud in the manner of its enactment, or of wrong, in deed or purpose, to anyone who recommended or voted for it. The imaginary charge, also, that sought to link with its enactment the deceased bimetallist, Mr. Seyd, as a secret agent of a foreign conspiracy, was so utterly exploded in the debate of 1893 as to render that figment of disordered suspicion henceforth ridiculous. Whatever the effect of it, the act of 1873 can no more be denominated "crime" than the act of 1837 or any other piece of legislation. It was not until 1876, when the silver product of the United States had risen to $38,000,000 during the year, and silver stood at nearly 18 to 1 of gold in commercial rating, that public interest came to be manifested in Congress in behalf of silver.

Then it was, sir, although the silver dollar of the United States had never been a thing of common use or necessity, although in all the preceding years of our nation's experience, with the privilege of free coinage proffered to all, but 8,000,000 silver dollars had been made, and these chiefly exported or melted in the arts, then, when the mine owners of this country discovered the lessening price of silver while their produce of the metal was rapidly increasing, then it was that they sought partnership in the booty of protection and went into the councils of the "confederacy of rapine," demanding help to throw on the shoulders of the American people the burden of making a market and holding up the price for the produce of silver mining. The authors of the project were well instructed in the art which has been so serviceable to protection always in dealing with the people. They copied well the ingenuity which has made the galled shoulders of American labor submit to the yoke as if it were a stay and support. It was not the portrait of the silver-mine owner which was painted on the banner of the new crusade. Skillfully appealing to that quality of human nature which bows to the mysterious and indefinable, and worships most what it least can comprehend, the idol of bimetallism was raised before the popular vision like the golden calf before the Israelites, while the prophets of silver decried the good old faith that promises reward for simple industry and thrift, and turned our eyes from solid earth to the rosy pictures they have painted in the clouds. For twenty years we have been chasing that fatuous light, our heads swimming with the vision of a blissful condition, ever just before, when bimetallism shall swell the gains of the husbandman, sweep away as by a fairy hand the oppressive weight of debt and mortgage, and make the world rich and happy with the plenteousness of money for all, big prices for everything one shall have to sell, and easy getting of all one wants. Yet, alas! the lighter grow our heads the deeper sink our feet in the bogs to which we have been lured.

Oh, no! Not for the silver interest, but in the cause of the people, all was proposed, all has been done. For a suffering public the National Silver League, the National Silver Committee, the secret order of Silver Knights, and the friendly and substantial cooperation of the mining interests have self-denyingly contributed their labor and sacrifices.

Mr. President, a well-organized and well-managed agitation of any sort, so addressed to the people, will gain some hearers at all times. It is peculiarly addressed to people undergoing trials which sometimes disorder and oppress the laboring classes; and circumstances of distress, such as might well stir compassion in any human breast, have for many years combined to heap affliction upon a large portion of the agricultural regions of the country. The distresses which nature sometimes tolerates or inflicts, as if resenting the invasion of man's transforming industry, have during some years in different localities borne hard upon our husbandmen, and much have they suffered under the severe and unjust discrimination drawn by our taxing laws against the industry of the fields. None, it seems to me, sir, can contemplate these conditions without a profound feeling of compassion and of indignation, and with earnest purpose to redress and relieve them. Least of all can any just man find it in his heart to lay blame or reproach upon the cries of pain from a people afflicted to such a degree as has been their hard fate in many quarters of the land.

But, Mr. President, history testifies, by many a painful tale of ruin, that no people, at no time, is more susceptible to the seduction of financial heresies, more incapacitated for sound judgment on questions of public finance, than amid such trials of industrial distress. No wonder! How can men pursue abstract and laborious study with that serenity and repose essential to understanding of the laws of finance when every element of misery accumulates about them, when labor, however faithful and patient, fails of reward, when the fruits of the earth turn to ashes, all the arts of industry are mocked with nothingness, and only poverty seems to gain increase? Should we marvel that, when the old road seems so barren and dreary, the siren song, which tells of plenty in some mysterious way, wins the ear of troubled men untaught in the laws or experience of finance?

Thus it happened, sir, that the silver agitation began with and has continued to find peculiar conditions favorable to its promotion. On the one hand, a closely united, intelligent, aggressive, vigorous class, whose prime interest was unmistakable to themselves; upon the other, large numbers of people, like David's recruits, "distressed, discontented, and in debt," readily receptive to alluring promises of relief, easily captivated by arguments so pleasing to their necessities and desires.

And thus, sir, we have had for the last twenty years two objectives to the measures of silver legislation—the one real and certain, obtruded on the public view to the least possible degree, but urged with keen, persistent, never-yielding pressure to win the largest market and the best price for silver; the other, the asserted excellence of bimetallism, always the prominent one, though shadowy and uncertain, exhibited with glittering splendors of argument, clouded with battalions of statistics, theories, and assertions of example from history, showing superficially an alluring aspect of popular importance. The pursuit of one has been steady, untiring, successful; it has shrewdly held its course; grasping at every turn its peculiar advantage, seizing every benefit or gain available to its purpose, never missing to pick up the passing opportunity; while the other has been flitting before the popular gaze, a fluttering fancy, alluring and persuading onward the people, but ever escaping their reach, though it beguiled attention from the load upon their backs.

Bimetallism! High sounding and splendid! If only bimetallism, the Elysian days might come! But, alas, what is it and where is it? Like—

> Dreams that wave before the half shut eye,
> Or gay castles in the clouds that pass, forever flitting in the summer sky—

always dancing before the vision, always something to be gained but never realized; the glittering bauble has fluttered on afar before the fatuous pursuit on which the public have so long been conducted, yet always to disappear save in the pleasing speech of silver advocates, while the realities of gain have been snatched by the other and mastering purpose.

Mr. President, from the beginning of this controversy to this very hour bimetallism, though always the signal word, has never been practically proposed to the action of Congress. At the time this agitation began, supposing it possible of continued maintenance at all, especially by the United States alone, which I do not believe, that bimetallism which our fathers undertook, and which is the only scheme with feasibility of aspect even, free coinage of gold and silver at the commercial ratio might easily have been established. Then the commercial ratio of silver to gold was but 18 to 1, and the silver dollar required but a small addition to the old-time quantity of fine metal in it. But there stood the silver interest, with the cry of the "dollar of the fathers," as if the fathers of our country had even dreamed of maintaining such a thing as a ratio of coinage contrary to the fact of value, as if it were possible to make anything else than silver monometallism by free coinage with an undervaluation of gold. So, at its inception, the cause was sacrificed to something which should give greater advantage to them who had the silver to sell. They must have, not the equal dollar which the fathers sought to have, but an inferior thing falsely gifted with the legal-tender quality, whereby their silver should have an added price put to it in their hands. But, notwithstanding, the followers of bimetallism followed them, seeming always to see their banner only in the hands which first had waved it, and the strange union of force swept its way through the House of Representatives.

Then came the realization. But of what? Bimetallism? Not at all. The very opposite. A sheer measure of protection to silver, a device to uphold its market price as a commodity; the Bland-Allison law of 1878, with all the Bland out of it, and nothing but the silver interest ruling it! The United States—what would the fathers have thought of such a scheme?—was forced into the markets as a purchaser, at the cost of the people, of silver which it did not want and only undertook to buy in order to maintain its price. And to what extent? Every year this Government was to buy three times as much silver as in all its past history had been made into dollars! Doubtless it may then have seemed to silver producers that the great object had been won; a market for the future and a guaranty against a fall in price. It did, indeed, exert

a temporary influence; but the greatest result was to stimulate production and accelerate the decline.

A few years proved it a vain delusion. The people did not want silver dollars, and strenuous effort of the Government could force but a small quantity of the bulky pieces into the commerce and pockets of citizens. Yet, year after year, the country continued to buy what it did not want. The glutted vaults of the Treasury were piled with silver dollars. Large addition to their capacity was made, and still the mass piled up, inert, useless, practically valueless. The Government no more wanted these dollars than it wanted wheat, or corn, or oats, or any other produce of labor, to be stored in public warehouses. And still the price of silver fell, and fell, and fell! By and by came the election of 1888 and Republicanism triumphed. The protectionists had every hold of power, Congress and Executive. Protectionism was rampant, defiant, jubilant. This was the time for silver. The product of every other class favorite was given a new addition of price to be exacted from the people! Why should not silver share in the jubilee? And so the old banner of bimetallism was waved again in the sky, the old cry sounded, with a fanfaronade of new statistics and sophistries to explain the last failure and excite new visions.

Again the clamor for free coinage to redress the people's wrongs, upraise prices, pay debts, and spread a halcyon glow over all the troubled walks of labor. More history, jointed to need, more interminable talk, sharper cries about the gold bugs, fiercer imprecations upon selfish England, resounded through the country. But for what? Bimetallism? Again, not at all. Still free coinage of nothing but the "dollar of the fathers"—free coinage at 16 to 1 of silver now worth only 20 to 1. Again the bimetallism sought was the monometallism of silver! The mastering influence of silver producers continued to guide, watchful and sure that the price of the produce should dictate the measure, before whose advance the trumpets of bimetallism were sounded. And yet again the bimetallists followed their standard carried by the silver miners' color-guard, devotedly reckless where they led. And again the combination seemed pressing to its victory. Again apparently within the grasp of the confederated interest lay bimetallic free coinage, if ever to be had under a false ratio or in the United States alone. I have heard it said it was possible, though I am unable to affirm it, that free coinage at 16 to 1 could have won its way through the Fifty-first Congress; certainly nothing else seemed too monstrous to find favor there.

The House was carried and the Senate became the scene of decisive contest. Now again, at the crisis, the insistent silver interest dropped its popular allies for its special gain. The certainty of its advantage lay in the compromise called the Sherman Act, and the United States were driven again into the markets to buy a doubled share of this favored product of the mines; though it ought to be said that those who contested strenuously for bimetallism realized the fact and cast their influence and votes against it. That 154 tons a month, 54,000,000 ounces of the stuff every year, should be put upon one buyer, who should bury it, when bought, in vaults where it was as safely hidden as in the earth itself, seemed too promising of market and of price.

And for the moment the market jumped, and lucky speculators filled their pockets. But for how short a time the glow abided! Never was the fatal blight of protectionism better illustrated by object lesson. The rush of greed, overproduction, falling prices, feverish distress, as they always do, soon embittered all the earlier gains of the favored interest, and, infinitely worse, the world soon saw the Treasury of the Government begin to stoop under its tremendous load, that the back of the nation's credit was breaking. Then came the wild, ungoverned rush of fear, and panic spread its darkness over the land, conspicuous illustration of the eclipse of reason which begot it! And now the final stage in the legislation of the silver crusade! The Sherman Act was repealed, and all that remains of the twenty years is the disjecta membra of the dead statutes, an increased load of public debt, an enormous heap of useless silver, a well-nigh ruined national currency and credit, and bitter remembrances.

Now, Mr. President, whatever our differences on the point of bimetallism, our ends or hopes for the future, is it possible for a fair man to deny that, in point of fact, all the legislation begotten so far of the silver agitation took shape conformable to the interests of silver producers, and whatever of benefit—conceding any—ensued was theirs alone? In short, to that date, the resultant of all the struggling forces was a new measure of protection in our country, and nothing else—save its evils.

Sir, I can sum up this argument from the speeches of the two distinguished and powerful Senators by whom the people of Colorado proclaim their capacity to choose, and establish here their State, of less than half a million people, in equality with the strongest in the Union. When securing the enactment of the Sherman Act, the junior Senator said, in the debate on the 17th of June, 1890:

> The prosperity of the mountain States and the Territories of the West must ever rest chiefly on the product of its mines; yet we, who are less benefited than any other portion of the Union by the high protective tariff, are asked to stand by the duties which the East formulates; and when we ask that our silver shall also be protected, and have behind us the wishes of a vast majority of the people of the United States, we are called speculators and told that our ideas are those of a dissatisfied and visionary people. I wonder how long the Republican majority of Rhode Island, for instance, would last if the interests upon which the people depend for their livelihood were no longer fostered and protected by the party in power. The worm of Democracy seems already to have made some headway in that Commonwealth, possibly because its duties are not yet high enough. And how long does the Senator from Rhode Island expect the miners and farmers of the West will help protect the industries which he represents while he and other Senators who agree with him can find for us only words of criticism and denunciation?

Turn next to that moving appeal which the senior Senator poured forth here with a pathetic eloquence that touched all hearts in the closing days of the repeal! I am glad that after events have proved his fears unfounded. I shall not now extend my remarks by quotation from it, and especially as to choose a part were invidious. But let him who will read it, and, disenchanting himself, discern that from beginning to end it was but an appeal for continuance of a purely protective law.

And there, sir, I leave the subject, as it bears relation to the first class of promoters of this agitation. They have been the only winners; they perhaps won much for themselves in the gains of the years they enjoyed. I know not what, nor do I begrudge them a shilling. I will not arraign them for what the law of the land gave them to take, however much they contributed to make it. It is the false and evil spirit of such legislation, its injustice when tried by the rule of equal right, its iniquities in the injuries it inflicts on the masses of our countrymen that a few may be benefited, which I arraign and denounce. Let them support it who are inheritors of Federalism, and derivatively of monarchical distrust of the people and recklessness of popular right. It is their creed and portion. But it has no lot or part with the Democratic faith of equal rights for all.

Mr. President, can any man point out benefits to the people of the United States at large by the purchase during these years of the enormous mass of silver now buried in the Treasury vaults? Over 15,000 tons! Such another heap of silver metal, such another monument of folly, the world can not show! The people do not want it; they will not use it for money. Who that lives can tell when or how that immense and useless pile, that has cost so much of debt and trouble, will come out of its burial place to be put to any use in the world?

Mr. President, I turn now to the consideration of the nature of the claim for free coinage which actuates the second class of promoters, debtors who hope thereby to discharge their debts with dollars of far less value than those they owe.

Here, also, as throughout this argument, my purpose is to point out how abhorrent to Democratic principles is every motive, every suggestion of reason or basis for such a measure, while, at the same time, is shown its insupportability by every just standard of public judgment, and, as well, its futility to advance the ends proposed.

It is a proposal never brought forward in debate with that distinct, open avowal of meaning it really implies. Notwithstanding, I believe it has far more influenced the sentiments of some people, even in widespread regions, than all the sounding cymbals which have been rung by the forces of bimetallism at any stage of the contest. Nothing is more captivating or seductive than the whispered argument that tickles the ear with notion of private gain from some course advocated wholly upon other grounds. The wink will outweigh argument a thousandfold with men either weak in mind or strongly beset by distressing conditions. But it will rarely be found in this world, sir, that an argument which goes without words, covertly, with a wink of the eye or a nudge of the rib instead of fearless and manly discussion, is worth anything, even to those to be seduced by their supposed private interest in its effects. And so it is, sir, with this argument. It is a cheat and a fraud, and none are worse deceived than they who lend the greedy ear of private gain while they close the mind to judgment and the heart to justice.

Their postulate, plainly stated, is that the Government of this country shall debase the standard of its coin, making it a legal tender for a double value, simply that debtors may have the help of Government to defraud their creditors of what their promises and the law entitles them. Let ingenuity and sophistry say what they may, such a proposal can never enter into the judgment of the world, except as a measure of wrong and outrage. It has sometimes been the trick of kings to cheat their subjects, but never without the execration of mankind, not more for its immorality than for its evil consequences.

What does it mean, sir, in its best aspect? What one thing but this: that by law there shall be taken from one class to be given to another; that upon them to whom debts are due there shall be laid an enormous penalty, in hope that some of the gain of it may help the debtors. The Congress of the United States is invoked to enact a law that every man who happens to have his property in credits shall yield up one-half, or whatever the proportion, of his substance. For what? For any end of govern-

ment? No; but that other men who happen to owe the debts shall escape one-half of their rightful obligations.

No sophistry can sweeten this to my mind or mitigate the horrors of its injustice. It means nothing less than the use of public power in destruction of the very objects for which government was instituted among men. If this may be done avowedly there remains no rule but the will of a temporary majority, unrestrained by law or justice.

And for Democrats, bred in that fundamental of Democracy which forbids the interference of government in the private concerns of men, what art or rhetoric, what bedevilment of reason can gild such a proposal or make it for an instant tolerable? We who have cried out against class legislation; we who stand here to-day pledged by every obligation of honorable men to strip down as rapidly as possible the hideous mass of class legislation which has fettered and impoverished the agricultural laborer of the country; we who rejoice in the name of Democrat, how can we talk of such a scheme but in words of burning condemnation?

I have heard it said, sir, that excuse might be found for such a course of legislation in the fact that debts are payable in the legal-tender coins of this country, including silver as well as gold; that they were contracted for payment, in some instances, when silver was equally current with gold, and, in other instances, when the current money of the country was worth much less than either gold or silver, and that such a measure would therefore be but redress or compensation for injustice done the debtor.

The proposition is delusive and untenable. It is not addressed, rightfully considered, to present conditions. The entire effect was accomplished when the United States, on the 1st day of January, 1879, resumed specie payment. For seventeen years since the measurement of money has been by the present standard. In all that period silver has been maintained at a parity with gold, regardless of its actual value. And to-day, whatever its enormous depreciation in real worth, the silver dollar of the United States still holds this equality, because the Government makes good its pledge of that parity. Beyond dispute, therefore, in all debts contracted since the 1st day of January, 1879, the consideration moving to the debtor has been the full measure of the present standard. Bethink you, sir, what is the proportion of the private and personal debts of the United States thus contracted. Doubtless not less than 95 per cent of the whole volume. Besides the debts of the Government and the large corporations of the country, not 5 per cent are fifteen years old. Five years will discharge the great mass of individual obligations. Debts of commerce are of much shorter duration. If we examine in detail the most lasting private obligations, real-estate mortgages, comparatively few will be found to have been created so long as ten years ago. Statutes of limitation are rarely over six years, except upon specialties. Of the debts of the Government only its bonds and some trust funds can fairly be called of older date.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Will it disturb the Senator from Wisconsin if I ask him a question?

Mr. VILAS. Not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin to have just stated that since 1879 all debts, public and private, contracted in this country must of necessity have been and were as a matter of fact contracted upon the basis of the single gold standard. I wish to inquire whether that statement applies to the $62,000,000 of indebtedness incurred by the Government of the United States a while ago.

Mr. VILAS. Does the Senator from Oregon refer to the bonds?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes, sir; I refer to the last public loan and the bonds.

Mr. VILAS. I stated that the debts had been contracted upon the present standard of gold and silver as we have it, with the silver dollar at a parity with gold. Of course, the debts which have been contracted by the Government in the last few years have been contracted on that standard and are to be paid upon that standard, I hope.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Senator believes, then, that the indebtedness of $62,000,000 contracted sometime last year by the issuance of bonds payable in coin should be paid in gold coin?

Mr. VILAS. They should be paid in precisely as good money as we have now—gold, or silver maintained at a parity with gold.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Is it not a fact that the same persons who took these bonds, speaking to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury, agreed that if the bonds were made payable in terms in gold they would take them at a figure very vastly different from and in excess of that at which they did take them?

Mr. VILAS. Indeed, sir, it is; and it has always seemed to me a great reproach upon this body that we accepted gold and promised to pay in a standard measured by gold and silver at parity with gold, and then rejected the advantage which was offered.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand that; but admitting that all that the Senator says is true, so far as that is concerned, as a matter of fact Congress did decline to authorize the issuance of bonds payable in gold in terms, and bonds were issued payable in coin only. Does the Senator think, in view of these facts, whether Congress did right or whether Congress did wrong in declining to authorize a gold bond—and I think Congress did right—that the bonds should be paid in gold?

Mr. VILAS. I think they should be paid in precisely what the standard of value was at the time when we made the debt; and every bond that has been issued by our Government ought to be paid in like manner.

Mr. GRAY. May I inquire of the Senator from Oregon, with the permission of the Senator from Wisconsin, by what sort of moral casuistry he justifies a Government that issues a bond under the existing law, which provides that the Government shall maintain the parity of the two coins, in afterwards seeking to pay that bond in a depreciated coin, the depreciation being brought about by the Government's own action?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is not the question at all. It is not the question I submitted to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GRAY. It is the question which I put to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The question I put to the Senator from Wisconsin is simply this——

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Wisconsin answered it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. No; I beg pardon. The bondholders said, "We will pay so much if you will give us bonds payable in gold coin, and if you will not give us bonds payable in gold coin, but give us bonds payable simply in coin, then we will pay you so many million dollars less for your bonds," amounting to a difference, as figured out by the Secretary of the Treasury, of about $16,000,000 on this one loan of $62,000,000. The Congress of the United States declined to authorize an issue of bonds payable in gold coin, and the Secretary of the Treasury went on under the authority he had and issued bonds payable only in coin and not in gold coin. Now, what I want to know of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Wisconsin is, whether there would be any dishonesty upon the part of the Government in paying those bonds in silver?

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Oregon declines to answer my question.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Or would the Senator from Delaware pay the bonds in gold coin and thus give to the bondholders a bonus of about $16,000,000?

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Oregon is better at asking questions than at answering them.

Mr. VILAS. I do not think there is a particle of difficulty about it. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he believes the purchasers of the bonds last year would have offered the United States as much by practically one-half the amount they did offer if they had believed the bonds would possibly have been paid in silver?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I only know what they agreed to do. They said, "We will pay so much if given bonds payable in gold coin; we will give you so many million dollars less if you give us bonds payable in coin."

Mr. VILAS. Will not the Senator from Oregon recognize that if the purchasers of those bonds had supposed it possible that they would be really paid in silver they would not have paid half as much for them?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Then, if that is the case, and if that is what they thought, they tried to play a bunco game on the United States.

Mr. VILAS. What they proffered of difference represented simply the effect upon the market of the shade, the thin shade of fear, which the action of the Government had necessarily given to it, or the debates in Congress, perhaps, rather than the action of the Government.

The Senator from Oregon will acknowledge beyond all question that in the money markets of the world it sometimes takes but the mere breath of rumor to affect values by substantial degrees, yet not the hundredth part of what the fact which the rumor indicates would produce. Is that not true? Does the Senator from Oregon recognize that the difference that was offered in the case we have been speaking of merely represented an acknowledgment or reckoning on the shade of fear which had been cast upon the markets of the world?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I can answer that question by saying simply this: The Senator from Wisconsin has stated that the parties who furnished the money and took the bonds had not the slightest idea, as he thinks, that they would ever be paid in anything else than gold coin. Now, if that is the case, then by their coming in here and saying to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Congress of the United States, "We will give you so much if you make the bonds payable in gold coin, but we will give you" fifteen or sixteen million dollars, or whatever it was, "less if they are payable only in coin," they were simply, as I said before, undertaking to play a bunco game on the Government of the United States.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to pass his own judgment upon the purpose of those men, but I must differ

from him in this respect. I think it was a most natural thing that purchasers of bonds of the United States (which were by law payable only in coin, and especially at the time when those bonds were purchased, this Government hanging over the brink of the abyss of a fall to silver payment instead of gold, a premium already rising upon gold) should want to guard themselves against the risk of the effect of that condition upon the market and be willing to yield a small shade of the annual interest in order to effect that result. It was not bunco, but a distinct, honest proposal which I confess I believed at the time it was made, with all our differences and with all our controversies, would be immediately accepted.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the language of the law enacted in 1893, which entered into the contract?

Mr. VILAS. Yes, sir; I remember what it is, but I will be glad to have the Senator from Delaware call attention to it, because it is an explicit answer in the terms of the statute similar to that which I gave the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRAY. I read from the act approved November 1, 1893, repealing the Sherman law:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value.

Mr. VILAS. Let me add at this point that every bond issued since the act of July 14, 1870, reads upon its face that it shall be payable in coin of the United States of the standard value at the date of that act.

Mr. PUGH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to ask him a question? In the face of the law just read by the Senator from Delaware, giving bondholders the security of that provision, which he insists they had, why is it that they authorized the President of the United States to send a message to Congress recommending that we give them the guaranty of an additional law allowing them to have the bonds payable specifically in gold? If they already had the protection of the law, which the Senator from Delaware has quoted, why did they not stand upon it?

Mr. VILAS. The reason is perfectly plain. Instead of their depending upon the standard of value as it then stood fixed by law they wanted the authority of Congress that their bonds should be payable in the specific coin which they gave the United States for the bonds—gold.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VILAS. I must decline, Mr. President. However, if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to ask a question, I will yield, but I was going to say that I have already occupied more time in this way than I intended to consume.

Mr. TILLMAN. What were the prices of similar bonds on the market at that date?

Mr. VILAS. I suppose everybody must be familiar with the facts in relation to those bonds. If the Senator from South Carolina chooses to turn to the speech which I made about a year ago he will find all those points elaborately discussed and my views on them presented. I do not care to be diverted from the argument I am making now to chase down again the will-o'-the-wisps which were sufficiently disposed of at that time.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin decline to answer any further questions?

Mr. VILAS. I refer the Senator to the place where he can find the answer elaborated in full.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why not give it here again?

Mr. VILAS. Because it would occupy unnecessary time, and I do not wish to be diverted from the argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CALL in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well.

Mr. VILAS. I return again to the point I was discussing. Of the debts of the Government only its bonds and certain trust funds can be fairly called of older date. By far the greater volume of its obligations, especially of its pension charge, vastly outstripping in importance all its other permanent liabilities, has been imposed within the last fifteen years. So of the great corporate obligations. There is probably not 1 per cent of the enormous aggregate liabilities of the banking institutions of the country, of its trust companies, of its insurance corporations, with the exception, perhaps, of some policies of life insurance, which have not been entered into since the adoption of the present standard. And of railroad corporations, the largest corporate debtors, their bonded obligations have been entered into within that period or are, by the terms of the bonds, specifically payable in gold. Is it sought to relieve these great corporations, to facilitate their repudiation of part of their debts at the cost of the holders? Is this the thing which commends this scheme to the labor interests of the country? The question needs no answer. It needs not be said that unless there be some relief for private debtors this scheme is utterly without acceptation to any of our people. If, then, we grant this argument of compensating injustice as tolerable at all, its applicability can not possibly touch the twentieth part of all the private debts of the country. The lapse of time has robbed it of whatever force it might ever have exerted. The sophistry must fail to seduce even a willing judgment in the face of the actual facts to which it must be applied. If ever there were anything to justify such a basis for public action, its force was wholly directed to the period when specie resumption was under consideration. The moment that step was taken its force began to fail, and has long since evaporated.

The enormous disproportionate injury such a measure must inflict ought to condemn it in every fair mind, even of debtors who fancy any relief from it. Suppose it be granted that, by a free-coinage act, the standard value of money will be reduced approximately one-half, measured by the present worth of silver. It is obvious this would destroy to the creditor so much of the worth of every debt not specifically payable in gold. That is the one certain and immediate consequence. At once, upon such an enactment, thousands of millions of dollars, in the aggregate, are struck from our citizens any part of whose means is in the form of obligations for money. It will not alone be the mortgagee who holds a debt charged upon a farm, the merchant whose accounts represent supplies to families and to business in his neighborhood, the shylock, if you please, who has put his money to uses, or the petty neighborhood usurer who has planted his substance in chattel mortgages at high rates of interest; these constitute, all told, but a small proportion of the creditor class. But down go, likewise, all the accumulated savings of depositors in banks to an aggregate of thousands of millions of dollars, all trust assets, the inheritance of widows and children invested in stocks and securities familiar to business, the endowment investments of educational and eleemosynary institutions, all life insurance, all the pensions of the country; in short, the manifold investments of capital in every form of debt by which the business affairs of the country have been carried on and its useful establishments given income; by which labor has saved its accumulations, and provision for families and children has been made. The sufferers will be not only the few greatly rich; vastly more in the total aggregate are persons of moderate circumstances, or of the thrifty poorer classes. None would suffer more than the pensioners of the country, more and more dependent as the years roll on. Sir, the enormity of this proposed iniquity is incalculable, the injuries it would inflict beyond human forecast. The whole range of human history will furnish no parallel for such an unspeakable outrage upon a civilized country in the form of legislation.

Sir, is it possible to suppose that this American people, with their important concerns and interests, can be brought to the block for sacrifice in this manner? If this were not the nineteenth century, if this were not a land which had enjoyed a hundred years of freedom, if this were some darkest period in the Dark Ages, when force was concentrated in the hands of the few and the collar of servitude was worn by the multitude as serfs, the monstrous possibility might enter the brain as conceivable, but for the fact that no people who would tolerate it could possess such objects for sacrifice. But in this day and generation, with all the lights of science and experience, and the qualities of manhood in American freemen, this is the idlest, the weakest, the most impossible of proposals to stand upon the footing of a relief to debtors.

But suppose the thing possible, and the step taken. How would it avail the debtors throughout the country? Would it at once bestow the means by which to appear before their despoiled creditors and demand their obligations? Before they could discharge even their diminished debts they must obtain the dollars, silver though they be. The same old rule would still apply to them. However lessened in value, they will still be had only for labor or the produce of labor. And meantime everything except labor would change in price according to the change of scale for measurement of values. Labor would go lagging behind and strikes and lockouts prevail.

Utterly trivial compared with the enormity of the injury would be the gain of debtors when even any was so secured. Can one contemplate for a moment the ruin of credit, the destruction of business which such a blow at law and good faith would cause, without recognition of the certainty that labor and all the methods of labor would be left practically helpless? We had but a feeble sample of what would be the horrors of the situation in the distress of 1893. That was indeed but a foretaste; the preliminary shudder at the first glance of the direful possibility. The poor would not unload their burdens in such a day of financial misery and devastation. Their means of gaining money to discharge their debts would suffer a far greater proportionate injury than the measure of their debts would receive reduction. Labor finds its most active demand, its best wages, its most elevating and profitable employment in the days of universal prosperity. When business misfortune blights and checks the enterprise of the country labor is first to feel its devastating consequences and to be turned loose upon the world. The army of tramps takes up its ghastly

march not when the sun of prosperity shines, but when it is obscured behind the clouds of doubt, disaster, and fear. Who, among all those who profess this expectation of relief to debtors, can put his hand upon any example in the history of the world where the debasement of the coin produced aught else but misery among those who need money the most?

Sir, let Congress, if it will pursue such a policy of relief to debtors, pursue it directly, and appropriate to all the debts of the land whatever percentage is thought fit to assuage the debtor. Far better that outrage upon the Constitution than this utter demolition of all the structure of law and order.

And, sir, let us especially note that somebody is to be cheated should the scheme prevail. It is constantly argued that with free coinage the price of silver will advance and the United States alone can push it up until it regains parity with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. If that be so, where, then, will come this relief to the debtors? The silver dollar commercially worth a gold one will be no easier to get than the gold dollar itself. I grant I do not believe it. I have not the least shade of belief that free coinage by the United States will sensibly appreciate the value of silver; but I arraign the argument as utterly unsound, if no worse, which maintains this two-faced appeal to discontented debtors and sanguine bimetallists.

But sir, whatever may be the soundness or fallacy of the argument so addressed to debtors, there can be no question of one result. Where could the American lift his head among the peoples of the earth; how enter the walks of civilization and enlightenment without skulking furtively from the glance of scorn that would spurn the citizen of a country which declares its contempt for the obligation of contracts, which would take from its creditors, abroad and at home, the measure they hold our word of promise to give? Nor, sir, would it avail us in the long run if we could so make present gains as the price of shame. God's laws bind nations not less than individuals. The mass can no more escape than the atoms which compose it. And of all the laws which bind mankind, experience proves none more potential for good, none so promotive of national as well as individual prosperity, than the law of good faith, the honest face toward every obligation, whatever the apparent temporary cost and hardship. It requires no religious teacher nowadays to tell us that nothing more promotes the material prosperity and happiness of the individual than the upright character which will bend to no adversity nor peddle justice for the gains of iniquity. And so it is with the nations of the earth. National prosperity never long survived national honor, nor the honor of a nation the character of its citizens.

Mr. President, I think I may at this point challenge the judgment of every fair Democratic advocate of bimetallism that neither for the interest of silver producers nor of distressed debtors alone can the proposal of free coinage in the substituted bill be defended for an instant, because entirely intolerable to Democratic principle and indefensible upon any ground limited to these two classes. I shall expect such an adversary to agree that unless he can maintain the excellence of this measure upon the ground of the common good, not of class interest, his cause is untenable. And there I next undertake to confront him.

Without indulging in self-laudation, it ought to be said of a body constituted as is the American Senate that recognition will be universal here of the fact that the currency and monetary affairs of the world and every country in it are subject to some laws beyond the control of any legislature. The movement of gold and silver among men responds to natural law as surely as the currents of the ocean; and while the course or volume of movement may be altered by changing conditions, they will be stayed by no arbitrary decree. To bring to pass a beneficial change, the first essential is a true perception of the unfavorable conditions and the governing law. And hence, it must be acknowledged, understanding of bimetallism is not promoted by terms so often used by impassioned advocates before the people.

I confess to a certain admiration for what may be called the vocabulary of silver. It is to the full as curious and effective as the terminology of alchemists of the olden time. Instead of an inanimate metallic substance, like gold, copper, lead, or iron, to be regarded with reference to its utility and value, we not unfrequently hear silver personified in speech, and usually with a tender, feminine cast. "She" has her "friends" and her "enemies"; she has been put to woes that would provoke the indignant devotion of every chivalrous gentleman. She has been "degraded," "struck down," criminally put upon, "disinherited," nay, even "assassinated." Upon the other hand, there is gold, a brutal, ruffianly fellow, grasping all the good things of earth and putting the yoke of slavery upon all mankind. Him we should all detest and spurn; her continually court and love. Curiously enough, the union of these two in a so-called "marriage" is a thing to be ardently desired of all men. In like manner of argument, silver has also her vituperations. Whoever does not contribute to her "cause," that is, to advance the price of the metal in the market, is a "gold bug," the precise horror of which I have not yet been able to understand. Beyond all, such a man is accursed as a friend of England, if not actually bought to betray his country by British gold, that old, well-worn, and most powerful argument of protection in the tariff also. Yet I have heard the Senator from Nevada tell the Senate that England has so laid all the world under tribute that the debts of other countries to her people amount to ten thousand million dollars; that all the world ministers to her riches and yields her income. Would it not be wise for our countrymen to reflect that England has had a single gold standard since 1816 and free trade for nearly fifty years? Or shall we plunge deeper into folly if England has been wise before ourselves?

Sir, I once knew of two eager students of natural science who, coming into dispute concerning the manner in which the moon produces and affects the tides, and being unable to resolve it by mutual asseveration, fell to blows, by which course of solution both were seriously battered. Yet, notwithstanding, the lunar orb has not since ceased to draw the floods in her diurnal revolution, after the fashion which nature decreed. Doubtless, sir, the people of the United States may batter their heads together so long as folly and passion keep them at it, and yet the inevitable laws decreed by nature to monetary affairs will have their way also.

The word bimetallism is of no ancient date, and has but recently intruded into dictionaries. It is itself a product of "free coinage," well devised to catch the ear and muddle the brain, like many another patent medicine for popular consumption. It appears to be adaptable to vastly diverse and even antagonistic conditions. Two-metaled money etymologically seems to mean money compounded of two metals, or the use of two metals as money. In that sense, every civilized nation enjoys bimetallism at least, for all use both silver and gold more or less. Our country rejoices in trimetallism, for we employ three metals in our money. Bimetallism, if thus intended, is consistent with the adoption of either silver or gold as the standard of value. Is this, in truth, the meaning in which advocates of silver use the term, proposing by adopting their bimetallism to hurl the country from its present basis of business transactions to another standard much inferior? To charge them with it would but apply the rule of law that every person is held to intend the consequences of his deliberate act.

But I believe, sir, we shall all agree that bimetallism is intended to signify the use of gold and silver as money, each being separately coined, with such a quantity of metal in the common dollar unit of both as will not only make their value the same at the start, but by operation of the laws of trade or of public statute will keep it so.

The bimetallism which is extolled to us with so much eloquence must be such an employment of the two metals that the intrinsic or commercial value of both combines—through their adjustment in a perfect ratio of interchangeability, supported by adequate ingenuity of law, or the common consent of commercial nations—to fix and maintain a single standard of monetary measure into which the value of both metals enters and to which each contributes. This is the wedded bliss of the two-metaled union.

Two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one.

If we fail to secure the double cooperation, if either metal rules the monetary household, then the entire virtue of this principle of compound money becomes lost. It destroys the usefulness of bimetallism in this sense if the ratio of the two metals changes so that either becomes alone the monetary standard of measuring values, for then the other must yield to that measurement by the one, which true bimetallism abhors and must prevent, or be lost.

That moment when either metal fails to furnish equal contribution to the measuring standard of money by the sustenance of its own commercial value is the death of bimetallism, because then it becomes, with pathetic accent if it be silver, a commodity. There is no meaning but this, sir—which I, at least, am able to discern—in all the argument which is adduced to the beneficence of bimetallism. Otherwise there is no force whatever to the contention that by a standard money which enjoys the double value of both metals, the price of commodities will be enhanced and maintained at a higher level than if measured by gold alone. Otherwise the idea utterly fails that by the flow of one metal to whatever country lacks it in any degree the so-called equilibrium will be restored and the common unit of measure will be regained, if momentarily lost by any derangement. This meaning, Mr. President, was ably set forth in 1893, in a speech by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], with many learned quotations to support it. It is unquestionably the only true meaning, except the single one of the use of two metals without reference to the standard.

Assuming this as the true idea of the thing, I add for myself that if it be possible to have it, if it be a practicable thing to so adjust the use of gold and silver as money as to secure such an interfused standard of value, partaking of the value of both metals, which will continue permanent and stable, I am entirely willing and ready to accept it. Indeed, I have always supposed I was a bimetallist in this meaning of the term. I deny to any Senator,

however able or distinguished, the least advantage by reason of professed devotion to the cause of "bimetallism," if by it he means, or reserves to himself the right to claim to mean, the idea of bimetallism in this interpretation. For here we all stand on common ground. The trouble comes when the question is put, How will you attain to this bimetallism? How will you provide for the use of both gold and silver on such terms that the standard of monetary value will be the compound of the values of both, and so abide, steady, durable, and trustworthy? There arises the illusory problem which no one solves, there lies the cause which turns this well-desired bimetallism into an airy phantom, ever dancing before the eye of fatuous pursuit.

Sir, there is not to-day a country on the face of the globe where this bimetallism exists. I confess, sir, that until driven to research for the evidence I had always supposed it once existed among commercial nations; but I think no one can read the recent work of Mr. Shaw, his History of Currency, and maintain that opinion with undisturbed conviction. It is not, however, now worth while to dispute whether it ever had a really stable form, or whether, if the truth can be ascertained, its apparent existence has not been illusory and temporary. Silver has indeed at times furnished the measuring standard in many countries, but that does not constitute bimetallism. The fact stands forth, whatever the past, that at the present time no nation gives us the example of bimetallism; none can teach us how to create it or maintain it, under the conditions of to-day.

Mr. PUGH. Will the Senator allow me at this point to state a fact which is germane to the question he is discussing? At the time the Constitution of the United States was adopted there was not a single government in Europe that did not grant to both metals the free and unlimited right of coinage. Granting this right through many centuries of free and unlimited coinage to both metals, can the Senator name a single one of those European Governments that dropped silver out of coinage when there was any disparity between the value of the bullion of both metals or the money coined out of both metals? Was silver dropped out of coinage on account of any disparity at the time in the bullion value of the two metals or the money value of the two metals?

Mr. VILAS. I think if I had the material at hand that I could mention the countries and show to the Senator that when there was free coinage of the two metals in the manner of which he speaks there was in no country continuously anything like the bimetallism of which we are speaking, and that the free coinage of silver was dropped by several of those countries when there was a considerable disparity between the silver coins and the gold, for the reason that they could maintain the circulation of silver best by having the standard of gold to measure the currency of the country, maintaining at the same time the use of as much silver as possible then.

Mr. PUGH. I have never read any such thing as that in history.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to commend to the Senator the work to which I have referred; but I disclaimed the purpose to go into the argument of the past, and therefore I do not wish to follow the Senator's interesting question further than to repeat that if he will turn to that work to which I have made reference I think he will find his opinion somewhat shaken, as mine certainly was when I read it, for I supposed the fact was that bimetallism had existed in the fair sense. But I consider it immaterial at this time for the argument I am now about to adduce. I repeat (and I think the Senator from Alabama, learned as he is upon this subject, will agree with me that I am stating only the fact), that whatever the past, at the present time we have in no nation on the earth an instance of bimetallism of the character of which we are speaking.

Mr. PUGH. Merely because silver has been dropped out of coinage.

Mr. VILAS. Well, for whatever reason.

This appears to me, sir, a fact of tremendous import. It is a fact which a wise and a sagacious people will not discard for a theory at the instigation of any class of men whose special interest is manifest. It is a fact which could not exist, it seems to me, if this bimetallism were the excellent and easily-to-be-enjoyed thing which we hear so often asseverated. For either bimetallism has heretofore existed, or it has not; and if you assume that such bimetallism has existed in the past, but all the world has turned from it, surely does this not prove by the experience of mankind that it is not useful and beneficent, as its advocates so loudly contend? It is idle to talk of a "gold-bug" conspiracy as the occasion of this universal transformation, if such it really be. It was not in the darker ages of the world that the methods of finance kindest to the people were known and followed, nor has the nineteenth century, the brightest of all human history, marvelously illuminated by knowledge in every other particular, become blackest of all ages in understanding of the true principles of finance. Sound and rational money is not only the hand servant of commerce, it is its essential and indispensable friend and auxiliary; and can any man delude himself that this age of unexampled freedom and magnitude of intercourse has grown more stupid and silly in understanding and use of money? No, sir, if this bimetallism once was, but has been superseded by all nations, that fact is as demonstrative of its inutility as the abandonment of astrology disproves the aid of the stars in foresight of human affairs.

If you indulge the contrary assumption, that bimetallism has never existed in this true sense, has never yet shown the world its beneficence to man, what is the task which they assume who undertake to impose their theory of it on our countrymen against the whole experience of mankind? They may, indeed, be right; but to demonstrate its excellence, much more its possibility, so as to justify exposure of the vast interests of this country to their experiment, ought to require such plentitude of reason as should win almost universal consent. Newton found the unknown law of gravitation, Copernicus the magnificent order of our solar system, and Harvey the circulation of the blood; and it may be that the mine owners of the West have discovered some way to compound gold and silver by separate coining of the two in one standard of money value after a fashion the world has never known. But if so, let them prove it, as Newton, Copernicus, and Harvey affirmed their discoveries to universal acceptance, without overturning our world of finance or drawing off our commercial blood. I repeat, sir, that the fact that all nations discard this bimetallism of which we speak is of tremendous import as a testimony of the judgment of mankind against this proposal, upon either assumption that it has at some time been tried or that it never did exist.

But, Mr. President, the only path to bimetallism proposed to our feet is a return to the practice of unlimited free coinage, the very practice which, once common, has been abandoned and discarded by the leading commercial nations, the brightest, best-instructed, highest-civilized peoples of the globe. Yea, even the countries of the Latin-Union, the friends of silver, the most faithful of all nations to the cause of bimetallism, put a stop to it before our act of 1873.

And now it is demanded the United States alone shall again undertake what all these people failed in together. Sir, the proposal carries its refutation with it, in the face of this history. At the very least, Mr. President, we ought to be given an argument for it that should be moral demonstration. No shadowy speculation, no theories maintained only by captivating eloquence, no appeals to class favor or the discontented elements of society can warrant such an experiment. Above and beyond all, sir, the argument which invokes the tremendous power of Government to such an object ought to stand upon a clear and just recognition of the rightful purposes for which government is created, the rightful uses to which its power can be addressed.

Now, sir, what, in the last analysis, is the great argument upon which this effort for bimetallism depends? Distinguish and discard the ad captandum appeals to special interest, the contentions drawn from words of the Constitution, the multitudinous, bewildering, and always disputed statistics and inferences from other countries, and especially the vociferation of passion and controversy, and what is the great argument on which, in the ultimate, the whole force of the bimetallic movement stands?

Sir, we had it, abundantly and ably given, in the speech of the Senator from Arkansas in opening this debate. It may be summarized as the argument of falling prices. In glowing rage we hear depicted the miseries of a community when commodities decrease in market valuation, and painted with the color of the rose the prosperity that attends their rise; and thereupon it is assumed, without warrant, as I think, in the facts, that the fall of prices during the past twenty years was due to the adoption by other nations of the gold standard and the demonetization by this of the silver dollar in 1873. A short answer, and a complete one, to the latter postulate is thatns 1a nc878 the United States has coined for circulation over fifty times as many silver dollars as in all its previous existence as a nation, and if silver money would raise prices they must have risen, not fallen, since 1878.

However, I grant that is not the bimetallism we are now discussing, and it is due to this argument, and to all the mischiefs it has done, to give it a far wider consideration, from the Democratic standpoint.

But in the first place, let me ask, is it an evil which mankind should defend against that the prices of those things which make for human comfort and joy should decrease? Is it lamentable that the family which depends for bread, clothes, and education on the toiling father's wages should be able to buy now, for one day of his labor, many times as much of all the means of happiness as he could thus have provided in past generations? No man worth listening to will pretend such a thing. Our civilization finds expression of its practical benefits more in the enormous increase of production and the constant fall of prices, not only of the necessaries, but of all the auxiliary comforts and luxuries which expand and sweeten modern life, than in any other feature. Nothing, except the wondrous works of God, can more excite delight and admiration than the marvels of human ingenuity in

multiplying the objects and cheapening the production of the goods which mankind needs. Famine and pestilence have even largely yielded their horrors, and the life of man has been made longer as well as happier. Examine minutely the privileges and habits of the nobility of England in the splendid reign of the third Edward—we might even come down much later—and you shall find that the thrifty tradesman and artisan in our land today enjoys a more cheerful home, eats more varied, wholesome, and nourishing food, is supplied with and intelligently reads more and better books, and rejoices in greater advantages of education for his children. Indeed, not alone in personal liberty and the security of law, but in all their fruits, in all that makes for enlightened advancement and happiness, in the cheapened and ever-cheapening produce of science and invention, the prudent, sensible, well-conducted American citizen of this generation outstrips in the pursuit of happiness the noblest and wealthiest ranks not many generations gone.

Falling prices! May they continue to fall until everything of excellence shall be within the reach of all deserving men; till mankind shall revel in abundance. Falling prices mean shorter hours of labor, longer hours for enlightenment. It is the hope of the good and wise that looks to a coming time when all the earth affords for the needs and happiness of those man loves and toils for shall be so abundantly and cheaply provided that the curse of toil may vanish in the blessing of labor which is only beneficent.

But, granting all this, as I think the Senator from Arkansas meant to do in his speech the other day, yet it is argued that when the fall in prices is due to a rise in the value of money, by decrease of its relative quantity, so that all commodities are alike affected with depreciation, then evils of public distress, more or less severe, will follow.

Properly understood, this proposition requires no denial, although the effects are often overrated. Nor do I withhold hearty assent to the denunciations or interference by government to produce such results. It must be a rare case, indeed, if ever tolerable, when such an act will not be a perversion of the just power of government, iniquitous in policy and unjust in effect.

But this is only the half truth, not intelligent expression of the true law. There must be a deeper penetration of the subject if we will have a just understanding of its principles.

There are two aspects in which the rise and fall of the value of money is to be considered. The one its fall or rise from natural causes, so to speak; that is, its increase in quantity by new discovery in metal, new appliances of art, the application of greater human effort to its production; or its diminution by exhaustion of mines or relaxation of pursuit. The other aspect is the artificial rise or fall of money produced by interfering legislation immediately, or by subtle indirection, operative on the value of the standard.

Let us for the present pass the former by, and address attention to the right of governmental interference with the quantity or value of money or, in other words, with the standard of measurement of commercial values. It is with this that we are immediately concerned; it is the exercise of such a power that is proposed by this substitute. All natural causes or effects are here utterly disregarded, and the proposal now is to exert the full potency of the extremest legislation.

The argument of its advocates, strenuously put by the Senator from Arkansas in opening this debate, begins with the postulate, which I have accepted, that an increase in the value of money that causes a general fall of prices, is, especially when effected by legislation, an injury to any civilized community, productive of distress and injustice, and worthy of condign condemnation. It is next asserted that to diminish the value of money and thus produce a rise of prices is beneficial to society and productive of prosperity, and therefore legislation may be employed in this direction to win this benefit.

Right here, sir, I join issue and undertake to dispute the fairness or wisdom of the conclusion. It is, in my poor opinion, unsound in principle, inimical to the interests of this or any country within the civilized pale. Especially does it appear to me un-Democratic; in flagrant dissonance with those doctrines of governmental limitation and equal justice on which the Democratic party is built.

I grant at the outset that, in whatever way effected—by increase in the quantity of money or otherwise—the gentle and gradual diminishment of the value of the monetary standard will, for the time being and as its immediate effect, stimulate enterprise, increase production, tend to the easier payment of existing debts, and give the fictitious appearance of prosperity. But it is a short-sighted view which accepts these consequences as a real, especially a just and enduring, prosperity, desirable in the view of statesmanship to establish by legislation. It is the policy of the drunkard or opium eater who indulges the delirious joys of intoxication, reckless of the injuries and pains which must follow to his life.

It lies, sir, in the nature of the proposition that the day of reckoning must come, and will bring with it, in heightened and intensified degree, the very evils which we hear now so loudly denounced, the returning wave of a rising standard and falling prices, inflicted upon an overexcited and excessively indebted community. For how is it possible, sir, that there can go on forever a fall in the value of money, a continuing rise of prices, never to cease rising? How can the monetary standard be unceasingly depressed and diminished, and continue to exist at all? All reason and all experience show the utter folly and wrong of such a course. It is doubtless true that for even a few years sometimes there may be induced, by a skillful, gradual, and subtle change in the quantity of money—never by such a reckless and violent shock as is now proposed—a seeming flush of general prosperity, albeit at the cost of gross injustice to them to whom obligations are due. One generation, even, may sometimes thus despoil their children. But is that a policy to be pursued by an enlightened country, to be supported by Christian statesmen? History is full of examples of the consequences of such temporary and harmful prosperity, of the certainty of the pains and penalties by which it is to be expiated. It matters not whether the cause were natural or artificial. In every instance that consequence has been certain, inescapable, direful. Whether to a great nation or to a small community the trial has happened, with differences in time or degree, the retribution has been no less sure, no less compensatory. What halcyon days followed to Spain after the discovery of this continent and she had begun to gather the treasures of gold and silver from its native inhabitants or its mines! Yet what has been her consequent portion in the enjoyment of national power or in the welfare of her people? The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella was a sturdy, vigorous country, with every promise of independent and growing importance. Swollen with her sudden wealth of money, she towered for a time among the nations of Europe. The golden stream ceased to flow and her lusty native strength had been ruined.

In closer view, not long ago we saw beaten, humiliated, impoverished France strip her people of a marvelous heap of money to buy her peace from victorious Germany. Yet how quickly did the unbending law of nature bestow rewards upon the country which had parted with its money, depreciating prices, and assign business misfortune, although not in that case lasting, to the other which had swollen its money volume with enhancement of prices?

It has been none the less true in the experience of the United States. We need not go back to the story that had its catastrophe in 1837, of unlimited paper issues substituted for money, until the allurement of rising values converted the country into a financial Bedlam, and the wreck of the collapse was wide as our settlements. We have had our example of too much gold as well. The abundance of Californian riches gave us the prosperity of inflation in the sixth decade of the century, and intoxicated the nation with rising prices, expanding credits, and entrapping the wisest in the network of debt, for which the panic of 1857 inflicted the penalty.

So, too, in 1873, was reaped the harvest of distress and ruin which followed on the inevitable and necessary turning back upon the artificial diminution of the standard of money which the exigence of war had occasioned. The financial terrors of 1893 are too near us, too intimately wrought into the fiber of this controversy, to admit of concurrence as to their cause. But, sir, I believe it will be written in history, when it shall be written dispassionately, that the same law of finance underlay the disaster of that year, precipitated to volcanic intensity by the Sherman Act of 1890.

Indeed, sir, I think it will be agreed by intelligent, acute, and fair masters of finance the world over that by far the greater number of all the pitiful catastrophes of business which have gained the name of panics have had their origin in some expansion of currency beyond the just measure of business need, begetting a fictitious rise in prices, with the inevitable allurement to unsound and speculative enterprises which stimulate credit and induce excessive debts. It will be surely agreed on all hands, even in this debate, that no cause can be more grievously or more suddenly productive of business ruin and universal distress than disorders of the currency. Yet, sir, is it not true that every disorder of the currency carries with it and begets its worst effects by derangement of the value of its monetary standard, albeit this may sometimes happen by the excessive use of paper credits as well as expansion or contraction of the supply of metallic money?

I have thus sought to point out that the theory of blessing from rising prices caused by the diminution of the standard of value is far from being a sound or useful doctrine. I can not trespass upon the patience of the Senate to elaborate the proofs or read the opinions of instructed and experienced financiers. If reason does not approve it to any, or induce the study which will convince the inquirer from the records of man's financial follies and suffering, I must now pass him by. Indeed, so much has been written by so many, and out of such errant minds, and we are treated here to such multitudinous and contradictory testimony, that if one offers as authority the opinions of the wisest financier he is liable to be confounded with the host of quacks whose financial nos-

trums are plentiful as the "leaves in Vallombrosa," and valueless as the figments of a dream. The important question now demanding attention is whether the powers of Government may be justly applied to reduce the standard of value and excite thereby a nominal increase in the prices of commodities. Nominal only, of course, because their true value is not in their relation to money, which serves as the medium of exchange, but in their relations to each other, or to the wants of men and the labor which will get them. I arraign this proposition as depending upon the abuse of power, essentially iniquitous.

It carries the curse of paternalism. It assumes that Government may rightfully interfere in the private and personal commerce of men to thwart the course which in exercise of natural liberty they would otherwise mutually pursue. It awards to the Government authority to interpose compulsion on the buyer to give the seller of commodities more than otherwise he would need to give. It is protection over again.

It means, sir, also, that the standard may be rightfully increased as well as diminished by Government authority. It means a right of oppression if political success throws Government into the hands of one interest as against another. It means to transform politics into huckstering chicane. It means corruption, and in its most deadly form, the debauchery of citizens, the destruction of patriotism. It means to rob Government of allegiance, law of respect. It strikes from the hearts of men the noblest sentiments and substitutes the basest. It is the law of might, which spurns justice for greed. It is to turn our hearts from the aspirations which have led men to liberty and fill them with evil machinations. Sir, we have for many years witnessed the perilous development of this spirit in our institutions. Let us stop it; turn it back if we can; but, for love of men, let us indulge it no further. It is the precursor of anarchy.

Sir, that spirit reigns dominant in every material feature of this project. Its name does not signify its chiefest wrong. It is not merely its "free-coinage" clause by which the Government is to be compelled to maintain its mints and without charge perform the work of making over into coin all the silver which any person, citizen or alien, may bring to it. That would be comparatively insignificant. But the bill requires such silver to be made into coins purporting and certified to be of twice the value of the silver, and leaves to stand in force the pledge of law that the United States will maintain their parity with gold, as now is done. It means, therefore, to give outright to the owners of silver bullion substantially twice its present value, if this Government can carry the load of that undertaking. This is the direct proposal of the bill, unless it be expected by its friends that the Government will repudiate its pledge or break down in the effort to keep it. Is this the doctrine of Democracy? Is this to be the portion of a free people who will have equal rights and justice in their laws?

But, sir, who believes the Government can succeed in such a desperate undertaking? The world now possesses, so statisticians say, in round numbers, somewhere about four thousand million dollars' worth of silver. If the quantity be but half so much, what will be our course when it comes rushing to our mints? There stands the pledge of parity; shall we try to keep it? Sir, we have lately heard much denunciation by the advocates of this measure against the issue of bonds to buy gold; but what will be the Government's necessity to buy gold when instead of 440,000,000 silver dollars, the obligation falls on it to support the parity of all the coin which can be made from all the silver which will be brought to our mints? What is the meaning of all this contradictory and confusing argument? Is the duty to maintain parity to be left obligatory upon the Administration? If so, why complain of bonds? It will at least require our buying all the gold in the world if we undertake to double the value of all the world's silver.

Or is it not perfectly seen and known to the friends of this project that parity disappears instantly with its enactment, because as impossible to maintain as to pump dry the Atlantic Ocean? Why, then, does not this bill repeal the parity law? Plainly, because that confesses it at once an enemy to bimetallism, the guaranty of silver monometallism, a measure of revolution and ruin.

Look to another feature. Not content with having the Government make coins of double value for the holders of silver, it is proposed to enact that these coins shall be a legal tender for that double value. Therefore, unless the parity be maintained, they will be available to pay old debts for nearly twice what they will serve to pay new ones, or to buy any commodity. For such an object the power of the United States is to be applied to despoil some of its citizens, to raise the value of silver for a time to those who happen to have it. Mr. President, very differently have I been taught the principles of Democracy. Am I indeed so utterly distraught and wild—I appeal to my associates on this side of the Chamber—am I such a wanderer from the great party of liberty and law which has professed to be the embodiment of the rights of man in their purest conception? I can understand how this can be demanded by the Populists or the Socialists, but never as consonant with Democratic principles.

For, sir, I can not but hold as a Democrat that the paramount duty of a good government is to extend to all its people the protection of law, the assurance of justice, the enjoyment of liberty; that its laws must rest on that natural justice which, like that of heaven, is no respecter of persons, but assures to all the perfect equality of right, preferring no classes, no ranks, no orders or conditions of men; a justice which makes an injury to the meanest citizen an insult to the State, and which will guard the righteous gains of its richest, as it will treasure the mite of the poorest for him. Above all, sir, a government which yields to every man, and all men, the utmost measure of lawful liberty the God of nature gave them; that full and perfect self-control which abridges only no rights of others to the same.

Sir, the Democratic party, as I understand its faith, insists upon the strict limitation of the powers of government and proclaims that government best which, while it most firmly protects and defends the safety of the person, the security of property, the obligation of contracts, yet least interferes with the natural liberty of man. That government the Democrat esteems most beneficent which all good men feel the least, except as they feel the joyous sunshine and the delicious airs of nature's glorious days to invigorate strength, elevate the mind, and swell the soul with happiness and pride. Restricted and applied to affairs of business, trade, and commerce, what Democrat but must say every interference is intolerable which abridges the most generous freedom, save in the interest of humanity, or for the overruling necessities of governmental support? Therefore, by inevitable consequence, the Democratic principle demands in respect to money that it should be of genuine intrinsic value and of the utmost possible stability and unchangeableness that nature will permit. Above all does it follow that no government can meddle with it for the gain of any class, sort, or condition of men, because that is a sure oppression of others entitled to its care, its jealous care, in preservation of their rights. For in this respect every change inflicts special injury and falls always hardest upon the most defenseless in financial affairs, the numerous body engaged in husbandry or who win their bread by daily toil.

Mr. President, in every aspect of its promotion, in every circumstance of its operation, this measure for free coinage is to be condemned by the sound faith of Democracy. There are those who, as my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] avowed yesterday, can support it as a measure of protection. It goes hand in hand with their principle, and it ought to go only with the practice of protection, avowedly put and understood.

I have already long engaged the attention of the Senate, and am unwilling to presume further upon its patience. I have not sought so much to present the argument of sound finance as to urge the antagonism of this measure to the political principles professed by this side of the Chamber. And I am but too painfully conscious how inadequately that has been done, how much more deserves to be said, and with what greater power.

For, sir, I revere the noble principles of the Democratic faith as the only true and righteous foundation of just government among men. I cherish the Democratic party as the only political organization through and by which their perfect work can be done in our institutions. And, never, in all the years while it bore so gloriously the rising fortunes of the young Republic, never yet was it so necessary to the American people as it seems to me today.

It is not, sir, that I covet a mere party success. Long and ardent as has been my attachment, it is only the victory of its principles I would seek, the happiness their faithful execution will bestow on our countrymen.

No Democrat can now survey the conditions which beset our public affairs without profound realization of the wide and perilous departure which has been made from the line of good government, nor without some shudder when he tries to penetrate the veil before our future.

Upon the one hand has arisen again to meancing height the Federalism of old, rejuvenant in the Republican party of our time, renewing its old theories inherited from absolutism, building stronger the tower of central dominion, multiplying extravagant expenditures, devising heavier taxation, and strengthening class riches and power, while burdens increase upon the masses. And on the other side, as the natural, the certain result of it all, there is looming the dark and portentous cloud of a party never known in days of Democratic justice; charged with wild, fantastic theories of social disorder and wilder schemes of remedy, threatening, should it grow apace, no one can foretell what violence of social tempest.

Their different roads both lead to the same end; their political polarity intensifies the strength and the evil of both, while they still will dicker in political traffic against their common enemy, the Democratic party, which, if faithful to its principles, will main-

tain our institutions and laws for the general benefit only of the entire people. Sir, there it stands, the old party of the fathers, the party of the people; humanly infirm, sometimes wandering from its faith and duty, as did God's chosen people, and visited like them with the penalty of sin and folly; but with all its failings, all its errors, still bearing on the ark of the covenant of our liberty with the tablets of the law of justice, peace, good government for men. Often has it been borne down in unequal strife, but never conquered; it rises ever again to struggle for the rights of man, the equality of equity in the dealings of government with all.

Sir, in the last thirty years it has been faithful to this duty when fidelity brought its followers contumely, trial, and sacrifice.

But it has survived to see the cause of justice triumph at its hands; and in the restored and perfect equality of every State with every other in the Union, and of all the rights of all the citizens of every State, now assured beyond the risk of peculiar peril, while the warm bond of a common patriotism binds all in closer fraternity than ever known before, the old party of Jefferson and of Jackson has won another honor, not the least among its historic glories, and which ought to fix it deeper in the hearts of all who accept its principles.

Sir, it will continue on its great career, and though adversities be decreed to its lot, it will not cease to strive in its mission to carry forward the Constitution and the Government of the Federal Union on their established course with power and safety, yielding neither on one side or the other to the reactionary forces of old absolutism or the lurid fires of anarchy.

Mr. BATE obtained the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Tennessee will allow me for a moment, I desire to give notice that at 4 o'clock I shall move that the Senate take a recess until half past 7 this evening.

Mr. HARRIS. If my colleague will yield to me a single moment, I will state that in view of the notice given by the Senator from New Hampshire I shall be exceedingly glad if we can get an agreement by unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock, according to the notice of the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senate shall take a recess until half past 7 o'clock this evening, in order that all Senators who desire to be heard upon the pending measure may have an opportunity of speaking to-night, except my venerable friend from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] who desires to be heard when the Senate meets to-morrow morning. I should be glad to have an agreement that after the recess which is to begin at 4 o'clock this afternoon, when we break up to-night, it be to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, and after the Senator from Vermont shall have concluded his remarks, that the Senate proceed upon amendments under the five-minute rule until we reach a final vote upon the passage of the bill at the earliest hour to-morrow that the Senate may be ready to come to such vote, not later than 2 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent for that agreement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. There is no objection to that programme so far as it has been stated. Let this further understanding be had, and I shall be content. There is some question as to what the effect of such a unanimous-consent agreement may be. It of course will be held not to preclude a motion to substitute, to take up another bill, not to preclude a motion to lay upon the table, not to preclude a motion to indefinitely postpone. With that understanding there is no objection to the request.

Mr. HARRIS. A motion in the shape of an amendment in the nature of a substitute would certainly fall within the unanimous-consent agreement that I have asked for. A motion to lay upon the table would be perfectly legitimate in my opinion under such a unanimous-consent rule. But a motion, if such rule shall be carried, to take up for consideration some other bill would be wholly inconsistent with the very object and purpose that I have in view, and I hope the Senator from New York will exclude that proposition from his suggestion. Each of his other suggestions I concede as being perfectly consistent with the unanimous-consent agreement I ask for.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the Senator referred to a motion to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. HARRIS. That motion I think would be legitimate. It is a regular proceeding incident to the passage of a bill; but a motion to proceed to the consideration of some other bill would not be consistent with the consent rule I have asked for.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the Senator from Tennessee does not preclude any motion whatever applicable to the pending bill?

Mr. PLATT. Not to preclude any parliamentary motion.

Mr. HARRIS. Any motion that can legitimately be made under the rules of the Senate I would hold to be in order under the unanimous-consent rule——

Mr. CHANDLER. As to the pending bill.

Mr. HARRIS. With the single exception that debate is to be limited to five minutes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Upon amendments?

Mr. HARRIS. Upon amendments.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the way I understand the request.

Mr. HARRIS. I would want to limit debate upon a motion to indefinitely postpone, as that involves the whole question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood that there would be no debate upon anything but amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. But if I can get an agreement to vote at 2 o'clock, then I shall raise no question on the limit of debate even upon a motion to indefinitely postpone.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. It is distinctly understood that the agreement to vote does not preclude a motion to lay upon the table, does not preclude a motion to indefinitely postpone, upon which I will say no debate is desired. I think the Senator from Tennessee ought to concede the right to substitute to proceed to the consideration of another bill. What objection can there possibly be to such a reservation being included in the agreement?

Mr. HOAR (to Mr. HARRIS). It will not hurt you any.

Mr. HILL. I make this statement because I recollect that in the Senate some time ago, when an agreement had been made as to debate, a question was raised as to what could be done after the time had been reached which was fixed in the agreement; and it was then claimed that a motion to indefinitely postpone was not in order, and it was especially claimed that a motion to postpone to a further date—the next session—was not in order. That is the reason why I make the suggestion. I wish the Senator would agree to admit the motion. It may not be made, but what harm can it do? If the majority desire to proceed to the consideration of another bill, it seems to me they ought not to be cut off at this time.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from New York, as does every Senator other than he, understands the main and primary object I have in view. It is to reach a final vote by 2 o'clock to-morrow, in order that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] in charge of the pending bill may be at liberty to leave the city for a short period, as it is important to him to leave at that time. Now, I shall have no objection to the motion suggested by the Senator from New York except the consumption of time. But if I can get the agreement that we shall come to a vote at or before 2 o'clock to-morrow upon the final passage of the bill, I care not how the time may be consumed until we reach that hour.

Mr. HILL. Then, with the understanding that the motion to substitute, if any, shall be made prior to 2 o'clock—is that satisfactory? Without debate?

Mr. HARRIS. If it be without debate, and the yeas and nays upon it, if the yeas and nays be ordered, shall not go beyond 2 o'clock. I am quite content to accept the suggestion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am quite content, too.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 162) regulating proof of death in certain pension cases;

A bill (H. R. 225) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska;

A bill (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands;

A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution;

A bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska; and

A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims.

The message also announced that the House requested the Senate to furnish the House of Representatives with a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, the original having been lost.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 1860) for the relief of John M. Guyton, late postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes;

which were referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD LAND GRANTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives to furnish a duplicate engrossed bill (S. 708) in lieu of the original, which has been lost; and by unanimous consent the request was ordered to be complied with.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 162) regulating proof of death in certain pension cases was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 225) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 1199) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed.

A bill (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands.

A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford now in the Department of Justice was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, in the absence of objection.

Mr. PLATT. A bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for the incorporation of the Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Perhaps the bill which has come from the other House had better be also referred to that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SILVER COIN AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

FINANCIAL FICTIONS—AN EMERGENCY TARIFF AND A GOLD BOND BILL.

Mr. BATE Mr. President, finding myself unable to sustain either of the fiscal measures sent to the Senate by the coordinate branch of Congress, it is due to the people of the State which, in part. is represented by me in the Senate that I should state the reasons which influence my votes on the present occasion. Having on a former occasion in this Senate given my views fully touching the free coinage of silver, I purpose now to confine my remarks, as strictly as I can, to this substitute to the House bill and to do so as briefly as I can.

An emergency tariff, supplemented by a gold bond bill, is a combination of measures directly in conflict with the opinions and wishes of the people, as I understand the drift of public opinion. The one increases taxes not necessary to the support of the Government and the other imposes a heavy burden, both present and future, neither just nor necessary.

With an existing surplus of about one hundred and seventy-five millions in the Treasury, the temporary falling off of receipts from customs, consequent upon a temporary depression of business, will not sustain Congress in again disturbing the gradual improvements of business by an alteration and increase of customs duties. It was the general understanding of the people that this Congress would give to trade and business a rest from tariff agitation; and no matter which political party controlled this Congress, the virtual pledge was that peace and quiet should not be disturbed by the conflict between protection and tariff for revenue, at least until business and trade were once more fairly reestablished. It was the hope, as it was the right, of the people to have their trade, commerce, and business left undisturbed for at least two years by the warfare of politics over "specific" and "ad valorem," over high and low rates, over protection and free trade.

The officer charged by the laws with the administration of the affairs of the Treasury, as well as the President, have stated in their several communications to this Congress that the embarrassments which at present beset the Treasury result, not from a deficiency of revenue, but from a defect in the laws with regard to the redemption fund. These officers tell us that it is not a question of more money, but one of better money, which is causing the present trouble. And it must be apparent to all that gold can not be retained in the Treasury so long as the "endless chain" of greenbacks and Treasury notes are redeemed in gold, unless that fund is periodically replenished with the yellow metal by the sale of bonds.

The coordinate branch of the Congress takes issue with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and insists that it is more money that the Treasury needs, and proposes as a remedy a horizontal increase of customs taxes upon the consumption of the people. If the remedy proposed shall become law it would only have the effect of bringing more greenbacks and Treasury notes redeemable in gold into the Treasury, create more gold links for the endless chain, and supply the shippers of gold with more facilities for drafts upon the redemption fund, thus increasing rather than lessening the necessity for selling more gold bonds.

Congress has the power, but I deny the wisdom, of adding unnecessary taxes to the burdens of the people by collecting unneeded greenbacks which can only increase the existing embarrassments of the Treasury.

The Treasury and the country are now reaping that harvest of evils the seed of which was sown in 1873, and which have been diligently cultivated by subsequent legislation and administration. The remedy is not to be found in the quackery of a horizontal tariff, but must be sought in the heroic treatment which cuts out the ulcerous abscess planted by the demonetization of silver and inoculated by the gold standard. Neither will the unnatural stimulant of a gold-bond bill revive the sinking patient; the disease has become chronic from long abuse.

The able speech of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] conclusively demonstrates that the country in its trade and business is and has been suffering from the effort imposed by the demonetization of silver to do an increasing volume of trade on a decreased amount of currency. If that is a true presentation of the existing depression of business affairs, and so far no one has ventured to question his premises and conclusions, then neither an emergency tariff nor a gold-bond bill, nor both combined, will supply the only remedy which the country needs; for the former adds not a dollar to the currency, and the latter gives but a temporary relief to the redemption fund, to be soon again depleted and refilled by further sales of gold bonds.

The divided condition of public opinion is exemplified by the divergence of views on the currency question between the two Houses of Congress. The emergency tariff passed by a large majority in the other House is yet in the Senate Committee on Finance, while the gold-bond bill emerges therefrom as a free-coinage-of-silver bill. It is not necessary to consider now what political exigency compelled the construction of the Finance Committee of the Senate on lines of fiscal policy so entirely consistent with the teachings of that campaign of education which since 1892 has awakened the people to a full realization of the wrong and injury inflicted upon the trade and business of the country by the legislation of 1873. The people fully comprehended that though the "fathers" required the coinage of both "gold and silver," the "juggling fiends" of party politics palter with the country in a double sense and keep the word of promise to the ear by coining silver as subsidiary money but break the promise to our people by demonetization of the white metal.

The Senate Committee on Finance has, by its silver-coinage substitute, attempted to bring the country back to the constitutional currency of both gold and silver; to restore the only legal-tender medium mentioned in the Constitution, and which, but a few years back, was departed from under the Supreme Court's ruling that Congress could constitutionally invest the greenbacks with the legal-tender faculty. I am not here to impeach that ruling, but it is a fact, within the memory of all on this floor, that that ruling gave a rude shock to the convictions of every strict interpreter of the Constitution. Nor has it been entirely forgotten that the reorganization of the Supreme Bench, by which the ruling was obtained, elicited severe comments and much unsparing criticism. The legal-tender faculty was given to the greenbacks by adding one justice to the Supreme Bench, while it was bestowed on gold and silver by the Constitution. A few years after investing irredeemable paper money with the legal-tender faculty, the real constitutional legal-tender money—which required neither briefs, nor arguments, nor opinions, nor judgments to give it sanction—was demonetized, and the next year its chief coin stricken from the statute books.

To correct these wrongs, and to bring back to our currency the vast sums of silver now lying idle in the Treasury, is the purpose and object of the Senate substitute. Let the result of this effort be effectual or ineffectual, the consequence of the Senate's failure in this effort must rest upon that coordinate branch of the Government which shall assume the responsibility of refusing to the people a return to constitutional money.

The Senate, in providing for the free coinage of silver, makes no innovation upon the principles of sound money. It is an earnest and honest effort to restore to the currency of the country that money which, since Abraham bought the field of Ephron with "400 shekels of silver current money with the merchants," has been current in all trades and with all peoples until the gold

interest interfered, first in England, then on the Continent, and finally in the United States, to disrupt the harmony which had existed between the two metals from the earliest times to the present day.

It is the claim of all political parties that they are bimetallist, holding with Mr. Jevon that "silver and gold alone are of small volume, easily guarded, easy of transport, divisible without loss, beautiful and brilliant, and durable almost to eternity," and agree with Turgot that silver and gold "became universal money by the nature and force of things, independently of all convention and law," and as such were recognized and required by our Constitution to be coined, and that to proscribe silver by law is a violation of the nature of things, as well as of the Constitution of the country. Such have been the professions of parties and their pledge in platforms, but the redemption of those professions and pledges have so disappointed the people that we are witnessing in some localities disaffection in political parties and bitter antagonisms in honored organizations of long standing. Party allegiance, once the strongest bond between men, has been so weakened by pledges unperformed that men, feeling self-preservation to be their first duty and the recuperation of trade to be the supreme necessity of their country, have in many instances sought political affiliation in new organizations.

It is a vain waste of time to tell the people that silver is not sound money. Such assertion is contradicted by the lesson of history. They know that the will of the state—the power of law—has heretofore maintained a statutory ratio between the coins of the two metals circulating together, and has floated irredeemable paper money on the stormy waves of war. The people do not believe that the cost of producing the two metals determines their value as money, any more than that the cost of printing fixed the value of the greenbacks, but they hold that the quantity of money regulates its value. They have seen the law of the United States maintain, through years of peace and war, the ratio of 16 to 1 between the coins of the two metals, and such is the faith and confidence of the people in the resources of their country that they are confident that law and its faithful execution and administration will again sustain and maintain the ratio of 16 to 1.

It may be patriotism, it may be pride, but it is also the positive conviction of the people that the position of the United States among the nations of the world is potential enough to stamp its declared policy upon those international exchanges into which the vast volume of their products enter, and to exert so dominating an influence over the commerce of the world that when once again this country has fixed its ratio and free coinage of silver has been entered upon, the same ratio will force itself into recognition in other nations. It is the common conviction of our people that with free coinage of silver there will be no inducement to export either metal other than arises from the necessary exchanges of commerce, and that "Gresham's law" will cease to operate under a legal ratio of 16 to 1. They hold that there will be greater stability of value under a currency of the two metals than is possible under any single standard.

But, above all the considerations which theorists have promulgated, our people believe that the greater abundance of money which the coinage of the now idle silver in the Treasury would throw upon the country would result in an immediate rise in values of all kinds, and that prosperity would quickly take the place of depression and our country again enter speedily upon that wonderful career of enterprise and wealth which was so rudely shocked and destroyed by the legislation of 1873.

The country demands an American policy for American affairs, political, financial, and commercial.

Mr. President, this Senate substitute emphasizes another fixed and settled purpose of the people—that there shall be no increase of the public debt by issuing bonds in time of peace. Such augmentation is repugnant in every sense to sound financial policy. It is unnecessary so long as hundreds of millions of silver bullion and coin lie idle in the Treasury. If it is desirable to retire the greenbacks, redeem them in silver. No matter what may be the present price of silver bullion in the markets, it can not bring a less sum than the Government realized from the greenbacks when first issued, with gold at a premium of more that two and a half to one. The Government can not pay less for greenbacks than it got for them on their first appearance.

When, in 1868 (January 6), the movement for the demonetization of silver was initiated by the honorable Senator from Ohio by the introduction of a bill entitled "A bill in relation to the coinage of gold and silver," the one-hundred dollar greenback was worth but $74.04 in gold or silver; that is to say, it took $133.25 in greenbacks to buy $100 in gold or silver; or, in other words, $74.04 in gold or silver would buy $100 in greenbacks, and the United States, which owed $100 in greenbacks, could have discharged its debt with $74.04 in gold or silver; but in 1869 it required $77.07; in 1870 it required $83.33; in 1871 it required $90.29; in 1872 it required $91.32; and in 1873, when the demonetization was finally accomplished, $89.28 in gold or silver would have redeemed $100 in greenbacks. In 1874 the metals had risen to $90.70; in 1877 to $93.46, and then to $100 in greenbacks. And the United States, which in 1864 got but $49 in gold or silver for its $100 in greenbacks, is now redeeming the latter at $100 in gold. In all those years silver and gold were money in theory, but neither was money in actual fact. Yet these values made the worth, in gold and silver, of the money actually paid for the United States bonds.

It was in 1868, the same year the Senator from Ohio initiated the movement to demonetize silver, that he wrote the letter read by the Senator from Alabama, in which he said:

I think the bondholder violates his promise when he refuses to take the same kind of money he paid for the bonds.

And—

If the bondholder can legally demand only the kind of money he paid, then he is a repudiator and extortioner to demand money more valuable than he gave.

The money that "extortioner" "gave" for the bond was valued in gold or silver at $74.04 in 1868. In 1870, the year the refunding act passed, the greenback was worth but $83.33 in gold or silver; and if the bondholder was paid to-day "in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver" he could have no just cause of complaint against either the Government or the Senator from Ohio. The United States bonds issued under the act of July 14, 1870, and its amendatory act of the Forty-first Congress (second session, Chapter CCLVI), amounting to $2,000,000,000, were not paid for in coin. They were exchanged for the higher rate of interest bonds issued during and immediately after the war. It was those higher rate of interest bonds for which the depreciated greenbacks, ranging in gold or silver value from $42.20 in 1864 to $83.33 in 1870, were paid, and the enormous profit reaped entirely from legislation were further enhanced by the fiction that "coin" meant only gold. Thus this shylock process went from greenbacks to "coin" and from coin to gold, and each transaction was a fraud on the taxpayer.

What part in that factitious enhancement of the value of the gold actually invested in United States bonds the demonetization of silver played it may be impossible at this time to estimate, but the restitution of silver to our currency and the payment of the bonds in silver equally with gold will restore the situation to the conditions in operation when the bonds were authorized, and when they were purchased by exchanging the old bonds bought with depreciated greenbacks. By legislation Congress has raised the greenbacks to the value of gold, and the country now demands that by legislation silver shall be restored to its exchangeable value in gold. If it is said that Congress can not restore silver, the country demands that we make the experiment, and so far as the redemption of bonds is concerned, it demands that we place the Treasury in the exact position that it was when the bonds were authorized and purchased with the positive legislative provision that they were redeemable "at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of July, A. D. 1907, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870"—three years previous to the demonetization of silver, and which "standard value" was specifically declared by Congress to be "silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver."

The act authorizing the 4 per cent bonds refers to and reaffirms the conditions of the act authorizing the 5 per cent bonds, which latter act was conditioned by the resolution of Congress—

That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said act hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver.

Thus conditioned, the bonds were bought and taken cum onere, from which they can not legally or morally be changed. The act of 1875 provided for the redemption of greenbacks "in coin" after the 1st of January, 1879. The people have no responsibility for that "fiction" of the Treasury which held "coin" to mean only gold. It was without authority or warrant of law, and the most charitable view of it is that it was a great mistake; but it would be a crime, not only against the people but against every law of sound finance, to invest a noninterest-bearing note in an interest-bearing bond.

Another fiction not born of law, but which, like Topsy, "simply growed," was the redemption fund in gold. The late letter to the Senate from the Secretary of the Treasury tells us that it was without form and void; that it had no local habitation in the Treasury; was never "segregated or set apart" from other moneys of the Treasury; but rested for its legal sanction on the inconsequential provision of the law of 1882, that—

The Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the issue of such gold certificates whenever the amount of gold coin in the Treasury, reserved for the redemption of United States notes, falls below $100,000,000.

Only that and nothing more is there to be found in the laws fixing or defining the so-called redemption fund.

Yet that fund is the "danger signal," to approach which is fraught with such dire consequences that the people have learned to fear some terrible catastrophe whenever the gold in the Treasury approaches the fiat minimum. And it is that same "danger signal" which is hoisted by the shippers of gold to force a sale of bonds.

Furthermore, the corporations which issue long-time bonds have accepted that "danger signal" as an excuse to demand gold at maturity. As late as the 18th of the present month the press has published that the Norfolk (Va.) Street Railway Company has effected a loan of $1,100,000 in 5 per cent forty-year bonds, payable in gold. But when it comes to making contracts like life-insurance policies, some of these corporations have made their policies payable in lawful money of the United States, whatever that may be at maturity. The gold rule does not work both ways, but makes receipts payable in gold while expenditures are confined to lawful money. This process is going on now all over the country, and what will become of it when these bonds fall due God only knows.

Hence it has been by fictions in the Treasury as to "coin," by a fiat minimum as to gold reserve, and the "endless chain" of the gold bankers that the Treasury of the United States can have neither will nor policy of its own, but has been manipulated from the outside and driven to increase the public debt within the last two years by these bond issues to the amount of over $150,000,000, and now, in response to the Oliver Twists "asking for more," is awaiting a popular reply to another issue for $100,000,000.

Since 1888, when there was in the Treasury in gold the sum of	$330,763,985
There has been added, in 1894, the February loan of	58,660,917
Also the November loan of	58,444,000
Also the loan of 1895	65,116,275
Making a gross total of	512,985,177
If from which is deducted the amount paid for United States bonds	262,552,930
We have	250,432,247

which has been sunk in that "Serbonian bog" we call the reserve fund, and afterwards transferred to the bankers' safes. And for that piece of financiering we can show only an increase of the public debt amounting to over $150,000,000, with another $100,000,000 of bonds to be handed over on the 6th of February. And there appears to be no limitation to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the public debt at the demand or in consequence of the manipulation of the reserve fund by the shippers of gold. Having started the resumption of specie payments by the sale of bonds, the ball can be kept rolling only by the continued sale of bonds.

All this is in consequence of legislation administered under the auspices of the gold standard. Silver has had no connection with that financiering, but—

> Cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd, bound in
> To saucy doubts and fears—

it has laid in the Treasury powerless, functionless, and guiltless of offense against the public debt.

Hence, Mr. President, for these reasons I hail the Senate substitute with peculiar satisfaction. Its first section rehabilitates silver with its proper currency function, and it does that in a straightforward, bold, and defiant manner. Its second section removes all fictions as to "coin," clears away all clouds of doubt about the redemption of greenbacks by compelling their redemption according to the option only of the Treasury in gold and silver and taking away from the holder of a note the power and the right to name the money of redemption, restores sovereignty to the Government, and rests the selection of the kind of money with which its notes shall be redeemed in the sovereign which issued the note and stamped the image and superscription on the coin.

"The Man of Galilee," the Master, holding a silver coin, commanded that we "render unto Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's," that we give to government its proper prerogatives in all that relates to money, and honesty forbids any violation of the sanctity of contracts, as well by the holder of the note as by the Government which is to pay it. But as nominated in the bond so shall it be in the discharge, with the stern mandate that no blood be drawn in cutting the pound of flesh.

"Coin" is the word used in the Constitution, and that instrument itself interprets the meaning of "coin" when it says no State shall have a legal tender in payment of debts but gold and silver—not one alone, but both—and makes no distinction between them. Then I submit that it was and is the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, when the interest of the Government required it, to pay any kind of governmental indebtedness in silver as well as gold. In the exercise of his discretion he has not done so, but paid out gold exclusively for greenbacks. This Senate substitute for the House bill, if passed into a law, will relieve this embarrassment, and when a raid is made on the Treasury for gold let the Secretary, if he will not so exercise his discretion, be directed to pay silver as well as gold for greenbacks when presented for redemption. This will break the "endless chain" and at once put an end to the shylock raids upon the gold-reserve fund, and do away with any assumed necessity for the issuance of bonds to keep this gold-reserve fund up to the $100,000,000 maximum. This, in my opinion, will end the trouble.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, the bill before us originated in the House of Representatives in response to an appeal made by the President in his message of the 20th of December last for aid at the hands of the Congress to meet the evils of our present financial system.

It presents a question familiar to us all in its varied phases; a question that occupied much of our time and attention during the special session of 1893, when we were called together to take action with reference to the operation of the act passed during President Harrison's Administration generally known as the Sherman law.

There were many of us then on this side of the Chamber who thought that the time had come for a change in our financial and coinage system upon the lines laid down in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago, upon which platform we had but a few months before won a splendid political victory; but there were others who insisted that the financial disasters from which the country was then suffering were caused by the issue of Treasury notes under the Sherman law for the purchase of silver bullion, and that the repeal of the section of the law requiring the monthly purchase of the bullion would cause the storm to abate, revive confidence, restore activity to business, and result in a high degree of prosperity.

The moneyed interests of the country and the newspapers under their control took it upon themselves to censure those who were not satisfied with this proposition to repeal a single section of the law when we were pledged to the country to overthrow the financial system embodied in the legislation as a cowardly makeshift because there was not an immediate response to their wishes. But, after a prolonged debate, the unconditional repeal of the section of the law which had been singled out for attack was effected and the system which had been so severely condemned was allowed to remain upon the statute book, where it has continued to produce trouble, confusion, and disaster in the monetary affairs of the country.

The repeal of the purchasing clause did not produce the hopeful results which were promised to the country, and again the aid of the Congress is invoked to afford relief from the effects of the unfortunate and vicious legislation which has come down to us from our predecessors. The bills that have been passed by the House of Representatives to meet the difficulties referred to in the President's message only propose temporary relief without undertaking to remove the causes of the oft returning financial disturbances which hinder and retard the prosperity of our people. The one before us deals with only one phase of our financial difficulties, as did the act which was passed during the special session of 1890. The amendment deals with the whole question, and proposes to enlarge the basis for our money system by returning to a bimetallic policy.

This question is national in its character, and must be definitely settled before we can reasonably hope for the reestablishment of the business of the country upon a secure and permanent foundation.

The great political parties of the country have all declared themselves in favor of bimetallism and the use of both gold and silver as standard money, but in spite of these declarations, made often and earnestly, the country continues upon a monometallic basis, and silver continues to occupy the subsidiary place in our mintage to which it was reduced more than twenty years ago.

The first step toward a settlement is a proper and fair statement of the issue, and nothing is gained by attempting to represent those who think that all the business and credit and money promises and obligations of the world should rest upon two metals instead of one as advocating dishonesty; nor is it fair to charge that the advocate of a restoration of silver to the place as a money metal which it held under our Constitution and laws prior to 1873 is a silver monometallist who desires to reduce our people to an inferior civilization. There are a few silver monometallists in the United States, but they are not an influential class, nor are they likely to become so.

The great body of the American people are bimetallists, without respect to party affiliations, if we are to judge from utterances of leading public men of all shades of political thought, and from the platform declarations of the great national parties in the electoral contests which have been fought since the question has come prominently before the American people. Let us examine these declarations and the manner in which they have been fulfilled by the representatives of the different parties intrusted with the administration of the Government, after publishing to the country these statements of the views and policy by which they were to be guided.

Though silver was demonetized while the Republican party was in full possession of all the departments of the Government and responsible for the legislation enacted by Congress, the change to the single standard was never advocated in a Republican national convention before its accomplishment, nor was it afterwards mentioned with commendation as one of the great achievements of the party. The first national convention that met after the passage of the act was in 1876. The platform makes reference to the resumption of specie payments and promises the redemption of United

States notes in coin, but there is no hint or suggestion that the recent statute had left gold as the only coin of redemption. Gold is only incidentally mentioned in the platform of 1880, when it is claimed that the Republican party "has raised the value of our paper currency from 38 per cent to the par value of gold."

It speaks also of a "solid-basis payment in coin for all the national obligations;" but there is no laudation of the act of 1873. It was passed by in silence. In 1884 the party declaration is for the establishment of an international standard which shall fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage. In bolder tone it is declared in 1888, "The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money," and an accusation was laid at the door of the Democratic Administration for "its efforts to demonetize silver," although it had been an accomplished and completed act nearly twelve years before Mr. Cleveland became President. In 1892 it was announced that "the American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as a standard money." In a subsequent clause the efforts to secure an international conference upon the subject are commended.

There is no great difference between these declarations and those found in the platforms of successive campaigns proclaiming Democratic views and framed by Democratic hands during the same period, except that those in the latter series are rather more definite and emphatic. The first direct reference to the money standard in recent years is in the platform of 1880; the pledge was to "honest money—consisting of gold and silver and paper convertible into coin on demand." In 1884 a belief was declared "in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution," and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss. This language was expressly reaffirmed in 1888. In 1892 the language was, "We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage." It expressly insists upon "the dollar unit of coinage of both metals—of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

The new political organization which first nominated a Presidential ticket in 1892 and styled itself "the People's Party of America," but more commonly known as Populists, also made a platform declaration upon this subject demanding "free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1." Thus the sentiment in favor of the money system that existed prior to the passage of the demonetization act, which for a few years after that event was dormant and silent, has gradually been awakened and aroused as the effects of this legislation have developed and become manifest, until the representatives of the different political parties have presented to the country positive declarations in favor of the use of both gold and silver as standard money and pledged their different organizations to a bimetallic policy. It is indeed a remarkable fact that, notwithstanding the demonetization of silver and a continued adherence to a monometallic policy for more than twenty-two years, no political party has ever yet had the courage, if it has had the disposition, to go before the American people upon a platform advocating the single standard.

But although the national political parties were slow and cautious in their platform declarations in favor of bimetallism, the evil effects of this legislation which destroyed one-half of our standard money were soon felt, though the cause was imperfectly understood, and efforts were made as early as 1876 to reestablish the free coinage of silver and again give it the same privileges at the mints which gold has enjoyed. The first bill having this purpose in view was introduced by the late Judge Kelley, a Pennsylvania Republican, whose name is familiar to the country by reason of his earnest advocacy of the cause of protection during a long service in the House of Representatives. This effort in the Forty-third Congress failed, but a similar bill, introduced by Mr. Bland of Missouri, was passed by the next House of Representatives. In the Senate, through the active efforts of Senator Allison and others, this bill was transformed into a bill for the purchase of silver by the United States and its coinage into dollars to a limited amount. It became a law in February, 1878.

These dollars were made dependent for their value, in part, upon the assurances of the Government, as the smaller silver coins have been treated in our system since 1853, and as nickel and copper are, and always have been, treated. This system of monthly silver purchases and restricted coinage failed in its purpose. Though it added to the country's stock of subsidiary coin, which served as money of circulation, this circulating medium did not possess the most valuable function of perfect money—it could not be used to redeem the promises and obligations of the Government, or of private individuals, as gold is used. In fact, it continued to be a mere commodity, and its enlarged use did not even arrest the downward tendency of its market value.

Although there was no further legislation for twelve years, the friends of the double standard did not abandon their cause. The party platforms indicate from time to time the changes in public sentiment upon the great questions which come before the country and the progress and advancement of any particular views, and the expressions upon the coinage question from 1880 to 1892 afford an illustration. The law of 1878 satisfied neither political party, but the public mind was diverted for a time by propositions for international conferences to consult and endeavor to reach an agreement under which the principal commercial nations of the world might restore silver to its former place in their coinage systems with all the functions of money upon a uniform ratio. Three of such conferences were called and held, but no such international agreement resulted from their deliberations.

During this period of inaction the political power of the country was divided between the two leading parties, and delay and postponement were the natural fruits of a divided responsibility. But in 1889 the Republicans once more came into full possession of all the departments of the Government, and they had won their victory upon a platform, as I have already shown, favoring the use of both gold and silver as money and condemning the policy of demonetization. Some affirmative action was necessary, and the Sherman law of 1890 was the result. It was based upon the same plan as the Bland-Allison Act, of purchasing and coining silver on Government account; the purchases were to be made with Treasury notes instead of money, and a larger amount of bullion was to be purchased each month than was authorized by the former law.

The measure originated in the House; in the Senate the Democratic Senators, with the assistance of a number of Western Republicans, amended and changed it to a free-coinage bill, but when it went back to the House in this shape the silver-purchasing features were restored through the action of a committee of conference, and it became a law by Republican votes. This new legislation did not prove satisfactory to any interest or party. The price of silver increased while the debate continued and as long as there appeared to be a prospect of free coinage, but as soon as the new law went into force and its provisions became known the market began to decline even in the face of the increased demand created by the compulsory purchase of 4,500,000 ounces a month to comply with the law.

The presentation of the Treasury notes used in its purchase for redemption in gold depleted the Treasury, the Democratic party denounced it as a cowardly makeshift, and even those who aided in its passage readily joined hands with some of its original enemies, three years later, in repealing the section which had attracted the Republican friends of silver to the support of the bill, and the purchase of silver bullion to be coined into dollars was abandoned. Those who resisted the repeal did so upon the ground that the law should remain until some better system was agreed upon to take its place, and not because they favored the Sherman law as a proper settlement of the money question.

The passage of this repealing act left the country with a large supply of silver bullion and of silver dollars coined under the two silver-purchasing laws—the latter worth much less than their face value, according to the market value of the metal they contained—but still with the single gold standard. The people had to be content with a mere declaration, incorporated in the body of the law, that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of a safe system of bimetallism, and it was declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value. This pledged the country to the double standard of gold and silver, but left the single standard of gold upon the statute book and the battle still to be fought.

The victory up to the present time remains with the monometallists. They secured the passage of the demonetization act, and are satisfied as long as it continues in force. The time spent in fruitless efforts to secure a settlement of the question by international conference and agreement and in vain experiments in systems of silver purchasing and its limited coinage have enabled them to enjoy the advantages and profits of the single standard for twenty-two years. It is now proclaimed in some influential quarters that further legislation as to the basis of our money system is unnecessary; that the present system, based upon gold alone, is the best and only solution of the money question; that a double standard conveys no idea and is impracticable, and that those who seek to restore silver to its former status as a money metal are attempting to establish a dishonest dollar in the currency of our country.

The class of avowed gold monometallists is small in numbers, but when we remember that they overturned the coinage system of the country twenty-two years ago without the open aid of any political party, and that in spite of the platform declarations of the principal political parties of the country and the able efforts of influential public men of all parties to the contrary, they have maintained their single standard ever since, we must admit that they form an influential class. This is, in part at least, because their efforts are strengthened by another class, who assist in making bimetallic platforms, who make earnest declarations in favor of the

double standard of gold and silver, but who when pressed to action take refuge in the dilatory policy of waiting for international action among the leading commercial nations of the world.

In the early part of my remarks I stated that the great body of the American people are bimetallists, and so far as words and declarations go, I think I have proved my assertion. But words are not always used in exactly the same meaning, and sometimes an adroit reasoner, who desires to guide public thought and action in the direction where his political and financial interests lie, rather than to develop the truth, will endeavor to gain an advantage by using terms in a misleading sense. Thus the word "bimetallism" is often used as if it meant merely the use of coins composed of two different metals in a system of coinage. As nickel and copper are used in our mintage, as well as gold and silver, it is manifest that if this were the correct use of the word our system would properly be designated as quadrimetallic rather than bimetallic. I use bimetallism as meaning a system which employs coins of two metals as standard money at a fixed ratio, the two constituting a medium to which all obligations, promises, and liabilities may be reduced, each being a measure of values as well as a medium of circulation, and a bimetallist is one who favors such a system.

Mr. President, I understand that a recess is to be taken at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Such the Chair understands to have been the unanimous agreement of the Senate.

Mr. PASCO. As that hour has nearly arrived, and as I have reached an appropriate point in my remarks, I prefer to yield now and to go on this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.). If there be no objection, the Senate will take a recess under the unanimous agreement of the Senate. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senate takes a recess until 7:30 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at half past 7 o'clock p. m.; and Mr. HARRIS resumed the chair as Presiding Officer.

AMENDMENT TO PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the pension appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consideration of the regular order will be proceeded with, upon which the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] is entitled to the floor.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, a fair analysis of the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1892 will, I think, demonstrate that both parties have pledged themselves to such a use of gold and silver in the national coinage; and the true meaning of the statutory declaration embodied in the law of 1893 repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law is in harmony with the same view.

The Republicans—

> Commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure a parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

No such conference would be necessary to settle the value of metal to be used in making subsidiary coins, for their value depends upon the statutory obligations of the country which issues them and not upon the size or weight or shape of the coins, or the value or fineness of the material of which they are composed.

The establishment of a parity between gold and silver is to form a basis of coinage in which coins of the same denomination and of different metals are to be of equal intrinsic value, without reference to any governmental pledge, so that they may be used interchangeably in the business affairs of our own people and in their commercial transactions with other nations. The purpose, then, of these international conferences was to reendow silver with all the functions of perfect money. But another clause in the platform shows that the party did not propose to wait longer for foreign action to restore bimetallism. It is declared that the American people favor it "from tradition and interest," and that the use of the two metals as standard money on a parity of values is to be accomplished by provisions to be determined by legislation. History as well as tradition teaches us that bimetallism in America has meant something more than the use of two metals in a system of coinage, one of full money functions, the other subsidiary. The platform can only mean the true bimetallism which uses the two coins on equal terms at a just ratio. If this were doubtful the doubt would disappear when we find the further declaration in favor of both gold and silver as a standard money.

The Democratic platform holds "to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country," not to the use of one as a standard and the other as inferior and subsidiary. It holds to the coinage of both without discriminating against either metal, therefore bullion holders are entitled to like privileges whether they carry the yellow or the white metal to the mint. The former must, under existing law, be coined for the owner, and this has been the owner's right ever since the establishment of the mint; the owner of silver had the same right prior to 1873, and the manifest meaning of the platform declaration is to revive and renew this right. The further pledge is to restore this privilege to the owner of silver of having it coined "without charge for mintage," which can mean nothing else than free coinage. Only one thing is left unsettled—the ratio; and like the Republican platform, it points to legislation as one of the means by which a parity between the two metals is to be established, and mentions also the other avenue to the desired result, by an international agreement, which has been thrice attempted in vain.

The law repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act and setting forth the policy of the United States with respect to its currency also declares in favor of gold and silver as standard money. This statutory declaration, which became a law by the President's approval on the 1st day of November, 1893, is as follows:

> And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

This section of the statute received the support and vote of every Senator on both sides of the Chamber who is opposing the pending amendment, and the law of which it forms a part was approved by the President.

The policy to which the Government pledged itself in this act was manifestly not to maintain the present silver dollar at its face value by any new legislation. Though its value as a piece of metal changes from day to day, according to the fluctuations of the market, and though the metal it contains has never been worth a dollar since the act of 1878 was passed, and at times has been worth less than half that amount, there has never been any depreciation in the value of the coined dollar. The fiat of the Government and the pledge and promise contained in the law as it existed when this act of 1893 was passed have been sufficient to maintain the coin at its face value, notwithstanding its light weight and the inferior market price of the metal of which it is composed. There was no inconvenience of this sort to be remedied by legislation, and there was another end in view when Congress made this declaration of the financial policy of the United States, which is plainly disclosed in the act.

The policy of the Government is declared to be to coin money of both metals of equal intrinsic value. When this is done, the market value of the metal contained in a gold dollar and the market value of the metal contained in the silver dollar will be the same, and such a system will maintain the equal power of every dollar coined by the United States, whether in the markets of the country or in the discharge of public and private obligations, and the paper obligations issued by the Government resting upon this broad and double basis will pass current as a part of the circulating medium as readily as the coins in which it is redeemable.

The statutory pledge of the Government to establish such a safe system of bimetallism as will give the people gold and silver dollars not equal merely in exchangeable value by the fiat and pledge of the Government, but equal and self-sustaining because of the equality in commercial value of the material of which they are composed, is, like the platform pledges of the two great parties, still unfulfilled. The same two avenues by which the country is to return to the bimetallic system are indicated in the law as in the platforms, legislation, and the thrice-tried international conference. The former only is entirely within our control, and it is nowhere suggested in platform or law that the legislative avenue is impassable. The Republican party came into power in 1888 holding forth the promise of a change, but they gave the country only a modification and extension of the silver-purchasing policy, and for this and other causes they lost the confidence of the people. The Democrats in 1892 denounced this Republican legislation as a cowardly makeshift, promised the people a dollar unit of both metals of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value. But this cowardly makeshift is still the law of the land, and the subsidiary

silver dollar whose intrinsic value is but half that of its gold namesake is a lawful coin, retaining its exchangeable value because of the pledge of the Government.

I think I have clearly shown that these platform and statutory declarations all point to the restoration of a bimetallic system of money, in which silver shall be restored to the place it occupied in our mintage prior to 1873 on equal terms with gold, which means the free and unlimited coinage of both metals as the remedy for the financial ills of the country.

The demands of the people in favor of the restoration of their constitutional money have reached the ears of their delegates in these national conventions, as they have assembled every four years and have found expression in these platforms, but without any practical results thus far. The effects of the demonetization continue to bear disastrously upon the country. The prices of our staple products and the wages of our agricultural laborers have been tending downward, and no other satisfactory explanation has been given for the decline than the destruction of a large part of the standard money and the resulting increase in value of the residue, which increase is manifest in its larger purchasing power.

The monometallist sometimes points to a temporary improvement in prices to refute the opinion that this is an influential cause of shrinking values, but an examination of the causes of an improved market will show that other elements of value have acted favorably, and it has never been claimed that the reduction of our money system to a gold basis is the sole cause of the shrinkage in prices. An enlarged demand or a diminished supply will easily account for a temporary improvement; and thus a partial failure in crops, drought, blight, mildew, or the bollworm may temporarily neutralize the palsying effect of an insufficient and shrinking basis upon which the currency of the country rests, and the fortunate ones who escape the full effects of the calamity reap a benefit from its results.

The disastrous effects of the change to a monometallic basis are felt in another direction. As the remaining metal increases in purchasing power the value of all long-time obligations increases, and the debtor finds his burdens constantly growing larger. Public as well as private obligations are thus affected, and a heavier drain is made upon the resources of cities, counties, States, and the whole country to meet the interest and principal of bonds which have to be paid by taxation upon the labor and industry and resources of the citizen.

It would take three times as much cotton to pay a debt at the average price in New York of the crop of 1894 to 1895 as at the price of the crop of 1872 to 1873, the last crop marketed before the demonetization of silver, and the general tendency of the market has been downward since that year. The last crop has not been fully marketed, and the statistics will not be made up for a few months. They will show an improvement upon the price of last year, caused by a bad crop year and a short crop, and, as I have already said, the amount of the supply is an element in settling the price of a commodity.

But this monometallic system is resulting in another serious burden upon the American people. As the insufficiency of the supply of gold to form a basis for the business of the commercial nations becomes more and more apparent, it is sought for with increased eagerness and industry, and it tends toward the creditor nations and the money kings of the world. The facility with which our supply can be reduced and exhausted under the regulations and practice of the Treasury Department has encouraged the gold speculators to make frequent and continuous raids upon the stock kept by the Government, and a profit is made by exporting it. From 1889 to 1895 gold coin and bullion to the amount of $465,574,843 was sent abroad.

The resumption act of January 14, 1875, provided for the redemption in coin of the legal-tender notes then outstanding when presented for that purpose at the office of the assistant treasurer in New York in sums of $50. The Sherman law of 1890 provided for the redemption in gold or silver coin at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury notes issued under it for the purchase of silver bullion. But there was added to this provision a declaration that it was the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the existing ratio of 16 to 1 or such ratio as might be thereafter provided by law. This law was passed during the Administration of President Harrison, and this declaration has been treated by the Secretary of the Treasury and his successor under the present Administration as a legislative mandate to redeem the Treasury notes as well as the legal-tender notes in gold whenever the holders of these obligations presented them and demanded gold coin from the Treasury.

But this declaration was coupled with no provision for a constant supply of gold to carry it into effect, and a fund which has been kept in the Treasury ever since the passage of the resumption act of January 14, 1875, under a construction of that act has been resorted to for the redemption of these obligations when presented.

As a matter of fact, this fund, which is constantly referred to and designated as a reserve fund and is supposed to contain $100,000,000, has never had a separate existence, and its amount has constantly been changing. In 1877 and 1878 the Secretary of the Treasury sold United States bonds for resumption purposes to the amount of $75,500,000, and the proceeds were deposited with the general cash in the Treasury; this seems to have been the origin of the so-called fund, and ever since the Secretary has endeavored to keep a surplus of gold in the Treasury as nearly as possible to this amount.

Under the discretion granted to the Secretary and already referred to, he has the authority to coin the silver bullion purchased with the Treasury notes authorized by the Sherman law and to use this coin in redeeming them, but he has deemed it his duty to redeem the notes in the coin called for by the holders of the notes because the policy of the Government declared in the act to keep the two metals at a parity could, in his opinion, only be thus maintained. It would seem that the same reasoning upon which this opinion rests requires the silver certificates also to be redeemed in gold, but up to the present time this has not been done.

The present Secretary in a recent communication to the Senate, dated January 11, 1896, gives the following history of this fund:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Senate resolution dated the 3d instant, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if the sum of $100,000,000, or any part thereof, has at any time since the establishment of the so-called gold reserve been actually segregated or set apart from the other currency or money in the Treasury Department, in gold coin, or gold coin and gold certificates, or either, for the redemption of the legal-tender notes and different forms of paper money of the Government; and when and by what act of Congress, giving the title of the act and the date of its approval, said so-called gold reserve was established, and if not established by act of Congress, state by what authority, if any, it was established."

In reply thereto the Senate is respectfully informed that at no time since the establishment of the so-called gold reserve has the sum of $100,000,000, or any sum, been segregated or set apart from the general cash in the Treasury for the redemption of the legal-tender notes of the United States, or for the redemption of any other form of paper money for which the United States is liable. There is no provision of law requiring a separate fund or separate account to be kept, and all moneys received into the Treasury, from whatever source, are deposited in the general cash. The fund for the redemption of United States notes was accumulated under authority of the act of January 14, 1875, which directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for such redemption on the 1st day of January, 1879. No specific sum was prescribed, but the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to use the surplus revenues, from time to time to sell certain descriptions of bonds to an extent necessary to carry the act into full effect.

In the exercise of the discretion thus conferred upon him the Secretary sold for resumption purposes in 1877 and 1878 United States 4 per cent and 4½ per cent bonds to the amount of $95,500,000 and deposited the proceeds, $96,000,000 in gold, in the general cash in the Treasury. This, with other gold which had been received as surplus revenue, constituted the fund prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Treasury for the redemption directed in the act of January 14, 1875.

The existence of the reserve fund was generally recognized from the time of its establishment, as above stated, and one of the measures adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent its unnecessary depletion was the discontinuance of the issue of the gold certificates authorized by the act of March 3, 1863. This act authorized but did not direct such issue.

Some inconvenience resulted from this discontinuance, and by section 12 of the bank act of July 12, 1882, the Secretary was authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin and bullion and to issue certificates therefor; but it was provided "that the Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the issue of such gold certificates whenever the amount of gold coin and gold bullion in the Treasury reserved for the redemption of United States notes falls below $100,000,000."

No other reference to the reserve fund is contained in the laws of the United States.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Under this view of his duty the Secretary redeems in gold, whenever it is demanded, the legal-tender and Treasury notes that are presented to him, and whenever this so-called reserve fund is reduced to what is regarded as the danger point United States bonds are sold for gold and the supply of the Government is replenished, to be again reduced, when the same or other notes are again presented with a demand for their redemption, and by this never-ending process, appropriately denominated an endless chain, the gold is kept constantly flowing into and out of the Treasury without accomplishing any permanent results. The President is engaged in a task as hopeless as the labor of Sisyphus. The bonded debt of the country has been increased to the amount of about $162,000,000 in less than three years, to keep up this system of redemption, and a further increase of $100,000,000 is now being provided for. The interest upon this new indebtedness will be an additional annual burden of more than $10,000,000 upon the taxpayers of the country, and the only method of escape from a constant increase of this burden that is proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury is to retire the legal-tender notes and leave the circulation to the banks, thus shifting the troublesome and costly work of redemption upon these institutions, and largely increasing the interest-bearing indebtedness of the Government.

The adoption of this policy would deprive the people of a safe and useful circulating medium, contract the currency to an extent that would threaten universal bankruptcy, give the banking corporations the dangerous power of regulating and controlling the volume of money in circulation, and add $500,000,000 to our bonded indebtedness.

The House has declined to adopt this policy and has offered a plan of relief comprised in two bills.

The one before us continues the bond policy and authorizes the issue of 3 per cent bonds from time to time to an amount limited only by the discretion of the Secretary, payable in coin, the proceeds to be used only for the redemption of the legal-tender notes. There is no provision that they are to be sold for gold, and the Secretary is left to exercise the implied authority thus to sell them under which he has heretofore acted with reference to the recent issues of bonds. The proceeds of these bonds are to be segregated from the other funds in the Treasury and are to constitute a reserve fund in fact and not merely in name.

The legal-tender notes may be reissued when redeemed with the gold thus obtained, but the bill does not provide any way of getting them into circulation. As long as gold is regarded as more valuable than paper money and is sought after by the redemption process as a means of profit and gain there will be no large demand for their reissue in exchange for gold, and they must be withheld from circulation and be allowed to accumulate and increase in the Treasury and be as effectually retired and withdrawn from the active business of the country as if the law provided for and directed their cancellation. Thus the law will enable the Secretary to accomplish his plan of retiring the legal-tender notes indirectly, while in terms it forbids their retirement.

The second section provides certificates of indebtedness drawing 3 per cent interest, to be issued by the Secretary to an amount not to exceed $50,000,000 to provide for any temporary deficiency, but as there is at present a surplus of about $120,000,000 besides the reserve fund and no deficiency is likely to arise within the next few years, the proposed legislation seems premature, and at the present time altogether unnecessary.

It has been often alleged that the restoration of silver to its coinage privilege would have the effect to drive the gold out of the country, but the gold is leaving without waiting for such restoration, and at a time when legislation to bring about such action is known to be impossible. If this exodus of gold is adverse to our business interests, it must be remembered that it has come to us under the existing system of coinage. Gold, as a circulating medium, has already disappeared in ordinary business operations, both in the form of coin and of gold certificates. It is rarely now presented, even at the custom-houses, in payment of import duties. It is controlled mainly by bankers and financiers, individually and combined in syndicates, and comparatively a few men, working together with a common purpose in view, can control its movements. As long as they find it profitable to move American gold to Europe and to furnish our Treasury with a new supply for a valuable consideration, the present movements will continue; and there ought to be some better remedy than a surrender of our legal-tender circulation or a continuous increase of our bonded indebtedness.

Even if the legal-tender notes should be retired by direct legislation or indirectly by the operation of the bill as it came from the House, what assurance have we that the Secretary of the Treasury or some successor will not construe the parity declaration of the Sherman law as a mandate to redeem the silver certificates in gold, and thus continue the movement of the endless chain till they, too, are retired and the bonded indebtedness is still further increased? Practically all the business of the people is now carried on in these certificates and the silver coin which they represent. The Government pays them out for salaries, pensions, and in discharge of its ordinary business obligations; the gold is reserved for those who keep the endless chain in motion. If the holders of the silver certificates were to follow the course marked out by the holders of the legal-tender notes and demand that their parity with gold obligations be maintained in the same manner that the gold value of Treasury notes is demonstrated, the reserve would melt like snow in summer if the Secretary continued the present governmental policy, and consistency would require its continuance.

The true remedy for the existing condition of our currency is a return to bimetallism. The coinage will then rest upon a foundation of gold and silver dollars equal in intrinsic and exchangeable value, and with this broad basis of support the paper money of the Government, redeemable in either coin, will cease to be a cause of embarrassment. I shall vote for the Senate amendment to the bill, in the hope that we can return to the former ratio of 16 to 1 with safety. I do not feel that that particular ratio is sacred, and if, after a careful investigation of the question of ratio and parity, it should seem to be manifest that the French ratio of 15½ to 1, or some other ratio that placed the value of silver lower would secure a safer system of bimetallism, I would prefer such ratio. I regret that those who profess a belief in bimetallism and who have fought the battles of Democracy upon the platforms to which I have already called attention, and who regard the committee amendment as unsafe, do not offer us a better plan, in harmony with Democratic precedents and party promises. When it becomes manifest that the platform pledges made to the people upon this subject by all political parties are to be redeemed, the question of ratio will not be in the way of their fulfillment. Meanwhile I shall continue my efforts to reach bimetallism by acting with those who believe that the parity of the two metals can be maintained in the future at 16 to 1 as it was in the past.

This system of free coinage of gold and silver without limit or restriction as to amount prevailed from 1792 to 1873, a period of eighty-one years. The ratio fixed first at 15 to 1 continued till 1834. During this period the European coinage ratio was 15½ to 1, and it would have been best to have established the American coinage of the two precious metals upon this same ratio. While this ratio continued from 1792 to 1834, the bullion value of the two metals varied from 15 in 1793 to 16.25 in 1813, as shown in the tables of A. Sootbeer, a statistician of recognized authority. The average ratio of the bullion values for the forty-two years was 15.6.

The ratio was changed in the United States in 1834 by reducing the amount of gold in the coins, and a ratio of 16 to 1 was established, going as far below the European ratio as the act of 1792 was above that ratio. Under this system, until the demonetization of silver in 1873, a period of thirty-nine years, the two metals varied from 15.19 in 1859 to 15.93 in 1843. The average ratio was 15.59. These figures indicate that whatever confusion and inconvenience prevailed in our coinage system was caused by our establishing a ratio which did not agree with that in use by other commercial nations, and made silver more valuable abroad than in the United States. At the time of the demonetization of silver in 1873 there had been no decline below the face value of that metal. The value of a silver dollar in gold in 1872 was $1.0225, as shown in a table prepared from the records of the mint. During 1873 it fell to $1.0046. The decline since then has been steady and continuous, as indicated by the following figures, which give its bullion value in different years:

1874	$0.988	1885	$0.823
1875	.964	1890	.81
1880	.886	1892	.604

Silver was demonetized in England in 1816, but notwithstanding the commercial interests of that country and her vast foreign trade, her action seems to have produced but little effect upon our coinage, and for fifty-seven years after this action our mint was open to the coinage of silver without disturbance to the business interests of the country. This experience of eighty-one years, in war and in peace, with and without the cooperation of England, during periods of financial disaster and panic as well as during periods of prosperity, shows that some reasons existed for demonetization that were not made known to the people when the act of demonetization was passed.

Silver and gold had been coined at our mints on equal terms during all this period, and the widest variation of values was 1½ cents, and with the omission of two years the variation had been but 1 cent. Even the discoveries of gold in California and Australia and the opening of the rich silver mines in the West did not cause any sudden change of ratio or materially affect our monetary system. But immediately after silver lost its money function and its coinage was discontinued, except as subsidiary money, as nickel and copper are coined, its value began to diminish.

The only apparent reason for the beginning of this decline was the loss of the money function. The restoration of this function will manifestly increase its value and those who maintain that it will at once regain its former value may be correct. Experience teaches that the effect will be to give a comparatively steady value to silver when it ceases to be a mere commodity, and the increment in its price caused by its recognition at the mints as a money metal will soon appear. If the result shows that some different ratio from that now proposed is required to keep coins of both metals in circulation on equal terms, such ratio should be ultimately adopted.

Among the many charges which are being constantly made by those who use their influence to continue the gold standard is that the movement in favor of the restoration of silver to its mint privileges is solely in the interest of owners of silver mines. The people in the State which I have the honor in part to represent and in the section of country where my home is own no silver mines and have no pecuniary interest in the results of silver mining. Their interest in silver is the general benefit that will come to the people of the United States by its use as standard money so that the business of the whole country may rest upon a surer and broader basis. The profit that may come to mine owners is incidental; it might be urged that owners of gold mines will be bene-

fited by a continuance of the monometallic system. But this great question is not to be decided by paltry considerations of this character. If it were I might call attention to the vast amount of silver belonging to the people of the United States, warehoused in the Treasury under the operation of the silver-purchasing laws, which would get the benefit of an increment to its value by the restoration of its money function.

The ultimate settlement of this great question must be upon the foundation of right and justice. The creditor class at home and abroad who, under the present system, see the long-time obligations which belong to them grow more and more valuable as the years roll on without any new consideration passing from them to their unfortunate debtors, earnestly desire its continuance, and insolently assail those who insist upon a return to the double standard and a restoration of silver to its mint privileges on equal terms with gold without discrimination against either metal as impracticable if not dishonest. They affect to believe that the people have lost interest in the subject and have accepted the single gold standard as the best possible solution of the question. They attempt to belittle those who are standing faithfully by the platform obligations of their party and their pledges to the people whom they represent, and falsely charge that they are acting against the wishes and interests of the people of their States. They threaten to use their power and wealth and influence in the States where such Senators reside to defeat their reelection if they do not "come out hearty and strong" for what they are pleased to denominate "sound money."

The Democrats of Florida fought out the campaign of 1892, one of the results of which was my reelection as a member of this body, upon the national platform of the party which I have already recited and analyzed and upon a State platform one plank of which expressly reaffirmed the national platform of 1888 and another plank demanded "the unlimited coinage of silver." During the campaign of 1894 I went from county to county to address the people, as far as I had time and opportunity after the adjournment of Congress, and told them what I had done here during the contest over the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and my course was everywhere sustained and indorsed. The vast majority of the people of the State, without respect to party affiliations, are bimetallists and favor the free coinage of silver on such a ratio as is just and fair. Newspaper writers in other States who allege to the contrary are attempting to deceive their readers or are not properly informed as to the views and sentiments of our people upon the subject.

Mr. President, they who believe in a true system of bimetallism, in which gold and silver are admitted to free mintage on equal terms, are as honest as those claim to be who have fastened gold monometallism upon the country, and who are striving for its perpetuation. It is with this feeling of respect for one another that the subject is generally discussed upon this floor, and it will be well for the interests of the whole country to realize that the dividing line between those who favor both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and those who favor gold alone as the standard is not a line which separates honesty and dishonesty. The obligations of the Government should be carried out according to their true meaning and effect, and they will be, but a system which has been tried for twenty-two years and more and has resulted disastrously to our people, particularly to our large agricultural interests, ought to be abandoned and the gold and silver coinage which was authorized by the Constitution and the early legislation of the country should be restored. History and experience have demonstrated the wisdom of the early fathers in establishing it, and we have abundant reason to believe that business activity and commercial prosperity will follow its restoration.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President——

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me a moment, that I may offer an amendment?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. PALMER to the substitute reported by the Finance Committee to House bill No. 2904.

Amend the bill by adding after the words "seventy-eight," in line 11 of page 5 of the bill, the following:

"But it is the declared policy of the United States to maintain the parity between the gold coinage of 25$\frac{8}{10}$ of standard gold and the dollar of 412½ grains of standard silver, authorized to be coined by the first section of this act, and to maintain the equal power of the said silver dollars of 412½ grains of standard silver and the gold dollar of 25$\frac{8}{10}$ grains of standard gold in the markets and in the payment of debts. And the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to exercise the discretion given to him by the fourth section of this act, so as, in his judgment, to best advance and promote the policy hereinbefore declared."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, with more money in the Treasury than is necessary to defray current expenses and meet the obligations of the Government, but with a financial situation that is a constant menace to the gold reserve, the President asks for legislation to relieve the country from this abnormal state of affairs. He points to the greenbacks and the Treasury notes as the source of danger, and recommends their retirement and their funding into bonds to form the basis of a currency adequate, safe, and elastic.

The House responds by a bill to increase revenue, and another to authorize emergency 3 per cent Treasury bonds, not exceeding $50,000,000.

The Senate Finance Committee responds by a free silver coinage bill at 16 to 1.

This is the situation. From the persistence with which the silver advocates have pushed their free-coinage scheme, and the unwavering fidelity and ability with which they have maintained it, in and out of Congress, no one can doubt their sincerity; but can we say the same of the Republicans who claim to stand for sound money?

The act of 1875 provided for the resumption of specie payment and the redemption of the greenbacks.

The act of 1878 prohibited the final redemption of the greenbacks not then redeemed, and commanded the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue them. The language is mandatory. It is as follows:

When any of said notes may be redeemed or be received into the Treasury, under any law, from any source whatever, and shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but they shall be reissued and kept again in circulation.

Yet the veteran Senator from Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, tells us, in his speech delivered in the Senate on January 3, the language of the act is permissive; in other words, the Secretary may reissue them, but he need not. He may take them into the Treasury, and may keep them there for an indefinite period. Perhaps ingenuity can construe language against itself, but it is difficult to construe a Senator against himself. These difficult feats have nearly been accomplished by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who with graceful agility has not only jumped over the statute, but has practically jumped over his own construction of it.

The amount of greenbacks redeemed and reissued since the act of 1878 shows conclusively that the Senator from Ohio is wrong by the statute and wrong by his own construction. Hear him:

A note redeemed by coin is in the Treasury and subject to the same law as if received for taxes or a bank note redeemed by the corporation issuing it. Authority to reissue does not depend on the mode in which it is returned to the Treasury.—*Report of Secretary Sherman of 1877.*

Now, when notes are in the Treasury and the Secretary can reissue them, notwithstanding their mode of entrance, the Senator knows that the dues of the Government to its creditors compel the reissue and that the notes can not, in the nature of things, remain piled up there. To do so would be, first, a violation of law, and, second, a violation of sound policy. It would illegally contract the currency and bring about surreptitiously and illegally a retirement of notes which the present law requires to be constantly kept in circulation. Besides, the constant and uninterrupted practice of each Secretary of the Treasury has been to reissue the greenbacks, which would of itself, were the language of the statute ambiguous, form a precedent for the action of the present Secretary.

In the speech of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in the Senate on the 22d instant, he said:

If the Senator will get up here and say that in his judgment the maintenance of the gold standard and the maintenance of $100,000,000 in the reserve is compensation for what we suffer in the issuing of from two to three hundred million dollars a year of bonds, that will be all right; we shall know when to meet it. What I complain of is that on this side of the Chamber the majority of the Republicans are absolutely without a policy. You have not got any and you will not have one now. You dare not redeem the greenbacks; that you know would afford you relief. You dare not go before the public in 1896 with your candidate on that kind of a platform; you know where you would land. You would be landed where the Democrats were landed at the last election and where they expect to be landed now if we do not make some such blunder as that. You are afraid to do that. A majority of the gold men in this Chamber believe it ought to be done. You are in sympathy with the President, in my judgment, on that point, and if you are going to maintain the gold standard I repeat what I said before, that is the logical and only way out of it, unless you are willing to increase the public debt just as long as men will buy bonds at 3 per cent, or 5 per cent, or any other rate per cent.

This is the deliberate attack of a Republican Senator, of great and acknowledged ability, on the cowardly attitude of the reputed sound-money Republicans on the money question of the day.

Here is what a distinguished Democrat, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], says:

We are now engaged in an irrepressible financial conflict, a conflict as irrepressible as that which marched the armies of the North and South in the civil war. I trust that the arbitrament may not be by violence; I hope and believe that it will not be; but the conflict is just as irrepressible, and must be fought out to the last extremity between those of us who believe in retaining silver as standard money of redemption and those who believe in the single gold standard and the use of silver only as fractional coin. All attempts to evade this issue are impossible.

So it appears that from a leading silver Republican and a leading silver Democrat we have the square issue presented of keeping up the reserve, retiring greenbacks, or going to a silver basis.

The silver advocates conscientiously think that a silver basis is a financial heaven, where the streets of the New Jerusalem are paved with silver. The gold Democrats and gold Republicans think that such a heaven were worse than a financial hell. They want the streets of the New Jerusalem paved with gold, as the Scriptures have it.

Mr. President, the Republican party quailed before what it thought to be popular opposition when they passed the act of 1878, which partially destroyed the act of 1875. They quail now, when, after adopting another bad act, that of July, 1890, adding to the difficulties of maintaining the reserve and a gold standard, they refuse to do the only wise thing left to be done, namely, retire the greenbacks and provide an automatic bank issue based for redemption on the bonds into which the greenbacks must be funded.

There is a majority of Republicans ostensibly for sound money; there is a minority of Democrats in this body in favor of sound money, according to our vocabulary.

Every highly civilized nation on the face of the globe has funded its paper war debt except the United States. It hangs over our finances like a dark cloud filled with elements of destruction, ready to burst at any moment and devastate the country. In vain does the Republican party point to a deficiency of revenue and say with trembling lips, pile on more taxes and the reserve is safe; in vain do they say that the balance of trade is against us. The ceaseless working of an inexorable law assails the gold standard with destruction; the silent force of economic law brooks no trifling expedients to arrest its course; the fiat of economic law has long since gone forth, that depreciated paper and depreciated coin will drive out a superior coin; the fiat has gone forth from the same high authority that the fear of depreciation will have the same effect.

The expedient of the senior Senator from Ohio to pile up taxation, get the Treasury full of greenbacks, and hold them is simply to afford a refuge for the Republican party from the fierce attacks of the silver men and divert the issue to tariff.

The President is between two fires. To keep up the gold reserve he is compelled to issue bonds; to redeem greenbacks and Treasury notes in silver is to go to a silver basis. It is infinitely better to keep our present standard than to incur the enormous ills of a silver basis. Every security, every debt, would be halved. The foundation of our vast financial and industrial fabric would be shaken.

To sell bonds means entailing a burden on the future; it may mean a useless volume of paper in the Treasury temporarily. But as the apprehension of a silver basis is the cause of our troubles, the wise and courageous policy of the President to maintain the reserve by the sale of bonds will inspire confidence, gold raiding will cease, and business resume its normal régime.

That gold withdrawals from the Treasury is the effect of fear as to the soundness of the currency is shown from the periods of largest exports of gold corresponding with periods of apprehension and alarm.

In 1892 the excess of exports of gold over imports was $495,873. The excess of exports of merchandise over imports for the same year was $202,875,686. In 1893 the excess of exports of gold over imports was $87,506,463. The excess of imports of merchandise over export swas $18,737,728. In 1894 the excess of the exports of gold over imports was $4,528,942. The excess of exports of merchandise over imports was $237,145,950.

So it appears that with the balance of trade in our favor for three years to the extent of $411,283,908, there was an export of gold over import for the same period of $92,531,278.

These figures are taken from the Statistical Abstract for 1894. This puts to flight the theory of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that the cause of financial troubles is the balance of trade being against us for the last few years.

Gold ought to have been imported to settle this balance, if our gold standard were not constantly threatened.

There is no danger of contracting the currency by getting all the greenbacks and Treasury notes into the Treasury. They would not be there long enough to work much damage.

If gold withdrawals go on, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] says, and bonds are sold to keep up the reserve, and there be a scarcity of currency in consequence, the demand for it for exchanges will be too great to allow the endless-chain operation to go on. If the currency is all congested in the Treasury, the custom dues and internal-revenue taxes will have to be paid in gold or silver, and so, as the gold is paid in, the Treasury can afford to redeem the greenbacks with it without impairing the reserve.

For preventing the basis of sixty-five billions of wealth to be seriously threatened and shrinking its value to the extent of all that portion of it represented by securities the people of this and future times will call President Cleveland a wise and patriotic man. He can only effect this by the sale of bonds, Congress refusing to pass laws to remove the source of danger.

The device of piling up taxes by more tariff when the Treasury is threatened with a plethora of paper money is like pouring water in a vessel already full.

Mr. President, is the fear well founded that the silver forces are strong enough to bring about a silver basis?

No one can say that there is not some remote danger of such a result, for the organization, strength, and numbers of the silver movement are acknowledged of all men.

While I think that the free coinage of silver is fraught with more evils than imagination can picture, more than ever it could or did bring in any period or in any country, there is a legion of honest, intelligent men who think just the opposite.

I fondly hoped that the discussion which has gone on in Congress, on the hustings, in the press, in lecture rooms, and in periodicals, would ere this have dispelled the delusions which have captured the judgment of a large portion of our people.

I set up no superior knowledge, I claim no infallibility, but with the best light that my intellect furnishes I firmly adhere to the present standard of our country; the standard of the civilized commercial world; the gold standard, with silver as subsidiary money, with the full legal-tender quality it now has, and to the amount now existing.

The free-coinage advocates hold that the gold standard adopted by statute in 1873 cut off half of the metallic money of the United States, and that its adoption by Europe cut off half of the metallic money of the world; they hold that silver at a fixed ratio had circulated pari passu with gold, until its "taking off," for over four hundred years; that the mint rates always regulated and controlled the commercial rates, and will always do so. They hold that "cutting off" silver left the money function on gold alone, which consequently appreciated, has appreciated ever since, and will always appreciate, as the supply is unequal to the demand.

They aver stoutly that there was and is a conspiracy of the money power in behalf of gold and against silver, whereby the poor are made poorer and the rich richer; that prices have gone down to starvation figures, and that the people mourn for silver as Rachel mourned for her children. They draw such dreadful pictures of all gold countries, ground beneath the heel of a remorseless gold despotism, as to make many of them sigh for the silver solitudes of Mexico and the silver glories of Japan and Venezuela.

A distinguished advocate of silver in this body, quoting the status of France as a shining example of alleged bimetallism, says—I quote from Senator JONES of Arkansas in a late speech:

> In the June number of the North American Review the great English statistician, Mulhall, said:
>
> "If we take a survey of mankind in ancient or modern times as regards the physical, mechanical, and intellectual force of nations we find nothing to compare with the United States in this present year of 1895. At the same time we see that the wealth of the American people surpasses that of any other nation past or present.
>
> "He states the energy or our working power to compare with that of France as 129,306 to 34,580, our producing capacity as 475 to 115, and he says that the 'merchandise transported in the United States is shown by official returns to be double the amount of the land carriage (at least by rail) of all the other nations of the earth collectively.' We are known to be the largest consumers of the necessaries as well as the luxuries of life on the earth, and of course our internal commerce as well as our external commerce must be enormously large. We have 41,000,000 of instructed citizens, and spend a hundred and fifty-six millions on schools, against thirty-one millions in France. As France successfully maintained a 'rated equivalence' at 15½ to 1 for seventy years, may we not reasonably anticipate that if we should declare in favor of bimetallism that we could easily accomplish our purpose; that we are powerful enough to keep the ratio of 16 to 1 prevalent, a lower rate than that of France?"

If the United States, a gold country, is nearly three and three-fourth times the working power of silver France (as alleged), and our producing capacity four times as much, has gold impaired our wealth or destroyed our greatness? In every walk of life, from the lowest to the highest, in comfort, in property, in advancement, in wages, and in education, we are far ahead of France. Why adopt her late silver policy?

The example of France is adduced to show that if a weaker nation like France, single handed, kept up a double standard for seventy years, why not we in the full zenith of our power?

France, single handed, kept up for seventy years a double standard at 15½ to 1, therefore we single handed can keep up one at 16 to 1.

A simple question will put his interrogation to shame; why does not France keep on with her 15½ to 1 standard? If it was good for seventy years, why not good forever?

France has closed her mints to silver. France is supposed to know her own policy better than any other nation can know it. "Perfide Albion" had the gold standard; and it is not likely that France became a victim to the policy of her rival, nor that the money power threw its coils over the wily Frenchmen.

Mr. President, the whole difficulty lies in assuming that governments can regulate the exchangeable value of commodities. Metallic money is a commodity like anything else that human

beings wish to have and enjoy, for use, for pleasure, for convenience, or to gratify any desire—physical or intellectual.

The value of any commodity lies in comparison with some other commodity; this is called exchangeable value.

Money is a device resorted to from the difficulty of bartering what one person has for something that another has; barter springs from the diversity of pursuits among men; in a primitive condition of society, when everybody makes what he wants, there is no exchange; as soon as a man is confined to producing one or a few articles, he can only satisfy his wants by procuring what others produce, by exchanging his surplus for theirs; money therefore comes into play. Governments never made money, nor can they.

When a common denominator of values is introduced among men the common denominator must, by comparison, have an exchangeable value equal to everything that it exchanges for. The commodity itself must be valuable; it must have what is called, for want of a better term, intrinsic value; it must possess those qualities which mankind attribute to it, of being equal to whatever it is given for.

Now, as value springs from the estimate that each party to an exchange puts on his own and the commodity offered for it, it follows that the exchange is an individual act, springing from individual estimate. This estimate is an intellectual process, and until governments possess the power of substituting despotic will for the free and independent action of the brain of the citizen, governments can not fix upon any commodity, be it gold, silver, copper, wheat, corn, or cotton, any value whatever.

It is related in history that the Emperor Charles V, in his retirement, after abdicating the throne, amused himself by regulating watches. He could never make two watches keep exactly the same time.

"If I can not make two watches go alike," said he, "surely I can not make two persons think alike."

I quote from memory, without the history of Charles V before me, and use my own language to convey the idea of the historian. He might have said: "If two persons will seldom place the same value upon any two commodities, how can kingly authority step in and prescribe to either what one or both of the commodities should be worth?"

When once the idea is firmly grasped that metallic money is a commodity; that when it is offered in exchange it is subject to the same mental process as if it were another commodity; that if it is bad money, or depreciated, it will exchange for less of other commodities than good money will; then we are on the road to a clear perception of the economic laws to which it is subject.

Metallic money has no other function than to effect exchange and to furnish a common measure of values, and it enjoys these functions from the voluntary and wholy independent action of the parties to an exchange. In the genesis of money it is clear that money is used, ex necessitate, before govermental action comes in to fix its weight and fineness and attest its genuineness.

Primitive people, with few exchanges, use as media of exchange various commodities. Cows, tobacco, wampum belts, bits of compressed tea, shells, and hides have been used, as history tells us, by people in a rude state of society; then came the metals, iron and copper first, then silver and gold.

When Abraham bought the field of Machpelah for a burying ground for Sarah, his wife, he weighed out in the audience of the sons of Heth 400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant, as the purchase price. This is about as ancient a transaction as history records.

No governmental stamp, no 16 to 1, no superscription of any shepherd king, but simple silver weighed in the audience of the sons of Heth.

Had there been a law compelling copper and silver to circulate at 16 to 1, the trade would either have not been made for metal money or, if so, Abraham would have delivered unto Ephron about four chariot loads of copper for the cave of Machpelah.

It has always occurred to me, Mr. President, that if government can, in the face of a commercial ratio of 30 to 1, fix gold and silver at 16 to 1, they can circulate them evenly. Then why take such a costly material as silver and gold. Why not take paper? The Populists have the best end of the argument. If an artificial legal ratio can prevail against the commercial ratio, then government can make money out of the whole cloth. If they can impart value to silver, they can impart it to anything else.

The Populists favor 16 to 1, because it is a long step in the direction of fiat money. "Facilis descensus Averno." If we now go half-way, they hope in good time we will go the whole length of their doctrine.

But again, a law of universal application intervenes. If two commodities are at hand for a person to pay a debt in, he will always use the most inferior. Money is only useful when it is parted with; none but misers hoard it. It is currency, derived from the word "currens," it runs; and when a man has a chance of parting with one of two commodities in exchange for other commodities, he will always part with the least valuable of the commodities. Thus it is that bad money runs out good. It has done so in our country. It may be gold or silver that is bad, measured by the legal ratio as compared with the commercial ratio.

I confidently say that history affords no case when a metal underrated by the legal ratio as compared with the commercial ratio has not run away and overrated bad money, remained in circulation. The facts of our own history are well known on this point.

Again it is averred that it is true that metal money is a commodity. Money follows the law of supply and demand like other commodities, but the gold countries do not admit silver to free coinage; this lessens the demand for silver, and consequently its price falls. This is a fallacy. Governments can not make a demand for anything. The demand is an action of the mind. It springs from a desire to have money as an instrument of exchange or as a standard of value. Government can no more make demand than it can make the bargain which springs from it.

Now, when a commodity presents itself to human intelligence as a common denominator of all other values and as a medium of exchange, that intelligence immediately compares it with another commodity, presented for the same purpose. As attributes of commodities change from changing conditions and changing desires, this comparison is not inflexible and stationary, but is constantly fluctuating.

When silver presents itself as a medium of exchange and a measure of value, comparisons are immediately instituted among men as to how it stands with gold. It may stand at one period at 10 to 1, as it did generally during the Middle Ages, or 11 to 1 at another, or some other ratio at another. In fact, from 2 to 1 to 33 to 1 represents the varying but always lower value that silver bears to gold as civilization advances.

How did it start in 1792 at 15 to 1? Was it arbitrary? Hamilton is shown to have sedulously endeavored to get as near the commercial ratio as he could. He said:

> In establishing a proportion between the metals there seems to be an option of one or two things: To approach, as nearly as it can be ascertained, the mean or average proportion in what may be called the commercial world, or to retain that which now exists in the United States.

When the gold standard was effectually, though indirectly, adopted in 1837 and sanctioned and ratified by the report of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures in 1853, it was in pursuance of the wishes and interests of the people of the United States. It was distinctly asserted that the gold standard was best suited to our commercial and business interests and reflected the wishes of the people. Indeed, I confidently say that no standard can be imposed by government on a free people that they do not want. I do not believe that governments ever adopted a standard that was not in use long before government established it. It was so in England, according to Mr. Giffen, in 1816. It was so in the United States in 1834. The history of various commodities being used by the people as media of exchange before ever government intervened to establish the volume, weight, and fineness, of the material shows this to be so.

Government can despotically interfere in the voluntary action of individuals in selecting the best commodity their business needs require as a medium of exchange, and incidentally as a measure of value, but whenever they do so counter to the commercial needs of the people they inflict immeasurable wrong. History is full of sad examples of the wretchedness inflicted by kings in debasing the coin.

To attempt to give more value to silver than it has and force it upon creditors is of a piece with mediæval tyranny in forcing debased coins on an unwilling people. In 1873 there was neither gold nor silver in circulation. Inconvertible paper had driven them out of circulation. Brave silver hid, as well as cowardly gold.

Gold had theretofore been the standard in point of fact, and the act of 1873 simply put into law what had been recognized as fact, and what was honestly and intelligently wanted by the statesmen of the antebellum period.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the Senator to say that silver was depreciating. Was it not at a premium at the time it was demonetized in 1873?

Mr. CAFFERY. It was.

Mr. DANIEL. Had not civilization advanced?

Mr. CAFFERY. It had.

Mr. DANIEL. Then how can the Senator be correct in his statement that as civilization advances silver goes down, when it was at a premium at a time when civilization was advancing?

Mr. CAFFERY. I referred to a general decline of silver. The gold discoveries of California and Australia and elsewhere had resulted in such an output of gold that temporarily the price of gold compared with silver had gone down, and silver was at a premium; and I say silver being at a premium in 1873 was no

reason why gold should not have been adopted as the standard of value, because all experience up to that date, and all experience since that date, has shown that it possesses the quality of more invariable value, that it is less fluctuating in value, better adapted to the needs of extensive commerce, has greater value in less bulk, circulates the world over according to its bullion value, and, therefore, international as well as domestic exchanges can be better founded upon it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CAFFERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to ask the Senator from Louisiana if silver had not been stripped of its chief element by being proscribed as a money metal, although at a premium when it was so proscribed? Now, suppose cotton or wool had been prohibited to be manufactured into cloth, what would have been the effect upon the value of wool or cotton? Would you not have deprived each of those materials of its chief element of value, as you did deprive silver of its chief element of value? What would have been the effect upon those two materials?

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, in the hypothesis supposed by the Senator from Tennessee cotton or wool would have been totally destroyed. I do not doubt the power of government to destroy arbitrarily and despotically, but I do claim that in a free government where there is no despotism government can not regulate the mind, can not regulate the estimate of commodities. The parallel, or the case put by the Senator from Tennessee, does not exist in regard to silver. It is not true to say that silver has been destroyed.

Mr. HARRIS. Was it not effectually destroyed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CAFFERY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. HARRIS. Was silver not effectually destroyed when you by law demonetized it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg pardon. I thought the Senator had yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana said he would yield in a moment.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. CAFFERY. It is not true to say that silver was destroyed at all. It is true to say that since 1873 to date there has been more than fivefold the amount of silver coined into dollars in nineteen years than there was in the period elapsing from 1792 to 1873. If, therefore, silver has been used, how can anybody say that it has been destroyed? It has been used as money, it has performed the money function, and its value is by no jot or tittle impaired because it has been denied the power of money of ultimate redemption.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. CAFFERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator stated that as civilization advanced silver went down. Will the Senator please state how that is consistent with the fact that from 1847 to 1850, when more gold was produced, the same people who are now warring upon silver led the crusade against gold and actually demonetized it? How is that consistent with the idea of the natural law, as claimed by the Senator from Louisiana, that carried silver down as civilization advanced?

Mr. CAFFERY. I think the Senator from Virginia has not correctly stated the facts. Gold has never been demonetized in Europe.

Mr. DANIEL. In one or two countries it has been.

Mr. CAFFERY. There is no country that I know of in Europe—of course the superior information and knowledge of other Senators on that point will correct me if I am wrong—that ever demonetized gold. At the period of the discovery of the gold mines of California, when there was a tremendous output of gold, gold being a commodity like everything else, a noted French writer of that period, Mr. Chevalier, in discussing the finances of France, thought perhaps it were best to demonetize gold, but it was never done.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Germany demonetized gold, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TELLER. And so did Holland in 1847.

Mr. CAFFERY. I stand corrected, then, and the question of the Senator from Virginia now needs an answer. Notwithstanding a temporary rise in the value of silver about the period of and after the discovery of gold in California, silver went to a premium as compared with gold, but, notwithstanding that, gold then held the supremacy. It holds its supremacy because it is a metal better suited to the needs of a large commerce. It is more valuable in less bulk. It is recognized everywhere as money. It is demonetized nowhere, and all along the line, from the inception of gold coinage, which was in Florence, I think, shortly after the commencement of enlightenment in Europe, about the time of the last Crusades, it has steadily advanced; and as commerce advanced, as the necessity of exchanges demanded a superior metal, gold has claimed and asserted its superiority.

So Hamilton adopted the commercial ratio. There was a difference in value between the metals then as now, and as ever will be, and the commercial ratio will always govern.

The silver advocates say, notwithstanding silver has been coined to the extent of $538,444,467 in the United States since 1873, and notwithstanding it is on a par with gold at 16 to 1, and is a legal tender for all debts, yet the law of supply and demand does not apply, because silver is a secondary money, a subsidiary coin, and does not possess the faculty of primary money, and therefore it is depreciated and drops constantly in the market.

The demand for metallic money is not regulated by its being primary or secondary, just so as it performs all the functions of money. The demand of the world was not cut off from silver in 1873. India had been for ages the great reservoir for all the surplus silver of the world; South America and Mexico were open to it, and yet we are told that, after using at home more in nineteen years by fivefold than we had for eighty years before, with the demand of the silver countries active, the demand for silver had been ruthlessly cut off.

Suppose that silver were to become suddenly more useful for arts, and the world product should be in demand, would the demand for it as necessary to the arts be less potent to give value than the demand for it as money?

In the language of Macaulay, it is not easy to perceive why a piece of metal fashioned as a disk should be more valuable than when fashioned as a spoon. Half the world was using silver as the primary money, the other half was using it as subsidiary money, and the United States was buying 50,000,000 ounces of it per annum.

A nickel passes for 5 cents. Everybody knows that there is not 5 cents in value to it. Why does it pass for 5 cents? Simply because it is necessary for the smallest exchanges, and it is legal tender up to 25 cents. Silver is depreciated about one-half, yet because it is necessary for certain exchanges larger than nickel exchanges, and because it is legal tender for any amount and is held to parity by the Government, it passes for 100 cents on the dollar.

Silver can be kept at par with gold by coining it in limited amounts, as the needs of trade require, and giving it legal-tender qualities to a small amount. We can hold all we have at par with full legal-tender quality.

The demand for silver as subsidiary coinage is sufficient to give it as much, if not more commercial value, than if it were admitted to free coinage at 16 to 1, for production would so increase the quantity that the ratio would drop lower and lower.

The modern improvements of deep and cheap mining would pour a constantly swelling stream of silver into the mints until inflation, with its spurious prosperity, would end in collapse and bankruptcy.

But the quantitative theory of money is exploded; the multiplication of transfers by private instrumentalities, checks, drafts, and notes has largely done away with the use of metallic money.

Exchanges of an enormous commerce can be carried on almost without metallic money. Its main use is to settle foreign balances by shipment of coin when rates of bills of exchange rule too high, and to form the reserves of banks, to redeem their paper issue and guarantee their deposits.

Here is a statement taken from the New York Times of a recent date:

THE CLEARING HOUSE.

The formal opening of the new home of the New York Clearing House yesterday was a notable event in the history of one of the most powerful, most remarkable, and most honorable institutions, not only in this city, but in the United States. Its original object, economy of time, labor, and the actual use of currency in effecting exchanges between the banks of the city, remains substantially the same as at the modest beginning. But not only have the operations connected with this object grown, with the passage of time and the development of the commerce of the country, to vast proportions, which a half century since would have been incredible if not inconceivable, but the associated bankers have found themselves gradually and naturally undertaking and successfully discharging functions of the utmost importance which were not dreamed of at the outset.

It is a mere commonplace of daily experience and observation that the perfect honesty and scrupulous accuracy of its transactions are the necessary condition of success, yet it may impress some not familiar with the business world to remark that while these transactions in forty-three years have reached eleven hundred billions of dollars, not one cent has been lost by misconduct or mischance. And the spirit that has produced this marvelous result has animated the clearing house at all times and under all conditions. It has always stood, as it stands now, for absolute honesty, for strict fairness, for sound banking, sound credit, and sound currency. At times of great distress and danger it has upheld honorable business men and saved them and the country from incalculable loss. And its vast and long service has been rendered with no authority and no aid from any government, often protecting the country from the evils of bad legislation and the errors of in-

competent rulers. It is an example of what the freedom which is the essence of our institutions enables men to do.

This is an example of the potency of the modern vehicle of exchange. Money is a mere tool of exchange, says Bonamy Price, pages 7 and 8:

Coin is manufactured in order to effect a service; in other words, it is a tool; it does its work not by staying in its owner's hands, but by leaving them. No other conception of coin is rational or intelligible. It may be purchased long before it is used, as Napoleon I stored many millions of pounds at the Tuileries, in readiness for possible war, or as bankers pile up reserves to guard against the uncertainty of the payments of their debts, being suddenly demanded of them. But this changes nothing in the nature of money; it only indicates that it is occasionally wise, with money, as with other tools, to provide a stock of it beforehand, lest it may not be procurable at the moment when it is required for use. The truth always remains the same, that money is of no utility whatever, except when employed as a tool, that is, when it exercises its proper function by being got rid of in exchange for other property. It is a machine—a means, not an end—an instrument of the same class as a ship or a cart, a means of conveyance. The common cart transfers weights, the money cart transfers ownership. Whoever bought a cart for the purpose of enjoyment in itself? What man not under a delusion ever bought money, coin, except with the object of exchanging it for something which he needed?

Mill is to the same effect. He says:

It must be evident, however, that the mere introduction of a particular mode of exchanging things for one another by first exchanging a thing for money and then exchanging the money for something else makes no difference in the essential character of transactions. It is not with money that things are really purchased. Nobody's income (except that of the gold or silver miner) is derived from the precious metals. The dollars or cents which a person receives weekly or yearly are not what constitutes his income; they are a sort of tickets or orders which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases, and which entitle him to receive a certain value of any commodity that he makes choice of. The farmer pays his laborers and his landlord in these tickets as the most convenient plan for himself and them; but their real income is their share of his corn, cattle, and hay, and it makes no essential difference whether he distributes it to them directly or sells it for them and gives them the price. There can not, in short, be intrinsically a more insignificant thing in the economy of society than money, except in the character of a contrivance for sparing time and labor. It is a machine for doing quickly and commodiously what would be done, though less quickly and commodiously, without it; and, like many other kinds of machinery, it only exerts a distinct and independent influence of its own when it gets out of order.

Now, if credit is substituted for the coined disc, the exchanges, especially those operated through clearing houses, which represent all the exchanges done by associated banks, are simply enormous.

About 2 per cent of these clearings are settled with money in New York. At this ratio twenty-two billions in money in forty years were required to settle eleven hundred billion dollars of transactions in that city.

Mill says that credit exchanges have as much to do with prices as metal money, namely:

In the case, however, of payment by checks, the purchases are, at any rate, made not with the money in the buyers' possession, yet with money to which he has a right. But he may make purchases with money which he only expects to have, or even only pretends to expect. He may obtain goods in return for his acceptances payable at a future time, or on his note of hand, or on a simple book credit, that is, on a mere promise to pay. All these purchases have exactly the same effect on price as though they were made with ready money. The amount of purchasing power which a person can exercise is composed of all the money in his possession or due to him and of all his credit. For exercising the whole of this power he finds a sufficient motive only under peculiar circumstances, but he always possesses it; and the portion of it which he at any time does exercise is the measure of the effect which he produces on price.

If this be so, Mr. President, and there is no gainsaying it, wherefore these tears about driving down prices by demonetizing silver, when bits of paper do immensely more work than either gold or silver?

The favored metal, that for which hideous conspiracies are hatched which ruin kings and money lords as well as everybody else, does not figure in these transactions any more than silver. Gold simply stands behind these credit transactions to redeem ultimately the balances found due.

Interchange of commodities necessarily constitutes mutual debts and credits; these offset one another to 98 per cent in large commercial centers and about 95 per cent as a general average.

These credits depend upon confidence; confidence in personal integrity, and confidence in the final adjustment of balances in the best money. If this confidence is impaired in the currency dependent upon gold the whole fabric is threatened.

This accounts for the disastrous effects of the panic of 1893. Confidence in the ability of the Government to keep up a reserve of one hundred millions, to hold up a volume of subsidiary and paper money of upward of one thousand million dollars, was seriously impaired.

There were abundant crops, and prices, though low, compared favorably with the flourishing decade antedating the war.

It was not an industrial but a financial panic, acute, penetrating, and destructive, though of short duration.

Now, Mr. President, I propose to show that the free coinage of silver, at any ratio, has never kept the metals together, nor has the legal ratio ever corresponded for any length of time with the commercial ratio. I annex tables from Soetbeer and Shaw, the latter showing the legal ratio in Europe for two hundred years and the former the commercial ratio.

Annual average of output of gold and silver in kilos, the ratio of production, and the commercial ratio.

[From Soetbeer's Materialen.]

Period.	Production of gold.	Production of silver.	Proportion gold to silver.	Commercial ratio.
	Kilos.	*Kilos.*		
1492–1520	5,800	47,000	1 to 8	1 to 10.74
1521–1544	7,160	90,200	1 to 12⅝	1 to 11.25
1545–1560	8,510	311,600	1 to 36⅝	1 to 11.30
1561–1580	6,840	209,500	1 to 44	1 to 11.80
1581–1600	7,380	418,900	1 to 56¾	1 to 12.25
1601–1620	8,520	422,900	1 to 48½	1 to 14
1621–1640	8,300	393,600	1 to 47⅜	1 to 14.50
1641–1660	8,770	366,300	1 to 41¾	1 to 15
1661–1680	9,260	337,000	1 to 36½	1 to 15
1681–1700	10,765	341,900	1 to 31¾	1 to 15.20
1701–1720	12,820	355,600	1 to 28	1 to 15
1721–1760	21,850	482,000	1 to 22	1 to 14.60
1761–1780	20,705	652,740	1 to 31½	1 to 15.50
1781–1820	15,660	771,000	1 to 49	1 to 15.75
1821–1840	17,250	528,000	1 to 30⅝	1 to 15.83
1841–1850	54,759	780,415	1 to 14¼	1 to 15.40
1851–1860	200,500	895,000	1 to 4½	1 to 15.50
1861–1870	195,000	1,220,000	1 to 6¼	1 to 15.97
1871–1875	173,904	1,969,425	1 to 11⅓	1 to 15.80
1876–1880	172,414	2,450,252	1 to 14¼	1 to 17.81
1881–1885	149,137	2,861,700	1 to 19¼	1 to 18.63

Table of legal ratios in different countries of Europe.

[Statement from Shaw, pages 69 and 70.]

Date.	England.	Netherlands.	France.	Spain.	Germany.[1]	SW. Germany.[2]	Venice.
1474				9.824			
1475				10.985			
1480				11.555			
1483				11.675			
1484					11.37		
1489		10.05			11.2		
1497			11.83	10.755			
1506				10.262			
1511							
1517					[3] 10.31	11.32	
1519		10.15	11.76			12.04	
1524					11.38		
1527	12.23					10.03	
1529						11.07	
1537				10.760			
1539			11.68				
1540		10.62	11.82				
1542							
1548		11.10					
1549			11.86				
1550			12.07				
1551			11.47		[4] 10.83		
1552	11.10						
1553	11.05						
1554		10.70					
1559	11.79				[4] 11.44	11.55	
1560			11.77				
1561							10.81
1562						11.01	11.53
1566				12.294	11.55		
1572		12.42					
1573			11.76				12.33
1575			11.68			11.11	
1576		12.67					
1578							10.61
1579		10.62					
1582						11.40	
1583						10.93	
1585					11.63		
1586		10.66					
1587						12.03	
1589		11.21					
1590						11.86	
1590						11.32	
1591						10.95	
1593						11.18	
1594						11.70	12.34
1596		10.90			11.50		
1597						11.78	
1597						12.16	
1598		11.29					
1599						11.05	
1601	10.90					11.86	
1602			11.18			12.22	
1603		11.64				12.24	
1605	12.15					12.01	
1605						12.49	
1606		11.92					
1607						12.61	
1608						12.16	11.04
1608						12.46	
1610		12.54			12.20		
1611	13.32					12.08	
1612				13.52		12.30	
1613						12.35	
1613						12.29	
1615		12.03	13.90			12.31	
1617						12.58	
1618						12.11	
1619		12.10					
1620	13.34						
1621		12.50					

[1] Imperial system.
[2] Wurtemburg, Strasburg, Colmar.
[3] Erfürt.
[4] Imperial edict.

Table of legal ratios in different countries of Europe—Continued.
[Statement from Shaw, pages 69 and 70.]

Date.	England.	Netherlands.	France.	Spain.	Germany.[1]	SW. Germany.[2]	Venice.
1622		12.65					
1623					11.64	11.74	
1624						13.42	
1624						12.58	
1626		12.65					
1630							10.31
1631						13.42	
1633		12.25				15.10	
1634						14.80	
1635							
1636			15.36				
1637						15.10	
1638	13.39						14.38
1640		14.49					
1643		13.50					15.37
1645		14.13					
1648							
1651							
1652		14.13					
1653		14.13					
1656			14.71				
1660							
1663		14.43					
1665				16.47			14.39
1667					12.88		
1669	14.48				15.13		
1679			14.91				
1690					15.13		

[1] Imperial system. [2] Wurtemburg, Strasburg, Colmar.

These tables show that for two hundred years the legal ratios of Europe were constantly altered, and yet an equivalence between them and the commercial ratios was never attained.

They show that it is beyond the power of man or of government to establish an arbitrary equivalence between commodities. Our own Government ought to afford a convincing example. In 1792 the legal ratio of 15 to 1 corresponded, for a time, to the commercial ratio. After a space silver became overrated by the ratio of 15 to 1; as a consequence, gold fled the country. In 1834 the ratio was changed to 16 to 1. This overrated gold by the ratio, and silver fled. In 1853 the fractional coinage was debased in order to keep it from running away, and a gold standard was deliberately adopted by underrating silver in the coinage, with the avowed purpose of keeping the gold standard. France was practically a silver country until the discovery and development of the California and Australian gold mines, when she became a gold country.

I read in this connection from the speech of Mr. Cyrus L. Dunham in 1853. The bill to regulate fractional coins was up, and he said:

> I repeat, in reply to the gentleman, we propose, so far as these coins are concerned, to make the silver subservient to the gold coin of the country. We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved; what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be best, and what the committee believe to be necessary and proper—to make but one standard of currency, and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make the gold the standard coin, and to make these new silver coins applicable and convenient not for large but for small transactions. I trust this sufficiently explains the reason of our pursuing this course.

The theory of the bimetallist that a double standard is so arranged that the demand will fall on the dearer metal when the cheaper gets scarce and high and keep the money plane even is wrong in principle and disastrous in practice. It ignores the essential factor of individual estimate and comparison. It flies in the face of every correct theory of political economy and every fact of history. The double standard implies a single standard. The metals will part; the dearer will leave and will not return until the ratio conforms to the commercial value. This involves a constant and never-ending recoinage, which is impracticable and inefficient.

In this condition of affairs, wisdom points to accepting the free and unbiased action of other civilized nations of the world. It appears, further, from the table annexed, that prices now are not greatly different from those prevailing in the decade from 1850 to 1860. True, they have been low, but there is no single article cheapened in price where the decline can be attributed to an appreciation of gold. It is an accepted canon of political economy that nothing but a rise in money will effect a universal and uniform fall in prices. This must be so, because trade, being an interchange of product through the instrumentality of money, one commodity falling another must rise. Where prices fall or rise irregularly other than money causes must be at work. While it is true that general advancement in production necessarily brings about lower prices, it is equally true that a fall must be horizontal in order that it may be attributed to appreciated money. Now, the table of prices from the London Economist, copied from Senate Report 1394, shows a decline, but it shows an irregular decline from the seventies to 1891.

I here insert this table, showing the average price of various articles and of all articles from 1840 to 1891.

Relative prices in gold (a), by groups of articles, 1840–1891.

[From Senate Report No. 1394, second session Fifty-second Congress.]

Year.	General average prices.								
	Food.	Cloths and clothing.	Fuel and lighting.	Metals and implements.	Lumber and building materials.	Drugs and chemicals.	House-furnishing goods.	Miscellaneous.	All articles.
1840	96.6	110.7	395.8	123.5	110	145.8	116.4	147.1	116.8
1841	94.4	113.4	208.9	123.7	111.8	141.3	116.4	147.1	115.8
1842	82.9	100.9	202	118.7	108.8	131.6	116.4	170.6	107.8
1843	79.3	99.9	187.5	114.7	105.4	121.4	100.3	123.5	101.5
1844	81.6	105	119.7	133.3	103	119.7	102.3	129.5	101.9
1845	87.3	97.1	239.6	110.8	106.7	121	102.3	114.8	102.8
1846	94.6	95.3	143.8	116.9	106.2	123.9	111	111	106.4
1847	94.7	97.6	110.7	120.6	108.2	112.5	120.3	121.7	106.5
1848	83.5	87.5	106.1	119.7	105.3	113	121.7	125.6	101.4
1849	79	82.2	100	124.9	97.6	111	120.5	109.8	98.7
1850	85.5	91.3	102.6	114.8	102.2	123.6	125.6	107.7	102.3
1851	90.6	94.7	97.3	119.2	97.2	125.8	120	102.7	105.9
1852	88.7	88.7	93.5	117.7	100.4	111.8	111.9	100.5	102.7
1853	101.2	98.6	101.6	122.8	103.2	107	118.7	109.2	109.1
1854	105.9	97.4	106.8	125.6	114.1	110.7	121.2	108.4	212.9
1855	111.8	94.7	121.1	117.8	103.4	129.2	121.2	115.2	113.1
1856	110.4	100.6	126.4	115.3	102.8	135.5	115.5	121.6	113.2
1857	117.5	106	113.3	110.4	105	126.8	116.8	110	112.5
1858	94.6	98	111.4	101.3	103.8	116	108.7	97.1	101.8
1859	98.8	101.1	98.8	100.1	98.7	104.2	103.2	100.8	100.2
1860	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1861	95.8	94.9	103.5	102.5	108.9	101.3	96.8	100.7	100.6
1862	107.7	121.1	94.8	114.3	145.6	113.6	87.3	101.2	114.9
1863	91.7	132	73.8	96.5	122.1	101	84.8	89	102.4
1864	106.6	167.7	115.9	115.6	142.3	109.5	105.9	99.3	122.5
1865	100.1	138.4	110	88.5	84.2	125.6	83.8	93.8	100.3
1866	124.1	161.7	200.2	122.1	133.4	164.3	132.3	122.1	136.3
1867	121.8	133.7	145.8	119.8	132.8	156.9	118.2	119.9	127.9
1868	118.6	106	157.9	108.7	125.8	128.4	97.4	118.5	115.9
1869	120.1	108.8	152.5	104.2	122.3	118.7	89	119.7	113.2
1870	126.8	114.9	162	105.4	122.3	123.3	100.2	122.6	117.3
1871	152.9	120.4	130.2	110.4	136.8	125.9	116.1	134.4	122.9
1872	122.2	131.1	136.8	117.3	153	122.8	112.9	121.6	127.2
1873	115.2	121.5	119.4	115.2	152.5	125.6	96.8	117.5	122
1874	118	114.8	134.3	108.7	139	131.8	98.3	116.5	119.4
1875	116	106.8	139.1	104.4	127.7	128.2	84.4	109.2	113.4
1876	109.1	95.3	128.2	96.1	121.7	108	77.3	101.2	104.8
1877	113.3	95.9	101.7	94.2	118.5	115.2	74.4	111.3	104.4
1878	105.5	91.9	91.7	90.8	115.2	112.6	73.3	110.2	99.9
1879	97.6	91.1	95.3	88.4	115.1	110.9	68.6	102.1	96.6
1880	107.6	104.5	100.2	96.3	130.9	113.1	85.2	109.8	106.9
1881	110.9	99.9	113.7	91.1	131.3	110.4	77.6	108 8	105.7
1882	118.8	98.7	110.1	91.2	137.5	107.6	78.1	114.6	108.5
1883	118.8	94.8	114.2	87.5	134.3	98.1	77.5	117.3	106
1884	108.9	88.9	102.4	81	129.5	95.7	76.3	111.9	99.4
1885	98.7	84.8	89.6	77.4	126.6	86.9	70.1	97.5	93
1886	99.5	85.1	86.2	75.8	128.5	83.9	68.4	91.3	91.9
1887	104.2	84.7	88.6	74.9	126.5	83.6	66.4	88.6	92.6
1888	109.4	84.7	94.9	74.9	124.8	86	66.9	89.3	94.2
1889	111.9	83.6	95.3	72.9	124	88.8	70	88.8	94.2
1890	104.6	82.4	92.5	72.2	123.7	87.9	69.5	89.7	92.3
1891	103.9	81.1	91	74.9	122.3	86.3	70.1	95.1	92.2

a In converting currency prices into gold we have used the value of $100 gold in currency as given for January of each year in the American Almanac for 1878, as follows: 1862, $102.5; 1863, $145.1; 1864, $155.5; 1865, $216.2; 1866, $140.1; 1867, $134.6; 1868, $138.5; 1869, $135.6; 1870, $121.3; 1871, $110.7; 1872, $109.1; 1873, $112.7; 1874, $111.4; 1875, $112.5; 1876, $112.8; 1877, $106.2, and 1878, $101.4.

The table shows a decline, mostly in manufactured articles. For instance, fuel and lighting show a decline from the basic line of 100 in 1860 to 91 in 1891; house-furnishing goods show a decline from the same line to 70.1; the first, 9 per cent; the second, 30 per cent.

Take clothing. The decline is to 81.1 from the basic line of 100 in 1860. Then compare with lumber and building materials, where we find a rise to 122.3, which is an advance of 22 per cent. The fall in clothing is 21 points from 100; the rise in food is 3 per cent. The table shows a decline in manufactured articles where inventive methods have been mostly applied, and an actual rise in some where it is manifest no great inventive skill has been adopted.

The average, 92.3, is only a fall of 7.7 from 1860 to 1891.

There are also some instructive instances of the decline and rise of prices by taking the period from 1840 to 1860. Fuel and lighting, in 1840, stood at 395.8; in 1859, at 98; drugs and chemicals, at 145.8 in 1840; in 1859, at 104.2; house-furnishing goods in 1840, at 116.4; in 1859, at 103. So there were as violent fluctuations, and more so, in the two decades from 1840 to 1860 as in the three decades from 1860 to 1891. The standard, practically, was gold then as now, but no outcry about the crime of demonetization was heard.

Now, though prices have declined irregularly, human labor has advanced about 30 per cent.

As the efficiency of human exertion increases, so the human toiler is paid more and more, but the product is diminished in cost, and the human toiler feeds his fellow-creatures more cheaply, houses and clothes them better at less cost than ever before in the history of the race. Is this not a blessing, Mr. President?

But it appears that at and about the time civilized nations discarded an inferior to adopt a superior tool of exchange, and a more stable standard of value, there was a surprising development of inventive skill and genius in adopting labor-saving machines to secure larger output with less cost.

So says Mr. D. H. Wells in his work entitled Recent Economic Changes.

As victory after victory is won and as production is constantly cheapened, so will the multitudes of the earth rejoice in the joint blessings bestowed by kind Providence and their own skill and industry.

Sir, I was charmed with the showing made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] in his very able speech in the Senate on the 10th instant of the prosperity of the woolen factories in the United States. But I was startled when he diverted my gaze from the roseate picture of prosperity and advancement in the woolen industry to have them turned by the same magic tongue of eloquence to the irrepressible conflict between two metals. He hoped, and the hope implied a fear, that the "conflict" would not be settled by the sword.

Sir, our country is advancing with more rapid strides than any country ever did before under God's kind heaven. Wealth, though abnormally large in some cases, is more evenly distributed, life and liberty are better protected, comfort and happiness are more universal, than in any country or in any clime. And we pause in the midst of our greatness and wealth and comfort and liberty to almost come to arms about whether one bit of metal should circulate as money with another bit of metal at 16 to 1.

You and I, Mr. President, are to have nothing to say about it, the trading world is to have nothing to say about, the parties to an exchange are to have nothing to say about it, but a kind, paternal Government, by statutory law, by force, as it were, of governmental wind, is to say these two bits of metal shall circulate at the talismanic figure of 16 to 1.

Sir, I know it is a pleasing statement to make to the ordinary man: "My friend, you haven't money enough; these money kings are keeping you out of half your money." Says the man, "How am I to get it? Of course I haven't enough." "The easiest thing in the world. Just make your representatives in Congress vote for a law to admit silver to free coinage at 16 to 1 and you will have all you want. All the silver will come in and your corn, oats, wheat, and cotton will run up to double the present price."

This pleasing delusion is seized on with avidity, and the followers of the silver standard are arrayed as a hostile camp against those who have the temerity to think that government can not put more value on a piece of metal than the estimate of mankind puts upon it.

The report of the Director of the Mint for 1895 shows that in five years from and including 1881 to 1885 there were $99,116,000 produced in the world, and in the year 1894 there were $180,626,100 of gold produced, nearly twice as much in one year as there was in the five years mentioned, and the production of gold from 1887 shows a marked increase, and the production of silver shows no marked decline.

This shows that there need be no alarm about a scarcity of gold. It is produced faster than population increases, and meets the quantitive theory with a complete answer. Another delusion is the per capita argument. It is held that because France has some $40 per capita, therefore we ought to have $40 per capita.

I annex tables prepared by the Treasury Department, showing that we have now more per capita circulation than we ever had, than we had in the halcyon days of prosperity between 1850 and 1860.

But, sir, no man can tell what the needs of a particular nation may be as to circulation. It is clear that, when the vast majority of business exchanges are conducted without any money, but a small per capita circulation is wanted. Money will inevitably flow where it is most wanted. It is most wanted in large commercial centers, and there it will always flow. Country people have less need of money, have infinitely fewer exchanges, and the idea that everybody's pocket ought to be filled, for no purpose of exchange, is absurd. Mill, page 327, lays down the proposition that credit is purchasing power and affects prices as much as money; consequently does away with money to the extent it is used.

Says Mill:

3. But a more intricate portion of the theory of credit is its influence on prices, the chief cause of most of the mercantile phenomena which perplex observers. In a state of commerce in which much credit is habitually given, general prices at any moment depend much more upon the state of credit than upon the quantity of money. For credit, though it is not productive power, is purchasing power; and a person who, having credit, avails himself of it in the purchase of goods, creates just as much demand for the goods, and tends quite as much to raise their price, as if he made an equal amount of purchases with ready money.

Credit, in short, has exactly the same purchasing power with money, and as money tells upon prices not simply in proportion to its amount, but to its amount multiplied by the number of times it changes hands, so also does credit; and credit transferable from hand to hand is in that proportion more potent than credit which only performs one purchase.

Production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America.

[From 1493 to 1885 is from a table of averages for certain periods compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. For the years 1886 to 1894 the production is the annual estimate of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Period.	Gold.				Silver.				Percentage of production.			
	Annual average for period.		Total for period.		Annual average for period.		Total for period.		By weight.		By value.	
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Coining value.	Fine ounces.	Coining value.	Gold.	Silver.	Gold.	Silver.
1493-1520	186,470	$3,855,000	5,221,160	$107,931,000	1,511,050	$1,954,000	42,309,400	$54,703,000	11	89	66.4	33.6
1521-1544	230,194	4,759,000	5,524,656	114,205,000	2,899,930	3,749,000	69,598,326	89,986,000	7.4	92.6	55.9	44.1
1545-1560	273,596	5,656,000	4,377,544	90,492,000	10,017,940	12,952,000	160,287,040	207,240,000	2.7	97.3	29.4	69.6
1561-1580	219,906	4,546,000	4,398,120	90,917,000	9,628,925	12,450,000	192,578,540	248,990,000	2.2	97.8	30.7	73.3
1581-1600	237,267	4,905,000	4,745,340	98,095,000	13,467,635	17,413,000	269,352,700	348,254,000	1.7	98.3	22	78
1601-1620	273,918	5,662,000	5,478,360	113,248,000	13,596,235	17,579,000	271,924,700	351,579,000	2	98	24.4	75.8
1621-1640	266,845	5,516,000	5,336,900	110,324,000	12,654,240	16,361,000	253,084,800	327,221,000	2.1	97.9	25.2	74.6
1641-1660	281,955	5,828,000	5,639,110	116,571,000	11,776,545	15,226,000	235,530,900	304,525,000	2.3	97.7	27.7	72.3
1661-1680	297,709	6,154,000	5,954,180	123,084,000	10,834,550	14,008,000	216,691,000	280,166,000	2.7	97.3	30.5	69.5
1681-1700	346,095	7,154,000	6,921,895	143,088,000	10,992,085	14,212,000	219,841,700	284,240,000	3.1	96.9	33.5	66.5
1701-1720	412,163	8,520,000	8,243,260	170,403,000	11,432,540	14,781,000	228,650,800	295,629,000	3.5	96.5	36.6	63.4
1721-1740	613,422	12,681,000	12,268,440	253,611,000	13,863,080	17,924,000	277,261,600	358,480,000	4.2	95.8	41.4	58.6
1741-1760	791,211	16,356,000	15,824,230	327,116,000	17,140,612	22,162,000	342,812,235	443,232,000	4.4	95.6	42.5	57.5
1761-1780	665,666	13,761,000	13,313,315	275,211,000	20,985,591	27,133,000	419,711,820	542,658,000	3.1	96.9	33.7	66.3
1781-1800	571,948	11,823,000	11,438,970	236,464,000	28,261,779	36,540,000	565,235,580	730,810,000	2	98	24.4	75.6
1801-1810	571,563	11,815,000	5,715,627	118,152,000	28,746,922	37,168,000	287,469,225	371,677,000	1.9	98.1	24.1	75.9
1811-1820	367,957	7,606,000	3,679,568	76,063,000	17,385,755	22,479,000	173,857,555	214,786,000	2.1	97.9	25.3	74.7
1821-1830	457,044	9,448,000	4,570,444	94,479,000	14,807,004	19,144,000	148,070,040	191,444,000	3	97	33	67
1831-1840	652,291	13,484,000	6,522,913	134,841,000	19,175,867	24,793,000	191,758,675	247,930,000	3.3	96.7	35.2	64.8
1841-1850	1,760,502	36,393,000	17,605,018	363,928,000	25,090,342	32,440,000	250,903,422	324,400,000	6.6	93.4	52.9	47.1
1851-1855	6,410,324	132,513,000	32,051,621	662,566,000	28,488,597	36,824,000	142,442,986	184,169,000	18.4	81.6	78.3	21.7
1856-1860	6,486,262	134,083,000	32,431,312	670,415,000	29,095,428	37,618,000	145,477,142	188,092,000	18.2	81.8	78.1	21.9
1861-1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	29,747,913	614,944,000	35,401,972	45,772,000	177,009,862	228,861,000	14.4	85.6	72.9	27.1
1866-1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	31,350,430	648,071,000	43,051,583	55,663,000	215,257,914	278,313,000	12.7	87.3	70	30
1871-1875	5,591,014	115,577,000	27,955,068	577,883,000	63,317,014	81,864,000	316,585,069	409,322,000	8.1	91.9	58.5	41.5
1876-1880	5,543,110	114,586,000	27,715,550	572,931,000	78,775,602	101,851,000	393,878,009	509,256,000	6.6	93.4	53	47
1881-1885	4,794,755	99,116,000	23,973,773	495,582,000	92,003,944	118,955,000	460,019,722	594,773,000	5	95	45.5	54.5
1886	5,135,679	106,163,900	5,135,679	106,163,900	93,297,290	120,626,800	93,297,290	120,626,800	5.2	94.8	46.8	53.2
1887	5,116,861	105,774,900	5,116,861	105,774,900	96,123,586	124,281,000	96,123,586	124,281,000	5	95	45.9	54.1
1888	5,330,775	110,196,900	5,330,775	110,196,900	108,827,606	140,706,400	108,827,606	140,706,400	4.6	95.4	43.9	56.1
1889	5,973,790	123,489,200	5,973,790	123,489,200	120,213,611	155,427,700	120,213,611	155,427,700	4.7	95.3	44.3	55.7
1890	5,749,306	118,848,700	5,749,306	118,848,700	126,095,062	163,032,000	126,095,062	163,032,000	4.3	95.7	42.1	57.9
1891	6,320,194	130,650,000	6,320,194	130,650,000	137,170,919	177,352,300	137,170,919	177,352,300	4.4	95.6	42.4	57.6
1892	7,102,180	146,815,100	7,102,180	146,815,100	153,151,762	198,014,400	153,151,762	198,014,400	4.4	95.6	42.5	57.5
1893	7,608,787	157,287,600	7,608,787	157,287,600	166,092,047	214,745,300	166,092,047	214,745,300	4.4	95.6	42.4	57.6
1894	8,737,788	180,626,100	8,737,788	180,626,100	167,752,561	216,892,200	167,752,561	216,892,200	4.9	95.1	45.6	54.4
Total			415,080,077	8,580,467,400			7,836,325,160	10,131,814,100	5	95	45.6	54.1

Statement of the coin and paper circulation of the United States from 1860 to 1894, inclusive.

Year.	Coin in United States, including bullion in Treasury.	Paper money in United States.	Total money.	Coin, bullion, and paper money in Treasury.	Circulation.	Population.	Money in United States per capita.	Circulation per capita.
1860	$235,000,000	$207,102,477	$442,102,477	$6,695,225	$435,407,252	31,443,321	$14.06	$13.85
1861	250,000,000	202,005,767	452,005,767	3,600,000	448,405,767	32,064,000	14.09	13.98
1862	25,000,000	333,452,079	358,452,079	23,754,335	334,697,744	32,704,000	10.96	10.23
1863	25,000,000	649,867,283	674,867,283	79,473,245	595,394,038	33,365,000	20.23	17.84
1864	25,000,000	680,588,067	705,588,067	35,946,589	669,641,478	34,046,000	20.72	19.67
1865	25,000,000	745,129,755	770,129,755	55,426,760	714,702,995	34,748,000	22.16	20.57
1866	25,000,000	729,327,254	754,327,254	80,839,010	673,488,244	35,469,000	21.27	18.99
1867	25,000,000	703,200,612	728,200,612	66,208,543	661,992,069	36,211,000	20.11	18.28
1868	25,000,000	691,553,578	716,553,578	36,449,917	680,103,661	36,973,000	19.38	18.39
1869	25,000,000	690,351,180	715,351,180	50,898,289	664,452,891	37,756,000	18.95	17.60
1870	25,000,000	697,868,461	722,868,461	47,655,667	675,212,794	38,558,371	18.73	17.50
1871	25,000,000	716,812,174	741,812,174	25,923,169	715,889,005	39,555,000	18.75	18.10
1872	25,000,000	737,721,565	762,721,565	24,412,016	738,309,549	40,596,000	18.70	18.19
1873	25,000,000	749,445,610	774,445,610	22,563,801	751,881,809	41,677,000	18.58	18.04
1874	25,000,000	781,024,781	806,024,781	29,941,750	776,083,031	42,796,000	18.83	18.13
1875	23,000,000	773,273,509	798,273,509	44,171,562	754,101,947	43,951,000	18.16	17.16
1876	52,418,734	738,264,550	790,683,284	63,073,896	727,609,388	45,137,000	17.52	16.12
1877	65,837,506	697,216,341	763,053,847	40,738,964	722,314,883	46,353,000	16.46	15.58
1878	102,047,907	689,205,669	791,253,576	62,120,942	729,132,634	47,598,000	16.62	15.32
1879	357,268,178	694,253,363	1,051,521,541	232,889,748	818,631,793	48,868,000	21.52	16.75
1880	494,363,884	711,565,313	1,205,929,197	232,546,969	973,382,228	50,155,783	24.04	19.41
1881	647,868,682	758,673,141	1,406,541,823	292,303,704	1,114,238,119	51,316,000	27.41	21.71
1882	703,974,839	776,556,880	1,480,531,719	306,241,300	1,174,290,419	52,495,000	28.20	22.37
1883	769,740,048	873,749,768	1,643,489,816	413,184,120	1,230,305,696	53,693,000	30.60	22.91
1884	801,068,939	904,385,250	1,705,454,189	461,528,220	1,243,925,969	54,911,000	31.06	22.65
1885	872,175,823	945,482,513	1,817,658,336	525,089,721	1,292,568,615	56,148,000	32.37	23.02
1886	903,027,304	905,532,390	1,808,559,694	555,859,169	1,252,700,525	57,404,000	31.50	21.82
1887	1,007,513,901	892,928,771	1,900,442,672	582,903,529	1,317,539,143	58,680,000	32.39	22.45
1888	1,092,391,690	970,564,259	2,062,955,949	690,785,079	1,372,170,870	59,974,000	34.39	22.88
1889	1,100,612,434	974,738,277	2,075,350,711	694,989,062	1,380,361,649	61,289,000	33.86	22.52
1890	1,152,471,638	991,754,521	2,144,226,159	714,974,889	1,429,251,270	62,622,250	34.24	22.83
1891	1,163,185,054	1,032,039,021	2,195,224,075	697,783,368	1,497,440,707	63,975,000	34.31	23.41
1892	1,232,854,331	1,139,745,170	2,372,599,501	771,252,314	1,601,347,187	65,520,000	36.21	24.44
1893	1,213,413,584	1,109,988,808	2,323,402,392	726,701,147	1,596,701,245	66,946,000	34.70	23.85
1894	1,252,071,667	1,169,390,080	2,421,461,747	759,626,073	1,661,835,674	68,397,000	35.40	24.30

NOTE 1.—Specie payments were suspended from January 1, 1862, to January 1, 1870. During the greater part of that period gold and silver coins were not in circulation except on the Pacific Coast, where, it is estimated, the specie circulation was generally about $25,000,000. This estimated amount is the only coin included in the above statement from 1862 to 1875, inclusive.

NOTE 2.—In 1876 subsidiary silver again came into use, and is included in this statement, beginning with that year.

NOTE 3.—The coinage of standard silver dollars began in 1878 under the act of February 28, 1878.

NOTE 4.—Specie payments were resumed January 1, 1879, and all gold and silver coins, as well as gold and silver bullion in the Treasury, are included in this statement from and after that date.

NOTE 5.—This table represents the circulation of the United States as shown by the revised statements of the Treasury Department for June 30 of each of the years specified.

Statement of the specie and bank-note circulation of the United States in the years specified from 1800 to 1859.

Year.	Number of banks and branches.	Estimated bank notes outstanding.	Estimated specie in United States.	Total money in United States.	Specie in Treasury.	Money in circulation.	Population.	Per capita.
1800	----------	$10,500,000	$17,500,000	$28,000,000	e$1,500,000	$26,500,000	5,308,483	$4.99
1810	----------	28,000,000	30,000,000	58,000,000	e3,000,000	55,000,000	7,239,881	7.60
1820	----------	44,800,000	24,300,000	69,100,000	e2,000,000	67,100,000	9,633,822	6.96
1830	----------	61,000,000	32,100,000	93,100,000	5,755,705	87,344,295	12,866,020	6.69
1831	----------	77,000,000	32,100,000	109,100,000	6,014,540	93,085,460	13,221,000	7.04
1832	----------	91,500,000	30,400,000	121,900,000	4,502,914	117,397,086	13,590,000	8.64
1833	----------	91,500,000	30,650,000	122,150,000	2,011,778	120,138,222	13,974,000	8.60
1834	506	94,839,570	41,000,000	135,839,570	11,702,905	124,136,665	14,373,000	8.64
1835	704	103,692,495	51,000,000	154,692,495	8,892,858	145,799,637	14,786,000	9.86
1836	713	140,301,038	65,000,000	205,301,038	e5,000,000	200,301,038	15,213,000	13.17
1837	788	149,185,890	73,000,000	222,185,890	e5,000,000	217,185,890	15,655,000	13.87
1838	829	116,138,910	87,500,000	203,638,910	e5,000,000	198,638,910	16,112,000	12.33
1839	840	135,170,995	87,000,000	222,170,995	2,466,932	219,704,033	16,584,000	13.26
1840	901	106,968,572	83,000,000	189,968,572	3,663,084	186,305,488	17,069,453	10.91
1841	784	107,290,214	80,000,000	187,290,214	987,345	186,302,869	17,591,000	10.59
1842	692	83,734,011	80,000,000	163,734,011	230,484	163,503,527	18,132,000	9.02
1843	691	58,563,608	90,000,000	148,563,608	1,449,472	147,114,136	18,694,000	7.87
1844	696	75,167,646	100,000,000	175,167,646	7,857,380	167,310,266	19,276,000	8.68
1845	707	89,608,711	96,000,000	185,608,711	7,658,306	177,950,405	19,878,000	8.95
1846	707	105,552,427	97,000,000	202,552,427	9,126,439	193,425,988	20,500,000	9.43
1847	715	105,519,766	120,000,000	225,519,766	1,701,251	223,818,515	21,143,000	10.59
1848	751	128,506,091	112,000,000	240,506,091	8,101,353	232,404,738	21,805,000	10.66
1849	782	114,743,415	120,000,000	234,743,415	2,184,964	232,558,451	22,489,000	10.34
1850	824	131,366,526	154,000,000	285,366,526	6,604,544	278,761,982	23,191,876	12.02
1851	879	155,165,251	186,000,000	341,165,251	10,911,646	330,253,605	23,995,000	13.76
1852	----------	171,673,000	204,000,000	375,673,000	14,632,136	361,040,864	24,802,000	14.63
1853	----------	188,181,000	236,000,000	424,181,000	21,942,893	402,238,107	25,615,000	15.80
1854	1,208	204,689,207	241,000,000	445,689,207	20,137,967	425,551,240	26,433,000	16.10
1855	1,307	186,952,223	250,000,000	436,952,223	18,931,976	418,020,247	27,256,000	15.34
1856	1,398	195,747,950	250,000,000	445,747,950	19,901,325	425,846,625	28,083,000	15.16
1857	1,416	214,778,822	260,000,000	474,778,822	17,710,114	457,068,708	28,916,000	15.81
1858	1,422	155,208,344	260,000,000	415,208,344	6,398,316	408,810,028	29,753,000	13.78
1859	1,476	193,306,818	250,000,000	443,306,818	4,339,276	438,967,542	30,596,000	14.35

e Specie in Treasury estimated.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. If the quantity of the metal in circulation does not affect the value of money and of commodities, why is it that the Senator argues that if we coin so much silver and there is more silver to coin the price of it will go down? He argues in one breath, permit me to say, against the quantitative theory of money and then he urges the quantitative theory of money against the coinage of silver. If the quantity of money in circulation does not affect the value of money and the value of commodities, I ask how is it that he argues that the multiplication of silver dollars will depreciate the currency and injure trade?

Mr. CAFFERY. The Senator from Virginia will pardon me. I never said the multiplication of silver dollars will not affect the currency at all. I have conterded and do contend that the coinage of silver at 16 to 1 will contract the currency just precisely by the amount of gold we possess, because I believe the

admission of silver to coinage at 16 to 1 will inevitably run out the gold.

Mr. DANIEL. Where will it run the gold to, if the Senator will allow me to ask him?

Mr. CAFFERY. It will run the gold to the four corners of the globe.

Mr. DANIEL. Now, will the Senator allow me to ask him another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. If gold is driven to Europe and other countries by the coinage of silver in this country, will not the gold that goes to those countries swell the volume of currency in gold there; and swelling the volume of currency in gold, will it not increase the prices of cotton, corn, wheat, meat, and other things that we send to the markets in which there is that increase in the volume of money?

Mr. CAFFERY. That is a hypothetical question which hardly admits of an answer yea or nay. A large portion of the gold would be hoarded. A very large portion of the silver used now in silver countries would be displaced by gold. To that extent I believe there would be no increase of the currency of Europe, because the gold would simply supply the place now held by silver. However, I have not held that there is nothing in the quantitative theory. I say there is not everything in the quantitative theory, as applied to metallic money.

I have argued that credit in the shape that credit now purchases in the United States and England has just as much effect upon prices as purchases made in metallic money. That has been my argument. I say the amount of money that is necessary to circulate the products of any particular country is of all matters the most difficult of exact arithmetical computation, for money is valuable as a vehicle of exchange in proportion to the rapidity of its circulation, in proportion to the number of exchanges it effects. One dollar will sometimes do as much with a highly commercial people as a hundred dollars. Therefore, you can not say, in my opinion, that this nation, that nation, or the other nation has to have a circulating medium just exactly proportioned to its population.

The fact is that more silver coin is used now in this country under a gold standard than was ever used under a bimetallic standard. Gold countries use silver as a necessary adjunct; but silver countries do not and can not use gold. It will not circulate where a cheap metal is the standard. But another fact of pregnant importance is that wherever gold has become the standard of value it has never been supplanted by silver in modern times; but silver has been dethroned from supremacy in every advanced nation and can not regain its sway.

The charge that the rulers and bankers of the earth are combined to ruin the masses by maintaining a standard constantly appreciating, and thereby constantly depreciating all commodities, is hardly worth considering. No banker will ruin himself. No ruler will despoil his subjects simply to despoil. The ruler, the banker, the toiler, and the beggar stand on the same plane as to sound money.

Civilization, from diversity of pursuits, from difference in intelligence and of industry, makes wide differences in human beings and in human possessions. It is the penalty for enlightenment and advancement. The savage alone remains in an equality of ignorance and of property. As man advances to a higher plane the difference between human toilers becomes marked. All along the incline that leads to the summit of civilization the busy throngs struggling for the top are separated from each other by various gaps. They pass and repass and constantly change places. It is decreed thus in the economy of God.

And who will chide at the divine arrangement which makes some hewers of wood and some drawers of water, so that in the school of adversity and poverty those powers and qualities are developed that make men rulers of men and princes of the earth; that make the foremost in the column give way to the superior energy and ability of those in the rear; that place a French lieutenant on the imperial throne of France, and a rail splitter in the Presidential chair of the greatest, freest Republic of the world?

I have tried to prove—

First. That value only originates from the estimation that parties to an exchange of commodities place upon the commodities offered in exchange.

Second. That metallic money is a commodity and is subject in every exchange to this estimate.

Third. That the estimate, being subjective and mental, can not be made by governmental statute.

Fourth. That when two metals are attempted to be held by a legal tie, one or the other will become underrated by the commercial ratio, which is the estimate placed upon it by exchangers, and therefore will leave circulation.

Fifth. That consequently bimetallism is really monometallism.

Sixth. That in case the United States adopted 16 to 1, when the commercial ratio is 32 to 1, gold would leave circulation, and we would be on a silver basis.

Seventh. That no man can contemplate this result without a shudder at the fearful loss, ruin, and disorder that would ensue.

Mr. President, I have here a speech delivered in Texas by Judge George N. Aldredge, and I propose, with the consent of the Senate, to insert it in my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SPEECH OF JUDGE GEORGE N. ALDREDGE, OF DALLAS, TEX., ON THE FREE COINAGE OF SILVER.

The proposition that this Government should coin silver for the world, in unlimited amount, at double its market value, is so repugnant to the common sense of mankind that it ought to be unnecessary to discuss it, and would be but for the fact that a portion of our people have been misled by appeals to their prejudice and by the specious reasoning of sophists. If our Government were asked to declare that 2 quarts equaled a gallon, or to revise the multiplication table and enact that 10 times 10 equaled 200, all men would see the folly; but when asked to believe that $10 worth of silver, by being touched by the Government stamp, instantly becomes worth $20, many people honestly believe this miracle may be accomplished, and many others affect to believe it for practical purposes. In all ages of the world there have been delusions in reference to money, and in spite of uniform disastrous results many are ever ready to listen to the teachings of any charlatan who claims that he has discovered a shorter route to wealth. They refuse to apply to money that hard common sense which they exercise in dealing with the everyday affairs of life. The ignorant have always had superstitions about silver. Among the negroes of the South nothing would kill a witch but a silver bullet.

That our ancestors a hundred years ago fixed a unit of value in gold or silver and fixed a ratio between them is immaterial to us. Their example in so doing is not more binding on us than their methods of business, their means of transportation, or the implements with which they sowed and reaped. It would be a sad commentary upon our intelligence if we had learned nothing in a hundred years. We do know that in fixing a ratio they attributed no magic to the Government stamp, but sought diligently to ascertain the market value of the two metals in the leading nations of the world, and conformed, as they thought, strictly to this market ratio. By pursuing the method adopted by them we would now fix the ratio at about 32 to 1.

The consistent man is not the one who stands in one place always, regardless of the changing conditions around him, but it is he who, with intelligence and circumspection, adapts himself to the changed condition of affairs. For nearly twenty years every enlightened nation in the world has been on a gold-standard basis. They are all representative governments and their laws are made by their people and for their people. The government which first established the gold standard is more obedient to the will of its people than ours is. When an important administration measure is defeated by the representatives of the English people, the government is immediately placed in the hands of the opposition. The gold standard nations are those that have reclaimed the world from barbarism, and have given it all its learning and invention; where schools and churches abound; where the dignity of man is maintained and labor properly rewarded; and they control the commerce of the world.

These nations, after testing gold and silver for hundreds of years, voluntarily adopted the gold standard. No nation to-day has the silver standard from choice. It is only because they are weak and helpless to remedy the evil that any of them remain on a silver basis. But to-day the United States, the foremost nation in all the earth in solvency and resources, in intelligence and energy, is seriously invited to abandon the standard of civilization and commerce and to consort with half-civilized, half-clad people, who are weak and ignorant; who have little or no commerce; where bull fights abound and schools do not; where human labor is in sharp competition with the meek and lowly jackass; where a breech-clout is preferred to a full suit, and where the bulk of the people know no more about a standard of value than a mule does about the nebular hypothesis. Surely we would do well to take a look at the company before we sit down to the feast.

The invitation is that this country, after having adjusted its enormous business for twenty years to a gold standard, shall suddenly readjust all business and all values to what is termed a double standard of gold and silver. The arguments advanced in behalf of such a change are:

First. A double standard resting upon gold and silver would give a more correct measure of value and one less liable to fluctuation than a single gold standard.

Second. Gold has appreciated in value and all property measured by it has declined in value.

Third. The supply of gold is inadequate to make it a safe standard and the scarcity of it will tend to the depression of prices.

Fourth. The free, unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will create unlimited demand for silver and restore it to par.

Fifth. Free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 will increase the prices of property.

With reference to the first proposition: A standard of value is some exact measure which enters into and becomes a part of every contract and to which all obligations are referable. If our Government could, by legal enactment, fix the value of gold and silver in the markets of the world and could keep them adjusted to a fixed ratio, a double standard would be practicable. But it can not fix or maintain value; the buyers of the world—the merchants—do that. When Abraham purchased his lot in Ephron's cemetery he weighed out to Ephron silver "current money with the merchant." And the merchants of the world have been saying what shall be "current money" from that day to this.

Governments are as powerless to suspend the law of value as they are to suspend the law of gravitation. Such being the case, I can conceive of two standards, one of gold and the other of silver, and contracts might be made referable to either standard; but the indeterminate double standard, resting on two metals, not linked together by any binding obligation, but both acting under go-as-you-please rules, is to me absolutely incomprehensible. We can not bind them together as we do two metals in the pendulum of a clock, or in the mainspring of a watch.

No people ever did business under the imaginary double standard, and every attempt to enforce it has resulted in alternating from one standard to the other. England tried it for four hundred and seventy years and it was an utter failure. France changed her ratio 118 times in twelve years trying to walk the double-standard tight rope. We tried it, and went first to a silver basis, then to a gold basis, then to a paper basis, and then back to a gold basis. The phrase, "double standard," is a contradiction of terms. Standard means correct measure, and there can not be two different correct measures of value, any more than there can be two different correct weights to sell by, two different correct compasses to sail by, or two different correct thermome-

ters to measure temperature by. If one measure is correct, the other can not differ from it and be correct. It is an inexorable law of money that when two metals are coined at a fixed ratio and both made legal tender, if either is undervalued in the coinage law the undervalued metal goes out of circulation.

About the middle of the fourteenth century Nicholas Oresme, the father of finance in France, announced his great law to Charles V; one hundred and thirty years later Copernicus, the founder of modern astronomy, announced it to the Prussians, and thirty-two years still later Gresham announced it to Queen Elizabeth. Macaulay, in his History of England, shows how perfectly this law worked in England, and eloquently describes the direful consequences. He was describing coins debased by clipping, but still legal tender. A coin is just as bad when debased by overvaluation in coinage as when clipped or counterfeited. In the one case the creditor is deceived and in the other he is forced. It is simply the difference between theft and robbery. The law of money has never failed. We know what will be its operation just as we know that the deadliest poison will kill because it always has killed.

The gold-standard advocates believe in gold as a standard with the largest possible safe use of silver among the people. The 16 to 1 dreamers believe in the so-called double standard and we are driven by this law to the use of silver alone. All gold-standard countries use large amounts of silver and no silver-standard country uses any gold whatever. As the practical question is the use of the metals, it follows that we are the bimetallists and the 16 to 1 people are the monometallists. Hence, the battle that is to be fought to a finish next year is whether we will remain under a gold standard with actual bimetallism in use among the people—gold and silver circulating freely without discrimination against either; or shall we have a so-called double standard at the mints and nowhere else, with silver monometallism in actual use? The battle is between substance and shadow, between those who want bimetallism in fact and those who want it in name only.

We are the friends of silver money, who would bring to its aid the power of the Government to keep it good, and they are its enemies, who, by unlimited coinage, would take from it the guaranty of parity by the Government, and thereby degrade it to its market value. Our Government has been and is now coining silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. It is enabled to do this because under the law it can restrict the amount coined, and being vested with this control it undertakes to make every dollar good money. The moment the Government loses control of the coinage, confidence in its ability to protect the money issued is gone, and a silver dollar then rests on its merits and is worth 50 cents. To illustrate: A merchant could very well guarantee the expenses of his clerk if he were allowed to control the expenses, but if the clerk demanded free and unlimited expenses, then the merchant would have to "stand from under" and let the expenses take care of themselves.

We hear a great deal of indignant declamation because the Government does not pay its "coin" obligations in silver. To maintain the parity between gold and silver it is essential that the Government in receiving its dues and paying its debts must ignore the inferiority of silver, just as a mother pretends not to see the limp of her lame child. This gives the option of metals to the person dealing with the Government, whether as debtor or creditor. If the Government should discriminate against silver by refusing to receive it for dues or by insisting on paying it instead of gold, that moment the parity would be gone and the silver in every man's pocket would be at a discount. Its coinage being under the control of the Government, the Government makes it good at its counter, and this makes it good at every counter in the world.

If there is anything in the double-standard-stability idea we ought to work for it for all it is worth. If two metals will fix value better than one, then three metals will beat two, and four beat three, and by having eight or ten metals in the standard we can anchor it so that it will not crawl an inch in a thousand years.

The second proposition is that gold has appreciated, and thereby depressed prices. The same cause operating upon a number of articles will produce the same effect in all those not affected by a contravening cause. When we contemplate prices we find that since the gold standard was adopted, February 12, 1873, some articles have declined in value, some have remained stationary, while some have risen in value; and no contravening causes will account for the failure of gold to depress all alike. We find that no two articles have declined at the same time or in the same degree, nor has any one article remained uniformly depressed. This demonstrates that, as to those articles that have declined, no one controlling cause can be assigned as having produced these results.

The stock argument of the 16-to-1 people is that wheat and cotton have declined, and they seem to gloat over the fact. I knew an old negro who, when asked how he was getting along, always replied, "Poorly, thank God," and they are thankful when the country is poorly on wheat and cotton. Since 1873 the vast fertile prairies of the Northwest have been turned into wheat fields, so that the production of wheat in the United States has been doubled since then. The same thing has been going on in Russia and South America. The wonderful improvements in machinery for harvesting wheat and the extension of railroads for transporting it to market gave an immense impetus to the production of it. A farmer can make more money raising it at 50 cents per bushel to-day than he could at $1 per bushel twenty years ago.

The result has been that the overproduction of wheat has reduced its price, and the gold standard had nothing to do with the reduction. Its price is regulated by supply and demand. Last May a little bug settled down on the wheat fields of the Northwest and in one or two weeks ate up one-half of the 16 to 1 argument on prices and sent the prices back into the neighborhood of those of 1873. The old hayseeds, who knew the habits of the chinch bug and the kind of a multiplication table he used in regulating the increase in his family, took the trains for Chicago, commenced buying wheat and broke all the smartaleks in the city. They may have talked gold-standard depression at home, but they put their money on the chinch bug in the city, and won.

The caterpiller and bollworm can do the same thing for cotton. I only know the chinch bug by reputation, but I am personally acquainted with these worms. They are composed of appetite and skin. They do not care a tinker's blessing for anybody's standard, and when they invade the cotton fields of the South they send the price of cotton up in every mart of the world, gold standard or no gold standard. They have been doing business with us this summer and have moved the price of cotton up 60 per cent. This bug and these worms have not many friends, but as sluggers in an argument with a 16 to 1 crank they are entitled to the belt.

Cotton brought $1 a pound in New York during the war, and 30 or 40 cents a pound the first year after the war, on account of the four years' cotton famine from 1861 to 1865, and it was several years getting down to its normal price. The price declined when we made too much of it. The largest cotton crop made with slave labor was 4,669,770 bales, and I remember it was confidently predicted that no such crop would ever be made with free labor. The crop of 1872 was less than 3,000,000 bales, and we gradually increased it to a little less than 10,000,000 bales in 1894. India, Egypt, and Brazil are also raising larger crops of cotton. The immense crop of 1894 was thrown upon a market illy prepared to receive it. For three years there had been less cotton goods consumed than usual, owing to the world-wide panic and depression of business following the Baring failure, and these two conditions meeting, overproduction and underconsumption, brought cotton down to a very low price.

Some of the Populists tell us there can not be overproduction until every man, woman, and child in the world has a rotund stomach and a full suit of clothes. This is based upon the communistic idea that it is the duty of the Government to take care of every loafer who is too lazy to work for a living, and is too contemptible to waste an answer on. If the gold standard depressed wheat and cotton, it was surely loaded at both ends, for it has shot some things up in price. The corn crop of the United States is more valuable than both the wheat and cotton crops combined.

The crop of corn made just preceding the gold standard, in 1872, sold for 34 cents at gold figures, and the crop of 1894 was worth 45 cents in gold, and it has generally been above the 1872 price. The oat crop is about equal to the wheat crop; oats were worth 29 cents in 1872 and 32 cents in 1894. Fat beef steers were worth $40 in gold in 1872 and $60 in gold in 1895. Hogs are worth more now than they were in 1872 and have generally been higher than they were then. The farmers' wives get as much in gold now for butter, chickens, and eggs as they did in greenbacks in 1872, and this crop is more valuable than the wheat and cotton crops combined.

Tobacco, potatoes, bacon, hay, coffee, leather, whisky, and a hundred other things have not declined in price. The labor crop is equal in value to all other crops combined, and it has steadily advanced in price. Land is much more valuable in gold now than in 1872, notwithstanding it was depressed by the panic of 1892 and 1893. The price of wool has declined, but the world's production of it since 1872 has doubled and the use of it has been partly supplanted by the use of cotton goods. Horses have declined, but the railroads, electric cars, and bicycles are doing the work they did.

The cost of the production of an article fixes its value. This is necessarily so, because if the profit is large, others will be attracted to the business until the price is brought to its proper level. All articles manufactured by machinery have declined in price, for the reason that with each invention the cost of producing the article is lessened. Human genius has produced more results for cheapening production in the last fifty years than in all the ages of the world before that time. These grand triumphs of man over matter, instead of showing depression from a standard of value, show forth the glory and dignity of the human intellect, and are an unmixed blessing to the whole human family. Could anyone outside of a lunatic asylum attribute all these diverse and inconsistent movements of prices to one cause, and that cause acting evenly and uniformly upon all things alike?

Interest has declined since 1872 in my part of the country from 3 per cent per month to 6 and 8 per cent per annum. There is no denying the fact that the gold bugs did that. The South and West have saved more on the decline of interest than they have lost in the decline in wheat and cotton. Interest is always low under an honest standard, among an honest people, where money is plentiful. It is lower in London than in any other spot on the globe, because her standard is stable and her commercial integrity has been the care of her statesmen and her people for ages past. England's punctuality in meeting her obligations has made London the clearing house of the world.

Tyre was the London of ancient times. Seated on the eastern end of the Mediterranean, she reigned queen of commerce for centuries. The scepter of commercial greatness passed from her when her own children reared Carthage at the other end of that sea. Some three hundred years ago England planted colonies in America, and to-day the United States is England's only formidable rival for the commerce of the world. The object lesson of ancient history is being repeated. If the insatiable mine owners, by use of their millions, and the place-hunting demagogues, by unctuous appeals to prejudice, succeed in driving this country from the standard of civilization and commerce, the standard that announces integrity at home and inspires confidence abroad, to a flat standard and silver basis, then England will have no rival to grapple with her in the marts of the world.

The third proposition is that the supply of gold is insufficient to make it a correct standard, and its scarcity will tend to depress prices. The average annual output of gold of the world for the first half of this century, in round numbers, was $15,000,000. From 1851 to 1865, covering the gold boom in California and Australia, the yearly average was $130,000,000. The output for 1893 was $155,000,000, and for 1894 $181,000,000. The birth rate among gold-using countries is not increasing, while the production of gold is on the increase, as just stated. This answer ought to satisfy even the extreme 16 to 1 people—the "per capita" Populist—especially in view of the fact that improvements in power and machinery are being applied to the production of gold, while the genius of invention finds no inducement offered nor field for operation in the population business.

My next answer is that the more highly enlightened the world becomes, and the greater the improvements in business methods, the less necessity there is for the use of actual money of any kind. Steam and electricity have so knitted civilized people together that they are practically one community. Business men speak to each other around the world as if they were assembled in the same building. Their business is done on a system of credits, without the use of money, except for ultimate settlement, Nor is this method confined to business men. It is broadening with the evolution of man from a lower to a higher plane of intelligence.

A farmer may now live for a whole year on the fat of the land and never handle a dollar in money during that time. He may receive checks for his crop, deposit them to his credit with a bank, and draw on the bank for what he owes and spends. Neither he nor the men who bought his crop had a dollar in the bank. They only had credit there. The bank owns the money in its vault, and its customers simply have the bank's obligation. Bank credits perform precisely the same work that gold and silver do, and they perform it much quicker and more conveniently. The Scots are the most conservative people in the world, and they have had the best banking system of any people for two hundred years. On a gold reserve of $23,652,000 they support bank credits to the amount of $448,288,000. The best authorities estimate that only one bill of exchange in five hundred thousand is ever paid in money in England. Gold, silver, and other money perform 1 per cent of the exchanges in this country, and credits, in the shape of bills, notes, checks, etc., do the other 99 per cent. The business of the world could no more be done to-day with gold and silver than its inland transportation could be done with ox wagons.

The 16 to 1 orators, in denouncing the act of 1873, assert that half the money of the country was destroyed, and hold out the idea that our money has been contracted to that extent. In 1872 our population was 40,596,000, and our per capita of money was $18.79. In 1894, after the country had been suffering with gold standard for twenty-one years, our population is 68,275,000 and our per capita of money is $35.44, and we have much better money now than we had then. The adoption of the gold standard as a measure of value did not increase the demand for gold for use to any great extent. Alcohol is the standard for measuring the strength of all spirituous liquors, yet that fact has never been found to be very straining on alcohol.

Fourth proposition, that the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 would create unlimited demand for silver and restore it to a par. How the mere coinage of silver can in any way increase its use among the people I am unable to understand. If there was not enough of it for use as money and the Government was limiting the coinage of it, and thereby denying the people the use of it as money, then there would be force in the proposition to increase the coinage of silver. But our condition is exactly the reverse of that. The amount of coined and uncoined silver in the Treasury is $512,000,000, while the amount in circulation is about $107,000,000.

To encourage the use of silver by the people the Government exchanges coined silver at its mints for gold or legal-tender currency, and pays the express charges on the silver to any part of the country. This coined silver is all good money. The dollars are legal tender for all debts in any amount,

and the halves, quarters, and dimes are exchangeable, in sums of $20, for gold or other legal tenders. Notwithstanding the inducement offered by the Government to promote the use of silver, it has hitherto been unable to force into circulation more than about one-fifth of its stock on hand. Then why all this clamor for more coinage? If a man had five times as much blood in his body as his arteries and veins would circulate and four-fifths of it was lying idle around his heart, would anyone say that such a man needed a free and unlimited infusion of blood?

A government can no more induce people to use money they do not want than it can induce them to eat what they do not like. The true place of silver is as a change money. It is indispensible for that purpose and unsuited to any other, and all the silver-tongued orators in the land can not change this fact. The $1, $2.50, and $3 gold pieces were too small and were unpopular as change money, and the Government stopped the coinage of them. On the other hand, silver is not a debt-paying money in any considerable amount, nor the money of commerce, for the reason that it is too bulky and too heavy. When a man gets over $5 or $10 of it, he unloads on the first bank he comes to, and the bank unloads on the Treasury. Thus the circulation of it is limited to just what the people will use. When the people get enough of a thing they know it, and you can not argue with them about it. They are gullible on theories, but intensely practical in business.

We have heard a great deal about demonetization of silver. Let us see the extent of "the great crime of 1873." In 1853, in order to prevent the subsidiary coin from going abroad, the silver half dollar was reduced in weight from 206¼ to 192 grains, and the quarters, dimes, and 5-cent pieces were reduced in the same proportion. These coins were then made a legal tender for only $5 in amount, and the coinage of them for private account was stopped; but the Government purchased the silver bullion and coined them as they were needed. So, no crime was committed in 1873 against the halves, quarters, dimes, and half dimes. That crime was committed under Millard Fillmore.

In 1879 these coins were made legal tender for sums not exceeding $10. In 1873 the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains was left out of the coinage act and the trade dollar of 420 grains was substituted for it. This was done at the request of the Pacific Slope, to enable our dollar to compete with the Mexican dollar of about that weight in China and Japan. The standard dollar was not a legal tender from February 12, 1873, to February 28, 1878, at which time its recoinage was provided for and it was reinstated as a legal tender for all debts, in whatever amount. But $8,000,000 of this "daddy dollar" was coined prior to 1873, out of a total coinage of $1,000,000,000. Jefferson stopped the coinage of it in 1805, and for thirty years not one of them was coined, and the daddies never complained.

They did not have sense enough to see that Jefferson had sold out to Lombard street! These dollars were not in fact legal tenders prior to 1873, because the people did not tender them in payment of debts nor in purchase of goods. They had not been in circulation since Andrew Jackson was President, and hardly any middle-aged man had ever seen one of them. The people had demonetized them by melting them down, or by sending them abroad for that purpose, and to this good day they have never been demonetized in any other way. The act of 1873 simply recognized what the people had done, and for five years continued the policy that the people had been pursuing for nearly half a century. The legal-tender faculty of this dollar was restored to it seventeen years ago.

The Government has $350,000,000 of it on hand now, and has stood ready at all times to furnish it to anybody who wanted it. This is the biography of the demonetization mouse that has been evolved from a mountain of denunciation. The poor little thing never lived but five brief years, and has been as dead as a doornail for seventeen years. While it lived it was so harmless the people paid no attention to it. Shakspeare says, "The evil that men do lives after them." But it is even worse in the case of this mouse. The evil that it did not do lives after it in the shape of grasping mine owners, two-ply editors, and unscrupulous politicians.

We are told that the standard dollar is not primary money. It is not a promise to pay; it is a legal tender for all debts, and it does not have to be redeemed in anything on the face of the earth. If any man can give a better definition of primary money than this I would like to see it.

This Government is the fast friend of silver money and of the people who use it rather than of the American and English corporations who mine silver and would coin it at a fictitious valuation. Prior to 1873 this Government coined $144,000,000 of silver; since then, $537,000,000. In twenty-one years, under a gold standard, nearly four times as much silver was coined as in eighty-one years under the so-called double standard. A certain kind lady always chloroformed her child when she whipped it. Miss Silver was assassinated in 1873, at a time when there was almost none of her in circulation, and since that fatal day she has thrived on assassination and has grown from a living skeleton to be the fat woman in the circus. In contemplating her brilliant post-mortem career I am constrained, with the apostle, to exclaim, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

After 1873 this country prospered as no other ever did for nineteen years, and we are asked to believe that it took this wide-awake nation nineteen years to find out that it was ruined by the legislation of 1873. The negroes in some sections believe in a hoodoo charm which is harmless for a year, and then suddenly develops insanity, fits, etc. The crime of 1873 seems to have worked in a hoodoo way.

The 16 to 1 people tell us that the coinage of silver will create unlimited demand for it. They decline to give us the howness or the whereforeness of this newborn demand, but with childlike faith they expect it to rise in all its beauty, as the fabled Venus rose from the froth of the sea. They say the demand will come; so the Seventh Day Adventists tell us the end will come, and if their picnic comes off first, they will not need silver; the demand will be for free and unlimited water. They contend, if this Government takes all the silver that comes at 16 to 1 silver will be worth par all over the world, and they use an egg argument to prove it.

They say if a merchant advertises that he will pay 25 cents per dozen for eggs, so long as he has the ability to take all that comes eggs will be worth 25 cents in all that country. But suppose the merchant did not take them? Suppose when a farmer drove up to his store the merchant said unto him, "My friend, you have misunderstood me. I am not buying eggs, I am simply counting them; certifying that they are good, and handing them back to you." What would eggs then be worth? The same old 10 or 15 cents per dozen. Under unlimited coinage the Government would not buy silver nor guarantee the value of the coins. It would stamp it "without recourse." Silver would come from every country in the world, and the Government would be a fool to undertake to guarantee the value of the coins by trying to preserve the parity between the metals. If a herder drove a lot of cow ponies through the mint, and they were branded "$100 horse" and delivered to the owner at the other end of the building, it would not improve the breed of the ponies nor create a wild demand for them at the brand price.

Our Government has lost $200,000,000 trying to create demand for silver, for the sole and separate use, behoof, and benefit of the silver mine owner, by buying it when it did not want it and had no need of it; and the silver-mining "villain still pursues" it! Uncle Sam has this silver on hand now. It would load a two-horse wagon train 173 miles long, putting 1,000 pounds on each wagon, and letting them occupy 30 feet each in line; and I am mean enough to want to see him get even with the game before we start a new deal for anybody's benefit.

If the unlimited coinage of silver by our Government could bring it to par, the immediate effect would be to start every mine and mill in the world running at its utmost capacity, a large portion of the unemployed capital of the world would seek this field, and the bowels of the mountains of the earth would be torn asunder to get the benefit of the double price. In 1894 $214,000,000 of silver was mined and sold at about 63 cents per ounce. If the price was raised to 129 cents per ounce, the 16-to-1 price, what would the harvest be? The old rule of three will solve the problem. If a railway engine will run 90 miles an hour on 63 pounds of steam pressure, how fast would it run on 129 pounds of pressure? The blasted thing would have to stop once in a while and wait for its shadow to catch up.

Senator STEWART and his crowd tell us there can be no flood of silver. In Noah's time there was a man of sanguine temperament like that. He was standing on the tip end of a high mountain and the waters were licking his toes. He hailed Noah and begged to be taken in the ark, but Noah had sailing orders from above, and refused to take him aboard. As Noah sailed away he shook his fist at the old man and exclaimed, "Go to the devil with your old dugout, it isn't going to be much of a shower anyway."

The fifth proposition is that 16 to 1 coinage will increase the prices of property. If this Government should open its mints to coinage of the world's silver at 16 to 1, we would go at once to silver monometallism. This is the voice of all history emphasized by the present status of every free-coinage country on the earth. We can no more have bimetallism in actual use and unlimited silver coinage than we can have a square, round object, or dry, wet weather. Wherein would the people be benefited if they get double prices in half-value money? If farmers' products brought double-prices so would the manufacturers.' The benefits and advantages would be equal, except that buyers would always deduct enough to safely cover the fluctuations of silver, and this amount would be a dead loss to producers and a premium to speculators. I knew a boy who sold a cur dog for $100; but he took pay in pups at $20 apiece, so he was not materially benefited by the inflated prices.

The inflationists admit that their scheme is against the interest of all those who live upon fixed salaries. This includes everyone whose services are paid for by the year, month, week or day, from president of a railway system to hod carrier and those who draw pensions from the Government. History teaches that wages have never participated in boom prices created by debauching the money of a country. They have remained about the same whether paid in good or bad money. The wage earner is a traitor to himself and his family when he lets his prejudice lead him to the inflation camp, and agrees to take his fixed pay in a depreciated money. If this 16 to 1 movement should succeed he would find that he had lost all the vantage ground for which he and his brethern had struck and struggled for a hundred years.

The modicum of prosperity in manufacturing interests in Mexico is based on the degradation of their labor. We do not want prosperity at such a price, and we are getting it rapidly without swindling our labor. When the laborer prospers he becomes a consumer and his prosperity reacts upon and benefits all other interests. In Mexico they have many refined and wealthy people, but their laborer is a peon. He gets from 10 to 30 cents per day in money worth half its face value. He lives in a miserable mud hut, eats the poorest food that will keep his body alive, wears the meanest cloth that will hide it, and is even denied the privilege of a gentlemanly jag and has to get drunk on cactus juice. In every silver or double-standard country in the world the same degradation of labor is apparent.

We are told that silver is the poor man's money. This appeals to his prejudice, and is wholly untrue. Wages are not paid in silver at the end of each day, but they are paid by the year, month, or week in currency or gold, with just enough silver to make the correct change. The kind of money in transit is immaterial so it goes, but when it is hoarded, laid by for a rainy day, then its staying quality becomes interesting. The rich man hoards by investing in property or by depositing in a bank, and the bank has the option of paying him in silver, while a large per cent of the poor men patronize the sockleg and the bosom of the earth, and they always hide gold for two reasons, they have more confidence in its stability, and being less bulky it is easier to hide. So these poor men are on a gold basis and the rich men are on a silver basis, if the banks elect to put them there.

Prejudice is the curse of this country. It is the only reef in the path of our ship of state, the only menace to our experiment of self-government. The prejudice of the uninformed makes them the prey of professional agitators, calamity howlers, and politicians who are an hungered for office.

The argument is made that we owe so much foreign debt that the interest is confiscating us. The ablest financiers on this continent, who have made the subject a study, place our foreign debt at $2,000,000,000, which, as they estimate at a 4½ rate of interest, amounts to an annual interest account of $90,000,000.

Our globe-trotters are spending annually $47,000,000 abroad. Most of them are ignorant of the beauty and grandeur of their own country, which far surpasses anything they see abroad. They ought to give up this foolish fad and spend their millions getting acquainted with this country for a few years. If we are actually insolvent and can not pay we ought to make a general assignment for the benefit of all our creditors. That is the way an honest man does when he fails in business. He does not hide out his property and offer 50 cents on the dollar. Instead of being insolvent we are better able to pay than any people on the face of the earth. Our national debt is in round numbers $915,962,000. It has been reduced to one-third its former amount. In 1865 it was $2,845,907,000.

The debt of Great Britain and Ireland (the creditor nation) is $3,350,719,000; the debt of France is $4,446,000,000; Russia, $3,491,000,000; Austria-Hungary, $2,866,000,000; Italy, $2,324,000,000; Germany, $1,656,000,000; Spain (with one-fourth of our population), $1,251,000,000. The per capita debt of France is $116; of Great Britain and Ireland, $87; Italy, $76; Spain, $73; Russia, $30, while our per capita debt is $14. Uncle Sam, bless his old soul, is the only good housekeeper in the whole lot! Our bank deposits amount to $4,000,000,000, while those of all Europe only amount to $6,500,000,000. By our last census our per capita of wealth, as shown by the assessment rolls, was $341, and the people have never been bad about assessing their property too high.

The war veterans can not be for repudiation on account of our alleged inability to pay. It is a fundamental principle of law and morals that a man must be just before he is generous, and that gifts made by an insolvent are void as to creditors. Our Government is giving them about $140,000,000 annually. If we can afford to be liberal we ought to strain a point and be honest, too. If our Government can give it like a prince, it ought to pay like a gentleman.

A large part of the debts figured against us are in fact not interest-bearing debts. They consist of railroad, real-estate, and other corporation debts where defaults were made, and mortgages on the property have been foreclosed, the property sold, and the debts practically extinguished.

The only debts that the people at large are interested in are the national debt and the State debts. The State debts, by the last census, amounted to $228,997,387. The county debts amounted to $145,048,045; school-district debts, $36,701,948, while the debts of cities and towns amounted to $724,463,060, making a total of $1,135,210,442. You will observe that about three-fourths of this total debt is owed by cities and towns. With this borrowed money they have built gas, electric-light, and waterworks plants, paved their streets, etc.

Now the 16 to 1 city man asks his country brother, who uses coal oil in his house and darkness outside, who draws his water from a well and bathes in the creek, who splits the mud in wet weather and kicks up the dust in dry, to help him repudiate the debt incurred by him in getting ahead of the

countryman as to these comforts and conveniences of life. As to all our private domestic debts, it is immaterial to the Government whether the redheaded men owe the blackheaded ones or the blackheaded ones owe the redheaded ones. One holds the debt and the other holds the property it purchased, and they cancel each other.

The suggestion is sometimes made that by the enhancement of gold debts have been increased when measured in property, and therefore they ought to be scaled. I have discussed the gold enhancement theory, but desire to add that practically all our debts were contracted since the gold standard was adopted, and that standard entered into and became a part of every contract, and if gold has advanced it would be just as dishonest to pay by any other standard as it would be if it had not advanced. If a man contract for a thousand bushels of corn it is no answer to his contract to say that corn has risen since the contract was made. Besides, all our obligations have passed from hand to hand, most of them many times, and the present holders had no more to do with the rise or fall of gold than they did with the rise or fall of the tides.

The underlying fructifying element of this 16 to 1 movement is socialism. It is the same old effort to get something for nothing. The Coxeyites wanted grub for nothing. The single-tax cranks want land for nothing. The Populists want Government monopoly of transportation and private monopoly of the wailing business for nothing. The 16 to 1 people want 50 per cent of debts for nothing. The Bellamyites want everything for nothing. And I might suggest that the new woman wants our bifurcated garments for nothing; but that is not pertinent to the subject under discussion, and I will not do so.

The movement means repudiation. All else is theory, pretense, and dreams. It is an effort to pass a left-handed bankrupt bill, not for the benefit of the unfortunate debtor who can not pay, but for the rich as well, who can pay but want to beat their creditors. The poor man is not in debt; he never had a chance to get in debt. The corporations, speculators, and plungers generally constitute the debtor class. Every wage earner belongs to the creditor class. No one would be benefited by 16 to 1 coinage except the debtor class. Even the mine owner would not, for the temporary stimulus given to silver would increase its production until the price would fall below what it is now. On the other hand, all would suffer.

If a bill for free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 were to pass either House of Congress, and it was ascertained that it would pass the other House, and that the President would sign it, the panic that would ensue would be to that of 1893 what a tornado is to a zephyr. Creditors, to avoid being paid in debased money, would crowd and crush for payment as the people do for exit in a theater on an alarm of fire. Credit and confidence, the twin divinities of prosperity, would depart from us. All business would be paralyzed, labor unemployed, and despair would hang her black pall in millions of homes, only to be lifted when reason resumed her sway. It took France fifty years to entirely recover from the John Law fiasco.

The demagogues, in order to undermine the moral sense of the people and make repudiation palatable, rail about England's wealth, and falsely assert that she is trying to dictate our monetary system and to crush us. England is rich, but if she is trying to ruin us she has a peculiar way of manifesting her hostility. For the year ended June 30, 1894, she took $423,000,000 of our exports, about seven times as much as all the free-silver countries in the world. We took $107,000,000 of her exports, and she paid us the difference in gold or its equivalent.

Did you ever hear a butcher or a baker or a man with cotton to sell complaining that his customers had too much money to spend? Instead of trying to drive us to a gold standard it would be immensely to her interest to have her commercial rival abandon the standard of commerce and take a back seat with the half-civilized, noncommercial nations. The ridiculous story of Ernest Seyd was exploded years ago, and though the vase was shattered, the scent of that lie hangs 'round the country still. The silver-tongued orators still tell the people there was a conspiracy to demonetize silver, although no man has ever been able to call the name of a single conspirator.

In 1873 the motive for demonetizing silver was on the wrong side. The silver dollar was then worth nearly 3 cents more than a gold dollar. Who at that time could foresee the fall of silver? Our statesmen and financiers are as shrewd as any on earth, and they got no glimpse of the coming event. Only to these unnamable conspirators was the revelation vouchsafed. It seems they had a little Patmos Isle all to themselves, and worked the world on the heavenly tip!

Several Congressmen, in the presence of an irate constituency, have stated they did not know the standard dollar was being demonetized when they voted for the act of 1873. It was read several times in their presence. There is no way to make people understand things. They might have been deaf. One all-sufficient reason why they did not so understand is that it was not being done. This dollar was not demonetized, but, on the contrary, has been money and good money every day since 1792.

England has loaned us money at a lower rate of interest than anybody else would. This is the very head and front of all her offending, and the violent 16 to 1 people want to punch her head for doing this. There is an old adage which runs this way: "If you want to lose a friend, lend him money."

To prove that it is repudiation of debt and not coinage the 16 to 1 man is after, propose to him free and unlimited coinage without the legal-tender attachment. If there is nothing the matter with silver except the fact that it is debarred from the mints, then free and unlimited coinage, without the leagl-tender provision, would set it all right and bring it to par. Gold would not suffer by such a test. Your proposition would nauseate him. Why? Because it is not coinage he is after, but repudiation, by means of legal-tender law.

They propose two plans for forcing a debased silver standard on the country; first, not allow contracts for payment in gold; second, if this does not work, then reduce the gold in a gold dollar. With reference to the first plan, maintaining the value of money by legal enactment and penalties has been tried in most countries and has proven an ignominious failure in every instance.

England tried it off and on for nearly five hundred years. France tried it for centuries. The North tried it with greenbacks and the South tried it with Confederate money. While it was a death penalty in France to refuse the assignats, they fell in value until it took $36,000 of them to buy one dollar in specie. Eggs must have been worth $500 apiece in assignats. What a pity our inflation friends could not have lived there and then. A government can rob one part of its people for the benefit of the other part as to existing debts, but there its power ends. It can not make its people trade with each other except upon terms satisfactory to both parties to the contract.

If the money offered to the seller does not suit him he does not sell. If offered to a laborer he would need rest. If offered to a farmer for his produce he would only have enough for home consumption, until he found a man with better money, and so it would be all along the line. The proposal to take away the right of contract shows that desperation has usurped the seat of reason. We hold all that we do hold by virtue of contract right. It is the bulwark of our liberty. It was for this, above all things, that Magna Charta was written. When we surrender this supreme right we go back to barbarism and become miserable puppets to every mob that may seize the helm of state.

The other method suggested to bring about parity of the metals is to reduce the gold in a gold dollar. Our Government has hitherto manifested blind, unreasoning prejudice against that kind of statesmanship. Indeed, it has had its deputy marshals busy for a hundred years hunting misguided patriots who were trying to take this near cut to wealth. If this sort of bill ever passes Congress, I suggest as a rider to the bill that all convicted counterfeiters be liberated and given right of action against the Government for false imprisonment. All Governments have honored their pioneers, and these men were but the forerunners—the John the Baptists of this new religion of debauchment of our money.

A republic rests entirely upon the morals of its people. The story of Washington and his hatchet, told by loving lips to innocent childhood, has made millions of truthful men and women. What would be the effect in this country upon unborn generations of a story like this: At the close of the nineteenth century the people of the United States became so corrupt they repudiated one-half of their debts by paying them in money worth only half of its face value?

An American in a foreign land looks with a swelling heart upon "Old Glory" as it proudly flaunts the breeze, the symbol of liberty and honor. Pass this act of repudiation and he would look upon it with shame. For enthusing purposes we might as well pull it down and run up a dish rag.

But, Mr. President and gentlemen, allow me in conclusion to say that our country is in no danger of repudiation. This 16 to 1 coinage clamor is but one of the manifestations of hard times, brought on by the late panic. On lowlands, in the nighttime, a deadly miasma accumulates, but when the bright sun climbs over the hilltops and shoots his purifying rays into the bottom, the miasma is dispelled, the atmosphere is sweetened and made wholesome, and men go forth to their daily avocations with assurance of health.

In spite of all the isms that have afflicted us, in spite of demagogism on the stump and in legislative halls, this country is rapidly advancing. Our factories are taxed to their utmost with orders, and the wages of their employees have been everywhere voluntarily raised. Prices that have been depressed by the panic are improving. Sinister discontent, with all her imps, is fleeing before the benign presence of prosperity, and in after years the heresies of to-day will only be remembered as a troubled dream. The American people are honest and patriotic. Upon this rock we build our faith, and all the ages and agencies of truth are ours for the superstructure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this discussion has elicited so many of the arguments upon which the majority of the Committee on Finance have deemed controlling that I do not regard it essential to delay proceedings for the purpose of making any extended dissertation. As far as the silver question is concerned, I have seen no reason to alter the opinions which I expressed in an address delivered in this Chamber on September 21, 1893. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] recently called the attention of the country to the circumstance that gold monometallists, who are ably represented by the minority of the Committee on Finance, have presented nothing; that they are here without a policy and without a suggestion worthy of consideration as a financial plan. They declare that all national obligations must be paid in gold; that although our bonds, notes, etc., are clearly otherwise worded that still, in deference to the sensibilities of the financial world, we must yield our convictions and forego our contractual rights. Perhaps some of us might be willing to give all that we now possess in testimony of our good faith, but even then we would be constrained to entertain gloomy forebodings as to the future.

Everyone concedes that the present financial system is bad. Everyone knows that the sale of bonds in times of peace indicates governmental inefficiency. Were our country void of resources, were our people indolent and brainless, our present embarrassment might be accounted for. No one will claim that silver advocates have had their way. Not only has the legislative department discredited silver, but the executive has practically announced that while gold is constitutional money silver, though similarly mentioned in that instrument, is not to be so considered. And after thus contributing every effort to convince the world that silver can not be used in common with gold we hear complaint that there is a difference in the actual value of the two metals, a difference that does not depend upon production and what has no apparent or actual relationship to the amount of metal in circulation or existence the world over.

The President proposes to retire the greenbacks and to trust the financial affairs of the Government to the national banks. If I read the history of my party correctly, its greatest men, its ablest teachers, have always declared a public debt to be a curse, and have advised the payment of governmental obligations at the earliest practicable moment. The historical reference made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] some days since I shall annex to my remarks in demonstration of this proposition. Whenever the financial affairs of this country are placed absolutely in the keeping of national banks or of any private banking system free government will cease, and wealth resulting from our deliberate misfeasance will rule imperiously and indisputably. Are we prepared to disregard the advice of our revered and patriotic statesmen? The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], if I understand him, does not agree that greenbacks should be destroyed. He would store them in the Treasury. I agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that as between the two propositions that of the Administration is the more logical, and I notice that the advocates of the gold standard throughout the United States quite generally accept Mr. Cleveland's view.

In his address delivered at the annual meeting of the Board of Trade in the city of Chicago, Mr. William T. Baker, the president of the board, and who referred to the free-coinage advocates as persons afflicted with free-silver lunacy, said:

> In order to maintain the credit of the Government by keeping the parity between gold and silver as required by law, the Treasury must redeem greenbacks and Sherman notes in gold, and this redemption is accompanied by the absurd requirement that such notes must be paid out again and kept in circulation, to be again and again redeemed in gold. This imbecile legislative contrivance has placed us at the mercy of foreign enemies or alien speculators in bullion, and recent events have shown us that such enemies and speculators know their advantage and are not slow to profit by our weakness. There is but one remedy for this deplorable condition of affairs. Provision

must be made for the permanent retirement of the five hundred millions of greenbacks and Sherman notes. Long-time bonds, bearing a low rate of interest and payable in gold, should be authorized for this purpose, and if such bonds were permitted to be used by national banks as security for circulation redeemable in gold, they would be quickly absorbed, and the transition would be easily and safely made. All the hoarded gold in the country would immediately come back into circulation, and this country would enter upon an era of unexampled prosperity. There is no politics in this proposition. There is only partisanship, ignorance, and greed opposed to it.

The gentleman whose comments I have read uses this expression: "There is only partisanship, ignorance, and greed opposed to it"—the proposition which he advocates. So-called conservative expressions of this kind with reference to those who in good faith favor the free coinage of silver are heard wherever gold monometallists promulgate their dogmas. We daily peruse in the great newspapers of the gold center of the United States extravagant denunciation of this type. Indeed, Senators who faithfully advocate the principles which for years they have openly avowed and who honestly act in redemption of their promises are derided and accused of misrepresenting the very constituents who elected them because of the opinions which they here reiterate. Because of certain reflections of this nature, I wish to make a few citations from platforms adopted by the Democracy of California.

The money of the Constitution, gold and silver, the only legal tender.—*Democratic State Platform, 1876.*

That this convention recommends the passage of an act of Congress providing for the free coinage of both gold and silver, by the terms of which act all gold and silver bullion offered at the several mints of the United States shall be received in exchange for money, or gold or silver certificates at the rate now fixed by law for standard dollars of gold or silver, which certificates shall be receivable for all public purposes and interchangeable for gold or silver, as the case may be.—*Democratic State Platform, 1886.*

That this convention recommends the passage of an act of Congress providing for the free coinage of both gold and silver, by the terms of which act all gold and silver bullion offered at the several mints of the United States shall be received in exchange for money, or gold or silver certificates at the rate now fixed by law for standard dollars of gold or silver, which certificates shall be receivable for public purposes and interchangeable for gold and silver, as the case may be.—*Democratic State Platform, 1888.*

A depleted Treasury, the imposition of unequal and oppressive taxes, the effort to enact coercive legislation, the arbitrary disregard by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of all parliamentary rules, and the shameless servility displayed by the majority in the House of Representatives in yielding ready obedience to his tyrannical mandates, their refusal to join the Democracy in its efforts to procure the passage of a measure permitting the free coinage of silver.—*Democratic State Platform, 1890.*

Over one of these conventions I had the honor to preside, and in another instance I was the chairman of the committee on resolutions. In every instance I voted for the platforms from which these citations are made.

I take it to be a fact that the only proposition offered for the rehabilitation of our financial system by those who are opposed to the views held by the majority of the Finance Committee is that which involves either the retiring or hoarding of greenbacks, the withdrawal from circulation and the substitution of the national bank for the Government in the regulation and control of our financial system. I will not elaborate upon the consequences of this condition. The obviously fatal tendency of such a scheme has been most fully presented here. In the first place we would suffer from a most ruinous contraction. Notwithstanding all the inducements that have been heretofore offered to the national banks, they have but a comparatively small amount of circulation, and many of them have manifested a disposition to retire much of this. It is certain that they would never, if they procured the contemplated additional privilege, supply money equal in amount to that which our friends proposed to destroy or withdraw; and the utter futility of maintaining a gold basis in this country would give rise to disaster and bring about the further centralization of gold and all the direful consequences of a congested and inadequate currency.

Speaking from Democratic ground, I may be permitted to say that I do not understand how any follower of Jefferson or Jackson can stand the new departure which the Administration insists we shall adopt. Platform after platform of our party, year in and year out, has been so drawn as to call the attention of the world to the criminal subserviency of the Republican organization to the national banking system, and yet now we are to meekly follow not only the financial leaders of that organization, but are to submit ourselves absolutely to the dictation of those who have thus been selected to determine the volume of our currency and whether we shall have an adequate money supply. I know of no tyranny more odious than that which has thus been partially established and which it is proposed to deliberately fasten upon the people of the United States.

I have before me a work called the Democratic Campaign Book. It is a document which was issued by the Congressional Committee of the Democratic party in 1890 and contains the arguments upon which it was hoped the party might gain an important contest.

REPUBLICAN FAVORITISM FOR NATIONAL BANKS—AN ACT TO CREATE AND DONATE $15,000,000 TO THESE PETS—INCREASING CIRCULATION TO PAR VALUE OF BONDS DEPOSITED.

Mr. Dorsey, Republican (Nebraska), introduced in this Congress the following bill:

"A substitute for bill No. 537 to provide for the issue of circulating notes to national banking associations.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That upon any deposit already or hereafter made of any United States bonds bearing interest in the manner required by law, any national banking association making the same shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency circulating notes of different denominations in blank, registered and countersigned as provided by law, not exceeding in the whole amount the par value of the bonds deposited: *Provided*, That at no time shall the total amount of such notes issued to any such association exceed the amount at such time actually paid in of its capital stock. And that all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

January 29 an attempt was made to push the bill through without discussion. Mr. Bland objected to the consideration of the bill, and the ayes and noes were taken, which resulted in the bill being then taken up for one hour's discussion. The vote on the question of consideration stood thus:

Yeas—Democrats 18; Republicans 125.

Nays—Democrats 103; Republicans 9.

Under the present law national banks are allowed to issue circulation up to 90 per cent of the par value of Government bonds held by them. This bill is to allow them to increase their circulation to the full par value of the bonds.

Under existing law these banks are the owners of $145,000,000 of bonds, and their circulation, based on these bonds, is $128,000,000. Bonds are far above par, due in a large measure to the demand upon the part of banks for these securities as a basis of circulation, and the immediate and intended effect of this bill is to increase the value of the assets of the banks.

Upon the passage of the bill the banks could, without the purchase of another bond, issue $15,000,000 more of notes. That is to say, the bill is a Republican proposition to make the banks a present of $15,000,000 to be loaned out to borrowers at any rate of interest that necessity may compel the borrowers to pay.

The further and necessary effect is, of course, to increase to the extent of the increase of circulation the power of the banks to expand and contract the currency.

This is another instance of Republican friendship toward the banks, and a corresponding act of unfriendliness toward silver.

This bill has not been finally voted upon in the House, but it and several others containing like propositions are still pending there, while in the Senate JOHN SHERMAN has another on the Calendar awaiting the coming of the second session of this Congress.

The following Republican expressions made during the hour's debate on this bill are sufficiently indicative of the purpose of the Republican party to enable the people to judge as to the probable result should that party be retained in power.

Mr. Dorsey of Nebraska: Now, if the House passes this bill it will be an encouragement for the national banks to continue to hold the bonds that they are holding to-day at a positive loss and it will give them cause to hope that this Congress will pass such a measure as will perpetuate the national banking system of the country. I know it was popular some years ago, especially in the West, to cry out against national banks, but I am happy to say that day has passed.

Mr. Conger of Iowa, chairman of Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Why, gentlemen, I am in favor of any measure that will do any public good in this country, even if it should make a few men rich.

Suppose the national banks do receive some benefit from this proposition. The national banking system, in my judgment and in that of the civilized people of this world, is the best that history has ever known. This will tend in some measure to perpetuate that system; but, gentlemen, I know you do not like the national banking system; you never did like it; I do not suppose you ever will. It was a Republican measure; and it is the highest compliment that has ever been made to the history of the Republican government of this country.

So far the Democrats have, with the assistance of a very few Republicans, been able to prevent the passage of any of these bills, but the Republican who was most in sympathy with them has not been renominated, and should they be in the minority in the coming election the bill will certainly pass.

A proposition of like nature was made in the Fiftieth Congress, but the Democratic majority ignored it entirely, and it was never even considered.

Those upon whom Democratic orators thus instructed impressed these views are not disposed to abandon their convictions, no matter from whom the solicitation or mandate may come.

Mr. President, I desire to say at this point that in my judgment no compromise is possible. The Sherman and Bland-Allison acts were failures. These were compromises. A bill which I might almost call immaterial regarding the coinage of the seigniorage was vetoed, thus indicating that the Executive did not believe that any concession whatever should be made, and after all, with the views which that distinguished officer entertains, his veto of that bill should have been anticipated. His sentiments have been expressed uniformly. He has not changed. He has been consistent. This is more than can be said of many who have followed in the pathway which he has, as far as the Democracy is concerned, pioneered.

Now and then some one comes upon the scene who thinks he has a programme which will solve all difficulties. An idea of this kind is embodied in a resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] concerning the coinage of the American product.

Upon principle no free-coinage man can vote for such a proposition, because the moment that a discrimination of any kind or character is made against silver, the moment its use is limited or a peculiar burden imposed upon it, whenever an avenue of usefulness is opened to one metal not permitted to the other, that moment bimetallism as we understand it ceases and the true theory is abandoned.

But there is another reason independent of this which absolutely interdicts the success of the idea advanced in the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER]. This I will illustrate by the following quotation from the Coinage Laws of the United States, 1792–1894. The article has reference to the significant experience of Venezuela:

PROHIBITION OF THE IMPORTATION OF SILVER COIN.

The Venezuelan Government issued the following decree on the 14th of August, 1893:

1. From and after this date the importation of Venezuelan silver coin through the customs stations of the Republic is prohibited, except when the same is imported by the Government. The import of all foreign silver coin is also prohibited by law.

2. The collectors of customs in seaport towns shall consider all silver coins, inclusive of Venezuelan silver coins, which it is sought to import into the country as articles whose importation is prohibited, and persons found guilty of such attempted importation shall be punished by the confiscation of the coin and a fine equal to 50 per cent of its value.

The reasons for the issuance of this decree are explained by Mr. E. A. Plumacher, our consul at Maracaibo, in the following words:

"At this moment, when the silver question is attracting universal attention, it may interest the Department to know that for some time past there have been imported into this country large quantities of Venezuelan silver coins which have been discovered to be of unauthorized coinage.

"Since 1886 the importation of foreign silver of all nationalities has been prohibited, but all classes of gold coins and Venezuelan silver have until now been allowed free entry and are constantly being introduced through the custom-houses. It now appears that parties abroad, taking advantage of the low price of silver bullion, have coined hundreds of thousands of Venezuelan silver dollars, exact facsimiles of the emission authorized by the Government, and containing an equal, or, as it is said, even a greater amount of pure silver.

"The Government has acted promptly in the matter and issued a decree prohibiting the importation from abroad, except by the Government, of Venezuelan silver coins, and declaring them contraband should efforts be made to introduce them. This will put a stop to the business through the custom-houses, but large amounts will no doubt continue to be successfully smuggled.

"It is a striking commentary on the situation that such a speculation is possible, producing, it is said, nearly 40 per cent profit, although it is freely admitted that the surreptitious coins are in all respects equal to those authorized by law.

"Advices from Curaçao, which is and always has been a dumping ground for money of all nationalities, show that Venezuelan silver, since the late developments, is received at only one-half its face value; moreover, it is intimated that it will soon be rejected entirely."—*Consular Reports*, November, 1892, p. 321.

In the last Congress we reduced the tariff upon opium 50 per cent because of the circumstance that opium was readily and most successfully smuggled—the profit of the illegal traffic being so great. Silver, of course, would be much more easily brought into this country, and the evils resulting would be intolerable. But the main objection is that first stated. It ought to be conclusive upon those who are really anxious for the restoration of silver.

It has been said that the remedy for all our ills is an increased revenue, and that the passage of a bill to add $40,000,000 to the income of the Government will put us upon a satisfactory basis. The same individuals who favor the tariff bill favor the bond bill. They say that we must have the revenue and also the proceeds of the bonds, and still they tell us that if we have the revenue we do not need the bonds. The records plainly show that the deficiency is something less for the last year than the amount proposed to be raised by the new emergency horizontal tariff bill, and still we must, it is declared (and this sentiment is echoed by all the gold monometallists), have both bonds and revenue. And now comes the Republican section of the gold monometallists and informs us that the difficulty consists wholly in a lack of revenue. I think that a majority on this floor are opposed to issuing bonds at all. These Senators believe that such issuance is entirely unnecessary, and that there is enough of coin at the disposition of the Government, or which can be made available to meet current demands. If it is undesirable to raise money by issuing bonds because of the burden to be thus put upon the people, is it not also undesirable to tax the people to such an extent that the same amount of money will, in fact, be squeezed out of them? If a hundred millions of dollars is necessary it is a question how that money should be obtained. Are the people of the United States prepared to supply it by means of taxation? Is it not a fact that the general sentiment is that gold obtained either as the result of taxation or the issuance of bonds is not needed? Our friends assert that gold is essential; that we must have gold, and that we will have plenty of it if the revenue laws are amended properly. After all, the money is to come from the people. The burden is to be imposed in one form or the other. If we do not run in debt it will be because we contribute cash from our own individual resources instead of supplying it upon the strength of governmental promise. If we are to have a gold standard, and if we are to further debase silver, Mr. Cleveland is right. He should have authority to issue gold bonds; he should retire all greenbacks and Sherman notes, and the crisis will then have been reached. Where the gold is to come from to maintain us in such a contingency is to me a mystery.

Our friends of the opposition assert and reiterate that those who favor free coinage are really silver monometallists. This accusation is unfounded, in view of the fact that we ask nothing for silver that is not accorded to gold. We seek to impose no new money upon this country or upon the world. We ask that the gold and silver which constitutes the coin referred to, not only in the Constitution, but also in our obligations, shall be used honestly and carefully and patriotically by the Treasury in such a way as to maintain the parity of both by ignoring the potency of neither. To assert that the Government is aiding the cause of silver when it announces that silver is not money save in a restricted sense, and by continually warning Congress against its recognition, is as unreasonable as it is contrary to instruction of the Constitution. The attempt to evade the explicit wording of our bonds and the force of the Matthews resolution, by the pretense that the act declaring that the parity must be maintained requires the Treasurer to ignore silver, can not be entertained in good faith by sensible men.

Those who favor the committee's amendment admit that it would be difficult under an Administration holding the financial views which dominate Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet and which controlled Mr. Harrison's management of public affairs to fairly enforce a free-coinage law. Such a law should be dealt with by its friends. Day by day, hour by hour, the return to what can be truly called sound money is made more and more embarrassing, though such return is certain and the continuance of existing conditions impossible. I have no doubt that free coinage, supplemented by efforts made in good faith by officers honestly and earnestly seeking to establish bimetallism, would be rewarded by the accomplishment of every promise made by the advocates of silver, and that the results of such exertions would be that coin would be paid on demand and gold and silver taken indiscriminately and without injury to the condition of the Treasury. It is not the aim of the silver advocates to force silver only upon a creditor, but we believe that the debtor has some rights, and that when there is a deliberate attempt by speculators, backed by tributary newspapers, to bankrupt the national Treasury through such invasions as we have recently witnessed, the Government should announce that it will exercise its option for its own interest, as of right it may do. It is true that money is timid and that financiers must often be treated in the most tender and careful manner to avoid harrowing their feelings. They are touchy. But while recognizing this situation we must draw the line somewhere. There is a point beyond which self-respect and self-defense forbid us to go, and a time must come when the Government will control money matters and will refuse to subject itself to the personal and private demands of those whose impudent dictations it now tolerates.

In an address delivered in this Chamber on the 22d of last month the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] made several very interesting statements regarding the foreign trade of England, and showed from publications contained in the Statist and London Economist that the foreign trade of the United Kingdom was more profitable in 1895 than at any time in the history of that country. The Senator upon the same occasion called attention to the fact that our policy is building up in Asiatic countries a competition which can not be met. As bearing upon this proposition, I call the attention of the Senate to a report made by our consul-general at Shanghai, Mr. Jernigan, and contained on pages 93 and following, of volume 50, No. 184, Consular Reports. The article is entitled "Labor and wages in China." I quote:

LABOR AND WAGES IN CHINA.

No country in the world is more abundantly supplied with labor than China, and in no country in the world does the laborer receive less compensation. A Chinese laborer will save money on wages that would hardly be sufficient to supply the absolute necessities of an American laborer. This is made possible by the cheapness of the vegetable diet on which the Chinese laborer is content to live; the small cost of house accommodations, for several families will subdivide one room of a house and live in contentment in it, and the low price paid for clothing, which is made of the coarsest cottons. But the cheapness of labor in China does not mean that the products of that labor are inferior in quality. The Japanese laborer, receiving higher wages, is more artistic in his work—his productions are more finished; in dyes and in the blending of colors he is superior to his Chinese rival, but in substantial and lasting quality the latter is fully the equal and in some instances the superior.

The silk that comes from the looms of Japan compares in gloss and fineness with any in the world, and Japanese crapes have a reputation in almost every market for softness of beauty and harmony of color; but for substantial wear, for lasting quality, the silk goods of China are most favorably known to the merchants of all lands.

Among western nations the impression prevailed at one time that Asiatic races were more imitative than original, and that in the industrial departments, where originality was the chief element of success, the Occident need not fear the Orient as a rival. The test has been made, and the result has greatly modified if not entirely removed the impression. Within the last quarter of a century Japan has thrown off a most oppressive form of feudalism and advanced to the forefront as a nation of progressive ideas. Twenty-five years ago a system of government obtained in Japan which discouraged all liberal enterprise. Centuries of political slavery, intrenched in formidable prejudices, seemed to have crushed out the very soul of the Japanese people, and the Empire was dominated by the tyranny of great feudal chiefs, the remains of whose castles, now scattered over Japan, attest to the traveler the strength and wealth of the former owners and the servitude and poverty of their retainers.

All has given place to an enlarged liberty. With the adoption of a written constitution, the Japanese mind began to develop more rapidly, and in defining, by a written law, the organic structure of his Empire, the Emperor of Japan not only did what no other Asiatic ruler has ever done, but caused a new era to dawn upon Japan.

The gates of the Empire of Japan, so long closed to the Westerner, were opened to his coming, and the Japanese soon learned to appreciate and utilize the productions of Western thought and skill. To-day, the navy-yards, arsenals, factories, banks, and large commercial houses of Japan prove that there is in Japanese character a reserve force which is destined, if judiciously regulated and directed, to assure still greater achievements in industrial fields. The attestations are too numerous to leave doubt that the Japanese are not only original in conception, but possess the power of concentration and execution.

* * * * * * *

And the problem of China's awakening should not be solved without the intelligent influence of the business men of the United States. The solution will involve more intimate and valuable trade relations with western nations, as well as define such relations in their future extent and value. Occupying the more favored geographical position, the United States can and should

send to China much of their overproductions in exchange, if not absolute sales, for those of China's products that may be needed.

During the last fiscal year the value of the trade relations between Japan and the United States was estimated, in round numbers, at $28,000,000, but the figures show a balance against the United States of $19,000,000. Japan is nearer to the United States than any other Western nation, and several thousand miles nearer than Great Britain, and yet the balance sheet, for comparison, between Japan and Great Britain shows a balance in favor of the latter about as large as the balance against the United States.

During the same period, the value of the aggregate trade relations between China and the United States was estimated at $24,000,000, with a balance against the United States of $16,000,000, while in China, as in Japan, Great Britain checks off large balances in her favor, although more remote from China by thousands of miles.

The population of China is many times larger than the population of Japan, and with the varied productions of the United States there ought to be a much more valuable trade with China. This consideration should be regarded as of special importance at a time when the symptoms of political and commercial changes in China appear so clearly, even on the surface. When the 400,000,000 Chinese feel the influence of Western civilization they will, as their Japanese neighbors have done, acquire and assimilate in many respects the habits and desires of the Westerner, and the United States should be prepared to supply their share of the demands.

European nations are sustaining the efforts of European merchants more substantially than the American merchant is sustained. The latter, in the competition for Asiatic trade, has to rely upon his own skill and energy, while the merchants of Europe are encouraged by the aid given to the great steamship lines which carry their flags and pour the productions of Europe into Asiatic ports. At the port of Shanghai, the great commercial and distributing center of Asiatic trade, Great Britain, France, and Germany have direct mail and commercial communication—the steamers entering and leaving the port every week, carrying the flags of their respective nationalities, while no ship carrying the American mail and flying the Stars and Stripes touches at Shanghai at all. The American merchant must often unduly wait for his mail after its arrival at Yokohama, and send his purchases in foreign bottoms to the ports of his native land. The trade relations of the United States with China can not be satisfactorily enlarged until American merchants are secured a more advantageous position. They can not successfully compete for Asiatic trade, even with the natural advantages of their geographical position, when such advantages are so greatly neutralized by such resources and means at the command of their competitors as referred to.

* * * * * * *

These observations have been suggested by the following table showing the price of Chinese labor:

Wages of Chinese at Shanghai September 30, 1895, reduced to American currency.

Description.	Wages with food.	
	Per day.	Per month.
Blacksmith	$0.13	
Brass worker	.16	
Barber	.03	
Bootmaker:		
Native	.10	
Foreign		$5.28
Bamboo cabinetmaker	.11	
Bricklayer	.10	
Compositor:		
Native		5.28
Foreign		7.92 to 15.84
Carpenter	.11	
Cabinetmaker	.13	
Cooly*	.13	
Bookbinder:		
Native		4.22
Foreign*		6.34
Lithographer*		10.56
Furniture polisher	.21	
Tailor:		
Native	.10	
Foreign		6.34
Pressman		6.34
Coachman:		
Native		3.17
Foreign		6.34
House boy:		
Native*		2.11
Foreign		4.75
Cotton-mill machinist	.11 to .22	
Cotton-factory hands	.18	

*Without food.

Mr. President, it is too late at this time to enter into a discussion of the arguments made yesterday and at different times during this debate to the effect that gold has not appreciated. In this connection I beg leave to quote certain remarks made by me when speaking upon this same subject in the address delivered in the Senate in 1893. I then said:

To begin with, these gentlemen all admit that a certain quantity of gold will now buy about 50 per cent more of the necessaries of life than could have been purchased with the same amount of the same metal at the time of the demonetization of silver in 1873. But they contend that this is due to improved machinery, to new and more economical methods of production. I think that the address made by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] at the opening of this discussion disposes of this subject, and I will not spend much time discussing it. I have had the pleasure of listening to arguments wherein it was stated that wages are higher now than ever, and that hence it follows that gold had not fallen. It may well be doubted whether there is any foundation for this assertion, save in a very limited classification, but assuming it to be true that wages are higher with reference to certain industries, that increase is obviously attributable to other causes.

But if wages have increased is such increase due to the monometallic standard, and must wages depreciate because of the Sherman law? Are we to suppose that no other cause or causes influenced wages in this country than the action of our Government regarding currency? During the last campaign gentlemen who now sit in this Chamber were preaching Democracy to assembled multitudes, and they never gave as a reason for appreciation of wages the argument they rely upon here. Do they still hold to their older and oft-asserted view? Is it true that wages have appreciated merely because we demonetized silver?

I well remember that we all contended, and I think with much force, that the well-organized exertions of trades unions had much to do with keeping up labor prices. No general rule can be applied to this matter from which any such deduction as that insisted upon by the Senator from Delaware is authorized. In the same States for the same class of labor and the same number of hours different rates are charged. North, South, East, and West prices vary, depending often upon the mere ability of the laborer to obtain his rights, and in some instances of the employer to procure his work to be done at a reasonable rate.

* * * * * * *

One of the most distinguished monometallists of Great Britain is Mr. Giffen, chief of the statistical department of the board of trade, and although he has not seen fit in his later work to republish the views I am about to quote, I desire, nevertheless, to quote an abstract from his paper entitled, "Recent changes in prices and incomes compared." He there positively places himself upon record in support of the proposition that gold has notably appreciated, and, moreover, he argued that this appreciation was likely to continue, and that therein was found the true explanation of the fall in the price of commodities.

In 1879 he pointed out that this rise would soon become evident. Let me quote:

"If the test of prophecy be the event, there was never surely a better forecast. The fall of prices in such a general way as to amount to what is known as a rise in the purchasing power of gold is generally, I might almost say universally, admitted. Measured by any commodity or group of commodities usually taken as the measure for such a purpose, gold is undoubtedly possessed of more purchasing power than was the case fifteen or twenty years ago, and this high purchasing power has been continued over a long enough period to allow for all minor oscillations."

* * * * * * * *

The Senator from Delaware argues, as do many of the authorities, that the fall in the value of the various commodities is due to the great development which has been made in the arts, and he calls attention to Bessemer steel as a notable instance. So it is a notable instance, and so far as steel is concerned, it is clearly established that improved methods have lessened the cost; and there are many similar cases.

If the fall in prices was due to improvements in machinery the prices would be maintained with reference to those articles regarding which there had been no improvements affecting production, and in cases where inventions and new appliances had diminished the cost the depreciation would be noticed. But we know that there has been a uniform fall of prices all along the line, and the tables and charts prepared by eminent statisticians clearly prove that the drop has been general and is therefore due to some cause utterly different from that to which Sir John Lubbock and others attribute it. For instance, let us take wool, at present very low. My Republican friends may say that this is because our people are afraid of tariff changes. Let us so assume, and take a date anterior to the triumph of the Democratic ticket, and it will be found that then wool was exceedingly dull throughout the country, and on the Pacific Coast, where the staple is short, owing to the circumstance that we are compelled to clip twice a year, wool was so low prior to Mr. Cleveland's election that it did not even reach the duty line.

It is untrue that the expense of woolgrowing has become less and less as years have rolled by. When a child I have seen thousands of sheep roaming over the public domain, the pasturage of which cost the man who owned them not a cent. Gradually, as the progressive American moved over this territory and took it up under the homestead and preemption laws, the ranges were curtailed and the sheep were driven back, so that now many of them subsist at certain seasons on the mountain sides, sometimes at an altitude of from 8,000 to 10,000 feet above the sea, there seeking with difficulty that support before readily obtained. Hence the expense of maintenance has increased. Besides, lands have become useful for other purposes, and the sheep in the West is becoming more and more a burden.

Therefore there is depression not alone in those lines concerning which the cost of production is lessened, but it is found all throughout the list, demonstrating to you as legislative physicians that some other prescription must be applied than that suggested by the Senators who are opposed to me.

I believe that a careful analysis of the situation will show numerous examples which can not be explained upon the basis expressed in the ably conducted argument of the Senator from Delaware. I have not had time to carefully scan this branch of our dispute, but have said enough to suggest a conclusion. In the matter of eggs there has not been any invention promoting production. The ancient methods are still utilized. And yet I find there the same depreciation.

It has been frequently stated, and truly, that the gold price of silver prior to 1873 was remarkably stable, and that since that time it has been utterly unstable. But the theory that silver has depreciated and gold remained stable does not account for admitted phenomena. I refer to the phenomena which I have just recited. Suppose that we adopt a gold standard, pure and simple, manifestly when gold is very plentiful it will buy fewer things, and this is called a rise in prices. When gold is scarce it will buy more of everything. This means a fall in prices. There is no mystery as to this. The experience of every gold-standard country in the world discloses a universal fall in the prices of commodities.

And let it be remembered—and it is a most cogent circumstance—that this depreciation does not antedate 1873. If we are trying this case upon its merits, and are to enter a judgment upon it, let us look at the evidence. The rule suggested by the other side does not apply, because the fall is universal and the diminished cost of production is not universal.

Then we have this other significant feature, that the fall in the price of commodities dates from 1873 or thereabouts—the date of the demonetization of silver. Why is this remarkable coincidence presented? There may be some means other than that hinted at to account for it. I am not here to withhold any information. I know that I am obliged to bring forth every fact that will tend to elucidate. The truth should be known that we may legislate wisely and in the interest of the people whom we represent. I can not find and have not heard any explanation, in harmony with the gold-appreciation theory, of the incidents which I have cited.

In China, where gold is a mere commodity and is sold just as lead or tin would be in this country, prices have not varied in twenty years. This information I derive from an article quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle and written by W. S. Wetmore for the Hongkong papers. Mr. Wetmore selected some twenty articles for his index numbers and discovered that the prices had been practically stationary since 1873, while gold had risen nearly 50 per cent.

In a recent article by the same gentleman, printed in the North China News, he shows that notwithstanding the enormous depreciation in the gold price of silver in Europe, America, and India, there has been no variation of importance in either China or Japan. He gives an instance within his own personal experience to illustrate his meaning. Seventeen years ago he employed a boy, at a salary of twenty-one Mexican dollars a month, and although at the present time silver is worth in gold less than a third of its former price,

Mr. Wetmore has discovered that his servant is able to live now just as well as he did in 1876, and has not deprived himself of any of the advantages which he then enjoyed, although, as I have said, commodities have not fallen.

At the risk of being tautological, I will say that in all the great silver-using countries of the world an ounce of silver will buy just as much of the necessities of life at this day as could have been bought twenty years ago. If gold is declared to be the standard of the world, and if it is said that there is no other kind of money, gold will be more sought for, there will be greater need for it, its purchasing power will necessarily increase.

If half the stock of gold were destroyed, no one doubts that the remaining portion would be more valuable. And so if the use to which gold is applied be made more extended, if it becomes more essential to the public comfort, so will we be more anxious to get it, so will its purchasing power develop. This subject was very ably and thoroughly discussed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada in his argument before the Brussels conference. Indeed, he left nothing to be said upon the subject. The man who insists that the less money we have in the world the better off we are is no more inconsistent than the party who admits, as he must, that the legislation of the world has been in favor of gold, and that metal has been cornered and placed in a few hands, and still insists that its purchasing power has not increased.

A very instructive and interesting article on this topic by the Mexican minister, Mr. Romero, can be found in the June (1895) number of the North American Review.

It is sufficient to say in general of this measure that no doubt there are large interests in the United States which might be affected adversely by the free coinage of silver. Those whose business it has been to reduce the value of that metal and who have been growing wealthier day by day in consequence of that policy will realize reduced profits with corresponding gain to the public at large. Those whose monetary and selfish programme has been thus far followed, and whose power has been, unfortunately and I trust but temporarily, fastened upon the American people, can not be expected to willingly release the great advantages which have accrued to them. They necessarily struggle; they necessarily denounce. The newspapers which they own and to whose support they largely contribute also join in the calumniating cry. But those of us who believe in free coinage, and who have uniformly and fearlessly asserted our views in that direction, are not to be deterred from the discharge of our duties by either threats or prophecies of personal calamity.

While the change proposed would bring about some disturbance, we must recollect that business affairs are far from settled now. The great gulf that separates the poor and the rich is daily becoming more and more pronounced. While not interfering with property rights, we must recognize prevailing conditions. I do not apprehend anarchy, revolution, or kindred horrors. Milder remedies are within reach. If the wrongs to which I refer really prevail, if my conclusions are well founded, the people have the power in their hands to redress their grievances.

It is to be hoped that the true solution will be reached, that those arguments upon which we have relied and in which we have full faith will be controlling at the polls. The American people, Mr. President, have not lost their right to vote. If they are suffering it is their own fault, not deliberate, perhaps, not willful, it is true, but nevertheless the consequence of misconception because of inattention or the result of neglect.

The true American who has faith in the system under which he lives has the utmost confidence that all political issues, whether economic or other, will be solved justly and patriotically. Even those whom the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] informs us do not understand financial problems because of engrossing cares and arduous occupation, have, I think, more knowledge of the real nature of our troubles and certainly more disposition to redress them than many more favorably surrounded. The masses will soon unite, not for blood and lawlessness, but in the peaceful and determined effort to enforce at the ballot box those policies which, however odious to gold monopolists, are essential to the happiness and comfort of the people.

APPENDIX.

DEMOCRATIC AUTHORITY ON BONDS AND NATIONAL BANKS.

National-bank notes shall be retired, their further issue prohibited, and United States Treasury notes substituted therefor. The power to issue paper money and coin as a legal tender is only vested in the National Government. Arkansas, 1878.

COLORADO.

In 1878 Colorado denounced "the retirement and destruction of legal-tender notes and the maintenance of the national banking system," and said: "No further increase in the bonded debt and no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes; a gradual extinction of the public debt by the redemption of the interest-bearing portion thereof in such currency as the law will permit."

ILLINOIS.

That the present system of national banks can and should be abolished at once, and the notes of such institutions redeemed and their place relieved by noninterest-bearing notes of the Government, thus saving to the people annually $20,000,000.—*Illinois State Democratic platform, 1868.*

That it is the exclusive prerogative of the United States to issue all bills to circulate as money, and a right which ought not to be exercised by any State or corporation. That the national-bank notes should be redeemed, and instead thereof there should be issued by the Government an equal amount of Treasury notes.—*Illinois State Democratic platform, 1878.*

INDIANA.

That the national-bank system organized in the interest of bondholders ought to be abolished and Un ited States notes substituted in lieu of the national-bank currency, thus saving to the people in interest alone more than $18,000,000 a year; and, until such system of banks be abolished, we demand that the shares of such banks in Indiana shall be subject to the same taxation, State and municipal, as other property of the State.—*Indiana Democratic State platform, 1868.*

We are in favor of the repeal of the national-bank law and the substitution of greenbacks for the national-bank currency.—*Indiana State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1876: We declare in favor of the adoption of measures looking to the gradual retirement of the circulation of the national banks and the substitution therefor of circulating notes issued by the authorities of Government.

1878: The right to issue paper money as well as coin is the exclusive prerogative of the Government. * * * We demand that the national-bank notes shall be retired, and in lieu thereof shall be issued by the Government an equal amount of Treasury notes with full legal-tender quality.

IOWA.

That the national-bank system, organized in the interest of bondholders, ought to be abolished and United States notes substituted in lieu of the national-bank currency, thus saving to the people in interest alone more than $18,000,000 annually; and, until such system of banks shall be abolished, we demand that the shares of such banks in Iowa shall be subject to the same taxes, State and municipal, as other property of the State.—*Iowa State Democratic platform, 1868.*

1869: A national debt is a national curse.

1875: We favor a sufficient supply of national currency for business purposes. Opposition to the present national banking law.

1876: The resumption law should at once be repealed.

1877: We favor the retention of a greenback currency, and declare against any further contraction, and we favor substitution of greenbacks for national-bank bills.

We deprecate the funding of our noninterest-bearing debt. * * * We oppose any further retirement of the United States notes now in circulation, and favor the substitution of national Treasury notes for national-bank bills.—*Iowa State Democratic platform, 1878.*

1879: We are in favor of the substitution of United States Treasury notes for national-bank notes, and of the abolition of national banks as banks of issue. * * * We favor a reduction of the bonded debt as fast as practicable and the application of the idle money in the Treasury to that purpose.

KANSAS.

We demand the repeal of the national-bank law, and that the Government shall issue a legal-tender currency direct from the Treasury.—*Kansas State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1876: We demand that the act of Congress creating the national banking system be repealed; that the notes of the national banks be withdrawn from circulation, and in lieu thereof the paper of the Government of the United States be substituted. That as Congress has the sole power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, it should also have the sole power to provide a paper currency for the people.

1876: We are opposed to all banks of issue, whether chartered by Congress or the State legislature, and we desire that banking on the part of corporations or private individuals shall be confined by law exclusively to exchange, discounts, and deposit.

That as Congress has sole power to coin money and regulate the value thereof under the Constitution, it should also exercise the sole power of providing a paper currency to be used as money. * * * That we favor the retirement of national-bank notes and substitution of Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks, in their stead.—*Kansas State Democratic platform, 1878.*

LOUISIANA.

1878: The Louisiana Democracy demands that the national banking system should be abolished and national-bank notes retired, and in lieu thereof that the Government of the United States should issue an equal amount of Treasury notes, commonly known as greenbacks.

MASSACHUSETTS.

1868: Every dollar received by taxation from the people not absolutely necessary for the economical and legitimate expenses of the Government to be applied to the payment of the public debt.

1877: *Resolved*, That the practice of borrowing money for other objects than those of strict public necessity has generated schemes of extravagant expenditure, until taxation has become well-nigh an intolerable burden. Honesty, economy, and "pay as we go" should be the rule in all the appropriations of the people's money. The power of the State, counties, cities, and towns to borrow money ought to be rigidly limited, so that an end may be put to the system which "anticipates the labor of coming ages and appropriates the fruits of it in advance; which coins the industry of future generations into cash and snatches the inheritance from children yet unborn."

MICHIGAN.

1879: We demand that all money, whether paper or metallic, shall be issued by the General Government only, and made a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, except as to such contracts heretofore made as were originally payable in coin. We are opposed to all banks of issue, and demand that greenbacks shall be substituted in place of national-bank bills.

MINNESOTA.

1878: We are opposed to any increase of the bonded debt, and to the sale of bonds for the purpose of obtaining coin for resumption purposes. We are in favor of the gradual substitution of national Treasury notes for national-bank notes and making such Treasury notes the sole paper currency of the country, and placed on such basis as that the same shall be equal in value with coin, and as a legal tender the same as coin.

MISSOURI.

We regard the national banking system as being oppressive and burdensome, and demand the abolition and retirement from circulation of all national-bank notes and the issue of legal-tender notes in lieu thereof, and in quantities from time to time sufficient to supply the wholesome and necessary business demands of the entire country, and that all greenbacks so issued shall be used in the purchase and retirement of the bonds of the United States, so that the interest-bearing debt of the country may be lessened to the extent of the greenbacks thus put into circulation.—*Missouri State Democratic platform, 1878.*

MAINE.

That so long as the currency consists in whole or in part of paper money, issued under the authority of the National Government, such paper should be issued directly by the Government itself, and that the great and valuable privilege of issuing three hundred millions of this money, yielding a profit equal to eighteen millions annually in gold, has been too long enjoyed by favored individuals associated under the national-bank law, and should be forthwith assumed by the people represented by the political authority of the United States.—*Maine State Democratic platform, 1868.*

1878: The payment of the bonded debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable. No further issue of Government bonds whereby equal taxation with the other property of the country is avoided. * * * We are opposed

to an irredeemable currency, but believe in a currency for the Government and people, the laborer and officeholder, the pensioner and soldier, the producer and the bondholder. We are opposed to the present national banking system and in favor of the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national-bank bills.

NEBRASKA.

1878: We demand the gradual substitution of United States legal-tender paper for national-bank notes and its permanent establishment as the sole paper money of the country; the immediate repeal of the national banking act; no further issue of interest-bearing bonds; no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes, but a gradual extinction of the public debt.

NEVADA.

The substitution of the United States currency for the national-bank notes. No further sale of interest-bearing bonds for coin for resumption purposes, but the gradual reduction of the public debt.—*Nevada State Democratic platform, 1878.*

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

1878: One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder. That whatever currency is issued by the Government should be issued for the benefit of the whole people, and not for the benefit of capitalists at the expense of the people.

OHIO.

1869: We denounce the national banking system as one of the worst outgrowths of the bonded debt, which unnecessarily increases the burden of the people $30,000,000 annually, and we demand its immediate repeal.

1870: We are opposed to the system of national banks, and demand the immediate repeal of the law creating them, and that in place of the notes of such banks Treasury notes of the United States should be substituted.

1871: Honor and duty alike require the honest payment of the public debt.

Believing that a better system can be devised, and one that will be free from unjust privileges, we are in favor of abolishing the franchises of the national banks to issue a paper currency as soon as the same can safely and prudently be done, and that the notes so withdrawn by the banks be replaced by the Government with legal-tender currency.—*Ohio State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1875: That the policy already initiated by the Republican party of abolishing the legal tender and giving national banks the power to furnish all the currency will increase the power of an already dangerous monopoly and the enormous burden now oppressing the people, without any corresponding advantage, and that we oppose the policy and demand that all the national-bank circulation be promptly and permanently retired, and legal tenders be issued in their place. * * * No paper currency except such as may be issued directly by and upon the faith of the General Government.

1876: The gradual but early substitution of legal-tender for national-bank notes. * * * The issue by the General Government alone of all the circulating medium, whether paper or metallic.

1877: We favor the retention of greenback currency as the best paper money we have ever had, and declare against any further contraction. * * * We favor the issue by the General Government alone of all circulating mediums, whether paper or metallic, to be always of equal tender and interconvertible.

1878: The gradual substitution of United States legal-tender paper for national-bank notes and its permanent establishment as the sole paper money of the country. * * * No further increase in the bonded debt and no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes, but the gradual extinction of the public debt.

1879: The issue of money in any form and the regulation thereof belong to the General Government alone, and ought not to be delegated or intrusted to individuals or corporations. We oppose the perpetuation of the present national banking system as a means of control over the currency of the country, and demand the gradual substitution of Treasury notes for national-bank currency.

OREGON.

1875: The institution of the system of national banks was a fraud upon the country and an injustice upon the laboring classes, and we demand such prudent legislation as will gradually bring this vicious system to a close; that all currency which may be issued shall be convertible into coin upon demand and be issued directly by the Government.

That the gratuity of nearly $24,000,000 now paid to national banks by the Government is simply levying tribute upon the people for the benefit of the capitalists. We therefore favor the repeal of the law under which they were established and the direct issue by the Government of currency, receivable for all public dues, sufficient to supply the place of the present bank-note circulation.—*Oregon State Democratic platform, 1878.*

PENNSYLVANIA.

1875: That the policy already indicated by the Republican party of abolishing legal tenders and giving the national banks the power to furnish all the currency will increase the power of an already dangerous monopoly and the enormous burden now oppressing the people without compensating advantage, and that all the national-bank circulation be promptly and permanently retired and full legal tenders be issued in their place.

1875: The honest payment of our just debts and the sacred preservation of the public faith.

1876: The honest payment of the public debt.

1878: Gold, silver, and United States legal-tender notes at par therewith are a just basis for paper circulation.

NEW YORK.

1874: Honest payment of the public debt in coin.

TENNESSEE.

That we favor the abolition of the present odious national-bank system and the payment of the bonds of the Government by issuance of its non-interest-bearing notes, according to the contract expressed and implied at the time of the creation of such obligations.—*Tennessee Democratic State platform, 1874.*

The substitution of Treasury notes for national-bank currency at the earliest moment practicable.—*Tennessee State Democratic platform, 1876.*

1878: The odious national banking act be repealed and greenbacks be substituted for the circulation of national banks. * * * That no more interest-bearing bonds be issued; that all loans required by the Government be raised by the issuance of noninterest-bearing Treasury notes.

TEXAS.

1878: We favor one currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder. * * * The substitution of United States legal tender for national-bank notes and its permanent reestablishment as the sole paper money of the country.

No further increase in the bonded debt; no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for redemption purposes, but a gradual reduction of the public debt by payment according to the original contract by which it was created.

VERMONT.

1878: The honest payment of the public debt in such currency as its terms imply, and the preservation of the public faith.

One currency for all. We oppose the present national banking system and recommend the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national-bank bills.

WISCONSIN.

1887: Declares its opposition to a longer continuance of the national-bank currency and demands that the Government furnish its own notes in the place thereof.

UTTERANCES OF EMINENT STATESMEN.

These are the words of Mr. Jefferson:

"It is a wise rule and should be fundamental in a government disposed to cherish its credit, but at the same time to restrain the use of it within the limits of its faculties, 'never to borrow a dollar without laying a tax on the same instant for paying the interest annually, and the principal within a given term; and to consider that tax as pledged to the creditors on the public faith.' On such a pledge as this, sacredly observed, a government may always command, on a reasonable interest, all the lendable money of their citizens, while the necessity of equivalent tax is a salutary warning to them and their constituents against oppression, bankruptcy, and its inevitable consequence, revolution. But the term of redemption must be moderate and at any rate within the limits of their rightful powers. But what limits, it will be asked, does this prescribe to their powers? What is to hinder them from creating a perpetual debt? The laws of nature, I answer. The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead. The will and the power of man expire with his life, by nature's law."

* * * * * * *

"In seeking, then, for an ultimate term for the redemption of our debts, let us rally to this principle and provide for their payment within the term of nineteen years at the furthest." (Volume 6, pages 136, 137.)

"We must raise, then, ourselves the money for this war, either by taxes within the year, or by loans; and if by loans, we must repay them ourselves, proscribing forever the English practice of perpetual funding, the ruinous consequences of which, putting right out of the question, should be a sufficient warning to a considerate nation to avoid the example." (Volume 6, page 197.)

"At the time we were funding our national debt, we heard much about 'a public debt being a public blessing'; that the stock representing it was a creation of active capital for the aliment of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture. This paradox was well adapted to the minds of believers in dreams, and the gulls of that size entered bona fide into it." (Volume 6, page 239.)

"The misfortune is that in the meantime we shall plunge ourselves in unextinguishable debt, and entail on our posterity an inheritance of eternal taxes, which will bring our Government and people into the condition of those of England, a nation of pikes and gudgeons, the latter bred merely as food for the former." (Volume 6, page 409.)

"Funding I consider as limited, rightfully, to a redemption of the debt within the lives of a majority of the generation contracting it; every generation coming equally, by the laws of the Creator of the world, to the free possession of the earth He made for their subsistence, unencumbered by their predecessors, who, like them, were but tenants for life."

* * * * * * *

"And I sincerely believe, with you, that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies; and that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale." (Volume 6, pages 605–608.)

"No earthly consideration could induce my consent to contract such a debt as England has by her wars for commerce, to reduce our citizens by taxes to such wretchedness as that, laboring sixteen of the twenty-four hours, they are still unable to afford themselves bread, or barely to earn as much oatmeal or potatoes as will keep soul and body together." (Volume 7, page 7.)

* * * * * * *

"I am not among those who fear the people. They and not the rich are our dependence for continued freedom. And to preserve their independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are; our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, give the earnings of fifteen of these to the Government for their debts and daily expenses; and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes; have no time to think, no means of calling the mismanagers to account, but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers. Our landholders, too, like theirs, retaining indeed the title and stewardship of estates called theirs, but held in trust for the Treasury, must wander, like theirs, in foreign countries, and be contented with penury, obscurity, exile, and the glory of the nation. This example reads to us the salutary lesson that private fortunes are destroyed by public as well as by private extravagance. And this is the tendency of all known governments. A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second, that second for a third, and so on till the bulk of the society is reduced to be mere automatons of misery, to have no sensibilities left but for sinning and suffering. Then begins, indeed, the bellum omnium in omnia, which some philosophers, observing to be so general in this world, have mistaken it for the natural instead of the abusive state of man. And the forehorse of this frightful team is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its turn wretchedness and oppression." (Volume 7, page 14.)

* * * * * * *

"I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared. We see in England the consequences of the want of it—their laborers reduced to live on a penny in the shilling of their earnings, to give up bread, and resort to oatmeal and potatoes for food; and their landholders exiling themselves to live in penury and obscurity abroad, because at home the Government must have all the clear profits of their land. In fact, they see the fee simple of the island transferred to the public creditors, all its profits going to them for the interest of their debts. Our laborers and landholders must come to this also unless they serenely adhere to the economy you recommend." (Volume 7, page 19.)

—

"The incorporation of a bank and the powers assumed by this bill have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution."—*Opinion against the constitutionality of a national bank, February 15, 1791,* volume 7, page 556.

—

"The bank filled and overflowed in the moment it was opened. Instead of 20,000 shares 24,000 were offered and a great many unpresented who had not

suspected that so much haste was necessary. Thus it is that we shall be paying 13 per cent per annum for eight millions of paper money, instead of having that circulation of gold and silver for nothing. Experience has proved to us that a dollar of silver disappears for every dollar of paper emitted; and for the paper emitted from the bank 7 per cent profits will be received by the subscribers for it as bank paper (according to the last division of profits by the Philadelphia Bank), and 6 per cent on the public paper of which it is the representative."—*Letter to Colonel Monroe, July 10, 1791*, volume 3, page 268.

—

"Our public credit is good, but the abundance of paper has produced a spirit of gambling in the funds, which has laid up our ships at the wharves as too slow instruments of profit, and has even disarmed the hand of the tailor of his needle and thimble. They say the evil will cure itself. I wish it may, but I have rarely seen a gamester cured, even by the disasters of his vocation."—*Letter to Gouverneur Morris, August 30, 1791*, volume 3, page 290.

—

"You will see further that we are completely saddled and bridled, and that the bank is so firmly mounted on us that we must go where they will guide. They openly publish a resolution that, the national property being increased in value, they must by an increase of circulating medium furnish an adequate representation of it, and by further additions of active capital promote the enterprises of our merchants."—*Letter to Colonel Monroe, June 12, 1796*, volume 4, page 140.

—

"I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our Government to the genuine principles of its Constitution; I mean an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing. I now deny their power of making paper money or anything else a legal tender."—*Letter to John Taylor, November 26, 1798*, volume 4, page 260.

—

"The monopoly of a single bank is certainly an evil. The multiplication of them was intended to cure it; but it multiplied an influence of the same character with the first, and completed the supplanting the precious metals by a paper circulation."—*Letter to Mr. Gallatin, June 19, 1802*, volume 4, page 440.

—

"From a passage in the letter of the president [of the United States Bank] I observe an idea of establishing a branch bank of the United States in New Orleans. This institution is one of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution. The nation is at this time so strong and united in its sentiments that it can not be shaken at this moment. But suppose a series of untoward events should occur, sufficient to bring into doubt the competency of a republican government to meet a crisis of great danger or to unhinge the confidence of the people in the public functionaries, an institution like this, penetrating by its branches every part of the Union, acting by command and in phalanx, may in a critical moment upset the Government."—*Letter to Mr. Gallatin, December 13, 1803*, volume 4, page 519.

—

"That we are overdone with banking institutions, which have banished the precious metals and substituted a more fluctuating and unsafe medium; that these have withdrawn capital from useful improvements and employments to nourish idleness; that the wars of the world have swollen our commerce beyond the wholesome limits of exchanging our own productions for our own wants, and that, for the emolument of a small proportion of our society, who prefer these demoralizing pursuits to labors useful to the whole, the peace of the whole is endangered, and all our present difficulties produced, more easily to be deplored than remedied."—*Letter to Abbe Salimankis, March 14, 1810*, volume 5, page 516.

—

"One of the great advantages of specie as a medium is that, being of universal value, it will keep itself at a general level, flowing out from where it is too high into parts where it is lower. Whereas, if the medium be of local value only, as paper money, if too little, indeed, gold and silver will flow in to supply the deficiency; but if too much, it accumulates, banishes the gold and silver not locked up in vaults and hoards, and depreciates itself—that is to say, its proportion to the annual produce of industry being raised, more of it is required to represent any particular article of produce than in the other countries. And to fill up the measure of blessing, instead of paying, they receive an interest on what they owe from those to whom they owe; for all the notes, or evidences of what they owe, which we see in circulation, have been lent to somebody on an interest which is levied again on us through the medium of commerce."—*Letter to John W. Eppes, November 6, 1813*, volume 6, page 239.

—

"Everything predicted by the enemies of banks in the beginning is now coming to pass. We are to be ruined now by the deluge of bank paper, as we were formerly by the old Continental paper. It is cruel that such revolutions in private fortunes should be at the mercy of avaricious adventurers, who instead of employing their capital, if any they have, in manufactures, commerce, or other useful pursuits, make it an instrument to burden all the interchanges of property with their swindling profits, profits which are the price of no useful industry of theirs. * * * I am an enemy to all banks discounting bills or notes for anything but coin."—*Letter to Dr. Thomas Cooper, January 16, 1814*, volume 6, page 295.

—

"Until the gigantic banking propositions of this winter had made their appearance in the different legislatures, I had hoped that the evil might still be checked; but I see now that it is desperate, and that we must fold our arms and go to the bottom with the ship."—*Letter to Joseph C. Cabell, esq., January 17, 1814*, volume 6, page 300.

—

"I have ever been the enemy of banks, not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting their own paper into circulation, and thus banishing our cash. My zeal against those institutions was so warm and open at the establishment of the Bank of the United States that I was derided as a maniac by the tribe of bank mongers who were seeking to filch from the public their swindling and barren gains."—*Letter to President Adams, January 24, 1814*, volume 6, page 305.

—

"From the establishment of the United States Bank to this day I have preached against this system, but have been sensible no cure could be hoped but in the catastrophe now happening. The remedy was to let banks drop gradation at the expiration of their charters, and for the State governments to relinquish the power of establishing others. This would not, as it should not, have given the power of establishing them to Congress. But Congress could then have issued Treasury notes payable within a fixed period, and founded on a specific tax, the proceeds of which, as they came in, should be exchangeable for the notes of that particular emission only."—*Letter to Thomas Cooper, esq., September 10, 1814*, volume 6, page 381.

"Let us be allured by no objects of banks, public or private, or ephemeral expedients, which, enabling us to gasp and flounder a little longer, only increase by protracting the agonies of death."—*Letter to James Monroe, October 16, 1814*, volume 6, page 395.

—

"The fatal possession of the whole circulating medium by our banks, the excess of those institutions, and their present discredit cause all our difficulties. Treasury notes of small as well as high denomination, bottomed on a tax which would redeem them in ten years, would place at our disposal the whole circulating medium of the United States; a fund of credit sufficient to carry us through any probable length of war."—*Letter to his excellency Mr. Crawford, February 11, 1815*, volume 6, page 419.

—

"The Government is now issuing Treasury notes for circulation, bottomed on solid funds, and bearing interest. The banking confederacy (and the merchants bound to them by their debts) will endeavor to crush the credit of these notes, but the country is eager for them, as something they can trust to, and so soon as a convenient quantity of them can get into circulation, the bank notes die."—*Letter to Jean Batiste Say, March 2, 1815*, volume 6, page 434.

—

"Their merchants (the English) established among us, the bonds by which our own are chained to their feet, and the banking combinations interwoven with the whole, have shown the extent of their control, even during a war with her. They are the workers of all the embarrassments our finances have experienced during the war."—*Letter to Cæsar A. Rodney, March 16, 1815*, volume 6, page 449.

—

"Like a dropsical man calling out for water, water, our deluded citizens are clamoring for more banks, more banks. The American mind is now in the state of fever which the world has so often seen in the history of other nations. We are under the bank bubble, as England was under the South Sea bubble, France under the Mississippi bubble, and as every nation is liable to be under whatever bubble, design, or delusion may puff up in moments when off their guard. We are now taught to believe that legerdemain tricks upon paper can produce as solid wealth as hard labor in the earth. It is vain for common sense to urge that nothing can produce nothing; that it is an idle dream to believe in a philosopher's stone which is to turn everything into gold, and to redeem man from the original sentence of his Maker, 'In the sweat of his brow shall he eat his bread.'"—*Letter to Colonel Yancey, January 6, 1816*, volume 6, page 515.

—

"The metallic medium of which we should be possessed at the commencement of a war would be a sufficient fund for all the loans we should need through its continuance; and if the national bills issued be bottomed (as is indispensible) on pledges of specific taxes for their redemption within certain and moderate epochs, and be of proper denominations for circulation, no interest on them would be necessary or just, because they would answer to everyone the purposes of the metallic money withdrawn and replaced by them."—*Letter to William H. Crawford, June 20, 1816*, volume 7, page 8.

—

"The bank mania is one of the most threatening of these imitations. It is raising up a moneyed aristocracy in our country which has already set the Government at defiance, and although forced at length to yield a little on this first essay of their strength, their principles are unyielded and unyielding. These have taken deep root in the hearts of that class from which our legislators are drawn, and the sop to Cerberus from fable has become history. Their principles lay hold of the good, their pelf of the bad, and thus those whom the Constitution had placed as guards to its portals are sophisticated or suborned from their duties. That paper money has some advantages is admitted. But that its abuses also are inevitable, and by breaking up the measure of value makes a lottery of all private property, can not be denied. Shall we ever be able to put a constitutional veto upon it?"—*Letter to Dr. Josephus B. Stuart, May 10, 1817*, volume 7, page 64.

—

"There is, indeed, one evil which awakens me at times, because it jostles me at every turn. It is that we have now no measure of value."—*Letter to Nathaniel Macon, esq., January 12, 1819*, volume 7, page 111.

—

"The evils of this deluge of paper money are not to be removed until our citizens are generally and radically instructed in their cause and consequences, and silence by their authority the interested clamors and sophistry of speculating, shaving, and banking institutions."—*Letter to Mr. Adams, March 21, 1819*, volume 7, page 115.

—

"The paper bubble is then burst. This is what you and I and every reasonable man, seduced by no obliquity of mind or interest, have long foreseen, yet its disastrous effects are not the less for having been foreseen. We are laboring under a dropsical fullness of circulating medium. Nearly all of it is now called in by the banks, who have the regulation of the safety valves of our fortunes, and who condense and explode them at their will. Lands in this State can not now be sold for a year's rent."—*Letter to J. Adams, esq., November 7, 1819*, volume 7, page 142.

—

"If we suffer the moral of the present lesson to pass away without improvement by the eternal suppression of bank paper, then, indeed, is the condition of our country desperate, until the slow advance of public instruction shall give to our functionaries the wisdom of their station."—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 145.

—

"The plethory of circulating medium which raised the prices of everything to several times their ordinary and standard value, in which state of things many and heavy debts were contracted, and the sudden withdrawing too great a proportion of that medium, and reduction of prices far below that standard, constitute the disease under which we are now laboring and which must end in a general revolution of property if some remedy is not applied."—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 146.

—

"Interdict forever, to both the State and National Governments, the power of establishing any paper bank, for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium and the same revolutions of property to go through every twenty or thirty years."—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 147.

—

"The State is in a condition of unparalleled distress. The sudden reduction of the circulating medium from a plethory to all but annihilation is producing an entire revolution of fortune."—*Letter to H. Nelson, esq., March 12, 1820*, volume 7, page 151.

"I should put down all banks, admit none but a metallic circulation, that will take its proper level with the like circulation in other countries, and then our manufacturers may work in fair competition with those of other countries, and the import duties which the Government may lay for the purposes of revenue will so far place them above equal competition."—*Letter to Mr. Pinckney, September 30, 1820*, volume 7, page 180.

—

The expansion of the currency by the issue of paper in a period of prosperity will inevitably be succeeded by its contraction in periods of adversity.—*W. H. Crawford.*

—

The great object now in view is to terminate forever the evil of the present system, and to place the currency on a foundation so stable that it can not again be shaken. If a broad and sure foundation of gold and silver is provided for our system of paper credits we need not hereafter apprehend those alternate seasons of abundance and scarcity of money suddenly succeeding each other, which have so far marked our history and irreparably injured so many of our citizens.—*Report of R. B. Taney, Secretary of Treasury, April 15, 1834.*

—

Proneness to excessive issues has ever been the vice of the banking system, a vice as prominent in national as in State institutions. This propensity is as subservient to the advancement of private interests in the one as in the other; and those who direct them both, being principally guided by the same views and influenced by the same motives, will be equally ready to stimulate to extravagance of enterprise by improvidence of credit.—*President Van Buren's message, September 4, 1837.*

—

The history of trade in the United States for the last three or four years affords the most convincing evidence that our present condition is chiefly to be attributed to overaction in all the departments of business, an overaction deriving, perhaps, its first impulse from antecedent causes, but stimulated to its destructive consequences by excessive issues of bank paper and by other facilities for the acquisition and enlargement of credit.—*President Van Buren's message, September 4, 1837.*

—

The limited influence of a national bank in averting derangement in the exchanges of the country, or in compelling the resumption of specie payments, is now not less apparent than its tendency to increase inordinate speculation by sudden expansions and contractions; its disposition to create panic and embarrassment for the promotion of its own designs; its interference with politics, and its far greater power for evil than for good, either in regard to the local institutions or the operations of a government itself. What was in these respects but apprehension or opinion when a national bank was first established now stands confirmed by humiliating experience. The scenes through which we have passed conclusively prove how little our commerce, agriculture, manufactures, or finances require such an institution, and what dangers are attendant on its power—a power, I trust, never to be conferred by the American people upon their Government, and still less upon individuals not responsible to them for its unavoidable abuses.—*President Van Buren's second annual message, December 4, 1838.*

—

The experiment has been tried and local paper has failed as a national currency, and out of that failure arose the second United States bank. It will fail again and again, and forever. There is no safety for the Federal revenues but in the total exclusion of local paper, and that from every branch of the revenues—customs, lands, and post-office. There is no safety for the national finances but in the constitutional medium of gold and silver. After forty years' wandering in the wilderness of paper money we have approached the confines of the constitutional medium.—*Benton, December 14, 1836.*

—

The evils of a redundant paper circulation are now manifest to every eye. It alternately raises and sinks the value of every man's property. It makes a beggar of the man to-morrow who is indulging in dreams of wealth to-day. It converts the business of society into a mere lottery, while those who distribute the prizes are wholly irresponsible to the people. When the collapse comes, as come it must, it casts laborers out of employment, crushes manufacturers and merchants, and ruins thousands of honest and industrious citizens. Shall we then, by our policy, any longer contribute to such fatal results? That is the question.—*Buchanan, September 29, 1837.*

—

For myself, I am opposed to investing in banks the power of manufacturing a paper currency. This power of creating a currency for a nation is one of the highest and most important attributes of a sovereign power, and more deeply affects all the diversified interests of society than the exercise of any other power whatever. It is more important than coining money, for that must be preceded by the purchase of the bullion; but here is a power to manufacture paper money at pleasure, to constitute the currency of a State or nation, a power intrusted to the irresponsible directory of a bank, acting in secret, and whose chief interest is to abuse their power. In proportion as a bank increases in currency are its dividends and profits augmented, and hence the stimulus to overissues is irresistible, and especially is this the case where, as we have seen by the evidence before quoted, the very directors which manufacture the paper loan out, as a general rule, more than one-fourth of it to themselves. This power, then, of issuing their paper as money is truly fearful, and when united with the power of loaning at pleasure, in secret conclave, and to whom and for what purpose the bank directory may think proper, and of recalling it at pleasure, and of contracting and expanding as suits their caprice, is a power which few European despots would dare to exercise, and is utterly incompatible with the fundamental principles of a free government.—*From the speech of Robert J. Walker in the Senate January 21, 1840.*

—

Allow me, moreover, to hope that it will be a favorite policy with you not merely to secure a payment of the interest of the debt funded, but as far and as fast as the growing resources of the country will permit to exonerate it of the principal itself. The appropriations you have made of the Western lands explain your disposition on this subject, and I am persuaded that the sooner that valuable fund can be made to contribute, along with other means, to the actual reduction of the public debt, the more salutary will the measure be to every public interest, as well as the more satisfactory to our constituents.—*Washington's second annual address to Congress, December 8, 1790.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 38.)

No pecuniary consideration is more urgent than the regular redemption and discharge of the public debt. On none can delay be more injurious or an economy of time be more valuable.—*Washington's fifth annual address to Congress, December 3, 1793.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 49.)

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The time which has elapsed since the commencement of our fiscal measures has developed our pecuniary resources so as to open the way for a definitive plan for the redemption of the public debt. It is believed that the result is such as to encourage Congress to consummate this work without delay. Nothing can more promote the permanent welfare of the nation and nothing would be more grateful to our constituents. Indeed, whatever is unfinished of our system of public credit can not be benefited by procrastination; and as far as may be practicable we ought to place that credit on grounds which can not be disturbed and to prevent that progressive accumulation of debt which must ultimately endanger all governments.—*Washington's sixth annual address to Congress, November 19, 1794.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 59.)

The consequences arising from the continual accumulation of public debts in other countries ought to admonish us to be careful to prevent their growth in our own. The national defense must be provided for as well as the support of Government, but both should be accomplished as much as possible by immediate taxes and as little as possible by loans.—*President John Adams's message, 1797.*

When effects so salutary result from the plan you have already sanctioned, when merely by avoiding false objects of expense we are able, without a direct tax, without internal taxes, and without borrowing, to make large and effectual payments toward the discharge of our public debt and the emancipation of our posterity from that moral canker, it is an encouragement, fellow-citizens, of the highest order, to proceed as we have begun, in substituting economy for taxation, and in pursuing what is useful for a nation placed as we are, rather than what is practiced by others under different circumstances. And whensoever we are destined to meet events which shall call forth all the energies of our countrymen, we have the firmest reliance on those energies, and the comfort of leaving for calls like these the extraordinary resources of loans and internal taxes.—*Jefferson's second annual message to Congress, December 15, 1802.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 160.)

I am uneasy at seeing that the sale of our western lands is not yet commenced. That valuable fund for the immediate extinction of our debt will, I fear, be suffered to slip through our fingers. Every delay exposes it to events which no human foresight can guard against.—*Letter to James Madison, June 20, 1787*, volume 2, page 153.

The question whether one generation of men has a right to bind another seems never to have been started either on this or our side of the water. Yet it is a question of such consequences as not only to merit decision, but place also among the fundamental principles of every government. The course of reflection in which we are immersed here, on the elementary principles of society, has presented this question to my mind; and that no such obligation can be transmitted I think very capable of proof. I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self-evident, that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living; that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it. The portion occupied by any individual ceases to be his when himself ceases to be, and reverts to the society. If the society has formed no rules for the appropriation of its lands in severalty, it will be taken by the first occupants, and these will generally be the wife and children of the decedent. If they have formed rules of appropriation, those rules may give it to the wife and children, or to some one of them, or to the legatee of the deceased. So they may give it to its creditor. But the child, the legatee, or creditor takes it not by natural right, but by a law of the society of which he is a member and to which he is subject. Then, no man can, by natural right, oblige the lands he occupied, or the persons who succeed him in that occupation, to the payment of debts contracted by him. For if he could he might during his own life eat up the usufruct of the lands for several generations to come; and then the lands would belong to the dead and not to the living, which is the reverse of our principle.

What is true of every member of the society individually is true of them all collectively, since the rights of the whole can be no more than the sum of the rights of the individuals. To keep our ideas clear when applying them to a multitude, let us suppose a whole generation of men to be born on the same day, to attain mature age on the same day, and to die on the same day, leaving a succeeding generation in the moment of attaining their mature age, all together. Let the ripe age be supposed of 21 years, and their period of life thirty-four years more, that being the average term given by the bills of mortality to persons of 21 years of age. Each successive generation would, in this way, come and go off the stage at a fixed moment, as individuals do now. Then, I say, the earth belongs to each of these generations during its course, fully and in its own right. The second generation receives it clear of the debts and incumbrances of the first, the third of the second, and so on. For if the first could charge it with a debt, then the earth would belong to the dead and not to the living generation. Then no generation can contract debts greater than may be paid during the course of its own existence.—*Letter written from Paris to James Madison, September 6, 1789*, volume 3, page 103.

Not those who promote unnecessary accumulations of the debt of the Union, instead of the best means of discharging it as fast as possible, thereby increasing the causes of corruption in the Government and the pretext for new taxes under its authority, the former undermining the confidence, the latter alienating the affections of the people.

The real friends of the Union are those who are friends to the authority of the people, the sole foundation on which the Union rests;

Who are friends to liberty, the great end for which the Union was formed;

Who are friends to the limited and republican system of government, the means provided by that authority for the attainment of that end;

Who, considering a public debt as injurious to the interests of the people and baneful to the virtue of the Government, are enemies to every contrivance for unnecessarily increasing its amount, or protracting its duration, or extending its influence.

In a word, those are the real friends of the Union who are friends to that republican policy throughout which is the only cement for the union of a republican people, in opposition to a spirit of usurpation and monarchy, which is the menstruum most capable of dissolving it.—*No. 15, Writings of Madison, March 31, 1792*, page 480.

If Providence permits me to meet you at another session, I shall have the high gratification of announcing to you that the national debt is extinguished. I can not refrain from expressing the pleasure I feel at the near approach of that desirable event. The short period of time within which the public debt will have been discharged is strong evidence of the abundant resources of the country and of the prudence and economy with which the Government has heretofore been administered.—*President Jackson's message, 1833.*

I can not too cordially congratulate Congress and my fellow-citizens on the near approach of that memorable and happy event, the extinction of the public debt of this great and free nation. Faithful to the wise and patriotic policy marked out by the legislation of the country for this object, the present Administration has devoted to it all the means which its flourishing commerce has supplied and a prudent economy preserved for the Public Treasury. Within the four years for which the people have confided the executive power to my charge, $58,000,000 will have been applied to the payment of the public debt.

* * * * * * *

The final removal of this great burden from our resources affords the means of further provision for all the objects of general welfare and public defense which the Constitution authorizes and prevents the occasion for such further reduction in the revenue as may not be required for them.—*President Jackson's annual message, 1833.*

The paper-money system and its natural associates, monopoly and exclusive privileges, have already struck their roots deep in the soil; and it will require all your efforts to check its further growth and to eradicate the evil. The men who profit by the abuses and desire to perpetuate them will continue to besiege the halls of legislation in the General Government as well as in the States, and will seek, by every artifice, to mislead and deceive the public servants. It is to yourselves that you must look for safety and the means of guarding and perpetuating your free institutions. In your hands is rightfully placed the sovereignty of the country, and to you everyone placed in authority is ultimately responsible. It is always in your power to see that the wishes of the people are carried into faithful execution, and their will, when once made known, must sooner or later be obeyed. And while the people remain, as I trust they ever will, uncorrupted and incorruptible, and continue watchful and jealous of their rights, the Government is safe, and the cause of freedom will continue to triumph over its enemies.

But it will require steady and persevering exertions on your part to rid yourself of the iniquities and mischiefs of the paper system, and to check the spirit of monopoly and other abuses which have sprung up with it, and of which it is the main support. So many interests are united to resist all reform on this subject that you must not hope the conflict will be a short one nor success easy. My humble efforts have not been spared, during my administration of the Government, to restore the constitutional currency of gold and silver; and something, I trust, has been done toward the accomplishment of this most desirable object. But enough yet remains to require all your energy and perseverance. The power, however, is in your hands, and the remedy must and will be applied if you determine upon it.—*Jackson's Farewell Address.*

The creation, in time of peace, of a debt likely to become permanent is an evil for which there is no equivalent. The rapidity with which many of the States are apparently approaching to this condition admonishes us of our own duties in a manner too impressive to be disregarded. One, not the least important, is to keep the Federal Government always in a condition to discharge with ease and vigor its highest functions, should their exercise be required by any sudden conjuncture of public affairs—a condition to which we are always exposed, and which may occur when least expected. To this end it is indispensable that its finances should be untrammeled and its resources, so far as practicable, unencumbered. No circumstance should present greater obstacles to the accomplishment of these vitally important objects than the creation of an onerous national debt. Our own experience, and also that of other nations, has demonstrated the unavoidable and fearful rapidity with which a public debt is increased when the Government has once surrendered itself to the ruinous practice of supplying its supposed necessities by new loans. The struggle, therefore, on our part, to be successful, must be made at the threshold. To make our efforts effective, severe economy is necessary. This is the surest provision for the national welfare, and it is at the same time the best preservative of the principles on which our institutions rest. Simplicity and economy in the affairs of state have never failed to chasten and invigorate republican principles, while these have been as surely subverted by national prodigality under whatever specious pretext it may have been introduced or fostered.—*Van Buren's third annual message.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 2, page 1121.)

A few years ago our whole national debt growing out of the Revolution and the war of 1812 with Great Britain was extinguished, and we presented to the world the rare and noble spectacle of a great and growing people who had fully discharged every obligation. Since that time the existing debt has been contracted; and, small as it is in comparison with the similar burdens of most other nations, it should be extinguished at the earliest practicable period. Should the state of the country permit, and especially if our foreign relations interpose no obstacle, it is contemplated to apply all the moneys in the Treasury, as they accrue beyond what is required for the appropriations by Congress, to its liquidation. I cherish the hope of soon being able to congratulate the country on its recovering once more the lofty position which it so recently occupied. Our country, which exhibits to the world the benefits of self-government in developing all the sources of national prosperity, owes to mankind the permanent example of a nation free from the blighting influence of a public debt.—*Polk's first annual message, December 2, 1845.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1462.)

The amount of the public debt to be contracted should be limited to the lowest practicable sum, and should be extinguished as early after the conclusion of the war as the means of the Treasury will permit.

With this view it is recommended that as soon as the war shall be over all the surplus in the Treasury, not needed for other indispensable objects, shall constitute a sinking fund and be applied to the purchase of the funded debt, and that authority be conferred by law for that purpose.—*Polk's third annual message, December 7, 1847.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1704.)

Besides making the necessary legislative provisions for the execution of the treaty, and the establishment of Territorial governments in the ceded country, we have, upon the restoration of peace, other important duties to perform. Among these I regard none as more important than the adoption of proper measures for the speedy extinguishment of the national debt. It is against sound policy and the genius of our institutions that a public debt should be permitted a day longer than the means of the Treasury will enable the Government to pay it off. We should adhere to the wise policy laid down by President Washington, of "avoiding the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden we ourselves ought to bear."—*Polk's special message, July 6, 1848.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1743.)

In my message of the 6th of July last, transmitting to Congress the ratified treaty of peace with Mexico, I recommended the adoption of measures for the speedy payment of the public debt. In reiterating that recommendation, I refer you to the considerations presented in that message in its support.

* * * * * * *

The public expenditures should be economical and be confined to such necessary objects as are clearly within the powers of Congress. All such as are not absolutely demanded should be postponed and the payment of the public debt at the earliest practicable period should be a cardinal principle of our public policy.—*Polk's fourth annual message, December 5.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1774.)

The following are from Clay, Calhoun, Crawford, and Benton:

Mr. Clay said, in 1816, he would—

"Lay down a general rule, from which there ought never to be a departure without absolute necessity, that the expense of the year ought to be met by the revenue of the year. If in time of war it were impossible to observe this rule we ought in time of peace to provide for as speedy a discharge of the debt contracted in the preceding war as possible."

And in 1824 he said:

"The payment of that debt and the consequent liberation of the public resources from the charge of it is extremely desirable.

"The moral value of the payment of a national debt consists in the demonstration which it affords of the ability of a country to meet and its integrity in fulfilling all its engagements. * * * Whoever may be entitled to the credit of the payment of the public debt, I congratulate you, sir, and the country most cordially that it is so near at hand."

I shall oppose strenuously all attempts to originate a new debt; to create a national bank; to reunite the political and money power—more dangerous than that of church and state—in any form or shape.—*Calhoun on the bill for the issue of Treasury notes, United States Senate, September 18, 1837.* (*Abridgment Debates in Congress*, volume 13, page 363.)

An attentive examination of the rise and fall of public debts in other countries can not fail to impress the American Republic with the necessity of making suitable exertions in periods of peace to release the national revenue from so heavy an incumbrance.—*W. H. Crawford, December 16, 1816.*

What more unwise and more unjust than to contract debts on long time, as some of the States have done, thereby invading the rights and mortgaging the resources of posterity, and loading unborn generations with debts not their own? What more unwise than all this, which several of the States have done, and which the effort now is to make all do? Besides the ultimate burden, in the shape of final payment, which is intended to fall upon posterity, the present burden is incessant in the shape of annual interest, and, falling upon each generation, equals the principal in every periodical return of ten or a dozen years. Few have calculated the devouring effect of annual interest on public debts and considered how soon it exceeds the principal.—*Benton's speech on assumption of State debts; Thirty Years' View*, volume 2, page 173.

The following are the declarations of the national Democracy in their platforms:

"A rigorously, frugal administration of the Government and the application of all the possible savings of the public revenue to the liquidation of the public debt, and resistance, therefore, to all measures looking to the multiplication of officers and salaries merely to create indebtedness and augment the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing."—*Platform of 1800* article 4.

"We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium, because gold and silver is the only safe and constitutional currency."—*Platform, 1836.*

"ART. 6. That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people."—*Democratic platform, 1840.*

Democratic platform of 1844 affirms article 6 of the platform of 1840.

Democratic platform of 1848 declares—

"For the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt."

The platform of 1848 further declares that the triumph of 1844 had fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in defeating the declared purposes of their opponents to create a national bank. In protecting the currency and labor of the country from ruinous fluctuations and guarding the money of the country for the use of the people by the establishment of a constitutional Treasury.

Also—

"*Resolved*, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt."—*Democratic platform, 1852*, article 8.

Article 9 of the same:

"That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power above the laws and will of the people."—*Democratic platform, 1852*, article 9.

That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the American people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people.—*Democratic platform, 1856*, article 7.

Payment of all the public debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable.—*Democratic platform, 1868*, article 3.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, according to the unanimous agreement of the Senate this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m., Friday, January 31) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 1, 1896, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 31, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I ask consent for the immediate consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of 1893, authorizing the St. Lawrence Railway Company, of the State of New York, to build and maintain a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at some point in St. Lawrence County, State of New York, be, and is hereby, amended by extending the time for the completion of said bridge to

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The following amendments, reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, were read and agreed to:

After the word "act," in line 3, strike out the word "of" and insert "approved February ninth."

After the word "to," in line 8, add the words "February ninth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight."

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS of New York, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR CONVENTION.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to report favorably a

joint resolution from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for which I desire immediate consideration.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896" was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant to the committee known as "The Committee of 1896," of which W. H. H. Smith is chairman, having charge in the city of Washington, D. C., of the arrangements for the Fifteenth International Christian Endeavor Convention, permits for the temporary occupation and use, during July, 1896, of the reservation or public space known as the White Lot for the purpose of erecting three or more great tents and the necessary platforms, seatings, etc., capable of seating about 10,000 persons each, for the meeting places of the Fifteenth International Christian Endeavor Convention, to be held July 8 to 13, inclusive, 1896, and such smaller tents as may be required for the distribution of literature, etc., together with such portions of the Monument Grounds as said committee may require, if in his opinion such use will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon such grounds, reservation, or public space: *Provided*, That said "Committee of 1896" guarantee, at their own cost and expense, to restore and make good any temporary injury that may be inflicted to said grounds by reason of their use thereof.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The following amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to:

In line 11, after the word "three," strike out the words "or more"; so as to read "for the purpose of erecting three tents," etc.

After the word "seatings," in line 12, and after the word "literature," in line 17, strike out the words "and so forth."

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MORSE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CESSION OF LAND TO OHIO.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution of the Ohio legislature be read and printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

House joint resolution No. 12.

Joint resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in securing the passage of an act ceding certain lands to the State of Ohio.

Whereas the Ohio canal commission, in the prosecution of its work of investigating the titles of State lands, finds that section 7, town 6, south range 4 east, Auglaize County, Ohio, is the property of the United States; and

Whereas said section 7 is wholly within the limits of the Mercer County reservoir and therefore a part of the public works of Ohio, and any disposition of it to private parties or corporations would work great injustice to the public works of the State; and

Whereas the canal commission having made application to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for a patent to the land in the said section 7 under the swamp-land act of 1850, and said application having been rejected and the application is now pending on an appeal before the Secretary of the Interior; Therefore

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their good offices in securing the passage of an act ceding the land in question to the State of Ohio, and that the governor be requested to forward to our Senators and Representatives of Ohio a certified copy of this resolution.

CHARLES H. BOSLER,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted January 29, 1896.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution just read will be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CONTESTED ELECTION—ROSENTHAL VS. CROWLEY.

Mr. JENKINS. I desire to call up the report of the Committee on Elections No. 3, in the case of Rosenthal *vs.* Crowley, from the Tenth Congressional district of the State of Texas. Before the resolutions reported by the committee are taken up for consideration, I wish to say that I am requested by Mr. Rosenthal to state that he thanks the House very warmly for the courtesy extended yesterday in granting him permission to address the House on his own behalf for one hour to-day, but that upon reflection and on consultation with his friends he has decided not to avail himself of the opportunity so kindly granted, and is willing that the resolutions reported from our committee should pursue their regular course.

While I am on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a report from the same committee in the same case, upon the question of permitting Mr. Rosenthal to amend his notice of contest. I ask for the reading of the resolutions as reported yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to file an additional report in regard to the amendment of notice of contest?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir; a report on a resolution referred by the House to the committee, authorizing Mr. Rosenthal to amend his notice of contest. It is a matter entirely separate from the matter reported on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this report to which the gentleman now refers should be handed in later; it should not be a part of the present proceedings. The Clerk will report the resolutions reported yesterday, and which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS] now calls up.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That A. J. Rosenthal was not elected a Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of the State of Texas to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is not entitled to the seat.

Resolved, That Miles Crowley was duly elected a Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of the State of Texas to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is entitled to the seat.

The question being taken, the resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether this courtesy has been accorded to that committee heretofore?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. In former Congresses it has been.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; and it was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CHARLES W. STONE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DUPLICATE ENGROSSED BILL.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to furnish a duplicate engrossed bill, S. 708, in lieu of the original, which has been lost.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 105) for the relief of ex-Naval Cadets John P. J. Ryan, John R. Morris, and Chester Wells.

Be it resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint John P. J. Ryan, John R. Morris, and Chester Wells to be assistant engineers in the Navy: *Provided*, That they shall pass an examination in steam engineering that shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy: *And provided further*, That they shall take rank and receive pay only from the date of their appointment, and shall rank with each other in the order of merit as shown by the examination herein provided for.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, we ought to have some explanation of this.

Mr. HULL. I shall have to object to the consideration of that resolution.

Mr. CROWTHER. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection and permit me to say that this meets the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. In fact, I hold in my hand a letter suggesting that the resolution be adopted, for the reason that the maximum number of assistant engineers now in the Navy is 23 less than the law provides for.

The three young men mentioned in the resolution have been educated at the expense of the Government. They failed to pass a technical examination in steam engineering last June, and there can be no objection to the passage of the resolution, inasmuch as it is to the advantage of the service and meets the approval of gentlemen having these matters in charge.

Mr. TERRY. I think it ought to go to a committee.

Mr. HULL. While I concede that what the gentleman from Missouri has said may be all true, I insist that this must go to a committee, and I object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

DISTILLATION OF BRANDY FROM PRUNES.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. I refer to the bill (H. R. 886) relating to the distillation of brandy from prunes, and amending section 3255 of the Revised Statutes, with amendments recommended by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its present consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 3255. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, peaches, grapes, or prunes from any provision of this

title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon, when in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is there a report from the committee accompanying this bill?

Mr. EVANS. There is.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report of the committee may be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred H. R. 886, report the same back to the House with the following amendments:

In line 9, after the word "grapes," insert the words "pears, pineapples, oranges, apricots, berries."

Amend the title so as to read "To amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States concerning the distilling of brandy from fruits."

Section 3255 of the Revised Statutes gives the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the right to exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, peaches, or grapes from certain provisions of the law related to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon. This bill extends the provisions of section 3255 to brandy made from pears, pineapples, and berries. It does not affect the tax on such brandies.

The Committee on Ways and Means recommend the passage of the bill as amended.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Is this reported from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. EVANS. It is, unanimously; and has the recommendation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to hear the bill read as it is proposed to be amended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be read as it will stand if amended.

The bill as proposed to be amended was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. EVANS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

STEAMER MATTEAWAN.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk (H. R. 4698), to provide an American register for the steamer *Matteawan*.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamer *Asturian Prince*, owned by Charles W. Hogan, a citizen of the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States under the name of *Matteawan*.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause the inspection of said vessel, steam boilers, steam pipes, and their appurtenances, and cause to be granted the usual certificate issued to steam vessels of the merchant marine without reference to the fact that said steam boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances were not constructed pursuant to the laws of the United States, and were not constructed of iron stamped pursuant to said laws; and the tests in the inspection of said boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances shall be the same in all respects as to strength and safety as are required in the inspection of boilers constructed in the United States for marine purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. PAYNE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4698) providing an American register for the steamer *Matteawan*, have considered the same and report as follows:

The evidence filed with the committee shows that the *Matteawan* is a steel steamship, was built in 1893, and was wrecked on the east point of Curaçao, West Indies, on or about June 3, 1895, where she was abandoned by her crew and remained for four months, when she was, after six weeks' work, floated by the Merritt wrecking organization, of New York, and brought to New York, where she was sold as a wreck December 9, 1895, by the agent of the foreign underwriters to her present owner, Mr. Charles W. Hogan, of New York, a citizen of the United States, for the sum of $10,139.38. The *Matteawan* is now being repaired for Mr. Hogan by the John N. Robins Company, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the contract for said repairs shows that the cost of same to put the vessel in a first-class seaworthy condition will be $50,801.50, and the repairs will be completed by February 8, 1896.

In view of the fact that this vessel is eligible for registry under the general law (sec. 4136, Rev. Stat.) in all respects save that she was not wrecked within the waters of the United States, your committee believe that the spirit of the law will be observed by granting the register, and recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw this bill until these repairs are completed. This is something unusual. I shall have to object until the repairs are completed. It is only a matter of a couple of weeks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—ROSENTHAL VS. CROWLEY.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a report from the Committee on Elections No. 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS] desires to make the report which he offered before, with regard to the case of Rosenthal *vs.* Crowley.

The report (by Mr. JENKINS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Elections No. 3, to whom was referred the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the contestant, A. J. Rosenthal, be, and he is hereby, authorized to so amend his notice of contest in the case of A. J. Rosenthal *vs.* Miles Crowley, Tenth Congressional district, State of Texas, by adding thereto the following, to wit: That there were unlawfully counted in making up the returns from said district, divers precincts in Galveston County, in which no returns had been made according to law, viz, all of the precincts in said county, except Nos. 2, 3, 7, 7½, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 13½—

Respectfully submit the following report.

That inasmuch as in the unanimous report of the committee in the foregoing case this resolution has been considered as if filed, and inasmuch as no injustice can be done to the contestant by an adverse report, they respectfully recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to move that the resolution be laid on the table?

Mr. JENKINS. I do.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. CROWTHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk. I think there will be no objection now to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CROWTHER] offered a resolution this morning, to which there was objection. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to now withdraw his objection?

Mr. TERRY. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection?

Mr. DINGLEY. Before consent is given, I should like to ask to hear a statement with reference to this.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri will be recognized to make an explanation.

Mr. CROWTHER. This resolution refers to the appointment of three ex-naval cadets as assistant engineers in the United States Navy. They graduated from the Academy last June. They have diplomas stating that they have passed satisfactory examinations, and they would have been appointed to a line office, that of ensign, had there been sufficient vacancies. Each one of the cadets was several points short of passing the examination in steam engineering, and as a result they failed to be appointed as assistant engineers. There are twenty-three vacancies in the positions of steam engineers, or twenty-three less than the law provides for. This question has been submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, whose letter I hold in my hand, in which he suggests a change in the resolution, which has been made, and he states with that amendment it meets with his approval, and he suggests that the resolution do pass. I will send the letter to the Clerk's desk to be read if any member desires it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should like to ask if this has been considered by the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CROWTHER. I have seen all the members of the Naval Committee who are present, and there has been no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. I simply desire to say that I think it ought to be an extraordinary condition of things that would allow us to pass any bill here of this or any other character without first having it referred to a committee of this House for examination. We legislate largely through standing committees, and we ought not to violate the rule unless there is some special necessity for it. Ordinarily, every matter should have the consideration of a standing committee before it is brought before the House; but with the statement that the members of the committee have examined it and find no objection to it, I have nothing further to say.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask what committee reported this resolution?

The SPEAKER. No committee has reported it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has it been before any committee?

The SPEAKER. It has not; the gentleman from Missouri says that it has the approval of the Secretary and the individual members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. CROWTHER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COURTS FOR NORTHERN DIVISION OF EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on the Judiciary on House bill No. 1676, and ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee.

Be it enacted, etc., That the terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee, held at Knoxville, Tenn., shall commence on the first Mondays in March and September of each year, instead of the second Mondays in January and July, as is now provided by law; and each of said terms shall continue as long as the presiding judge may deem necessary.

SEC. 2. That no action, suit, proceeding, information, indictment, recognizance, bail bond, or other process in either of said courts shall abate or be rendered invalid by reason of the change of time in the holding of the terms of said courts, but the same shall be deemed to be returnable to, pending, and triable at the terms herein provided for.

SEC. 3. That this act take effect from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it; and that all laws and parts of laws conflicting with this act be, and are hereby, repealed.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, has unanimous consent been given for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Has it been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary favorably?

The SPEAKER. It has been reported from that committee. The Clerk will read the report if the gentleman desires.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would, reserving the right to object.

The report (by Mr. BROWN) was read, as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration House bill No. 1676, to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit court for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BROWN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MEDICAL COLLEGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2656) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia for the purpose of correcting the report.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I will call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to go into Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. PATTERSON. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to ask for the reprint of the bill (H. R. 3837) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reprint will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole was then agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5210) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this bill I shall take but a very few minutes. It is principally a story of figures, and they are summarized in the closing paragraphs of the report. I will present them briefly. The total amount recommended to be appropriated for the general expenses of the District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, in the bill submitted, exclusive of the water department, is $5,225,365.97. Of this sum the General Government is required to pay $2,612,682.98, and the District $2,265,991. The former amount is $2,655 less than the estimates submitted.

The amount appropriated for the general expenses of the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year, that is, of 1896, including $15,940 in the sundry civil and urgent deficiency acts, is $5,559,263.97, being $333,898 more than is recommended in the accompanying bill for 1897; and the whole amount recommended in the accompanying bill, including sums for the water department—on a basis that will be explained in a moment—is $343,422.86 less than was appropriated for the current fiscal year. Now, the amount recommended for the water department, the object of which is to develop the water revenues, is $192,594.42; and the amount appropriated for the water department for the current year is $202,119.28, being a reduction of nine thousand and some odd hundred dollars.

It is estimated that the water revenues for the fiscal year 1897 will amount to $307,000, but it is provided in the accompanying bill, as it was provided in the acts for the four preceding fiscal years, that any surplus of these revenues over the appropriations specifically made therefrom shall be applied to the work of extending the high-service system of water distribution, for which there is an appropriation in the bill. Now, this improvement, it is estimated by the engineer officers of the District, would cost, when completed, $600,000.

The surplus water revenues devoted to this object, on account of expenditures made and obligations incurred since the said authority was granted, amount at this time to $355,615.72.

The total general revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1897, it is estimated by the Commissioners, will amount, exclusive of any estimated surplus of the revenues of prior years, to $3,225,081.56, or a surplus of $547,538.58 after meeting the appropriations proposed by the accompanying bill, together with the obligations (estimated at $64,860) imposed upon the District by the act of March 2, 1889, establishing the National Zoological Park, and for one-half the expenses of the court of appeals and supreme court of the District. This surplus, to the extent of $300,000, will be applied, under the operation of section 3 of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1893 and a provision of the accompanying bill, to the satisfaction of the indebtedness of the District to the United States on account of the cost of the increased water supply of the city of Washington under acts approved July 15, 1882, and March 3, 1891, which of course relates to what is known as the Lydecker tunnel.

These figures, Mr. Chairman, present in a summary way the scope of this bill, so far as the Treasury is concerned, and so far as the necessities of the District are concerned, which, of course, are the two great matters to be considered in every appropriation bill.

The amount appropriated by this bill is less, you will notice, than the estimates, and less than many of the friends of public improvements in the city of Washington hoped it would be; but, after all, it is not so bad when compared with former bills, for, while it falls short of the estimates by some $300,000, it exceeds the bill making appropriations for the current year, as it went to the Senate in the last House, by some $26,000.

With these general remarks I am disposed, if there be no desire for further general debate, to suggest that we proceed at once to consider the bill by paragraphs.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there any new legislation in the bill; and if so, what?

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman's question whether there is any new legislation in the bill, I will say that it contains some provisions which are new in this respect, that they have not heretofore appeared, but we think that none of them are subject to a point of order. These provisions will come up for explanation in the course of the consideration of the bill by paragraphs; but perhaps I may as well explain some of them now. The first is a provision with reference to the markets. We have reduced the salaries of the two market masters $200 each, and have forbidden the collections which have been made heretofore from people coming in from the country for the purpose of marketing their products, collections made from them for cleaning the market place and the streets of the dirt resulting from the presence of their horses and from other causes in connection with the business done there.

These assessments have been made heretofore, or collected, without authority of law. I will not say just that, because there is an old law providing that persons so occupying the market place shall clean up after themselves, and as every man coming in to the market from the country does not bring a shovel with him and could not do it himself, the custom grew up of employing the laborers around the market to do the work and paying them for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to disturb the plan which the gentleman in charge of this bill has mapped out for its consideration, but the printed bill has only come into our hands this morning, and if he will kindly indicate now at what points the new legislation is to be found, it will enable members to look it over and be prepared to consider it when it comes up in the regular order.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, all these points are set out in the report submitted with the bill, and if each member will provide himself with a copy of the report it seems to me that he will get therefrom the information he desires more easily than I can give it.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Does the report show what was added last evening?

Mr. GROUT. Yes; everything is embraced in the report. However, Mr. Chairman, as I have entered upon this market question I may as well complete it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I withdraw my request for an explanation.

Mr. GROUT. Well, let me complete this point now, in order to save time, and because unless I do so what I have already said will appear to be fragmentary. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that when a farmer came to market with his produce and did not want to stop to clean up after himself, when he got ready to leave the market place he would arrange with the laborers there to have the work done at slight cost. Now, it fell out that these collections from farmers amounted to some one hundred or two hundred dollars; in some instances, I believe, to between three hundred and four hundred dollars in one market, and there was no accounting for this money.

It was an unauthorized collection, really, the result of a private arrangement. The market masters made complaint that they had not only to give the laborers this money, but that they had also to pay the laborers from one to two hundred dollars a year out of their own compensation; so the committee thought they would take the market masters at their word, would reduce their salaries by the amount which they said they had had to pay, would transfer the payment of the rents to the collector of the District, and at the same time would prohibit any further collections of this character from people coming from the country to sell their products, and provide for paying the laborers out of the public funds for keeping the markets clean.

This is the first provision in the bill which may be said to be in some sense new legislation, although it does not contravene in any way existing law, while it does help, as we think, to a sensible and practical administration of the old law and in a better way than has heretofore prevailed.

Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen will refer to the report they will see these matters explained in detail. Every new provision which may be the subject of criticism will be found referred to in the report, and gentleman will, of course, have the opportunity to raise points of order upon any provision when it is reached.

Mr. DINGLEY. These matters are referred to in the report under the head of "Limitations"?

Mr. GROUT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLUE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], I will call his attention to the provisions on page 15 of the bill. The provisos attached to the provisions in regard to gas lighting and electric lighting are the principal matters which may be considered to embrace new legislation, and upon which some question may be raised as to whether or not they are in contravention of the rule. I refer to the system of competitive biddings for the supply of the city with gas and electric lighting.

The other provisions are, I think, in the main, simply additions rendered necessary by changed conditions. For instance, there have been a number of new schoolhouses added to the school system; and under the head of "Schools" there will be found provisions for a number of additional teachers. There is also provision for an increase of the police force to the extent of 25 members. An increase of 125 was asked; but in the bill we give only 25 new policemen.

The chairman has referred to the provision reducing the salaries of the two market masters. From the information which we have been able to gain, including the statement made to us by the clerk of the committee, it would seem that when the offices of market masters were created they were required, in addition to the policing of the markets, to look after the cleaning in and about them. The testimony of one of these market masters showed that he had been paying something over $200 out of his annual salary to laborers for completing the cleaning.

The committee discovered on investigation that the persons who sell on the sidewalks around the market do not receive or pay for licenses, but they have been required to clean off the sidewalks after the market hours were over. It appeared from the testimony that the laborers and the market masters were in the habit of collecting from these people sums which were paid to the laborers in addition to the compensation fixed by law. It was thought wise in this connection to reduce the salaries of those market masters to $1,000 each and to increase the compensation of the laborers; and inasmuch as this system of collections from these people who sell upon the sidewalks is wholly without authority of law, and liable, as the committee thought, to be made a system of blackmailing, we have embraced in this bill a provision prohibiting the collection of anything in that way, so that there might not be levied upon and collected from these people by the market masters and laborers an indefinite sum without any regulation of law.

These, I believe, are the radical changes in this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BLUE] whether the provision beginning with the word "Provided," in line 13, page 16, is not new legislation of a very radical character, and whether a similar proviso beginning on line 14, page 17, is not subject to the same criticism.

Mr. BLUE. In reply to that inquiry, I will say that while this may be new legislation, I do not understand that it interferes with any existing law. According to my understanding, there is no law upon the subjects covered by these new provisions; so that, while they may be regarded as new legislation, they do not come within the prohibition of the rule, because they do not interfere with any existing law.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is existing law prohibiting any person from interfering with the surface of the streets of this city. No one can break up the pavements or dig trenches or ditches. Anything of that kind is forbidden by law.

Mr. GROUT. Will the gentleman refer to the statute by which it is forbidden?

Mr. HEPBURN. There is no question that it is against the law.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; let us see the provision.

Mr. HEPBURN. No man can trespass upon these streets——

Mr. NORTHWAY. This is not a trespass.

Mr. HEPBURN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, this is a trespass.

Mr. PITNEY. I rise to a question of order. I submit that the time for the discussion of points of order upon this bill has not yet arrived.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am simply stating my view.

The CHAIRMAN. The point that questions of order can not now be raised upon the bill is well taken, because the Committee of the Whole is now proceeding with the general debate.

Mr. HEPBURN. I was simply asking this question, as I undertood, with the gentleman's permission; but if he is sensitive about the matter I will not press it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BLUE] yield to me a moment?

Mr. BLUE. The time belongs to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GROUT. I said a few moments ago that I was ready to submit this matter without further debate, but I find it can not be done so quickly as I had hoped.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that it would contribute very much to the orderly consideration of this bill if these several propositions be debated when they are reached in their order? I presume the gentleman in charge of the bill will be disposed to give ample time for the consideration and discussion of each item.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly; I have so expressed myself. In regard to this matter of electric lighting, which seems to have riveted special attention, and upon which this sharp debate has already broken out, I will say for myself that I am not going to enter into the discussion at present, but will say one word further by way of general explanation of the bill.

That is, that while the Commissioners recommended the increase of a large number of salaries, extending to a number of persons in the District employ, including, if you please, the whole of the fire department of the District, the bill does not contain a single independent increase of salary. Now, for those who are disappointed in this matter, and their name is legion in the District, let me say that the committee felt, at a time when the Treasury was empty, when times were hard, when confessedly the cost of living is low, not high, thereby enabling salaries heretofore fixed to amply meet demands under the present order of things, and the fact that so many are out of employment, without salaries of any kind, and are seeking employment; the fact, also, that while the laborer in many instances has had his wages reduced from the necessities of times, and the salaries already being received by these people being reasonable, that these, with many other considerations, would justify the committee in refusing all applications for increases of salary, although, let me say, Mr. Chairman, some of them were meritorious. There are some unfair discriminations as to salaries as they now stand, but we felt that we could not enter upon the readjustment of them at the present time, and therefore deferred it, as the diplomats say, till a more auspicious occasion; in short, till such time as business shall revive, prosperity shall return, and, under more economic laws, money again flow into the Treasury.

I may say in this connection that there is one clerk added to the collector's office, in which there was overwhelming proof of an insufficient supply of necessary help, at $1,000 per annum. There were a couple of elevator operators and a fireman made necessary because of the fact that the District Commissioners were occupying a very much larger building than heretofore, which gives ample accommodations for most of the various offices of the District, and we made this increase at this cost as well as the increase spoken of by the gentleman from Kansas in the number of policemen. This is the only increase of force provided for in the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], that if we go to the consideration of the bill by paragraphs we shall get along really faster, more understandingly, and with satisfaction to everyone. Of course, if anyone chooses to address the committee now in a general way—in general debate—let him make it known, and I shall make no objection.

Mr. HULICK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. HULICK. Was the demand general from these laborers to have their salaries increased, or was it only in special or particular cases?

Mr. GROUT. There was a very general estimate for an increase in salaries.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is human nature, too.

Mr. HULICK. How many of these persons demanding an increase of wages proposed, in the event they did not get it, that they would retire from the service?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. None.

Mr. GROUT. None said so to us. It came to us as a rumor that their services might not be retained—fears were expressed that some would seek other employment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We could very well fill the places if they did go.

Mr. GROUT. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] desire to occupy the floor?

Mr. DOCKERY. Only for a moment. I wish to make a single statement in this connection, and will then be content to have general debate closed, and that we thereafter proceed under the five-minute rule.

In further answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HULICK], let me say that the demand for increases of salaries throughout the District is somewhat epidemic, as has been the case heretofore. This bill carries $343,422.86 less than the current law. It should be stated in justice, however, to the House Committee on Appropriations of the last Congress that this increase of the District bill was made by the Senate. The bill as it passed the House at the third session of the last Congress carried $25,853.14 less than the bill now reported by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT]. It appears, therefore, that the bill now under consideration is substantially, in amount, the same as the bill passed by the House at the third session of the last Congress. In the main the pending bill thoroughly and effectively illustrates the policy of judicious economy, of which the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], and myself are such conspicuous exponents. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I will not further detain the committee.

Mr. GROUT. I move that we proceed to the consideration of the bill by paragraphs.

Mr. PICKLER. I understand general debate has not yet been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] has the floor. To whom does the gentleman from Vermont yield?

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know if a member has not a right to the floor in his own time under general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has the floor at present.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not have to ask the gentleman from Vermont——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota knows he can not take the gentleman from Vermont from the floor without his permission.

Mr. PICKLER. The point is, I have a right to the floor in my own right in general debate without permission from anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from Vermont yields the floor, but not before that time.

Mr. GROUT. Let me say to the gentleman from South Dakota that if he or any other member desires to enter into the discussion of this bill generally, in what is called general debate, there will be no objection to it. Any member may have such time as he wants now.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not want to enter general debate, I want to ask a question or two.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; but we are trying to make progress with the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the gentleman asking?

Mr. GROUT. That we proceed to the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PICKLER. Before that, I have a matter that I could not get in in the five-minute debate, which I want to inquire about. I could not get it in when we are considering the bill by sections.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, you can get in; I will see that you do.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not understand just what people are asking for an increase of salary. I have a petition that I wanted to bring before the Committee on Appropriations. It has been before them heretofore, and it is in regard to the many charwomen in this city. Undoubtedly a great many of them are employed in institutions that are covered by this appropriation bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That matter comes in on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire, in my time, to have this petition read.

Mr. GROUT. As to charwomen, there are none provided for in this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to have this petition read in my time. It is short.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont yield?

Mr. GROUT. I want to get along in a good-natured way with this matter, if I can.

Mr. PICKLER. I had the floor, Mr. Chairman. We are all good-natured.

Mr. GROUT. I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from South Dakota has the floor, except as he usurps it. I understand the floor is mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has not yet been recognized.

Mr. PICKLER. Then I will wait until I can be recognized, if gentlemen do not want to concede anything.

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman will explain to me why he can not have this read under the five-minute rule, I will yield to him now.

Mr. PICKLER. Simply because some gentleman will get up and say this is out of order under the section which has been read.

Mr. GROUT. It will be no more out of order then than it is now.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes; indeed many things are in order in general debate that would not be in order under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have his memorial read.

Mr. PICKLER. I object to that. I do not ask unanimous consent. I am much obliged to the gentleman. I am standing here on my own right.

Mr. GROUT. Let the gentleman's paper be read. We will see if it will bring peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont can yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; I yield to the gentleman to have his paper read.

Mr. PICKLER. I will be recognized in my own right, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman very kindly, but I will shortly be recognized in my own time.

Mr. GROUT. Not now, Mr. Chairman; I will have no dictation.

Mr. PICKLER. I will wait until my turn comes. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his kindness. Let the gentleman keep his temper.

Mr. GROUT. It is not my temper that is ruffled. Now I ask unanimous consent to proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraphs.

Mr. PICKLER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the gentleman from Vermont has the floor. I see his colleague on the subcommittee—the gentleman from New Jersey—on the floor, and I suppose he wants to be heard. It seems to me the gentleman from South Dakota——

Mr. PICKLER. I rise to a point of order. I want to know how the gentleman from Illinois obtains the floor.

Mr. CANNON. By the sufferance of the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from Vermont yielded the floor.

Mr. GROUT. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, gentlemen, just go on; we will see how you proceed.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey——

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, if any gentleman desires to address the committee in general debate, and will let it be known how much time he desires, I will yield to him.

Mr. PICKLER. A parliamentary inquiry. I want to know if the gentleman in charge of the bill controls general debate. The rule certainly always has been that the committee has the first right in general debate, and then, until it is closed, every member has the right to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Dakota that the gentleman from Vermont was recognized for general debate and has an hour, which has not yet expired. Until that time elapses he will have the floor; and in the meantime if he desires to make any motion limiting debate he can do so.

Mr. GROUT. I move that general debate be limited to thirty minutes.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is out of order.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is in order.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PICKLER. Division, Mr. Chairman. [Cries of "Oh!"]

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman desires more time, let him indicate what time he desires.

Mr. CANNON. I object.

Mr. PICKLER. I want ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I object, and call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4115) to amend section 1309 of the Revised Statutes; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.;

A bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. PICKLER. Pending that, if I can be recognized in my own time, I will withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is out of order, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. I call for the regular order.

Mr. PICKLER. Regular order; let us have it.

The question was taken, and there were—ayes 4; noes 45.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Vermont by increasing it from thirty minutes to two hours.

Mr. GROUT. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that will be voted down.

Mr. PICKLER. I move to amend the amendment by making it four hours.

The CHAIRMAN stated the question.

Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw the last amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the proposition of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. PICKLER. I moved that general debate be limited to two hours, and the gentleman from Vermont accepted it; but the gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. GROUT. Is it in order for me to withdraw my motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The gentleman from Vermont made a motion that all debate be closed in thirty minutes. The gentleman from South Dakota moved as an amendment that all debate be closed in two hours. The gentleman from Vermont accepted that. Therefore, the Chair thinks the gentleman can not withdraw his motion. The question is on limiting debate to two hours.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a point of order, under the rule, and also in the interest of harmony. The point of order is submitted under clause 5 of Rule XXIII, and in the hope that some amicable adjustment may be reached on the other side. General debate can not be closed by the Committee of the Whole. Debate can be closed in Committee of the Whole after debate under the five-minute rule has been entered upon, but general debate must be closed by the House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed in two hours on this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. The same point of order prevails against that that the gentleman from the other side made.

Mr. DOCKERY. We do not want two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was under the impression that the rules of the Fifty-first Congress provided that general debate could be closed in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request so as to ask consent that general debate be closed in one hour.

Mr. PICKLER. The point of order has been made that the Committee of the Whole can not, under the rule, close general debate by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOCKERY. I never made any such point of order as that. Of course it can be done by unanimous consent, but not upon motion.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, is this question debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that the Committee of the Whole can not close general debate except by unanimous consent. If the gentleman from Vermont desires to be heard upon the point of order, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. GROUT. I have not examined the rule and will not undertake to speak on that point now, but I am willing to submit to the judgment of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question can be decided by reference to the rules. The Chair was under the impression, as he has already stated, that under the rules of the Fifty-first Congress the Committee of the Whole could close general debate, but if no gentleman gives a reference to the rule, the Chair will hold——

Mr. DOCKERY. I will refer the Chair to the rule.

Mr. GROUT. Now, Mr. Chairman, will you let us have a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota limiting the time of debate to two hours?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been raised against that amendment.

Mr. GROUT. I understood the Chair to overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not overruled the point of order. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. DOCKERY. Sections 5 and 6 of Rule XXIII settle the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read sections 5 and 6 of Rule XXIII.

The Clerk read as follows:

5. When general debate is closed by order of the House, any member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon; but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

6. The committee may, by the vote of a majority of the members present, at any time after the five minutes' debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such section or paragraph, or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only (which motion shall be decided without debate); but this shall not preclude further amendment, to be decided without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be closed in thirty minutes, fifteen of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. PICKLER. That will suit me.

Mr. CANNON. If fifteen minutes is as much time as my colleague on the committee desires, I have no objection.

The question being taken on the request of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE for unanimous consent, there was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of this committee, and especially the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, to the prayer of the petition here offered. It is one that has been before the Committee on Appropriations heretofore, and is, in my judgment, one of the most deserving applications that can be presented to that committee or to this House. I refer to the prayer of the charwomen employed in the Capitol and in the different governmental offices and buildings for an increase in their pay from $20 to $25 a month. I think there are about 500 of them interested in it, and I ask to have the petition read in my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to the gentleman that that is a matter which is provided for on the legislative bill and not on this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, I ask to have the petition read in my time.

The petition was read, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

The undersigned most respectfully beg leave to present this petition for the relief of the charwomen employed in the various Departments in the city of Washington. We most earnestly pray that their present compensation of $20 a month be increased by the slight sum of $5, to $25 per month, for the reasons following, briefly stated:

1. They are generally women of family or have those dependent on them

whom the ties of nature require them to support—mothers, fathers, sisters, and children unable to maintain themselves.

2. The work they perform is "woman's work" of the hardest kind. On bended knees, with head prone to the ground, this work must be done. The position of the body and head, suggestive of vertigo and other affections, is an element of the work upon which too much stress can not be laid.

3. As to time, they are virtually employed as much time as watchmen, messengers, and other nonclassified inferior workers of the Government.

4. Rents are high and have increased immensely in late years, thus driving these women farther away from their work, to which they must walk for most obvious reasons.

5. The nature of their work evidently unfits them for other independent work during the day, and tells rapidly upon their constitutions. This is confirmed not only by observation, but statistics show that the women who draw the cars on the tramways in the low contracted galleries of European mines on their hands and knees are unhealthy and short lived.

6. Many of these women are the widows, wives, daughters of soldiers; preference, we understand, being given to that class in the selection.

7. It would seem to be a work of supererogation and impertinence to attempt further to present and elucidate the claims of these worthy claimants to the intelligent consideration of your honorable body, and we conclude and leave the matter with you, fervently hoping, in consideration of the winter being on us, that our prayers may be speedily granted.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I heard a question of salaries discussed by some gentlemen, on this bill, and I do not understand exactly what salaries are covered by the bill, but I desire to ask the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] now whether any of these charwomen are appropriated for in this bill, or in what bill they are appropriated for?

Mr. GROUT. In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. PICKLER. They do not any of them come in this bill?

Mr. GROUT. None are in this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I simply desire on this occasion to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the petition of these charwomen and of others in their behalf. They have nobody here to champion their cause, but I trust that the subcommittee will give due consideration to their petition, because I am firmly of the opinion that if there is any class of employees anywhere in the city of Washington in the Government service who are entitled to an advance in their pay it is these poor women. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY].

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, I should not have addressed the committee at this time concerning any of the provisions of this bill had it not been that I gathered from what has been said here that particular attention is to be directed to those provisions which pertain to street lighting in general and electric lighting in particular. Those matters have engaged the serious consideration of the Committee on Appropriations, and as I suppose I am to be held responsible, to a considerable extent, for a part of the provisions on that subject contained in the bill, I wish to say a few words now in explanation, although perhaps they would come in quite as properly later on in the discussion. If members will turn to page 15 of the bill they will find an appropriation "for illuminating material," etc., intended to provide for the lighting of the streets with gas, amounting to $122,000. The appropriation for the present year is $142,400. There is, therefore, a reduction in the appropriation for this purpose of $20,400. At the same time we increase the service in the streets, we provide for additional lamps to the number of 380, and we provide for keeping those lamps lighted a somewhat longer time each night. If any gentleman desires the figures I can give them now. We also provide that the contract for gaslighting shall be let at public competition, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder.

The next provision is that with regard to electric lighting. The current law provides an appropriation of $47,600 for electric lighting in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, for the purpose of "maintaining the existing service and necessary extensions," and at the same time it provides a certain time schedule, namely, from sunset to sunrise, and a certain maximum charge specified in the bill. The maximum price under the existing law is 40 cents per night for electric arc lights. We have limited that maximum to 28 cents per night, and we have done that after careful consideration. We have provided a sufficient appropriation for putting in 70 additional arc lights. We have provided, not that the specific service now in operation shall be maintained, but that the service shall cover the same streets and public places which are covered by the existing arc-light service; and for good and sufficient reasons, as it appeared to the committee after careful investigation, we have put in a proviso, which, I judge from the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, will be attacked on a point of order.

The provisos to which I refer are, first—

That the entire service of electric lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor—

But more particularly the following:

That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with an underground system of wires and conduits in the streets and other places covered by such service the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground conduits and wires for electric lighting in and along such streets and other public places as may be necessary for said service, such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress, without compensation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to be heard later upon the point of order, if it is going to be insisted on, as I hope it will not be, that this proviso is obnoxious to the rules of this House. But we want to look straight in the face the main object aimed at in this proviso. The committee does not want to mislead any gentleman on this floor. We think it is not only, as it has been called, a somewhat radical provision, but that if carried out in good faith, as we have reason to hope it will be, it will result to the great benefit of the citizens of Washington and to the great benefit also of the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman believe it possible for any existing or nonexisting corporation to make an honest bona fide bid to light the city with gas, and then to lay pipes for that purpose within the year which the contract will provide for?

Mr. PITNEY. I am not now discussing the question of gaslighting; but I have no objection to answering the question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the same question in regard to electric lighting, if it is to be done by means of underground conduits?

Mr. PITNEY. With regard to electric lights, we are assured by persons of thorough responsibility that a company with a paid-up capital of $200,000 can, and if permitted will, come into competition, and if their bid be accepted will lay down conduits and wires in all the streets now covered by the electric-lighting system in seasonable time to enable them to commence the lighting at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And with a proper bond behind them.

Mr. PITNEY. Yes, sir; they propose to give a sufficient bond to do this. Now, the committee recommend this proposition in regard to electric lighting. They say, according to information which comes from a good source, that if this matter be left to the sound discretion of the Commissioners they will impose such stipulations as shall make it impossible for any "straw bidder" to come in and make a bid under this proviso.

Now, with regard to the gaslighting, I will say in answer to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], that a practical proposition has not been made to our committee; but inasmuch as the committee, after careful hearings and investigations, determined that it was proper at this time to take this step opening the electric lighting to competition, it seemed no more than fair to open the gaslighting to similar competition. We have no information which renders us sure that competitors can be found in the business of gaslighting; but we thought we might encourage competitors to come forward, and if, between the present time and the time this bill becomes a law, any objection should be brought in that there is no practical proposition presented, some way to obviate that objection might be found.

Mr. HILL. Does not the gentleman see that the effect of a provision like this might be to encourage new organizations in each of these lines of business to undertake to tear up all the streets of the city every year?

Mr. PITNEY. The committee considered it a very serious question whether for the purpose of enabling bidders to compete the Commissioners ought to be authorized to permit the tearing up of the streets of Washington. The committee desire to preserve the streets of this city and also to have them well lighted at a reasonable cost to the Treasury. But the proviso in the bill does not authorize the tearing up of the streets for any other purpose than to enable a competing bidder, if successful, to comply with the contract that may be let.

Mr. HILL. Does not the organization of existing gas and electric light companies give Congress entire control of the prices at which they shall furnish light to the city? Has not Congress absolute legislative control over the existing companies?

Mr. NORTHWAY. We can not compel them to accept anything.

Mr. PITNEY. I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, that Congress can require the electric-light company or the gas company to perform the service if the company is not satisfied with the price which may be paid. We can determine that we will pay them 28 cents or 10 cents or 2 cents per light; and if they accept the price they will do the work; otherwise they will not.

Mr. GROUT. Let me say to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that these companies do not give the right of which he speaks to Congress; but the right inheres in Congress to regulate this matter.

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. GROUT. But, further, let me say to the gentleman that these companies do not allow Congress peaceably to perform that function, and have not done so, as the history of legislation on this subject when fully developed will show.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PITNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from New Jersey whether or not in his judgment Congress has the power to

fix the compensation for the services of the gas company or the electric light company in this regard? Is not that power reserved in the articles of incorporation, and have we not authority to say now, not only the character of the gas that shall be furnished, but the price at which it shall be supplied, and has not Congress exercised that power, with reference to these local corporations, time and again?

Mr. PITNEY. Subject, of course, Mr. Chairman, to the superior information of the gentleman from Iowa, I will say that I do not understand that Congress has placed in the organic law of either of the companies in operation here—the gas company or the electric light company—the reservation that Congress may limit the price, for the very good reason that Congress did not organize or incorporate either of them. No; I will correct that statement. Congress did authorize the organization of the gas company, but not of the electric light company. That is a foreign corporation, which comes here and exercises a franchise by permission of Congress, exercising it for the supply of private citizens and for the lighting of the public streets of the city, and both the citizen and the public have the right to offer such price for the service as they may deem reasonable. If the company wish to accept it, and furnish the electric light for the price offered, they can do so. Otherwise, they are privileged not to accept it.

But since this point has been raised, let me say that it has occurred within the past year that the District Commissioners, acting under authority of the present appropriation act, which limits the maximum price paid for lighting the streets to 40 cents per light per night for each electric light, but which does not say that they shall pay that much, the Commissioners undertook in pursuance of that law to lower the price, the maximum price authorized to be paid, for the purpose of enabling them to use the surplus money to extend the service into other streets not then covered by the service; and the company took the ground that the Commissioners had gone beyond their authority under the law, and that they had no power to reduce the maximum price authorized, and so the company refused to enter into a contract to light the streets at $37\frac{43}{100}$ cents per light per night, insisting upon the full maximum price of 40 cents authorized by Congress. They did enter into a temporary arrangement respecting the matter, an arrangement which is now in force, but only as a temporary expedient.

Moreover, the electric light company now operating here claims that under existing law—and it deduces the claim from the appropriation bills of the last five years—that they have a monopoly of this business, and the point of order proposed to be made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], if it has any foundation, is based on the same ground, namely, that the company is now entitled to the monopoly.

Now, I will discuss the point of order when it is raised, but as to the advisability of this change—the pending question—there can be, in my opinion, no doubt that it is advisable to allow competition in this important public service if we can do it without too great a sacrifice of the good of the city with reference to the tearing up of the streets. Now, we have provided that that work shall be done under such reasonable restrictions as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall think proper to prescribe, they having the power to extend this privilege only to the company which shall make a successful bid, provided they are not already supplied with a subway for their wires.

I think I have replied to all the points involved in the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman yield to me for an interruption?

Mr. PITNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I notice that the committee closes each separate paragraph of this item by saying that "Congress may revoke this authority at will."

Mr. NORTHWAY. That is embodied in all of the appropriation bills.

Mr. PITNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is good as far as it goes. But the company or association, whichever it may be, that becomes the successful bidder under this provision would certainly have certain property in the way of its wires and conduits in the District, and would acquire, by virtue of this legislation, certain rights in connection with that property. What I should be glad to have the gentleman explain is how he regards this right, whether as equivalent to an incorporation under the District of Columbia, or what its relations would be to the body politic of the District of Columbia.

Mr. PITNEY. I presume the relation existing between the electric light company and the body politic would be the relation of contractors with each other—the one making a contract with the other. The District Commissioners would make a contract with the electric light company for the current year. So far as the power granted by Congress is concerned, the Commissioners, under the authority of Congress, would grant a license to the electric company which became the successful bidder to lay down a subway at the risk of revocation at any time by Congress. Congress can revoke the power at any time under this provision of law.

Now, the privilege exercised by the present company arose by virtue of a provision or authorization placed in the appropriation bill passed some years ago, practically the same in terms as that now before this committee for its consideration.

In the appropriation act passed July 18, 1888, for the fiscal year then following, the Commissioners of the District were prohibited from permitting any more overhead wires to be strung, and were required, as this bill requires them, to light the city by means of a system of underground wires and lights, and it was provided that the Commissioners of the District might—

> Under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize the wires of any existing telegraph, telephone, or electric light company now operating in the District of Columbia to be laid under any street, alley, highway, footway, or sidewalk in the District, whenever, in their judgment, the public interest may require the exercise of such authority—such privileges as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation, and no such authority to be exercised after the termination of the present Congress.

That was the Fiftieth Congress, and that limit of time was afterwards extended. We did not put that limitation in this bill.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. But there is one vast difference between that and the legislation now offered. That was limited to an existing company.

Mr. PITNEY. Yes.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Now you authorize any foreign corporation to come in here and acquire certain rights, it seems to me, by this legislation. That is, having expended, say, a million dollars, or a quarter of a million dollars, as the case may be, in these underground conduits, Congress will very naturally favor such a company or such an organization, and the query arises at the threshold, ought we thus in an indirect way to permit people to come into this city and acquire rights which will subsequently permit them to come before Congress with an additional claim for an act of incorporation?

Mr. GROUT. What does the gentleman propose touching that matter?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I would drop it out altogether.

Mr. GROUT. And not have any competition?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It seems to me that, with the limitations you have put upon this bill as regards price, there is nothing left——

Mr. GROUT. Then you would not disturb those in possession of the conduits?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is not what I mean, but I would do this——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY], and I should like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota yields to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PITNEY. Let me say, first, the question of the gentleman from New Hampshire was whether the license under the act of 1888 was not limited to the wires of the existing company. Yes, Mr. Chairman, and the present company hold that it gave them a monopoly and prevented the District Commissioners from making a contract with any other concern.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Unquestionably Congress can incorporate any other companies that it sees fit; but it seems to me that the legislation proposed in this bill seeks to accomplish without any incorporation that which various companies have been seeking from the authorities in this District for years and years, and that they should not indirectly accomplish in an appropriation bill that which Congress has heretofore refused in a special bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If my colleague will permit, I will say to the gentleman that if a company without a charter makes this bid, it must get a charter, and therefore the gentleman's position is not tenable.

Mr. PITNEY. I can not remember all the questions which have been asked me.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. If the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is correct, then this legislation will have no effect whatever.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to ask if the Committee on Appropriations are doubtful as to whether under the present régime Congress has the power to limit the price?

Mr. PITNEY. We have no doubt that Congress has the right to limit the District Commissioners to a certain sum, and not to allow them to pay any more; but we do not find any law which authorizes Congress to compel the company to accept the price.

Mr. PICKLER. And the proposition is to get competition in the lighting of the city?

Mr. PITNEY. Yes; and the benefits will come not only to the public Treasury, in getting the public lighting done for a less amount, but it will result in competition for the patronage of citizens along the lines of the electric lighting companies, and will put the price down to a reasonable figure. The hearings before the committee showed that by the improved methods of manufacturing electricity introduced since the institution of this plant the cost can be most materially reduced and the profits of the company still be left at a reasonable figure.

Mr. HILL. The question that I wish to ask is this: You claim that Congress has no control over the fixing of prices by the existing company?

Mr. PITNEY. I can not answer that question any better than I have already done. We can fix the maximum, but we can not make the company take it.

Mr. HILL. Have you any greater control over the new company than you have over those that now exist?

Mr. PITNEY. We make two companies compete, instead of one company which claims to have a monopoly.

Mr. HILL. You will simply cause a consolidation unless you keep legislative control.

Mr. PITNEY. We do retain legislative control, by a provision in this bill under which we are able to revoke the authority to maintain electrical conduits and wires at any moment.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to ask, if Congress controls the price of gas and has the authority to fix the price, what difference does it make to the people what companies it is taken from, provided that Congress does its duty?

Mr. PITNEY. Congress may control the price, but can not improve the quality.

Mr. BABCOCK. It has assumed authority to legislate as to the quality and as to price.

Mr. PITNEY. Well, I do not claim any special information on the question of gas.

Mr. BABCOCK. The House passed a bill last session requiring a standard of 22 candlepower.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Do you think it has ever reached that?

Mr. PITNEY. I do not claim to have any special information upon the gas question. The question of electric lighting was gone into very thoroughly, and is the one more particularly aimed at by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. While the object is undoubtedly good, I think the proper way to reach this subject is by giving a charter to these other companies, to afford competition. This throws the door wide open to anybody who wants to come in and make a contract for gas and electric lighting.

Mr. PITNEY. I believe my interrogator is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I should be very glad if he would report a bill to improve the law.

Mr. BABCOCK. We will have a gas bill.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I wish to ask the gentleman from New Jersey would not the result of this legislation if carried into law be simply this: You will enable people to come into the District of Columbia and exercise functions here without incorporation that they can not now exercise?

Mr. PITNEY. Just this once, for the sake of getting competition in this line.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. And after they may have thus spent a million dollars under that authority, do you not think they would have certain claims, morally, at least, which they would not have in the incorporation?

Mr. GROUT. There is full power under existing law, the general incorporation act, to incorporate manufacturing companies; and what is a gas company but a manufacturing company. They can organize any time they choose under the general law.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then the matter goes still further than I had suggested. We incorporate under the general law these companies and give them authority to tear up the streets of this city at their own sweet will.

Mr. PITNEY. Not at all.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. And if this can be done in one appropriation act it can be done in every other.

Mr. PITNEY. I will not yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire unless I may have the privilege of answering his questions.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Go on.

Mr. PITNEY. I say it does not give them the right at any time. It provides that they may exercise the privilege only once; that they may tear up the streets, but under such reasonable restrictions as the District Commissioners may prescribe.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. And under the two provisions for gas and electric lighting, would it not amount to having the streets torn up this year and every year?

Mr. PITNEY. Oh, no; only once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that there might be a tearing up of the streets every year, and a multiplicity of companies come in, for merely speculative purposes, and after having torn up the streets and laid conduits they might fail to give the necessary service.

Mr. PITNEY. The idea of putting in that provision was simply as a safeguard. The practical difficulty which gave rise to this provision is this: The present electric light company claims a monopoly of the whole District, and that no other company may be authorized to put in a single underground conduit or overhead wire for the purpose of electric lights. They have instituted three suits enjoining the Commissioners from granting the privilege to another company at any time. A temporary injunction has been granted. The United States Electric Lighting Company, the complainants in these three suits, claim that they have a monopoly by reason of the provisions of appropriation bills, passed by previous Congresses, granting to them the privilege and limiting the time within which any such privilege could be granted to another company, so that the United States Electric Lighting Company now has, as it claims, the only privilege which can be granted by the Commissioners.

Now, we thought, upon careful investigation, that the time had come when at least one opportunity should be given to a bona fide company to come in and compete in this field.

Several members addressed the Chair.

Mr. PITNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Your bill provides that Congress may revoke the right to maintain these conduits?

Mr. PITNEY. It does.

Mr. GARDNER. What do you contemplate is to become of them? They are there. You get clear of them by revoking the right to maintain them. That means, perhaps, that they are to be torn out. Now, who is to put the streets in proper order again?

Mr. PITNEY. The revocation of the right to maintain the conduits would not give to the company the right to tear up the soil for the purpose of taking them out. It would be simply a forfeiture of all the company's privileges.

Mr. GARDNER. It is a forfeiture. Then the provision in the bill is that Congress, by this legislation, invites bidders to lay conduits at an expense that I can not estimate, but half a million dollars, more or less, Congress reserving the right to make a revocation which will work a forfeiture. Is that the idea?

Mr. PITNEY. That is the idea to this extent: These people put their money into the ground in the same way that every water company, every gas company, every telephone company, every other company of this kind does. The money goes into the plant. It goes into the ground, and when the earth closes over it the plant is valueless if dug up again, and the only valuable right that remains is the right to use it for the public service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And they make their bids with full knowledge of that.

The time for general debate having expired, the Chairman directed the Clerk to read the bill by paragraphs for consideration under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the half of the following sums named, respectively, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, for the purposes following, being for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, namely.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, page 1 of the bill, and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "That the following sums named, respectively, are hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia for the purposes following, being for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, namely."

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Pending the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the point of order?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order while I say a few words on the amendment.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; if the gentleman desires to be heard I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by me would make the appropriations carried by this bill payable out of the revenues of the District of Columbia. The bill as it stands requires that one-half of the sums thereby appropriated be paid out of the public Treasury and the other half out of the treasury of this District. Most of the items of these appropriations, as any gentleman can see by referring to the bill, are local and special, having reference solely to this District, and can not be said to be in any sense matters which concern the people of this nation. The amount carried by the bill is something over $5,000,000.

Among the items of annual appropriation are streets, country roads, etc., $458,800; public schools, $1,780,156; police, $576,730; over $1,200,000 for interest upon the old District of Columbia debt and on account of the sinking fund for its extinguishment, and so on.

The amendment which I offer is to conform to the real reading of this bill—the appropriations carried by it. The proposition of the bill is to make appropriations "for the expenses of the District of Columbia." Those expenses ought to be such as relate to the District government. I concede there are expenses which ought to be incurred here by the General Government and paid by the people at large. But only a small portion of such expenses are involved in this bill, and they can easily be provided for elsewhere. Among other things in the bill is an appropriation of $85,000 or $86,000 for private and sectarian charities. We find in the bill an appropriation for this or that foundling institution, or asylum, or hospital; for institutions for the dispensing of this or that charity under the auspices of this church organization or that church organization. While I have nothing to say about the usefulness and the merit of these various institutions, I do wish to say that I think it is not just to the people whom we represent in our several districts to compel them to pay half of the expenditures in the District of Columbia for these purposes, purely local and specially confined to the District.

Take schools. I am not here to say a word against the public schools. On the contrary, I am their friend, and on proper lines and within proper bounds would go as far as any gentleman to encourage and foster them. The people of my district and the people of all the several districts represented on this floor are, I take it, supporting their own public schools, educating their own children out of their substance by tax money, providing themselves for these necessary and most noble public institutions. Why should they, after doing that, be forced to provide also half of the money necessary or half of the money expended in building houses, paying teachers, and generally conducting the schools of this District?

Taxation in this District upon the average is lower than throughout the States; would be lower, if the people here should meet all these local expenditures themselves, than taxation in three-fourths of the districts represented on this floor. I had occasion some time since to look into this matter; and I found that, generally speaking, with the exception of some municipalities in New England—some of those small towns where expenses are exceedingly light, and where, as a consequence, I take it, the government is exceedingly good—with the exception of the municipal expenses in some of the New England States, especially in some of the smaller towns and boroughs in those States, taxation all over this country, East and West, North and South, is higher than taxation would be here if the people of this District bore all the expenses incident to carrying on their own government and taking care of their own local concerns.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I wish to ask the gentleman this question: The General Government owns in this District an immense amount of property—property belonging to the people of the United States——

Mr. MEREDITH. More than one-half of the property within the city.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Fully one-half, and I have seen it stated frequently more than one-half of all the property within the city.

Now, does not the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] think that the Government ought to bear its proportionate amount of taxation on the immense quantity of property which it owns here?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] suggests that the Government owns half or more than half of all the property of this District, and he asks me whether I do not think that in view of this fact the Government ought to pay a portion of the taxes of the District. First, I do not believe that the claim that the Government owns half the property in this District is well founded. But, for the purpose of the argument, let that be conceded; I care not as to that. I answer the question, and I say "no." Such a thing as the Government paying tax upon its own property is an anomaly, an unheard-of thing. I say further, however—I am not trying to escape upon any quibble—I say the Government ought to take care of the expenses incident to and required by such property as the Government has in this District and elsewhere. Whether those expenses be great or small, I say they ought to be borne by the people of the United States. If there is an appropriation in this bill for any purpose that has reference to property of the Government of the United States, I say that the Government ought to pay not only one-half of such expense, but that it ought to pay all of it, and that the people of the District ought to be relieved of any burden of that kind, except that which they bear in meeting their proportional part as citizens of the United States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. I should like to occupy a few moments more, if the House will indulge me.

Mr. DOCKERY. How much more time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Five minutes will suffice.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. DE ARMOND] be allowed five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I am obliged to the House for this extension of time and I will not abuse the courtesy. The question under discussion is one which it seems to me is well worthy of discussion in this House.

Now, I am not urging any proposition here in a spirit hostile to the District, or to the beautiful city of Washington, or to any of the interests of this city, or this District, or to any of the people in the city or District. To my mind—of course I may look at the subject wrongly—it is a question of simple fairness and justice. Shall the people of your districts and mine, after contributing of their substance to carry on local government in their several townships, towns, cities, and States, be compelled to pay also half of what is laid out for the benefit of people living in this favored city? Such, I think, is the proposition. Take the matter of the public schools, for instance. Can any member on this floor suggest a good reason, an honest reason, why the people of his district or my district should be taxed in order to pay a dollar for every dollar that is contributed by the people of the District of Columbia for the education of their own children?

Mr. MEREDITH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEREDITH. I wish to ask if the gentleman does not know it to be a fact that there are thousands of children here from the States who, by reason of the fact that this is the head of the National Government, are brought here from the different States by people who are temporarily here, and are being educated in the schools of the District?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Including the children of members of Congress and all the officials of the Government.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, of course I can not, and do not, undertake to say how many children, or whose children, are brought here from the different States of the Union to be educated in the schools of the District. But I do say that the people of the United States are not justly chargeable with any responsibility for their education.

It has been suggested by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] that included in the schools of the District are children of the members of Congress. Shall we be told, sir, that the people of his district and mine are to contribute their one-half of the million of dollars of this appropriation in order that his children and mine, and the children of other Members and Senators, may be educated here? For me, I ask not the people of my district to pay for the education of my children in these schools; I ask not that they be kept open for that purpose; I ask not that my children be admitted to them at all, if that admission is to carry with it a suggestion that as a member of this body I shall sanction, either indirectly by my silence or directly by my vote, the compelling of the people of my district to contribute toward raising the million of dollars for school purposes in the District of Columbia.

But take account of the Government property located here. The Government owns this Capitol building; but, Mr. Chairman, we ought not to forget the fact that but for this building and the other buildings of the Government in this city, now stretching and spreading far and wide the magnificent capital of the American nation, there would be but the swamps in which sportive gentlemen could go duck shooting, and no doubt find abundance of game without going very far, either. Washington is just what the people of the United States have made it. The public buildings, the Government improvements erected here, were erected at the expense of the people of the United States, and they are what has given value and permanence to everything worth thinking of in this city. As well talk of taxing the court-house in the poorest county in the Union; as well talk of taxing the jail that shelters criminals and protects and guards society from their dangerous attacks, as to talk of taxing this building, the White House, or the Treasury, or the Pension building, or the War and Navy building, or any other of the great structures in the city of Washington belonging to the people of the United States. Nowhere except here is such public property regarded as the just subject or object of taxation.

Now, let the Government pay all it should pay for improving, protecting, beautifying, taking care of its own property, but let not the people who sent us here be compelled by Congress to pay what ought to be levied on the private property of the people of this District.

I have said all I desire to say on the subject.

Mr. GROUT. I suppose now that the point of order will be disposed of.

Mr. DE ARMOND. What is the point of order? I did not understand it.

Mr. GROUT. That it changes existing law, and it is all stated in a nut shell in Rule XXI, paragraph 2, the last clause, which says:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in a general appropriation bill or any amendment thereto.

And the organic act, section 16, says:

To the extent to which Congress shall approve such estimates, Congress shall appropriate to the amount of 50 per cent thereof.

This amendment of the gentleman changes, therefore, the existing law, and the provision under the former rule that it reduced expenditures does not apply under the present rule.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman from Vermont yield to me for a few moments, reserving the point of order?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friend from Vermont for sufficient time to make a statement in support of the suggestion embodied in the question I submitted to my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] in regard to the value of Government property in the District of Columbia.

I hold in my hand a report from the office of the assessors for the District of Columbia, dated April 28, 1894, and in it is given the taxable values of all the property in the District. It shows that the valuation of private property subject to taxation is $191,417,804. Of course, the same board of assessment which assessed the private property assessed the Government property of every kind and character in the District, and this report gives the exempt property in the District of Columbia, as follows:

United States property:	
Value of land, not including streets and alleys	$98,705,639
Value of improvements	99,352,500
Total United States property	198,058,139

or over seven millions more than all the private property, valued on a very fair and reasonable assessment, in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENRY. Does that include parks?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I think not. I say this was a very fair assessment. In the Fifty-second Congress I had the honor to serve on a committee to investigate the tax assessments in the District of Columbia, and we very thoroughly overhauled the work of the board of assessors at that time. We started in with the idea that the assessment was inadequate, that it was too low; but we became thoroughly convinced before we finished that it was exceedingly fair, and equaled the average in any other similar community in the United States. Under these circumstances, I think the people of the United States, the people of my district, and the people of the district of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] would be very willing to pay their proportionate expense of the Government, even if the law was not as it is.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. WASHINGTON. My time has expired, but if I may have additional time I will be glad to answer any question which the gentleman desires to ask.

Mr. GROUT. I yield sufficient time for the gentleman's reply.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the rate of taxation in his State, including State, county, road, school, and various items of taxation that go to make up the total, does not amount to more than $1.50 on the hundred, the highest rate of taxation known in this District?

Mr. WASHINGTON. In answer to the gentleman I will state that in the county in which I live we have no city tax, but the State and county tax for all purposes is about 1 per cent on a much lower valuation of property than that which prevails here. I think in the city of Nashville it is higher than it is here, because we have to pay taxes for three distinct forms of government—for the State, for the county, and for the municipality. There are three distinct forms of government that must be maintained by local taxation. Here you have but one form of government, because of the peculiar conditions that surround the District. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee, I will publish as part of my remarks the report from which I have quoted.

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 28, 1894.

To the Commissioners, District of Columbia.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to transmit the following statement, showing in detail all taxable property, by sections, and all nontaxable property in the District of Columbia, with table showing the percentage of valuation.

This statement is based upon the valuation of the general assessment of 1893-94.

MATTHEW TRIMBLE,
Assessor District of Columbia.
E. W. W. GRIFFIN,
Assistant Assessor.

Taxable property in the District of Columbia.

	Northwest.	Southwest.	Northeast.	Southeast.
Value of land	$72,014,010	$5,245,899	$7,510,034	$5,989,812
Value of improvements	52,153,666	5,238,250	6,842,934	5,275,271
Total valuation	124,167,676	10,484,149	14,352,968	11,265,083
Percentage of valuation in city	77.47	6.54	8.96	7.03
Percentage of valuation in District of Columbia	64.87	5.48	7.50	5.89

	Georgetown.	County.	Totals.
Value of land	$4,341,970	$17,728,658	$112,830,383
Value of improvements	3,281,100	5,796,200	78,587,421
Total valuation	7,623,070	23,524,858	191,417,804
Percentage of valuation in District of Columbia	3.98	12.28	

Exempt property in the District of Columbia.

United States property:					
Value of land (not including streets and alleys)				$98,705,639	
Value of improvements				99,352,500	
Total valuation				198,058,139	$198,058,139
District of Columbia property (including public schools and other municipal institutions):					
Value of land				1,527,320	
Value of improvements				2,126,500	
Total valuation				3,653,820	3,653,820
	City.	Georgetown.	County.	Totals.	
Church property:					
Number of churches	137	14	32	183	
Value of land	$1,443,678	$50,027	$60,087	$1,553,792	
Value of improvements	$2,789,000	$157,200	$113,200	$3,059,400	
Total valuation	$4,232,678	$207,227	$173,287	$4,613,192	
Charitable institutions (not municipal):					
Number	18	15	17	40	
Value of land	$1,052,951	$105,721	$383,453	$1,542,125	
Value of improvements	$654,700	$10,000	$164,300	$829,000	
Total valuation	$1,707,651	$115,721	$547,753	$2,371,125	
Educational institutions (private):					
Number	18	5	6	29	
Value of land	$314,463	$44,882	$378,224	$737,569	
Value of improvements	553,300	342,000	439,300	1,334,600	
Total valuation	867,763	386,882	817,524	2,072,169	
Foreign legations:					
Value of land	120,771				
Value of improvements	141,800				
Total valuation	262,571			262,571	
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company:					
Value of land	30,883	87,375	2,614	120,872	
Value of improvements	2,600	3,300	200	6,100	
Total valuation	33,483	90,675	2,814	126,972	
Total exempt property in the District of Columbia					9,446,029
					211,157,988

Total taxable property in the District of Columbia	$191,417,804
Total United States property in the District of Columbia*	198,058,139
Total District of Columbia property	3,653,820
Total all other exempt property in the District of Columbia	9,446,029
Grand total valuation	402,575,792
Percentage:	
Taxable property	47.55
United States property	49.20
District of Columbia property	.91
All other exempt property	2.34

*Not including streets and alleys.

Mr. MEREDITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no more time.

Mr. GROUT. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia such time as he desires, leaving the point of order pending.

Mr. MEREDITH. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] as I understand it, is in the line of the theory of my friend, which has been pressed upon this House time and again. The object which the gentleman from Missouri has in view, if we may judge by what has arisen here before, is to put upon the District of Columbia the entire expense of running the District government. My friend ignores the fact that this is the capital of a nation of seventy millions of people. But if that is to be ignored, Mr. Chairman, I desire briefly to call his attention to the fact which has been shown by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON], when he read from the report of the assessor that there is very much more property owned by the General Government in this city than is owned by private individuals.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman kindly permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I should like to ask what property that is? Will you specify some of the items?

Mr. MEREDITH. I have not the statement of the assessor before me.

Mr. DE ARMOND. This Capitol is the first item, is it not?

Mr. MEREDITH. The Capitol where we are assembled is a part of the property.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman means this Capitol and similar property?

Mr. MEREDITH. The public streets and public parks of this city are owned by the General Government. When the first owners of the soil granted to the Government these lots, which have been reserved from that day to the present, they gave this property freely, and they gave an amount of property, as I understand, to the Government equal to that which is now occupied by the citizens of this District. Yet my friend seems to be astonished that the Government should be called upon, and that his district should be required to pay a part of the school expenses for the education of children in this District. I desire to call his attention to the fact that there are thousands of officeholders here, many of them from his district, some of whom he has brought here.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Not many, let me tell you. They have a different kind of fellows in the offices. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he takes the position that the people back at home ought to pay for educating the children of officeholders who are here, and who get much better salaries than the people at home make by ten times as much labor?

Mr. MEREDITH. I take the position that if the people who are here temporarily residing, and who pay taxes at home in your district and my district, to their State governments, who pay the taxes that are assessed against them, when they are brought here to fill official positions to which they have been appointed, they are entitled to have their children educated here, and it is no more than right and just that the Government should pay its proportion.

For years and years the Government of the United States has borne dollar for dollar with that borne by the city, and gentlemen who live in distant States have been unable to realize the fact of its propriety and justice. It is the duty of the Government, in my judgment, and it has been the duty in the judgment of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which is composed of gentlemen from all over this country; and it is but fair and just that those obligations should be borne equally by the Government and by the District of Columbia. My friend behind me has properly suggested that this District occupies the condition of a Territory; but above and beyond all that, this is the national city, the national city of a nation composed of 70,000,000 people; and I say that each member of Congress, I do not care whether he comes from the State of Missouri or what State he comes from, ought to take a just pride in this national city, and ought to be willing to contribute from the revenues of the Government its just proportion, especially when the Government owns more than one-half of all the real estate of this District, when we come to the assessor's statement, which has been shown by my friend from Tennessee.

Now, I have been on the Committee on the District of Columbia, and these matters have come before us time and time again, and we have found that some gentlemen were very hard to be converted to the fact that it is absolutely just that the Government should bear its just proportion of the obligations which rest upon this District; and we have found that my friend from Missouri time and time has endeavored by amendment and otherwise to put the entire expenses of this District upon the District, and to relieve the Government from any expense whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. GROUT. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order, but for one reason. Of course I assume that the point of order will be decided fatally to the amendment; but the discussion had is calculated to prejudice the mind of the committee against this city. The argument offered in support of it is calculated to mislead the minds of a number of members; so I will state that in previous Congresses this has been gone over again and again.

I simply want to say a few words for the purpose of correcting any erroneous impression that may have been created by that argument. This is not the city of Washington alone; it is the capital city of the United States of America. It belongs to us as a nation, and since the Blackburn Act of 1878, that gave us the present form of government—what is known as the half-and-half rule—this city has been picked up out of the mud and dirt and a condition of disgrace to the Republic, and made the first city in the world; something that an American can be proud of. The people of the District have literally no control over this property.

The United States is the great owner. This is the capital city, to be visited by us, by our constituents, and by all our people. It is under our absolute control; and, as I have often said, this body is the city council for the District. We make its laws and control it; and it will be a mistake to ever go back to the period antedating 1878, when we adopted the present system. We now educate our children here. We have an army of over 20,000 citizens from other States doing the business of the Government here; and I hope no feeling in this House against this city will enter into the minds of this committee because of this amendment and the discussion had thereon. I believe in the present system, and I hope that the members of Congress will feel a responsibility resting upon them to study this District and its necessities, and treat it with the same reason and fair play that they would the city or town of their own home.

Mr. GROUT. If the Chair is ready to rule, I do not desire to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I beg to ask the gentleman from Vermont if he has the law before him, the law of 1878; and I will ask him whether the provision is not with reference to the "government" of the District of Columbia? The bill itself covers items that are totally distinct from governmental expenses.

Mr. GROUT. To what items does the gentleman allude?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I allude to such things as schools, for instance, charitable institutions, streets, sidewalks, etc., expenses incurred in other localities and borne in other localities by individuals owning the abutting property. The point I submit is that as to all these things they are not properly included within items of governmental expense or for the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROUT. Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to that I will say that the law requires that estimates be submitted covering every expense of the city.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Vermont that the Chair is ready to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman asked me a question and I was simply answering it.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS.

For work on streets and avenues named in Appendix X, Book of Estimates, 1897, $100,000, to be expended in the discretion of the Commissioners upon streets and avenues specified in the schedules named in said appendix and in the aggregate for each schedule as stated herein, namely:

Georgetown schedule, $9,000.
Northwest section schedule, $30,000.
Southwest section schedule, $15,000.
Southeast section schedule, $23,000.
Northeast section schedule, $23,000.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether these items have not been materially reduced below the ordinary appropriations for these purposes?

Mr. GROUT. They have been reduced in the aggregate $44,500 below the appropriation for the current year, and the reduced amount is distributed pro rata among the different sections of the city as specified in the bill.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. But the amounts for these several sections are not equal to the amounts appropriated under the same heads in the last bill?

Mr. GROUT. No; the aggregate is $44,500 less than the appropriation for like purposes in the current law.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move that the amount of this appropriation be increased by adding $44,000, to be distributed pro rata among the several sections named in the bill.

The amendment of Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire was read, as follows:

Page 11, line 7, insert before the word "thousand" the words "and forty-four"; so as to make the appropriation read: "$144,000."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs to pavements: For renewal, resurfacing, and repairs to concrete pavements with the same or other not inferior material, $150,000.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 16, page 11, strike out the words "and fifty," making the clause read: "$100,000."

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment principally for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the attention of members of the House generally to the outrageous tearing up, cutting up, and obstructing of the fine streets of this city for the purpose of so-called "repairing"; for I assert that more than one-half of the money that has been expended, nominally for the repair of the pavements of this city, since I have been here during the past twelve years, has resulted in actual detriment to the streets. There can not be any question that more than 50 per cent of the money so expended has been expended to the actual injury of the streets of Washington.

Three years ago one of the streets here on Capitol Hill that had not a break in it was invaded by these "repairers"; they came and made their chalk marks and drew their lines around little depressions in the pavement, many of them not half an inch below the ordinary surface of the street, the pavement being perfectly sound; they set their men at work to cut out 2 inches deep of solid asphalt, and then put in some new material, leaving it, in almost every case, as far above the common surface of the pavement as the spot had previously been below it. I suggest to gentlemen present that when they see gangs of these repairers at work upon the streets of this city, they go and observe how they do the work. If you can catch them when they are marking it out, just notice the number of places, of from 10 or 12 inches to a yard in diameter; proposing to cut out perfectly sound pavement merely where the surface is a little depressed. Any gentleman can verify my statements if he will only take the trouble to observe these people at work.

I want to make one other statement. I ask members of the House to observe the next crowd that they see repairing the streets and see the manner in which they work. If I can not take ten ordinary laboring men and do more work in a day than a hundred of these fellows can do, then I will acknowledge that I do not know anything about the subject. [Laughter.] You will find them in sections standing idly by, looking on to see what the others are doing. Somebody is paying them for doing that. Now, I wish it understood that I do not object to any proper expenditure for the improvement of the streets of this city. What I do object to is the tearing up of these fine streets all the time. In the city where I live we have bituminous paved streets the same as these in Washington, there being, perhaps, a little difference in the quality of the bitumen and the asphaltum used here.

Those streets in my city have to bear heavy traffic; some of them are in the neighborhood of steamship wharves, where five and six tons are put upon a truck and hauled over the streets, and yet those pavements have not been repaired and have not needed repairs in the last five years; and I assert that in nine cases out of ten where the streets of Washington are cut into for the alleged purpose of "repairing" the result has been actual damage to the streets. If heretofore we have appropriated money enough to repair the streets of this city, then I assert that one-half of this appropriation is all that is required for doing the necessary work for the next year. If these men must be employed, employ them; if they must be paid, pay them; but do not let them destroy the beautiful streets of this city. There has hardly been a fair day during the time when I have been here when the streets of this city have not been barricaded at some point in order that somebody might get paid for doing so-called repairing where in reality it was not needed.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, ought to be adopted, but, as I said at the beginning, I have offered it rather for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on Appropriations and of the members of the House to this matter. Again, I say to members the next time you see "repairs" going on in our streets, investigate the matter personally and see how they are made and how the men work.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill one question. I have seen it reported in the papers and in other publications that Washington is the cheapest governed city in the country, and its government is run at less expense in proportion to the population than that of any other city. Is that true?

Mr. GROUT. I have not investigated that question, but I think it will be found that the cost of governing this city is not exorbitant as compared with the cost of governing other cities—possibly the expense here would be found below that in other cities.

Mr. SPERRY. The reports say that this is the most cheaply governed city.

Mr. GROUT. I presume that is true.

Mr. BOWERS. That does not affect this question at all.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BOWERS, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs, county roads: For current work of repairs of county roads and suburban streets, $40,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the repair of all county roads, except such as are rendered useless by the opening and improving of new highways established under the act approved March 2, 1893.

Mr. HULICK. In reference to the provision just read, I wish to ask the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] whether the committee has taken into consideration the judgment of the court declaring unconstitutional the act establishing a system of highways?

Mr. GROUT. Acting upon that decision, the committee refused to make an appropriation for further carrying out that act, as will be found when we reach that paragraph in the bill relating to that matter. But the present provision refers to what has been already done. It is made necessary by work already inaugurated and partly accomplished under the act referred to.

Mr. HULICK. Then this is not affected by the decision of the court?

Mr. GROUT. Not at all.

Mr. HULICK. I did not know whether the appropriation would be affected by that decision or not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of county roads: For construction of county roads and suburban streets, as follows:

For grading and regulating Sherman avenue, Roanoke and Irving streets, continuing improvement, $10,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for removing buildings, terracing banks, and replacing fences of Garfield Hospital grounds and other premises abutting on Sherman avenue between Grant and Princeton streets: *Provided*, That the owners thereof dedicate to the District of Columbia the ground for widening Sherman avenue in conformity with the adopted and recorded plans of highway extensions.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I should like to have the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] explain this provision in regard to the Garfield Hospital grounds. I should like to hear something in reference to the relation of those grounds to the streets here referred to, and how the grounds will be left when the proposed improvement has been made.

Mr. GROUT. I do not know that I can give any further explanation than is afforded by the language of the bill itself. It says:

This appropriation shall be available for removing buildings, terracing banks, and replacing fences of Garfield Hospital grounds and other premises abutting on Sherman avenue, between Grant and Princeton streets: *Provided*, etc.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I have been informed that this grading and regulating of Sherman avenue, Roanoke and Irving streets, makes a deep cut into the grounds of the Garfield Hospital property, leaving those grounds in some cases 10, 15, or 20 feet above grade. The question in my mind is whether that is an appropriate thing to be done at all. I should like to know whether the committee has looked into that part of this appropriation and ascertained its probable effect.

Mr. GROUT. The attention of the committee was not called to that particular view of the case. This provision has been recommended by the Commissioners, and very likely, as there is mention made here of "terracing banks" and the like, it may carry the streets below the grade, making these terraces necessary; but when the improvement is completed it is supposed (although there was no investigation before the committee on that point) that it will leave the situation in equally good shape, or that some other counterbalancing advantage will be obtained. We did not investigate this question particularly.

Mr. PITNEY. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] that this subject was referred to, as I think the gentleman from Vermont will recall, in the hearings before the subcommittee, and the Commissioners recommended this particular improvement as most important. They said there was a large bank which they desired to remove.

Mr. GROUT. That is just what I stated—that the Commissioners recommended this provision. They testified before us. There was no issue raised as to the propriety of the provision. That is what I meant by saying that it was not specially investigated.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Does he think that under existing law the District ought to pay for terracing the grounds around the hospital and replacing the fences? When it may be necessary to cut away those grounds, in order to bring the street to the proper grade, ought not that charge to be borne by the property itself?

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman will observe the proviso to the paragraph:

Provided, That the owners thereof dedicate to the District of Columbia the ground for widening Sherman avenue in conformity with the adopted and recorded plans of highway extension.

Now, it is supposed to be a most desirable thing for the public that this avenue should be widened; and as it was submitted to us without objection from anyone, and as it met the approval of the Commissioners, I will say it was probably thought that if the owners would contribute the ground for widening the street the Government could afford to do the balance, and that the result when the work was accomplished would be all the better for everybody concerned.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will not the resulting benefits to the abutting property from the widening of this street be sufficient compensation to the owners for giving up their land?

Mr. GROUT. That I can not say; that matter was not inquired into, because no issue was made. We took the provision upon the recommendation of the Commissioners; and as nobody objected, we supposed it to be correct. It certainly looked reasonable.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I raised my inquiry because I have been informed (though I have not investigated the matter myself and therefore do not speak from my own knowledge) that this improvement is a material detriment to the hospital grounds, although a great improvement to the other property adjoining the widened streets. I do not make any motion because I have no personal knowledge of the matter. I have stated my information on the subject. [Cries of "Read!" "Read!"]

The Clerk read as follows:

Lighting: For illuminating material, lighting, extinguishing, repairing, and cleaning public lamps on avenues, streets, roads, and alleys; purchasing and expense of erecting new lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures; moving lamp-posts, painting lamp-posts and lanterns; replacing and repairing lamp-posts and lanterns damaged or unfit for service; for storage and cartage of material, $122,000: *Provided*, That no more than $16 per annum for each street lamp shall be paid for gas or oil, lighting, extinguishing, repairing, painting, and cleaning, under any expenditure provided for in this act: *Provided*, That all of said lamps shall burn every night, on the average, from forty-five minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise: *Provided further*, That before any expenditures are made from the appropriations herein provided for the contracting gas companies shall equip each street lamp with a self-regulating burner and tip, so combined and adjusted as to secure, under all ordinary variations of pressure and density, a consumption of six cubic feet of gas per hour: *Provided further*, That the entire service of gas lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor: *Provided further*, That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with a system of underground pipes for the purpose of conducting gas in the streets, roads, and alleys to be lighted hereunder, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground pipes for said purpose in and along such streets, roads, and alleys as may be necessary for said service; such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against all this paragraph after the word "therefore," in line 13, down to the close of the paragraph, and refer the Chair, in support of the point of order, to the final clause of paragraph 2, Rule XXI:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

I send to the Clerk's desk to be read section 268 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia, bearing upon this question.

The Clerk read as follows:

If any person shall alter or in any manner obstruct or encroach on a public road, or cut, destroy, deface, or remove any milestones set up on such road, or place any rubbish, dirt, logs, or make any pit or hole therein, such person may be indicted, and upon conviction thereof before the proper court, shall be fined and imprisoned in the discretion of the court, according to the nature of the offense.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, there is no authority for this provision in the pending bill. It authorizes the successful bidders to make holes in the roads of the District of Columbia and to place obstructions thereon, contrary to existing law. It is an extension of legislation, on general principles, giving the Commissioners authority not warranted by law, and should be stricken out. I leave the question to the Chair, reserving my time.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, if that is the law my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] had in mind when he said that this was without authority of law, and that we would be shown the law which prohibited the opening up of streets for the purpose of laying conduits as contemplated in the pending bill, I can only say that for myself I fail to see that it has the slightest application to the question in hand. The provision read refers to an unauthorized act, unauthorized by the executive power of the District of Columbia—that is to say, the Commissioners—in the way of obstructing or tearing up or interfering with the public streets, and concerning this there can be no question whatever. This provision, however, in the pending bill provides that it may be done under the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who have charge of the streets and alleys of the District under the law.

Now, unless there be some good authority produced, prohibiting the Commissioners of the District from authorizing the streets to be opened for this necessary purpose, for lighting them either by gas or electricity, and for the purpose of opening the streets to supply the people with water, then there can be no possible ground on which the point of order can rest.

The organic act confers on the executive power of the District of Columbia authority to grant permits for such necessary purposes as are contemplated in the law, and when that authority is granted, it is in entire accordance with the law. Water and light are essential to the good order and proper government of any city. The opening of the streets that a supply of both may be furnished are absolutely necessary; and this provision of the bill only seeks to put a limitation upon it, instead of operating as an enlargement of the power. It says that it may be done, but not without the consent of the Commissioners. No man may do it of his own will. He shall do it only in obedience to, and under the direction of, the executive power of the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that there is no possible ground on which the point of order can for a moment be entertained.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a word in reference to the point of order.

The section cited by the gentleman from New Hampshire as embodying the existing law, which he contends operates as a bar to the provision contained in this appropriation bill, is a statute to prevent malicious mischief on the public highways and prohibiting a public nuisance to be maintained upon them. It has no reference to the lawful care and control of the streets or to the power which exists by law in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to control the streets, roads, and avenues of the District.

The statute to which the gentleman refers is in these terms:

If any person shall alter or in any manner obstruct or encroach on a public road, or cut, destroy, deface, or remove any milestones set up on such roads, or place any rubbish, dirt, logs, or make any pit or hole therein, such person may be indicted, and upon conviction thereof before the proper court, shall be fined or imprisoned in the discretion of the court according to the nature of the offense.

The intention is to make it a criminal offense to commit such malicious mischief upon the roads, and in order to show that such was the intent of the lawmaking power a marginal note is appended which gives an index or contains a description of the statute in the following words:

Penalty for *willful* injury to public roads.

This proviso, Mr. Chairman, in the bill now before us is an incident to the main object of the section, which is to make an appropriation of money. Suppose, sir, there were no system of gaslighting here in this District. Suppose there were not a pipe laid under the ground for that purpose—and we all know that that is the only way in which gas can be distributed to light the streets—suppose that not a pipe was underneath the surface of the streets, undoubtedly Congress has the power to grant money to light the streets, for the law contemplates that they shall be lighted. Then we say in an appropriation bill that so much money shall be spent to light them with gas. In the case supposed, there being no gas pipes under the streets, we must as a necessary incident to the appropriation for the purpose of lighting the streets grant to somebody the privilege of laying a system of gas pipes under the streets. Inasmuch as it must be done by a pipe, the District Commissioners are allowed to authorize the company which furnishes the light to lay mains under the streets. That is all.

Now, whatever would be permissible under this bill—supposing that there were no system of gas mains in the streets—is permissible in case a new company comes into the District to operate here under this law. This simply gives to the successful company—the company that makes the successful bid, under the terms of this appropriation bill—the right to lay its mains or pipes in the streets.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. No one will dispute that.

Mr. PITNEY. Therefore it is simply the grant of an incidental power, necessary for the carrying out of the purpose of a lawful appropriation.

Mr. GROUT. Call it a privilege instead of a power.

Mr. PITNEY. Yes; it is a grant to the Commissioners, of the lawful power to grant a privilege to a citizen of this or some other State, for the purpose of enabling such citizen or company to carry on a useful public purpose, which Congress is under the duty of appropriating money to sustain.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman himself has admitted my entire contention. It is a grant contrary to law; consequently it changes existing law. It undertakes to legislate in an appropriation bill concerning something which is not an appropriation. The statutes of the District of Columbia have made it an offense, punishable by fine, to dig into the streets of the city, to make pitfalls there, or to obstruct them; and a person doing so may be imprisoned. The proposed legislation says that a person doing it under certain conditions shall not be impris-

oned or fined. Evidently it is a change of existing law, and if it were not a change of existing law there would be no necessity for it here at all. Therefore, it comes plainly within the provisions of the clause to which I have referred in Rule XXI. Without the proposed grant of power the Commissioners could not do it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, as the law stands to-day there is no requirement upon the part of the District Commissioners to let the contract for the furnishing of gas to the lowest bidder. This provision requires that they should do so. That is a change in existing law.

Again, let me illustrate the other proposition. Under existing law the gentleman who has charge of this bill has no authority to in any way deface the streets of the city of Washington. He can not dig up the surface. He is prohibited from that. Now he seeks by changing the law to secure the power to do it. How? First, by becoming a bidder for the furnishing of gas to the city of Washington. To-day he can not, by bidding upon any contract of that character, be authorized to tear up the streets. The law forbids him doing it. He is seeking now to secure such a change in the statute as will authorize him to do that. Is not that the kind of a change of existing law which is prohibited in this class of legislation?

Again, there is but one organization in the city of Washington that is authorized by law to furnish gas for consumption. This bill proposes to change that statute and to authorize a certain one this year, another next year, and another the third year, to furnish gas to the city of Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be understood as opposing any legislation that reduces the price of gas to the consumer, but I insist that this legislation is not only obnoxious to our rules, but is entirely unnecessary. The committee are trying to effect a reduction in cost——

Mr. PITNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question? I understand the gentleman's position to be that the present gas company now operating in Washington have an exclusive franchise for that purpose, and that we can not authorize any other company to light the streets without changing existing law. Has the gentleman's attention been directed to the seventh section and the ninth section of the organic act incorporating the Washington Gas Light Company? The seventh section gives that company the right to lay pipes for the purpose of conducting gas, in any of the streets, avenues, and alleys of the said city, and the ninth section provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any person or persons, or any incorporated company hereafter to be created by Congress for that purpose, from engaging in and pursuing the business specified in the seventh section of this act.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is all right, sir. Now the gentleman proposes to authorize these other persons to destroy this monopoly by engaging in this business.

Mr. HILL. Without being incorporated?

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). Which they can not do until there is a change in existing law. That establishes my proposition, I think, very satisfactorily.

Mr. PITNEY. The law itself provides that they shall not have a monopoly, and that nothing shall prevent Congress from giving the right to others to engage in this business.

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly Congress can do it, just as it can do anything else; but what I am objecting to is the attempt to do it in this act, which is forbidden by the rules of this House. No one doubts but that Congress has the power to authorize any other corporation to serve the people of this city in this way. There is no question about that. That is not the subject of dispute. The question at issue is whether or not that power can be exercised under our rules in this way and at this time and upon this bill.

Mr. GROUT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. GROUT. Which section are you talking about—the one relating to gas or electricity?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am talking about this one to which objection has been made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, whether the proposition is meritorious or not as contained in the bill, I will not at this time discuss. That it is not subject to the point of order seems to me plain. Now, what does the section do? It appropriates money for lighting the city—for lighting by lamps on avenues, streets, roads, and alleys, etc., of the city. Now, lighting the city of Washington is evidently a public object for which we can appropriate money. If that is true, it necessarily follows that we can procure lighting through appropriations, as we may provide or limit in a clause making the appropriation. In other words, this appropriation is made for a public object. Now, we can, if we choose, contract that this money shall be used for hanging old-fashioned tin lanterns upon posts to be erected on every street corner.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. There is no law against that. That is a different thing.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; that involves the planting of the post and hanging the lantern. In other words, lighting the city of Washington is the performance of a municipal duty, and when we appropriate the money we may provide how it shall be expended.

Now, what does this clause do? Very properly it seems to me, within the rule, it provides as follows:

Provided, That all lamps shall burn every night on an average from sunset to sunrise, substantially: *Provided*, That there shall be certain equipments as to the lamps.

Provided further. That the entire service of gaslighting authorized by this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor—

The gentleman from Iowa says no, and says that is legislation. Oh, no; that provides how the money shall be expended in lighting the city, and is in order, as it seems to me, beyond a question. It necessarily follows from authority to appropriate. What next?—

That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with a system of underground pipes for the purpose of conducting the gas in the streets, roads, and alleys to be lighted hereunder—

That is, under this appropriation for the public lighting—

the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground pipes for said purpose in and along such streets, roads, and alleys as may be necessary for said service—

What service? Why the service of lighting the city—

such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation.

Now, having that power, we may place the limitation upon the use of the money. We have a gas company now in the city.

It is in the city under a charter, and has laid the mains. Now, this gentleman's contention is that we can not regulate on an appropriation bill in any way or shape the lighting by gas, except to utilize the company that now exists, because, he says, it changes existing law.

Well, there have been a good many rulings along this line, not upon this exact kind of an amendment, but substantially the same as this amendment. The rule itself is as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law—

Is not this expenditure for lighting authorized by law, and is it not competent for us to say whether it shall be by candle, gas, electricity, or any other agent—

unless in continuation of appropriation for such public works or objects as are already in progress.

Now, this rule has been liberally construed to enable us to provide in appropriation bills and appropriation laws for the public service where the letter of the law is silent. Given the right under the law to light the city of Washington, all means necessary to light it are necessarily implied, and are matters of detail, direction, or limitation. Gentlemen may ask, are there any precedents? Yes; I now read from the Digest:

A provision in the Navy appropriation bill for additional ships was held to be in order, as being in continuation of a public object already in progress, namely, the maintenance of the Navy.

There is no battle ship or cruiser that has been constructed in the last ten years but what has been authorized and its construction begotten upon an appropriation bill under the rule and under the rulings. Gentlemen understand that ordinarily a public building can not be built until first an act authorizing the construction of the public building has been enacted. Then for the first time it is in order to appropriate. Yet I find the following decision. The Chair well knows that under general provisions of law we have a military academy in the State of New York.

In the Military Academy appropriation bill a provision for a fire-proof building on the site of the public grounds at West Point is within the purview of the rule. The construction of a building is an incident to the maintenance of the academy itself, the object being already in progress, the main object contemplated not only by the bill but by the very institution of the academy itself.

That was the decision of Mr. Cox, late a Representative from the State of New York. Here is the character of the decision: That you can not appropriate under the rule for a public building in the city of New York or in the city of Utica until a law shall first be enacted authorizing it. It is true an appropriation for such a building without authorization would not be in order upon an appropriation bill; but in the case given, the law establishing the academy at West Point, the buildings followed as a necessary incident. So here the law places the District of Columbia under the direction of Congress; the lighting of the public streets and parks is under the law, and it is idle to say that a provision as to how they shall be lighted is subject to a point of order, because such provision is absolutely essential as a necessary incident to the lighting itself.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Under the existing law there is a company, is there not, which has the right to light the streets of Washington?

Mr. CANNON. No.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is there not a company that is now doing that lighting under existing law?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; under the existing appropriation there is a company which lights the streets and parks for the current fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Now, is it not proposed by this amendment that other companies than that one may come in and lay down their conduits in the streets, and if they do so, will they not do it under this proposed law and not under any other law?

Mr. CANNON. If somebody, either an individual or a corporation, is a lower bidder than the existing company for lighting the streets and the parks of this city, under the appropriation proposed in this bill, and that individual or corporation is without means or appliances to deliver the gas along the line of the streets and in the public parks, it is proposed by this bill that the District Commissioners may permit that individual or corporation to lay down mains for the purpose, and only for the purpose, of lighting the public streets and parks.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is there any existing law that would authorize the Commissioners to give authority to any other company to lay mains for the purpose of lighting the streets and parks?

Mr. CANNON. I understand not. But it appears to me from his question that the gentleman fails to understand my position. It is this: In pursuance of existing law, for a municipal purpose, it is competent for Congress to appropriate money to light the public streets. That being the case, by limitation, by license, we can direct how the money shall be expended to effect the object in view, namely, the lighting of the streets, and we can, within Rule XXII, if necessary for the purpose of lighting the streets, authorize the planting of posts and the hanging of lanterns upon them, or the erection of posts for lamps, or the stringing of wires and the laying of conduits and of gas mains, or whatever else is necessary as incident to the public lighting for which we appropriate this money. Whatever is necessary for carrying out the work for which the appropriation is made may be authorized in connection with the appropriation giving authority for the expenditure of the money. Otherwise we could not light at all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the purpose of this provision in the bill to be to open to public competition the lighting of the District by either electricity or gas, and that inasmuch as there is to-day a practical monopoly of gas lighting and electric lighting here, the Commissioners are authorized, in case a lower bid is presented, to permit the bidders to establish an underground system for their gas lighting or their electric lighting.

Now, it is obvious that, so far as gas is concerned, the time for that form of lighting in municipalities is about expiring. Gas in future will be used mainly for heating and for power, and not for lighting. The light of the future is the electric light; and I wish to make a suggestion to the Committee on Appropriations with reference to that subject, for doubtless it will be further considered in conference when this bill shall have been reported from the Senate.

The question is this: We have within reach of Washington, only 14 miles distant, the Great Falls of the Potomac, now partially owned by the Government. The Potomac at that point is the source of our present water supply. I am told that the District Commissioners wish to secure control of the entire Great Falls, and that that power is one of the most efficient in all this Eastern country, standing second only to Niagara. Now, it seems to me that this is the time, while electric lighting is in its infancy and while no corporation of that kind has yet any very large vested right in this community, to determine the question whether the municipality itself shall not own an electric-lighting plant and whether it can not operate such a plant in connection with its water system to the great advantage of the District and with great economy to the taxpayers.

I am quite sure that the District Commissioners, if they are given authority, will inaugurate a system of electric lighting vastly superior to any that would be provided by a private corporation under the provisions of this bill, for I take it that no private corporation will invest any large amount of money in an efficient system of lighting with the threat hanging over its head, as provided in this bill, that Congress may, whenever it sees fit, forfeit the right; in other words, that the privilege of using the streets may be taken away while the property invested in the improvement still remains there. It seems to me that the wise, the rational, the prudent solution of this question is to take the District Commissioners into the confidence of Congress with reference to this matter and devise a system of municipal lighting by electricity, and not to provide for the destruction of the streets of Washington by giving the Commissioners power to grant to some new corporation, or to some individual, the right to lay down new gas mains and electric-light conduits.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a moment on the point of order, unless the Chair is ready to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, the language of clause 2 of Rule XXI has been so frequently referred to on the floor that it is hardly necessary to repeat it; yet I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the exact language of that provision:

> 2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if this provision in the bill under consideration changes existing law, it is clearly obnoxious to the rule, unless it comes within the exception—

> Unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works or objects as are already in progress.

What is the existing law in respect to gas and electric lighting? I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no existing law other than that found in the annual appropriation bills. In other words, there is no statute on the question. The statute invoked by the gentleman from New Hampshire, if strictly construed, would absolutely forbid the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from repairing the streets, because in order to do so they must to a certain extent make excavations in the streets.

I repeat, there is no existing statute in respect to this matter aside from that found in the current appropriation bills. That being the case, if the point of order raised by the gentleman from New Hampshire is a correct one, then it must lie against every line of this paragraph. If section 286, to which the gentleman refers, relates to this proviso, then not only the proviso, but the entire paragraph is obnoxious to the rule. I think the gentleman from New Jersey clearly demonstrated the fallacy of the position taken by the gentleman from New Hampshire in respect to the construction of the section referred to.

The case has also been so clearly stated by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] that it seems hardly necessary to add another word. This is a public object, and this House has repeatedly sustained decisions of Chairmen of Committees of the Whole to this effect. Old members will recall the original decision, made February 26, 1887, by Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, then and now a member of the House. In that case it was proposed to provide for the construction of some new ships for the Navy. The point of order was made that the provision for the new ships was in violation of the rule because not authorized by legislation.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole properly held that the construction of ships was in "continuation of a public object" already in progress—the maintenance of the Navy. Of course, if that had not been the ruling, no addition could be made to the Navy except by an independent, original statute. The gentleman from Kentucky in rendering that decision said:

> If the object is a public object, and is already in progress, then there need not be any previous legislation authorizing it.

So that we are brought to this conclusion at last: If the contention of the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from Iowa is correct, then this law in respect to gas and electric lighting is like "the laws of the Medes and Persians"; it must stand as originally placed in the appropriation bill. But, sir, the matter of gas and electric lighting are incidental to the operations of a great city. It is a necessary incident of the government of a city; and a provision such as that contained in this bill is not, in my judgment, in any manner obnoxious to clause 2 of Rule XXI.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not care on this question to go into a discussion of the rules and the precedents as to whether this is new legislation. But I can state to the Committee of the Whole a few facts from which they can draw their own conclusions.

There is now in preparation in this city a bill which proposes that the Government shall acquire the balance of the property at Great Falls, of which it now owns nearly all. By so doing it will control that enormous water power, of sufficient capacity to light the city of Washington with electricity. That measure will be brought before this House. We have pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia a bill to reduce the price of gas to $1 per thousand and to increase the illuminating power to 22 candles. We have also before us two bills asking for new charters to be granted in the regular way, each for a lighting and heating company.

Now, the gentlemen asking these charters are men of means, of capital and ability. If this bill passes, it will practically nullify all of such legislation, and it will be useless to report it from the committee to this House. Why? Because in the provision now pending here we propose to give anybody authority to bid for gas lighting or electric lighting in this city. Congress, by this provision, proposes to delegate the authority it has jealously guarded for many years to control this subject in the District of Columbia. All this authority it proposes to turn over to the Commissioners in this District and to permit anybody to come in here, whether responsible or not, and make bids for gas or electric light-

ing; and to the lowest bidder, whoever the party may be, the Commissioners can give authority to tear up the streets and put in new gas mains or wire conduits. The gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] has very aptly spoken about the condition of our streets; but think what the streets of this city would be if we should enact into law any such provision as that now pending. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that this provision practically nullifies the legislation now pending before the Committee for the District of Columbia, and such being the case, it must necessarily be new legislation.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] have each referred to paragraph 2 of Rule XXI. But the gentleman from Illinois in no part of his remarks has referred to that portion of the clause under which this point is made.

He talked very eloquently about appropriations for public works, and objects "already in progress." I did not make any point of order at all under that clause. The decision he cited has no reference whatever to the point I made; and the same is true with regard to the decision cited by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. I am not talking concerning public works in progress; but after all the clauses in the rule they cited, there comes the grand overshadowing one of all, under which I made the objection, and that is this:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

Now, I need say no more, except to inquire if this is not a change of existing law, in that it authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to do something that they would not for an instant entertain if not authorized by the proposed act. The section of the law I cited applies to every street and every alley in the District of Columbia, and while subsequent power has been given to the Commissioners by law, for appropriate objects, to grant permits to dig up the streets, they will not do it at the dictation of any irresponsible bidder who may come into the District with not a dollar's worth of ground or property here, nor having a dollar of interest in taxation. They have no authority so to do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman—— [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Well, Mr. Chairman, if they want to have a vote now, if they are satisfied with the question as it is, I am perfectly content. If not, I desire to say a few words on this subect. [Cries of "Go on!"]

It is perfectly plain to my mind—and I do not profess to be a lawyer, either—I do not think a man need to be one to understand the question; for it is not necessary either to be able to repeat the rule in Shelley's case, nor to quote the Pandects in order to see that the argument on this floor with reference to the pending subject is this—on one side it is contended, by the report brought in here by the Appropriations Committee, that this is not a change in the existing law, but that it is the institution of a rule or regulation to carry out existing law; and it seems to me that the statement is very clear, indeed, and I shall vote according to my understanding of the case. On the other hand, there is a demand made, not by a straight discussion of a legal point, but by the bringing in of extraneous arguments of a very comprehensive character, to carry the point of order against the report of the committee. We have been invited, and adroitly invited, to the contemplation of a rose-colored scheme about a water plant to be established up the Potomac, which is to furnish electricity and light to the city in coming time; and that we had better not pass any such section as that contemplated here, which might operate against that scheme, but wait until the good time shall come.

Now, the speeches that have been made here clearly show that we are not infracting any law, but simply making rules to carry it out, and I shall vote, Mr. Chairman, accordingly, believing this project to be for the best interest of all concerned.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the first ground of objection in Chairman DINGLEY'S ruling the other day read from the desk as a part of my remarks, as the reason for the rule I have invoked very briefly and concisely stated. It is only one of several, but it makes a strong suggestion in connection with the pending matter.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is a good ruling, but has no connection with this subject.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I ask the Clerk to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

First. That inasmuch as general appropriation bills carry the appropriations necessary to maintain the Government, and only appropriations already authorized by existing law, it is of the highest importance that they should not be impeded or jeopardized by differences in the House, or differences between the House and Senate, or differences between the two Houses and the Executive over any legislative propositions that may be proposed as amendments to such bills, each of which should be tried out on its own merits in separate bills.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I presume, after the very sensible remarks which the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLIS] has made, that no further suggestions are necessary with reference to the point of order. But of course it is important that we do not go wrong in this matter. I feel that I am almost willing to trust the Chair without further debate. But just a word respecting the matter and I will submit to the decision of the Chair.

They say this provision changes existing law. If it does, of course it ought to go out of the bill. But, let me ask, what law does it change? The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] read a statute which relates to the subject no more than the sermon on the mount. It is not even a sixteenth cousin to it. It refers wholly to malicious trespasses and misdemeanors and obstructions on the public highways of the District, without authority or color of it.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Is it not new legislation?

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman mistakes the language of the rule. The rule says that it "shall not change existing law." Let us hold to that language. It does not say "new legislation." It is new to this bill. Yes; this precise proposition, with all of its belongings, has not been proposed before, but that does not make it subject to the rule quoted by the gentleman.

But what other law is suggested as being contravened by this proposition? They cite the charter of the Washington Gas Light Company. Now, my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY] read from section 8 of the act incorporating that company, which is an old one, how it authorized the company to lay down pipes and to dig up the streets. Very well. Then he calls attention to a clause in section 9 which expressly provides that it shall not be construed to give this exclusive right to this corporation. If it had given exclusive right to do this to that corporation, then I grant, Mr. Chairman, that would be law which this provision would contravene; but that act of incorporation, in section 9, expressly withheld exclusive privilege. Now, what other law do they claim it changes? There has not been a word of suggestion as to any other law. That solves the whole problem. I feel that I need not further occupy the time of the committee.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman inform us by what authority the Washington Gas Light Company is permitted to put its pipes under ground?

Mr. GROUT. By virtue of its charter.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then if some other corporation or individual were permitted, under an act of Congress, to lay its pipes under ground, would it not be a change of existing law?

Mr. GROUT. It would, if the exclusive right was given to the Washington Gas Light Company; but it was expressly reserved to the people by the enacting power, and may now be exercised, and in no way run against any provision in the Washington Gas Light Company's charter. It is a provision rightfully derived, as I suggested when upon the floor before, from the organic act conferring the right to appropriate the money necessary to correct, full, and complete municipal administration.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Can the Commissioners grant this permission to lay these pipes without this enactment?

Mr. GROUT. I think they could; I said so in the committee. I think if we were to provide that they should give us an underground service—this refers to the gas proposition, however—if we gave to a competing gas company the right to furnish lights, it would carry with it the implied right to put these gas pipes under ground, because it is the universal rule to do so. It would follow by implication. I think it was unnecessary to insert the specific recital of authority to the Commissioners to grant the privilege. I think it is fairly incidental to the power to appropriate, and any court would have so held. I suggested it to the gentleman who formulated the proposition, but I agreed with him that it could do no harm, because the right still exists.

Mr. FISCHER. If this provision was stricken from the bill, what method would be pursued in order to lay gas pipes?

Mr. GROUT. If a competing gas company should make a bid, and if they guaranteed by sufficient bond to the Commissioners that they would light the city, the Commissioners could give leave to that new company when organized—and it is said to be already in embryo—to open up the streets without a word from Congress, in my opinion, as an incident to their executive authority in administering the affairs of the District, because here is the appropriation of the money, and it can not be made effective without that incidental privilege—it is a mere incidental privilege.

Mr. FISCHER. That is the law as it is to-day?

Mr. GROUT. I think so.

Mr. FISCHER. Does not this change it?

Mr. GROUT. No; it only reasserts it. It only makes it more plain. [Cries of "Rule!" "Rule!"]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAYNE). The Chair is ready to rule. The provision in the bill against which the point of order is raised allows the private individual or corporation that may happen to be the lowest bidder for lighting the streets of the city to enter upon the streets and dig trenches and lay pipes, etc., for the purpose of supplying gas. Now, the Chair must assume that the streets of the city of Washington, like the streets of all other

cities, are dedicated to the public for the public use in the ordinary way, for the passing and repassing of teams, vehicles, and the public, and not for the private use of entering upon the streets for the purpose of digging them up and laying gas pipes or anything of the kind by private individuals or corporations. In furtherance of that view of the Chair, we are cited to two sections of the statute which provide a penalty against the digging up or obstruction of the streets in any manner. This provision would allow a private corporation to obstruct the public traffic by digging up the streets and laying pipes. Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, it is a change of existing law.

Now, it has been argued that this is an incident or a limitation on the appropriation that is made for the lighting of the streets. Of course these other provisions, against which the point of order is not raised, are not provisions of that kind. They limit the price per lamp or the price to be paid for a lamp which shall burn all night, and which shall not burn during moonlight, and other limitations of that character, and those provisions would not be subject to the point of order.

In the Fifty-first Congress, under this rule, a clause was inserted in the District of Columbia appropriation bill providing that after a certain time no electric light company should have wires stretched upon poles in the streets, a provision intended to compel electric light companies to use underground wire. This same point of order was raised against that provision, and the same contention was made that that was only a limitation upon the method of lighting the streets, and that therefore it was in order. But the Chair sustained the point of order in that case, although the amendment was offered in a different form; and therefore the Chair feels compelled in this case to sustain the point of order against this provision.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the section as it now stands.

Mr. CANNON. What goes out?

The CHAIRMAN. The last proviso, commencing at line 13.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order was made against the proviso before that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point was not made against that.

Mr. HEPBURN. I remember very distinctly that I made it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that no point of order was made against that.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out the remainder of the proviso and insert the following, commencing at line 10, striking out all that and inserting:

Provided further, That the District Commissioners are hereby invested with authority and are required to fix the price at which gas shall be furnished to consumers, including the District and the United States, at a price not to exceed $1 per thousand feet: *And provided further*, That said Commissioners are authorized to determine the candlepower of all gas to be consumed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PITNEY. I raise the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Iowa on the point of order.

Mr. PITNEY. I want to state the ground of my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PITNEY. The point of order was intended to be confined to this ground, Mr. Chairman: A former part of the bill, which has been passed by the committee, provides the rates for these gas lamps, which will be about 69 cents per thousand feet, and this proposed proviso would now authorize a rate of $1 per thousand feet. It is therefore obnoxious to the criticism that it renders the two parts of the section contradictory one of the other, and it ought not to be submitted in that form. I hope the gentleman will amend his motion.

Mr. HEPBURN. If that is the point of order, I will not make the argument I proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please send up his amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Supposing the point made against this amendment was similar to the one made by the gentleman from New Hampshire, I was only going to call attention to the argument that was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] a little while ago; and by the way, Mr. Chairman, I want to caution those gentlemen against too freely editing their speeches between now and to-morrow morning. I want all of those arguments to appear in the RECORD. [Laughter.] I want that speech of my friend from Illinois to be a veritable Banquo's ghost, to haunt him on a thousand occasions. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the amendment has not yet been stated from the desk, and we really do not know what it is.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is to strike out all after and including "*Provided further*," in line 10, page 16, and insert.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 10, strike out the words "*Provided further*," and insert—

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Strike out how far?

Mr. HEPBURN. Strike out all in the paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What are the words to be stricken out?

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the entire service of gas lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is proposed to be stricken out?

The Clerk read as follows:

And insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the District Commissioners are hereby invested with authority and are required to fix the price at which gas shall be furnished to consumers, including the District and the United States, at a price not to exceed $1 per thousand feet: *And provided further*, That said Commissioners are authorized to determine the candlepower of all gas to be consumed in the District of Columbia."

Mr. PITNEY. I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order that it changes existing law and therefore can not be inserted in a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Iowa on the point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would be glad to know, if the gentleman will tell us, what law is changed by this amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, the very words in which it is offered show it is a change of existing law. When an amendment provides that certain officers "are hereby vested," the language presupposes that until that moment the power attempted to be conferred upon the officials was not vested in them.

Again, the amendment says that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are "hereby authorized," clearly implying that until that moment the Commissioners were not authorized to exercise any such power or function as that which is attempted to be conferred upon them by the amendment. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition is so clear that so good a lawyer as the gentleman from Iowa ought not to need any argument to convince him.

Mr. NORTHWAY. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Is not your amendment the law now?

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has just asserted that it is not. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. Will you not please answer my question: Is not your amendment the law now?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that this amendment is obnoxious to a point of order. [Laughter.] I would not have had any doubt about it an hour ago, but I have listened to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and I confess that if the propositions laid down by those gentleman are correct the ideas that I had previously entertained have undergone a considerable change. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 10, page 16, strike out the words "*Provided further*, That the entire service of gaslighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania please explain the object of his amendment?

Mr. MAHON. The proviso which I propose to strike out amounts to nothing, after the ruling of the Chair, because there is only one gas company here, and there is no one to compete.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is, the amendment reported by the committee having gone out on the point of order, there is confessedly only one gas company here that has power to enter upon the streets of the city, and therefore, to undertake to advertise for bids would be a mere farce. That is the gentleman's idea, as I understand him?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] says that "confessedly" there is no other company except the one in existence that has the right to lay down pipes. I would like to know who has confessed it.

A MEMBER. He has.

Mr. GROUT. Yes; that may be so. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may confess it, but certainly the ruling of the Chair does not make it so.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Do you claim——

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have the floor, I believe.

Mr. GROUT. If you have, all right, but I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman had remembered the ground

which I took on the point of order a moment ago, he would hardly have said it was "confessed" that there was no power left to take up the streets and lay down new mains. I expressly stated that in my opinion as a lawyer—I have not practiced lately, but I thought I did know something about law before I got into the midst of these demoralizing scenes [laughter]—I stated that in my opinion the power was in the Commissioners without this provision in the pending bill to grant that permit, and I think so still. Now, the proposition, after the ruling out of the provision that has just gone out on the point of order, is to strike from the bill this proviso which would leave the service open to competition.

It is stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] offering this amendment that there is no other company to compete, and the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] echoes that statement; while, on the other hand, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia says there is a new gas company about to be chartered, perhaps by a bill which will be presented here to-morrow. Very well; whether a new company be formed or not, this proviso in the bill does no harm. It really does good. I can understand very well why gentlemen are so restive when this gas problem is struck——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What is the reason?

Mr. GROUT. If gentlemen will make a comparison of the figures presented in this bill with the figures in the existing law, they will see that we have made here a very great reduction in the price of the gas which is to be furnished to the public—a very great reduction—and that accounts for all this bustle when a proposition like this is made. The gas company is hurt. I can not myself believe that it is out of pure devotion to the spirit of the law or from a wonderful admiration and deference for the rules of the House in their spirit as well as letter that gentlemen are prompted to raise points of order on the provision which has now gone out, and then to discourse learnedly with reference to the impossibility of executing this provision. If they will look at the figures reported in this bill, they will see it is provided that a lamp which before cost $20.50 shall now be furnished for $16, and that it shall be burned eight hundred and some odd hours per year more than under existing law. That is what this provision amounts to when you figure it out; and who will say that this does not account for the great care here displayed lest the rules of the House or the law in some way be violated? Now, unless you want to save, and I do not believe that this House or this Committee of the Whole does want to save——

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him whether any question has been raised in this discussion as to the price of gas? I do not understand that that question has been raised.

Mr. GROUT. We have not heard much about that.

Mr. BABCOCK. I understood from the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] that that question had been before the House. I do not understand that it has.

Mr. GROUT. It is before the House in this paragraph now under consideration.

Mr. BABCOCK. The prices, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, have met, I think, the approval of every member of the House, but when the committee went further and attempted to enact new legislation, that was a ground of objection.

Mr. GROUT. I can not yield for a speech. I yielded merely for a question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Was it not stated by the chairman of the committee that the District Commissioners had already attempted to reduce the price of gas furnished by the present company, but that the company had refused to comply with the demand of the Commissioners?

Mr. GROUT. I have not heard any such statement. If it has been made, gentlemen will remember it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. It was made some time ago.

Mr. GROUT. To go back to the proposition I was upon; we provide a new schedule, which is no longer the "moon" schedule, but from forty-five minutes after dark to forty-five minutes before daylight, and at the same time make this reduction from $20.50 per lamp to $16 per lamp. I find that those gentlemen who make objection here are now ready to concede the provision as to price, but they evidently want to avoid the feature of competition. Sir, this bill has not yet been acted on by the Senate and returned from that body. In what shape it may come back here as to the price of gas no one knows.

But supposing this competition clause be removed, there are suits now pending in which it is contended that where a limit is fixed the meaning is that the whole amount fixed by the limit, and nothing less, shall be paid. Some lawyer has been so wise as to plant a suit upon that basis. Now, I believe that as the result of the competition here proposed, instead of getting these lamps for $16 apiece we are likely to get them for $10 apiece. They can be furnished at $10 apiece and money made upon them. Gentlemen say there is no company to compete. But surely if the company which my friend, the chairman of the District Committee, promises will soon be brought into being we shall then have competition.

It has been suggested that the municipality should own the gas plant and the electric plant, and that might be a wise thing to do. Let me state what has been the experience in the city of Philadelphia. There the city owns the gas works; and the streets and public buildings are lighted, and gas furnished to the citizens at $1 a thousand.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I am not opposed to the retention of this provision in the bill. I simply asked my colleague [Mr. MAHON] his purpose in offering it.

Mr. GROUT. I supposed the gentleman was urging reasons why the provision should be stricken out.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. GROUT. If nobody objects, let us take a vote on the proposition.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment because there is only one gas company in the city of Washington. When the committee drew this section of the bill, they very properly put in the words which I now ask to have stricken out; but since, under the point of order, all the remainder of the clause has gone out, why allow these few words to remain, which will compel the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to advertise in the daily papers, at an expense of $600 or $700, inviting competition, when there can be no competition? If the committee want these words to remain in the bill, I do not care.

In reference to the residue of the bill, I did not intend to say anything. However, I have had some experience Mr. Chairman, in legislative bodies in my own State, where we would call a clause of this character in the pending bill a "snake." I have no reflection, of course, to make upon the gentlemen composing the committee, because I know that these gentlemen have brought this proposition in believing it to be the best for the people of the District and for the District itself. But if any gentleman will examine it for even a very few minutes, as we have another section immediately following this one of the same kind—if parties wish to obtain a large and valuable franchise in this city, let them come to Congress to ask for the franchise. The section just ruled out on the point of order, and another coming on immediately afterwards, gives to the three Commissioners of the District the right, within the next year, to give to any person—one man, two men, three men, or any number of individuals or any corporation in the United States—the right to come into the streets of this beautiful city to dig them all up and put in gas mains or electric wires and absolutely control the lighting of the city.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If it is in the interest of the taxpayers of the city to dig up, why not?

Mr. MAHON. When such a valuable franchise is asked for, let them come to Congress and ask it. Do not allow the Commissioners to give away this valuable franchise.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Could any better use be made of the streets than to make them available for the interests of the people?

Mr. MAHON (continuing). In Philadelphia they have been held by the throats by lighting corporations under somewhat similar circumstances.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why not let the streets be dug up, if the citizens are to be benefited by the digging?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman misapprehends my point. I am willing to give the right to anybody under proper circumstances and through the proper channels, but I am unwilling that it shall be at the option of these three Commissioners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word more. I do not believe that the House should give any company the right to come and tear up the streets of this city. Your parks are in darkness. The magnificent park around this building is in darkness. Let the District authorities—let the Congress authorize the authorities of the District or some authority to erect a great electric plant; let the city or the District own it and furnish commercial light as other cities are doing, and put the revenues into the treasury of the District of Columbia. [Applause.]

But I repeat, that my objection is to putting in the hands of the Commissioners this valuable franchise. Do you not know that there are men in this country who would willingly pay $500,000 or $1,000,000 for a privilege that Congress proposes to give away absolutely without a dollar of compensation? You give me the authority to authorize four individuals or any number of individuals to come and get permission from the District Commissioners to put gas and electric mains through the streets and furnish light and heat to this city, and I will guarantee to get for you or for the District treasury a million dollars for the right.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You had better do it then and apply the fund to paying off the District debt. We need the money badly.

Mr. MAHON. But they claim in extenuation that there is a proviso appended that this is only for one year, and that Congress at the end of the year may revoke the privilege and confiscate the property. But do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that after a com-

pany had obtained this privilege and gone on and made its preparations, established its plant, torn up the streets, and put in its mains, that you are going to take possession of that property without compensation?

Now, I merely call the attention of the House to these matters. I have no reflection, I repeat, to make upon this committee and its members. I only call attention to this and the following section to show that you are passing a valuable franchise, worth a million, or rather you are putting it in the hands of three men to grant it, to do just as they please with it, without any return to the District.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MAHON. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. How much did the present electric light company and the gas company pay for the franchises they own, and which they exercise to the absolute exclusion of everybody else?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They did not pay a dollar.

Mr. MAHON. You mean the gas company in this District—this city?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. No; I do not know what they paid.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, they got that franchise for nothing.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, we can not complain of what was done in good old Democratic days. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAHON. Well, if Congress has done foolish things in the past, it is time for it to stop now.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to have the attention of the committee for two or three minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me for a moment, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Vermont to a danger that might be involved in the existence of the proviso precisely as it reads, after the second proviso has gone out on the point of order.

Provided further, That the entire service of gaslighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor.

Supposing—and it is entirely possible—that but one company, the existing company, should bid, and that they should put in a bid of a dollar and a half a thousand, or more, do you propose to compel the Commissioners to accept that bid?

Mr. GROUT. No, and if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. DINGLEY. I merely called the attention of the gentleman to the matter.

Mr. GROUT. I think I can answer. If the gentleman will turn to the part of the bill above, where it reads that no more than $16 per annum for each street lamp shall be paid for gas, and so forth, he will find the necessary limitation on this clause, because the whole must be read together; but if the gentleman thinks that is insufficient, we have not the slightest objection to making it perfectly plain.

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think it would be well to do that.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is timely, and it is well for the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment out of abundant caution. Now, then, the House is in this attitude in considering the proposition under discussion: A point of order has been invoked which has stricken down the provision authorizing a competing company to lay its pipes and mains. That proviso has gone out on a point of order.

Following this disaster comes the assault on the proposition for competition with the plausible plea that because there is an absence of authority (the point of order having been sustained) to lay gas mains, therefore the proviso authorizing competitive bids should be stricken from the bill. I congratulate gentlemen upon the adroitness and ability with which they have relentlessly pursued this paragraph of the pending bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire both sides of the House to understand clearly the issue here, not only in respect to this paragraph, but also the one which follows, relating to electric lighting. A point of order will also be employed to prevent the grant of authority to a competing electric company to lay down its wires. Following that point of order there will doubtless be a motion to strike from that paragraph any authorization of competition. So that, gentlemen, we are face to face with this situation: These companies to-day, under seeming authority of law, exercise the sinister privileges of monopoly.

Mr. HEPBURN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. In just a moment; and because a company has recently had the temerity, under a charter from the State of West Virginia, to enter this District to compete with the existing electric light company, it is plied with injunctions now "three deep" in the courts, the United States Electric Light Company claiming that it has the sole privilege of lighting the city with electricity. Now, let us understand the contention. I concede there is some force in the suggestion of gentlemen who oppose granting new charters. I admit their sincerity when they insist that it is sound public policy to control these corporations by regulating rates of compensation rather than by the authorization of competition.

Our position, Mr. Chairman, is this: We would regulate both as to rates by express provision of law, and also by inviting that wholesome competition which exists or should exist everywhere. Now, unless gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber—for this is a question not clouded with partisan considerations—are willing that the gas and electric light companies shall continue to exercise an unchallenged monopoly, they ought to leave these provisos in the bill, amended as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], and then let us go to the Senate and fight out this battle with the Senate for cheaper gas and cheaper electric lights in the national capital. This is the issue. [Loud applause.]

If you strike out the proviso on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania there will not remain a "peg" upon which to hang a proposition for a fair and just compromise with the body at the other end of the Capitol. Gentlemen talk about tearing up the streets. Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary to dig up the streets in order to dig up monopolies, then I say dig up the streets of the city of Washington. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, we are indebted to the advent in this city of a new electric light company for the fact that this bill carries a reduction of the cost of electric lighting from 40 cents to 28 cents per night.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILES. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOCKERY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the reason why we have secured this large reduction in the cost of electric lighting is due to the existence of the new competitor for electric-light service which has recently entered the District of Columbia and is clamoring to-day at the doors of Congress for recognition. Not for a monopoly, Mr. Chairman, but the single privilege of entering the field of open, honorable competition for the service for which you appropriate the money of the people of the District and of the people of the United States.

Gentlemen say we can not secure competition. I violate no confidence when I say that within the last sixty minutes I have had a conversation with a distinguished citizen of my own State, formerly a member of this House, in which he recited the history of the contest of the people of Kansas City in their efforts to reduce the cost of gas in that city. A little more than thirty years ago, as I remember from the memorandum I made, there was granted by the city council of Kansas City to M. J. Payne and others the exclusive franchise for the privilege of gaslighting in Kansas City. The charter did not terminate at the end of the thirty years, but within that time the gas company had an exclusive monopoly of gaslighting in that city.

At the end of thirty years the common council of Kansas City passed an ordinance reducing the cost of gas from $1.60, as it was then—the price had varied, sometimes higher—to $1 a thousand. The company which had for thirty years enjoyed the monopoly of gas lighting, invoked the aid of the courts and insisted that the city council had no warrant of law for the reduction from $1.60 to $1 a thousand. The contention of the company was not sustained by the courts. A new company was chartered, and after the appearance of that company upon the field of business operations in Kansas City there was a gradual reduction in price until this time. Under the original company gas had never cost the citizens less than $1.60 per thousand. Now the rate has been reduced to 50 cents per thousand.

Now, I know, Mr. Chairman, that excessive competition sometimes operates unfavorably; but I appeal to members of this House to recall their own experiences. In private business the law never shields individuals with the armor of a monopoly. They never have or enjoy exclusive privileges. If engaged in farming there is no monopoly. If engaged in the practice of law there is competition. If pursuing the practice of medicine there is an open field and honorable competition. Mr. Chairman, in the vast scope of private enterprise the law never intervenes to grant exclusive privileges. Shall the power of this House be invoked in the splendid capital of our country in behalf of either a gas or an electric light monopoly? I do not believe this House will permit it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I am just as much in favor of active competition in lighting the streets of Washington as my friends upon the other side. If this amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania will in any shape or form add an obstacle to competition, I am sincerely opposed to it. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it will do any harm to allow the bill to stand with the proviso in it directing the Commissioners to advertise for bids.

Mr. Chairman, we are assured by a gentleman who represents the Committee of the District of Columbia that that committee

already has under consideration the chartering of companies to compete for the contract of furnishing gas to this city. I had the honor to introduce a bill that is pending before that committee, and, in speaking in behalf of the people for whom I introduced that bill, I will say that they are amply responsible and abundantly able to perform all their undertakings, and they may insert in that charter a proviso to furnish gas to the citizens of Washington at the sum of 50 cents a thousand, and they will accept that; and of the $122,000 appropriated by this bill, two-thirds of it may be saved if we can get this competition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply arose to say that when the gentleman from Missouri addresses his remarks to this side of the House, assuming that we are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think he is wrong in his assumption. I do not think the gentleman himself cares to insist upon his amendment. If the proposition in the bill as it now stands, as it now appears, will in any way, shape, or form authorize the Commissioners to invite competition, let us let it alone. I do not see for myself, if the point of order was sustained, how any company not having legal rights to enter upon the streets can possibly be given that right by replying or bidding in response to the advertisement; but let it remain if anybody thinks it can.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I, with the balance of the members of the House, was delighted to hear the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. I welcome him into the ranks of the antimonopolists. Year after year, Mr. Chairman, for the last fifteen years there have been contests in this House over this question of the reduction of the price of gas, and up to this time, that is, when these propositions were pending, when something might possibly be done, the gentleman waits until everything has gone out of the bill looking like control, and then floods the House with his oratory upon this question.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman will allow me to say that I addressed an argument to the Chairman on the point of order. It seems, however, to have been ineffective.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, year after year we have had this contest, and I have never on any previous occasion seen the lance of the gentleman from Missouri put in rest against monopolies of this kind. I remember, sir, that at the last session some of us succeeded in having a bill passed by this House limiting the price of gas, exercising the power that the Congress clearly has with regard to this local gas company; but the gentleman from Missouri was not a participant in that contest.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I will say that the Committee on Appropriations, I having charge of the bill, reported the existing law, which made a pronounced reduction in the rate theretofore paid for gas and electric lights.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, yes; a pronounced reduction in behalf of the Government, leaving the gas company free range to prey upon the people and make reprisals upon their private patrons. Is that hostility to monopoly?

Mr. Chairman, we have the power to control this company. Control of that kind is, to my mind, infinitely better than the questionable benefits that may come from competition. Competition does not always accomplish the results desired. In fact, sir, competition often precludes that which is sought to be accomplished and which might be accomplished in another way.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Let me get through with this idea, and then I shall be glad to listen to the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, what is it that we desire to do by competition? It is to lower the price of gas. Will we accomplish that by dividing the business and doubling the capital invested in carrying it on? Surely not. Clearly the better plan is to let one party have all the business, but to compel that corporation to do the business at a fair price. That is the sensible course for us to pursue.

I repeat, we have absolute control over this subject. This Congress can fix the rate. The corporation is bound to accept the rate that Congress fixes not only as to the gas used by the Government, but that used by all consumers. Is it not infinitely better that we should fix a fair rate than that we should invite another party to come in to tear up our streets, keep them in disorder for months, divide the business of supplying gas to this city between the new corporation and the old one, and, by that very means, make it necessary to double the capital invested, while the business is cut in two? Is it not unwise to expect, or to seek to obtain by such means, the low rates which otherwise we can command and compel?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, the idea of control and the right to control being taken for granted, how low does the gentleman from Iowa propose to put the price of gas to the citizens of Washington? Where is his amendment?

Mr. HEPBURN. It was proposed in the act that we passed last year to put it at not more than $1 per 1,000 feet to all consumers, public and private.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But this competition proposes to put it at 60 cents a thousand feet to the citizens. Are you willing to go as low as that?

Mr. HEPBURN. In the amendment here it is proposed to fix it at a sum not to exceed $1 per thousand, and that is the rate that is fixed in this bill. The exact limit of the rate I would put within the control of the Commissioners, or of some power that knows what it ought to be, for I confess that I do not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Are you willing to put it at 50 cents per thousand feet to the citizens?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would be willing to do so.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, offer that amendment, and then we will believe that you are willing to practice what you preach. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word on this subject, but I will waive it for the present and move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5210, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FENTON, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. MOZLEY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. FISCHER, for three days, on account of important business.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 8 p. m., the Speaker announcing that Mr. PAYNE would preside as Speaker pro tempore at the evening session.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., Mr. PAYNE in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The Clerk will read clause 2 of Rule XXVI.

The Clerk read as follows:

2. The House shall on each Friday at 5 o'clock p. m. take a recess until 8 o'clock, at which evening session private pension bills, bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only shall be considered; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock and 30 minutes.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar under the special order.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. PICKLER, the Speaker pro tempore declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TALBERT. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 57.

Mr. TALBERT. There is no quorum present, Mr. Speaker. I do not propose to make the point of no quorum, however, but merely to draw the attention of the House——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The negative vote has not yet been taken. Those who are opposed will rise and stand until counted.

There were no votes in the negative.

Mr. TALBERT. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not do this with the intention of making the point of no quorum, but merely to call attention to the fact that it would be very much better to legislate with a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this question the ayes are 57, and the noes none. The motion is agreed to, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will please take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business under the special order. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Private Calendar.

SUSAN D. WRIGHT.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan D. Wright, former widow of James W. Wells, late a private in Company I, Tenth New York Volunteer Cavalry.

An amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Lines 4 and 5, strike out "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws" and insert "at the rate of $12 per month."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the report be read.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill was pending at the adjournment a week ago, and the report was then read, but it can be read again by unanimous consent.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question for information. Is not this the bill that we left off with at last Friday evening's session?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands it to be the same bill. If there be no objection, the report will be again read.

The report (by Mr. POOLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright, have duly considered the same, and report as follows:

It appears from the evidence submitted to the committee, that Susan D. Wright, prior to her marriage to one Artemus Wright, was the widow of James W. Wells, of Company I, of the Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, who died April 27, 1864. As such widow she was placed upon the pension roll of the United States and was in receipt of a pension, under certificate No. 44793, from the date of her first husband's death to the 4th day of March, 1872.

On the 9th day of March, 1872, said Susan D. Wright (then Wells) was remarried to Artemus Wright and has since drawn no pension, and her name has been dropped from the pension roll of the United States.

On the 25th day of May, 1894, said Artemus Wright died at Middlebury, in the State of Connecticut, and said Susan D. Wright again became and now is a widow.

Said Susan D. Wright is in indigent circumstances and in poor health, having no means of support except her daily labor. She is now 61 years of age, and by reason of age and feeble health is unable to do hard work.

Having carefully considered the bill, and in view of the foregoing facts, your committee recommend that the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws," in lines 4 and 5, be stricken out, and the words "at the rate of $12 per month" be inserted in lieu thereof, and that, as so amended, the bill do pass.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I introduced the bill which is now before the House. Last Friday evening I was absent, but in looking at the RECORD I see that this bill was very generally discussed, and I suppose the facts were brought to the attention of the House. Possibly, however, there are some gentlemen here who were not present that evening, and I desire very briefly to direct attention to the main points in the case, and then to ask the favorable action of the House upon it.

Mrs. Wright married the soldier Wells and was his wife during the war. He died leaving her a young woman, under 30 years of age. Some six years later, being in indigent circumstances and a woman perhaps 35 years old, she had an offer to contract an eligible alliance. She married Mr. Wright and lived with him as his wife until his death. During the period of her married life the Government of the United States was saved from the payment of the pension which would otherwise have been given her. Having no means left her by her late husband, as she had none left her by the former one, she is in indigent circumstances. That she was a true and faithful wife to the soldier is unquestioned.

Now the question comes up for the consideration of this House—and I have had no intention to disguise the real issue—whether or not the Government of the United States shall continue its supervision and care over those who were at any time wives of her soldiers—those who were faithful in the marital relations—whether after that relation has ended they are to be placed on the pension roll. I say that such a policy is in accordance with what was adopted many years ago in the cases of those who were engaged in the war out of which grew this nation. There were given pensions to those who married the survivors of that war; and we have to-day on the pension rolls women who, marrying in their teens venerable soldiers of the Revolution, protected and nursed them during their lives. The Government, in placing such women upon the pension rolls, set the example of a beneficent policy to be observed in subsequent years.

This woman, if her application receives the approval of Congress, will receive only the same treatment which has been accorded in similar cases in the war of the Revolution. In passing this bill we simply follow what has been the practice in previous Congresses during which I have had the honor of a seat on this floor. I have voted for such bills. The two Congresses preceding this have passed such bills. There are now upon the pension rolls cases similar in character to that now presented.

This is a plain question. It should be brought to a vote without unreasonable delay. In view of the statements which have been made, I doubt whether there is any desire for further argument either for or against the bill. The question having been fully discussed, I hope members will be willing to come to a direct vote on this measure without delay.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that every word which has been spoken by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] is true. I have great respect for anything he may say on this floor. But, sir, on last Friday night there was a pension granted here to a lady who was only the sister of a dead soldier. The pension was granted in violation of all law and all principle. And now here we have an application to pension a lady who, having once drawn a pension as the widow of a soldier, chose after his death to remarry, thereby voluntarily relinquishing her claim upon the Government for a pension.

Mr. Chairman, there is a principle involved in this bill. There is, I hope, no prejudice or partisanship in the heart of any person on this floor, and I trust no such feeling will enter into the discussion of these pension claims. They should be decided without reference to any such influences. We should treat these pension claims as business men, looking upon them as business propositions. And we should pass these claims only when they are based upon law and principle, upon right and justice. I dare say, sir, that every old soldier, every old soldier's widow, all old soldiers' children, if justly entitled to a pension, will receive it under the pension laws of the United States, which are liberal and just and right.

Now, knowing the liberality of the gentleman from New York, and in view of the fact that this bill has already caused some friction, and may possibly continue to excite objection, I ask the gentleman from New York whether he will not allow it to lie over with an unfavorable report or let it take its place at the bottom of the Calendar? I ask the gentleman to pursue this course in order that other claims, more meritorious, based upon principle, upon justice, upon law, may come up and receive favorable action. I ask that this bone of contention be taken out of the way at the beginning of these Friday night sessions. Let us go on and do justice to all those to whom justice is due. I ask the gentleman from New York whether, in view of all the circumstances, he will not allow this claim to be laid aside with an unfavorable recommendation, as it ought to be?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. In reply to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT], who has made frequent references to the law on the subject of pensions, I wish to say that there is no general law under which this woman can get a pension. If we succeed in the passage of this bill we establish a special law in her case.

Mr. TALBERT. Does the gentleman want her to get a pension outside of all law—illegally, unrighteously, unjustly—without regard to principle?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Allow me to answer. These Friday night sessions are held for the purpose of passing bills in such cases as are not covered by the general law. This is one of those cases.

Mr. MILES. The point made by my friend from South Carolina, as I understand, is that the pension proposed to be granted by this bill is in contravention of the general law now on the statute books.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I know that; I am so stating. I recognize that fact; and I want my friend from South Carolina to recognize it. But for the fact that these cases are outside of the general law, we should have no Friday night sessions.

If the general law covered all these cases, of course this special legislation would not be necessary. The only trouble is that there is no such general law, and therefore special exceptions in meritorious cases must be made. There is not a bill that passes the House of this character that is not in "contravention," to use my friend's language, of the general law. It is only because the general law does not cover these specific cases that Congressional action must be invoked.

Mr. MILES. But the contention of the gentleman from South Carolina is that the general law expressly provides against such a pension as this.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman from New York allow me an interruption?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there is a very large number of widows in the same condition as the one which this bill is framed to relieve?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Well, I can only answer my friend by saying that my acquaintance with widows is not very extensive. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEREDITH. I presume the gentleman is taking old Weller's advice to beware of the widows.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. LITTLE. I regret that the gentleman finds it necessary to defend himself before any charge is made.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. No; it is not that; it is only my regret that I am not able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LITTLE. But seriously, I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not think that in the course of pension affairs there must be many just such cases? Now, if Congress takes the step which the gentleman proposes to take in this case, does he not think that it would be only an act of justice, if it is proposed to take this action at all, to make provision by a general law for all cases of this character?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I think it would be very well to

pass a general law; but pending the passage of a general law I believe it is desirable to consider these meritorious cases.

Mr. LITTLE. The truth is, that there must be very many cases of this character, people who are in the same condition as this woman; and it would seem, if the House is determined to pass a bill of this character, that it would be simply an act of justice, and avoid the appearance of discrimination, to make provision under a general law for the whole of them. I have no doubt that the other side of the House has ample courage about this question, whether they have a quorum or not; and I would suggest to the gentleman that it would be better some general legislation should be had upon the subject if any is to be had.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Well, we are only attempting to do justice, in individual cases, in the absence of a general law. If Congress passes a general bill, of course it will do away with the necessity for this special legislation. I believe it just and proper to do so myself; and I hope my friend, if he believes it to be just, will vote in favor of the bill. But I do not think it desirable to withdraw it, as suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina. It is better now, at the very threshold of this business, to settle the policy that is to be adopted.

Mr. TALBERT. I only wanted to suggest to my friend that he might probably put a block or obstacle in the way of the passage of other meritorious claims. I do not think the gentleman from New York wants to do that.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I think the House fully understands the bill, and we are ready now to vote upon it. It has been well discussed, and I hope I will not be considered as unkind to my friends if I ask consent now to close the debate.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the Fifty-third Congress I had occasion frequently to submit minority reports upon a similar class of cases, and I send up one that I have resurrected from the RECORD of the last session, in order that the Clerk may read it in my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The minority have expressed their views in this class of cases in report 601 on the bill 2908, to pension Martha E. Miller. That statement is equally applicable to this case, and is as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to restore her to the pension roll the same as if she were still the widow of the soldier whose name she voluntarily surrendered years ago.

To pass this bill is to nullify for the benefit of this one individual the substantial limitation of the general laws that the pension of soldiers' widows who have remarried shall cease.

The objections to be urged against such bills as this are numerous. In the first place, it makes an exception of a case which is in no wise exceptional. There may be varying degrees of destitution in different cases, but it may be fairly stated that all cases of widows who have remarried and again become husbandless, by reason of death or divorce, present the same substantial conditions.

If any widow so situated should be restored to pension, all widows so situated should be restored, and this by general enactment and not by individual private bills, whereby those who may happen to have a friend to espouse their cause secure a benefit which the modest and the unknown never think of seeking. Special pension acts are justifiable only in cases which are essentially exceptional and should not be used to grant to one that which is denied to the many whose situation is precisely the same. But aside from this consideration, however, the soldier's widow who remarries voluntarily relinquishes her pension because she prefers to do so.

The Government can not become an insurer against an unfortunate termination of this second matrimonial venture either by divorce or death. To restore pension in case of divorce is to encourage remarried widows to seek divorces, and, in any event, it is to give them an ostensible claim upon the soldier's death and memory which they have long since renounced by preference.

Furthermore, it is not to be assumed that legislation of this character is in the line of justice or of honor to the soldiers themselves, or that it is necessarily desired or favored by the soldier classes. A contribution from the public Treasury to the support of the widow of the soldier, so long as she remains his widow, every soldier, perhaps, desires, and the common consent of the nation for thirty years has sanctioned this; but that each soldier looks forward to and desires that his services and his memory shall be the basis of a pension to his wife at some remote day, beyond an intervening period of matrimonial alliance with some other husband, is by no means self-evident or fairly to be presumed.

Mr. ERDMAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that report contains in condensed form the argument against this bill. I have not seen or heard anything since to change my views as expressed at that time.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Let us have a vote.

Mr. ERDMAN. There is a great deal of maudlin sentiment expressed, but no sound argument that I have listened to. We have recently established another kind of widow. We have the remarried widow, the divorced widow, and by a bill passed a day or two ago we have a widow with a presumed living husband. I am opposed to any further legislation of this kind, unless it be by a general law, as stated in that report.

I appeal to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] to let this bill be laid aside, because what was done in the last session in regard to bills of this character will, while I am here, be done in this session. I propose to have a quorum to say that this bill shall become a law before it can become a law. There was one bill of this character enacted into law in the Fifty-third Congress, and only one, and that was an accident. While I am here I shall want a quorum to pass upon any such bills, and I beg the gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, one week ago to-night I felt it to be my duty to oppose this bill. I gave such arguments in opposition to it as at the moment I was able to suggest. I have thought of the matter very much during the last week, and I have interviewed very many old soldiers upon this question, both officers and privates. I have interviewed many of those who are as earnest and faithful members of the Grand Army of the Republic as there are in this city. I have not found one man who gave this bill his hearty support, and only one man who gave it even a partial support. They were all opposed to this class of legislation. I do not know that there can be any stronger or more earnest argument against the bill than such a statement and such testimony as that.

Mr. GARDNER. Did you interview the wives of these soldiers, and get their opinions?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. In matters of legislation I am not accustomed to go beyond what is known as the head of the family.

Mr. GARDNER. The persons whose opinions I think we should take are those who are affected.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] said this is not new legislation, if I understood his words correctly, and he gave us a general statement about the pensioning of the widows of the Revolutionary war and the war of 1812; but he can not point us to a single instance where a remarried woman of such a soldier has ever been granted a pension.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Do you mean in respect to the last war?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I am speaking now of the Revolutionary war and of the war of 1812.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I did not speak of the war of 1812, but every widow of a soldier of the Revolution was granted a pension, and I have been informed by those who have made a careful examination of the rolls that the pensions have been continued where the widows married and again became widows. Certainly, in respect to the war of 1861–1865, I have known of bills of this character to pass in former Congresses.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The gentleman has in no wise contradicted the statement which I made. Now, to come down to the war of 1861–1865. I have made something of a study of these pensions, and I know of only two cases where pensions similar to that asked for in the pending bill have ever been allowed. Both of those were in the closing days of the last session of the last Congress.

It would not matter even if there were more. The principle, to my mind, is entirely wrong. It is a principle which I do not think the people of this country will sustain. I do not believe that gentlemen on this side of the House can afford to place themselves upon record as sustaining such a principle. I do not believe that it is good policy politically or as a nation, upon grounds of patriotism or of honor.

The gentleman upon the other side said that this bill, if passed, would be in contravention of law. That statement is accurate. The existing law absolutely and unconditionally prohibits such pensions, and in that respect this bill differs from the legislation which we are usually called upon to enact on Friday evenings, for that is not in contravention of law, but in aid of law, and there is a vast difference between the two.

We must for a moment at least consider what we are doing if we pass such legislation as this. Already word of it has gone out throughout the land, and this bill is only the forerunner of a hundred thousand others. I have in my pocket a letter from a lady in some obscure town in Indiana that I never heard of until I got her letter.

Mr. HARDY. We have no obscure towns in Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It was from a town that in my ignorance I never heard of until I received her letter, and she, strange to say, had heard of the discussion here a week ago to-night, and said that she believed she ought to have a pension, although she was a remarried widow, and cited me two cases where it had been already granted, and said she wanted her bill passed just as soon as we got through the other one.

Now, following exactly that same proposition from Maine to California, and from the lakes to the Gulf, you can easily see what this bill will lead to. It will add a million to the pension roll. It has neither justice nor equity. It is not law. It has something of maudlin sympathy attached to it—nothing more; and I hope the gentlemen of this House will not put themselves on record in any such way as this bill provides.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Will my friend give way for a moment?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. And permit me to read the law on the subject, for your information, which I was not able to give a

few moments ago. I read section 4743 of the Revised Statutes, approved July 1, 1848:

In all cases where a pension has been granted to any officer or soldier of the Revolution in his lifetime, the evidence upon which such pension was granted shall be conclusive of the service of such officer or soldier in the application of any widow or any woman who may have been the widow of such officer or soldier to a pension; and upon proof by her that she was married to any such officer or soldier, and that she is a widow, that she shall thereupon be placed upon the pension roll at the same rate that such officer or soldier received during his lifetime.

I am now ready for the apology of my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. What are you reading from?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I am reading from the statutes of the United States, in support of what I stated upon the floor upon information derived from a gentleman whom I know to be well informed upon this question. I was not able to give the language at the time I made the statement that in case the widow of a soldier of the Revolution should remarry and again become a widow she should be placed upon the pension rolls.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. What is the date of that statute?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. It is section 4743 of the Revised Statutes, and the act was approved July 1, 1848.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. However that may be——

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman desire to address the committee again? I doubt whether he is in order, but I shall not object.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will inform the chairman of the committee that I never have resumed my seat or given up the floor, but yielded to the gentleman from New York, and if the gentleman will possess his soul in patience a little while we will get to this question.

Mr. PICKLER. I am not impatient.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Very well. It may be true that late in years, nearly a century after the war of the Revolution, by some ill-considered legislation, that has been granted. I take it that near a hundred years after the war, when the number of those widows may have been reduced to fifty, no one would object to such kindly consideration for them. But certainly to take the number and the proportion of those who were engaged in the late war, instead of it being fifty there will be ten thousand. Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. LACEY. Would you not make a difference in a case like this, where the widow was the wife of the soldier during the war, where she remained at home and farmed and took care of the family while he was at the front, and was killed in battle? Would you not consider that the service of her husband under those circumstances entitled her to the pension, even though eight years after the death of her first husband she married again and lost her second husband? Do not such circumstances make a peculiar case and take it out of the ordinary rule?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, it does take it out of the usual category, and does add to the merit of the case, but it does not change its legal aspect. There are undoubtedly strong features in favor of the pending bill that will not come to the support of most of the bills that will be offered in pursuance of precedent of this bill. I will go to the extent which the gentleman's question implies; that is, of giving special consideration to all widows who married prior to the war and during the war, and even within five years after the war; but, as I said here last Friday night, I do not believe that a widow who marries an old soldier now has any right or justification for receiving a pension at all.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Does not the gentleman know that even under the law of 1890 the woman must have been married to the soldier previous to June 27, 1890, in order to be entitled to a pension? We are not seeking here to pension women who marry soldiers at this late day, and none of the laws apply to such cases.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I am perfectly well aware of the limitation in the act of 1890, but there is no limitation under the general statutes. Therefore, in relation to a very large number of all the claimants there is not any limitation, and a woman who married an old soldier thirty years after the war is just as much entitled to a pension under the law upon his decease as though she had been his widow during the war or during the whole intervening time. I do not think that is right. I think a limitation should be put on the general law as well as upon the other, and that it should even antedate 1890.

Now, as to the pending bill, it is necessary that we should consider the case not alone with reference to this lady, but as determining the general principle, and upon that general principle I am opposed to this bill, and believe that it should not receive the sanction of even a minority of this body. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. PICKLER. I will detain the committee but a moment. Each of these cases brought up at these Friday evening sessions stands upon its own merits, and it is not the fact, as the gentleman from New Hampshire says, that each of these bills constitutes a precedent for all other bills. The whole matter resolves itself into this, gentlemen——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions whether there are any other bills of this character reported from the committee?

Mr. PICKLER. I think there is one more. I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, that the matter resolves itself into this: Whether these widows, even widows like this one, now in their old age, none of them under 60—this one, I believe, is 61, and most of them are 60, 70, or even 75, as their cases appear before our committee, and nearly all in indigent circumstances—whether we shall place them, as former Congresses placed the widows of the soldiers of the Revolutionary war, upon the pension roll, or whether we will send them to the poorhouse. That is the only question. Shall we treat them as the widows of the soldiers of other wars were treated by other Congresses when this nation was not one tithe as able as it is now to pay pensions, or shall we let them go to the poorhouse? Shall we show our appreciation of their merits, of their services to their soldier husbands, when they stayed at home and took care of the children, and cultivated the land, and helped to sustain the soldier fighting for his country, or shall we turn our backs upon them and let them become paupers? That, I repeat, is the only question.

Mr. HULICK. Mr. Chairman, the remark which the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [Mr. PICKLER] has just made causes me to rise at this time to ask him a question. The gentleman said just a moment ago that this bill, if passed, would not be considered as a precedent. Now, sir, if that be true, it furnishes the best reason in the world why this bill should not pass. I take it that there is not a member of this House who has not a number of cases like this, and if the passage of this bill is not to be a precedent, then we are notified by the chairman of the Invalid Pensions Committee that we need not bring in our bills in cases like this and expect to have them passed upon favorably.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Ohio can not fairly construe my language in that way. I said that each of these cases considered at Friday evening sessions stood upon its own merits, but I did not say that no other case than this would be reported favorably by the committee. I am in favor of a general bill, applicable to all these cases, and the committee, even in the last Congress with its Democratic complexion, brought in a general bill to provide for all these widows, yet it appears that now we are not willing to treat these poor women as fairly and liberally as our fathers treated the widows of the Revolutionary war.

Mr. HULICK. In answer to that, I wish to say that I think we ought to act upon this subject considerately. Now, I have written to widows of this class in my district that their cases would not be considered on special bills; that the law was against them, but that a general act would doubtless be passed by this Congress providing for all such cases. I am in favor of such a general law, and the discussion this evening would apply very well to a general bill proposing to place upon the pension roll every widow of a soldier who had remarried and then become a widow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is there peculiar in this case? There is certainly no peculiar hardship in it. This lady was a widow for eight years. During that time she drew a pension. She then married and remained a married woman for thirty years——

Mr. MAHON. And during that time she saved the Government $1,820.

Mr. HULICK. Certainly, and I think that is a good argument why a general law should be passed. This lady has been a widow now for not quite two years. I shall vote for this bill, but at the same time it raises this general question which we have to face: Are we to have all the widows who have remarried and then again become widows, in my district, and in every district in the country, pensioned by special act? If that is to be the policy of this Congress, then we must bring all those cases in here. If this were the only widow in like circumstances, this bill would have been passed last Friday evening. If the case were one of fifty there would be no trouble in passing it. If it were even one of a thousand, probably there would be no trouble in passing this special act, and by a series of such acts all widows in like circumstances would be pensioned. But there are not only hundreds, but thousands of cases just as meritorious as this, and the very moment this bill is passed they will be sending in their applications to be pensioned by special acts.

Now, let the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions be as zealous in this matter as he usually is in all matters connected with pensions, and we shall succeed in passing during this Congress a general law providing for all cases of this class. Let him introduce to-morrow, or at some early day, a general bill, and let us have a general act passed in favor of every soldier's widow in the land who, after having remarried, has again become a widow. I will vote for such an act; but when the chairman of

this committee says that this case is not to be made a precedent, I want to know whether we are to consider ourselves as thereby notified that we need not bring other bills of this character before his committee and expect a favorable report.

Mr. PICKLER. My remark was that this case would not be a precedent for all other cases; that if we passed this bill, it does not follow that we shall pass every other bill of this kind.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I observe that the report of the committee in this case states that after carefully considering the bill, and in view of the facts recited, they recommend that the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws" be stricken out and the words "at the rate of $12 a month" be substituted. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS], who fathers this bill, asked, I believe, in his extreme modesty, a pension of only $8 a month in this case. If this woman were entitled to a pension under the general law, she would get but $8 a month; but it appears that in this and many other cases which have been reported, the fact appearing that the applicant is not entitled to a pension under the general law, it is proposed in these special bills to grant pensions in excess of the amount which would be received under the general law—to the extent of $12, $15, and in some cases $20 a month. In all cases the committee does not pursue this course.

On last Friday night, although the committee passed one bill pensioning a dependent daughter at the rate of $12 a month, there were two cases where there was presumptive evidence of the death of the soldier—where he had been absent for twenty-five or thirty years without being heard from, so that the common-law requirement as to proof of death was complied with. This generous committee gave the widows in those cases, who were clearly entitled to pensions under the intent of law, only the amount of pension they would receive under the law. But it appears that if there is no law reaching the case, then the generosity of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is exercised, and they propose to put their hands into the public Treasury and to say, "We, the guardians of the Treasury, propose to dispense the public money to the people who are making their applications here such sums as we see fit."

Now, I put the question in all seriousness, is this a proper and just course of policy to pursue? I put the question to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, is it proper and just that when you put on the pension roll a woman who clearly is not entitled to a pension under the law, you should say that she shall receive a greater pension than a person clearly entitled to a pension within the full meaning and intent of the law?

Mr. LAYTON. I wish to say on behalf of the minority of the committee that we have opposed that course in every instance.

Mr. LOUD. I trust that the gentleman from New York who introduced this bill, and who in doing so was modest enough to ask only a pension of $8 a month, will now ask that this amendment be not adopted.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I am perfectly willing to accept the gentleman's suggestion. I am quite willing to have this bill passed without the amendment, so that this lady shall be pensioned "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws." When the vote comes upon the amendment, I shall be very glad to ask that it be not agreed to.

The question being taken on the amendment proposed by the committee, it was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now upon laying the bill aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation. Is there objection?

Mr. ERDMAN. I object.

The question being taken,

The CHAIRMAN said: The ayes seem to have it.

A division being called for, the question was again taken, and there were—ayes 70, noes 8.

Mr. MILES. No quorum.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. This is a matter which so far as general legislation is concerned is in charge of the Pensions Committee, and while I am personally willing to withdraw the bill, I prefer to have the decision of the chairman of the committee on that matter.

Mr. PICKLER. The bill will not be withdrawn with the consent of the committee. I am surprised that members of the committee make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MILES. You will be surprised a great many times at the exercise of what I consider to be proper courage.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask that the vote be announced, so that it may be determined whether there is a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes were 70, the noes 8; no quorum voting.

Mr. PICKLER. I think that if the Chairman will make a count under the rules a quorum will be found present. A number of members did not vote.

Several MEMBERS. Call the roll.

Mr. MILES. I want to say in reply to the remark which fell from the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota——

Mr. PICKLER. I call the gentleman to order. Debate is not in order.

Mr. MILES. Then the gentleman himself was not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is not in order and will take his seat.

After a pause,

The CHAIRMAN (having made a count of the Committee of the Whole) said: No quorum is present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

Abbott,	Dalzell,	Lawson,	Sayers,
Adams,	Dayton,	Lefever,	Scranton,
Aitken,	De Armond,	Leisenring,	Settle,
Aldrich,	Denny,	Lester,	Shafroth,
Allen, Miss.	De Witt,	Lewis,	Shannon,
Anderson,	Dingley,	Linney,	Shaw,
Apsley,	Dinsmore,	Linton,	Sherman,
Arnold, R. I.	Dolliver,	Livingston,	Shuford,
Babcock,	Doolittle,	Lockhart,	Simpkins,
Bailey,	Dovener,	Long,	Skinner,
Baker, Md.	Downing,	Lorimer,	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead,	Draper,	Maguire,	Snover,
Barham,	Ellett, Va.	Mahany,	Sorg,
Barney,	Elliott, S. C.	Marsh,	Southwick,
Barrett,	Ellis,	McCall, Mass.	Sparkman,
Bartlett, Ga.	Fairchild,	McCleary, Minn.	Spencer,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Fenton,	McClure,	Stahle,
Beach,	Fitzgerald,	McCormick,	Stephenson,
Belknap,	Foote,	McCreary, Ky.	Stewart, N. J.
Bell, Colo.	Foss,	McDearmon,	Stewart, Wis.
Bell, Tex.	Fowler,	McEwan,	Stone, W. A.
Bennett,	Gamble,	McKenney,	Strait,
Berry,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLachlan,	Strong,
Bingham,	Gillett, Mass.	McLaurin,	Strowd, N. C.
Black, Ga.	Griswold,	McMillin,	Sulzer,
Black, N. Y.	Grosvenor.	McRae,	Swanson,
Boatner,	Grout,	Meiklejohn,	Taft,
Boutelle,	Grow,	Mercer,	Tarsney,
Bowers,	Hadley,	Meyer,	Tawney,
Bromwell,	Hall, Mo.	Miller, Kans.	Tayler,
Brosius,	Halterman,	Milliken,	Terry,
Brumm,	Hanly,	Miner, N. Y.	Towne,
Buck,	Harmer,	Minor, Wis.	Tracewell,
Bull,	Harris,	Mondell,	Treloar,
Burrell,	Harrison,	Money,	Tucker,
Burton, Mo.	Hart,	Moody,	Turner, Ga.
Burton, Ohio	Hartman,	Morse,	Turner, Va.
Cannon,	Heatwole,	Moses,	Tyler,
Catchings,	Heiner, Pa.	Mozley,	Underwood,
Chickering,	Henderson,	Murphy,	Van Voorhis,
Clark, Iowa	Hendrick,	Newlands,	Wadsworth,
Clark, Mo.	Hicks,	Noonan,	Walker, Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Hilborn,	Odell,	Walsh,
Cobb, Ala.	Hitt,	Ogden,	Wanger,
Cobb, Mo.	Hooker,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Cockrell,	Hopkins,	Owens,	Washington,
Coffin,	Howard,	Parker,	Watson, Ind.
Colson,	Howe,	Pearson,	Watson, Ohio
Connolly,	Howell,	Pendleton,	Wellington,
Cook, Wis.	Hubbard,	Perkins,	Wheeler,
Cooke, Ill.	Huff,	Phillips,	White,
Cooper, Fla.	Hull,	Pitney,	Wilber,
Cooper, Tex.	Hunter,	Powers,	Williams,
Cooper, Wis.	Hurley,	Price,	Willis,
Corliss,	Hutcheson,	Quigg,	Wilson, Idaho
Cousins,	Jenkins,	Ray,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cowen,	Johnson, Cal.	Reyburn,	Wilson, Ohio
Crain,	Johnson, Ind.	Richardson,	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robertson, La.	Woodard,
Crowther,	Jones,	Robinson, Pa.	Woodman,
Crump,	Joy,	Rusk,	Woomer,
Culberson,	Kendall,	Russell, Conn.	Wright,
Cummings,	Kiefer,	Russell, Ga.	Yoakum.
Curtis, Iowa	Latimer,	Sauerhering,	

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. I heard gentlemen asking to have their names recorded after the roll call, and while I would not undertake to suggest anything to the Chair, knowing his ability and experience, I thought probably it may not have been noticed by him. I think the rule does not allow members to have their names entered after the roll has been called. I simply make the suggestion, however.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of pension bills, a number of which are on the Calendar and will probably be unobjected to, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call be vacated and the bill under consideration be withdrawn for the present.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. MILES. The request was made and objected to by the gentleman who expressed such woolly surprise at my conduct.

Mr. PICKLER. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the committee now rise and report to the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole had found itself without a quorum, whereupon he had directed the Clerk to call the roll, upon which 100 members had answered to their names, and he now reported the list of absentees to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The names of the absentees will be entered on the Journal. It appearing that a quorum is present,

under clause 2 of Rule XXIII, the committee will resume its sitting, and the gentleman from Iowa will again take the chair.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its sitting.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ERDMAN. Has the name of Mr. FITZGERALD been recorded as present?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman has been recorded as present.

Mr. ERDMAN. Well, that is a mistake. I understand that he is ill and in Nashville.

Mr. HARDY. If you are not Mr. FITZGERALD you have no right to inquire.

Mr. ERDMAN. I think I have.

Mr. MILES. It is pertinent to know who did answer to his name. I desire to know, as a matter of privilege, who answered for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that is a question of privilege.

Mr. MEREDITH. It certainly is a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, or at least it ought to be.

Mr. MILES. This gentleman sits here right by my seat; he has been an invalid for three weeks; and to my personal knowledge has not been here for that length of time. When the name was called some one answered, and it is certainly a question of privilege to know who answered to his name.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it appearing beyond any question that the name of Mr. FITZGERALD had been recorded as present, when it is known to the members of the House and to myself personally that he has been here but once during the whole session of the House, and is now absent on account of sickness, that a quorum did not appear to be present, and we can not go on and do business without the presence of a quorum.

Mr. PICKLER. But members have come in since that.

Mr. MEREDITH. But does not the question at issue go further than that?

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has suggested to the House that there was no quorum present. Let me make this statement. Mr. FISCHER, who sits next to me, answered immediately after his name was called, and just as the Clerk was calling the name of Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no doubt that in that manner the inaccuracy resulted. Mr. FISCHER should be recorded as present and Mr. FITZGERALD absent.

Mr. PICKLER. He did not answer to Mr. FITZGERALD'S name, but to his own. We have a quorum present.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope that motion will not prevail.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PAYNE) there were—ayes 17, noes 64.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

Mr. PAYNE. I made this motion that the committee rise for the purpose of determining whether a quorum is present.

Mr. MEREDITH. Before my friend takes his seat, I wish to say that I think the question which arose just now goes further than the mere question of no quorum. Somebody—inadvertently, I hope—answered to the name of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. NORTHWAY. That has been explained. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISCHER] answered to his name when the name of Mr. FITZGERALD had been reached, and the Clerk recorded it as Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. THOMAS. And Mr. FISCHER'S name was not checked off on the roll.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. FISCHER'S name was not checked off, but Mr. FITZGERALD'S was.

Mr. MEREDITH. I did not understand that that explanation had been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is only able to count 99 members present. The committee finding itself without a quorum, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following members failed to answer to their names:

Abbott,	Beach,	Burrell,	Cooper, Tex.
Adams,	Belknap,	Burton, Mo.	Cooper, Wis.
Aitken,	Bell, Colo.	Burton, Ohio	Corliss,
Aldrich,	Bell, Tex.	Cannon,	Cousins,
Allen, Miss.	Bennett,	Catchings,	Cowen,
Anderson,	Berry,	Chickering,	Crain,
Apsley,	Bingham,	Clark, Iowa	Crisp,
Arnold, R. I.	Black, Ga.	Clark, Mo.	Crowley,
Babcock,	Black, N. Y.	Cobb, Ala.	Crump,
Bailey,	Boatner,	Cobb, Mo.	Culberson,
Baker, Md.	Boutelle,	Cockrell,	Cummings,
Bankhead,	Bowers,	Coffin,	Curtis, Iowa
Barham,	Bromwell,	Colson,	Dalzell,
Barney,	Brosius,	Connolly,	Dayton,
Barrett,	Brumm,	Cook, Wis.	De Armond,
Bartlett, Ga.	Buck,	Cooke, Ill.	Denny,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Bull,	Cooper, Fla.	De Witt,
Dingley,	Hunter,	Money,	Stewart, Wis.
Dinsmore,	Hurley,	Moody,	Stone, W. A.
Dolliver,	Hutcheson,	Morse,	Strait,
Doolittle,	Jenkins,	Moses,	Strong,
Dovener,	Johnson, Cal.	Mozley,	Strowd, N. C.
Downing,	Johnson, Ind.	Murphy,	Sulzer,
Draper,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Newlands,	Swanson,
Ellett, Va.	Jones,	Noonan,	Taft,
Elliott, S. C.	Joy,	Ogden,	Tarsney,
Ellis,	Kendall,	Overstreet,	Tawney,
Fairchild,	Kiefer,	Owens,	Tayler,
Fenton,	Latimer,	Patterson,	Terry,
Fitzgerald,	Lawson,	Pearson,	Towne,
Foote,	Lefever,	Pendleton,	Tracewell
Foss,	Leisenring,	Perkins,	Treloar,
Fowler,	Lester,	Phillips,	Tucker,
Gamble,	Lewis,	Pitney,	Turner, Ga.
Gillet, N. Y.	Linney,	Powers,	Turner, Va.
Gillett, Mass.	Linton,	Price,	Tyler,
Griswold.	Livingston,	Quigg,	Underwood,
Grosvenor,	Lockhart,	Ray,	Van Voorhis,
Grow,	Long,	Reyburn,	Wadsworth,
Hadley,	Lorimer,	Richardson,	Walker, Va.
Hall, Mo.	Maguire,	Robertson, La.	Walsh,
Halterman,	Mahany,	Robinson, Pa.	Wanger,
Hanly,	Marsh,	Rusk,	Warner,
Harmer,	McCall, Mass.	Russell, Conn.	Washington,
Harris,	McCleary, Minn.	Russell, Ga.	Watson, Ind.
Harrison,	McClure,	Sauerhering,	Watson, Ohio
Hart,	McCormick,	Sayers,	Wellington,
Hartman,	McCreary, Ky.	Scranton,	Wheeler,
Heatwole,	McDearmon,	Settle,	White,
Heiner, Pa.	McEwan,	Shafroth,	Wilber,
Henderson,	McKenney,	Shannon,	Williams,
Hendrick,	McLachlan,	Shaw,	Wilson, Idaho
Hicks,	McLaurin,	Sherman.	Wilson, N. Y.
Hilborn,	McMillin,	Shuford,	Wilson, Ohio
Hitt,	McRae,	Simpkins,	Wilson, S. C.
Hooker,	Meiklejohn,	Skinner,	Woodard,
Hopkins,	Mercer,	Smith, Mich.	Woodman,
Howard,	Meyer,	Sorg,	Woomer,
Howe,	Miller, Kans.	Sparkman,	Wright,
Howell,	Milliken,	Spencer,	Yoakum.
Hubbard,	Miner, N. Y.	Stahle,	
Huff,	Minor, Wis.	Stephenson,	
Hull,	Mondell,	Stewart, N. J.	

Mr. FISCHER (when his name was called). Mr. Chairman, I understand my presence here has been questioned. On the previous roll call, when I answered, the name of Mr. FITZGERALD had been reached by the Clerk, but to make it certain now, I make the statement, in order that the matter may be understood. I was present then, and am present now, and I answered for myself, and not for Mr. FITZGERALD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE) having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the committee finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Clerk to call the roll, and he asked that the Clerk report the names of the absentees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the names of the absentees.

The Clerk reported the names of those members who failed to respond.

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. TERRY, went home this afternoon, sick. He said nothing about being excused to-night, but I know that he is sick, and I ask that he be excused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It appears that there are 107 members present.

Mr. PICKLER. That is a quorum in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the committee will resume its session, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will take the chair.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session, with Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be laid over for this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] asks unanimous consent that the pending bill be laid aside for this evening.

Mr. CROWTHER and others objected.

Mr. PICKLER. I demand the regular order.

Mr. LACEY. Then I move that the bill be laid aside until next Friday evening.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PICKLER. I demand that the question be taken on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside to be reported favorably to the House?

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN and others demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 2.

Mr. ERDMAN and Mr. TALBERT. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting the committee). One hundred and one gentlemen are now in the Hall; a quorum is present.

Mr. TALBERT. I move that the committee rise. [Cries of "Announce the vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. On the question of laying aside the bill with a favorable recommendation the ayes are 83, the noes 2. The ayes have it, and the bill is laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

MARTHA BROOKS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Martha Brooks, dependent mother of John M. Brooks, late of Company L, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. BAKER of Kansas) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks, submit the following report:

Martha Brooks, the claimant, is the mother of John M. Brooks, deceased, who was a private soldier in Company L, Second Regiment of Nebraska Cavalry Volunteers. Said Martha Brooks was a widow when her son John M. Brooks enlisted, and remained and still is a widow. John M., the soldier, was her only child and her sole support. He remitted a portion of his pay to his mother during the period of his service. The mother was poor, having no property or income from any source, and since the death of the soldier has earned her living by manual labor, except as she has been assisted by friends.

The soldier enlisted in March, 1863, at the age of 16 years, and was discharged in January, 1864. He was in poor health at the time of his discharge. He made his home with his mother from the time of his discharge until his death, which occurred in Brown County, Kans. The mother is now 83 years of age, is unable to work, and depending entirely upon others for support.

Your committee, therefore, recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "twenty," in the seventh line, and inserting the word "twelve" in lieu thereof, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. LOUD. I move to amend the amendment by inserting "eight" instead of "twelve."

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this motion will not prevail. This son, as appears from the evidence filed in the Pension Office, and also by the evidence filed in the committee, was the sole support of this lady. She was a widow at the time he enlisted, has remained a widow ever since, and is now past 83 years of age.

Mr. PICKLER. Dependent mothers are never granted any less than $12 a month.

Mr. BRODERICK. The chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions informs me that dependent mothers are never granted less than $12 per month. I have not examined the law as to that, but she applied for a pension in the Pension Bureau in 1891. She filed all the evidence she could procure, and had the pension been allowed then she would have received more at $8 per month than she could possibly receive now if this bill were to pass and she were allowed $12 now, from the fact that she can not live many years. She failed to obtain a pension simply from the fact that she could not furnish the technical evidence required by the Department that the soldier's death was due to his service, which is required in these cases, while she did file the affidavits of two or three responsible witnesses that at the time the soldier was discharged and ever after he was in delicate health, and the presumption arises that his death was due to his army service; yet the Pension Bureau was not satisfied as to that fact. Now, I hope this amendment will not prevail. Most certainly this House will not stand upon a question of $4 per month to this mother who is now past 83 years of age.

Mr. ERDMAN. May I interrupt the gentleman before he takes his seat?

Mr. BRODERICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERDMAN. Has the gentleman read the evidence?

Mr. BRODERICK. I have carefully read the evidence filed in the Pension Office, and also the evidence filed with the committee. I know personally some of the circumstances in the case, although this applicant does not reside in my county. This lady is poor, and a number of her neighbors whom I know personally have written me that she has no property whatever; that she had none at the time her son enlisted, and that he remitted a portion of his pay during the time he was in the service. He made his home with her after he was discharged, and helped to support her up to the time of his last illness.

Mr. ERDMAN. That is not the point of my question. The question is as to the evidence showing where the disability was acquired. Do you say that from your reading of the evidence you are of the opinion that probably the disability was acquired during the war?

Mr. BRODERICK. Yes, sir. I say that the evidence tends to show that fact. There are two affidavits filed stating that the soldier was in delicate health at the time he was discharged and never recovered his health afterwards. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment of the committee, to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment suggested by the committee, to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve."

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

KATE A. PITMAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Kate A. Pitman, widow of George Pitman, late a private in Company C, One hundred and second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her $12 per month, the same to be subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force on and after its passage.

The report (by Mr. KERR) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman, respectfully report:

The husband of this widow, George Pitman, served as private in Company C, One hundred and second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, from August, 1862, to June, 1865, and from January 25, 1867, to January 25, 1870, in Company B, Forty-fifth United States Regulars. Mrs. Pitman married this soldier in 1872 and lived with him in Mansfield, Ohio, until his death, in 1879. They have two children, both daughters. Her claim for pension was rejected by the Pension Office on September 28, 1873, on the ground "that after a special examination the evidence fails to show lawful marriage to soldier. Death of former wife not shown."

There is no question but that this woman was legally married to this soldier, if he had no other wife living when the marriage was solemnized.

The only evidence of a former marriage was the fact that a license to marry had been issued to the soldier and a woman from the probate judge of Montgomery County, Ohio.

There was no record found anywhere that the marriage had been consummated. The laws of Ohio require every officer or minister to make a return, and that return to be recorded. This license seems to have been taken out while the soldier was on his way from the service to his home in Mansfield, Ohio.

A comrade who testifies that he was with the soldier on his way home, makes affidavit that there was no marriage of Pitman to this woman. It seems that the soldier picked up this woman and lived with her a short time. After Pitman and this woman lived together a short time, the evidence shows a man came from the South, claimed her as his wife, and she went away with him and has never been heard of since.

In no court would the evidence upon which the Pension Office rejected this widow's claim be received as sufficient to establish a prior marriage and render illegal the marriage between Pitman and his widow.

The passage of the bill giving her $12 a month is therefore recommended.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "twelve" before the word "dollars" and insert "eight." Now, sir, I do not believe there is anyone on the floor of this House who has the courage to claim that this soldier died in consequence of his services during the war. If there is any such here, I would like to see the color of his hair.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in reply to the gentleman from California that the evidence in the Pension Bureau shows that this soldier did die from disabilities originally incurred in the service, and there was no question made in the Bureau on that point. The claim was rejected because a special examiner, or one of those detectives that they send out through the country, found that a license had been issued for the marriage of this man and woman in Ohio, but that there was no evidence that they had ever been legally married. There was no question in the Bureau that the man had died from disabilities incurred in the service. Now, if that will satisfy the gentleman from California he ought to withdraw his amendment, because in such a case as this under the general law the applicant would be entitled to $12 a month.

Mr. LOUD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that as a general rule some evidence of the character just stated by the gentleman ought to be submitted to the House when a case of this kind is presented for consideration. I wish to call attention to the fact, however, that this soldier was well enough some years after the war to pass a most critical physical examination for admission to service in the Regular Army, and, on the whole, I think it is very evident from the report that he could not have suffered seriously from any service that he rendered to the country during the war. It is just possible, of course, that he may have died from arduous services rendered after the war around New York or at some of the other United States barracks. [Laughter.]

However, the point I wish to impress upon the member advocating this bill, and upon the Committee on Invalid Pensions, is, that if there is anything in this case tending to show that this man really died from disabilities incurred in the service, in justice to the House that evidence ought to be laid before us; and I would like to hear now what evidence the gentleman has to offer tending to show that this soldier's death did result from disabilities incurred in the service.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. LOUD, the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 14, noes 66.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 14 and the noes are 66. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises the point of no quorum. [After a count.] Ninety-three gentlemen are in the Hall, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Who made the point of no quorum?

Mr. ERDMAN. I made the point. I desire to have settled the question whether we will give greater pensions to widows by special bills than we give by the general law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not in order. The Clerk will proceed with the call.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following-named members failed to respond:

Abbott,	Curtis, Iowa	Kiefer,	Russell, Conn.
Adams,	Curtis, New York	Kyle,	Russell, Ga.
Aitken,	Dalzell,	Latimer,	Sauerhering,
Aldrich,	Dayton,	Lawson,	Sayers,
Allen, Miss.	De Armond,	Lefever,	Scranton,
Anderson,	Denny,	Leisenring,	Settle,
Apsley,	De Witt,	Lester,	Shafroth,
Arnold, R. I.	Dingley,	Lewis,	Shannon,
Babcock,	Dinsmore,	Linney,	Shaw,
Bailey,	Dolliver,	Linton,	Sherman,
Baker, Md.	Doolittle,	Livingston,	Shuford,
Bankhead,	Dovener,	Lockhart,	Simpkins,
Barham,	Downing,	Long,	Skinner,
Barney,	Draper,	Lorimer,	Smith, Mich.
Barrett,	Ellett, Va.	Maguire,	Sorg,
Bartlett, Ga.	Elliott, S. C.	Mahany,	Sparkman,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Ellis,	Marsh,	Spencer,
Beach,	Fairchild,	McCall, Mass.	Stahle,
Belknap,	Fenton,	McCleary, Minn.	Stephenson,
Bell, Colo.	Fitzgerald,	McClure,	Stewart, N. J.
Bell, Tex.	Foote,	McCormick,	Stewart, Wis.
Bennett,	Foss,	McCreary, Ky.	Stone, C. W.
Berry,	Fowler,	McDearmon,	Stone, W. A.
Bingham,	Gamble,	McEwan,	Strait,
Black, Ga.	Gillet, N. Y.	McKenney,	Strong,
Black, N. Y.	Gillett, Mass.	McLachlan,	Strowd, N. C.
Boatner,	Griswold,	McLaurin,	Sulzer,
Boutelle,	Grosvenor,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Bowers,	Grow,	McRae,	Taft,
Bromwell,	Hadley,	Meiklejohn,	Tarsney,
Brosius,	Hall,	Mercer,	Tawney,
Brumm,	Halterman,	Meyer,	Tayler,
Buck,	Hanly,	Miller, Kans.	Terry,
Bull,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Towne,
Burrell,	Harris,	Miner, N. Y.	Tracewell,
Burton, Mo.	Harrison,	Minor, Wis.	Treloar,
Burton, Ohio	Hart,	Mondell,	Tucker,
Cannon,	Hartman,	Money,	Turner, Ga.
Catchings,	Heatwole,	Moody,	Turner, Va.
Chickering,	Heiner, Pa.	Morse,	Tyler,
Clark, Iowa	Henderson,	Moses,	Underwood,
Clark, Mo.	Hendrick,	Mozley,	Van Voorhis,
Clarke, Ala.	Hicks,	Murphy,	Wadsworth,
Cobb, Ala.	Hilborn,	Newlands,	Walker, Va.
Cobb, Mo.	Hitt,	Noonan,	Walsh,
Cockrell,	Hooker,	Ogden,	Wanger,
Coffin,	Hopkins,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Colson,	Howard,	Owens,	Washington,
Connolly,	Howe,	Patterson,	Watson, Ind.
Cook, Wis.	Howell,	Pearson,	Watson, Ohio
Cooke, Ill.	Hubbard,	Pendleton,	Wellington,
Cooper, Fla.	Huff,	Perkins,	Wheeler,
Cooper, Tex.	Hull,	Phillips,	White,
Cooper, Wis.	Hunter,	Pitney,	Wilber,
Corliss,	Hurley,	Powers,	Williams,
Cousins,	Hutcheson,	Quigg,	Wilson, Idaho
Cowen,	Jenkins,	Ray,	Wilson, N. Y.
Crain,	Johnson, Cal.	Reyburn,	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	Johnson, Ind.	Richardson,	Woodard,
Crowley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robbins,	Woodman,
Crump,	Jones,	Robertson, La.	Woomer,
Culberson,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.	Wright,
Cummings,	Kendall,	Rusk,	Yoakum.

The committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the committee having found itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, and that the Clerk would report the names of absentees.

The Clerk then read the names as above.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call discloses the presence of 104 members.

Mr. PICKLER. Do I understand that there is a quorum present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is. Under the rule the Committee of the Whole will resume its sitting. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. HEPBURN in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight."

Mr. PICKLER. That is the amendment on which we voted. The roll having been called, and the presence of a quorum disclosed, that motion is now carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from California. [The question was put.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. TALBERT. I call for a division.

Several MEMBERS. This is the question we voted on before.

Mr. CROWTHER. I rise to a question of order—that this question has already been settled by a vote of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken; it has not been settled. When the question was taken before, the ayes were 14 and the noes 66. The point of no quorum was raised, and it appeared on a count that no quorum was present.

Mr. PICKLER. But the roll call just taken has disclosed that a quorum was present.

The CHAIRMAN. It disclosed that a quorum is present now, but it did not disclose that a quorum was present at that time.

Mr. PICKLER. The roll call disclosed that there was a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was unable to count a quorum.

Mr. PICKLER. It seems to me the motion is already carried.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I rise to a question of order. We have once voted on this question, and the vote was announced. Then we proceeded to find out whether there was a quorum, and it appeared that there was a quorum present when that vote was taken.

Mr. GROUT. Not when that vote was taken.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think I am stating this point of order.

Mr. GROUT. You are not stating the facts.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I have the floor at any rate, whether I am stating facts or things which are not facts. If after we have ascertained the presence of a quorum we are to take the vote again, and then have that vote doubted and a division called for, and the point of no quorum again raised, we may go on with the proceeding all night. The Chair has once counted the Committee of the Whole and announced that there was no quorum present. But we have ascertained by the roll call that there is a quorum present. If that fact is not ascertained there was no use in calling the roll. The next question, therefore, I submit, is whether this bill shall be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. PAYNE. There can not be any doubt that the decision of the Chair is correct. When the vote was taken on this question before the committee divided, and it was ascertained that a quorum had not voted.

Mr. PICKLER. But there was a quorum present.

Mr. PAYNE. Some gentleman raised the question of a quorum. The Chairman, under the rule, counted the members present and found there was no quorum present. Then, not for the purpose of ascertaining the presence of a quorum, but for the purpose of making report to the House, the Chair directed the roll to be called, and on that call it appeared there were 104 members present. There is no question that we go back now to take the vote on the original proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the question, and overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I demand a division on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from California.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 10, noes 69.

Mr. TALBERT. No quorum,

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Now, we may keep on with this proceeding all night.

Mr. PICKLER. We are now within ten minutes of the time at which we must necessarily adjourn. While I regret very much that we are unable to proceed—and this is not the first evening that filibustering has defeated pension legislation—I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PAYNE having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2800) to pension Martha Brooks, had directed that it be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation; and that the committee, having also had under consideration the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan B. Wright, had directed that it be reported to the House with an amendment and with the recommendation that as amended the bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first bill in order.

The Clerk read by title the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan B. Wright.

Mr. ERDMAN. I move that the House adjourn.

The question being taken,

The SPEAKER pro tempore said: The noes seem to have it.

Mr. TALBERT. I call for a division.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask whether it is now competent to take up bills reported from the Committee of the Whole with favorable recommendation. So far as the record appears, we now have a quorum, have we not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. So far as the report of the committee is concerned.

Mr. PICKLER. Then I call for the regular order, so that the bills which have been favorably reported from the Committee of the Whole may be put on their passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But the motion to adjourn is in order, and the House was dividing on that question.

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman on the other side insist on his call for a division?

Mr. ERDMAN. I insist that there must be a quorum of the House in order to pass that bill granting a pension to a remarried widow of a soldier.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman insists on his call for a division, we will have a vote on the motion.

Mr. ERDMAN. I insist.

The question being again taken on the motion to adjourn, there were—ayes 13, noes 69.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. PICKLER. I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the first bill reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright.

The question being taken on engrossment and third reading of the bill, on a division, demanded by Mr. ERDMAN, there were—ayes 67, noes 12.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Morocco D. Smith against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John A. Raine against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3742) to repeal section 553 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, requiring the district judge for the southern district of Florida to reside at Key West, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 200); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 522) to reimburse the State of Minnesota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 205); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4444) providing for commissioners to treat with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 206); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1691) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 207); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1984) to provide for the use and occupation of reservoir sites reserved by the Geological Survey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 211); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILBORN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 212); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 213); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROSIUS, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the resolution of the House, No. 108, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (House Res. No. 148) calling upon the several Executive Departments for information as to the number of employees, and salaries of each, who are below a fair standard of efficiency, together with cause of such inefficiency, accompanied by a report (No. 214); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft. (Report No. 191.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend. (Report No. 192.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 708) to increase the pension of Albert Ellis. (Report No. 193.)

By Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1104) granting a pension to Isaac N. Williams. (Report No. 194.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of James Hooper. (Report No. 201.)

The bill (H. R. 1903) for the relief of the National New Haven Bank of the State of Connecticut. (Report No. 202.)

The bill (H. R. 1014) for the relief of Ames & Detrick, of San Francisco, in the State of California. (Report No. 198.)

By Mr. DENNY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 98) for the relief of the estate of Arthur P. Selby, deceased. (Report No. 199.)

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 521) for the relief of Christopher Schmidt. (Report No. 203.)

By Mr. BRUMM, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1815) for the relief of the legal representative of George McDougall, deceased. (Report No 204.)

By Mr. DOWNING, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1430) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by the Chief of Ordnance Department of the United States Army in favor of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia. (Report No. 208.)

By Mr. SNOVER, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1180) for the relief of George F. Roberts, administrator of the estate of William B. Thayer, deceased, surviving partner of Thayer Bros., and others. (Report No. 210.)

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, adversely reported the bill (H. R. 294) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and the same was laid on the table. (Report No. 209.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5211) providing for the survey of certain rivers in the State of Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 5212) for the purpose of encouraging the enlistment in United States Navy of young men of American birth—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILBER: A bill (H. R. 5213) defining cheese and "filled cheese," and imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 5214) for the relief of the Miami Indians of Indiana—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5215) to improve the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 5216) to amend the fourth section of an act entitled "An act making appropriation for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895," approved August 18, 1894—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5217) making one year's residence in a Territory a prerequisite to obtaining a divorce there—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 5218) to enlarge the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 5219) to make Carrabelle, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5220) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAWSON: A bill (H. R. 5221) to create the eastern division of the northern Federal judicial district of Georgia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 5270) to provide for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and to prescribe the manner of such redemption—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) to prohibit the further issue of bonds unless hereafter authorized by act of Congress, and for the relief of the Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEPBURN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5272) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 5273) making an appropriation for the improvement of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 5274) to make free to the people of the United States the right to publish a series of school text-books—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 5275) to increase pensions in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: A bill (H. R. 5276) to establish a military post of the United States Army in or near the city of Bangor, in Penobscot County, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5277) for the creation of a United States commissioner to treat with a commissioner from each Christian nation of the world, for the correction of the intolerable evil, so persistently and still continuing, in the shape of the Ottoman Empire, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, requesting the passage of an act ceding certain lands within the limits of the Mercer County reservoir to the State of Ohio—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, requesting the passage of an act ceding certain lands within the limits of the Mercer County reservoir to the State of Ohio—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 5011) granting an increase of pension to Alvin F. Kimball—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5020) for relief of Col. Nat. Witt, of Rhea County, Tenn.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4747) granting a pension to Marian J. Kline—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4823) for the relief of Margaret O'Donnell, nurse, United States Volunteers—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4603) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Private Land Claims to try and determine a title—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4722) to correct an act entitled "An act to pension George Hunter"—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3674) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters-patent were issued to him March 25, 1852—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4262) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters-patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Letter from Mr. Ed. Sauer, of Dubuque, Iowa, favoring the establishment of a steamboatman's home by the Federal Government—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 5222) granting a pension to Oren E. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 5223) increasing the pension of William Shelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5224) for relief of William C. Randolph, of Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for relief Mrs. Elizabeth M. Williams, of Monroe County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5226) to give increased pension to Gen. James C. Parrott—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5227) granting a pension to John Brown, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 5228) granting relief to James R. Shrodes for services rendered during the late civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 5229) for the relief of George H. Lott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5230) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 5231) for the relief of Frank E. Williams, of Hills Fork, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5232) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Walter M. Macarty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5233) for the relief of William C. Chandler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5234) to grant increase pension to Russian Blair, Company B, Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 5235) increasing the pension of Jasper N. Brown, of Winamac, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5236) for the relief of J. F. Duvall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) to increase the pension of Azariah Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) to increase the pension of O. M. Jenkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) for the relief of Whitfield E. Graddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 5240) for the relief of George W. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5241) for the relief of H. Clay McKee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) for the relief of David R. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5243) for the relief of Francis Mooney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 5244) for the relief of Waldemer Jorgensen, master of the bark *Alexander McNeil*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) to increase the pension of Caroline B. Andrews—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5246) for the relief of Cullen C. Argo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) for relief of B. F. Walpole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5248) for the relief of James O. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 5249) granting a pension to Mrs. Bevilda Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 5250) granting a pension to Charles Klopping, of Hoboken, N. J., a veteran of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5251) granting a pension to Hiram H. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of Ogden H. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 5253) to reimburse John Waller, former postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mails—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer G. Howell, late a private Company F, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5255) granting a pension to Capt. John C. Heazlitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 5256) for the relief of John Barron, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5257) for the relief of Carlton Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5258) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Besler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5259) for the relief of George T. Simpson and Louis Shaw—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 5260) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of P. E. Hogue, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5261) granting a pension to Helen M. Titsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) granting a pension to Maria C. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) granting a pension to Henry Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5264) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5265) for the relief of Anson W. Gillett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5266) granting arrears of pension to William Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5267) for the relief of Hattie J. Rogers, née Edmonds—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5268) for the relief of Isaac S. Simpson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) for the relief of F. Varin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5278) for the relief of Jacob S. Fritts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5279) granting a pension to Jerusha H. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 5280) for the relief of George W. Freeman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) for the relief of Myron Powers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 5282) for the relief of William H. Crook—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 296 citizens of Point Marion, Fayette County, Pa., and vicinity, favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BAKER of Maryland: Petition of citizens of Maryland in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTON: Papers to accompany the claim of G. W. Edwards for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Three petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Lewis and Jefferson counties, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis and Bedloes islands, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of Adams Center, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of 140 citizens of Sturgis, Union County, Ky., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Petition and proposed bill of Le Grand Byington, of Iowa City, Iowa—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Kansas, asking Congress to institute an investigation of the cause of the imprisonment of Hon. J. L. Waller—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Eight petitions, viz, of B. L. Beaty and other citizens of Horry County; T. P. Ravenel and others, of Berkeley County; W. D. Morgan and others, of Georgetown County; R. I. Blackwell, A. B. Nicholls, and others, of Marion County; D. R. Smith and others, of Williamsburg County; J. F. Islar and others, of Orangeburg County; all of the State of South Carolina, in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvements under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ELLIS: Three petitions of W. P. Faught, John F. Clark, Charles Hartness, and others, of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity, asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ERDMAN: Three petitions of citizens of Allentown, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Territorial and county officers in Oklahoma, asking for relief for the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOOTE: Eleven petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clinton and Washington counties, N. Y., urging the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of E. Harman, C. S. Clark, and 22 other citizens of Erie, Pa., for amendment of the laws relating to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: Petition of William A. Streeter Post, No. 145, Grand Army of the Republic, of the Department of Massachusetts, in favor of House bill No. 306, giving pay and pension to soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAGER: Resolution of William Layton Post, No. 358, Grand Army of the Republic, of Oakland, Iowa, favoring a service-pension bill of $8 per month for all honorably discharged soldiers and the Hainer bill for an extra pension to ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., praying for the free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the passage of House bill No. 179, to remove discrimination against American sailing vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring liberal appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, to amend the navigation laws—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 180, granting licenses to chiefs and masters of sail vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of John J. Godfrey, Michael St. John, and 25 other citizens of Ormsby, Pa., for allowance of additional compensation for room rent, etc., for fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of John J. Smith and other citizens of West Genesee, Allegany County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, three petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance

Union of Forestville and Cuba, Allegany County, N. Y., for the prohibition of the sale of beer to immigrants on Staten Island and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JENKINS: Resolution of the Superior Commercial Club, of Superior, Wis., opposing the building or construction of any piers or other obstructions in the waters of Detroit River, at or near the city of Detroit, as a hindrance to the free navigation of the Great Lakes, to the growth and prosperity of the Northwest, and inimical to the commercial interests of the nation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: Seven petitions of various citizens and settlers of Oklahoma Territory, asking for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEONARD: Two petitions of D. R. Ball, S. P. Reynolds, and other citizens of Hebron, Pa., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of 203 citizens of Culpeper County, Va., praying for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the Franklin Methodist Episcopal Church, of Brockton, Mass., praying Congress to take some decided action in regard to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of citizens of Cushman, Ark., for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South Publishing Company, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OGDEN: Papers relating to the claim of Landry Baillie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper relating to the claim of John M. Tessier—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of citizens of South Boston, Va., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Ebenezer G. Howell for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petitions of sundry persons, citizens of various States, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: Petition of R. Sauerhering and 20 pharmacists of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2758, to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Resolutions of the State board of agriculture of Pennsylvania, relating to the distribution of seeds, etc., by the Secretary of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Cynthia Adams and others of Westmoreland, N. Y., against the sale of beer on Bedloes Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, two petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in relation to the sale of intoxicating liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of 146 citizens of Gettysburg, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Stone bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition and affidavits of 3 persons, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4758, for the correction of the military record of William R. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the improvement of the harbor at Ludington, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Charles Leader and 88 others of Ironwood, Mich., requesting the further improvement of the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Resolutions of citizens of Bowling Green, Ohio, extending sympathy to Cuban insurgents; also advocating the recognition of the belligerent rights of the insurgents of the Island of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of the Commercial Club of Muscatine, Iowa, for the improvement of the Upper Mississippi and the early completion of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of S. G. Burton, of Salem, Ill., for aiding prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Five petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Genesee and Wyoming counties, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Bedloes and Ellis islands, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILBER: Seven petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ruth, Cableskill, Charleston-four-corners, and Fort Plain, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Ellis Island, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 1, 1896.*

[*Continuation of legislative proceedings of Thursday, January 30, 1896.*]

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., at the expiration of the recess.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy of the 29th ultimo, requesting an immediate appropriation of $50,000 toward the equipment outfit of new vessels of the Navy, and submitting an estimate therefor; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney-General of the 30th ultimo, requesting that an appropriation of $10,000 be provided in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the payment of services and expenses of special assistants to the Attorney-General in private land cases in the Supreme Court; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, for an appropriation in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, a judgment by the Court of Claims, case No. 18041, decreed June 13, 1895, in favor of E. T. Gillian, of Rome, Ga., for extra pay as letter carrier, for $786.94; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying that an appropriation be made for improving the harbor at Ludington, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Galveston, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to commission pilots in the Revenue-Cutter Service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1861) to reduce the public expenditures, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to introduce three bills in order that they may be printed and be ready on Monday for the consideration of the Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent to introduce them now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1862) to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1863) to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals and for further relieving the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1864) to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to cases arising under the revenue laws, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like, for the same reason indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], to introduce a bill so that the committee can get at it promptly early next week.

Mr. HARRIS. I think anything in the form of morning business at this time is in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday. Of course I would not interpose an objection to the wish of any Senator if I could avoid it.

Mr. HALE. I understand it is not in accordance with the agreement, but I stated that the reason I desired to introduce it was that I wanted the committee to get at it the first part of next week. If, however, the Senator objects, I shall not introduce the bill at this time.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to object, but I want to remind the Senate of the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday.

Mr. HALE. I know it is in violation of the agreement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the bill will be received.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1865) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls in their respective Departments; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1866) for the incorporation

of associations for the improvement of the breed of horses, and to regulate the same, and to establish a racing commission; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

A bill (H. R. 886) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy and fruits;

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893;

A bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "the Committee of 1896."

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, it is proper for me to say that I did not agree with the majority of the Committee on Finance in the report of the substitute for the bill of the House of Representatives, now under consideration, but I hope to be pardoned for occupying the time of the Senate, even briefly, on a topic to which it no longer delights to listen. I know that, as chairman of the committee referred to, it was never expected that my views could any more be twisted into harmony with those of the majority of the committee than that the views of the majority could be straightened out so as to be in tune with mine.

The President asked Congress to amend the terms of the law under which he is authorized to sell bonds and to procure gold, to preserve the equal value of the various kinds of money now in the hands of our people, so that the bonds would bear a lower rate of interest, and mature at an earlier date. Was that not a fair request? The House of Representatives promptly responded to the President's demand, and supplemented it with an emergency tariff revenue bill, as a more permanent remedy against the export of gold. But the Senate Committee on Finance have proposed, as a substitute for the bond bill, a bill for the free coinage of silver, something too much of which is our present embarrassment. This may not be the first time when bread has been asked for that a stone has been presented, but it is the first time that a committee of the Senate seems to have perpetrated a practical joke almost good enough for the clown of Barnum's menagerie.

When any circumstances, or any political administration, as for two years past, compels our people to practice extreme care lest their daily expenditures exceed their income, it will be expected that Congress will show some sympathy with the economical virtues, and at once cut down any excess of revenue or of expenditure, but a deficient national income should be not less swiftly remedied than an excess. The present Administration, however, exhibits a bashful diffidence about acknowledging any deficiency of revenue derived from a tariff bereaved of its parents in early infancy, but with their hands behind them they may quietly take whatever money Congress may place in their hands for the Treasury, where the outflow of gold has been so swift as to make even the heads of the keepers dizzy. Certainly there is no mathematical equation between the monthly receipts and monthly expenditures, and the public debt visibly expands more rapidly than the public credit.

Changes of revenue laws, or of duties on imports of foreign merchandise, are always troublesome to administer, as well both to home as to foreign trade, and are only advisable when demanded by potential reasons or when substantial improvements will justify the changes made. The reasons now for change are abundant, but it may be unnecessary to mention more than one, and that is a deficit of revenue.

If this is disputed, it will only be necessary to remember that in 1893 there was a surplus of only $2,416,000, and that there has been a deficit each year since.

In December, 1893, the Secretary of the Treasury estimated a deficit of revenue for 1894 at $28,000,000, and a surplus for 1895 of $6,120,958.

The report of the Secretary, December 3, 1894, however, showed a deficit of $69,803,260, and instead of a surplus in 1895 there was an estimated deficit of $20,000,000, and an estimated surplus for 1896 of $28,814,920.

The report of the Secretary December 10, 1895, showed a deficit of $42,805,223, and estimated a deficit for 1896 of $17,000,000 and a surplus in 1897 of $6,908,926.83.

If further evidence of a lack of revenue should be asked, it may be found in the increase of our public debt. From 1889 to 1893 there was a large amount of the public debt paid. The present Administration has already obtained $162,000,000 of gold for which bonds have been issued, and proposals for one hundred millions more are outstanding. This has not been for ordinary expenditures, although more than half of the amount has been so used, but for a purpose not less necessary—the preservation of the public faith and the maintenance of a sound currency. The deficit of revenue should be remedied, and as early as possible.

The financial condition and policy of France is more frequently commended by silver orators as an example worthy of imitation than the condition and policy of any other people; and yet France abandoned the free coinage of silver more than twenty years ago, and never coined silver without exacting a sufficient seigniorage to pay for the risk as well as for the expense of coinage. France has not recently furnished any market for silver, and has only kept her old and usual stock in circulation. Nor is paper money there redeemed in anything better than silver, save at the pleasure of the Bank of France, which often chooses to pay only a small percentage of gold and the remainder in silver.

But silver in France is maintained at par with gold because the Government long ago suspended its coinage, and because there is no blustering silver party, and no silver-plated Democratic party there daily striving to pull down their money standard to that of depreciated silver; but they keep silver to the amount of $386,000,000, with $772,000,000 of gold, on the ratio of 15½ to 1.

The United States has been the friend and patron of silver to its own hurt, and made a large market for the white metal while many other markets were closed. It has coined silver by the million, and kept it with all of our currency at an equal value with the best money of the world.

Heretofore the Government has been required to buy only a fixed quantity of silver, that it did not want, and to pay no more for it than the existing commercial value. But under the free-coinage substitute, proposed for the bond bill of the House of Representatives, the Government will be required to run in debt, for what it does not want, and to give its notes for an indefinite amount of silver, limited only by the annual product of the whole world, and at a fixed cost of twice its commercial value, or at the rate of $1.29 per ounce, instead of its present value of 67 cents per ounce.

If our late investments of nearly five hundred millions in silver have been notoriously improvident and unprofitable, the disastrous results will appear as a drop in the bucket when compared with what must flow from the enormity of the present proposal, which is to open all of our mints to the free coinage not only of all our own silver product, but that also of all the world, excluding nobody from Dan to Beersheba, and to tempt a great increase of the annual product both at home and abroad by offering United States obligations for it at double the sum it now commands in any other market.

The vast product, whether in silver bullion or silver dollars, once in the possession of the Government must stay there forever, defunct as an Egyptian mummy, as the public long ago refused to aid in its larger practical circulation.

If an individual spendthrift were to make a like exhibition of incapacity to manage his financial affairs, there is not a court of any State having jurisdiction of the subject that would refuse, if asked, the appointment of a guardian.

Whenever the issuance of depreciated money is tolerated, so as to permit an increase of the amount outstanding, as is proposed by the silver free-coinage substitute for the bond bill, now under consideration, a further inexorable depreciation of such money must follow, as our own recent unhappy experience sufficiently demonstrates. When we began to coin silver dollars in 1878, silver was worth $1.20 per ounce, and the silver in our dollar was worth 93 cents, and has been growing less month by month ever since. Silver is now worth 67 cents per ounce, and the amount in the silver dollar is worth 52 cents only. It fell under the act of 1878 and continued to fall to a lower depth under the act of 1890.

That was the result of an honest effort of the United States Government alone to prop up the value of the world's silver money, and the dollar had a further drop from 93 cents to 52 cents.

The United States since 1878 has bought 459,946,701 ounces of silver, for which $464,210,262.96 has been paid, but its present value is only $309,536,118.17, which shows a loss on the part of the Government of $154,674,143.79.

This is the outcome of our years of bitter experience in the vain attempt to increase and maintain the ancient value of silver. No other nation yet appears willing to follow our example in this line of national policy.

We have more than once during this debate been warned of the danger to which we may soon be exposed by a flood of cheap Asiatic products imported from India, China, and Japan, where cheap wages are paid to laboring men in cheap silver, and strange as it

may appear to sane men we are now seriously urged to adopt the free coinage of silver in order to equalize financial exchange, so as to compete with these oriental artisans, who are blessed with hardly a tithe, certainly with not one-fourth, of the American compensation, and appear to be contented with silver money at about half of its face value. To me this looks only as the first step in equalizing the wages of labor instead of exchanges.

First, it is proposed to establish the silver standard of money, and unless this is to be followed by the Asiatic standard of wages also, it is difficult to see how these coming rivals are to be checkmated simply by our free coinage of silver.

In Mexico any of our money, being equivalent to gold, can there be exchanged for about double the amount in Mexican silver, with which cattle can there be bought at less cost than in the United States. But the contention here that a gold standard of money fixes low prices for all products and that a silver standard fixes high prices can not be true. Wheat is bought for silver rupees in India and sold profitably in England for gold.

The largest share of our imports come from Europe and Great Britain, and if we get such imports at low prices in consequence of their gold standard, so much the better for us. But we all know the sharpest competition we meet in selling agricultural products and provisions abroad arises from countries using a silver currency only, where they are destitute of skilled labor, and where cheap wages prevail. A market abroad for any surplus of wheat or corn, beef or pork, only occurs when the United States can undersell the rest of the world. Therefore the home market should be preserved. The price of cotton will not be fixed here until we are able to manufacture the major part of the crop at home. Asiatic competition can only be met by an American tariff, and can not be overcome by providing a low standard of money to pay for whatever we have to sell.

The absurdity of free coinage as a protection against oriental industrial rivals can not well be concealed. We might with almost equal propriety be invited to introduce an Asiatic plague, and have it just as logically urged, on the ground that it has long prevailed in Asia and yet they have not all died there. Instead of a remedy, free coinage of silver would be an aggravation of a sorry condition, offering, as it would, to American wage earners a standard silver dollar, though known to be depreciated to half of its former value, and forcing the American people to accept that depreciated standard of money for all of their immense annual productions.

The feeble pretense that the free coinage of silver dollars on the present ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold would not deprive silver money of its parity with gold never became respectable by its repetition, and is no longer serviceable even in the support of a wild and ponderous experiment. Seven hundred grains of pure silver may be had in any market for $1, and when we are fanatically urged to coin silver legal-tender dollars containing only 371¼ grains of pure silver, obviously it must be expected that some people are to find pleasure in being cheated, as well as those who cheat. The proposition is to set up a standard of silver money worth but half its nominal value, and then look in the face of our creditors and claim to be honest. "You may have a good reason," said Dr. Johnson, "why two and two make five, but they will still make but four."

The bimetallism of free-coinage advocates, claiming here to be for both gold and silver on the existing ratio, will not fail to be regarded as an organized hypocrisy. Knowing that the present Administration must buy gold to preserve our currency from depreciation, they refuse to amend existing laws and thus force its purchase at the highest rates of interest and for the longest term of years. Really, this kind of bimetallism is not on speaking terms with gold, which seems to be fleeing away, and yet they refuse to invite its return or to open any doors through which it might come back to its former home.

Some whispered threats have floated in the air that the extreme silver men, now fraternizing here and at home with the Republican party, would band themselves together on one dominant idea, forsaking all others, and, with auxiliary Democratic aid, hitch on to the tail of a great Republican measure, at the first opportunity, some tinkling silver amendment, hoping thereby to secure a silver triumph of a hybrid combination, although the grand old Republican party might perish. But there is little fear of these eruptive threats; for, if carried out, the riot act might be read at home to the offenders, upon whom public opinion would not fail to place its brand, and, whatever party might survive, not all of the garroters of the Republican party would be found among its members.

The Southern people can hardly be expected to see with much complacency over $100,000,000 annually expended for pensions to the survivors of our great Union Army, but they should bear in mind that these survivors are now diminishing by thousands year by year, and that the Confederates must be held responsible for the first gun in a deplorable war where they then took the chances whether their surviving and bruised soldiers or those of the Union Army should be rewarded for their heroic services. The Northern people were subjected to an enormous expense, national and State, to support the Union, and now by far the greater part of the pension money is paid by the more populous North as the largest consumers of merchandise upon which revenue has been collected.

Where silver mines abound, the raising of silver bullion is far more profitable than the cultivation of wheat, corn, or potatoes.

The amount of silver employed in the arts by the United States in 1894 was $9,661,871, or nearly three times as much as by Great Britain.

The Secretary of the Treasury annually fixes the value at which foreign coins shall be reckoned in computing the valuation of imported foreign merchandise. This year South American dollars were fixed at only a fraction above 49 cents, and Mexican dollars at 53 cents. Would this be "four square to the world," while the value of our dollars containing about the same amount of silver is fixed at one hundred cents?

Silver is mainly utilized as pocket change, and for anything more it is cumbrous and rarely used. No man owing to his merchant or to his bank a thousand dollars thinks of lugging along 60 pounds of silver to pay it. The annual industrial products of the United States amount to twelve thousand million dollars, or more, perhaps, than those of half of Europe, and our foreign trade is largely increasing. A silver currency would throw all these vast interests into a state of decrepitude. Five of our young and thrifty States, so ably represented in the Senate, now having considerably less than a million of present population, yet produce nine-tenths of the entire annual silver product of the United States. If silver were now rehabilitated, so that no more silver bullion should be produced than was produced fifty years ago, and at no cheaper cost, there would be no urgency for free coinage. The urgency is to induce the Government to do what no other Government on the globe is doing or will do alone.

The world's product of silver for the latest year of which we have any report was very large in spite of its low price. Its free coinage on the old ratio would amount to precisely the same thing as a standing offer by our Government for the purchase of all or any part of the world's product at $1.29 per ounce, as the Government would have the silver and issue its obligations therefor, which our people would have to redeem by accepting them as legal tender for any property or for debts. The Government would cease all quasi redemption of silver dollars, and all the loss from their overvaluation would fall upon their holders or the holders of silver certificates.

The increased product of silver throughout the world, from the rich mines and the poor, as well as that obtained from lead and copper ores as a secondary product, would be very large. Some of the mines in Nevada are too lean now to pay any profit, while others in Colorado produce silver bullion at a cost of less than 25 cents per ounce, and these give birth, not to gold bugs, but to silver millionaires.

The tired-out accusation that a diminished product of gold had greatly augmented its value has been refuted by the high authority of Mulhall, according to whom the world's total stock of gold in 1850 was $2,535,000,000, and in 1890 it had increased to $5,175,000,000, and has been increasing annually ever since.

Gold is wholly democratic in its character, a good neighbor, and never pushes silver from its company. So long as a just ratio is maintained, gold willingly does the heaviest part of the work. Depreciated legal-tender money, whether silver or paper, tolerates no gold.

I am aware that the largest half of the Democratic party in our Southern States has ceased to support with Jacksonian fidelity and courage the sound-money doctrine of their fathers, but has met their semirepudiating antagonists by accepting their subterranean silver platform, and they are now glued together by an equal hostility to banks, railroads, and home-built ships, having only some trifling unadjusted controversies about a proper distribution of future spoils and proper protection on wool, which they feel sure can be sweetly adjusted on the Kentucky plan, by a judicious separation of their platform from their candidates.

Will the free coinage of silver be a godsend to any part of our country, or confer a goodly prestige upon any party? There are many States in our great Republic, rich in varied natural resources, and now wanting nothing so much as an early increase of population and capital to place them in the front rank of a prosperous people. Will the white-money metal alone of South America or of China attract anything of population, or capital, or confidence to any of our States? I confess to some apprehension that free coinage would be more likely to cause a withdrawal of some part of what has long been supposed to have there been firmly planted.

Surely the South would make nothing by giving the world a chance to buy the cotton crop with cheap silver, nor can it be hoped to cheapen the cost of labor by paying its wages in cheap

silver, as that labor must have subsistence. Does it now get or ask for anything more?

There are some gentlemen who confidently predict the overthrow of the gold standard party, as though that would insure the enthronement of the single silver standard party. I am not aware of a single gold standard party in America; but there is a large party—the national Republican party—now in excellent health, which proposes to maintain both gold and silver in circulation, and to keep both metals in good health. The recent elections appear to show that the people have great confidence in the Republican party, and the nation's financial affairs will be intrusted to that party and to no other. The election of Republican governors in such States as New Jersey, Maryland, and Kentucky indicates that the old Whig States of the South are wheeling into line with their former brethren on questions which concern their industrial prosperity. The solid Republican Representative delegations in Congress can not be much of an encouraging sign to the new and nameless silver party; but there they stand, look at them: Michigan with its 12 members, Wisconsin with 10, Indiana with 13, Iowa with 11, Minnesota with 7, and many other smaller States, to which may be added such States as Pennsylvania with all Republican members but 2 out of a total of 28; Ohio all but 2 of 21; Missouri all but 5 of 15; Illinois all but 3 of 25; California all but 1 of 7; New Jersey all but 1 of 8; New York all but 6 of 34, and Massachusetts all but 1 of 13. These are the bulwarks which will prevent the further invasion of the silver epidemic.

Mr. President, the Republican party will at its earliest opportunity seek the cooperation of leading nations in the coinage of silver, and will meantime aim to maintain the integrity of business affairs and the honor of the country by the maintenance of every dollar of money in the hands of the people, without depreciation, at its full face value.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has alluded to the cheapness of the mining of silver. I did not care to interrupt the Senator in his speech, but I want to say to him that, while it is entirely true that we have mined silver in Colorado at 25 cents an ounce, it is equally true that we are now mining large quantities of gold at 25 cents an ounce, which is worth $20.67 at the mint.

As to the very remarkable mines which have been opened in what is called the Cripple Creek region, I am informed by the president of one of the largest companies that they have mined many thousands of dollars of gold that had cost them less than 25 cents an ounce. I was informed by an experienced engineer, a graduate of the Columbia College School of Mines, that he had examined the books of a mining company at Cripple Creek and he knew that very large amounts of gold were being mined in that mine at less than 25 cents an ounce. I called upon a gentleman who, from being a common laborer a few years ago, has become a man of vast wealth by mining gold, and he informed me that he was mining gold in his mine at 10 cents an ounce, and his foreman assured me that in three hours' work, with three men, he had taken out $4,000 in gold. I will venture to say there are more than twenty mines in Colorada to-day mining gold at less than a dollar an ounce. If that was silver, the Senator from Vermont, I suppose, would think it was a misfortune, but he will not so think when applied to gold.

We have heard a great deal about the silver barons, but we shall hear nothing about the gold barons, I suppose. I can select in the State of Colorado at least five men who were day laborers at three or four dollars a day, the poorest of whom has in five years from mining gold become worth a million dollars in hard money; one of them is worth at least, I should say now, five or six million dollars, and the others are proportionately wealthy.

Mr. MORRILL. But the usual complaint of the silver men is that there is a scarcity of gold, and that gold mines are no longer productive, so that a sufficient quantity of gold can not be produced.

Mr. TELLER. I am not discussing that question. It has been repeated again and again on this floor that silver should be coined at what it costs. Now, will the advocates of gold take the other horn, and say that gold shall be coined at what it costs? I do not contend for that. I always supposed it was the most foolish statement that could be made, and one not supported by logic or common sense, that the mint value of the precious metals depended upon what it cost to coin them. It is only in this Chamber that that heresy, fallacy, and absurdity has found a lodgment in the mind of any man.

Mr. President, I do not intend to debate the subject at this time. Some day I may present it if anybody desires that I shall, and I shall then present the evidence that thousands of dollars of gold have been mined in the last year in Colorado all the way from 10 cents to $10 an ounce, and any mine in Colorado that is supposed to be a rich and productive mine ought to yield gold at the rate of not above $15 an ounce.

I do not desire to mislead anybody when I speak of the vast profits from mining gold and sometimes from mining silver. I want to say that, while gold has been mined very cheaply in the mines to which I have referred, there are a thousand cases in this country where our people have expended fortunes in gold mining and have not made any money. While it is true that I have known a mine which produced silver at 25 cents an ounce, and even less than that, $400,000 was expended on that mine before any silver at all was taken out, and I believe from that mine its owners never took out enough silver to return the capital invested.

So it is not certain, even when a mine produces silver or gold very cheaply, that in the end the owner may not sink very much more money in it than he takes out. I believe it is a recognized fact in mining sections that more money is expended in mining than is received. Hundreds of miners work a lifetime without making any profit.

The man to whom I referred as having made a great fortune has mined in Colorado, I think I was told, for nearly thirty years without having made any profit. He has given his whole life to an effort to find a paying mine, and now when he has got to be a man of mature age, just about ready to depart from the stage of life, he has struck a very rich mine. It is the hope of being able to strike a rich mine which keeps up the mining industry in our country. It is a lottery, in which one man wins and hundreds lose, but you hear a great deal more about the one man who wins than the hundred who lose.

It is utterly impossible to fix the coinage rate of the precious metals by the cost of production. No man can say what it costs to produce the precious metals when taken in the aggregate. It is only when you have a mine which is rich, or a very poor mine, that you can say what mining costs. I have known silver mined very cheaply, as I have said, and I have known gold mined very cheaply. I have known a mine to pay $5 an ounce for every ounce of silver mined, and I have known a great many ounces of silver to cost the owner $100 an ounce or more. I have known three or four hundred thousand dollars to be put into a hole in the ground, and nothing to be taken out. These are the uncertainties of mining. What I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to is that the fact that some particular mine, the best mine perhaps in the world, was producing silver at 10, 15, or 25 cents an ounce has nothing to do with the question of minting, and neither he nor anybody else would propose to mint gold at less than the mint price of $20.67 to the ounce, because some fortunate man had produced it at 25 cents an ounce.

I have said in the Senate before, and I repeat it, that in the immediate neighborhood in which I live, in the early days, I have seen gold mined in great quantities for 5 cents an ounce. That was done in California and it has been done elsewhere, but when you sum up the total and give all the men who are laboring credit for their day's wages, and put against it all the gold and silver that are taken out, I believe it is pretty generally admitted that the labor account will exceed the gold account and the silver account.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I understand the pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. PALMER. I ask that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina may be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment reported by the committee by striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited; and that the Secretary of the Treasury, when redeeming United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, and when liquidating either the interest or principal of any of the Government's coin obligations, is hereby directed to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the maket value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver; but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, he shall pay the interest and the principal of said coin obligations as they become due in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold; and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment which has just been read, it provides that whenever the two metals part in parity gold shall be paid out instead of silver or instead of both indifferently. Several objections occur to my mind to this amendment. First, the very existence of such a provision in the law would create a factitious ground for efforts to make the two metals part in parity. A great motive would be engendered, a powerful force would be organized, an immense stimulus would be given to artificial efforts to create the very condition which we

are seeking to prevent. Thus, if it were known that any departure in the parity of the two metals would lead to the payment of gold instead of silver, or instead of gold and silver indifferently, the very existence of that provision in the law would inspire those who might have their own interests to subserve to make a raid upon one metal or the other, and thus bring about what they desired, when they might not be able to bring it about if the law itself did not have that provision in it.

In the second place, it never has been within the power of law, it never can be within the power of law, to preserve an exact mathematical, continuous, and undeviating parity between the coins of both metals. This is true independent of what may be the metallic value of the commodity which composes them, for there are transient, spasmodic, and unanticipated causes which, at different places and at different times, just like the shock of an earthquake to the sphere that we live upon, will create aberrations in the value of the two metals, and that, as I say, independent of what may be the market value of the metal in its commodity form. For instance, at the very time when the Sherman law was repealed in the autumn of 1893 the metallic silver dollars were selling in the marts of New York and in the marts of Richmond for a premium ranging from 3 to 5 per cent. Although the metallic substance in the silver dollar was much below the par of the metallic substance in the gold dollar, the silver coin was selling at a premium over the gold coin, for the reason that at that time there was a peculiar and transient and a spasmodic demand for those denominations to be found in the silver coin and not to be found in the gold coin. This was a case in which, it will be observed, the lower metal was bringing the premium over the higher because coins in those low denominations which were in demand——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Virginia that his five minutes have expired.

Mr. DANIEL. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I should have asked the Senator from Virginia to allow me an interruption if I had not known that he was speaking under the five-minute rule, in order to correct what seems to me to be a mistake on his part as to the purport of this amendment as I read it. As I read the amendment of the honorable Senator from North Carolina, it is not that silver shall be paid for the obligations of the Government whenever there is a difference in the parity of the two metals, but it is that whenever the parity has disappeared, and there is a difference in the commercial value of the two metals, that coin shall be paid in the discharge of public obligations which is the less valuable in the markets of the world, whether it be gold or whether it be silver. I do not think the Senator from Virginia apprehended the trend of the amendment in that respect. So the amendment is obnoxious, it seems to me, to the criticism which the Senator from Virginia did not make, of course, with his apprehension of the scope of the amendment, that here is an advertisement in advance by the Government, if this amendment should become law, that, however the state of the market may be with reference to the bullion which composes the coins of gold or silver, all that the public creditor can expect is to be paid in the cheapest, whichever it may be, and, while it was not intended, the practical effect would be that in any event "we are bound to cheat you if we can."

Mr. President, what is the necessity for such an amendment as that? Why should those who are asked to loan money to the Government be told in advance, no matter how low the rate of interest they are willing to take or are asked to take, that in the future, if there shall be, from any of the great economic causes which control the price of commodities which are made into the metal moneys of the world, differences between the prices of these metals, they shall be paid in that which has suffered the most from whatever financial cataclysm shall take place? I do not believe that on any ground such an amendment can commend itself to the common sense, the honesty, or the sense of fairness of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. May I be indulged to make a few remarks, as I see I did misapprehend the amendment? I ask unanimous consent to be heard.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought from my hearing of the reading of the amendment that it is one which requires the preference to be given to the higher metal. I perceive upon explanation that it requires the preference to be made by the Government in paying out the lower metal; and while this misapprehension of facts as to the meaning of the amendment guided my remarks, the same philosophy applies to this that would apply to the other.

It would not be right to provide that in any and all events the lower metal should be paid out, for that would create in a different line the same exterior interest and force to make the metals go apart. The true idea, as I conceive, is that in the administration of the law the power intrusted with the discretion should leave the matter entirely unknown to the person seeking payment as to which metal he would get. If the party going to a counter to receive payment knows that by indicating one metal he may demand that and thus deprive the Government of its option to pay in either, the preference of the outsider will always be directed to demand payment in the higher metal, and consequently by that artificial demand will increase the premium on the very metal which it should be the policy of the law to balance with the other. But if, on the other hand, before he goes to the counter to receive either metal, he is in doubt as to which he will get, he will have no motive to run down either, but a disposition to maintain that both are good, because he may get either. Therefore, for the like philosophy which would actuate me to oppose the amendment if it read as I understood it, I am obliged to oppose it as I now see it reads.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator from Virginia a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. DANIEL. With pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER. What does the Senator understand to be the purpose and meaning of the law which now invests the Secretary of the Treasury with the option of paying our coin obligations in either metal? What is the purpose of that law?

Mr. DANIEL. To allow the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out either metal.

Mr. GRAY. There is no such law.

Mr. DANIEL. There is such a law, I believe. As to the Sherman notes there is such a law. There is such a law.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. The object of that option, as I would conceive if I am put in the position of an interpreter, would be that the Secretary of the Treasury might exercise the discretion to select that metal in paying out which would best preserve the parity of both metals.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the object is to preserve the parity?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. How can he preserve the parity? What is the practical operation now that he must go through with in order to preserve the parity?

Mr. DANIEL. He can best preserve the parity by not letting it be known and by having no fixed rule made by which he would select the one or the other metal, so as to leave those who receive payment in doubt as to which metal they will get, and therefore without a motive to run down the other metal.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Virginia will pardon me. He does not meet my question squarely. In which metal should he pay? I am not asking about the discretion. In order to maintain the parity, which metal, in the Senator's judgment, should the Secretary of the Treasury pay out when he is called upon to pay out on coin obligations? Should he pay out the metal already at a premium, above par, or should he pay the one that should be brought up to a parity with the other?

Mr. DANIEL. I think he should treat them so indifferently as always to leave the outsider in doubt as to which metal he would get, paying one to-day and the other to-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not the question.

Mr. DANIEL. I can not permit the Senator to ask me a question and also to give the answer. I am giving my answer.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator will pardon me when I say that I do not think he understands the question.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. BUTLER. Or the Senator would not have given me the answer which he has given me.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think the Senator understands the answer, if he will permit me.

Mr. BUTLER. I think I do understand the Senator's answer, but I think it is such an answer that it leaves the Secretary of the Treasury with a cloak to violate the law as he is doing now; and certainly the Senator from Virginia does not want him to do that.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not undertaking, in speaking to an amendment, to go into all the details or to criticise or to commend the Secretary of the Treasury. I am merely trying to get at the abstract philosophy and the truth which should preside over any general principles of administration. I would give my answer so plain that everyone could comprehend it; and that is, in selecting a metal to pay out the Secretary of the Treasury should be guided by a discretion governed by the conditions and circumstances at the time existing, and should pay out that metal which, in his judgment, would best preserve the parity of the two metals.

If he thought it would best preserve the parity of the two metals to pay out the cheaper he should pay out the cheaper. If he thought at the moment that to be indiscriminate and indifferent about it and so to select the metals that he would keep it perpetually unknown which the person seeking payment would get, he would select the other. But you can no more lay down a fixed statutory principle which would control that discretion than you can tell a military commander under the batteries and fire of an

enemy what command he should give to his troops at this moment or that. It belongs to the elasticity of mental operation applied to a miscellaneous, shifting, and ever-changeable condition of facts.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator say whether he thinks the Secretary of the Treasury in using that elastic discretion for the varying conditions—for they have been varying—has succeeded in maintaining a parity, or has approached it by the way he has been paying our coin obligations?

Mr. DANIEL. All the records will answer that question without my being put upon the witness stand. It is evident that the parity between the two metals has not been maintained.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator think that the action of the Secretary of the Treasury has tended to cause a disparity?

Mr. DANIEL. When I desire to express my opinion upon that subject I prefer to do so upon an occasion when I am unrestrained by time and when it is apropos of the matter in debate. As to that question, which has no application to this amendment, I beg leave to say that I decline to answer.

Mr. BUTLER. This amendment never would have been offered if the spirit and the letter of the law had been used to maintain a parity. We have seen day after day that gold has been preferred and paid out on the coin obligations of the Government, and the disparity has grown greater under it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The five-minute rule is in operation, the Chair will state to the Senate.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Kentucky will allow me, I will state that, while I should be glad to oblige every Senator on this floor, I shall feel from this time henceforward compelled to object to any variation or modification of the consent agreement made on yesterday.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, of course as long as silver coinage is limited and as the ratio between gold and silver coin differs in bullion value, a condition like that we now have will continue to exist, and if it does continue to exist there might be some pertinency in the proposed amendment. But I understand the logic of those who favor the unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 is that the moment we come to that kind of coinage the difference in the bullion value of gold and silver will cease; that silver will appreciate in value or gold depreciate in value until a mean value will be found, and that the action of the Government of the United States in going to the free coinage of silver at the present ratio will so enhance the demand for silver as to bring the value of the two metals together.

If that be true there will be no necessity for any such amendment as the one now offered. There will be no time when the Secretary of the Treasury can pay out silver because silver bullion is below the value of gold bullion, and no time when gold bullion will be paid out because it is below the value of silver bullion. Therefore I suggest to my friend from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] that if the logic of his position is a logic that can be relied upon, the amendment ought to be defeated, because it is inconsistent with the very theory of those who insist upon the free coinage of silver.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to have an opportunity to close the debate. If there are any others who wish to speak, I will yield, as I desire to close the discussion on the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, there are a great many questions, of course, connected with the main proposition intended to be covered by the pending bill which are meritorious in themselves. When the committee were formulating their substitute they discussed many collateral questions about which we should have been glad to express an opinion or to have proposed legislation, but the main, the leading purpose of this bill is to provide for the unlimited coinage of silver. While there are many other things that it would be well to provide for, the committee were of opinion, or at least those members who sympathize with my views were of opinion, that it would be best not to complicate this question with any of the others.

The suggestions which have just been discussed on the floor of the Senate seem to me to be really irrelevant to the matter in hand, and I hope that the Senate will be willing to pass the amendment as it came from the committee, without adding any additional amendments. Without entering into a discussion of the merits of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina, I hope the Senate will not adopt any amendments to the amendment reported to the bill, but that it will pass the bill as it came from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it seems to me from my standpoint that if we can adopt the committee's amendment it will cover the whole ground; and I appeal to our friends who believe in supporting that amendment to let us come to a vote on it and not on this amendment. Several of these amendments would be very appropriate and proper if we did not have free coinage. If we get that we shall not need them. If we do not get free coinage, we can put the amendments on some other bill or somewhere else. I think free coinage covers the whole ground, solves the whole question, and settles all these amendments and the propositions contained in them.

I believe it would be better for us if we should not put such amendments upon a free-coinage bill. Some of them would not be harmonious with it. I do not like to vote against any amendment which looks like it would do something for the country, but at the same time I believe that the whole is greater than a part, and free coinage is greater than any of the amendments.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I regret very much to see the friends of free coinage weakening at this time. The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] is clearly in the line of restoring the parity between the two coins. The present so-called Sherman law of 1890 vests in the Secretary of the Treasury a discretion to redeem the notes under that act in either gold or silver coin. He has studiously and sedulously refused to carry out the discretion placed in him by that act, and by that means has caused the disparity which now exists between gold and silver.

The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is to the effect that whenever there is disparity between the two metals that disparity shall be restored by the action of the Treasury Department in paying out that metal or that coin whose bullion value is of the lower character or the less valuable in the market.

I do not now propose to discuss the question which we have discussed here for two or three years as to what is parity and how it is to be restored. I think the advocates of silver all along on both sides have agreed that there can be no natural parity between gold and silver as bullion, as articles of commodity, especially when one is unrestricted in its coinage and the other limited in its coinage. It is all idle, it is the worst kind of logical rot to claim that a parity can exist or be restored between the two metals under those circumstances.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. Does the Senator think that if we secured the unlimited coinage of silver we would then have a parity between the two metals?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly. Why not?

Mr. DUBOIS. That is the proposition.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

Mr. DUBOIS. Then what is the use of adding an amendment to secure that parity when you have a chance to vote for the unlimited coinage of silver?

Mr. ALLEN. Not at all, because I am well satisfied in my own mind that the amendment of the committee as reported will be absolutely ignored and violated in its execution unless the principle be couched in words which can not be avoided.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. We have had too much experience——

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to make a suggestion at this point?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], who, I believe, does not favor free coinage, made the same observation about this matter as that made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who favors it. I wish to say here—the Senator is coming to it, if he will pardon me—that it is perfectly clear, it seems to me, that free coinage will not maintain the parity unless the Secretary of the Treasury carries out the spirit and intent of the law in paying out the metals so as to maintain it. Besides, you must remember that there are to-day millions of gold mortgages in this country which were authorized under the Bland-Allison Act, and so long as they exist there will be an artificial strain on gold, and free coinage can not maintain the parity unless the provisions of the proposed act are carried out by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ALLEN. I am well persuaded that is true, and therefore I favor the amendment.

Now, just one more observation, and I hope my time may be extended sufficiently to make it. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] expresses the hope that no amendments will be offered to the bill as it is now proposed to be amended by the committee. What earthly use is there in adopting the amendment of the committee and sending this law to the Treasury Department to execute without some restrictions upon the Treasury Department in the issuance of Government bonds? I ask the honorable Senator from Colorado if we have not had experience enough with this Administration to know that by every contortion of language, and by the absolute violation of the letter and spirit of the law, this matter will not be carried out if there is a

possibility of avoiding it, and the money will be supplied just as it is supplied to-day by the issuance of Government bonds?

Now, why not put upon this bill an amendment that will prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing another interest-bearing obligation of the Government unless the necessity is declared by Congress.

Mr. TELLER. If I may answer the Senator, I will say, taking the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina, where it provides that there shall be no further issuing of interest-bearing bonds, I am prepared to vote for that amendment. I do not know that every friend of free coinage is; and I would rather get a vote on free coinage simply and alone, and then if we want to add to the provision any of these things—and some of them, I think, might then be properly added—let us add them to the bill. What I desire is that we may have a fair and square vote on the question of free coinage unencumbered by anything else. Of course I do not mean to say that many of these amendments would not meet my approval on the bill after we had voted for free coinage. I am in favor——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TELLER. I am in favor of restricting the issue of bonds by positive law.

Mr. WALTHALL rose.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute provides for free coinage, pure and simple, and while there has been notice given of a number of amendments dealing with the various refinements, and sometimes with other questions, more or less pertinent and germane, I wish to reach a vote upon the amendment reported by the committee just as it is, and I shall oppose all amendments, regardless of their refinements or such merit as they may possess. I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw that motion, for I want five minutes on the amendment before the vote is taken.

Mr. HARRIS. For the purpose of allowing the Senator from North Carolina to be heard under the consent rule, I will withdraw the motion, but I shall renew it as soon as the Senator has been heard, if I can get the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair was addressed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL] before the Senator from North Carolina rose.

Mr. WALTHALL. I simply rose to make the same motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I trust that the disposition of some to try to table this amendment will not prevail. It should be discussed, and besides every Senator ought to be willing to go squarely on record upon a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. PRITCHARD and others. We will.

Mr. BUTLER. All right. The first section of this amendment is germane to the bill that came from the other House. It provides that no more bonds shall be issued by the President for any purpose without the consent and advice of Congress. We have not done our duty by simply killing the bond bill passed by the House, for every Senator on this floor knows that the President will continue to issue the bonds under the old Republican law of 1875. Therefore, if you are opposed to bonds, you must not only refuse to pass this new bond bill, but you must also repeal the law under which the President has already issued $262,000,000 of interest-bearing bonds. I claim that the law of 1875 does not give him this power, but since he is assuming that power right under the nose and in the teeth of Congress, we should pass this amendment at once, which positively prohibits the further issuance of bonds without authority of Congress. The man who does not vote for this amendment says by his vote that he is willing for the President to continue the bonds deals, which have not only been disgraceful, but which have piled up a large interest-bearing debt upon our taxpayers, with nothing to show for it. It has all been done for the sole benefit of gold gamblers and speculators. Will we sit here and permit such robbery to continue? Let us vote for this amendment and stop it.

The second half of my amendment is germane to the free-silver amendment reported by the committee. I want to speak frankly as a man who favors free coinage as a great and fundamental principle of sound finance. I am not from a silver-producing State. I care nothing about the gold barons or the silver barons. I am from an agricultural State and an agricultural section of the country. Our prosperity and the prosperity of all wealth producers depends upon the amount of full legal-tender money in circulation. We do not care if all the money is gold coin, provided there is enough gold, but we all know that there is not enough of both gold and silver if every ounce was coined into money. It does not make any difference with us whether gold is dug from the mines at a cost of 10 cents an ounce or 5 cents an ounce. We all know that gold is now being mined at many places at a cost of less than 5 cents for the amount of gold that the Government stamps and calls a dollar. It costs more than that to mine the amount of silver that is in a silver dollar. Every man of common sense knows that the cost of digging these metals from the earth has practically nothing to do with the money value of the metals. That depends upon and is regulated by law and the stamp of the Government. I am not directly interested in the price of silver or the price of gold as metals, but I am interested and every wealth producer is directly interested in the amount of these that are coined into full legal-tender dollars. But it is necessary to bring about a parity between the two metals so as to overcome the difference in exchange between the Orient and the Occident. This can be done only by having the same law to apply to both metals. There must be free coinage for both and an equal strain on or demand for both.

Mr. President, as heartily as I favor free coinage, I say to-day, and I will repeat it every time such a bill is up, that I never want to see a free-coinage bill become a law until this amendment or some provision similar to it becomes a law with it. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], who is a gold man, shrewdly sees the point. He knows that if a free-coinage bill were to become a law to-day that the Secretary of the Treasury could cause a disparity between the metals by paying out gold alone on our coin obligations as he has been doing and is now doing. Besides, there was a clause put into the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 which allowed mortgages and notes to be taken payable in gold. There are thousands and millions of dollars to-day due in every section of this country on such gold mortgages and notes. This was done to appreciate gold and to depreciate silver. Now, the Government, to maintain the parity between the two metals, must pay out silver on our coin obligations until the strain on silver is equal to the strain on gold.

Then and then only will there be a parity. This is what the Secretary ought to do now. It is his option and duty under the law to do it, but he is not doing it. He is causing a greater disparity by putting a still greater strain on gold. Hence the necessity of this amendment, which directs him in express terms how to maintain the parity. If we pass a free-coinage bill with this provision, then silver and gold will always practically be of the same bullion value. If you do not, then the Secretary of the Treasury will continue to discriminate against silver to cause a disparity. Then every gold organ in this country would howl from ocean to ocean that free coinage had not produced a parity, and that the Senator from Colorado and others who favor free coinage had not told the truth. They would show that what we had promised had not come. They would start a fresh campaign to fool the people and get them to submit to a gold standard by taking advantage of their own wrong and our indiscretion. No true friend of silver can want to see a free-coinage bill passed unless there goes with it a provision that will force the execution of the law in good faith. If you leave the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion which he now has, he can and will discriminate against silver and in favor of gold. There is no way to maintain the parity but to stop and prevent this discrimination. Certainly we do not want to give the gold men an opportunity to rob us of some of the benefits of free coinage, and at the same time furnish them with fresh demagogy with which to fool the people.

The great agricultural section wants free coinage of gold and silver and also a parity between these metals, because it wants a bimetallic standard and more full legal-tender dollars. We want enough money to maintain stability of prices, and we want to correct the difference of exchange between silver and gold using countries, so that our farmers and manufacturers can successfully compete with the balance of the world. We have a wily foe to fight; and I tell you if you vote down my amendment and do not place such a provision upon the bill, every free-coinage man here will be put on the defensive before the gold advocates. That is the gospel truth about it.

The gold men try to chide us by saying that we favor paying our coin obligations in the cheaper metal. How, under heaven, can you ever pay out the coins so as to maintain a parity if you always pay in the dearer metal? It is absurd. Every man knows that you can not maintain the parity without putting an equal strain on both metals. When too great a strain has been put on gold, it goes to a premium. If you continue the strain, the premium goes higher. But take the strain off of gold and put it on silver and they at once come to a parity. Therefore we should pay in silver when gold is at a premium. It is absolutely necessary to do it. The Senator from Delaware says that this is robbing the bondholder.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Delaware said nothing of the kind.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood him to say so. My amendment provides for paying the bondholder exactly in accordance with the contract. To pay him in gold only is to rob the farmer and all the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. GRAY. It will rob the farmer more than it will rob the bondholder.

Mr. HARRIS. I renew my motion.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator to withdraw it for one moment. I shall not occupy any time.

Mr. HARRIS. I can not resist the appeal of the Senator from Georgia. I regret that he makes it, however.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. BACON. I only make it that my vote on this amendment may not be misconstrued. The first clause in the amendment I favor, and I favor it so strongly that I do not feel that I can cast a vote against it without giving my reason therefor. I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina only because of that part which relates to the payment of gold obligations by the Treasury. I do favor the first clause, which prohibits the issuance of bonds by any executive officer without authority of Congress.

I desire to say before taking my seat, in order that I may not be further misunderstood, that I do not agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the restoration of free coinage will not produce parity. I believe it will produce parity. Otherwise I should not favor it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not insist upon his motion to lay the amendment upon the table. Let us vote it down. There has been no greater obstacle to the restoration of the free silver dollar to the place it occupied before the crime of 1873 than the effort to get more than could be obtained when legislation was before Congress. Now, we can secure here, beyond peradventure, the free and unlimited coinage of the silver dollar, its restoration to the place it occupied in our laws before it was demonetized in 1873. Let us take that. The propositions of the Senator from North Carolina I favor, and when the appropriate time comes for voting for them I shall vote for them; but this is neither the time nor the place, in my humble judgment. I hope that the Senator from Tennessee will let us take a yea-and-nay vote and vote down the amendments. We can do it as quickly in that way as we can in the other.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment is still open for discussion? No motion has yet been made to lay it on the table, I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada upon the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I think the amendment is proper on the bill now under consideration. This is simply a bill upon which the Senate are going to vote their sentiments. There is no expectation that it will become a law. There is no expectation that we shall get free coinage. It is very doubtful if it will ever be considered by anybody after it leaves the Senate. It is simply an opportunity for men to vote their sentiments. We are now just maneuvering for position. It is giving those who want to parade before the country as friends of silver an opportunity to vote for it. They can do it now without hurting the Rothschilds or anybody else, because they know the bill will not become a law. It is the most harmless bill in the world.

If there is any sentiment that I have which is stronger than any other it is opposition to loading this Government with interest-bearing bonds in time of peace. That is the issue between the people and the two parties. Both the Democratic and the Republican parties are thoroughly committed to the principle of loading this country with interest-bearing bonds in time of peace.

This bill came here from a Republican House, and it was thought so important that this indorsement of the issuing of bonds should be made that we were not allowed to take the usual holiday recess. The Republican party and the Democratic party are both in favor of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace. The Populist party is opposed to it. There is no necessity for it. It is wicked to do it. There is no demand for issuing bonds whatever, as we have discussed and shown repeatedly.

I hope no Senator will move to lay the amendment on the table, but that there will be a direct vote on this proposition. I think we ought to have a direct vote on this matter—on the policy of issuing bonds—and hope no motion will be made to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am opposed to the issuance of bonds, but I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if, when we substitute an unlimited coinage bill for a bond issue, we are not voting directly against the authorization of bonds of any kind? That is the proposition here. We are substituting a free-coinage amendment for a proposition to issue bonds.

Mr. STEWART. Will you allow me to answer? We are simply on dress parade as voting our sentiments. We know very well that the free-coinage bill is not to become a law. I think it important for the Senate to be recorded in opposition to bonds. If that be the sentiment of Congress it may have some effect in checking these very wicked processes. This is merely voting a sentiment.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me to ask a question?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. By voting for this free-coinage bill you do not repeal the law that President Cleveland is now issuing bonds under. He is now issuing bonds.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator is talking about another proposition, not the one under consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to repeal the law, for if we do not repeal it he will continue to issue bonds.

Mr. STEWART. Of course this measure will not interfere with the President's doing anything. It is not to become a law. It is simply voting the sentiments of Congress, and if there is any sentiment against the issue of bonds let it be manifested here. Every time there is an opportunity we ought to protest against the issuing of bonds in any form. That ought to be done if a majority is opposed to the issuance of bonds.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I desire to explain my vote on the pending amendment. I shall vote for the substitute reported by the committee. I am in favor of prohibiting the issuing of bonds without the action of Congress. I am also in favor of requiring the payment of gold and silver coin by the Treasury as may be required to meet the obligations of the Government without preference of either, except as temporary exigencies may require one or the other. But there are matters in this amendment which will create difference of opinion, and they had better come up separately. For myself, I believe that when the law says two things shall be equal for the payment of private and public obligations there is no power in the world that can make them unequal. For that purpose that is all the parity that is possible to exist. The other may come from other causes, and it is not in any wise material to free coinage of silver that the market value of the metals shall be equal to the ratio established by Congress. Now, we have a difference of opinion. I am with the Senator from North Carolina upon these chief propositions. I am in favor of the equal payment of gold and silver by positive requirement and prohibition of law. But I prefer not to vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, just one word. Our experience ever since 1873 has been that the executive officers of the Government absolutely refuse to execute the law. They are doing it now and have been doing it continuously, and they propose to do it until there is a mandatory provision requiring them to execute the law. That is the principal reason why I favor the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina. It makes it obligatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to obey the written law, and until we have some such statute we shall have no execution of it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I ask permission to state to the Senate what it seems to me the Senator from North Carolina has lost sight of. I tried to make him understand me, but of course that could not be done in a moment, and he was on the floor. The Senator from North Carolina moves to amend the second section of the original bill. Suppose that is put in, and there is no other amendment. The next movement is the recommendation of the committee to strike off the whole bill, and the proposition will be to strike out the whole bill as amended.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. TELLER. Wait a moment, until I get through. Then, if we carry the free coinage we have stricken out the whole thing as amended, we have undone what we had just done. It seems to me logically that the Senator must wait until we dispose of the committee amendment, and then let it come in as a separate section with an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has been misrepresented by the printed slip on the table. I saw the force of that, and when I offered the amendment proper, as shown in the RECORD of January 14, I offered it in the place of section 4 of the report of the committee. Therefore it is an amendment to the amendment reported by the committee. It is a substitute for section 4.

Mr. HALE. It is an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. BUTLER. It is just an amendment to the substitute, where it is peculiarly appropriate. If we are going to vote on free coinage let us vote on a measure that is sound and will give relief if we ever get free coinage. We know it is not going to become a law; but when we say what will give relief let us say what is honest.

Mr. TELLER. That changes the attitude of the amendment very much. I had supposed it was as I have it in the printed form.

Mr. BUTLER. I corrected that.

Mr. TELLER. That is certainly an attempt on the Senator's part to amend and correct the report of the committee as to section 4. I have not seen any print of that kind.

Mr. BUTLER. It has not been printed.

Mr. TELLER. Then the proposition now is to amend section 4 by the Senator's substitute?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, we can not hear at all on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. TELLER. What I said was that, as I now understand from the explanation of the Senator from North Carolina, instead of the amendment being to the text of the bill, it is an amendment to the committee's amendment, which is section 4. That, of course, changes the parliamentary status entirely.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. STEWART called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHILTON. Let the amendment be again read.

Mr. FRYE. Was there not an amendment pending offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to that part of the bill proposed to be stricken out by the committee?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is not so advised. The Senator from Texas calls for the reading of the amendment to the amendment, which will be done.

The Secretary read the amendment proposed by Mr. BUTLER to section 4 of the substitute reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have section 4 of the substitute, which is proposed to be stricken out, read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The section referred to will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on the amendment to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], but on all questions relating to this bill a transfer has been made whereby the Senator from Illinois stands paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is called home to attend a funeral in his family. If the Senator from New Jersey were present, he would at any rate vote against the committee substitute—the unlimited-coinage provision—and I think he would vote against all amendments to the bill; but I do not feel at liberty to vote now unless some Senator on the other side of the Chamber can assure me that the Senator from New Jersey would vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Jersey before he left called my attention to the fact of his pair with the Senator from Idaho; and, without disclosing exactly what he said, I will say that I think the Senator from New Jersey did not expect the Senator from Idaho to vote on anything pertaining to the bill in the absence of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator thinks I should not vote?

Mr. HILL. I think so.

Mr. DUBOIS. I thought perhaps we might agree on this question and vote the same way.

Mr. HILL. The precise effect of this amendment upon the state of the bill might be uncertain, and therefore I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that he should not vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. Very well. Of course I expect to observe my pair strictly.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. I do not see him in his seat, and I ask his colleague how he would vote on this question?

Mr. BACON. I am not prepared to answer the question, as my colleague did not give me any information on the subject before he left.

Mr. GEAR. Then I withhold my vote; but if I were not paired I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], who is absent on important business; but as he and I agree on this question, I vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. Can his colleague inform me how he would vote on this question? Perhaps we might vote the same way.

Mr. CAMERON. I think my colleague, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN. Then I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and vote "nay."

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is unavoidably detained from the Chamber, is paired on all these questions with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE].

Mr. BURROWS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. I voted on this question under an impression—and that impression has been confirmed—that if present he would vote the same way that I have done. If there be no objection to that, I will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 60; as follows:

YEAS—13.

Allen,	Cannon,	Kyle,	Roach,
Brown,	George,	Peffer,	Stewart,
Butler,	Hill,	Pritchard,	Tillman.
Cameron,			

NAYS—60.

Allison,	Faulkner,	McBride,	Proctor,
Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan,	Pugh,
Baker,	Gallinger,	Mantle,	Shoup,
Bate,	Gibson,	Mills,	Squire,
Berry,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller,
Blanchard,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Thurston,
Burrows,	Hale,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Call,	Hansbrough,	Morrill,	Vest,
Carter,	Harris,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Nelson,	Voorhees,
Chilton,	Hoar,	Palmer,	Walthall,
Clark,	Irby,	Pasco,	Warren,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,	White,
Dubois,	Lodge,	Platt,	Wilson.

NOT VOTING—16.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Gordon,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Sherman,
Brice,	Elkins,	Martin,	Smith,
Caffery,	Gear,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, to be added to section 4 of the committee amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed at the close of section 4 of the committee amendment to add the following:

Provided, That after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall be deprived of the power to issue the bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government unless Congress shall first declare the necessity therefor, any act of Congress now in force to the contrary notwithstanding.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER. I am in favor of restricting the Treasury Department from issuing any bonds. I desire to do that, however, in a separate section after we have disposed of the other amendments. I am prepared to vote for such an amendment, but I do not like to vote for it at this time in this particular shape. I appeal to the Senator from Nebraska to wait and see if we can not afterwards put such a provision on the bill with proper deliberation. I believe if we can do it, it will be an expression of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I can not see anything to be gained by withdrawing the amendment at this time. If the Senator can explain to my satisfaction—and I am very easily satisfied—why this amendment should not be attached to this section, and why it should be made a separate section, I will willingly comply with his request.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know that it is necessary that it should be made a separate section. I thought I rather liked the form of the proposition, as it came from the Senator from North Carolina, a little better than the language of the substitute, and I thought we might have an opportunity to put it in better shape.

I want it distinctly understood that however I may vote upon this question, I am determinedly opposed to the issue of bonds by the Government of the United States in time of peace or at any other time, except as authorized so to do specifically by Congress. I am in favor of taking away that power if it exists. I am exceedingly anxious that we may have a fair vote on that question, unencumbered by the free-coinage question. It seems to me that we might have that, and that we might determine this other ques-

tion in the Senate, as we know we all have a right to do, when the bill is reported to the Senate. Should the Senator introduce his amendment in the Senate after we have disposed of the committee amendment, I should have no hesitation in voting for it as I am now advised. If it is not presented in any better form, I shall certainly vote for it as it stands, and cheerfully and gladly vote for it. I merely thought we had better take one thing at a time, and not complicate the main issue and the main question by any of these other questions until that shall have been disposed of.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I wish to say that I am decidedly in favor of the proposition contained in the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] or the same proposition contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]; but I am opposed to voting for that amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Finance. I am willing to vote for either one of the amendments to the bill when I can do so as a separate proposition. After we shall have passed upon the question as to whether or not the committee amendment shall be voted up or voted down, then, if this proposition shall be renewed as an amendment to the bill as amended, I stand ready and willing and anxious to vote for it, because I do not believe the Secretary of the Treasury should have a standing power to issue bonds at his own discretion. I think he should only have the power when an emergency arises and the power is given by Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado a question, the answer to which will control my vote on this proposition. Does the Senator from Colorado think that the adoption at this particular time of the amendment to the amendment would in any way impair or injure the chances of the passage by the Senate of a measure for the free coinage of silver?

Mr. TELLER. If I may be allowed to answer, I will state that I do not say that it will have that effect. I have been afraid that it might make some difference with some members of the Senate, and I felt that we had better settle the main question first, the importance of which we all recognize.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I believe it will lose votes for the substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator from Colorado a serious apprehension that such will be the result?

Mr. TELLER. If I had not, being very much in favor of the principle, I certainly should not have subjected myself to the danger of being misunderstood by voting against it. If I believed it would help the free-coinage provision I should have voted for it very cheerfully. I shall certainly vote for it after we have disposed of the main question.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, Mr. President, upon the judgment of so able a Senator as the Senator from Colorado, being, however, in favor of the amendment and being determined to vote for a similar proposition somewhere in this bill, in order not to cripple in any way or to impair the passage of a free-coinage bill, I will vote against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two on this subject, because it is one that concerns the interests of the whole country. In the first place, I am in favor of the free coinage of silver as a principle. I propose to vote in accordance with that conviction. I do not think it necessary that we should spend so much time in discussing the silver question here, except to show to the American people what the views of the American Senate are on that subject. Certainly nothing can be accomplished at this session in the way of legislation in favor of silver. That is already well understood. However, it is needful and proper that we should put ourselves on record as to where we stand on the question. The position I occupy is in favor of silver.

Now, when it comes to the other matter, the question of the issuance of bonds by this Administration or by any other, I take a different position from that of some of my friends who are in favor of the restoration of silver. I want to say that I am not afraid to have bonds issued if it is needful to borrow money to carry on the legitimate operations of the Government or provide for an emergency. I believe in sustaining the Government, first by the methods familiar to us all, taxation first, and customs taxation principally, supplementing it with internal-revenue taxation, but depending mainly upon customs duties, to be so levied as incidentally to protect American interests. I believe that it is wrong for us to deny to the people of the United States the revenue that ought to be secured from properly imposed taxation upon imports. I believe that this Government should have its coffers well supplied with the necessary funds with which to carry on the Government obtained from this source mainly.

But, Mr. President, I am also in favor of carrying on the Government and of sustaining its credit. I am in favor of carrying on all the great public works which have already been started and others that should be started as speedily as possible. I am in favor, for example, of the construction of the Nicaragua Canal. I am in favor of coast defenses for our country. I think we are indulging in criminal negligence, if I may properly use such an expression in this presence, by our failure to provide an adequate system of coast defenses for this country. The greatest military authorities of this country and the greatest naval authorities agree that we are in a perilous condition, and that it will take time to put ourselves in a proper state to resist an attack and to maintain the dignity of this country, if need be, in connection with our foreign affairs.

Therefore I wish to state at this time that I shall vote against such an amendment as is here proposed, because I am willing to support the hands of the present Administration in its effort to maintain the credit of the Government on the one hand, and I am in favor of the issuance of bonds whenever necessary to obtain funds that can not properly be obtained in sufficient quantity by taxation to carry on the great and necessary work for the development and protection of our country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] I think should be withdrawn, with all due deference to him. We do not know the views of every Senator upon this floor on all branches of this question, and there may be Senators who are in favor of the amendment proposed by the committee who would not support the proposition advanced by the Senator from Nebraska; and yet his amendment may be adopted. Senators who take the view of the Senator from New York, for instance, as evidenced by this last vote, may think it desirable to load the substitute of the committee with what might be called Grecian amendments. Gifts of this character may result in defeating the amendment proposed by the committee.

It is obviously the duty of those who agree upon the free-coinage proposition to dissever the subject from all others, and, presenting that unembarrassed, vote upon it, and not run the risk of losing the support of those who, while desiring free coinage, would be loath to adopt the extreme proposition advocated by the Senator from Nebraska. I do not speak of this because personally I am opposed to the amendment; on the contrary, I am in favor of restricting the issuance of bonds; but I do not wish to go into that subject or to trench upon the views of other Senators who, as I said awhile ago, favoring the amendment of the committee, might possibly object to that proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I desire to state very briefly that the bill as it comes from the House of Representatives does not meet with my approval. Neither does the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance. I shall vote for the amendment of the Committee on Finance as a substitute for the bill of the House in order to defeat the bill of the House. I believe that if the bill as it came from the other House should pass this body it would become a law. I am perfectly satisfied that if the Senate substitute passes this body neither will become a law. Therefore I shall vote for the amendment, as I suppose my friend from New York did, as he is at least charged with having done; in order to defeat one part of it I shall vote for any amendment that will defeat the other.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I wish to state that I favor both the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] and that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. I think, however, that it may endanger the bill to encumber and embarrass it by such amendments. While I feel that I want the time to come when I can vote for the principles enunciated in the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, as well as that of the Senator from Nebraska, I shall vote against the proposition at this time, but hoping that I shall yet have an opportunity to vote for it, for I favor it.

I am opposed to the issuance of bonds in time of peace, or that the Secretary of the Treasury should have authority to issue bonds. I am as absolutely of that conviction as is the Senator who proposes the amendment. Yet at the same time I think it is best for us not to encumber the bill. It is good as it is, and I wish to see it go through. Then after that we can put on these amendments if it is necessary. I favor the bill as it is proposed to be amended by the committee, as I have before stated, and therefore I shall vote in the way I have indicated.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, it is extremely curious to me to find gentlemen who claim to be in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver unwilling to follow the policy to its logical consequence. It is a strange thing to me that a proposition coming from the representatives of the only great party in this country which in 1892 declared in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 should be regarded by the friends of free silver as Greek gifts, coming ostensibly friendly but really hostile to the object to be accomplished.

Senators say that they are ready to vote for an amendment similar to this. At what time? If the amendment be right, why not vote for it now?

Mr. BATE. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. LINDSAY. Certainly.

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator from Kentucky vote for this amendment when the time comes?

Mr. LINDSAY. I shall vote for the amendment in order to make a logical bill.

Mr. BATE. Ah!

Mr. LINDSAY. And then, believing the amendment to be wrong, I shall vote against the amendment as amended.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Kentucky will vote for it when it can not pass.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes; and I will state that in all the history of the agitation for the free coinage of silver it has always been pressed when such a bill could not pass and never when there was an opportunity to pass it.

Mr. ALLEN. That is true.

Mr. LINDSAY. Never when there was an opportunity to pass such a measure has there been any serious attempt to pass it.

Now, the claim of the friends of free silver is that it will restore prosperity; that it will operate to revive business; that the Treasury will be full to overflowing with legal-tender money, and we will need no bonds.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to ask him a question? At what time since 1873 has there been an opportunity to pass a free-coinage bill?

Mr. LINDSAY. There was an opportunity in 1890, when the representatives of the silver-producing States of the Union combined with the protection people to defeat it. That is when there was a time to pass it.

Mr. STEWART. Let me tell the Senator how it was. The House had twice beaten a free-coinage bill by 30 majority, and everybody knew that the President would veto it. We were situated then just as we are now.

Mr. LINDSAY. Who said the President would have vetoed it? Who had authority to speak for the President?

Mr. STEWART. He said so.

Mr. GRAY. Did the President say so to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LINDSAY. There was at least a time when both Houses of Congress might have passed a bill and put the responsibility upon the Executive.

Mr. STEWART. Let us do so now. There is an opportunity.

Mr. LINDSAY. An opportunity presented itself to sell silver rather than coin it, and the friends of silver embraced the opportunity.

If the friends of free silver are right, that prosperity will come with the adoption of free coinage, then we need no bonds; then we ought to sell no bonds. If we want to build the Nicaragua Canal we shall have to have a special act of authority to sell bonds anyway. Further than that, the time has come when Congress ought to take charge of the credit of this Government, and not to rely upon the President exercising his authority under the act of 1875—the act for redemption. The President has gone as far as he ought to be required to go, and I hope he will not take another step in keeping up the credit of the Government by selling bonds, but that he will put the responsibility where it belongs, upon the Congress of the United States. If a calamity comes, then let the responsibility rest where it belongs.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. VOORHEES. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me to ask him a question? My understanding is that Mr. Harrison was President of the United States in 1890. Do I understand the Senator to say that the President at that time declared that he would veto a free-coinage bill?

Mr. STEWART. So we were informed. I was not in communication with him personally. [Laughter.] But several Senators told me that he had so declared.

Mr. VOORHEES. Will the Senator indicate who it was who told him or who was in communication with the President on this subject, and what his authority is for saying that President Harrison declared himself against the free coinage of silver?

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Nevada will allow me, I will state that I know of my own personal knowledge that President Harrison declared again and again that he would veto a free-coinage bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is quite sufficient.

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to say that I shall vote for the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, though it contains some minor propositions which do not meet my approbation. One of these is found in that part of section 4 which compels the reissue of greenbacks whenever redemption takes place.

For myself, I do not believe we shall ever achieve a restoration of orderly finance until the present system of reissuing the demand notes of the Government is abandoned, and whenever a fair and conciliatory plan looking to that end is presented to the Senate I expect to vote for it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not want a false impression to go out to the country that there has ever been an opportunity to get free coinage or that there ever will be an opportunity to get free coinage while a gold man is in the White House, and gold men have been there for the last twenty years. It would therefore require a two-thirds vote to get it, and the President, with 300,000 offices, using them to defeat it, makes that an impossibility. We have seen that over and over again. In 1890 there were several test votes in the other House. On what they regarded as a special test vote there was, if I remember correctly, 31 majority against free coinage in that body.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] who is not present has stated that he consented to that bill in order to defeat free coinage. There was no more chance then for free coinage than there is now. That is the way they expect to defeat free coinage forever—if they can get the President. The views of Mr. President Harrison on this subject are no different from those of Mr. President Cleveland.

Mr. LINDSAY. May I ask the Senator why he consented to that bill?

Mr. STEWART. Because I was informed that it would be executed; and no part of it was ever executed fairly and honestly by anybody. It is too long a story to tell. That would have been a good act if the Administration had coined the silver and paid it out on the Government obligations, paid it out in the redemption of those notes. There would have been no raid on the Treasury at all. We would have had plenty of money and prosperity. It was the conduct of both Administrations in refusing to obey the law, although it was mandatory, that caused the trouble.

This distress has been brought upon the country by Administrations in refusing to pay coin and by refusing to exercise the option. There would have been no raids on the Treasury, and we would have a supply of money from this source if it had not been for the surrender of the option of the Government. The act was a good one, and the Senator from Ohio himself, who voted for it and then voted to repeal it, stated here in his place that it had saved the country from a panic in 1890, and had done a great deal of good up to that date. But he was ready then to kill it. Why? Because he was in sympathy with the payment in gold. He was in sympathy with the process by which the Treasury was drained. He was in sympathy with those who gave away for nothing that valuable option which, if it had been exercised by this Government, would have given us prosperity. Doing the same thing we ask to have done did not injure the Governments of France and Germany. We ask for the exercise of the option in favor of the Government, because discrimination against Government money and the refusal to execute that law have brought calamity. If you would execute what is left of the law you would stop the raids on the Treasury.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I was induced to offer this amendment because Senators had declared upon this floor from time to time that they believed the time had come when it was necessary and proper to withdraw from the Secretary of the Treasury any power he might have under the act of 1875 to issue the bonds of this Government. I took occasion in some remarks I made in this Chamber two years ago the present month to show, I think conclusively, that every bond issued by the present Administration was issued in direct violation of law. I have not the slightest doubt but that I could impanel a jury of twelve honest men in this country and prove to them and receive a verdict from them to the effect that the bonds are issued absolutely without any authority of law whatever.

Senators from time to time have been in favor of withdrawing this power, if any power existed. Acting upon the supposition that some power does exist or may exist under the law of 1875, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of testing those who claim they are in favor of monetary reform, and I can not be induced by appeals to withdraw the amendment. If there is any Senator in this Chamber whose loyalty to silver is of such a precarious nature that it is liable to snap upon an amendment of this kind, I want to see him go upon record and let his loyalty be determined.

We have had altogether too much of holding up hands and professing loyalty to silver when there was no opportunity to enact it into a law, and we have had a scuttling to the moss and the deep places in the pool when it came to voting upon measures of this kind. I shall insist upon the amendment being voted upon at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURROWS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. I do not know how he would vote upon this proposition, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called).

The announcement that I made concerning the pairs of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] will stand on this vote as on the preceding vote.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I will announce the pair of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] for the day. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If the Senator from Georgia were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], but as we are of one mind on this question, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. Will his colleague inform me how he would vote if present?

Mr. CAMERON. I think my colleague would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. TURPIE. I withhold my vote. If the senior Senator from Minnesota were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] is absent and unpaired. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON] to the Senator from New Jersey and vote "nay."

Mr. BLANCHARD. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CAFFERY] is detained from the Chamber. A pair has been announced between him and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. I feel justified in stating that if my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" upon this amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. I withheld my vote, not knowing how the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] would vote, but upon the announcement of his colleague that he would vote "nay" I desire to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO. Has the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has voted.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 54; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Allen,	Butler,	Irby,	Roach,
Bacon,	Call,	Kyle,	Stewart,
Baker,	Cameron,	Lindsay,	Thurston.
Berry,	Cannon,	Mills,	
Blanchard,	Hill,	Peffer,	
Brown,	Hoar,	Pritchard,	

NAYS—54.

Allison,	Gear,	Martin,	Shoup,
Bate,	George,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Squire,
Burrows,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Wis.	Teller,
Carter,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Chandler,	Gray,	Morrill,	Vest,
Chilton,	Hale,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Clark,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Palmer,	Walthall,
Daniel,	Hawley,	Pasco,	Warren,
Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Elkins,	Lodge,	Platt,	White,
Faulkner,	McBride,	Proctor,	Wilson.
Frye,	McMillan,	Pugh,	
Gallinger,	Mantle,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—14.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Pettigrew,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Davis,	Quay,	Wolcott.
Brice,	Gordon,	Sewell,	
Caffery,	Jones, Nev.	Smith,	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. MORRILL. I offer an amendment to come in as a proviso after the first section of the substitute proposed by the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the first section of the committee amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That the seigniorage upon all coinage of silver under this act shall be retained by the United States equal in amount to the difference between the coining value and the commercial value of silver bullion when presented at the mint.

Mr. MORRILL. That seems to me so fair a proposition that it can hardly be objected to by anybody. Certainly the United States ought not to be compelled to work for nothing and to add about 2 cents to the cost and to the value of the silver dollar. When the French Government had their mints open to free coinage they often asked more than the cost for seigniorage, because there was a little more difference between the coining value and the actual value of silver and gold coin. This ought to be taken for the benefit of the Government. I think those who live in silver States, who are so anxious to bestow the beneficence of free coinage upon the whole country, will be glad to take away the selfish part of the bill, so that it will not be said that the silver mines are to profit by all the difference there is between the coining value and the commercial value of silver bullion.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not know why we should object to having silver certificates out for this silver. What objection is there? They are the best money we have, and about all the money we have. If you go to a bank and get anything besides silver certificates I shall be disappointed. I do not believe that outside of the banks, the hoards, and the Treasury Department, there is $30,000,000 of Treasury notes in circulation. The $330,000,000 of silver certificates, redeemable in silver coin, do three-fourths—I think four-fifths—of all the business that is done in the United States. That is practically all the money we have. If we could have more of that kind of money I think we would be better off.

Mr. PEFFER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont would, I have no doubt, be acceptable to every gold monometallist on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. It is an utter giving away, an utter sale, an utter barter by the silver men—the alleged silver men—of all that there is in the silver proposition. If there is anything in the principle involved in the free and unlimited coinage of silver, it is that as among metals gold and silver are exactly alike, one of equal value with the other so far as their money function is concerned.

The Senator from Vermont knows, as we all do, that the law protects the value of gold. The law fixes the value of gold. It has done so for nearly a thousand years, certainly for five hundred years, while we have thrown silver open upon the market to find its price level with corn, and wheat, and cotton, and tobacco, and horses, and cattle, and all other items of property.

Now, if we are to allow the Government to take the difference between the coinage value and the bullion value of silver, we give the entire question away. So far as the Populists are concerned, we shall undoubtedly vote solidly against this amendment. I know that the silver men upon the part of both sides of the Chamber, Democrats and Republicans alike, when we had a vote upon this question in 1893, voted in favor of a substantially similar proposition. It was presented by the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. Last year, in January, just a little more than a year from this time, the Senator from Arkansas proposed a bill, and it was advertised to the country as a free-coinage bill. The newspaper people were waiting anxiously day after day until a vote would be taken, in order that the silver strength of the Senate might be exhibited. Instead of being a free-coinage bill, the first seven or eight sections provided for the issuing of $500,000,000 of bonds in order to redeem the greenbacks. It did not reach the silver question until it came to the ninth section, and that embraced a proposition exactly similar to the one embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. I call the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country through the Senate to the vote that is about to be taken upon this amendment.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, although I recognize his great experience and general soundness upon these questions. I do not believe it is wise, whatever may be our system of coinage or the attitude of this Government toward the two metals, to attempt what has been so often discussed, to go into a matter of buying either one metal or the other. If we are to have free coinage we will have it; and I do not know that the consequences which I apprehend from such a state of things will be much worse than would result from buying silver or buying gold and paying the seigniorage into the Treasury of the United States.

I can understand the philosophy of bimetallism, but I do not understand the philosophy of the abnormal situation in which the United States has been for so many years since 1878, or that in which it would be put by this amendment, which is not recognized, I believe, by any sound-money men, so called, as consistent with their theories.

But, Mr. President, I was very much struck just now with something that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] said in regard to the curious situation in which we found ourselves on July 10, 1890, when the compromise measure known as the Sherman bill passed this body.

The Senator from Colorado said that he knew—I did not understand him to say that he had been told, but that he knew—that there was no danger of the President of the United States not vetoing a free-silver measure at that time.

Mr. TELLER. I did not understand the Senator's remark.

Mr. GRAY. I say I understood the Senator from Colorado to say that he knew—not that he had been told personally by the President—that the President would veto such a measure.

Mr. TELLER. I did not say how I knew it, but I said I knew it.

Mr. GRAY. That is just what I said, that the Senator said he knew it. To show the condition of apprehension at that time, which brought about the so-called compromise measure of 1890, I want to read from the interesting history recently published by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] in which he describes the situation. He says:

> The situation at that time was critical. A large majority of the Senate favored free silver, and it was feared that the small majority against it in the other House might yield and agree to it. The silence of the President on the matter gave rise to an apprehension that if a free-coinage bill should pass both Houses he would not feel at liberty to veto it.

I thought that ought to be read as a contribution to the history of that interesting period.

Mr. VOORHEES. Who is that from?

Mr. GRAY. From the book of the honorable Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], Forty Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet. So that it is well for the truth of history that we should remember that the Senator from Kentucky was correct when he said there was a time recently in the history of the Congress of the United States when it was entirely probable that a free-coinage measure might have been passed.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I shall vote for this amendment. I thought I would not vote for any amendment to the bill except the one proposed by the committee; but on seeing it at the desk and on considering it, particularly with reference to the source from which it proceeds, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is a very conservative member of that committee, and in view of his relations to all those who are considered as exceedingly conservative on that question, I think we may be able to get some legislation if we shall adopt this amendment in good faith, while I do not think we shall be able to get any if we simply adopt the amendment of the committee. That is the reason why I am willing to vote for the amendment. I think a half loaf is better than no bread; and I believe it is better for the people of the United States to have what help they can get in this way than not to get any. The condition we are in at present is that we are getting no coinage of silver whatever.

I believe the expansion to be derived from the adoption of the amendment of the honorable Senator from Vermont would give to the people additional money, and additional silver money. It will simply preserve in the Treasury an amount of silver that shall be equal to the difference between the coin value and the bullion value, while the silver coin representing the entire gold value of the full amount of silver bullion received would be issued as money, thus increasing the primary money of the country. In other words, it would be conforming somewhat to the amendments proposed some years ago by the honorable Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and others, increasing the ratio from 16 to 20 or 24, or some other practicable ratio, without changing the size and weight of the coin, as he proposed to do. That is what it would amount to; and I believe we ought, if possible, to get such legislation as will afford some measure of relief to the people of the United States, and I do not think there will be any injustice in it to the mine owners. I think they would get an additional market for their product, and the people of the United States, who create this additional value, under present existing circumstances, would have the benefit of the difference and not the mine owners.

I am not trying to discriminate against the mine owners. I should be willing to have the whole business on the line of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and that the people of the United States and of the world should enjoy all the benefits of such a law; but inasmuch as we know distinctly that we can not secure such legislation, I say it may be wise for us to listen to the counsel of the honorable Senator from Vermont, and to get this amendment incorporated in the bill. Perhaps, by this means, we may be able to secure the passage of a bill to which the President will affix his signature, and thus get a favorable result. It seems to me, as I said before, that it is better to take this half loaf than not to have any bread at all.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Washington allow me to ask him a question before he sits down?

Mr. SQUIRE. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask if he thinks there would be any difference between the bullion value and the mint value of silver if we had free and unlimited coinage?

Mr. SQUIRE. I will answer the Senator from Idaho. I believe that in time there would not be any difference, but I believe it would require time to adjust the present difference. There has been a disparity as to the value of the money metals when silver has enjoyed high privileges in that respect. I believe time will be required to close up the gap between the two metals.

Mr. DUBOIS. I was going to say, if the Senator would allow me, that the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver believe that immediately on the enactment of such a law the difference between the mint value and the bullion value would disappear.

Mr. SQUIRE. There is a wide difference between the views of extremists on this subject. The only safe thing for us to adopt at present is the middle path. We know that the friends of silver not only in this country, but in Germany, France, and England, believe that it is wise and proper for the money metals of the world to suffer no appreciable diminution; that there should be rather an increase than a decrease in the money of primary payment; and we know that there are men here willing to work in that direction, who have been doing it for years, and there does not appear to be any coming together between the two extremes. On the other hand, the gold men insist upon the gold standard, and apply that touchstone exclusively to the currency of the whole world. The chasm between these extremists is as wide as that between Dives and Lazarus. Thus nothing is done and the debtor class continues to suffer. I would have relief afforded by bringing both extremes together in the middle path, which I consider to be the path of safety. I take my stand with the silver men, but I am willing to accept a part if I can not secure all.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am in favor of this amendment, but I do not rise for the purpose of discussing it at this moment. As all debate is to end at 2 o'clock, I desire to explain at this time an amendment which I propose to offer to this bill when it comes out of Committee of the Whole and into the Senate, an amendment which has already been laid before the Senate, and on which there has been some slight discussion. The bill that came from the House of Representatives, as I said before, it is quite obvious can not pass the Senate. The silver substitute reported by the majority of the Finance Committee, to which I am utterly opposed as a measure utterly disastrous to business and leading directly to silver monometallism, can not pass the House of Representatives. We know that it is merely to go into conference and end there. The amendment I intend to offer does not bear on the question of gold or silver or the redemption of greenbacks; and as this free-silver substitute is an amendment to a bond bill, it is attempted to make provision for a popular loan, to be paid for in lawful money as needed for the purpose of coast defenses.

The Secretary of War has informed the country that it would take twenty years, at the present rate of progress, to supply the guns necessary for coast defenses; that it will take seventy years, at the present rate of progress, to supply the positions to put those guns on. The highest military authorities say that with a lump appropriation for a comprehensive plan we can have our coasts defended adequately and as they ought to be inside of three years; and it should be done in a simple, economical, intelligent method.

The amendment which I propose to offer bears simply on the creation of a popular loan in order to put that money into the Treasury. No one would undertake to raise eighty million or one hundred million dollars, which is needed for coast defenses, from revenue at once. It can not be done. The only way is a loan.

I desire to offer the amendment at this time. If the silver substitute is to perish in conference, as we know, and the bond bill is to perish in conference, there seems to be no good reason why out of the wreck we should not at least save a measure which will provide for coast defenses to be established by law hereafter under such acts as Congress may see fit to pass.

I merely desire to give this explanation of the amendment which I propose to offer, because I can see that the debate will be cut off before the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. SQUIRE. I do not wish to make a speech. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he is well advised when he states that these coast defenses can be provided in the term of three years? As I understand it, after some diligent application on my part to this subject in committee, it will be impossible to provide proper coast defenses, even with unlimited supplies of money, within three years, or anywhere near that. In a few days the statements of the great experts, the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of Ordnance, made before the Committee on Coast Defenses, will be printed, so that the Senator from Massachusetts can read and ascertain that the time required will be much greater.

Mr. LODGE. In making that statement I assume that there will be money in the Treasury to meet it.

Mr. SQUIRE. Even without regard to money.

Mr. LODGE. Very well. Supposing the money to be appropriated, I understand on the highest military authority, the head of the Army, that it can be done in three years.

Mr. SQUIRE. I think that the Senator from Massachusetts is incorrect about the time required.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, Congress has been called upon to give immediate relief to the Treasury. So urgently was that relief needed that we were requested to remain here during the Christmas holidays to see if it were not possible to perfect some measure which would relieve the drain upon the Treasury. In answer to that request from the Executive we have before us the pending bill from the House of Representatives as one of the series

of measures proposed—a bill to authorize the issuance of 3 per cent bonds and short-term certificates to meet any deficiency with regard to the current revenues. The Senate Committee on Finance, being hostile politically to the Administration, has responded by proposing the unlimited coinage of silver.

Mr. President, it was as well known on the day the pending substitute was reported as it is now that the present conditions upon the silver question are precisely what they were in 1890. It will be impossible to have this provision become a law at this time, or at any time prior to March, 1897.

Mr. MORGAN. Why?

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Alabama asks me why. The public declarations of the President of the United States must convince every man in the country that a bill containing such a provision can not meet with his approval. I stated a moment ago, if I mistake not, that such a provision could not receive the assent of a coordinate branch of this Government.

Mr. ALLEN. The Democratic platform calls for it.

Mr. GORMAN. Under the conditions which exist in this Chamber the advocates of the free coinage of silver can not themselves agree upon any proposition, as has been evidenced by this debate. Those who desire that silver shall be a metal of final redemption have not, as appears by the votes which have been taken to-day, been able to agree upon any proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to call his attention to the fact, which I know he will admit as fully as anybody on this floor, that it is no part of the duty of the Congress of the United States to legislate under the directions of the President of the United States. Their legislation must be independent.

Mr. GORMAN. I fully agree to that proposition, and only regret that there has not been more independence in the past. The Senator from Alabama will not go further than will I to resent the encroachments of any Executive, and to resent any suggestions or recommendations, except those he is bound to make by the Constitution of the United States, to which due weight should be given, without intimidation or the fear of political power or patronage from the President.

Mr. President, with a view to bring this question to a direct vote, I move that the amendment of the Committee on Finance be laid upon the table.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. There is a motion pending.

Mr. GORMAN. The amendment pending goes with it.

Mr. MILLS. Will the motion of the Senator from Maryland carry the bill with it?

Mr. GORMAN. No; the bill itself will stand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland to lay the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance on the table.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas and Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER. I do not think anybody understands what the motion is. I do not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state the pending question. The Senator from Maryland moves to lay upon the table the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. The substitute of the committee?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The substitute of the committee, which carries with it the pending amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM's name was called). The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has a standing pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] has a standing pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN]. A transfer of those pairs has been made, so that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. The other two Senators are released, so that they may vote.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He is detained, as I before announced, by a death in his family. I should vote "nay," were he present.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. Were he present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON] and vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] is unavoidably detained from the Senate, and is paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay." I suppose the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] would vote "yea."

Mr. GORMAN. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] would vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with the pairs, I will state that if the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask that the pairs be announced.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read the pairs.

The Reporter read the pairs as appearing above.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 43; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Allison,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Palmer,
Baker,	Gear,	Lodge,	Platt,
Burrows,	Gibson,	McBride,	Proctor,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Sherman,
Chandler,	Gray,	Martin,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hale,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Elkins,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Wetmore.
Faulkner,	Hill,	Murphy,	
Frye,	Hoar,	Nelson,	

NAYS—43.

Allen,	Chilton,	Mills,	Stewart,
Bacon,	Clark,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Pasco,	Tillman,
Berry,	Daniel,	Peffer,	Turpie,
Blanchard,	George,	Perkins,	Vest,
Brown,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Irby,	Pritchard,	Walthall,
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,	Warren,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Roach,	White,
Cannon,	Kyle,	Shoup,	Wilson.
Carter,	Mantle,	Squire,	

NOT VOTING—12.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Dubois,	Morgan,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the Senate refused to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of section 1 of the committee's amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That a seigniorage upon all coinage of silver under this act shall be retained by the United States equal in amount to the difference between the coining value and the commercial value of silver bullion when presented at the mint.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—33.

Allison,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Proctor,
Baker,	Gear,	Martin,	Sherman,
Burrows,	Gibson,	Mills,	Squire,
Caffery,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Wis.	Thurston,
Chandler,	Hale,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Davis,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Wetmore.
Elkins,	Hill,	Nelson,	
Faulkner,	Hoar,	Palmer,	
Frye,	Lodge,	Platt,	

NAYS—44.

Allen,	Chilton,	Lindsay,	Shoup,
Bacon,	Clark,	McBride,	Stewart,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mantle,	Teller,
Berry,	Daniel,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Tillman,
Blanchard,	George,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Brown,	Gray,	Peffer,	Vest,
Butler,	Harris,	Perkins,	Voorhees,
Call,	Irby,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Jones, Ark.	Pritchard,	Warren,
Cannon,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	White,
Carter,	Kyle,	Roach,	Wilson.

NOT VOTING—12.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Dubois,	Morgan,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Are amendments still in order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will have read the agreement in regard to a vote. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the agreement.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. HARRIS. * * * I should be glad to have an agreement that after the recess which is to begin at 4 o'clock this afternoon, when we break up to-night, it be to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, and after the Senator from Vermont shall have concluded his remarks, that the Senate proceed upon amendments under the five-minute rule until we reach a final vote upon the passage of the bill at the earliest hour to-morrow that the Senate may be ready to come to such vote, not later than 2 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent for that agreement.

* * * * * * *

The Senator from New York, as does every Senator other than he, understands the main and primary object I have in view. It is to reach a final vote by 2 o'clock to-morrow, in order that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] in charge of the pending bill may be at liberty to leave the city for a short period, as it is important to him to leave at that time. Now, I shall have no objection to the motion suggested by the Senator from New York except the consumption of time. But if I can get the agreement that we shall come to a vote at or before 2 o'clock to-morrow upon the final passage of the bill, I care not how the time may be consumed until we reach that hour.

Mr. HILL. Then, with the understanding that the motion to substitute, if any, shall be made prior to 2 o'clock—is that satisfactory? Without debate?

Mr. HARRIS. If it be without debate, and the yeas and nays upon it, if the yeas and nays be ordered, shall not go beyond 2 o'clock, I am quite content to accept the suggestion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am quite content, too.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHANDLER. I certainly understood that, while debate was to cease at 2 o'clock, amendments were not to be cut off at that hour, but that we were to proceed to vote upon amendments and the bill without debate and finish the bill. I did not suppose any Senator understood it differently. I do not know now that any Senator understood it differently.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has had read the agreement as the Chair understood it to be made by the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. My object was distinctly, or, at least, as distinctly as I was able to explain myself, that the Senate should come to a vote upon the final passage of the bill at 2 o'clock to-day. That was agreed to by the unanimous consent of the Senate. I submit that any amendment offered now or asked to be voted upon now is in violation of the agreement that we reached yesterday.

Mr. LODGE. On the point of order that has been made, I will state that day before yesterday when there was a discussion in the Senate as to coming to an agreement, I then asked if amendments were to be cut off. I was told that of course they were not to be cut off. I for one never should have agreed to any such proposition. I have an amendment which I desire to offer when the bill has reached another stage, and it is certainly something entirely new to attempt to cut off votes on amendments. I do not think any such understanding was had with the Senate, certainly not when I was present.

Mr. HOAR. If my colleague will allow me, I will suggest that when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] offered his amendment he was earnestly appealed to by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to delay offering it until the bill came into the Senate and not to press it at that time. And although the Senator did not withdraw his amendment, that argument passed unchallenged by the whole Senate that he would be at liberty to offer it at a later stage.

Mr. PALMER. I desire merely to make an inquiry for information with reference to a single amendment. Yesterday I gave notice that at some time I would offer an amendment, which is printed on page 1148. I desire to ask whether, in the opinion of the Chair, I may still offer the amendment and ask for a vote on it?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will answer the Senator from Illinois when——

Mr. HARRIS. The Chair has never held, so far as my observation has gone, that as a question of order the Chair could enforce a unanimous-consent agreement. It rests upon the observance of the body to the agreement it has made. I have raised no question of order; I shall raise no question of order; but I repeat that any amendment offered now at this hour is in violation of the express agreement of yesterday.

Mr. FAULKNER. If Senators will recur to the RECORD where it shows the proceeding at the time the agreement was made, they will clearly see that the question of amendment and the question of consent as to time of debate on amendments embraced one proposition, and that if amendments are now permitted, necessarily the other rule will have to follow, which would be the agreement as to five minutes' discussion. I do not think I exaggerate when I say I have seen a dozen agreements of this character, and no amendments were ever offered after the time was reached when it was agreed to vote upon the final passage of the bill, except such amendments as were pending at the time when the hour arrived. Therefore I feel compelled under the unanimous-consent agreement to refrain from offering any amendment after 2 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires at this stage to answer the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. The agreement entered into, as appears from the RECORD, which has been read, is not a rule of the Senate and can not be enforced by the Chair. The observance of an agreement is in the hands of the Senate. The Chair will recognize amendments that are offered under the rules of the Senate. The Senator from Kansas first addressed the Chair.

Mr. BAKER. I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me to make a statement? The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] refers to a statement I made. I was not present when the agreement was made and I did not myself know that we had either the five-minutes rule or the 2-o'clock rule.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me; it was not simply the view he took, but it was made in full Senate, so that the whole Senate understood it.

Mr. TELLER. That might have been upon the theory that we would get the bill into the Senate before 2 o'clock. I should feel very much embarrassed if I had misled the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], but as he did not accept my proposition, of course I have nothing to say.

Mr. COCKRELL. I beg Senators to observe in regard to this unanimous-consent agreement that it will be a dangerous precedent in the Senate for the remainder of this session.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Such an agreement has never been violated before.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not recall that such an agreement has ever been violated in the whole history of the Senate. This will be the first time that it has been violated, and its consequences may not be pleasant in the future.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Before the Senator from Kansas offers his amendment, I should like to have the question settled whether there is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. We are threatened by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri with woeful things if we violate a consent agreement, as they understand it. I do not think that Senators upon this side of the Chamber who wish to offer amendments are going to offer them under the implied presumption that they are offering them in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. I will read——

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will state any language of mine that amounts to a threat. I should be glad if he would state it, if he finds a threat in anything I have said.

Mr. CHANDLER. I except the Senator, then. His manner was somewhat threatening.

Mr. HARRIS. It is, perhaps, always so.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Missouri certainly warned us that woeful consequences would follow if further amendments were offered to this bill. Mr. President, the facts are very simple. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into I understood, and every Senator upon this side of the Chamber understood, that, although debate was to cease at 2 o'clock, there was to be no limitation upon the offering of amendments, or the voting upon amendments, either those of which notice had been given or those which might be offered.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me just there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I want first to answer what the Senator from West Virginia has already stated.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to correct the Senator from New Hampshire just at this point. The RECORD shows that in reply to the question of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] stated that the motion the Senator from New York proposed to make would be before 2 o'clock, and if the yeas and nays would not be taken by 2 o'clock the motion would have to fall under the consent agreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not so remember.

Mr. FAULKNER. The RECORD shows it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The RECORD does not show it. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Tennessee had a discussion as to whether a motion to proceed after 2 o'clock to take up for consideration some other bill would be in order, and the Senator from Tennessee insisted that it would not be in order. The Senator from New York, I think—he can speak for himself—conceded that that might not be in order, but it was conceded with equal distinctness that any motion whatever applicable to the pending bill would be in order after 2 o'clock. Now, I will read——

Mr. FAULKNER. I wish the Senator from New Hampshire, as he questions the correctness of my statement, would permit me to read from the RECORD. Will the Senator permit me to read what I rely upon?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will in a moment, if the Senator will wait. I read from the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. In

the course of his discussion with the Senator from New York, he said:

Mr. HARRIS. A motion in the shape of an amendment in the nature of a substitute would certainly fall within the unanimous-consent agreement that I have asked for.

That is to say, it would be admissible.

A motion to lay upon the table would be perfectly legitimate in my opinion under such a unanimous-consent rule. But a motion, if such rule shall be carried, to take up for consideration some other bill would be wholly inconsistent with the very object and purpose that I have in view, and I hope the Senator from New York will exclude that proposition from his suggestion. Each of his other suggestions I concede as being perfectly consistent with the unanimous-consent agreement I ask for.

A little later the following colloquy took place:

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the Senator from Tennessee does not preclude any motion whatever applicable to the pending bill?
Mr. PLATT. Not to preclude any parliamentary motion.
Mr. HARRIS. Any motion that can legitimately be made under the rules of the Senate I would hold to be in order under the unanimous-consent rule——
Mr. CHANDLER. As to the pending bill.
Mr. HARRIS. With the single exception that debate is to be limited to five minutes.
Mr. CHANDLER. Upon amendments?
Mr. HARRIS. Upon amendments.
Mr. CHANDLER. That is the way I understand the request.

And I say to the Senator from Missouri, who I do not think was here at the time the unanimous consent was agreed upon, and who had better ascertain what a unanimous agreement is before he threatens Senators upon this side of the Chamber with any great extremity in the near future, that he should find out what the unanimous agreement was before he threatens us; because——

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Because, in my judgment, although debate was to cease at 2 o'clock and we were to proceed to the final passage of the bill, it was distinctly understood that all amendments were to be in order.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to have the Senator from New Hampshire read what was said just before the unanimous consent of the Senate was given. That is the true criterion.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from West Virginia can read it.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I desire to bring it down to the exact proposition that I stated when I rose to address the Senate and was interrupted, and to read the conclusion of the discussion in regard to the unanimous-consent agreement. The matters to which the Senator was referring were in reference to a motion to lay on the table or a motion to indefinitely postpone, which motions of course would be in order at any time. But in the latter part of the colloquy which resulted in the consent agreement the following appears:

Mr. HILL. Then, with the understanding that the motion to substitute, if any, shall be made prior to 2 o'clock—is that satisfactory? Without debate?
Mr. HARRIS. If it be without debate, and the yeas and nays upon it, if the yeas and nays be ordered, shall not go beyond 2 o'clock. I am quite content to accept the suggestion.

Now, that excludes everything but a motion to indefinitely postpone or a motion to lay on the table upon proceeding to the third reading of the bill.

Mr. GRAY. Thereupon the consent of the Senate was given.

Mr. FAULKNER. Thereupon, immediately after that colloquy, the consent of the Senate was given.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question. Is not the reservation distinctly made of any motion whatever applicable to the pending bill?

Mr. GRAY. Provided it was before 2 o'clock.

Mr. CHANDLER. When the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] stated, "Not to preclude any parliamentary motion," I ask whether a motion to amend is not a motion applicable to the pending bill?

Mr. FAULKNER. Any motion applicable to the pending bill not involving amendments, the motions involving amendments being accompanied with the five-minute rule.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of what use would it be for us to discuss amendments here under the five-minute rule until 2 o'clock and then not be able to have them voted on?

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me one word?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. GORMAN. There has never been, I think, in the history of the Senate, any violation of an understanding of this sort. There have been sometimes, however, as there appears to be in this case, a disagreement as to the precise terms of an agreement, and whenever that occurs a liberal interpretation has always been given. Now, I trust we will proceed with the consideration of this measure, and, in view of the misunderstanding, permit amendments to be offered and to be voted upon without debate. The main idea suggested by the Senator from Tennessee yesterday, as we all understand, was that we should not only in the interests of the country dispose of this matter promptly, but it was a personal matter with the Senator in charge of the bill, as he must leave the city before 4 o'clock to-day. I ask that we may now go on, permitting any Senator to offer an amendment and vote upon it without debate, so that we may terminate the matter before half past 3 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland ask for unanimous consent?

Mr. GORMAN. I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HARRIS. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. On the 20th day of January, 1896, an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill was offered and printed. I desire now to have a vote upon that amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas will be stated from the desk.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1 of the amendment reported by the committee add the following proviso:

Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only.

Mr. BAKER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I hope that I may have the unanimous consent of the Senate to speak for a minute or two. An agreement made in the Senate for the disposition of a bill has never, in my experience, been violated, and I trust it will not be done in this case. Although I was not present during any part of the debate, having been detained at home, I must say that I can not read the statements of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]—the last one made—without feeling myself bound, as a member of the Senate, to proceed to take a vote upon the passage of the bill as it now stands. It seems to me that we ought to be very careful to avoid even the appearance of a violation of an understanding of this kind, notwithstanding that I hope my honorable friend from Tennessee will allow (as there has been a misunderstanding here among Senators) half an hour, by unanimous consent, so that the vote can be taken upon amendments. I wish to be guided entirely by the agreement made in my absence. I feel bound by it, and would not offer an amendment under the circumstances.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRIS. I simply——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. PALMER. I desire to say that, after a review of this whole matter, I concluded that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] was the best interpreter of his own purposes. On page 1140 of the RECORD it will be seen that the Senator from Tennessee said:

The Senator from New York, as does every Senator other than he, understands the main and primary object I have in view. It is to reach a final vote by 2 o'clock to-morrow, in order that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] in charge of the pending bill may be at liberty to leave the city for a short period, as it is important to him to leave at that time. Now, I shall have no objection to the motion suggested by the Senator from New York except the consumption of time.

That, in my judgment, is conclusive as showing that the real purpose was that there should be a final vote at 2 o'clock; and I withhold the amendment I suggested.

Mr. GRAY. That is right.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let us have a vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BAKER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senate will agree to the proposition of the Senator from Ohio. I have been here a long time. I see no reason why we should violate the consent rule; and it can easily be avoided by agreeing by unanimous consent to an extension of the time. I hope that the proposition of the Senator from Ohio will be accepted by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. I had but one object in asking for a consent agreement. If anybody was deceived as to what it meant it was his own fault, or the fault of my inability to state exactly what I meant; but I think the RECORD shows exactly what I meant. If this unanimous-consent agreement is to be disregarded—the Senator from New Hampshire charged me with uttering a threat a while ago; I will not utter a threat now, but no more consent agreements will ever be made while I hold a seat on this floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas will suspend a moment. The Chair desires the attention of the Senator from Ohio. Will the Senator from Ohio state his request in the form he desires to have it submitted to the Senate?

Mr. SHERMAN. I hope that half an hour, say, will be given for the consideration, without debate, of such amendments as

may be offered. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that that may be agreed upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair submits the request of the Senator from Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

Mr. BAKER. I think I can solve this question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The Senator from Kansas is recognized. The amendment has been stated and the yeas and nays demanded.

Mr. BAKER. There seems to be some misunderstanding with reference to the agreement. I supposed when the agreement was made that all amendments which had been noted before, and were of record for two or three days, and some of them longer, would be disposed of.

Mr. HARRIS. If before 2 o'clock.

Mr. BAKER. But it seems we are now practicing in a justice's court and relying upon technicalities. In order to avoid any question, I will forego my amendment at this time, and therefore restore the dignity of the Senate. I withdraw the proposed amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas is withdrawn.

Mr. HAWLEY. I beg leave to give notice that, if there be time after action upon the pending bill shall have been concluded, I shall move for an executive session. The business is in arrears.

Mr. LODGE. I desire, on the point which has been made by the Senator from Kansas, to say one word. I gave notice of an amendment before any agreement was reached. I gave notice of it because I desired to have a vote upon it. I consider that it is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement to cut off those amendments which were proposed and printed and had been discussed. I never should have assented to a unanimous agreement which, at a given hour, was going to cut off amendments. I understood that the amendments of which notice had been given were to have a vote without debate, and everyone else who had offered an amendment understood it that way. I consider it a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement to try and cut off debate at 2 o'clock. By the consent rule, as I understand it, I shall offer my amendment at the proper time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I was present in the Senate yesterday when this unanimous consent was given, and therefore I feel bound by it. On the 20th of December I offered an amendment to this bill, as section 5, which provides that—

> It shall be the duty of the Secretary to coin all of the silver bullion now in the Treasury at the rate of not less than $3,000,000 per month: and such coin shall constitute a reserve fund for the redemption of the notes herein provided for.

And it then provides for the issuance of notes. It was my sincere desire to offer this amendment; but in the light of the unanimous-consent agreement yesterday I do not feel as though I should be warranted in violating it by offering the amendment at this or at any other time without unanimous consent. Therefore, I am constrained to withhold it in observation of that agreement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLS and Mr. GORMAN called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). The announcement I made on the motion to lay the bill on the table relative to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] being paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] I desire to stand on this vote as before announced.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I announce that I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am generally paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], but I have transferred that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON], and I vote "nay." The Senator from New Jersey, if present, would also vote "nay."

Mr. TELLER (when Mr. WOLCOTT'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] is unavoidably detained from the Senate and is paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MORGAN. I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask that the pairs be read by the Reporter as they were stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read as requested.

The Reporter read the statement of pairs appearing above.

Mr. GALLINGER. I announce the pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. I will also state concerning the pair of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that if he were present, he would vote "nay" upon the pending question.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 34; as follows:

YEAS—43.

Allen,	Chilton,	Mills,	Stewart,
Bacon,	Clark,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Pasco,	Tillman,
Berry,	Daniel,	Peffer,	Turpie,
Blanchard,	George,	Perkins,	Vest,
Brown,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Irby,	Pritchard,	Walthall,
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,	Warren,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Roach,	White,
Cannon,	Kyle,	Shoup,	Wilson.
Carter,	Mantle,	Squire,	

NAYS—34.

Allison,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Palmer,
Baker,	Gear,	Lodge,	Platt,
Burrows,	Gibson,	McBride,	Proctor,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Sherman,
Chandler,	Gray,	Martin,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hale,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Elkins,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Wetmore.
Faulkner,	Hill,	Murphy,	
Frye,	Hoar,	Nelson,	

NOT VOTING—12.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Dubois,	Morgan,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to offer an amendment of four lines, which I shall read, with the permission of the Senate. I propose to add, as section 5, the following:

> From and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall not issue any bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government unless Congress shall hereafter first authorize the same, any act of Congress now in force to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HILL. If we are going to maintain the unanimous-consent agreement, let us maintain it. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and still open to amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Do I understand that I may offer my amendment now? ["No!" "No!"]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair heretofore recognized the Senator to offer his amendment, and it was withdrawn. If the Senator desires to offer the amendment now, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. BAKER. If it is in order so to do, I desire to have it voted upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has stated his position in regard to it. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. FRYE. It is as much against the unanimous-consent agreement as it was before.

Mr. HARRIS. If the rule is to be observed, it is not consistent with the consent agreement. If it is to be violated, the Chair has no power over it, I grant, and I raise no question of order; but it is in violation of the consent agreement of yesterday.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I simply desire to again state that I conceive the violation of the unanimous-consent agreement came with the attempt to cut off amendments of which notice had been given, which everyone who had them, including the Senator from Kansas and myself, understood were not to be cut off, and that a vote was to be had on the bill and amendments. I regard the violation of the agreement as coming from those who attempted to cut off the vote on such amendments and have kept us here an hour talking about it.

Mr. HALE. I only wish to contribute to the discussion the understanding that I had of the agreement. I heard the appeal of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] with reference to the desire of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] to leave town and to have a time fixed for the vote; but I supposed that with that agreement, as customarily made in such cases, when the hour was fixed, whatever it was, that the Senate would proceed to vote upon the bill and amendments then pending, and that no other amendments could afterwards be offered. That was my understanding.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the offering of my amendment is to bring up at this time the same old question again, over which there seems to be so much feeling, of course, I again withdraw it, but I supposed the unanimous-consent agreement was off.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator for the purpose of offering his amendment. It is for the Senator to decide whether or not he will again offer it.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to make an appeal to my honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], of whose desire to be perfectly fair and just nobody who has ever served with him in the Senate or anywhere else will express a doubt. This is not a question of violating a unanimous-consent agreement, and the Senator certainly would not want to fasten upon any one of his colleagues the charge

of a willingness to violate such an agreement. It is a question of a misunderstanding whether the Senator be right or somebody else.

There are some Senators here who had given notice long ago of a purpose to offer certain amendments. They have had them printed, and have declared they should move them when the bill came up. They did not understand that they were cut off by the agreement yesterday. They say so on their honor as gentlemen. I think they were cut off. I think the Senator from Tennessee is right. I think the last sentence he uttered, which was: "With the understanding that the substitute is to be offered before 2 o'clock, I consent." A substitute is only an amendment, and the Senator implied when he uttered that, that he supposed the substitute had to be offered before 2 o'clock; it was an amendment to be offered. So I concede he is right.

But I appeal to the Senator from Tennessee now to consent that those Senators who had given notice of amendments, who had them printed, and who say that they understood when the consent was reached that they were to be at liberty to offer them, be permitted to offer them now. It does not make much difference to-day; but it is a very serious thing indeed to have the Senate adjourn with any Senator thinking that any other has violated a consent, or with any Senator thinking that he has been compelled by an inadvertence to forego what he deemed his duty to the country or his constituents in offering amendments. I propose that the agreement be so construed that Senators who had given notice of amendments which they expected to offer, and say that they did not understand they were to be cut off when they consented to this agreement, may be permitted to move those amendments now, and have them voted on without debate. I think that will settle the whole matter satisfactorily to everybody.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, neither the Senator from Massachusetts nor any other Senator would go further to oblige his associates here than I. I had an object in asking for the consent rule yesterday. That object will be fatally defeated if we do not come to a vote on this bill in the next ten minutes.

Mr. HOAR. It can be done in the next ten minutes by adopting my suggestion.

Mr. HARRIS. There are numerous amendments of which notice has been given. I started out with an object; I adhere to it. With the most ardent desire to oblige everybody, the agreement I asked was put in language as plain as it was possible for me to put it. It can have but one meaning. I adhere to it, and if Senators choose to violate it they have a right to do so. That is all there is of it. ["Regular order!" "Regular order!"]

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue bonds to a total amount of $100,000,000 at such times and in such amounts as may be required to carry out the purposes of this section, as hereinafter described. Said bonds shall be payable in coin twenty years from the date of their issue. They shall be offered at par to the people of the United States in denominations ranging from fifty to one thousand dollars, and shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. The subscriptions to the loan, or to such portion of it as may then be required, shall be opened on July 1, 1896, and at such subsequent dates as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, at all subtreasuries of the United States and at all national banks, and the subscribers shall have the right to pay for the bonds in lawful money of the United States.

The sum of $3,000,000 shall be annually set aside from the revenue of the Government for a sinking fund to pay the bonds issued under this act at maturity, and the $3,000,000 thus annually appropriated shall take precedence of all other appropriations, except those for the sinking fund, now established by law, and for the payment of the principal and interest of the public debt.

The bonds authorized by this act shall constitute a loan, to be known as the "coast-defense loan," and the proceeds of said bonds shall be kept in the Treasury as a fund apart and shall be used only for providing for the defense of the seacoasts and lakes of the United States and for the manufacture of guns, the purchase of sites, and the erection of forts and batteries for that purpose, in accordance with plans prepared by the War Department, as authorized by existing law or by laws hereafter passed by Congress to provide for coast defenses.

Mr. TELLER. I move to lay on the table the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to lay on the table the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was read the third time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LINDSAY and Mr. MILLS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If present, the senior Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the senior Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). In again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], I wish to state that I have been advised that he would vote "nay" on this question were he present. I should vote "yea" if I were not paired.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea." He is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. If the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 35; as follows:

YEAS—42.

Allen,	Chilton,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller,
Bacon,	Clark,	Pasco,	Tillman,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Peffer,	Turpie,
Berry,	Daniel,	Perkins,	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Brown,	Harris,	Pritchard,	Walthall,
Butler,	Irby,	Pugh,	Warren,
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,	White,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Shoup,	Wilson.
Cannon,	Kyle,	Squire,	
Carter,	Mantle,	Stewart,	

NAYS—35.

Allison,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Nelson,
Baker,	Gear,	Lodge,	Palmer,
Burrows,	Gibson,	McBride,	Platt,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Proctor,
Chandler,	Gray,	Martin,	Sherman,
Davis,	Hale,	Mills,	Thurston,
Elkins,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Faulkner,	Hill,	Morrill,	Wetmore.
Frye,	Hoar,	Murphy,	

NOT VOTING—12.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Dubois,	Morgan,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, the title was amended so as to read "A bill to restore the coinage of silver dollars, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

The bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; and

The bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the unanimous consent of the Senate on Monday morning to proceed to the Calendar, if the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] does not object, in order that the resolutions in regard to Cuban independence may be considered by the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 886) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy and fruits, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "the Committee of 1896" was read twice

by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two hours spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

On motion of Mr. CHANDLER, it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 105) for the relief of ex-Naval Cadets John P. J. Ryan, John R. Morris, and Chester Wells, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 105) for the relief of ex-Naval Cadets John P. J. Ryan, John R. Morris, and Chester Wells was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

On motion of Mr. VILAS (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m., Saturday, February 1), the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being until Tuesday, February 4, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1, 1896.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

William H. Cannon, of Wisconsin, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Wisconsin, vice F. W. Oakley, whose term expires February 8, 1896.

James S. McCabe, of Rhode Island, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Rhode Island, vice John E. Kendrick, whose term expires February 9, 1896.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

William H. Anderson, of Maine, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Portland, in the State of Maine, to succeed Mark F. Wentworth, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William Galloway, of McMinnville, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Oregon City, Oreg., vice Peter Raguet, whose term of office will expire February 11, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Arthur A. Maynard, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana, in the place of John J. Wheeler, whose commission expired Jauuary 6, 1896.

Edmund W. Nutter, to be postmaster at East Bridgewater, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William B. Dayton, to be postmaster at Port Jefferson, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in the place of George P. Schryver, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Elmer Winner, to be postmaster at Liberty, in the county of Sullivan and State of New York, in the place of Harvey J. Sarles, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Elizabeth Wolf, to be postmaster at Peshtigo, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Col. John Joseph Coppinger, Twenty-third Infantry, to be brigadier-general.

Infantry arm.

Lieut. Col. Jacob Ford Kent, Eighteenth Infantry, to be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Ovenshine, Fifteenth Infantry, to be colonel.

Lieut. Col. John Henry Page, Twenty-second Infantry, to be colonel.

Lieut. Col. John Newman Andrews, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be colonel.

Maj. Clarence Mitchell Bailey, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. James William Powell, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Loyd Wheaton, Twentieth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. John William French, Fourteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Aaron Simon Daggett, Thirteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Capt. Charles Hobart, Third Infantry, to be major.

Capt. John Nichols Coe, Twentieth Infantry, to be major.

Capt. James Madison Johnson Sanno, Seventh Infantry, to be major.

Capt. William Spencer McCaskey, Twentieth Infantry, to be major.

Capt. Charles Franklin Robe, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be major.

Capt. Philip Howard Ellis, Thirteenth Infantry, to be major.

First Lieut. Charles Grenville Starr, First Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. John James Brereton, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. William Cathcart Buttler, regimental quartermaster, Third Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. James Seymour Rogers, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. George Shaeffer Young, regimental quartermaster, Seventh Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Charles Lee Steele, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Henry Buckman Moon, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. John Henry Hobart Peshine, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Edwin Forbes Glenn, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. George Russell Cecil, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. George Augustine Detchmendy, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Earl Clark Carnahan, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Archibald Atkinson Cabaniss, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Thomas Myron Moody, Twenty-second Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Charles Edgar Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Thomas Hugh McGuire [since resigned], Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. James William McAndrew, Twenty-first Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. John Simon Grisard, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Charles Perren Russ, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Edward Robert Chrisman, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Peter Charles Harris, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Munroe McFarland, Twenty-first Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William Toliver Wilder, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William Herman Wilhelm, Tenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William Roderick Sample, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

1. Corpl. Lawrence Burton Simonds, Company E, Twenty-first Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

2. Corpl. Robert Henry Allen, Troop D, Eighth Cavalry, to be second lieutenant.

3. Q. M. Sergt. Dwight Warren Ryther, Sixth Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

Corps of Engineers.

To be additional second lieutenants:

1. Cadet Edward Hugh Schulz.
2. Cadet Harry Burgess.

Artillery arm.

To be second lieutenants:

6. Cadet Harry Ernest Smith.
9. Cadet Joseph Lippincott Knowlton.
11. Cadet Thales Lucius Ames.

To be additional second lieutenants:

12. Cadet Conway Hillyer Arnold, jr.
15. Cadet Joseph Wheeler, jr.
16. Cadet Adrian Sebastian Fleming.
17. Cadet Brooke Payne.

Cavalry arm.

To be second lieutenants:

5. Cadet Casper Hauzer Conrad, jr.
7. Cadet Harry Howard Stout.
8. Cadet Herbert Arthur White.

13. Cadet Nathan King Averill.
14. Cadet Harry La Tourrette Cavenaugh.

To be additional second lieutenants:

18. Cadet Mortimer Osborne Bigelow.
19. Cadet William Gray Sills.
20. Cadet August Carl Nissen.
25. Cadet Clyde Emile Hawkins.
27. Cadet James Southard Parker.
34. Cadet Joseph Sutherland Herron.
35. Cadet Henry Benjamin Dixon.
37. Cadet George Barnard Pritchard, jr.

Infantry arm.

To be second lieutenants:

3. Cadet John Asa Gurney.
4. Cadet Jens Bugge.
10. Cadet Charles Herman Paine.
21. Cadet Thomas Walter Darrah.
22. Cadet Americus Mitchell.
23. Cadet Perry Lester Miles.
24. Cadet Milton Loomis McGrew.
26. Cadet Lorrain Thompson Richardson.
28. Cadet Charles Roscoe Howland.
29. Cadet Francis Pierpont Siviter.
30. Cadet Morton Fitz Smith.
31. Cadet Louis Meredith Nuttman.
32. Cadet Glenn Hedges Davis.
33. Cadet Franklin Swart Hutton.
36. Cadet Albert Sidney Brookes.
38. Cadet Thomas Francis Dwyer.
39. Cadet Fine Wilson Smith.
40. Cadet Walter Scott McBroom.
41. Cadet Louis Hoffman Lewis.
42. Cadet David Sheridan Stanley.
43. Cadet Benjamin Taylor Simmons.
44. Cadet Joseph Numa Augustin, jr.
45. Cadet Samuel George Creden.
46. Cadet Girard Sturtevant.

To be additional second lieutenants:

47. Cadet Louis Hermann Bash.
48. Cadet Anton Springer, jr.
49. Cadet Frank Bingley Watson.
50. Cadet Oscar Jerome Charles.
51. Cadet Thomas Absalom Pearce.
52. Cadet Daniel Duncan.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John A. Mason, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the Second district of New York.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Cleaves, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Greenport, in the State of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Joseph P. Briare, to be postmaster at Martinez, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California.

J. F. Banning, to be postmaster at Monrovia, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Harlan M. Raymond, to be postmaster at Cumberland Mills, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

Chandler C. Harvey, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine.

John E. Carr, to be postmaster at Nevada City, in the county of Nevada and State of California.

James M. Brookshire, to be postmaster at Biltmore, in the county of Buncombe and State of North Carolina.

Joseph J. Barrow, to be postmaster at Louisburg, in the county of Franklin and State of North Carolina.

Albert L. Stephenson, to be postmaster at Togus, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine.

Richard H. Smith, jr., to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Halifax and State of North Carolina.

George B. King, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Pitt and State of North Carolina.

Joseph S. Hunt, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Granville and State of North Carolina.

J. H. Hertz, to be postmaster at Macon, in the county of Bibb and State of Georgia.

George L. Swett, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

O. T. Wicker, to be postmaster at Farmville, in the county of Prince Edward and State of Virginia.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate February 1, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

William B. Wickes, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 1, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ESTATE OF THE LATE JUSTICE MILLER.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, the sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, the sum of $7,419, being equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. POWERS. I desire, Mr. Speaker, the ear of the House for a moment in explanation of this bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The bill can not be brought before the House except by the express consent of every member of the House. The gentleman desires to make a brief explanation, which can be done without objection.

Mr. POWERS. I will say that the widow of the late Justice Miller is the owner of a small house on Massachusetts avenue in this city, on which is resting a mortgage of $10,000, and the taxes upon which amount to $300 per annum. It is the only property the late Justice Miller left to his widow.

It seems to me, sir, that in view of the long and distinguished services of this justice and the precedents made in similar cases there is eminent propriety in Congress passing this bill appropriating the balance of the salary for the year in which he died, to be applied to the estate left to his widow. It has been done heretofore in other cases, and it seems to me to be a very worthy and deserving object. It passed the Senate unanimously, and was sent here on yesterday. For that reason I ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to inquire of the gentleman whether the bill has been considered by a committee of the House?

Mr. POWERS. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that it has not been, and the only facts that could be made to appear before a committee are already in possession of the House; those I have stated. This woman is in poor circumstances. She has a home, but there is a large mortgage upon it and no means to pay it off. No committee could report any additional facts.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Does he claim that there is only a precedent as the basis of the action sought here, or is there any law to justify it?

Mr. POWERS. There is no law except what we may make for ourselves in this case. But I will state to the gentleman that it has been made in other like cases, and I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina must see the propriety of the action proposed.

Mr. TALBERT. I will ask if Judge Miller's successor has not also drawn the salary proposed to be paid here?

Mr. POWERS. I presume so.

Mr. TALBERT. And will it not amount to paying the same salary to two persons?

Mr. POWERS. I was going on to say that I was unable to state certainly whether the successor of Judge Miller received the salary or not, although I presume of course that he did.

Mr. TALBERT. I think it a matter of very great importance. We are spending the people's money right along, and we ought to be well aware of what we are doing. It seems to me that it would be better to let the matter go to a committee, although I only make the suggestion.

Mr. POWERS. I will repeat that no committee could report any additional facts or give further information respecting it than has been already given.

Mr. TALBERT. Possibly that may be so; and while I do not insist upon the objection myself, I merely make the suggestion that it should go to a committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be the establishment of a bad precedent, and that it had better go to a committee.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the bill will be appropriately referred.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL BANK OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas it appears that V. McNally, captain and ordnance storekeeper, Ordnance Department, United States Army, did, on the 17th day of May, 1895, issue a check, No. 124138, upon the Treasurer of the United States at Washington, D. C., in favor of the Midvale Steel Company, Philadelphia, Pa., for the sum of $36,195.23, being in part payment for material furnished the Ordnance Department, United States Army, and said check was by the said Midvale Steel Company indorsed for deposit in the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., and so deposited and drawn against; which check was subsequently mailed by the Independence National Bank to the Treasurer of the United States to be exchanged for notes and was lost in transmission through the United States mails; and

Whereas the provisions of the act of February 16, 1885, amending section 3646, Revised Statutes of the United States, authorizing United States disbursing officers and agents to issue duplicates of lost checks, apply only to checks drawn for $2,500 or less: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That said V. McNally, ordnance officer, United States Army, be, and is hereby, instructed to issue a duplicate of said original check to the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., under such regulations in regard to its issue and payment as have been prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the issue of duplicate checks under the provisions of section 3646, Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. BINGHAM. If desired, I will ask that the report be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report may be read.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this simply authorizes the issue of a duplicate check?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is all.

Mr. DOCKERY. The general law limiting the issuance of duplicate checks to amounts of less than $2,500?

Mr. BINGHAM. It can not be done under the general statute, because of the limitation of $2,500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BINGHAM, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AMERICAN REGISTRY FOR BARKS MINDE AND JOHAN LUDWIG.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 173) to provide registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*, of the State of Florida, to be registered as vessels of the United States, the *Minde* to be registered under the name of "*Three Brothers*," the vessels being owned, respectively, by Albert F. Dewey, of Punta Gorda, Fla., a citizen of the United States, and the Gulf Transit Company, of Florida, incorporated under the laws of that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SPARKMAN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ST. LOUIS AND OKLAHOMA CITY RAILROAD COMPANY, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1691) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of Oklahoma Territory, be, and the same is hereby, invested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, owning, equipping, operating, using, and maintaining a railway and telegraph and telephone line through the Indian Territory, beginning at a point to be selected by said railway company at or near Sapulpa, in the Indian Territory, and running through the said Territory and the Territory of Oklahoma by way of Chandler and Oklahoma City to a point on Red River at or near the west line of the Kiowa and Comanche Reservation, with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, and sidings as said company may deem it to their interest to construct.

SEC. 2. That said corporation is authorized to take and use for all purposes of a railway, and for no other purpose, a right of way 100 feet in width through said Indian Territory and Territory of Oklahoma, and to take and use a strip of land 200 feet in width, with a length of 3,000 feet in addition, to right of way, for stations, for every 10 miles of road, with the right to use such additional ground where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 100 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*. That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein authorized to be taken shall be sold by the company, and they shall not be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railway, telegraph, and telephone lines; and when any portion thereof shall cease to be used, such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall have been ta[illegible]n.

SEC. 3. That before said railway shall be constructed through any lands held by individual occupants according to the laws, customs, and usages of any of the Indian nations or tribes through which it may be constructed, or by allotments under any law of the United States or agreement with the Indians, full compensation shall be made to such occupants for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of such railway. In case of failure to make amicable settlement with any occupant, such compensation shall be determined by the appraisement of three disinterested referees, to be appointed, one (who shall act as chairman) by the President, one by the chief of the nation to which said occupant belongs, or, in case of an allottee, by said allottee or by his duly authorized guardian or representative, and one by said railway company, who, before entering upon the duties of their appointment, shall take and subscribe, before a district judge, clerk of a district court, or United States commissioner, an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appointment, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award to and filed with the Secretary of the Interior within sixty days from the completion thereof; and a majority of said referees shall be competent to act in case of the absence of a member, after due notice. And upon the failure of either party to make such appointment within thirty days after the appointment made by the President, the vacancy shall be filled by the district judge of any United States court in the Indian Territory, or the Territory of Oklahoma, upon the application of the other party. The chairman of said board shall appoint the time and place for all hearings within the nation to which such occupant belongs. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each day they are engaged in the trial of any case submitted to them under this act, with mileage at 5 cents per mile. Witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed by the courts of said nations and the courts of Oklahoma Territory. Costs, including compensation of the referees, shall be made a part of the award, and be paid by such railway company. In case the referees can not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award. Either party being dissatisfied with the finding of the referees shall have the right, within ninety days after making the award and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to any district court in the Indian Territory, or Oklahoma Territory, which court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the subject-matter of said petition. If, upon the hearing of said appeal, the judgment of the court shall be for a larger sum than the award of the referees, the cost of said appeal shall be adjudged against the railway company. If the judgment of the court shall be for the same sum as the award of the referees, then the cost shall be adjudged against the appellant. If the judgment of the court shall be for a smaller sum than the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages. When proceedings have been commenced in court, the railway company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of the railway.

SEC. 4. That said railway company shall not charge the inhabitants of said Territories a greater rate of freight than the rate authorized by the laws of the State of Kansas for services or transportation of the same kind: *Provided*, That passenger rates on said railway shall not exceed 3 cents per mile. Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for freight and passengers on said railway and messages on said telegraph and telephone lines, until a State government or governments shall exist in said Territories within the limits of which said railway, or a part thereof, shall be located; and then such State government or governments shall be authorized to fix and regulate the cost of transportation of persons and freights within their respective limits by said railway; but Congress expressly reserves the right to fix and regulate, at all times, the cost of such transportation by said railway or said company whenever such transportation shall extend from one State into another, or shall extend into more than one State: *Provided, however*, That the rate of such transportation of passengers, local or interstate, shall not exceed the rate above expressed: *And provided further*, That said railway company shall carry the mail at such prices as Congress may by law provide; and until such rate is fixed by law the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation.

SEC. 5. That said railway company shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the particular nations or tribes or individuals through whose lands said line may be located, the sum of $50, in addition to compensation provided for in this act, for property taken and damages done to individual occupants by the construction of the railway for each mile of railway that it may construct in said Territories, said payments to be made in installments of $500 as each 10 miles of road is graded: *Provided*, That if the general council of either of the nations or tribes through whose land said railway may be located shall, within four months after the filing of maps of definite location as set forth in section 6 of this act, dissent from the allowance provided for in this section, and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, then all compensation to be paid to such dissenting nation or tribe under the provisions of this act shall be determined as provided in section 3 for the determination of the compensation to be paid to the individual occupant of lands, with the right of appeal to the courts upon the same terms, conditions, and requirements as therein provided: *Provided further*, That the amount awarded or adjudged to be paid by the said railway company for dissenting nation or tribe shall be in lieu of the compensation that said nation or tribe would be entitled to receive under the foregoing provision. Said company shall also pay, so long as said Territories are owned and occupied by the Indians, to the Secretary of the Interior, the sum of $15 per annum for each mile of railway it shall construct in the said Territories. The money paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act shall be apportioned by him in accordance with the laws and treaties now in force among the different nations and tribes according to the number of miles of railway that may be constructed by said railway company through their lands: *Provided*, That Congress shall have the right, so long as said lands are occupied and possessed by said nations and tribes, to impose such additional taxes upon said railway as it may deem just and proper for their benefit; and any Territory or State hereafter formed through which said railway shall have been established may exercise the like power as to such part of said railway as may lie within its limits. Said railway company shall have the right to survey and locate its railway immediately after the passage of this act.

SEC. 6. That said company shall cause maps showing the route of its located lines through said Territories to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and also to be filed in the office of the principal chiefs of each of the nations or tribes through whose lands said railway may be located; and after the filing of said maps no claim for a subsequent settlement and improvement upon the right of way shown by said maps shall be valid as against said company: *Provided*. That when a map showing any portion of said railway company's located line is filed as herein provided for, said company shall commence grading said located line within six months thereafter, or such location shall be void; and said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in sections of 25 miles before construction of any such section shall be begun.

SEC. 7. That the officers, servants, and employees of said company necessary to the construction and management of said railway shall be allowed to reside, while so engaged, upon such right of way, but subject to the provisions of the Indian intercourse laws, and such rules and regulations as may be

established by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with said intercourse laws.

SEC. 8. That said railway company shall build at least 50 miles of its railway in said Territory within three years after the passage of this act, and complete the remainder thereof within three years thereafter, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion not built; that said railway construct and maintain continually all fences, road and highway crossings, and necessary bridges over said railway wherever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way, or may be by the proper authorities laid out across the same.

SEC. 9. That the said Oklahoma Central Railroad shall accept this right of way upon the express condition, binding upon itself, its successors and assigns, that they will neither aid, advise, nor assist in any effort looking toward the changing or extinguishing the present tenure of the Indians in their lands, and will not attempt to secure from the Indian nation any further grant of land, or its occupancy, than is hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That any violation of the condition mentioned in this section shall operate as a forfeiture of all the rights and privileges of said railway company under this act.

SEC. 10. That all mortgages executed by said railway company, conveying any portion of its railway, with its franchises, that may be constructed in said Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, and the record thereof shall be evidence and notice of their execution and shall convey all rights and property of said company as therein expressed.

SEC. 11. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, or alter this act; and the right of way herein and hereby granted shall not be assigned or transferred in any form whatever prior to the construction and completion of the railway, except as to mortgages or other liens that may be given or secured thereon to aid in the construction thereof.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommended the adoption of the following amendments:

On page 2, line 5, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one"; on the same page, in line 6, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two"; on same page, in line 10, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert the word "fifty."

On page 4, line 34, after the word "mile," add the words "actually traveled."

In section 6, page 8, line 8, strike out all after the word "provided" and add the following: "That a map showing the entire line of the road in the Indian Territory shall be filed and approved before the work of construction shall commence."

On page 9, section 9, strike out all of line 1 after the word "said" and insert "Saint Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company."

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the reading of the bill. Is it a Senate bill or a House bill?

The SPEAKER. A House bill.

Mr. TALBERT. Has it been before the committee?

Mr. FLYNN. Yes, and it has been favorably reported. It passed both Houses in the last Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read to the House?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the reading of the bill, and I should be glad to have some explanation of it.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, for a right of way through the Indian Territory and part of the Oklahoma Territory, passed both the House and the Senate in the Fifty-third Congress. Gentlemen who were members of that House will doubtless remember that on the Sunday before our adjournment we undertook to pass the bill over the President's veto. Although the House was largely in sympathy with the Executive, the two-thirds necessary to pass the bill over the veto lacked but very few votes. The Committee on Indian Affairs at this session have recommended that the bill be so amended as to meet the objections urged by the President in his veto, with one exception. That was that the promoters of the enterprise should first secure the approval of the Indians. The Committee on Indian Affairs, in reporting on that proposition, say in their report:

A bill similar to this was passed by the Fifty-third Congress, but was vetoed by the President. The grounds for his refusal to approve the bill were: "(1) The bill did not provide for the procurement of the consent of the Indians; (2) the grant was too liberal as to side tracks, turn-outs, and branches, sidings, and extensions, and as to station privileges in general; and (3) the bill should have provided for the filing and approval of a map of definite location of the entire line of the road before any part thereof was constructed."

Your committee is of the opinion that the second and third reasons given by the President in his veto were sound, but do not agree with the first one.

Your committee is satisfied that the exercise of eminent domain over the country occupied by the five tribes of Indians does not violate the legal rights of the Indians, provided they are given a reasonable price for the land taken, and no more land than is actually necessary is taken.

In this view your committee is but following the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Cherokee Nation *vs.* The Southern Kansas (135 U. S.).

We ask the passage of the bill for the reasons stated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PICKLER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

KANSAS CITY, PITTSBURG AND GULF RAILROAD.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 1046.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg, and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting immediately after the word "Texas," in said section, the following words, to wit: "With the right to locate, construct, operate, and maintain a branch railroad, telegraph, and telephone line from some point on the main line of said railroad in the Indian Territory, south of the Arkansas River and north of the town of Poteau, by the most feasible and practicable route, to the city of Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, and with the right to build in the line of said branch railroad a bridge across the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall be first approved by the Secretary of War," and with the right to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a spur of its railroad from a point on said branch about 4 miles northeast of Scullyville, by the most practicable route to a point on the western line of the State of Arkansas, about 10 miles south of Fort Smith; and with the right to build in the line of said spur a bridge over the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall first be approved by the Secretary of War, so that the said first section when so amended shall read as follows:

"That the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, be, and the same is hereby, invested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, operating, using, and maintaining a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, beginning at a point on the south line of Cherokee County near the town of Galena, in the State of Kansas, and running thence in a southerly direction through the Indian Territory, or through the State of Arkansas and the Indian Territory, by the most feasible and practicable route, to a point on the Red River near the town of Clarksville, in the State of Texas, with the right to locate, construct, operate, and maintain a branch railroad, telegraph, and telephone line from some point on the main line of said railroad in the Indian Territory, south of the Arkansas River and north of the town of Poteau, by the most feasible and practicable route, to the city of Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, and with the right to build in the line of said branch railroad a bridge across the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall be first approved by the Secretary of War, and with the right to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a spur of its railroad from a point on said branch about 4 miles northeast of Scullyville, by the most practicable route to a point on the western line of the State of Arkansas about 10 miles south of Fort Smith; and with the right to build in the line of said spur a bridge over the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall first be approved by the Secretary of War, and with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings, and extensions as said company may deem its interest to construct along and upon the right of way and depot grounds herein provided for."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LITTLE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PER DIEM SERVICE PENSION BILL.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the Hazlett Post, No. 81, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of a per diem service pension bill, be read and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I object to printing memorials in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

PAYMENT OF LEGAL SERVICES RENDERED CERTAIN INDIANS.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2917) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay from their own funds for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of that part of the fund of the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians set apart by said Indians for expenses incidental to their claim against the United States, the sum of $8,300.86 to Reese H. Voorhees and John Paul Jones, for professional services rendered said Indians in defending said fund, upon proof of the full performance of the said services called for by their contract.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In lines 10 and 11 strike out the words "upon proof of the full performance of the said services called for by their contract."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington will be permitted to make an explanation.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the report, I think, fully explains this bill. I ask that it be read. This claim is for services rendered under contract. The contract was fully complied with

by these attorneys in securing the preservation of this fund, and was satisfactory to everybody interested.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report will be read.

The report (by Mr. DOOLITTLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill H. R. 2917, respectfully submit the following report:

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to pay, out of a fund in his hands owned by certain Indians, for legal services rendered said Indians in preserving said fund to them.

It is a matter of extreme simplicity and unassailable merit. The facts are these:

After about twenty years of pendency, a claim made by the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians against the United States was adjudged in their favor by the courts, and on August 23, 1894, $800,386.31 was appropriated by Congress in payment of the judgment. Of the amount which should be finally recovered the Indians had set apart, in many annual councils, 35 per cent to meet the expenses incident to the prosecution and final settlement of the claim. During the long pendency of the claim a large number of persons had been employed by the Old Settlers to aid in its prosecution. Of these some had died, having performed their contracts in small part only; some had abandoned their employment after small service, and some had rendered no service whatever. It was anxiously feared by the Indians that many unjust demands would be made on them for compensation where service had not been rendered, or for greater compensation than the service actually rendered merited. To protect their fund from this anticipated raid upon it, the Indians, in council at Tahlequah, Ind. T., on June 29, 1891, passed the following resolution:

"Moved that the sum of 1 per cent out of the 35 per cent be allowed Jones & Voorhees, attorneys, of Washington, D. C., to defend to a final termination the interests of the Old Settlers against all spurious, unfinished, or unreasonable claims by attorneys or other persons claiming to have rendered services in securing or aiding in the collection of the Old Settler claim. Carried."

Based upon the resolution, a contract was made with Mr. Jones and Mr. Voorhees November 20, 1891, on behalf of the Indians, by which they undertook the defense of the Indians and the fund, when recovered, against all improper and unjust demands.

The fears of the Indians of unrighteous exactions did not exceed the reality of the attempts made upon them. Claims for fees were filed against their fund in the Interior Department in great number, aggregating in amount over $500,000.

Every claim made which was not admitted to be just by the Indians was contested by Mr. Voorhees and vigorously fought, the work actually done being the searching for evidence and the building up of records, briefing, and oral arguments. This work covered months, and was very onerous in character.

As the result of the fight so made the cost of the prosecution of the claim was reduced from the $500,000 demanded to about $180,000. The amount which, under the law, the Secretary had the power to pay out for the prosecution was the 35 per cent set apart by the Indians, or about $280,000. The amount actually saved, therefore, to the Indians by this defense was about $100,000.

Your committee finds that the services called for by the contract have been very efficiently and fully performed; the Indians have received the services; the services have borne generous fruit. On every consideration these gentlemen are entitled to the stipulated compensation, and peculiarly so since it is to be paid out of the money preserved to the Indians by the services for which payment is asked.

Upon application to the Interior Department for its payment, it was held by the Secretary that he was without authority, under the existing law, to pay for this particular service; that his authority was limited to the payment for services rendered in securing the judgment and appropriation of the money, and that it did not extend to payment for services rendered in preserving the money to the Indians and securing its actual payment to them.

Your committee recommend, therefore, that the bill do pass as amended by your committee, namely, with line 10, beginning at the word "upon," and line 11 struck out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DOOLITTLE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. TALBERT. I demand the regular order.

UNITED STATES INSURANCE COMPANIES IN GERMANY.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution calling for copies of all correspondence between this Government and the Government of Germany relating to the exclusion of life insurance companies of the United States from transacting business in Germany, begs leave to report the same and recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the House copies of all correspondence between this Government and the Government of Germany relating to the exclusion of life insurance companies of the United States from transacting business in Germany.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bill and joint resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died—to the Committee on Claims.

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years—to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889; when the Speaker signed the same.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out in page 16, line 10, after the words "*Provided further*," the words "That the entire service of gas lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor."

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I expect all are ready to vote on this amendment, but I want just a word before that vote is taken. On yesterday the mover of the amendment to strike out this proviso, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON], while he disclaimed all intention of aspersing the Committee on Appropriations, spoke of this provision as what would be termed up in the Pennsylvania legislature as a "snake."

I tried yesterday afternoon, Mr. Chairman, to get the floor for the purpose of paying my respects to this "snake," but the debate waxed so hot and furious that I could not do so without displacing other gentlemen who wished to be heard, and debate was carried on to the very time of adjournment. I then thought it was perhaps better I did not obtain the floor, because it occurred to me that during the night the gentleman from Pennsylvania might think better of this uncanny allusion to the committee and strike it from the public RECORD; in short, I hoped that in the darkness and stillness of the night this serpent might crawl away out of sight and hearing and leave no trail behind him; but this morning I find the reptile in the RECORD, and not only that, but he is in the morning papers also.

Now, for just a moment, I want to see what kind of a "snake" this is, because it seems that not every quality about the serpent is harmful to man. We are told that those who looked upon the serpent of brass in the wilderness lived and did not die. This "serpent" that the committee have brought in here—for that is what the gentleman calls it—when you take into account the increased service and the reduced price, presents a proposition to light the city of Washington for the coming year for just about one-half what we are paying now. That is the committee's "serpent," and as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so our committee are willing to stand in the attitude of lifting up this serpent (so called by the gentleman) before this House and the American people; and I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] to look upon it and be cured of just one-half the cost of lighting this city of Washington for the ensuing year, so far as the proportionate share of his constituents is concerned, and the people of the District also may look upon it as curing them of one-half of their expense of lighting the city.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the kind of serpent that our committee has brought in here. If the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania had not gone into the RECORD this morning I should not have alluded to it; but it is there, and I hope this Committee of the Whole will not lose sight of the fact which I have stated, but about which gentlemen who have opposed this measure have said nothing. Another quality may be attributed to this serpent: It seems to have charmed all these gentlemen into silence, so far as opposition to the price is concerned. Here they are as gentle as sucking doves, and to what can it be attributed, unless it be to the mysterious influence of this reptile brought in here by the Committee on Appropriations? [Laughter.]

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, that while I believe members are now prepared to vote on this proposition, I want them to do it understandingly, knowing just what issue is at stake, because this bill is to go to another body and then to come back here, and in what form it may be returned no one can tell. The history of the District bill in the last session may throw some light on the possible fate of this one. The last District bill as originally passed by the House appropriated $145,000 for the gaslighting of the streets, at $20 per annum for each street lamp.

The Senate, by amendment, reduced the appropriation to $142,400 (the sum actually appropriated for the fiscal year 1895) and restored the price to $20.50 per lamp. The bill so amended came back here, and the House in conference agreed to it. The appropriation for electric lighting in the bill of last year as it passed the House was $54,000, and the price per lamp was reduced from

40 cents to 38 cents. The Senate reduced the appropriation to $47,000 and restored the price to 40 cents per lamp per night.

Now, note that in the House bill in both instances enlarged service was provided for, just as it is in this bill, but the Senate cut out the enlarged service, and, in each instance, gave these close corporations the business of lighting the city at the old rates, and the House in conference agreed to that change. Mr. Chairman, it remains to be seen whether the House will be controlled by the Senate in the final disposition of this question.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a provision of existing law which has come to my notice this morning, and to say that if my view of it be correct, this advertisement for bids is unnecessary, because the Commissioners have full power in their hands to fix the price and to compel the gas company to furnish lights at the price so fixed. In the Statutes at Large of the Forty-fifth Congress, page 208, we find this:

And the said Commissioners are hereby authorized to fix the salaries to be paid to the officers and privates of the Metropolitan police until otherwise provided by law; and to require the Washington Gas Light Company to light the city lamps at such price as shall to the said Commissioners appear to be just and reasonable.

I can not find that that provision of law has been repealed. It is carried into the Revised Statutes and is found on page 200 of the Supplement, where the same language is used:

And to require the Washington Gas Light Company to light the city lamps at such price as shall to the said Commissioners appear to be just and reasonable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I do not care about getting up a diversion here, yet, for the sake of obtaining a ruling upon the point, if it shall be in order when this other matter is disposed of, I will offer an amendment fixing the price at less than $16, in the form of a requirement that the gaslight company shall furnish the lights. I shall offer that amendment in order to test the question whether or not we have the power. Of course, if we have the power under the statute, as I think we have, then my amendment may be strictly in line with existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment striking out the proviso beginning on line 10, page 16, of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in order to vote intelligently upon the question which is now coming before the House, I would like to know if the committee has agreed to amend this clause which it is proposed to strike out, so as to meet the objections raised by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. GROUT. We are perfectly willing that the amendment shall be admitted as proposed. Several members of the committee are present, and if any of them dissent, let them speak; but for my part, I am willing, and I understand that the committee are perfectly willing, to accept any amendment which will, perchance, make the provision more explicit.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, in further response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi, I desire to give notice that if this committee will vote down the proposition to strike out the proviso which the Committee on Appropriations propose, to the effect that "the entire service of gaslighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor," I will offer a further amendment in these words: "At a price not exceeding the price above limited."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked the question because I wanted to determine how I would vote myself. With an amendment like that coming from the committee I would vote against the motion to strike out, but without it I would vote for the motion. In this connection I would like to make a suggestion. If the committee will add the words, "*Provided*, That nothing herein shall be held to compel the Commissioners to accept any bid offered," the matter will be guarded perhaps a little better than in the other way. However, with the amendment suggested, I will vote with the committee.

The question being taken on the motion to strike out the proviso, it was rejected.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If it be in order, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, beginning at the bottom of page 15, the following:
"*Provided*, That no more than $16 per annum for each street lamp shall be paid for gas or oil, lighting, extinguishing, repairing, painting, and cleaning, under any expenditure provided for in this act."
And insert the following:
"*Provided*, That the Washington Gas Light Company shall light each street lamp in the city of Washington for the sum of $12 per light per year."

Mr. GROUT. It is my belief that this service can be rendered for the sum named in the amendment; and speaking for myself individually, I shall not offer any objection to the proposition.

Mr. PITNEY. I hope the gentleman from Ohio who offers that amendment——

Mr. BABCOCK. I raise a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes rather late.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the point of order. I am glad to have the question raised whether under the statute we can take this action. I should be glad to know whether we have this power or not. I do not object to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] will state his point of order.

Mr. BABCOCK. The point of order I make is that this is not only new legislation, but that it changes existing law. The present law fixes the price per lamp at $20.50. This amendment proposes to make the sum $12.

Mr. GROUT. This is only for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that this point of order will not be sustained, if the Chair is inclined to sustain it, until there has been proper hearing of the question. Still I do not desire to burden the Chair with discussion unless it be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] refer to the law which the proposed amendment contravenes.

Mr. DOCKERY. I should think some reference to the law would be necessary in order to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has requested the gentleman from Wisconsin to refer to the law which fixes the price at $20.50.

Mr. BABCOCK. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, then, on the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. I suggest that the language of the amendment should be "not exceeding $12."

Mr. NORTHWAY. I should be glad to ascertain if there is any law in force which prevents our adopting such a requirement as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been withdrawn.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Otherwise I should not feel at liberty to offer an amendment which would seem to contradict what the committee has undertaken to do in fixing a limit. I only wanted to raise the question whether we have the power to make this requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PITNEY. I think I am in sympathy with the object which the gentleman from Ohio has in view, yet I do not believe this amendment is calculated to fulfill that object. I hope, therefore, he will modify the amendment or that it will be voted down.

Mr. DOCKERY. Did I understand the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. GROUT] to express himself as willing to accept the amendment?

Mr. GROUT. No; I did not say I would not accept it. I said I believed gas could be furnished at the price named in the amendment. Still I think we had perhaps best keep ourselves on conservative ground and adhere to the present limit, $16. We really have no definite knowledge, and can get no definite knowledge, as to what this gas costs. If we should go into an investigation we probably should not know much more about it when we got through than we do now. It is all a matter of speculation.

In my judgment, it would be well to stand by the bill as the committee has brought it in, as the measure is the result of the deliberations of the full committee, in which all the members were finally agreed. I believe, therefore, it is wiser to stand where we are. If we should be able to retain, when this bill becomes a law, even a large fragment of the reforms which the bill proposes, we shall have accomplished a good work. My great object is to have the House understand the matter now, because when the bill comes back to us from the Senate we may be in more of a hurry than we are at present and there may not be so much time for explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will at present withdraw the amendment, upon the suggestion of the gentleman in charge of the bill, as I do not wish unnecessarily to antagonize the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GROUT. To make this clause satisfactory to all gentlemen, and in order to keep faith with the assurance that an effort would be made to accomplish that result, I now send to the desk to be read an amendment which I think will be satisfactory to all, and in which the committee, so far as it has been consulted, has agreed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "therefor," in line 13 of page 16, the following words:
"*Provided*, That no contract shall be made for gaslight at a price exceeding the rate hereinbefore specified."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer on my own behalf the amendment I send to the desk, to come in after the amendment just adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Washington Gas Light Company and all other gaslight companies doing business in the District of Columbia, are authorized to charge and collect, after the passage of this act, for illuminating gas furnished to and paid for by the Government of the United States and other consumers in the Dis

trict of Columbia, at the rate of not exceeding 75 cents per thousand cubic feet, except that gas consumed in public lamps for lighting streets, highways, and public grounds in the District of Columbia shall be paid for at such rates as Congress may from time to time prescribe: *Provided*, That if consumers, other than the Government, shall not pay monthly any gas bill within ten days after the same shall have been presented, said company may charge and collect from said consumer so failing to pay said bill as aforesaid $1 per thousand cubic feet for the gas furnished to said consumer during said month.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, in connection with the amendment, that it is the exact language of a bill, so far as it appears in that amendment, which passed the House during the last Congress, except that I have fixed the price for gas to individual consumers at a maximum of 75 cents instead of $1 per thousand cubic feet, as was fixed in the bill to which I refer. The amendment also reserves to the Government the right to fix its own price for the service rendered for lighting the streets, highways, and public grounds. It also authorizes a charge of $1 per thousand in certain cases to delinquent customers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, is that not subject to the point of order?

Mr. DOCKERY. The point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is now too late to interpose the point of order.

Mr. HILL. I desire to make the point of order if permissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri was recognized and proceeded to debate the amendment, after which it was too late to interpose an objection.

Mr. PITNEY. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For electric arc lighting, including necessary inspection, in those streets now lighted with electric arc lights in the city of Washington, and for necessary extensions of such service, $43,600: *Provided*, That not more than 28 cents per night shall be paid for any electric arc light burning from forty-five minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise and operated wholly by means of underground wires; and each arc light shall be of not less than 1,000 actual candlepower, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for electric lighting by means of wires that may exist on or over any of the streets or avenues of the city of Washington: *Provided further*, That the entire service of electric lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor: *Provided further*, That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with an underground system of wires and conduits in the streets and other places covered by such service the commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground conduits and wires for electric lighting in and along such streets and other public places as may be necessary for said service; such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress, without compensation.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, under the last clause of paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, upon all after the word "therefor" in line 14 of that paragraph, for the same reason stated in the point made yesterday in reference to the portion of the bill on the opposite page.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. PITNEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The extreme importance of this proviso, and, as the Committee on Appropriations think, the unfortunate result which will follow in case the proviso is held to be inadmissible under the rules of the House as attached to a bill of this character, make it proper to say two or three words about it.

I think, and I respectfully submit to the consideration of the Chair, that the case presented by this point of order is essentially different from that upon which the present occupant of the chair ruled yesterday. It is different with regard to the law; for the law regulating the matter of electric lighting differs from that which governs the gaslight company in this city. We think further, and I beg to submit to your consideration, that while the Chair was correct in his recollection that there was a ruling upon a point of order raised on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia in the Fifty-first Congress, the Chair was incorrect in regard to the particular point raised at that time, and incorrect also in regard to the reasons which governed that decision.

And this is an illustration of the danger of deciding a case without argument on the point in question, for the precedent from the Fifty-first Congress was not mentioned in the debate on this floor yesterday upon the point of order then submitted by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER]. I have taken pains to look it up this morning before the meeting of the House, and I find that the proviso ruled out in the Fifty-first Congress on the point of order was a very different proviso—that it had a very different scope and purpose—from the proviso now the subject of discussion. The proviso then in question was attached to that part of the bill which granted an appropriation for the maintenance of the public electric lighting in this city, and the proviso was in these words:

And no overhead wires for public or private electric lighting shall be permitted on or over any of the streets or avenues of the cities of Washington or Georgetown after September 30, 1890.

Mr. Chairman, at the time that appropriation bill was under consideration before the Committee of the Whole in the Fifty-first Congress, the streets of Washington were filled with overhead wires strung through the streets for the purpose of serving telephone and electric light companies and telegraph companies. They were in the streets under some sort of right or privilege, vested or temporary. The effect of this provision, which was the subject of the point of order then, was not limited to the wires which furnished the electric lights. The proviso went to the extent of abolishing all electric-light wires then in the streets, whether they served the public electric lights or not; whether they had any relation to the party contracting to furnish the electric lights under the appropriation bill or not. Therefore it was legislation taking away rights which had accrued to the owners of the several companies under previous legislation, or under previous license from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and, a Mr. BURROWS of Michigan being in the chair, the point of order was raised by Mr. Atkinson in these words:

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against so much of this section as begins in line 24 with the following words:

"And no overhead wires for public or private electric lighting shall be permitted on or over any of the streets or avenues of the cities of Washington or Georgetown after September 30, 1890."

The point I make is, first, that the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction over the subject-matter, and, second, that this changes the existing law.

Then, after considerable debate, the Chair sustained the point of order and excluded the provision from the bill, but gave no reason for the ruling. The reason, I think, however, is manifest from the somewhat protracted argument that was had on the floor of this House in Committee of the Whole on that occasion. It was based upon the state of facts to which I have alluded, that there were electric lights already existing, and wires already existing, strung over the streets, some of which wires served the electric lights, and others of which served private parties, and the proposition was to abolish all those wires. I think it was properly held in that case that that was a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman before him the ruling that was subsequently made, on page 468?

Mr. PITNEY. That is the very ruling to which I have called the attention of the Chair. The ruling was made on page 468 of volume 103 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that session.

Mr. GROUT. With no reasons given?

Mr. PITNEY. No reasons were given, but the grounds of the ruling, as I said before, are manifest from the debate which took place before the ruling was made. For instance, Mr. McComas, the chairman of the subcommittee which had prepared the District of Columbia bill, and which had charge of the measure in the Committee of the Whole on that occasion, said, on page 468, just before the ruling:

This proposition ought to have the sympathy of the committee. We are striking here at these telegraph and electric-light companies, who usurp the air and fret it with wire. We want these wires placed underground. We have been trying to do it for four years, but it has not yet been fully done. I give notice that I am going to try again and again to have these electric-light and telegraph companies required to place their wires underground; and I do not think this question should be disposed of on this point of order.

That was before the adoption of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, and they were proceeding under the rules of the Fiftieth Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the proposition here is different, and I recur again to the language of the second paragraph of Rule XXI of the rules of the Fifty-fourth Congress—the present Congress—which paragraph is invoked by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] in raising the point of order. Not only the last two lines of that paragraph, but the whole paragraph, ought to be read for a correct understanding of the rule as it applies to the proviso now under consideration:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

Mr. Chairman, the last branch of that section relates to new substantive legislation, and the previous branch of the section relates to the limitations which are admissible in appropriation bills of this character. Therefore, if we can find that this appropriation before the House is for a purpose already authorized by law, and is in pursuance of the policy of the existing law relating to the District of Columbia, the provision is not subject to the point of order, because it is an appropriation for the continuance of an object already made lawful.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is too plain for argument that the lighting of the streets of this city is a purpose not only permissible by law, but required by law. It is a necessary police regulation. It is a necessary measure for the good and welfare of the people of the District. And in the performance of this duty which is imposed upon the District Commissioners they must adopt, not the old-fashioned lighting, but the best method which can be obtained in

the progress of invention; and so they have properly gone into the electric-lighting system for the lighting of some of the principal streets of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, there never has been a substantive act of legislation passed by Congress since Congress took control of the matter which has created an electric light company or has given a franchise to an electric light company, or which has prohibited an electric light company from putting subways beneath the pavement. And there is not a line in the organic act of the District, or in any act now applicable to the District, which prohibits Congress at any time, by substantive acts, or by incidental provision on appropriation bills, from providing that the wires to serve the lights for which they spend the money shall be placed beneath the pavement instead of being strung overhead.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an immense difference between this section and the clause decided yesterday. That decision was based on a special charter granted under the old régime, in "the good old times before the war," to this gas company; and I will say, in passing, that there seems to be a general belief that we are getting the same kind of gas that was furnished before the war; whereas in regard to the electric light the question does not depend upon a charter, but upon the right of the present company, arising from the same sort of incidental grant on previous appropriation bills, that we now ask to have incorporated in this appropriation bill.

The first of these acts was that which I mentioned yesterday, passed in the year 1888. The act provided "that the Commissioners might, under such reasonable conditions as they might prescribe, authorize wires of any company then operating to be laid under the streets." That power was limited in point of time to the termination of the then existing Congress, and the limitation was subsequently extended. The limitation has now expired by lapse of time; but at that time there grew up a practice of appropriating money from year to year for electric lighting, and the language of the annual appropriation bills was this:

For maintaining existing service and necessary extensions—

and the only law by which the electric light company has extended its wires is under that grant incidental to appropriations namely, the right to make extensions necessary to the then existing service.

We have in the now current law, the appropriation bill now in force, and under which the streets are lighted, or ought to be lighted, these very words, namely:

Maintaining existing service and necessary extensions.

It will appear, therefore, to be the settled policy of Congress in regard to this matter to adopt this system of lighting upon the principal streets, and to make extensions of that system in other streets, so fast as the needs of the District may require. We have the object already embodied in the law of the District by the annual appropriation bills. It is therefore now a lawful object; and I undertake to say, sir, that if we do not put in this proviso granting an express right to lay down conduits, yet the rest of the proviso would authorize the Commissioners to grant that privilege; and this limitation upon the power of the Commissioners is provided in order that the power they now have to allow wires put down shall be exercised in a reasonable manner and under reasonable restrictions, and that such privileges as may be granted by them under that power shall be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation.

Again, if these acts and this course of practice, and the general duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to take care of the streets and control them, do not create this power of lighting the streets with electricity as one of the incidental means necessary to accomplish that purpose, then there is no law upon the subject. We have an absence of statute or other law, and so there is no "existing law" to be changed, and it is only provisions changing existing law which are out of order in an appropriation bill.

Now, I do not want to weary the Chair or the committee with further argument upon this question, except to say that the question is a very important one, and that it is only by means of competition that we can have a proper service at a reasonable price.

The present law under which the streets are now lighted by electricity provides that "not more than 40 cents per night shall be paid for any electric arc light burning every night from sunset to sunrise and operated by means of underground wires." Last year, when the District of Columbia appropriation bill was first framed, it proposed a rate of 38 cents per light. I believe that is the proposition that was first laid before the House, but afterwards, in the conference committee, the rate was raised to 40 cents. Previous to that time, in the Fifty-second Congress or in the first session of the Fifty-third, the company had made a fight against having the price reduced below 50 cents per night per light, and yet, in the hearings before the subcommittee which prepared the bill now under consideration, the mere intimation of competition caused the company to reduce their price down to 28 cents per light per night. I ought not to say, perhaps, that that was literally their own offer, but they expressed themselves as willing to come down to $100 per year, which is just a shade less than 28 cents per night per light.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in discussing this matter, I have not used any intemperate language, I have not raised any antimonopoly cry merely for effect; I have not been talking to the galleries nor using my hat as a speaking trumpet. I have addressed myself to this matter as a pure business proposition. I recognize the moral claims of a company like this which has entered upon a new field as a pioneer and blazed out the way for others to follow. This company was the first to introduce this underground system in Washington. But, Mr. Chairman, they have a valuable franchise; they have a franchise that did not cost them anything except the putting down of the plant. They serve the people at a profit to themselves, and it is no more than right that they should be reduced to a reasonable profit. Now, the new company come in and say, "If you will give us this franchise we will enter the field as competitors;" and competition, while it may be sometimes used as a means of oppression, would in this case be only reasonable competition, because the old company have the advantage of previous possession of the field, they have their private customers, and even if they should lose the public contract the new company could not oppress them. Therefore we think it is a reasonable proposition that this new company shall be permitted to come in and make a bid for this important public service.

With these remarks I submit that the ruling of the Chair on yesterday does not apply to this case; that so far as the ruling depended on the precedent cited from the Fifty-first Congress, it was founded upon a precedent not applicable to this particular case, and that there is no provision of existing law which this proviso interferes with; but that, on the contrary, this is an appropriation in continuation of a public object already declared to be proper and lawful and already in progress.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY] thoroughly approves and proves my contention in relation to the point of order. He admits that this is new legislation, and legislation for a purpose—a purpose which might be appropriate in a separate bill, but not in an appropriation act.

In relation to the general argument which he has made here as to the granting of permits, I wish to say that the supreme court of the District of Columbia, I have been informed, has already handed down a decision entirely opposed to all the gentleman's arguments, which decision has been delivered since the Chair yesterday, with justice, ruled out the amendment on the point of order. I submit the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso is:

That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with an underground system of wires and conduits in the streets and other places covered by such service the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground conduits and wires for electric lighting in and along such streets and other public places as may be necessary for said service, such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation.

This proviso does not materially differ from the provision that was ruled out on the point of order yesterday. In order to carry it out the same disturbance of the streets would be required, the same digging and interference with public travel, and in that respect it does not differ substantially from the paragraph that was ruled out. The Chair does not understand that any provision of law has been cited which makes it lawful for any electric lighting company to dig up the streets of the city of Washington, especially any company which may happen to be the lowest bidder—a new company organized for that purpose. Any such interference with the streets and any authorization of such an interference with the streets of the city would be, in the opinion of the Chair, a change of existing law.

The Chair quoted yesterday a decision made in the Fifty-first Congress which has been criticised this morning. On returning to that question the Chair's recollection is confirmed. In the first place, the bill upon which the question rose was considered under the rules of the Fiftieth Congress, and the rule of the Fiftieth Congress upon that subject is in these words:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

The particular clause in that bill to which the point of order was directed was this:

And no overhead wires for public or private electric lighting shall be permitted on or over any of the streets or avenues of the cities of Washington and Georgetown after September 30, 1890.

That was confined exclusively to wires for public or private electric lighting, and did not apply to telegraph or telephone wires or to any other wires than those belonging to this special class. The point of order was made against that provision that it was a change of existing law. The Chair yesterday cited that case, not upon that particular ground, but because it was contended

here that the provision then under consideration was in order because it was simply a limitation upon the expenditure of public money, a limitation of the appropriation made in the bill to a particular object. It was upon that point that the Chair quoted the decision made in the Fifty-first Congress.

In the Fifty-first Congress the point was made by those who contended in favor of the provision in the bill that it was simply a limitation upon the expenditures of the Government. But at that time, notwithstanding the objection, it was directly held by the occupant of the chair that it was not merely a limitation upon the expenditure of the public money and was therefore out of order as being in contravention of the existing law and as changing existing law. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For electric arc lighting, including necessary inspection, in those streets now lighted with electric arc lights in the city of Washington, and for necessary extensions of such service, $43,600: *Provided*, That not more than 28 cents per night shall be paid for any electric arc light burning from forty-five minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise, and operated wholly by means of underground wires, and each arc light shall be of not less than 1,000 actual candlepower, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for electric lighting by means of wires that may exist on or over any of the streets or avenues of the city of Washington: *Provided further*, That the entire service of electric lighting authorized under this appropriation shall be let, after due advertisement, to the lowest responsible bidder therefor: *Provided further*, That in case such lowest responsible bidder be not provided with an underground system of wires and conduits in the streets and other places covered by such service, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, under such reasonable conditions as they may prescribe, authorize such bidder to lay down an approved system of underground conduits and wires for electric lighting in and along such streets and other public places as may be necessary for said service; such privilege as may be granted hereunder to be revocable at the will of Congress without compensation.

Mr. GROUT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "therefor," in line 14 of page 17, insert—

"*Provided further*, That no contract shall be made for electric arc lighting at a price exceeding the rate hereinbefore specified."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROUT. I also offer the further amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the amendment last adopted the following:

"That hereafter the United States Electric Lighting Company, or any other electric lighting company doing business in the District of Columbia, shall not charge or collect from the United States or any other consumer of electric arc or incandescent light, or electricity for power, prices exceeding 75 per cent of the price charged for such light and power on the 1st day of January, 1896, in the said District of Columbia."

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, this puts the provision in regard to electric lighting on a level with that relating to gas.

Mr. DOCKERY. And a very wise provision it is, let me suggest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the plans and specifications for each of said buildings, and for all other buildings provided for in this act, shall be prepared by the inspector of buildings of the District of Columbia, and shall be approved by the Architect of the Capitol and the Commissioners of the District, and said buildings shall be constructed by the Commissioners in conformity therewith.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 7, page 25, insert:

"For the purpose of purchasing a sufficient number of United States flags to place one on every schoolhouse in the District of Columbia on school days and during school hours, the sum of $1,000, to be expended by the school trustees of the District, and to be immediately available."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this amendment is subject to a point of order; at any rate, I have no desire to make such a point. I may suggest, however, that I am under the impression that most of the schoolhouses of this District are now furnished with flags. The United States flag is a very proper flag to be publicly displayed; and if there is any place on earth where it ought to be displayed, it is perhaps especially the District of Columbia. Whether it is wise to make this provision for furnishing flags to the schools when most of these schools are already supplied, the flags having been furnished by small subscriptions made by the children and the parents, I am not sure. My observation has been that those good things that cost something of personal effort are generally most highly prized.

There has been much of legislation throughout the country touching the placing of flags over every schoolhouse. It has been claimed that a requirement to have the flag exhibited under all circumstances over all schoolhouses tends to weaken respect for it from mere familiarity. Some enterprising citizens in some portions of the United States have, as others believe, run wild upon the subject of United States flags, and at their own expense have put a representation of that flag on every article they have manufactured. They have used it in connection with their business for advertising purposes so as to have it ever present in connection with the promotion of such business. Now, some people have objected to that, and I think there has been some legislation to prohibit it.

We have the flag displayed over this wing of the Capitol when the House is in session and over the Senate wing when the other body is in session; and I believe it is always displayed over the central part of the Capitol building.

Whether it would really promote patriotic sentiment to begin now with an appropriation of $1,000 for the coming fiscal year to be paid from the Treasury and the revenues of the District so as to provide, in addition to the flags floating over the public buildings, that the flag shall float over all the schoolhouses, I am quite sure I do not know.

If I thought that this provision would beget patriotic sentiment or aspiration which would not otherwise exist in the heart of any child, I would say, in my country's name, let the provision be adopted, whether it costs $1,000 or $10,000; for later on, no doubt, the cost will be $10,000. But in the promotion of a sound sentiment that otherwise would not exist the cost is of not much consequence.

Mr. Chairman, it has been claimed that some of the makers and dealers in flags have insisted on their universal use at the public expense. But how far we are justified in using the public money for this purpose when in the main heretofore patriotic sentiment has caused the flag to float quite generally throughout the country and has prompted nearly 3,000,000 people within this generation to peril their lives in its defense, I do not know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only want to inquire which side the gentleman is on. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am just trying to find out. [Renewed laughter.] I want to find what the object of this appropriation is, and its necessity, and then I can understand it a little better.

I will say again, though, Mr. Chairman, if it is believed by a majority of the House that, to promote sentiments of patriotism in the breast of the growing generation, or in the adult generation, that otherwise would not exist there, then I should say make the appropriation.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I have no rhetoric to ventilate on this subject. I simply desire to state briefly the reasons that suggested the amendment.

I understand that by private contribution on the part of the pupils of some of our public schools in the District of Columbia United States flags have been purchased and float over some of the buildings, and that there are other schools where the pupils are not able to purchase them. This is a proposition simply to place the United States flag over these public buildings owned by the United States in this District, over which it does not now float. They are the buildings occupied by the young people in the District, and there, if anywhere, should be cultivated the patriotic sentiment to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. In this we are only doing what a great many of the States have done for their public schools by State authority; and if I mistake not, one of these States is the great and glorious State of the gentleman from Illinois. At least from eight to a dozen States have made already some provision for placing the United States flag over the public schoolhouses in their limits. The State of Pennsylvania is one; Illinois, I understand, is another, and from eight to a dozen have already taken steps in this direction.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You can count Ohio in that category.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am informed also that Ohio has done so, as has Vermont, Connecticut, Montana, Iowa, Michigan, South Dakota, and several other States; and the proposition here is simply that the United States, within the limited space of the District of Columbia, shall at the expense of $1,000 float the flag of the country over every schoolhouse in the District where it does not now float, and in doing this we will do simply what a dozen or more of the States have done in their respective localities.

Mr. CANNON. Let me ask the gentleman if he can tell us how many schoolhouses there are in the District of Columbia where the flag does not now float?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Well, I do not know exactly. There are perhaps somewhere between 100 and 150 in all, but how many have the flag I do not know.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman, I think, is mistaken in the number.

Mr. CANNON. What will the flags cost?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am unable to state exactly, but somewhere between $10 and $15, I should imagine. I only make that as a guess, however.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no; they will not cost that much. Not exceeding $4, perhaps.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am informed that I made my estimate too high, and that the flags will not cost more than from four to six dollars each.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I remember correctly, when Mr. Harrison was President of the United States he ordered that the

United States flag should be placed on all of the public buildings in the District of Columbia. Did not that order also include the public schools?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I understand that it did not, and the amendment I have offered simply proposes to enforce that regulation of the President by providing that these flags shall float over all of the public schoolhouses of the District which are the property of the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not opposing the resolution at all; but I know that under that order the flag was placed on a great many of the public buildings in the District of Columbia; and I would like to ask the gentleman out of what fund the money came that paid for the flags which were placed under that order.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am unable to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thought possibly that there might be a contingent fund in each of the Departments that could be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I have no knowledge of the fact, and am unable to say.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I understood correctly the answer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] as to the number of schoolhouses not floating the United States flag in this District.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I regret to say that I am not able to state positively, and can only give an approximate guess at about 100.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand there are only about 109 buildings in all, used for school purposes in the District of Columbia. This does not include, however, a few that are rented for that purpose.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I understand that there are about 130 of them in all.

Mr. DOCKERY. There are 109 belonging to the District, which cost the Government about two and a half million dollars; and there are a number of rented buildings used for this same purpose.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I do not think, as far as my information goes, that there are more than ten or fifteen that have the flag floating over them, but of this I have no definite knowledge.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me incredible that anyone should oppose this very proper amendment. The United States differs from all other countries on earth in its source of strength and power, from the fact that it has not been large armies, but a spirit of devotion and patriotism to the country and the country's flag that has made it the greatest, the most powerful, the most progressive, and the most respected nation on the globe. We have no standing armies like the powerful nations of Europe, costing as they do from sixty millions to two hundred millions of dollars a year. These great standing armies are their elements of strength; but a spirit of love for country is the element of strength in our land. Anything that can be done, whether it costs $1,000 or $10,000, to further and encourage this spirit, is a good thing to do, and whether the number of flags floating over the schoolhouses of the children of this District be 10, 15, or 500, it makes no difference. It is a matter of surprise to me that the law has not long ago provided for such a judicious expenditure. Had I known that the law did not provide for the purchase of flags for schoolhouses I should have offered the amendment myself.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will say to the gentleman, as I understand it, there are flags already on all of the public buildings.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman who has charge of the amendment says that there are not; that they are only on the school buildings where the scholars have clubbed together and furnished the money to buy them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What has the flag of the country to do with the institution of schoolhouses, anyway?

Mr. WHEELER. It has a great deal to do with it, because the young scholars who are growing up to take our places and be the defenders of this country are inside those schools, and when they go out and look above the schoolhouse, let them look upon the flag of their country, which it may be their glorious privilege to stand under in battle in defense of their country some day. [Applause.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is almost superfluous to attempt to amplify what has been so well said by my friend from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER]; but I am astonished to think that any one should object to having the national ensign, to having "Old Glory" float above every schoolhouse not only in the District of Columbia, but in every State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON. Who has objected?

Mr. WASHINGTON. There is an inspiration of patriotism in the flag that nothing else can give.

Its graceful folds curling in the gentle breeze, its bright stars shining in its field of blue, its stripes of red and white sparkling in the sunshine appeal to the hearts and imaginations of the boys and girls as they come to their morning recitations in a way which will be felt not only for that day, but all through life. The modern way of teaching is by object lessons. What grander object lesson in history than the flag which stands for our nationality and for our power. It recalls every hard-fought field for freedom's rights from Lexington to Yorktown; from Lundys Lane to New Orleans; from Vera Cruz to Mexico; from Bull Run to Appomattox.

It is our flag to love and cherish; to look upon with pride. It should float from sunrise to sunset over every schoolhouse and over every public building not only in the District of Columbia, but in every State and Territory in the Union. Nay, more, it should float over every dwelling where the patriot rears his family. There is no stain upon its folds, there is no sacrilege in its adoration.

The suggestion of cost ought not to weigh against the proposed amendment. The expenditure for the purchase of all the flags contemplated will not be great and can not be seriously felt. A flag of sufficient dimensions and suitable quality can be bought for five or six dollars. If a hundred flags should be required the whole cost need not exceed $500 or $600. The good to result therefrom can not be estimated by any calculation based upon dollars and cents. It is patriotism, devotion to country, the advancement of the general welfare by which alone we can measure the benefit to the rising generation by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, just one word. I can not object to this appropriation. It has occurred to me that it perhaps might be somewhat less, for many of these schools have flags already, and the flags do not cost more than four or five dollars apiece, as I am informed. Probably not more than half the buildings are unprovided, and it might be done, perhaps, for half the money. We do not want to appropriate anything unnecessarily.

I can not object to this because in my own State, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has alluded, many of the towns supply the schools with flags, and they have set apart the day preceding Memorial Day as Flag Day for the scholars in the public schools, and have recognized the idea that the public schools, which are the nurseries of freedom, should have over them the national flag. The public school is not a private institution, nor does it belong alone to a town, county, or State, but it really belongs to the United States.

There is, perhaps, a good argument in favor of letting the children of the schools provide themselves with flags, as is now done here, on the ground that it cultivates the spirit of patriotism to contribute the small sum necessary to purchase a flag and put it on the schoolhouse, and that in doing this the children would take a greater interest in it than if furnished at public expense. The children have been patriotic in many instances in this District in this way, and I am told that all the schoolhouses constructed within the last few years have flag poles ready to receive the flags. In many instances the children have set themselves patriotically to work to furnish the flags; but inasmuch as they furnish, themselves, many other things, such as libraries and pianos, it does not seem amiss that there should be a small appropriation for this purpose. It seems to me that this should be distinguished from the use of the flag for private advertising purposes, which many consider a desecration of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you believe these flags over the schoolhouses and educational institutions of our country are conducive to a patriotic spirit?

Mr. GROUT. I do, most emphatically.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why was it, then, that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], who was educated under the flag at West Point, went into the rebellion in 1861?

Mr. WHEELER. Because his patriotic devotion to his own people sent him there.

Mr. GROUT. Ah, but he has come back to the flag, and sees Old Glory to-day as never before.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is one of the questions this country has never been able to answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will prevail. In my own State the custom is well-nigh universal to fly the flag over the schoolhouses. Persons who visit European countries from our own country, especially in England, find a Government building in almost every town, village, and hamlet, and over it flies the English flag that stands for Old England, for the Queen of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and Empress of India. It is educational. It inspires patriotism; and I think that this amendment is a wise and just one. I believe it is worth all it will cost to teach the children in the public schools of this District to love the old flag, the flag for which our fathers fought the long and bloody war of the Revolution, the flag which Jackson defended behind the cotton bales on the plains of Chalmette, the flag which General Scott defended at Lundys Lane, the flag that General Taylor carried into Mexico, the flag baptized anew on a

hundred fields fresh within the memory of us all, the flag above your head, Mr. Chairman, the old flag, whose azure blue, set with stars, symbolizes the starry firmament of God. School children should be taught lessons of patriotism; should be taught to love their country and their flag. Under other forms of government than our own the affections of the people cluster around the king, queen, czar, or emperor, the throne, and he or she who sits thereon. Having no such center of attraction in our own free Government, the affections of our people naturally cluster around the flag. Other people cry out "Long live the king," "Long live the queen," "Long live the czar." Let us teach our children to look at Old Glory on the schoolhouse, and cry out "Long live the Republic."

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I trust that all those who have any doubt of their patriotic sympathy may have leave to print their remarks.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. In order that there may be no question of appropriating too much money, I modify my amendment by making it read "$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary." I do not desire that any more money shall be appropriated than is necessary.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE.

For major and superintendent, $3,300; captain, $1,800; 3 lieutenants, inspectors, at $1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, $2,000; clerk, $1,500; clerk, $900; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at $540 each; for additional compensation for 12 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, $2,880, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 9 lieutenants, $1,320 each; 31 sergeants, at $1,140 each; 261 privates, class 1, at $900 each; 194 privates, class 2, at $1,080 each; 20 station keepers, at $750; each; 8 laborers, at $480 each; laborer in charge of the morgue, $680; messenger, $700; messenger, $500; major and superintendent, mounted, $240; captain, mounted, $240; 43 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, at $240 each; 21 drivers, at $480 each; and 3 police matrons, at $600 each; in all, $553,480.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman in charge of the bill to make some explanation of this provision and give the committee some idea of the cost of the force. It looks to me as if there was a very large sum of money appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, I will say that the present police force is 475 men, including the officers and privates, to which we have made an addition of just 25 privates, and the estimate was for 125 new men.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman explain why this increase is necessary?

Mr. GROUT. Well, sir, Major Moore testified before us that a large number of the force were now on detached service, or detailed service, I think he called it, at various points in the District, and that there was a real necessity for that increase of the force. Some were about the Capitol, some at the White House, and some elsewhere.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Twelve of them about the Capitol.

Mr. GROUT. They are about the grounds outside; not, of course, in the Capitol itself, but the grounds fall under the charge of the Metropolitan police.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman explain to us, further, as to what number of men are here for the protection of the public grounds—about the Capitol, for instance?

Mr. GROUT. My memory is that there are four on the Capitol grounds.

Mr. HEPBURN. And where are these other details?

Mr. GROUT. One of the details is at the White House, where there are 26 policemen, working in three reliefs. This is only about 1 to every 600 in population, and in other cities the average is 1 to every 500.

In further reply to the gentleman from Iowa, I will state that the detail at the White House is larger than heretofore, about twice as large as it has been in former years, as the Major stated. He said that details have to be made for receptions, and a large number of the committee thought we would provide at least 25; but I can not say that we were entirely clear that that would fully meet the necessities of the service, nor were we clear that more were needed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous: For rent of stable, $120.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask consent that we go back to that portion of the bill that relates to the telegraph and telephone service. I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether the city of Washington or the District of Columbia owns a telegraph and telephone plant here? I find nearly $27,000 of appropriation for this telegraph and telephone service. Does the District own this plant?

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, certainly; I have forgotten the number of miles, but the gentleman, if he will reflect for a moment, will see that the police department and fire department could hardly operate effectually without this service; and it is for the renewal of a portion of that line that a portion of this sum is given. The committee inquired into the matter very particularly, and they raised—I remember it was the case with myself, and I am sure it was the case with the other members of the committee—the question thoroughly as to whether this could not be delayed; but the understanding was that these poles were old. They were put up sixteen or seventeen years ago, and many of them were liable to fall over at any moment. It was therefore thought by the committee that this particular work of renewing should be entered upon, and could not safely be delayed.

Mr. HEPBURN. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will but think for a moment of the prices charged—$100 an instrument here is a sum that is equal to the cost of 270 instruments. Is not that enormous for the use of the city?

Mr. GROUT. What line in the bill does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HEPBURN. I refer to the aggregate of this appropriation, $10,800, $11,000, and $5,000. They aggregate nearly $27,000.

Mr. GROUT. Will the gentleman call attention to the line?

Mr. HEPBURN. Line 16, page 28, line 23 on the same page, and line 4 on the next page.

Mr. GROUT. That in line 16, the twenty-eighth page, is for the service of the superintendent and the operators, and that which you see at the bottom of the page is for supplies, for new batteries, and battery supplies, telephone renewals, purchase of poles, and so on. These instruments are not owned by the District, but they have to be rented.

The next item, for renewing city lines, is the cost of putting up the poles I spoke of a minute ago as being ready to fall down. Possibly too high a sum is allowed here for these instruments that the gentleman speaks of. I can not say. The committee did not take testimony or make any specific inquiry as to that, but accepted the judgment of those who were before them, the persons in charge of this branch of the service, who, it was supposed, would suitably guard the interests of the public and give the committee correct information.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman know how many instruments are used by the city in its offices?

Mr. GROUT. There are 200 telephone instruments in use, at $5 a year, and this gives authority to purchase, if that can be done on terms more advantageous to the District.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What about these telephone poles? Has the Government a telephone system in this city?

Mr. GROUT. Yes, sir; and a system of telegraph also.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. A system belonging to the Government?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly, to the District and the General Government. The people at large own half of it and the District owns the other half.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is it exclusively for Government use?

Mr. GROUT. It is exclusively for public use, the police, the fire department, and the different District offices.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Under what patent is it operating? The Bell telephone patents?

Mr. GROUT. I can not answer that. Not a word was said on that subject before the committee, and it was not inquired into.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Did the committee look into the question of whether it would not be cheaper to rent?

Mr. GROUT. We already rent 200 instruments, and pay but $5 a year.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then, if we rent the instruments, why should we be burdened with the expense of putting up the poles?

Mr. GROUT. The poles are for renewing the telegraph line, and the instruments are only an incident to the poles and wires when erected. If any gentleman can give us information by which any fair reduction can be made in the bill, the committee will be very glad to receive it, and will enter at once upon any reasonable course that may be necessary to carry it into effect.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the matter correctly, these lines are lines for the fire-alarm and such other service, but the District authorities rent telephones for their use the same as individuals do.

Mr. GROUT. They rent the instruments——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. They rent them the same as individuals do, and pay the telephone company as individuals do. And now, Mr. Chairman, as we have recurred to this subject, I desire to offer an amendment, to come in after the word "dollars" in line 5, page 29 of the bill.

The amendment was read, as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or for any telephone company doing business in the District of Columbia to charge or receive more than $50 per annum for the use of a telephone on a separate wire; $40 for each telephone, there being not more than two on a wire; $30 for each telephone, there being not more than three on a wire, and $25 for each telephone, there being four or more on the same wire.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that possibly I do not comprehend the full scope of the proposition. However, I shall not make any point of order upon it, but will place the responsibility for its correctness upon the gentleman who offers it.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, exclusive of water bonds, $1,213,947.97.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding the following, at the end of line 25, page 31: "to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. GROUT. I make a point of order upon that amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman state what his point of order is.

Mr. GROUT. The point of order is perfectly manifest. The amendment changes existing law. The law provides that this shall be paid as is provided in this bill, and if it is provided that it shall be paid differently the organic act is changed.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, while not assuming to know a great deal about the laws of the District, I am yet of the opinion, from the hasty and somewhat casual investigation which I have made, that the gentleman from Vermont, whose ability and information upon these subjects I fully concede, is in error in this case as to his point of order. I do not believe there is any law which requires that the United States shall pay half of this particular item of expenditure. What particular parts of the law the gentleman relies upon to sustain him in his point of order I do not know, and, not knowing, I shall call the attention of the Chair briefly to the law bearing upon this subject so far as I have been able to find it.

I do this in all sincerity, Mr. Chairman, not merely to invite the Chair to reconsider his ruling of the other day, but because, even conceding that ruling to have been correct, I think that my amendment as to this particular item is not obnoxious to the existing law or the rules of the House, and I invite the attention of the Chair and of the members of the House to this question. Of course I take it that if there be no law which requires the Government of the United States to bear half of this item of expenditure of more than $1,200,000 for a single year, then the question submitted to the House is an original question, and the amendment which I have offered ought to be adopted or rejected accordingly as gentlemen may believe that. Independently of existing law (for I think there is none on the subject), the United States ought to pay half or the District ought to pay all of this expenditure. Now, in good faith I address myself to that proposition and invite the attention of the Chairman and the House to it.

On page 23 of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States is the provision in regard to the 3.65 bonds of the District. In section 7 it is provided—

That the sinking-fund commissioners of said District are hereby continued; and it shall be the duty of said sinking-fund commissioners to cause bonds of the District of Columbia to be prepared in sums of fifty and five hundred dollars, bearing date August 1, 1874, payable fifty years after date, bearing interest at the rate of 3.65 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, to be signed by the secretary and the treasurer of said sinking-fund commissioners and countersigned by the comptroller of said District and sealed as the board may direct.

Further on in the same section it is provided—

And the faith of the United States is hereby pledged that the United States will, by proper proportional appropriations as contemplated in this act, and by causing to be levied upon the property within said District such taxes as will provide the revenues necessary to pay the interest on said bonds as the same may become due and payable, and create a sinking fund for the payment of the principal thereof at maturity.

This provision, upon examination, will be seen to lack a word or two, no doubt left out through the carelessness of the draftsman or in the printing. The same provision is repeated on page 64 of this Supplement with these words supplied. It will be found in an act entitled "An act to amend an act for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874. In this latter act the clause is in this form—I will not detain the Chair by reading the whole enactment, but merely those parts which I think pertinent—

And the faith of the United States is hereby pledged that the United States will, by proper proportional appropriations as contemplated in this act, and by causing to be levied upon the property within said District such taxes as will do so, provide the revenues necessary to pay the interest on said bonds as the same may become due and payable, and create a sinking fund for the payment of the principal thereof at maturity.

On pages 175, 176, and so on of this same Supplement will be found the general act upon which I suppose gentlemen rely in their contention that the United States have undertaken to pay half of such expenditures as this, as well as half of other expenditures relating to the District of Columbia. The act is very long, and of course I will not detain the Chair by reading it all. But I do not believe there can be found in any part of that act authority for this contention. There is a reference to this bonded indebtedness in these words:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the interest on the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia, issued in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 20, 1874, when the same shall become due and payable; and all amounts so paid shall be credited as a part of the appropriation for the year by the United States toward the expenses of the District of Columbia, as hereinbefore provided.

On page 253 is another reference to the same subject. The provision reads:

And there is hereby appropriated, out of the proportional sum which the United States may contribute toward the expenses of the District of Columbia, in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1878, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and annually thereafter, such sums as will, with the interest thereon at the rate of 3.65 per cent per annum, be sufficient to pay the principal of the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia issued under the act of Congress approved June 20, 1874, at maturity.

On pages 947 and 948 will be found what I believe to be the latest legislation bearing directly on this subject. I call the attention of the Chair to these several provisions of law without especial reference to their bearing and without insisting that they all directly and necessarily bear on this question. My object is to lay before the Chairman as best I can the provisions of law which, so far as I know, are all the provisions necessary to be considered in determining whether the point of order raised against the amendment I have offered is or is not good.

I will now read, beginning at the bottom of page 947, from "An act approved March 31, 1891," which I repeat is, so far as I know, the latest legislation on this subject, although there may be later:

And the faith of the United States is hereby pledged that the United States will, by proportional appropriations and by causing to be levied upon the property within said District such taxes as will do so, provide the revenues necessary to pay the interest on said bonds as the same may become due and payable, and create a sinking fund for the payment of the same at maturity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my contention in this matter is that the United States did not by the act of 1878, providing for the payment of one-half of the expenses of this District, provide for the assumption of any part of the debt of the District or bind itself to pay any proportion of that debt whatsoever, except out of the revenues of the District. The legislation (and I have quoted from the various acts) was for the purpose of refunding these bonds and guaranteeing their payment by the United States, to the end, I have no doubt, that behind the District and the credit of the District would be thrown the credit of the United States, so that the bonds might be floated at the lowest practicable rate of interest, for the benefit of the people of the District; that the United States would provide, as it became necessary, from year to year, for the payment of the current interest and for the creation of a sinking fund to ultimately extinguish the bonds themselves; and also (I think there is no straining of the language in this, but only a fair construction) providing for the levying of such taxes within the District of Columbia as would be sufficient to raise the revenue necessary to pay the amount which the Government itself would pay. In this act of 1878, where mention is made of the payment of this interest by the Government, I do not think it is said, I do not think it is implied, that the Government would pay half of that outright, but that the Government would pay all of it and that all that it did pay should be a credit to the Government upon the amount which it was bound to pay by this half-and-half arrangement upon other items.

In other words, I think the act when fairly construed shows that the Government agreed to pay half of certain expenditures of the District of Columbia, not including the payment of the debt of the District already accrued or the interest on that debt as it came due—excluding that; and that the Government further agreed, in order to enhance the value and increase the salability of these bonds, as a matter of benefit and accommodation to the District, that it would pay not the half, but all of this interest as it accrued semiannually, and what was necessary in order to create the sinking fund, and that it would credit itself with that sum, whatever it might be, as so much paid upon the other sums which it had agreed to pay—the 50 per cent undertaking of the act.

Now, let me read this language again:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the interest on the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia, issued in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 20, 1874, when the same shall become due and payable; and all amounts so paid shall be credited as a part of the appropriations for the year by the United States toward the expenses of the District of Columbia as hereinbefore provided.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to sustain that construction let us refer again to what I believe to be the latest enactment on this subject, found on pages 947 and 948 of this volume of the statutes, and at the close of that particular act we find this language:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to provide for the payment of all expenses connected with the engraving, issuing, and redemption of the above bonds upon vouchers to be approved by the Treasurer of the United States.

I do not say, of course, that this is conclusive of the matter; but if the United States were bound by a prior arrangement, namely, in the 1878 act, to pay one-half of the expense accruing in preparing these bonds, and half of the interest on these bonds, and the one-half necessary for their extinguishment, why should there have been a provision that in getting into motion the necessary machinery for that purpose the District of Columbia should pay all of the incidental expenses, as herein provided?

The act provides further—

That the Treasurer of the United States, ex officio commissioner of the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, is hereby directed to cause to be

prepared in sums of $100, $500, and $1,000, to be designated as ten-year funding bonds of the District of Columbia, bonds bearing interest—

And so on.

Now, not to unnecessarily detain the Chair, I submit that the act of 1878 did not bind the United States to pay one-half of this item of appropriation, either as to the interest or the principal of those bonds. There is no act, I claim, prior or subsequent thereto, which makes this a debt of the United States or binds the United States to pay it, except for the District of Columbia; and that the language itself, providing for this payment, thoroughly shows this. Take the pertinent paragraph of three acts—two prior to 1878 and one the act of 1891, passed on the 3d of March:

And the faith of the United States is hereby pledged that the United States will, by proportional appropriations, and by causing to be levied on the property within said District such taxes as will do so, provide the revenues necessary to pay the interest on said bonds as the same may become due and payable, and create a sinking fund for the payment of the same at maturity.

Now, I submit if it were meant that the United States should pay one-half and that the District of Columbia should pay the other half, this language is most unhappily chosen and must be distorted and perverted to give it that meaning. But if the meaning is that the United States shall pay, as I understand, and shall cause to be levied on the property of the District the taxes necessary to provide the sum to pay—"such taxes as will do so"—as the act says, then we have clearness and reason out of what would otherwise be confusion and uncertainty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why should the United States assume that debt? Why should this act, unless it is clearly so in terms—this act of 1878—be held to be retroactive in its effect? We all know, as a matter of current history, that prior to that period the District of Columbia had its own government, legislated for itself, regulated its own expenditures, had its own officers, made its own laws, subject, of course, to the supervision and jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. The District of Columbia created the indebtedness at that time. Why should the United States, then, assume that indebtedness, and why do we assume that the United States have assumed such indebtedness, unless it be clearly so expressed in the act itself? It would seem that when there was a change in the system, or in the policy adopted toward the District of Columbia, it may be reasonably assumed that the lawmakers would contemplate only that in the future a division of expenditure should be made, without any reference to the existing burdens of the District, accumulated in the past.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the burden is on him who claims that the Government of the United States assumed this indebtedness to clearly show a law or agreement which binds the United States in that respect. It is not so set forth in clearly expressed language in any of the acts to which I have referred—not even by fair implication; and I submit that the several provisions of the law which I have read are not to be reconciled upon common reason and according to the force of language with such a construction. It is clear enough upon the face of the acts themselves that the Government of the United States simply set itself up as a guarantor of the bonds, gave its promises that the bonds should be liquidated out of the revenues of the District.

The United States gave to the District a guaranty that they would float the bonds and gave the purchasers of the bonds assurance that the Government would see that they were paid; and the United States have nothing more to do with them than to comply with that agreement, raising the necessary funds by District taxation. The act itself specifies how the bonds are to be paid; not one-half out of the revenues of the Government and one-half by the District of Columbia, but by revenues to be derived by taxes upon property in the District of Columbia. In the language of the act itself, the Government, in order to pay, will "levy upon the property in such District such taxes as will do so." That is, will pay the interest and indebtedness, not one-half, but all of it, out of District revenues.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the act to which the gentleman is now referring?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The date of this act that I am now quoting from is March 3, 1891; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is, as far as I can find, the same provision in substance and essence as that which was contained in the act of 1874.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the significance of the words "by proportional appropriation"?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The meaning that I give to that, Mr. Chairman, is this: By such appropriations, from time to time, as shall be necessary to meet these accruing obligations. One year it would be so much and another year it would be less, or more. There is also a provision in these laws for taking in bonds. It would depend, too, upon the amount set aside at any time for the sinking fund. That is the meaning that I give to that phrase. I submit that it is a reasonable construction of it, or meaning for it, and that it is more in harmony with the language of the statute, and I think the purposes of these statutes, than any other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not to detain the House or the Chairman longer, I wish this matter could be passed over without prejudice, especially if the bill is not to be concluded to-day. Then you, Mr. Chairman, could examine these various provisions, and other gentlemen interested in the matter might look into it, so that the question might be decided upon investigation, which, it seems to me, would be a good thing. I am not captious about it; but I assume that, like members in general, the Chairman has not sufficiently looked into this matter so as to be fully informed upon it. I do not know that he has not. If he has specially examined the law, then of course there is no reason for postponement so far as he is concerned. Delay and a careful investigation, however, will, I believe, lead to the conclusion that the amendment is not out of order on account of the United States being bound by existing law to pay half of this item of expenditure, whatever it may be, for I believe there is no such law. No harm can come by investigation, it seems to me. I merely suggest this. Of course I have no right to ask it and do not ask it.

Mr. GROUT. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] that it is the hope of the committee to pass this bill to-day. Now, it seems to me the Chairman caught the vulnerable point in the gentleman's argument when he asked him what he understood by the expression that the faith of Congress was pledged to make proportional appropriations for payment of the debt. I do not know but the gentleman answered to the satisfaction of the Chair, but he did not answer to my satisfaction, although I will admit that my attention for the moment was somewhat diverted.

Why is Congress by these continued acts plighting its faith and agreeing, by proportional appropriations, to see these bonds or this debt paid, if it is only a guarantor. It seems to me that is strange language for a simple guarantor. What little knowledge I have of law would enable me to place it in the other category, and that is, when they talk about a proportional appropriation, I should understand it as the language itself plainly implies, that Congress thereby agrees to appropriate its share, its proportion, whatever it may be.

It is true the acts the gentleman read from do not define it, but the acts of 1874 and 1878 very clearly define that proportion as being one-half. There is that also in appropriation acts ever since those acts that make it plainer still, and that is the fact that the interest and sinking fund have been appropriated for annually and in the very language employed in this bill. But, as settling this matter beyond all question, there is a permanent appropriation on this subject in the sundry civil act of 1880, and it is in this language:

And there is hereby appropriated, out of the proportional sum which the United States may contribute toward the expenses of the District of Columbia in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1878, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and annually thereafter, such sums as will, with the interest thereon at the rate of 3.65 per cent per annum, be sufficient to pay the principal of the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia issued under the act of Congress approved June 20, 1874, at maturity; which said sums the Secretary of the Treasury shall annually invest in said bonds at not exceeding the par value thereof; and all bonds so redeemed shall cease to bear interest and shall be cancelled and destroyed in the same manner that United States bonds are canceled and destroyed.

It seems to me that this permanent appropriation must be accepted as a definite settlement of this question by express declaration of Congress; and in compliance with this permanent appropriation the District bill has annually carried this appropriation, in order to have the current appropriations show the current liabilities of the Government. Just about one-half of $1,213,000 is for the interest on the public debt, and the other half goes to the sinking fund.

Let me ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] if it does not seem strange to him, providing his view be correct, that this has not been discovered till now? I commend to the gentleman's careful consideration the act of 1880, which is a permanent appropriation.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Vermont if he will consent to let this pass over until the other provisions of the bill have been disposed of to-day, so as to give the Chair and members an opportunity to look into it. I do not mean to pass it over to-day, but until a later part of the day.

Mr. GROUT. This proposition has been sprung upon us without a moment's notice, but we do not ask any delay. I wish to say to the gentleman that he has presented in a very able and complete manner his argument, and as a special pleader I think it does him great credit. I can hardly see how he, who has evidently taken much time to carefully investigate this question, should ask for further time now. We are willing to submit it to the decision of the Chair now.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire for myself that it be laid over. I am not going to waste time in insisting upon it. I merely suggested it, and the only reason for the suggestion is that the Chairman, if he chooses to do so, could look further into it, and that other members of the House should have opportunity to look into it if they see proper.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of several

gentlemen about me, it seems to me that it is a very important question to determine whether the Government of the United States assumed all the District of Columbia debt and are obligated to appropriate $1,200,000 a year to meet a provision of the obligation assumed by the District for 3.65 bonds.

I am told by a gentleman near me that he has examined the Revised Statutes this morning, and that he is entirely satisfied that at least it is very doubtful whether the Government of the United States ever assumed any part of that old debt—that the mischief that they did assume looked to the future; and it being a question of such importance as it is, the gentleman having the bill in charge might let this matter go over until Monday, so that it could be examined.

Mr. GROUT. We are going to pass this bill this afternoon if we have good luck.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman may not have such good luck as he predicts if he starts out on that policy.

Mr. GROUT. How is that?

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman may not have such good luck if he starts out on that line.

Mr. GROUT. Oh, I understand; the gentleman can filibuster and prevent the passage of the bill, but I hope he will not.

Mr. POWERS. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can save the United States Government $1,200,000 a year we had better filibuster.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, it is not $1,200,000. That is the amount provided in this bill for next year. The debt of the District amounts to over $20,000,000.

Mr. POWERS. I read the language of the gentleman's bill:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, exclusive of water bonds, $1,213,947.97.

Mr. GROUT. That is just for this year.

Mr. POWERS. That is exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. GROUT. Yes; but the liability of the United States is for the debt the District owed at the time it went into partnership with the District, and the debt at the time we formed the copartnership with the District amounted to $20,000,000. That is the question that is involved; and if it were an open question, if anybody could fairly be in doubt about it, I would not hesitate——

Mr. SAYERS. I suggest to the gentleman from Vermont that this provision be passed over until the rest of the bill shall have been completed.

Mr. GROUT. Well, I will not object, but it seems to me that the party who made the assault ought not to ask quarter so soon.

Mr. POWERS. I am not making any assault upon it.

Mr. GROUT. I am not referring to my colleague; I am referring to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. POWERS. This is a very important matter, and my colleague has made it altogether more important than I had thought, for he says it involves an obligation to pay $20,000,000, which doubtless further involves the present obligation to pay $1,200,000. Now, that is an important matter that should not be rushed through the committee without giving the members of the committee and the Chair ample opportunity to look the question up—if we are bound to pay this money, and if there is any doubt, then the good sense of the committee would dictate that we take time to examine the question.

Mr. DOCKERY. I would suggest to my friend in charge of the bill that this item be passed over until we shall have completed the remainder of the bill, and during that time doubtless some arrangement can be made in respect to this item.

Mr. GROUT. I am willing to give these gentlemen further opportunity to study this problem, which seems to them a very complex one, and I ask unanimous consent that the item be passed over until we complete the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the pending amendment, with the point of order pending, be passed over until the close of the bill. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, $2,500.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this paragraph, and in that connection I ask the attention of the committee for a few minutes. The proposition which I make here brings us face to face with a vital question which is involved in this matter of charitable appropriations. I have made a motion to strike out the paragraph which has just been read not because I believe the purpose of that appropriation is not meritorious. I represent a district, sir, upon every quarter section of which there resides an ex-Union soldier. I certainly am not wanting in loyalty to that band of gallant men, some of whom may be so unfortunate as to stray within the confines of this District. But, Mr. Chairman, there is another great question involved here. We seek to appropriate under this subhead $219,925. Of this amount there is appropriated for exclusively private purposes $81,700 and $138,225 for public purposes. The items of private appropriation which are included in this general subject, and which make a total of $81,700, are the following:

For Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers	$2,500
For Woman's Christian Association	4,000
For Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital	15,000
For Children's Hospital	10,000
For National Homeopathic Hospital Association	8,500
For Washington Hospital for Foundlings	6,000
For Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish	1,800
For German Orphan Asylum	1,800
For National Association for Destitute Colored Women and Children	9,900
For St. Ann's Infant Asylum	5,400
For Association for Works of Mercy	1,800
For House of Good Shepherd	2,700
For St. Rose Industrial School	4,500
For St. Joseph Asylum	1,800
For Young Women's Christian Home	1,000
For Home and Help Mission	1,000
For Newsboy and Children's Aid Society	1,000
For Eastern Dispensary	1,000
For Washington Home for Incurables	2,000

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that several of the paragraphs appropriating for the institutions which the gentleman has enumerated have not yet been read.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I read these paragraphs as a part of my remarks. If the gentleman from Alabama will contain himself he will probably obtain some information which he has not now.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be very glad of that.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. These private appropriations make an aggregate of $81,700.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I make no question but that each of these institutions for which an appropriation is here sought to be made is doing a meritorious work. Some of them are sectarian and others are unsectarian, but each one of those to which I have called attention is a purely private institution. Their work, while philanthropic, is in the real sense private; they represent no public work. Let this committee understand it, these are institutions over which the Government has absolutely no control. These institutions, it is true, make reports to the superintendent of charities, but those reports are not made under oath. The Government of the United States, which makes these appropriations, has no right to say what persons shall enter any of these institutions or what persons shall go out of them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Neither can the Government examine their records.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No; the Government can not examine their records. It can not and does not specify the purpose for which a single dollar of the money that is here appropriated shall be expended. It can not and does not require an itemized report of their expenditures. It is true, as I have said, that reports are made by these institutions to the superintendent of charities, but those reports are not made under oath, nor are they verified in any particular. No officer of the Government has a right to go into these institutions and verify or check up their expenditures. No officer of the Government can call upon them for a statement of all their receipts. The Government can not call upon them for a clear, concise statement of all the moneys which come into their hands. It exercises no control over them. The public whose money is appropriated has but the merest general knowledge derived from perfunctory reports of the work they really do. Neither the Government nor the public has access to make investigation, correct abuses, if any exist, or institute needed reforms. The Government has but one function respecting any of them and that is to pay the bill. The credit is monopolized by the church or institute. The blame is buried with the unfortunates. Many of these institutions are self-sustaining. Let me call attention to some of them. Take, for instance, the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish. The report of that institution appears on pages 207–210 of the report for the year 1895, made by the superintendent of charities. On the pages I have indicated it appears that this institution receives a large amount of money. It is an institution founded——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman from Nebraska will be allowed additional time.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed without limit.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I thank the committee for its indulgence and I will endeavor not to abuse it.

On page 207 of the report to which I have referred will be found a statement of certain receipts by this institution. Its receipts from April 11, 1894, to March 5, 1895, it appears, were sufficient to enable it to pay on notes to one Bettes $1,027, and to Riggs & Co. on orphanage debt $5,000, making a total of $6,027 applied on indebtedness after paying all current indebtedness. On page 210 of the same report I find it stated this institution has property in this city and "at its country home in Virginia valued at about $50,000, which was secured from private sources, with the excep-

tion of $10,000 public money invested in improvements." It appears to be investing in, or at least holding, property as an investment, and continues to ask Government aid.

On the face of that statement it would appear that the total receipts of this institution were something over $10,000 for the time mentioned, but by referring to the succeeding page we discover that certain donations have been received which are not included in that statement, and you find on examination that not one dollar received from "donations" has been carried into this account. The real amount of money received by this institution, splendid though its work may be, does not appear. This is an institution attached to one of the wealthiest churches in this city. Among its patrons are numbered ladies who are recognized as millionaires. Among them are Mrs. Leland Stanford and Mrs. George T. Hearst. Again I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I make no question as to the value of the work of this institution, but I am pointing out the private character of this and all the institutions I have spoken of, and I ask this question: If you are to make appropriation here for this private institution, located in the city of Washington, and having for its patrons the millionaires of California and of other parts of the country, why, in the name of common sense, should you not with equal propriety make appropriations for worthy private institutions in the district in which I live, located in my town or in my State?

Go further through the list of these institutions and you find that some, in addition to being private, are sectarian. Basing my objection as I do on higher and more comprehensive ground, I make no question now upon that point. There are, it is true, a large number of people in this country who do make a question on that. There are many who recognize the fact that one of the foundation principles on which this Government is based is that there shall be an absolute divorce of church and state. You can not have this absolute divorce and at the same time appropriate money to sectarian institutions for purely sectarian purposes.

As I said, however, I do not now make point on that. It may not be seemly for me to object to any of these institutions because of their sectarian character. Certainly I would not assail one of them for the sole reason it belongs to the Catholic Church. I make no secret, gentlemen, of the fact I was born on a foreign shore and born of parents who belonged to the Catholic Church. In that church I was baptized. I am not a member, however, of that church or any other. But I revere the grand good work which that church has done. I recognize the fact that the splendid charitable institutions all over the world, founded and conducted by the Catholic Church and under its sheltering folds, have been doing and are doing to-day most noble work. But I want to say to the members of this House and the country that the good work they do does not depend upon appropriations coming from any Government. The appropriations upon which they depend come from people whose hearts go out to the poor, the sick, and the unfortunate in all this world. So it is with these other institutions. Take the Temporary Soldiers' Home. If the unfortunate soldiers must rely simply upon this pittance of $2,500, then they would better go to the potter's field at once. No; they will be cared for just as well without this appropriation as with it—aye, better. The patriotism of this nation will provide for them homes and shelters, sustenance and asylums, but it will do it directly and not secondhand.

Let it be known that we are contending here for a principle—a principle which must abide. We say that the Government should appropriate money only for public purposes; there should be absolutely no appropriation for private purposes of any character or description. I care not how meritorious they be, not one dollar should be appropriated for them. How many of you gentlemen here would willingly vote for the support of a Methodist college, a Catholic college, a Presbyterian college? Yet education is necessary to the maintenance of popular government; there is no question about that. But not one of us would so vote. And yet that question is a much closer one than that we are considering, for we all admit that it is the province of the Government to educate its children; we know that such is its duty, and we appropriate liberally for it. But we appropriate for governmental institutions. We make the public schools of our country one of the charges of our government—municipal, State, and national. And so it should be with these charitable institutions in this District. There is need for them, God knows. We need to appropriate more money for these laudable purposes. We should take care of all the sick and unfortunate of whom the public may properly take care. But we should fairly and squarely meet this question. We should establish public institutions, public asylums, public homes, public reformatories for the purpose of taking care of these unfortunates.

No gentleman can give one good, valid reason for appropriating public money for private purposes. Certainly no Democrat can favor such an appropriation. Members of that party have made their contention from time out of mind that the tariff policy of the Republican party is wrong, and why? Because, as they say, it lays burdens upon the people at large for the benefit of the few. If their contention were right, I should vote against any protective tariff. If their contention is right, then our system of tariff can not be defended. But we do defend that system by denying their premises. And so both Republicans and Democrats join in the principle that there should be no taxation for private purposes. Every dollar of this money comes from some form of taxation or tribute which the Government levies. The money expended is public funds. I base my opposition upon the broad principle, the broad ground, that no matter what church asks it, no matter what private institution asks it, I care not how meritorious may be its work, you have no right to vote one dollar for that purpose. And I shall make a motion to strike out, not only this paragraph which has been read, but every other of similar purport. Then I shall move that all the children that may properly be transferred to the board of children's guardians shall be remitted to their care. By doing this we plant ourselves upon a solid foundation.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion allow me to say that I make these motions not without great reluctance. I realize that there is much of loyalty due from me to the committee which I have been honored with membership upon. I know that by reporting them they seem to favor these items I am assailing. I know, too, that the good work which is done by these several institutions makes an appeal to us very hard to resist. Nor would I, Mr. Chairman, make this motion if I believed that any truly worthy destitute unfortunate person, young or old, would fail of proper care in the absence of these appropriations. But proper care will be furnished to all these people in distress.

The session is yet young. Only yesterday, when an attempt was made in this committee to relieve the people from the monopolistic outrages which the community have been suffering so many years—when that attempt was made we were routed by a sortie under the gallant leadership of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], whom I much admire, and we were prevented from effecting any such purpose by the interposition of a point of order. We were then given assurances that at an early day the proper committee would bring in general legislation bearing upon the subject. And we were treated to the dazzling prospect of a utilization of certain rapids 20 miles up the river, which would do away with all monopoly. If that argument was good, if it could obtain here at that time, I ask you now, why may not the Committee on the District of Columbia, whose able chairman is eager and ready, whose feet are swift in all good works—I ask you why may they not bring in a general bill which will take care of all these charities that we can not take care of under this appropriation bill by the institution of a rational public system of charities founded on right principle and violation of no principle of our Government? So, then, I say, from whatever standpoint we look at this matter, if we adopt the principle for which I contend, we are safe because we are right.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] who has just taken his seat speaks with a great deal of eloquence of the importance of these charities and their great needs, and, as he admits, their commendable merits. The charitable institution which he particularly attacks appeared to have been the orphan asylum connected with St. John's Church, and his charge is that two ladies, Mrs. Leland Stanford and Mrs. George Hearst, have contributed largely to its support, or, to use his language, have become its patronesses. Now, because two very excellent and charitable Christian ladies aid this worthy institution from their private means is the gentleman's ground of attack.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Pardon me; I made no attack upon any institution.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman did not attack the institution, but his attack was upon the small appropriation of $1,800 which has been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, and he opposes this meager appropriation, giving as a reason that the two ladies we have mentioned are patronesses of this asylum for orphans.

Now, the appropriation of $1,800 is only 3 cents per capita per day for each inmate of that asylum.

If the gentleman had studied the origin of the charitable institutions in this city I am confident that he would never have made that speech.

As far back as thirty-five years ago most of these institutions were inaugurated. They were built up and supported almost entirely by the charitable and Christian people of the District of Columbia by their own means.

St. Paul tells us:

> And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

There is probably no city in the world of the population of Washington where there has been so great an amount of money dispensed in charity as has been done in this city. The very nature of the government of this city seemed to make it necessary years ago for Christian people to take up this subject and estab-

lish institutions to care for the sick and needy. Years before the war, the great philanthropist, Mr. Corcoran, commenced devoting a large portion of his means to charity, and his gifts before his death were, by his dying bequest, perpetuated for all time. The late Mr. Riggs was also munificent in his donations, and the same spirit of liberality has been maintained by his family since the day of his death.

In the last twenty-five years the roll of the citizens of Washington who have devoted their time and means to relieving distress among the poor and providing for orphans has largely increased. I could mention many of these names, but they are well known among the people.

One institution that the gentleman referred to, the House of the Good Shepherd, was established by the efforts and means of the daughter of an eminent naval officer, Miss Annie E. Smith, who died recently, and who devoted all of her fortune and much of her life to the establishment of that charitable association. Here ladies, who receive no compensation, devote their lives to protecting the innocent and lifting up the fallen. The House of the Good Shepherd is without revenue, under debt for a balance still due on its building, and is trying to become self-supporting by taking in plain sewing.

Now, the gentleman also spoke of St. Joseph's Asylum. The report of the superintendent of charities shows that many of the children between 6 and 14 years of age in that institution are the children of disabled United States soldiers. They have been cared for without any recompense during the time when they were so small and helpless. The only source of their support is the bequests of the generous.

During the war the charitable institutions of this city gladly gave homes to a great number of wounded and disabled soldiers and the children of soldiers wounded or killed in battle. This patriotic and commendable action on their part of course impressed Congress, and with great propriety they contributed a small sum to these institutions to help defray expenses which by no means properly devolved upon local charitable associations.

An effort was made in the last Congress to deprive the institutions of these meager appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations was induced by ex parte statements to remit all these institutions to the board of children's guardians, giving to that body a sum in bulk equal to that which had been distributed among the various charitable associations; but after the bill was reported, the impolicy and injustice of the measure was made so apparent that the entire committee gladly acquiesced in an amendment which was offered upon the floor of the House which restored the greater part, distributing it as had been done in previous years and in about the same proportion as is provided for in this bill, and that amendment passed the House and Senate, as I remember, by an absolutely unanimous vote.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will permit me, I want the committee to understand that the Appropriations Committee did not strike any of these in the last bill.

Mr. WHEELER. No; two years ago was the bill to which I referred, and the bill as now framed gives to these associations 60 per cent of their former appropriations—the same amount that the House and Senate deemed it their duty to give in that bill, which passed the House and Senate, as I remember, without a dissenting vote. The gentleman spoke of the different religious associations which were connected with these institutions, and referred to their religious features as a reason for opposing the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference to me whether a man who worships the God of Heaven kneels in one church or another. It makes no difference to me whether the good people of this land who religiously devote their time and means to charitable purposes worship in one church or another; and most of them, God bless them, are the good women; and it is from them that comes nearly all the good there is in this world. They are all obeying the mandate of the sermon on the mount. All denominations are doing good, charitable work in the District of Columbia, and it is our duty to give them aid to the small extent that the bill proposes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. To support them.

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; not to support them; the Government does not support them; it gives but a very small percentage for the support of these institutions. Many of these institutions have been inaugurated at the cost of from ten to thirty-five thousand dollars, all contributed by the charitable people of the District, and these same good people contribute annually from $3,000 to $10,000 to each of these associations; and the gentleman objects to the small pittance which this bill proposes to add to the fund, and which enables them to care for and support the waifs and orphans who are brought here from all other parts of the country, and who would be a charge upon the different States were it not that these people here are active in their charity and come to the aid of these unfortunates.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want my friend from Alabama to answer this question, if he will.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Are you in favor of the United States Government supporting or aiding any one sectarian or religious denomination in any of its enterprises?

Mr. WHEELER. I am very sorry that the gentleman has, upon the floor of the House, asked such a question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I mean, to furnish them aid to carry on sectarian institutions.

Mr. WHEELER. I repeat that I am sorry to hear a gentleman stand in this Hall and bring in a question of difference of religious opinion when we are considering a cause of charity. [Applause.] The bill is not to aid any one sect or religious denomination. It proposes to aid the poor, needy, and infirm, and the helpless orphans, without any question as to their sectarian or religious denomination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask for permission to continue for just three minutes longer.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will answer my question, I will make the request that his time be extended.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get on with the bill, and will speak to the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska for a few moments.

Mr. WHEELER. I trust, then, if I can not have my time extended, that the House will vote against the amendment. For the sake of Christian charity, I say, in God's name, do not trample down the charitable efforts of the good people of the city, but aid them in this most commendable work, which they are so successfully prosecuting.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended five minutes. The House has just extended that courtesy to the gentleman who made the motion [Mr. HAINER of Nebraska].

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Alabama can come in subsequently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will not object, although we ought to proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes longer.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the gentlemen from Tennessee and the House. I think I answered Mr. LIVINGSTON'S question, and I fully concur with him that Congress should not make any distinction between any sects or religious denominations, and this bill is most notably exempt from any such feature. Congress bears the same relation to the District of Columbia that a legislature does to a State, and it is an imperative duty of Congress to make provision for the indigent, the sick, the infirm, the disabled, and the orphans which come under its care; and if the gentleman will examine this bill he will see that all institutions have been so justly provided for that a claim has never been made that any sect or denomination has been discriminated against. I see here institutions provided for which are under the control of Lutherans, Episcopalians, Catholics, and united denominations, which, I believe, include all religious persuasions.

It was admitted in this House two years ago that this board of children's guardians have rules and regulations which are so at variance with the rules and regulations of these institutions that it is impossible for their beneficiaries to be cared for by the board, and I understand the purpose of the gentleman is to remit all of the appropriations for these various associations to the board of guardians. While it will not reduce the expenditure a particle, it will simply change the direction of the appropriation and turn it into another channel, which the superintendent of charities says is not properly organized to administer it. The superintendent in his report begs Congress not to place these matters under his control, for if under the board of children's guardians it would be virtually under his supervision; but he asks that they be left to the institutions, because his experience during three years shows that the greatest good can not come from the fund if it is turned over to the board of guardians, and that the best good can only be attained by leaving it under the organizations which now have it in charge.

In a former report of Colonel Tracey, superintendent of charities of the District of Columbia, he shows how fully he appreciates the great work done by the people of the city, and his investigations show how the charitable institutions have depended almost entirely on the generosity of the people and not upon appropriations from Congress. He says:

It is deemed proper, in concluding this report, to refer to an erroneous impression regarding the charitable institutions of the District which prevails quite widely among those not familiar with them, as I know from experience before and since my official connection with the charities of Washington. This impression is that these institutions are unduly dependent upon Government aid, and that in fact some of them have been founded and are maintained rather with a view to securing to them participation in the United States Treasury appropriations than for the sake of the good they can accomplish. This belief is utterly baseless.

Colonel Tracey also tells us that besides these institutions which receive a small moiety of their incomes from the Government there are other charitable institutions which accomplish great good, and which are supported entirely by the benevolence of men and women of this city. These institutions, as stated by him, are conspicuous monuments to the goodness, benevolence, and charity of Christian people who devote their time, efforts, and means to these institutions of mercy. He says:

Not only are the unofficial charitable institutions of the District of Columbia maintained, as they were founded, by private benefaction in far greater degree than by public appropriation, but there are in Washington and its vicinity a number of admirable institutions which have never been, to any extent whatever, a public charge and do not now receive Government aid. As examples of such establishments founded and conducted by widely varying philanthropic influences, I mention three, the Home for Incurables, the Society of the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Washington City Protestant Orphan Asylum. They support helpless persons who would otherwise necessarily be public charges, and, to the extent of their benefactions, thereby relieve the public funds. The Home for Incurables is the most perfect institution of its class of which I have knowledge. It is a conspicuous monument to the benevolence of philanthropic men and women of Washington and a striking illustration of the fact that for practical munificence and volunteer charitable effort the city which is the seat of our Federal Government is second to none in proportion to its population and resources.

Colonel Tracey's report, which has just been published, shows the commendable economy with which the money appropriated by the Government has been used. The following table shows the amount proposed to be appropriated and the average number of inmates during the past year:

Institutions.	Proposed appropriation.	Average number of inmates.
Woman's Christian Association	$4,000	91
Washington Hospital for Foundlings	6,000	34
Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish	1,800	95
German Orphan Asylum	1,800	39
St. Ann's Infant Asylum	5,400	130
Association for Works of Mercy	1,800	26
House of the Good Shepherd	2,700	91
St. Rose's Industrial School	4,500	65
St. Joseph's Asylum	1,800	100
Young Women's Christian Home	1,000	328
Total	30,800	999

Annual cost to the Government per capita, $31.03.
Daily cost to the Government per capita, 8 cents.

Let us contrast this small expenditure per capita with the expense to the Government of maintaining, without private assistance, the Reform School, the Girls' Reform School, and the Washington Asylum:

Institutions.	Appropriation.	Average number of inmates.
The Reform School	$41,902	201
The Girls' Reform School	9,425	60
The Washington Asylum	62,415	522
Total	113,742	783

Annual cost to the Government per capita, $145.26.
Daily cost to the Government per capita, 26 cents.

Should this amount of appropriation per capita be given to the inmates of institutions cared for in great part by private benevolence the

Cost to the Government would be $145,114.74
Instead of 30,800.00

A cost of 114,314.74

more than is necessary under the present system. Or, if the inmates of these institutions were placed under the board of guardians, as suggested by the gentleman, the

Cost to the Government would be $157,112.73
Instead of 30,000.00

An increased expense of 127,112.73

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the House, and I will therefore again beg the House with unanimous voice to vote the amendment down.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. I desire to address myself to this clause in the bill, and to this motion:

For Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, $2,500.

Appropriations similar to this have been made annually since 1889. The Grand Army of the Republic at Washington and the Woman's Relief Corps have been incorporated under the title expressed in the item. Now, let us see why. I hold in my hand the report from this corporation, from which I will read a few words:

Those of you who are familiar with the relief work of this department know that the question of relief has been and is now one of great anxiety and responsibility, and as the years roll around the work increases in magnitude. The object of our temporary home is to care for our comrades who come here temporarily, and who have no place to stop and nothing financially to keep them during the few days they may desire to remain. Some come here to see about their pension claims, bounty, or back pay. Many come to try to gain admittance to the different national or State homes. Washington is their Mecca. From the year 1885 to July, 1889, the following statement was made—

And so forth. Now, last fiscal year the admissions were 1,036. The meals served were 18,000 and the lodgings furnished were 8,364. The expenditures were $2,516.76. The report then goes on to show all the donations that were made by comrades here in the District to this corporation and the gratuitous service of the good women who belong to the Relief Corps who help carry on this work as well as the brethren in the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield for a moment. I have only hinted at the necessity for this home. The report further goes on to show that as the years roll by the necessity for this work will disappear, as these men are fast passing from earth.

Now, this is a private corporation, organized to do public work, to relieve suffering humanity. It is carried on economically, in part by private contribution, eked out by this small appropriation, and although it is a private corporation, the work, which is of a public nature, is done for a mere tithe of what it could be done for if the United States were to build a home for this temporary purpose, own it, officer it, and pay all its expenses from the public Treasury; and instead of doing this work for a fraction over $2,400, it would be multiplied ten, twenty, thirty, forty fold in expense, and probably would be be no better done.

As practical people, mindful of our surroundings, we should avail ourselves of the voluntary help of these comrades and of the good women who extend this relief, and we should make this small appropriation.

I will grant, in reply to the gentleman from Nebraska, that much can be said about "the sovereign," "the Government," expending public appropriations only through public institutions. That proposition might be well if you had the system to do it. But human suffering does not wait; to build your hospitals it does not wait; to build your homes it does not wait. It comes all the time, and we have human suffering here, and through the years this work has grown up and is being well done, and, in my judgment, from a practical, a patriotic, and an economic standpoint, can be best served by appropriating this money.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman pardon me, just one moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROUT. I ask that the gentleman have time.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I have said all I want to. I am opposed to striking out this provision; and as we want to get this bill through to-night, I hope that we will take up one motion after another and dispose of each motion upon its merits.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not doubt the anxiety of the distinguished chairman of the committee to get this bill through——

Mr. CANNON. I have no desire to cut off my friend.

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). And for that reason during these two or three days' debate I have not occupied one moment of the time of the House, but the speech of the gentleman from Nebraska has impressed me materially, and I may say almost produced a profound impression upon me, and in looking into these items of the appropriation bill I am frank to say that I do not like the looks of them, and that, however much regard for the system that has grown up, it is, if not in direct terms a violation of the Constitution, an evasion, and a direct evasion, of the spirit of the Constitution. It does not, I take it, make any difference whether the appropriation is made directly for the support of religion or a sectarian institution or whether it is made in such a way that the practical benefit of it shall be to build up a sectarian institution.

Now, I am the last member of this House, in my judgment, who would hesitate to vote money for a charitable purpose. I have managed through all my life to keep myself poor by practical demonstration of my spirit in that direction, and I expect to die in the same condition; but I know there is a feeling growing up in the country that is entitled to great respect, and a feeling we can not deny to be in all respects American. I care nothing about any man's religion so he has a little religion in practice. I have not enough of my own to justify me in making war upon anyone else. I draw no line upon creeds, nor upon declarations of theology; but I can not understand, and I can not consent to the propriety of an appropriation of money to an institution that must necessarily be, in my judgment, indirectly, at least, a religious organization, and which is to be used for sectarian ends and purposes.

I do not go to the whole extent of the gentleman from Nebraska,

but we all understand we have passed beyond the time when, either without any consistency or without proper consistency, we can say that we will not use public money through the instrumentality of private hands for these charitable purposes. We give a large amount of money every year to the State Soldiers' Homes. They are, so far as we are concerned, private corporations, and yet we confer large donations of money upon them; for what purpose? So that we may aid in the care and support of indigent soldiers by indirect means, because in our judgment, legislative judgment, it is more economical and wiser to convey that charity through an organized channel than it would be to administer it upon any other system. So we can not say that we may not employ private corporations, if you please, or private associations or organizations, to take care of beneficiaries which otherwise we would feel called upon to make direct appropriations for the support of, but what I do not like, and what I wish we had a little further information from the committee on, is as to the necessity for these appropriations to which attention will be called, and which look so much to the public—possibly not to the committee, possibly not to this committee, but at all events to the public—as they see it as a use of public money for religious uses, and, more, in the system that has been so sharply criticised, and which you will hear a great deal more about in the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill—by which, practically, church organization has been benefited by the appropriation of money disbursed for the real purposes of government, and which practically has been diverted into other channels.

I will not support the pending motion, but I call attention to the principle I have referred to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have been profoundly impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska. I do not rise at the present time for the purpose of discussing these appropriations.

I do, however, think that this committee is entitled to some explanation in detail of this long list of charities for which it is proposed to appropriate so much public money. I desire to vote intelligently upon the subject, and before I can do so I think that, as a member of this committee, I am entitled, in spite of the passing time and the urgency of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to an explanation in detail of each one of these charities. If they are, as has been alleged by the gentleman from Nebraska, purely private institutions, entirely withdrawn from public supervision and control, I for one am unable conscientiously to vote for these appropriations, no matter what the purposes may be that they are intended to serve. I renew again to the committee which has charge of this bill the request that this Committee of the Whole receive a full explanation in detail of each one of these challenged appropriations for charities.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I read from the report made to the proper authorities touching the paragraph before the House. The motion is to strike out that paragraph, and, as the bill is read paragraph by paragraph, if any further motion is to be made to strike out any other items it can be made and discussed when the proper time comes. Action now is to be upon the paragraph that has been read. I have explained it; the reports have been referred to, and I suppose we are ready to vote.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman please tell us what is the pending paragraph?

Mr. CANNON. I will read it again: "For Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, $2,500."

The motion now is to strike out that paragraph, and, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not think anyone desires to strike that paragraph out or to have any discussion about it.

Mr. MOODY. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if the government of the District of Columbia has any supervision or control over this "Temporary Home"?

Mr. CANNON. None beyond the fact that the institution taking this appropriation is required to report to the superintendent of charities, who reports to the District, and I hold in my hand the report of the District Commissioners, which is to be found in the document room. This is a private corporation, composed of humane and patriotic people who desire to relieve persons who need relief, as I explained a while ago, and for one I am ready to vote on the motion to strike out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is not the charity which receives this contribution from the Treasury of the United States confined to members of the Grand Army of the Republic?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Read the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will read the paragraph for the third time. [Mr. CANNON here read the paragraph again.] Now, I will inform the gentleman that "Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic," is the name of the corporation to which this appropriation is made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, sir; "Temporary Home for Union Soldiers" is the name of the institution. Now, I want to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman again by saying that "Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic," is the name of the corporation which receives this appropriation of $2,500, and here is the report showing how the money is expended.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Are any but ex-Union soldiers taken into that institution and cared for over night?

Mr. CANNON. As I understand it, no. The institution is for that specific purpose. We appropriate elsewhere——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. For what?

Mr. CANNON. For other charities.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then this is not only a private corporation, but it is an exclusive corporation.

Mr. CANNON. It is exclusive to the extent that I have stated. If the gentleman does not approve of it, let him vote to strike out this appropriation.

Mr. HENRY of Indiana. I understood the gentleman to say in his former remarks that there was a large amount of donations given to this institution, by which it profited.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; work is donated, provisions are donated, and other things are donated.

Mr. HENRY of Indiana. Does not the gentleman's own statement show that only the amount appropriated was used by the institution?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, not at all.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that only ex-Union soldiers who are members of the Grand Army of the Republic are admitted to this institution.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is a mistake.

Mr. MILES. That is what I wanted the House to know.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. That is not true.

Mr. MILES. I know it is not true.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Conceding that this Temporary Home does excellent work, as I have every reason to believe it does, can the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] distinguish in principle between this appropriation and an appropriation for any of these other private institutions—for St. Ann's Asylum, for instance?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that this appropriation, if made, will go to this special corporation for the purpose indicated in the bill and will be so used.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I concede that.

Mr. CANNON. I will answer the gentleman further by saying that I believe this is a very proper appropriation to make; and until the United States, legislating for the District of Columbia, provides a place of its own and officers it and pays for it throughout to relieve the old soldiers who happen to drift in here temporarily from time to time, I will take the best means at hand to give them relief and will utilize this private corporation. [Applause.]

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. CANNON. I thought I did answer my friend's question as well as I am able to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which has had charge of this bill, I desire to say a few words on the proposition now before the Committee of the Whole.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] moves to strike out a specific appropriation on page 36 for Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, $2,500. It gives me pleasure, gentlemen, to testify that I am in favor of this appropriation, not only in this appropriation bill, but in every succeeding appropriation bill. I am glad that this opportunity has arisen that it may be demonstrated who are the true friends of the Union soldier. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Three of the gentlemen who have assailed this salutary provision, this very proper item in an appropriation bill, are gentlemen who attempted to pose quite recently in this House as special friends of an enlargement of the pension rolls. The very gentleman who makes the motion assumes generally to be a special advocate of the interests of the veterans. Yet he comes into the committee this afternoon and asks you to strike out this specific appropriation. Why is it? It is because he and his friends would rather sacrifice the Union soldier than to give up an opportunity to strike a blow at certain charities which they denominate "sectarian." Sir, I believe in every branch, in every sect of the Christian religion. I am broad enough to take them all in. I am broad enough and liberal enough to advocate an appropriation for each and every charity, be it Catholic, or Lutheran, or Calvanist, or whatever may be the sect to which it belongs.

What is the proposition now before the committee? It is that the Congress of the United States shall declare itself against the

rescue of the unfortunate, against the care of the sick, and against every charitable or reformatory institution. While all our States, while all our great cities are constantly ready and eager to contribute to the support of charitable or reformatory institutions, you are asked to take the position that the Congress of the United States, for the first time since the year 1889, is to refuse any contribution for the maintenance and support of institutions which are conceded to be in every respect meritorious and worthy of public confidence and support. I do not believe that this Committee of the Whole will sustain any such proposition.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says he wants an explanation in detail of the work of each and every one of these charities. Why has he not taken the time to read the report of the charitable and reformatory institutions in the District of Columbia? Is he to come in this afternoon and stop the business of the nation until he can glean some information which has been ready at his hands for months past? I say, gentlemen, you would incur a grave responsibility—I do not believe that one of you could rest peacefully to-night, I do not believe that sleep could come to you—if you should commit an act so cruel, so ungenerous, so unworthy as to refuse your support to these charitable institutions.

Now, what do they ask? Some of these institutions are supported entirely through the aid given them by Congress. Others are supported in part—to a greater or less degree—by such aid. But it must be manifest to every student of this subject that these institutions——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask a few moments more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York proceed?

Objection was made.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I know a little about the work of this home, and I desire to give the committee the benefit of what I happen to know. There are a great many old soldiers and sailors who like to visit Washington, but who are barely able to pay their traveling expenses, much less their board bills here. I know of more than one who in the last few years have walked hundreds of miles to get a chance to visit the city of Washington. This city is, as it were, the earthly heaven of many an old soldier and sailor who for years and years risked his health and his life in defense of the union of our country, its Constitution, and its laws.

Such a man glories in an opportunity to visit the city of Washington—to look down from these galleries upon "the assembled wisdom and patriotism of the nation." He wants a chance to go, also, to the other end of the Capitol and look down upon the sages there who represent the States of the United States of America. And he wants to go to the other end of the Avenue and look upon the White House and upon Grover I. He wants to see this magnificent city with its broad avenues, its well-paved streets, its beautiful private residences, and its magnificent public edifices.

It is the height of his ambition to have a chance once more to look upon the capital city of this great nation. But he has not the money to pay hotel bills or boarding-house charges. If he can get here, as he can, by walking (because many of these men are still able to march), or if he can secure money to pay railroad fare, all he wants is an opportunity to spend five, six, seven, eight, nine, or ten days in this city. I understand that ten days is the maximum stay allowed at this institution. He wants some place where he can get a soldier's accommodations—a chance to sleep at night and to obtain rations during the day.

I say that this Congress will be derelict in its duty to these old Union soldiers if it denies them the little pittance of ten days' board at this charitable institution, which during the last year had under its roof no less than 975 of these old soldiers and sailors, gave them no less than 18,000 meals, and furnished 10,385 lodgings. Yet this House that represents the 70,000,000 people of this country is here spending an hour deliberating on the question whether it will vote $2,500 to provide accommodations for such of the three, four, five, or six hundred thousand Union soldiers still living in this land as may desire an opportunity to visit the city once more before they die. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska obtained the floor.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is this amendment subject to division?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The motion is to strike out a single paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Does it not include several different institutions?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it includes only one.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in closing the discussion on this paragraph I feel that I can extend to the House and the committee the congratulations which are certainly due. We have been treated to the remarkable spectacle of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] actually declaring himself as the friend of the soldier. The "horse laugh" with which he was greeted testified to the confidence the committee had in the sincerity of his protestation. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I have but a poor opinion of a man who undertakes to measure his love for the old soldier by voting for an appropriation of $2,500 to any particular institution for the purpose of taking care of such unfortunates as may come temporarily into the District of Columbia. My purpose would not be to prevent any person from receiving charitable aid, as I have already stated. My objection to the pending proposition is that we are making an appropriation to specific institutions, trusting to them in turn to dispense charity. I say it is the wise and beneficent purpose of the Government to directly take care of all of the soldiers. My vote, and every vote I have cast, has been along the line that no soldier should ever enter a poorhouse. The gentleman from New York, however, by his vote and advice, as well as by his actions, which speak louder than words, would send to the poorhouse every old soldier in the land that he possibly could, unless outvoted by the patriotic majority in this House.

But let us put this issue plainly and bluntly. The only question involved is, shall the House of Representatives vote the money of the people to a private institution, for that institution in turn to dispense the charity? I say that you have no right to do it; and this paragraph, as well as the various expenditures proposed in other parts of the bill along this line, mean exactly that and nothing else. No expression of patriotic sentiment, no appeal to loyalty, generosity, nor any other noble attribute, no refinement of language or criticism, can make it otherwise. This paragraph itself, while the expenditure made directly by the Government or by an individual is entirely proper and appropriate, I think is simply the camel's nose inserted into the tent. I ask my friend from Illinois, who I know to be a friend to the old soldier, and charitably inclined, certainly, if he votes for this paragraph, how can he account to the people for a vote against every other paragraph of a similar character, in this charity section of the bill? He can not do it and be consistent.

I wish the House would plant itself squarely upon principle and take care of the old soldier by a sufficient direct appropriation. We have, Mr. Chairman, a Soldiers' Home already here in the District of Columbia; and there is not a State or Territory that has not one or more. We can and will take care of them. If it be suggested that the Soldiers' Home will not temporarily take care of them, or will not care for all soldiers, then it may be time enough for us to take the action proposed here.

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in supposing that the Union soldiers are taken care of in the home here. This home is for the soldiers of the Regular Army.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Very well; if there is no home here for the volunteer soldiers, erect one or open this one to them.

Mr. MORSE. How are you going to manage in the meantime?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Why, you have a committee here which can bring in general legislation to provide for them, if it is necessary. A bill can be drafted in an hour which will do it. You can pass it without delay by unanimous consent, or, if not, it is easy to bring in a rule. Who would oppose it? But let every dollar, whether it be for the support of soldiers and sailors or for any other charitable object, be dispensed directly by officers of the Government who are responsible to the Government for what they do. I insist, Mr. Chairman, there shall be no appropriation except for public purposes; that there shall be no money placed in the hands of anyone for any purpose, charitable or otherwise, who is not directly accountable to the Government for the expenditure. Our system of government is opposed to the principle of allowing money to be expended in any other manner. It is based on the correct principle of accountability to the people and to the Government. You are wandering away from that principle in every appropriation of this character for private purposes.

Now, having said this much, having challenged the attention of the House to what is involved in this subject of charity and in this appropriation, I yield most reluctantly to the appeals made to me to avoid even the semblance of withholding from the soldiers of the nation, who have already been too sorely set upon, and withdraw the motion I made, but will make a similar motion when we reach line 8, on page 38, and move to strike out the item "For the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish, maintenance, $1,800," and will urge it against each of the items of a sectarian character following. In this way a record may be easily made and the will of this House find expression.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Church Orphanage Association of St. Johns Parish, maintenance, $1,800.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item just read.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, it has become manifest that we can not complete the consideration of this bill to-night; and I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5210, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BULL, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. RANEY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MEIKLEJOHN, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain information as to the proceedings of his Department in carrying out the provisions of sections 20, 21, and 22 of an act making appropriations for expenses of the Indian Department, approved August 15, 1894; and also relating to certain lands in the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, relating to the report of officers delinquent, as shown by the accounts of the Auditor of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Kalamazoo River, Michigan, from Lake Michigan to Saugatuck—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4339) to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 216); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TERRY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 217); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 218); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2782) to codify and arrange the laws relating to pensions, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 219); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3637) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River, between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post-road," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 220); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Samuel Burrell. (Report No. 221.)

By Mr. HUTCHESON, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack. (Report No. 222.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5283) to abolish grade crossings in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5284) to regulate the course of study at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5285) to refund certain import duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5286) providing for disposal of lands lying within the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation, not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 5287) for the relief of widows who were wives of soldiers and sailors while in the service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 5288) to prohibit advances and regulate allotments of wages to seamen—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 5289) making appropriations for the payment of the French spoliation claims which have been adjudicated by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5290) to reestablish a subtreasury at Charleston, S. C.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5291) for the erection of an armor-plate and gun factory in the county of Hennepin, State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5292) to permit the location of mining claims in the Cascade Forest Reserve in Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 5293) for a light vessel off Fire Island, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5294) for the relief of persons who have filed declarations of intention to enter desert lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) to provide for extending the Government telegraph line from Neah Bay to Grays Harbor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALLINGS: A bill (H. R. 5356) to authorize the Montgomery Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5357) granting relief to settlers on certain lots in the town site of Port Angeles, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5358) to provide for pay and certificates of honorable service to the officers and men of Foster's Cavalry Battalion Missouri Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A resolution (House Res. No. 149) to authorize the Clerk of the House to appoint Fred. S. Bishop assistant clerk in the office which directs the special binding of public documents for the personal use of members of Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A memorial of the house of representatives of the State of Washington, in favor of the improvement of the Okanogan River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the Alaskan boundary—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring an appropriation for the construction of a fresh-water harbor at Olympia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relative to placing Government work on the ship railway at The Dalles under contract—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying Congress to prohibit immigration for a period of ten years—to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, petitioning Congress to pass a national bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring a bill to reorganize the Navy and to promote its efficiency—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: A memorial of the Ohio legislature, asking Congress to cede certain land within the limits of the Mercer County Reservoir, a part of the public works of Ohio, to said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BULL: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island, concerning the construction of a channel into Great Pond Harbor, Block Island, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5296) to amend the military record of certain enlisted men of the war of the rebellion named therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5297) for the relief of R. R. Robinson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5298) granting a pension to certain East Tennesseeans engaged in the secret service of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) for the relief of Mary E. Semerley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5300) for the relief of Lewis F. Self—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) for the relief of Isaac Esterley, of Cocke County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) for the relief of G. T. Larkin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) for the relief of Mack Fulton, of Morristown, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) for the relief of Solomon S. Crosswhite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 5305) for the relief of Henry Langdon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) for the relief of William C. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5307) granting a pension to Anna M. Sweet, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5308) for the relief of Anna V. Ingerton, widow of William H. Ingerton, late lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 5309) releasing Samuel K. White from payment of pension under ratings fixed by the Pension Bureau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5310) for the relief of Miles Goforth, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 5311) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Wible—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5312) for the relief of James R. Wyrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 5313) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander Arthur—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 5314) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Elisha Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 5315) granting a pension to Mrs. Amanda Stucker, of Gallatin, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5316) to pay Carlos W. Shone for services rendered in the winter of 1847–48 in the first Cayuse war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 5317) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Peterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5318) providing for the payment of the claim of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company for transporting certain negro colonists from New Orleans to Birmingham—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 5319) appropriating money for the payment of the claim of the Warren-Scharf Asphalt Paving Company of New York, for the grading and paving of North Seventh street, opposite the United States post-office, in the city of Terre Haute, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) for the relief of Edwards & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5321) for the relief of Benjamin F. Graham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5322) to grant a pension to Robert A. Mee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) to grant a pension to Dicey Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5324) to grant a pension to Hugh Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) to grant a pension to Rebecca L. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5326) to grant a pension to Sarah A. Blazer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) to grant a pension to James J. Gibbs, of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) to grant a pension to Narcissa Covington—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) for the relief of Dr. Thomas J. Coward—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5330) to pay Frank Green the amount found due him for property taken from him during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) to pay Frank Green the amount found due him for property destroyed during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 5332) to increase the pension of Anthony Benussia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) for the relief of Frances V. Davis, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5334) for the relief of the heirs at law of John Gregg, a second lieutenant in the Army of the Revolution—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5335) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Charles Berry Jones, for the destruction of his dwelling located at Xenia, Ohio, on the 21st of March, 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5336) to remove the sentence of court-martial from the military record of Joseph D. Hatfield, late colonel of the Eighty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Mary E. Gray, for the destruction ot property located in Dover, Stewart County, Tenn., in the years 1862–63, by United States troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) for the relief of Ann Eliza White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5339) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Thomas, late a private of Company I, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5340) for the relief of Warner R. Hancock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 5341) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Lightcaf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5342) granting a pension to Richard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) granting a pension to Sarah Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5344) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Sterling M. Turner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 5345) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5346) to pension Francis M. Kirby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 5347) for the relief of Jennie M. Hunt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENDLETON: A bill (H. R. 5348) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alexander Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5349) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Lavigne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Hanlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5351) for the relief of Richard Thieke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of Samuel Gibbons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5353) for the relief of James Brest—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5354) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Lemuel Corum, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5355) granting a pension to Harry Epright, late private United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Three petitions, viz, of George Weisenburger, William Rinne, and Col. Nelson Cole, asking for the passage of the bill for the relief of Capt. Henry Troll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolutions of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for appropriations for the protection of seacoast towns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, against the

passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the abolition of compulsory pilotage on coastwise vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the licensing of masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Anna V. Ingerton, widow of William H. Ingerton, late lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry, praying for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: Petition of Matthies Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Burlington, Iowa, favoring the service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CODDING: Petition of 76 citizens of Canton, Pa., praying for the recognition of the Cuban patriots as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George E. Riggs and 30 others, citizens of Granville, Pa., praying for increased compensation to fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, six petitions, as follows, viz, of 234 citizens of Canton, 106 citizens of Forest City and vicinity, 102 citizens of Burnwood, and vicinity, 38 citizens of Lemon and vicinity, and 37 citizens of Susquehanna County, Pa., favoring the passage of the restricted immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Nodaway County, Mo., memorializing Congress to pension Sarah Ann Wible, a dependent mother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Two petitions of S. H. Giffin and others, of Harrisville, and J. G. Miller and others, of Pleasant Grove, Ohio, in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of W. L. Van Horn and 24 others, of Grand Junction, Iowa, against the Sunday-observance bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of citizens and commercial bodies interested in the commerce and navigation of Puget Sound and the Pacific Ocean, in favor of telegraph lines from Neah Bay to Grays Harbor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens and companies representing the marine interests of San Francisco, in favor of a telegraph line from Neah Bay to Grays Harbor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the common council of the city of Hoquiam, Wash., favoring Congressional aid to the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Pastors' Union of Snohomish, Wash., denouncing Turkish atrocities in Armenia, and favoring the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of A. G. Bainbridge and 80 others, of Hennepin County, Minn., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of J. Hague Stiers and 34 other Grand Army men, of Beverly, Ohio, and vicinity, favoring a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANLY: Papers to accompany House bill to pay the claim of Frank Green, of Boone County, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lamont, Buchanan County, Iowa, favoring the Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: Three petitions, viz, of M. J. Snyder, Russell Ewing, A. P. Kimmel, and over 100 other citizens of Somerset County; J. A. Brant, C. A. Ross, Edward Price, and 47 others, of Shanksville; J. E. Murphy, William H. Pickerill, D. B. Wilson, and 35 others, of Cambria County, Pa., praying for the enactment of laws restricting immigration, and especially the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the board of supervisors of Amador County, Cal., asking for relief for the mining industry—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. JENKINS: Resolution of Nat Green Post, No. 243, Grand Army of the Republic, of Shell Lake, Wis., praying that the United States recognize the Cubans as a belligerent power, and give to them all the aid and comfort consistent with national usages, that they may be a free and independent nation—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: Objections of the Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia to Senate bill No. 325 and House bill No. 2652, to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution of the New Jersey State Improvement Association, asking for the passage of House bill No. 3339, to create a special commission of highways and to make appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the members of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association, asking Congress to secure to women, by appropriate legislation, full rights of citizenship—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Three petitions, of W. H. Hall and others, P. H. Ray and others, and C. O. Bethel and others, asking for free homes in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Three petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Clinton Corners and Wallkill, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LOCKHART: Petition of citizens of Morven, N. C., for allowance of claim of the Methodist Publishing House at Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Petitions of numerous citizens of South Carolina, with regard to contested-election cases—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of James Little, sr., and other citizens of Mapleton, Minn., favoring the passage of House resolution No. 11—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Petition of Robert B. Scarborough and others, for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Two petitions, viz, of D. F. Streeter and 42 others, of Shalersville, and W. H. Secor and 185 others, of Geneva, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of A. H. Kollefrath and 13 other members of the bar of Marysville, Ohio, praying for the passage of a law to pension Thomas Reed, to accompany House bill No. 3720—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of R. H. Babcock and 39 others, of Dodge Center, Minn., against the Sunday-observance bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of Thomas H. Millsaps—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petition of Hazlett Post, No. 81, Department of the Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 1305—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Four petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Oakfield and Castile, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WOOD: Memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rose Hill, Ill., for a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *February 3, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of Saturday, February 1, was read and approved.

RECOMMITMENT OF A BILL.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GRIFFIN] desires the recommitment to the Committee on Military Affairs of a bill reported from that committee, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2047) for the relief of Charles Fletcher, alias James H. Mitchell.

Mr. HULL. A parliamentary inquiry. That carries with it the report made by the committee, of course?

The SPEAKER. It carries with it the report. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 5359) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to reserve all points of order on that bill.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer and typewriter so long as may be necessary, for a period not exceeding three months from the adoption of this resolution, the same to be appointed by the chairman of the committee, subject to the approval of the committee, and to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of $6 per day.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the committee find it impossible to do their work without a stenographer, and the other stenographers are employed. We have no stenographer, and I have not been able to answer one letter in ten of those which have been received. This is only for ninety days.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask if the committee stenographers are employed?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. They are otherwise employed, so that we can not secure them as we need them, and we need a stenographer every day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if this were the only resolution of the kind that had come before us, or was to come before us, I should not object; but it seems to me that in the orderly way of transacting business it should first be considered by the Committee on Accounts. That is a committee privileged to report at any time.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I ask the gentleman not to object. This employment is only asked for ninety days, and business accumulates in the committee which it is impossible for us to do without this assistance. We can not secure one of the official stenographers to committees, because they are otherwise engaged.

Mr. CANNON. And still, notwithstanding what I believe to be its great merit, I am not willing it should be considered, because it would constitute a precedent.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Let me say one thing further. The committee ask further that they may have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, and it is necessary to have a stenographer to take the evidence that will be submitted right along from day to day for some time.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection to the permission to sit during the sessions of the House; and I will say to my friend that as to the other matter, it is only because it would constitute a precedent that I object.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Accounts. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during the session. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARKANSAS AND CHOCTAW RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Arkansas, be, and the same is hereby, invested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, owning, equipping, operating, using, and maintaining a railway and telegraph and telephone line through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, beginning at the point on the boundary line between the said Choctaw Nation and the county of Little River, in the State of Arkansas, where the said railway may run, when constructed in the State of Arkansas, thence running by the most feasible and practicable route in a northwesterly direction through the said Choctaw Nation, to such point at or near the town of Atoka, in said nation, as said corporation may select, with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, and sidings as said company may deem it to their interest to construct along and upon the right of way and depot grounds herein provided for.

SEC. 2. That said corporation is authorized to take and use for all purposes of a railway and telegraph and telephone line, and for no other purpose, a right of way 100 feet in width through the said Choctaw Nation, for the said Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company, the same to be 50 feet on either side of the track of said railway from the center thereof, and, in addition to the above right of way, to take and use a strip of land 200 feet in width, with a length of 3,000 feet, for stations at such points as the said railway company may deem to their interest to erect, with the right to use such additional grounds, where there are heavy cuts or fills, as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed and track, not exceeding 100 feet in width on each side of the said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*, That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein authorized to be taken shall be leased or sold by the company, and they shall not be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines; and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used, such portion shall revert to the Choctaw Nation.

SEC. 3. That before said railway and telegraph and telephone line shall be constructed through any lands held by individual occupants, according to the laws, usages, and customs of the Choctaw Nation, full compensation shall be made to such occupants for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of such railway and telegraph and telephone line. In case of failure to make amicable settlement with any occupant, such compensation shall be determined by the appraisement of disinterested referees, to be appointed, one (who shall act as chairman) by the President, one by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation, and one by said railway company, who, before entering upon the duties of their appointment, shall take and subscribe, before a judge or clerk of a United States court or United States commissioner, an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appointment, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award to and filed with the Secretary of the Interior within sixty days from the completion thereof; and upon the failure of either party to make such appointment within thirty days after the appointment made by the President, the vacancy shall be filled by the judge of the United States court for the central district of the Indian Territory upon the application of the other party. A majority of said referees shall be competent to act in case of the absence of a member, after due notice. The chairman of such board shall appoint the time and place for all hearings: *Provided*, That the hearings shall be within the county where the property is situated for which compensation is being assessed for the taking thereof or damage thereto, and at a place as convenient as may be for said occupant, unless the said occupant and said railway company agree to have the hearing at another place. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each day he is engaged in assessing compensation, with mileage of 5 cents per mile for each mile necessarily traveled in the discharge of his duties. Said board of referees shall have power to call for and examine witnesses under oath, and said witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed witnesses by the laws of the Choctaw Nation. Costs, including compensation of the referees, shall be made a part of the award and be paid by the said railway company. In case the referees can not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award.

SEC. 4. That either party, being dissatisfied with the findings and award of the referees, shall have the right, within sixty days after the filing of the award, as hereinbefore provided, and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to the United States district court for the central district of the Indian Territory sitting at the place nearest and most convenient to the land and property which is sought to be condemned; and said suit shall then proceed for determining the damage done to the property in the same and like manner as other civil actions in the said court. The said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the subject-matter of said petition, and the same shall be heard and determined by said court in accordance with the laws now in force or hereafter enacted for the government of said court; and the measure of damages in condemning property authorized by this act shall be that prescribed by the laws of the State of Arkansas, in so far as the same are not inconsistent with the laws now in force or hereafter enacted for the government of the United States courts in said Choctaw Nation in such cases. If the judgment of the court shall be for a larger sum than the award of the referees, the costs of the litigation shall be adjudged against the railway company, and if the judgment of the court shall be for the same as the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the appellant. If the judgment of the court shall be for a smaller sum than the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages. When proceedings shall have been commenced in court, the railway company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then shall have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of the railroad and telegraph and telephone line. If such appeal is not taken as hereinbefore set forth, the award shall be conclusive and final, and shall have the same force and effect as a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 5. That said railway company is authorized and hereby given the right to connect or cross with its tracks the tracks and railroad of any other company or person owning or operating a railway in the said Choctaw Nation. In case of failure to make amicable settlement with any such corporation or person for such crossing, such compensation shall be determined in the same manner as hereinbefore provided for determining the compensation for land and other property taken and damaged.

SEC. 6. That said railway company shall not charge the inhabitants of said nation a greater rate of freight than the rate authorized by the laws of the State of Arkansas for services or transportation of the same kind: *Provided*, That passenger rates on said railway shall not exceed 3 cents per mile. Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for freight and passengers on said railway and messages on said telegraph and telephone lines until a State government or governments shall exist in said nation within the limits of which said railway or a part thereof shall be located, and then such State government or governments shall be authorized to fix and regulate the cost of transportation of persons and freights within their respective limits of said railway; but Congress expressly reserves the right to fix and regulate at all times the cost of such transportation by said railway or said company whenever such transportation shall extend from one State into another or shall extend into more than one State: *Provided, however*, That the rate of such transportation of passengers, local or interstate, shall not exceed the rate above expressed: *And provided further*, That said railway company shall carry the mail at such prices as Congress may by law provide; and until such rate is fixed by law the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation.

SEC. 7. That said railway company shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the Choctaw Nation, the sum of $50, in addition to the compensation provided for in this act, for property taken and damages done to individual occupants by the construction of the railway, for each mile of railway that it may construct in said nation, said payments to be made in installments of $500 as each 10 miles of road is graded: *Provided*, That if the general council of the Choctaw Nation, within four months after the filing of maps of definite location, as hereinafter set forth, dissents from the allowance hereinbefore provided for, and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, then all compensation to be paid to said nation under the provisions of this act shall be determined as provided in section 3 for the determination of the compensation to be paid to the individual occupant of lands, with the right of appeal to the courts upon the same terms, conditions, and requirements as therein provided: *Provided further*, That the amount awarded or adjudged to be paid by said railway company for said dissenting nation shall be in lieu of the compensation said nation would be entitled to receive under the foregoing provision. Said company shall also pay, so long as said Territory is owned and occupied by the Choctaw Indians, to the Secretary of the Interior the sum of $15 per annum for each mile of railway it shall construct in the said nation. The money paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act shall be disbursed by him in accordance with the laws and treaties now in force within said nation: *Provided*, That Congress shall have the right, so long as said lands are occupied and possessed by said nation, to impose such additional taxes upon said railway as it may deem just and proper for the benefit of said nation, and any Territory or State hereafter formed through which said railway shall have been established may exercise the like power as to such part of said railway as may lie within its limits. Said railway company shall have the right to survey and locate its railway immediately after the passage of this act.

SEC. 8. That said company shall cause maps showing the route of its located lines through said nation to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and also to be filed in the office of the principal chief of the said nation; and after the filing of said maps no claim for a subsequent settlement

and improvement upon the right of way shown by said maps shall be valid as against said company: *Provided*, That when a map showing any portion of said railway company's located line is filed as herein provided for, said company shall commence grading said located line within six months thereafter, or such location shall be void; and said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in sections of 25 miles before the construction of any such section shall be begun.

SEC. 9. That the officers, servants, and employees of said company necessary to the construction and management of said railroad shall be allowed to reside, while so engaged, upon such right of way, but subject to the provisions of the Indian intercourse laws and such rules and regulations as may be established by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with said intercourse laws.

SEC. 10. That said railway company shall build at least 75 miles of its railway in said nation within three years after the passage of this act, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion not built; that said railway company shall construct and maintain continually all roads and highway crossings and necessary bridges over said railway wherever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way or may be by the proper authorities laid out across the same.

SEC. 11. That the said Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company shall accept this right of way upon the express condition, binding upon itself, its successors and assigns, that they will neither aid, advise, nor assist any effort looking toward the changing or extinguishing the present tenure of the Choctaw Indians in their land, and will not attempt to secure from the Choctaw Nation any further grant of land or its occupancy than is hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That any violation of the condition mentioned in this section shall operate as a forfeiture of all the rights and privileges of said railway company under this act.

SEC. 12. That all mortgages, deeds of trust, and other conveyances executed by said railway company, conveying any portion of its railroad, telegraph and telephone lines, with its franchises, that may be constructed in said Choctaw Nation shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, and the record thereof shall be evidence and notice of their execution and shall convey all rights and property of said company as therein expressed.

SEC. 13. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

SEC. 14. That the right of way herein and hereby granted shall not be assigned or transferred in any form whatever prior to the construction and completion of the road except as to mortgages or other liens that may be given or secured thereon to aid in the construction thereof.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommended the adoption of the following amendments:

In line 8 of section 2, strike out the word "two" and insert "one."

In line 9 of section 2, strike out the word "three" and insert "two."

In lines 13 and 14 of section 2, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

Strike out the proviso to section 8 and insert the following:

"*Provided*, That a map showing the entire line of the road in the Indian Territory shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before the construction of the same shall be commenced."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill which has been reported to the House? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MCRAE. There are some committee amendments.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. GROUT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, strike out all of lines 8 and 9.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the motion which I made on Saturday evening, and upon which I shall insist, is to strike out lines 8 and 9 on page 38 of the pending bill. These lines read as follows:

For the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish, maintenance, $1,800.

I desire that there shall be no confusion with respect to these items. It will be necessary for me to refer briefly to the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], which, after a very voluminous editing, in compliance with his usual custom, I find on page 1233 of the RECORD. In that edited speech I find comparison has been instituted between some of the more extensive reformatories in the District of Columbia and the ordinary children's institutions, the item in connection with which we were considering on that day. It will be evident from reference to these edited remarks that the gentleman has sought to institute a comparison between the amounts contributed by the general public to certain institutions as over against the entire cost of maintaining others which are maintained exclusively by the Government, which is, of course, manifestly unfair. Then, in addition, he has seen fit to institute a comparison between the most expensive asylums and hospitals, where difficult surgical operations are performed, as against institutions which care simply for children, many of whom are bound out to private families. As bearing upon this subject, I send up to the Clerk's desk to be read a letter written by Mrs. MacFarland, vice-president of the children's guardians, which explains itself:

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
GUNTON BUILDING, 472-478 LOUISIANA AVENUE, NW.,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1896.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the debate in the House on Saturday upon appropriations for charitable institutions in the District of Columbia. I have read with pleasure what you said about public control of public appropriations for public wards. I would like to call your attention to the statement made in the debate, reported on page 1233 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 1.

The statement there recorded confuses the issue by comparing the work of the board of children's guardians, for children simply dependent, with the work of the most expensive reformatories in the District, with which the board has not, and never could have, anything to do.

If there is any question as to the economy and efficiency of the work of the board of children's guardians, and if the principles upon which it proceeds are assailed, it can be safely said that the per capita cost of this work of the board for its wards has fallen in every department steadily since the work of the board began. The financial statement of the board, published on page 264 of the Report of the Superintendent of Charities upon Charitable and Reformatory Institutions in the District of Columbia for 1895, shows this decline in the per capita cost from every point of view.

I would call your attention particularly to the fact that from the operation of the system pursued by the board its beneficiaries are rapidly passed on to free homes, becoming absorbed in the population of the District and surrounding States, and cease to be dependent upon the public, in any degree, for maintenance.

You will notice in the last line of the second subdivision of the table on the page of the report above referred to that the number of children in free homes who were not at public charge for maintenance rose as between 1894 and 1895 from 46 to 114. The number of wards of the board under guardianship and supervision on January 31, 1896, was 297, of whom 49 were in institutions (the same as those mentioned in your remarks to the House of Representatives on Saturday as receiving public appropriations), and payments are being made to those institutions for the board of those children at a minimum rate of $96 per annum.

There are also supported in the homes of individuals, at public expense for maintenance 57 children, making a total now paid for of 117. As compared with these there are now 180 wards of the board for whom no expenses are being incurred, except, as estimated, per capita expense for 1897 of $12.71 for the salary and expenses of agents, who must visit and supervise them.

Yours, respectfully,

MARY L. D. MACFARLAND.

Hon. EUGENE J. HAINER,
House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman will have such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Nebraska be permitted to proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to insist upon striking out of this appropriation bill each one of the items which appropriate money to these institutions. I also purpose at the appropriate time to ask the adoption by this committee of the amendment which I now send to the desk to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 39, in line 16, after the words "place to place," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert "$61,200; in all, $95,200: *Provided*, That the institutions for children, including industrial and reformatory, namely, the Church Orphanage of St. John's parish; the German Orphan Asylum, the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, including its care of colored foundlings; the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, the St. Joseph Asylum, the House of the Good Shepherd, the Industrial Home School, and St. Rose's Industrial School, heretofore receiving aid by specific appropriation, are hereby remitted, except as herein specifically appropriated for, to the appropriation herein made, and to the said act of July 26, 1892, to provide for the care of dependent children in the District of Columbia, and to create a board of children's guardians, for all rights and benefits which they may have under the provisions of the said act."

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Gentlemen will observe that this amendment which I will propose takes care of all the children, all the dependents, that may properly be taken care of under the paragraphs of the pending bill. Let no member, then, lay the flattering unction to his soul that by voting down this amendment he will take care of the dependent children, or that by voting for it he will take bread out of their mouths. The purpose of this motion is not to reduce the expenditures for the laudable purpose of taking care of these children, but it is to place the appropriation for the care of these institutions where it properly belongs, namely, that whenever a dollar of public money is appropriated, with that dollar shall go public control; that there shall be no such thing as private control where the bills are footed by Uncle Sam. We will abundantly take care of every one of these dependents, including those heretofore controlled by the institution the appropriation for which I now propose to strike out here.

It has been suggested during the course of this debate that these several institutions make reports and are under the control of the Government. I beg gentlemen not to be deceived by any such proposition as that, because it is not well founded in fact. I hold in my hand the report for 1894 made by the superintendent of charities, Colonel Tracey. In that document will be found no report whatever from the Church Orphanage of St. John's Parish. There is, it is true, a letter which came too late to be incorporated

as a report, which, in general terms, refers to the necessities of the institution, but there is nothing that can possibly be called a report. So, Mr. Chairman, as I look further into the report made for 1895, I find Colonel Tracey himself, in defining his duties, stated that they are advisory only, and that is all they can be claimed to be under the law. He can advise with the heads of these institutions, and doubtless does, but that is all. If gentlemen will look over these reports, not only the report of Colonel Tracey, but the reports of these various institutions made to him, it will be found that they have organized themselves into a mutual admiration society, the various institutions complimenting Colonel Tracey, and Colonel Tracey in turn most effusively complimenting the various institutions. They remind one of those fragrant flowers which are said to bloom even on the garden walls of politics, and whose redolence has doubtless charmed us all; but, so far as giving us any practical information as to what these institutions are doing, they are absolutely nil. So it is that, aside from the great principle for which I am contending and in the maintenance of which I should have the assistance of every Representative on this floor, I insist there is every reason for voting in favor of this amendment and finally placing the control and care of these worthy objects of charity where they belong, namely, in the hands of the board of children's guardians.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the gentleman a question about his amendment?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand that this amendment puts the money here appropriated for different institutions in the hands of the board of children's guardians?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The amendment which is now pending strikes out this specific appropriation for the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish.

Mr. HENDERSON. And others?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I propose to follow it up with other amendments, striking out other specific appropriations for sectarian institutions, and then I will follow that——

Mr. HENDERSON. Here is the point I want to get at: Does the gentleman's amendment require the board of children's guardians to give any specific sum to this institution—for instance, the St. John's Church Orphanage Association?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No, sir; but it remits the children under the charge of the institution to the care of the board of children's guardians, and for which the aid of public money may be asked under the operation of the laws under which the board of children's guardians are acting.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the gentleman examined the act of 1892 creating the board of children's guardians?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the gentleman examined it to see whether it will apply to children now in these institutions? Does not that law apply to children sent there by order of the court? These children being in these institutions, will it be possible for the board of children's guardians to have jurisdiction over them under the law? I ask this question because I remember that when this matter was arranged in conference we found difficulty under the act of 1892 and had to segregate the appropriations in the manner that we did in order to be sure to take care of the children in these institutions.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The question of the gentleman from Iowa is one that should be frankly met and answered. The action which I propose to take now would not make adequate provision for all of the children in this institution to be taken care of by the board of children's guardians. Let me say, however, that this Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish is supported largely, and indeed mainly, by private fund. It is under the patronage of one of the Episcopal churches of this city and they have a large fund and valuable property. They have property valued at $50,000, as shown by their own reports. During the last year they paid on an existing indebtedness, out of the receipts which came to them for the year, over $6,000. I gave the items in my remarks on Saturday. Therefore they have ample means to take care of such children as would not be provided for by this appropriation. Every dollar which is sought to be appropriated under this item of the bill will go to the board of children's guardians, and they will expend it for the benefit of children for whom we may properly appropriate here.

Mr. WHEELER. How can the board of children's guardians take care of the children now in St. John's Orphanage Association?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. My dear sir, they can not take care of them all, but they can take care of part of them, and all of the money will be used to take care of children for whom we may properly appropriate.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman tell the House how they would proceed to do it?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The board of children's guardians can, for instance, place the children there. Every child that is sent to that institution by order of the court, every child that is properly subjected to their charge can be sent there.

Mr. WHEELER. Then you propose that the children who are now in the St. John's Church Orphanage Asylum shall be forcibly taken away and placed with the children who are sent to the board of children's guardians by the police court.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no; there is nothing of that kind; there is no forcible taking away whatever, and there is no intelligence in such a suggestion.

Mr. HENDERSON. The point which I make is this: We have spent a good deal of time over this matter in conference in past years, and we have tried to frame the appropriation so as to put the expenditure of the money appropriated for this purpose under the board of children's guardians, but we found that the existing law had no reference to children who were in these institutions before the passage of the act, and that the moneys could only be expended through the board of guardians for the benefit of children sent to them by the court after the passage of the law; so that we were powerless to take care of the children in these institutions who had not been sent there by order of the court, as contemplated by the act of 1892.

Now, whatever we may wish to do here (and I am not touching the merits of the question to which the gentleman has been directing his remarks), I protest against leaving these children where they will not be cared for by this Government so far as we, in our wisdom, think the Government should help them. The gentleman in his opening remarks said that none of us need be alarmed by the fear that the children would not be cared for. The gentleman, I believe, is a good lawyer; and if he will scrutinize the act of 1892—I am only speaking of it now from recollection, for I did not know this matter was coming up—he will find that if we appropriate the money in the way he proposes we shall leave all these institutions where these helpless children are in such a condition that the money can not go to the aid of those who were in the institution before any order of the court was issued under the act of 1892. Therefore, I caution the gentleman to consider this matter well before he presses his amendment.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's caution needs absolutely no apology. I certainly should be the last person to turn out of any home any child. I certainly should be the last person to withhold any aid from any worthy human being. I call the gentleman's attention, however, to the fact that the law of 1892 has already been in operation four years, and the argument which was cogently urged at that time can not obtain now, or certainly not with such great force.

At that time no provision could be made under the law providing for the board of children's guardians which would have antedated the act. But let me again call the attention of the committee to the fact that these institutions are supported largely by private contributions. These private contributions will amply support all the children who are not properly objects of public charity, or who were in the institution prior to the passage of the act of 1892. And further than that I know of no reason, nor can my friend from Iowa, who is a good lawyer, suggest any reason, why any child who is properly a public charge can not to-day, upon its condition being shown to be such as to entitle it to the relief proposed, bring itself within the operation of this law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I should like to inquire of the gentleman for information, how large a percentage of the gross expenditures of the Church Orphans' Association is represented by the $1,800 proposed to be appropriated.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Less than one-fifth. The report shows that the institution receives more than $10,000, and out of that sum it had not only money enough to take care of every child in the institution, but was able to pay over $6,000 on antecedent debts. So that it can not be claimed that the institution has not funds enough.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Would it not be a concise way of putting the argument—I submit the question to the gentleman from Nebraska—to say that it is the duty of the Government in the expenditure of public funds to build, if necessary, the institution wherein this $1,800 is to be expended, rather than to appropriate the public funds to a Catholic, a Baptist, a Methodist, or any other sectarian institution?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If the gentleman followed my remarks on last Saturday he will remember that I made the contention then that we had no right to spend a single dollar of the public money for any private purpose. I still adhere to that argument. I believe it is the only sound and safe argument for us—the only correct principle upon which we can plant our feet; and we should not allow any appeal to sentiment to swerve us from these correct principles.

This country is large enough and rich enough to take care of every worthy person who can properly appeal to us for assistance. We ought to render this assistance, however, through the medium of public instrumentalities. As I have said before, with every dollar of public appropriation there should go public supervision and public control. We have absolutely no right to appropriate one dollar to A, B, C, or D, however philanthropic they may be, however good and meritorious their work may be. We have no

right to appropriate one dollar to any individuals, in the faith and hope that they in turn will properly expend that money.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Allow me to ask, does this institution receive children generally—all that are brought there—or only such as belong to the church having charge of the institution?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, I do not know as to that. I assume that they allow every deserving child to come in.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no sectarian discrimination in the reception of children.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. So I understand. I concede that in the administration of this institution there is absolutely nothing wrong. I do not wish to befog or becloud this discussion by making assaults upon any institution. I am willing to concede that this institution is doing the good work which the amiable superintendent of charities says it does. I am making no assault upon any of these institutions. I am simply seeking to rest appropriations of money upon sound principles and to provide that not one dollar of public money shall be devoted to private or sectarian purposes.

I have already called attention to the fact that this is but the entering wedge. Why, sir, the report of the superintendent of charities informs us in plain terms that we are expending more than half a million dollars per annum upon institutions which are private in their character. We have large appropriations of this kind in the sundry civil bill and in the Indian appropriation bill and in various forms. This is simply the commencement, and I should like to have the present Congress at the very threshold face this matter fairly and squarely. On last Saturday I yielded to importunities, which were showered upon me from all hands, not to persist in a motion which seemed to bear upon the veteran soldiers of this country. The appeal was made, and I confess, in a moment of weakness, I yielded to that sentiment in which I personally shared. But every time that you let down the bars, every time that you yield principle to sentiment, whether the amount involved is $2,500 or $1,800 or any other trifling sum, you are compromising the only true principle upon which we should proceed in these matters.

Mr. CANNON. Just there would it embarrass my friend to ask him a question?

If these specific appropriations, one of which he moves to strike out, are all stricken from the law, and his subsequent amendment which he has suggested be adopted, increasing the appropriation to the board of children's guardians under the law, under that appropriation is it not entirely competent for that board—the board of children's guardians—to remit children that it has charge of to the care of these very institutions which the gentleman refers to and which he wishes to strike from the bill?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Unquestionably.

Mr. CANNON. Do they not do it now out of the funds which they now have?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have no information as to that, although I think it possible that they may do so.

Mr. CANNON. Further, let me ask, how can the gentleman from Nebraska justify himself, from his standpoint, for offering an amendment here that will enable this very board of children's guardians to utilize these sectarian institutions which he professes to be cutting up by the roots?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I am very glad, indeed, to have the gentleman from Illinois ask the question, for it is a proper question and demands an answer.

If my contention prevails, then the board of children's guardians may place children there, as they do in homes or in private families; they may leave them there a week or a month, but they have the absolute control of them. Another thing—they pay only while the children are there and pay only for such children as they may send to the institution. They have control of them, just as my friend from Illinois has control of his own children; if he sends one to a boarding school, he can take it away at any time he pleases, can make different arrangements, can give directions and orders respecting it, and retains control at all times of the child. The children in these institutions, under such circumstances, become a public charge, and in that respect they are as they should be.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me just at this point, for we both want to get at the exact facts.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman know that there is no dollar expended under any of these appropriations to private institutions but what, in detail, is reported to and audited by the auditing officer of the Treasury; first by the District officials, then by the auditing officers of the Treasury, so that a full account is given of every cent appropriated, and at the same time a full statement of every cent that comes from private sources, and thus we give the Government supervision and accounting under the other practice?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. My friend is entirely mistaken in his facts.

Mr. CANNON. Well, on the contrary, my friend is entirely mistaken in that statement, as I shall endeavor to show later on.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have in my hand the report of the superintendent of charities for 1894. I know my friend is a far-sighted gentleman, but he can not see things that do not exist. He is entitled to a magnificent chromo if he can find a specific report of this institution there. This appropriation is made in gross. They do expend their appropriations, it is true.

Now, in 1895, if my friend will turn to the report of this institution, he will find a statement of receipts amounting to over $10,000, and over $6,000 of that was paid out on a number of items of existing indebtedness. Then, I ask my friend, does he pretend to say that there is segregated the Government appropriations from other receipts? This appropriation of the Government which should be used entirely for the support of the children, was it separated from other moneys? They make, it is true, not a sworn, but a sort of perfunctory, report of a part of what they receive. It may be all or it may be a part. But no person can find how that specific appropriation of $1,800 provided by the act is expended. There is nothing in the report to indicate it, except as they show the expenditures in gross.

Mr. CANNON. Now, at this point—for it goes to the very core of the question—if the gentleman will allow me, I will say to him that, after careful inquiry, he is mistaken, and I call his attention to page 33 of the law that creates the superintendent of charities. It is in these terms:

> And it shall also be the duty of said superintendent to examine into the character of the administration of said institutions and associations, and the conditions, sufficiency, and needs of the buildings occupied for such charitable purposes, and also to ascertain in each case the amount contributed from private sources for support and construction, the number of paid employees, and the number of inmates received and benefited by the sums appropriated by Congress, and to recommend such changes and modifications therein as in his judgment will secure economy, efficiency, and the highest attainable result in the administrations of charities in the District of Columbia, etc.

And further on we find this:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 13, 1891.*
>
> *Ordered*, That hereafter all vouchers for expenditures of appropriations for charitable and reformatory institutions and purposes which receive aid from the District of Columbia shall be submitted to the superintendent of charities for review and approval, and when so examined and approved transmitted from that officer to the auditor of the District of Columbia.
>
> By order.
>
> WM. TINDALL, *Secretary.*

Further, on inquiry I find that there is no dollar of money expended but what the accounts are delivered in detail through this process and under this law, and go to the Auditor of the Treasury Department, and are audited just as the expenses of the War and Navy and other services of the Government are audited, and I was under that impression, but I verified it and find that it is absolutely true under the law and under the practice. Not a dollar or a cent is expended in any of these institutions without passing the lynx eye of even Mr. Bowler, the First Comptroller of the Treasury.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of my friend to the fact that he has been reading simply from the law. It matters but little what is in the law. It depends very much on the administration. Now, turning to page 7 of the report of the same superintendent for the year 1894, after quoting the same law which my friend has read with very many manifestations of physical energy——

Mr. CANNON. My friend will allow me?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Why, certainly.

Mr. CANNON. He is an honest man——

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. It is impossible, if I talk at all, that I shall not talk as directly as I know how, and I am not responsible for the physical energy God gave me. I can not help it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I should not help it if I could——

Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Except to increase it; and I trust that many years will be given to the gentleman, and that each successive year his strength, like the eagle's, will be renewed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was about to call attention to page 7 of the report of 1894.

Mr. CANNON. I have not the report of 1894. I have the last report, for 1895.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. After quoting in extenso the same law which my friend has quoted, the superintendent says:

> The duties thus imposed, advisory as to legislation and administrative organization, are necessarily of an executive nature, in the general direction of expenditures authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. They are "simply advisory."

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Ah, I have read the words.

Mr. CANNON. And administrative, as are other public expenditures; not advisory. The gentleman is not happy in construing the very language of the superintendent.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have given it in hæc verba, as the gentleman can see if he will examine the report.

Mr. CANNON. But it does not convey the same idea to the gentleman's mind as it does to mine. Now, the contention is that

there can not be one dollar drawn from or expended by this service without it goes into the hands of a bonded officer of the United States, and that bonded officer only pays it out upon itemized accounts; that it is audited by the auditor for the District of Columbia; that it goes to the auditing office of the Treasury Department for final audit just as every other dollar of public expenditure goes.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, let us put this matter fairly before this committee.

Mr. CANNON. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, my friend's contention—if it has any practical force—is that for this $1,800 which is sought to be appropriated, the same, I believe, as it was last year, there is a specific and itemized report made showing just exactly how that $1,800 was expended, that it was expended for the benefit of certain specific and specified public charges. If that were true, very much of the contention which I am now making would have no practical force.

Mr. CANNON. It is absolutely true.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, here is the report, and I call my friend's attention to it. In 1894 they made absolutely no report, and in 1895 the report is found commencing on page 207. I will ask my friend to follow me in the reading of that report. It shows that the receipts from various sources for that year amounted to $10,429.77.

Mr. GRAFF. Who received that?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The institution received it.

Mr. GRAFF. What institution?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's, commenced with April, 1894, "May, 1894, $368.29, paid on orders of Sister Sarah for maintenance."

Now, then, it goes into hundreds of dollars, total maintenance, including fuel, lights, etc., which aggregates $3,301.15, or less than one-third of the total receipts of the institution. Now, then, the expenditures, which passed the "lynx eye" of this Comptroller, and as shown there, also aggregates $10,429.75, including balance of $328.82 yet on hand. I read the items:

Insurance	$58.75
Interest paid	386.50
Printing annual report, etc	35.50
Rent of safe-deposit box	5.00
Notes to Eugene Bettes and interest	1,627.33
Paid Riggs & Co. on orphanage debt	5,000.00
Balance with the United States Treasurer	286.72
Balance with Riggs & Co	328.82

And then, on the following page, under the head of donations, I find here an aggregate of $794.75. I ask my friend where does that appear in the accounts which were submitted of receipts? And yet again——

Mr. CANNON. Well, I want to answer your question right at that point. This report is only a general statement of expenditures. My friend understands that there could be no reports of audited accounts in detail. If there was, then for the public service there would not be room enough in the new Library to hold them. And at that point let me say that this $1,800 appropriated from the public fund in aid of this work, to this private institution, that has nearly $10,000 income besides the $1,800 that it receives—and the $1,800 goes out of the Treasury into the hands of a disbursing officer of the United States, the treasurer of this institution, and he can only settle his accounts of that $1,800 as other disbursing officers settle their accounts. I say to my friend again that I suspected this was true, but since the last sitting of this committee I have absolutely exhausted all means of information, and now stand and say that I have found it to be absolutely true.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman asked the question where this $749.70 is accounted for. You will find it in the fourth item, $749.70. That is where it is accounted for.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, I wish to say to my friend from Illinois the point I make is this: The $1,800, or whatever amount is appropriated by the Government, has never been segregated in any account which he can find, either general or specific. The accounts here given have been presented, and have been passed, including, as I have already shown, the amount of money which was paid on its indebtedness; and so I find, as I have already suggested, this institution has received aid not only in these annual appropriations for maintenance ostensibly, but it has received even $10,000, which it has invested in property. On page 209 of this report I find the following——

Mr. CANNON. What report is that?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It is the report for 1895, on page 209, near the bottom of the page:

> Congress has been liberal in providing for the original purchase of the orphanage building, and later for an addition thereto. It has also appropriated an annual sum for maintenance, beginning in 1883 with $1,500, and increasing that amount in 1891 to $2,000, when the enlarged building and an increasing number of inmates had rendered that greater sum absolutely needful.
>
> In 1896, however, Congress was induced to enter upon a plan of appropriating a part only of what had in previous years been awarded to public charitable institutions of the District, and remitting those institutions for the remainder to the board of children's guardians.

So we have the fact established and remaining that this large appropriation has been made by the Government to assist this private institution in building an orphanage, the title of which is in private parties, and the value of which is constantly appreciating in the passing years. We are appropriating sums—last year $1,800—when their revenues were sufficient to enable them, as I have already called your attention, to pay over $6,000 of their antecedent debt. It can not, then, by any refinement of argument or by any persuasion of the gentleman from Illinois be made plausible to this House that this $1,800 was necessary for maintenance. Had we not appropriated that $1,800 they would simply have paid $1,800 less of their indebtedness. How many institutions of this country have gone into debt in the past year? Uncle Sam went into debt $162,000,000; but this institution, which comes to us with outstretched hands asking charity, paid of its indebtedness over $6,000, besides the amount which it had paid on interest. Now, I ask the gentlemen of this committee is there any real reason for this further appropriation?

What reason can you give to justify your action to your constituencies? Here is a nation which has gone into debt $162,000,000 in the past eighteen months; here are the printing presses in motion turning out bonds of the United States to pay practically current expenses. And yet we are called upon to appropriate money to the wards of one of the richest churches of this city, an institution which, while it is doing good work, has for its patrons the millionaire ladies of this country. We can, it is true, appropriate to this institution an additional $1,800 to pay on its indebtedness, which indebtedness was created for the purpose of enabling the institution to carry property in this city and its country home in Virginia, property which is appreciating in value. But gentlemen say: "These poor children will suffer if we do not make this appropriation."

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am tired and the country is tired of seeing wealthy institutions masquerading behind the widows and orphans. I am not wanting in consideration, but I want no false pretenses in this matter. The gentleman from Illinois can read the reports. I have called his attention to the fact of the expenditure of this large amount of money for the payment of debts. Those figures are more eloquent than even the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. They demonstrate absolutely that there is no necessity for this appropriation. The principle upon which it is sought to make appropriations to this and other private institutions is fraught with danger and is wrong and pernicious in every sense. It can not be justified, and even the flimsy pretext of a necessity is swept away by the logic of the figures which I have introduced.

No, gentlemen, you can not justify this appropriation. Try it as much as you can, but the plain people all over this land of ours, never wanting in charitable instincts and purposes, will never submit to an appropriation of money to these institutions which have really no need for them. This institution can use the appropriation; of course it can. So can my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. So could I use it; so could every other member of this House of Representatives use this appropriation. Remember, gentlemen, that there are charitable institutions all over this country. The people of my State, who have endured a combination of drought, Debsism, and Democracy [laughter], and from which, thanks to a vigorous constitution, they are rapidly recovering, could very well use this appropriation, and much more than this. But they do not ask it, and neither should this institution ask it. The children who are there, and who may properly be entitled to the public care, can be remitted to the board of children's guardians, who will amply take care of every child that is properly a public charge. In closing, I wish to call attention to a suggestion which has been sent to me by some kind friend, which is that the expenditures in each and every one of these cases are invariably made in advance of the auditing. The expenditures are all made by private persons. The appropriation is made here in gross, and when the vouchers are presented, provided only they are for maintenance of the institution, there is nothing to be done but accept them. The money is already gone.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask to be indulged for somewhat more than five minutes, as I want to talk about these appropriations, not having yet done so to any great extent.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be given unlimited time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I shall occupy more than ten or fifteen minutes. I will deal first with the last point made by the gentleman from Nebraska, a point furnished, as he tells us, by some anonymous person, and one as to which he ought not to have allowed himself to be imposed upon to the extent of voicing it here. The gentleman says that these appropriations are expended before the accounting. Of course they are. There is no appropriation made for the carrying on of this Government but that the expenditure is made before the accounting. In the very nature of things it is impossible that it should be otherwise, because if you were required to account before you expended, you could not do it; as there would not be anything to account for.

How are Government expenditures made? A bonded officer of the Government, called a disbursing officer, files his bond. Then a requisition is made by the proper authority. He takes the money and expends it according to that authority, and if he fails to keep within his authority it is at his own peril, because he can not settle his accounts. Now, this $1,800 appropriation is expended exactly in that way, just as the expenditures are made for the Army, for the Navy, for this House of Representatives, for the whole public service everywhere. I commend my friend from Nebraska to talk to the law and the pending amendments, and I will try to do so myself.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I have taken occasion to go to the bottom of this question, and I hold myself personally responsible for every statement of fact that I shall introduce here. I want to have this appropriation disposed of in view of the facts and not in view of general declamation. I can stand and declaim with my friend from Nebraska that I, too, believe in the Government making its own expenditures. I am not a member of any church, and the doubts which cluster in my mind as to whether anybody knows anything certainly about the matter to the exclusion of all others makes me wonderfully charitable to them all. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to declaim as to what my position is upon that general subject. I stand here as a Representative to do my duty. It is not necessary for me to legislate in the light of declamation; I prefer to legislate in the light of facts. On the general question I am not without record. I do not believe in sectarianism being supported at the public expense. General Grant inaugurated the peace policy with the Indians, and there grew up a church educational service in connection with the Indians, and as the years rolled around there developed an abuse. I had the honor to draft an amendment, which was offered in this House in a recent Congress, and which put in process of ultimate extinction the use of public money for sectarian education among the Indians. We did not undertake to stop it all at once, because if we had cut it off in the twinkling of an eye, before the Government was ready to furnish adequate facilities for educating the Indians, they would have gone without instruction; but the abuse is in the course of being wiped out. Wise legislation takes account of the surroundings and the circumstances, and moves judiciously in the right direction, taking care to cause as little disturbance and to do as little injustice as possible to the actual interests involved.

Now, having said this much by way of preface, let us look at what the facts in this case are.

Prior to 1892 we had two methods of relieving poor children and others in this District. One, practiced to a considerable extent, was to absolutely build the asylum or house of correction or other building where these persons were to be placed, superintend its operations, and pay all the expense. Another method, practiced during many years, was and is to cooperate with charitably minded people in contributing a part of the expense from the Government Treasury, they contributing the bulk of it from private means. Right or wrong, that was the system; like Topsy, "it growed." But in 1892 we commenced to take a new departure, and legislation was enacted to which I pray the attention of the House. This legislation created the board of children's guardians, with what powers?

I read the law:

That said board shall have the care and supervision of the following classes of children: First, all children committed under section 2 of the act of February 12, 1885, entitled "An act for the protection of children in the District, and for other purposes"; second—

Now I ask gentlemen to follow me in what I am about to read—

all children who are destitute of suitable homes and adequate means of earning an honest living; all children abandoned by their parents or guardians; all children of habitually drunken or vicious or unfit parents; all children habitually begging on the streets or from door to door; all children kept in vicious or immoral associations; all children known by their language or life to be vicious or incorrigible—

Now, is there any limitation in this? Observe the limitation. Here it is:

whenever such children may be committed to the care of the board by the police court or the criminal court of the District.

And then the necessary power is given to carry out the objects of the act. Under that law no child can pass under the jurisdiction of this board of children's guardians until it has had its day in court and has been adjudicated to belong to one of these classes designated, and is formally branded as having criminal instincts, or being unfortunate, or otherwise coming under some one of these definitions, and is also destitute. When that fact has been solemnly adjudged by the court the child is committed to the care of this board.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the board of children's guardians, as shown by their report, are doing nothing at all with "incorrigible" children. Those are properly taken care of by the Reform School, or similar institutions. I submit, therefore, that the construction which the gentleman is now placing upon the act of 1892 is hardly warranted. He is not justified in assuming that when a child is placed under the guardianship of this board there is any stigma or stain put upon it. There is absolutely nothing of that kind contemplated by the law.

Mr. CANNON. I know there is a Reform School that takes care of those children who have committed criminal acts, etc., and there are other institutions having similar purposes. The language of the act is:

All children kept in vicious or immoral associations, all children known by their language or life to be vicious or incorrigible, whenever such children may be committed, etc.

Now, this law went into force July 26, 1892. At the next session of Congress—the Fifty-second Congress, of which I had not the honor to be a member—the Committee on Appropriations, following the construction then given to that act, in reporting the District appropriation bill, struck out all child-caring charitable institutions and gave to the board of children's guardians the appropriations which had previously been given to such institutions. The bill passed the House in that shape, with all these institutions struck out, just as the gentleman from Nebraska now wants them struck out here. But the Senate restored the various institutions, giving them 70 per cent of the amounts of the previous appropriations. In conference the amounts were reduced to about 60 per cent, the other 40 per cent amounting to $24,200, being given to the board of children's guardians; and of that sum the board in its legitimate work was able to spend only about $17,000, leaving a balance of more than $7,000, which it was earnestly recommended (House Executive Document 103) before the close of the year should be distributed among the child-caring institutions; but the year closed before the deficiency bill was acted on.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Right there will my friend allow me to incorporate in his remarks——

Mr. CANNON. I would rather the gentleman should not "incorporate" anything in my remarks; but if he has any question touching this point, I will yield to him.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I desire, then, to ask my friend whether he has not overlooked a very significant part of the report of the superintendent of charities for the year 1895, page 269, in which reference is made to this board of children's guardians, and in which the following language is used:

It will be noticed that nearly all of the commitments promoted by our agent appear to have been for simple destitution, the number shown as having been rescued from immoral surroundings and taken from drunken and unfit parents having almost disappeared. This difference is more apparent than real. It has been found that it is much easier to prove that a child is "destitute of suitable home and adequate means of earning an honest living" than that he is the child of "drunken and unfit parents," or "kept in vicious or immoral associations," notwithstanding the fact that his destitution and lack of means of earning an honest living were the direct results of the "unfit" character of his parents or the "vicious and immoral" nature of his home associations.

No incorrigible children have been presented for commitment by our agent. It has been known throughout the year—

This is the passage to which I challenge the special attention of the gentleman from Illinois—

that the funds at the disposal of the board would not be sufficient to meet the demands upon it, and this class of children are always most expensive and troublesome to deal with. There are several reasons why the board could not give them terms of institution training, and to place them in free private homes without such training would simply be to turn them loose upon unsuspecting persons entitled to better treatment.

This shows that instead of there being a surplus of funds there is a deficit of funds in the hands of this public institution, the board of children's guardians.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend can contain himself until I can complete a statement of what has been done since this law of 1892 was passed, he will find that he and I do not disagree about the facts. If we do, it is my friend's misfortune, because I speak from the record. I say, the first year there was $7,000 which the board of children's guardians did not spend.

Now let me go on to the next step. At the first regular session of the Fifty-third Congress—the Congress just preceding this—the Committee on Appropriations again reported the District appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending 1895, omitting the child-caring institutions, and giving the money direct to the board of children's guardians; but after discussion of that provision (see RECORD, volume 139, page 2835), the institutions were restored to the bill in the same sums given in the previous year; that is, on the basis of 60 per cent for private institutions and 40 per cent to the board of children's guardians. That is the next step.

The Senate increased the amount for these institutions to about 90 per cent of the sums at both of the previous Congresses for the board of children's guardians, in order to give them approximately all that they had previously received, exclusive of what the board of children's guardians had expended, and relieved them of that—the board having reduced the expenditures $7,700 of the preceding year, an amount equal to the sum not expended the year before. In 1894 the board of children's guardians received $24,700, and for 1895 it was reduced on the basis of the expenditures to $17,000. For 1896 the appropriation was increased to $20,000, and they come now asking a further appropriation for

the balance of this fiscal year; and I feel that I am warranted in stating, as they now, for the first time, ask this relief, that the deficiency will be given for the full amount, and I have no doubt it ought to be on the regular deficiency appropriation bill.

For 1897 this bill recommends $27,400 for the board of children's guardians. There is no man in the House or in the country that welcomes efficient work by the board of children's guardians, under the law creating it, more than I do, and it is working. The first year it could not expend but $17,000; the next year about the same amount was expended; the next year it asked an appropriation of $20,000, and now comes asking for a deficiency. The coming year it is asking $27,000, and we have written every dollar of it in the appropriation bill. This board of children's guardians is growing, and I welcome its growth; and let me say, in passing, that the true friend of charity, from the standpoint of the Government administering its own appropriations, is the man that intelligently, without being prejudiced, founds that system and promotes its growth, traveling with the appropriations hand in hand with the efficiency of the service.

Now, what did the Committee on Appropriations do? In the light of this act of 1892, in the light of the action of Congress, the Congress before the last one, and in the light of the action of the last Congress at both its sessions, we recognized the growth of the board of children's guardians and gave them every cent they asked. We say to them: "Well done; we are glad you are becoming established;" and we are at the same time following along the line of caring for these helpless children as Congress did care for them and make the appropriations in the same direction until we can care for them otherwise.

Now, a word further. I hold in my hand a statement, and I call my friend's attention to it, made this morning by the president of the board of children's guardians, Mr. Simon Wolf, for thirty years a resident of this District, by birth and religion an Israelite, a man of broad views, a magnificent citizen, a man who has been conversant through all these years with charity, and he justifies the wisdom of the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations following the precedent we did follow in the words which I will ask the Clerk to read. I claim the attention of the House, especially the attention of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], while it is being read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives, February 3, 1896.

STATEMENT OF MR. SIMON WOLF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE GERMAN ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Mr. CANNON. How long have you lived in the District?

Mr. WOLF. Thirty-four years.

Mr. CANNON. Have you had occasion during a portion or all of that time to have had your attention directed to the charities of the District?

Mr. WOLF. Very much so.

Mr. CANNON. How long have you been president of the board of children's guardians?

Mr. WOLF. Since the institution was organized, with the exception of a part of a year in which Miss Loring was president, when I had resigned.

Mr. CANNON. Am I correct in understanding that the board of children's guardians only obtain jurisdiction of children by commitment through the courts?

Mr. WOLF. Entirely so.

Mr. CANNON. Is the work of the board of children's guardians growing?

Mr. WOLF. It is steadily increasing and would be much larger were our appropriations larger, as we can not take care of as many children as are applied for.

Mr. CANNON. Your estimates for this year are $27,400.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir; and a deficiency also. The amount necessary for feeble-minded children is inadequate in consequence of the high rates claimed at Elwin, Pa. We have been trying several other places, but we find the color line forms an important factor.

Mr. CANNON. These are institutions to which you commit feeble-minded children?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. In the present condition of charitable work in the District and of legislation covering the power of the board of children's guardians, what would be the practical effect for this fiscal year of a failure to appropriate for the utilization of the various private charities?

Mr. WOLF. A calamity for those institutions without conferring adequate authority upon the board of children's guardians. Before any such radical step could be taken further legislation is indispensably necessary, as the board is in a state of evolution. It has to propagate its ideas by practical work, and while we have accomplished much, and while primarily we claim that all appropriations given by the Government for the care of indigent children in the District of Columbia should go through us, we are not so blind as to ignore the tradition, sentiment, and feelings of a large number of well-disposed, well-meaning, kind-hearted, and charitable people.

Mr. CANNON. What would be the effect (without further legislation) upon the children who will be really entitled to relief, of the withholding of appropriation from the various private institutions?

Mr. WOLF. I think it would cripple private institutions and prove a great harm to many deserving people who, from a feeling of religion, habits, or traditions, do not like to have their misfortunes dragged into the public courts, and thus, while a principle would be observed, much practical harm might ensue for the present.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I understand you, from the standpoint of complete administration, through strictly governmental agencies, or Government appropriations, under existing conditions, without further legislation, such appropriations are not desirable.

Mr. WOLF. Not at present. In regard to the German Orphan Asylum, I will state that as far as the Government controlling expenses in any of these private institutions under existing law and rules adopted by the Commissioners, every dollar that is appropriated must be drawn from the Treasury of the United States. The treasurer or the auditing officer must give bond, and the vouchers must be submitted and passed through the auditing branches of the Government before any further appropriation can be utilized for said institutions. Every safeguard is thrown around the children of the German Orphan Asylum, which institution is strictly nonsectarian, having all shades of religious opinion represented on the board. This is also true of the board of children's guardians. All shades of opinion, as well as both colors, are represented on said board.

I will state that practically I have always been opposed to any union of church and state, and that I have so declared to friends. And once, when I appeared before the committee of the constitutional convention in the State of New York, I claimed that the Jews ought not to ask any money to be given by the Government; but, notwithstanding, I have opinions fixed, and therefore I recognize the conditions and do not believe in radical measures without first preparing the public mind. I think that reforms should go hand in hand with efficiency of public service.

I wish to state, if it is at all desirous, that the superintendent of charities, who is present, has been most efficient and energetic and in every way possible seems to be imbued with a single purpose to do his duty.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, that is the statement of a man who has been almost constantly at the head of the board of children's charities since its creation. Now, let us look at it practically. The Committee on Appropriations, under the rule of the House, can not report general legislation. It is subject to points of order, and absolutely prohibited by the rules, as gentlemen have seen on this bill. Mr. Simon Wolf says that without further legislation the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska, if enacted into law, would be most disastrous. To whom? Why, to the children. What do you make the appropriations for? To care for those who somehow or other in the operations of God's law are unfortunate. I would have the ideal institutions, if I could, to perform all the service of my country. When I can not get the ideal thing spoken into law in a second of time, full armed, as Minerva was when she sprang from the brain of Jove, I will do the next best thing, and I will care for the unfortunate, hungry, and defenseless children by the best means at hand.

I do not care whether it is St. John's Orphanage or some other orphanage. Before they shall go cold and hungry, and unprotected and uncared for, I will even utilize that institution that believes in the divinity of Christ possibly from a little different standpoint than I believe. It is not a question of the divinity of Christ from any standpoint, so far as this appropriation is concerned. It is a question of relieving the suffering of those who are not so fortunate as your children and mine have been. It is a question (pending the time we build good orphan asylums) of using those to take care of those children who have the means to care for them.

Now, gentlemen may ask what legislation is desired. Before the gentleman's amendment can be safely enacted, legislation is desired that will clothe this board of children's guardians with power to take the half orphan, whose unfortunate parent, father or mother, can not support him, and instead of completely pauperizing that parent, who may be only temporarily embarrassed by allowing her children to be adjudicated paupers or vicious, that she may say, "Here is my misfortune. I can not care for my helpless child. I hope for employment in three months or six months. For God's sake take my child and care for it."

Ah, but, says my friend, the child can be adjudicated a pauper by the courts. But, gentlemen, I would relieve people in that way, when they ought to be relieved in that way. I sometimes give charity, but I never have given to an adult without fearing that I have contributed something to break down the manhood of that adult. You may say that is sentiment. But, gentlemen, character is builded upon sentiment, and when we lose our self-respect and feel that others have lost respect for us, we are in a pretty bad way.

Now, when you clothe this board of children's guardians with legislative power to in some measure throw its arms around this class of unfortunates, as the grace of God is thrown around the unfortunate from the standpoint of love, and forbearance, and sympathy, then I will vote with my friend; but until you give that legislative authority I am not here to say that I will turn out of these institutions any children because forsooth they have not been, or the parent or guardian does not desire them to be, adjudicated paupers or vicious under the law as it now stands.

Now, a word as to the merits of St. John's Orphanage. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], it seems to me, in his criticism, was not quite as happy as I have heard him. He spoke of the millionaire communicants in this church, and mentioned the names of one or two on Saturday. Well, gentlemen, if I was running a church in the District of Columbia and had charitable work on hand, if I could reach out and bring into the charitable organizations of that church as rich a woman as Mrs. Hearst, I would do so. I would bring in everybody that I could.

Now, this institution is organized. It is an old church orphanage. My friends say that last year they paid $6,000 of their debt. Why, they have a private income. They had a bequest of $5,000 from Mr. Warder. Their parishioners contributed liberally, and I thank God they were able to do so. I did not contribute anything to this church orphanage, for I have my own little work to do in my own corner. But does my friend know what it costs the Government from the Treasury of the United States and the District of Columbia, how much per capita the Government contrib-

uted last year in this appropriation of $1,800? Just $20 per capita. In other words, for, in round numbers, 100 children in St. John's Church Orphanage that were cared for, and well cared for, the Government paid one-fifth, or $20 apiece.

Mr. WHEELER. Eighteen dollars, and last year $15.20.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. How does the gentleman know it did not go to the payment of that debt?

Mr. CANNON. My friend can not afford, after I again give him assurances that I have heretofore given, to play upon that string.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If my friend will permit me again, I said every dollar for this orphanage was expended for its maintenance and for payment of some obligation of the institution. The gentleman seems to think that he has segregated that $1,800 given by the Government, but the facts are against him; that amount has simply gone into the general fund and into the expenditures, the legitimate expenditures, I admit, of the institution. That is plain.

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary. Five thousand dollars of this was a special bequest given to pay this debt. Sometimes it is said we believe in funerals, but this man who is dead and gone did well. I can not afford to have any question of fact between my friend and myself as to the accounting for the appropriations; and I here and now hold in my hand a complete set of blanks that covers the reports of these expenditures in detail.

Now, follow me again, for I measure my words and speak whereof I know after an investigation. There is a treasurer of St. John's Orphanage. He has not and can not draw one cent of the public money until he executes his bond as a disbursing officer of the United States. Then he can draw one quarter of the $1,800 for the first quarter of the year. Now, that $1,800 is expended for care and maintenance, every dollar and every cent of it, and there is an itemized account kept just as any other public expenditures are kept. That report of expenditures is first given to the superintendent of charities. It goes next from him to the District Commissioners. It goes from them to the District auditor. I am now speaking of the three months' expenditures. It goes from that auditor to the auditing officers of the Treasury for final auditing, just as all Government accounts do; and the three months' expenditures must be audited and approved before the requisition of the disbursing officer will be recognized, and the next three months' expenditures are advanced by the Government. And my friend admits in his argument that if I am correct in this statement that it takes from him the foundation substantially upon which he stood.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no; let there be no mistake about this.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want any misapprehension. I understand that to be my friend's position.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If you can show that $1,800 was segregated, and that the $1,800 appropriated by the Government was expended for the maintenance of certain specific children who are specifically a public charge, then very much of the argument based upon the facts in this case will be taken away; but you can not do that, and do not pretend so to do. You simply say that these various amounts of money which came into the funds of the institution from various sources were paid out to meet the expenses of the institution. That is all.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I will admit that there is no question that it has been paid out to meet the expenses of the institution.

Mr. WHEELER. And for those who would be a public charge.

Mr. CANNON. I will not split hairs with my friend longer. I have stated three times the system of accounting.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am unable to see what relevancy or pertinency or force there is in the argument of the gentleman from Illinois which relates to the accountings or disbursing of this money. What I am interested in seeing is what we as Congressmen are called upon to do now, and I ask for information if this orphanage is a corporation?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is a sectarian corporation, a Catholic institution, is it not?

Mr. CANNON. It is an Episcopal institution. It is under the auspices of the Episcopal Church.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is what is known in common parlance as a sectarian institution. What we as Congressmen do find is this, that if we pass this bill as it now is we vote to appropriate $1,800 to a corporation organized under sectarian auspices for sectarian purposes. The matter of the number of auditings, the hands through which it goes, the matter as to the number of men who inspect the receipts and vouchers and accounts, do not signify. As I say, that does not touch the general question that by our votes we are asked to appropriate $1,800 of money to a sectarian corporation.

Mr. CANNON. Now, I am glad the gentleman has stated what he has, because it absolutely shows, after a man has studied the question to get at the facts for days, and then to the best of his feeble ability has tried to tell the facts, how poor he is in making the facts known when a gentleman so intelligent as the gentleman from Wisconsin arises and asks such a question as he has asked.

Now, to reply again in substance to him, the St. John's Orphanage Association, as I understand, is a corporation of many years' standing, under the patronage of the Episcopal Church. The people that are admitted there in pursuance of its organization are needy, those requiring nurture and the care of charitable persons in the absence of natural guardians having the ability to extend such care. Now, as the District of Columbia has not been provided, under law, with power to relieve these people, the Committee on Appropriations recommend this $1,800, as such sums have heretofore been recommended and appropriated, as a contribution toward the support of the 100 children in that refuge. But my friend [Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin] says he does not care anything about the accounting. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do, because this service is placed under an officer of the Government, duly appointed, confirmed by the Senate, duly sworn, and it is his duty, under the law, which I have before me, to know about the conduct of this institution and about the children that are in it. This money is drawn from the Treasury by a bonded officer of the United States, and, as proof that it is expended for the care and maintenance of those who would otherwise be hungry, and who are wards of this Government, the accounts are audited like other Government accounts.

Now, my friend says that he objects to this appropriation because it utilizes a sectarian institution, and from that I suppose that if he gets an opportunity he will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska. Am I correct in that?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know what the amendment is. I shall vote against the provision in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] strikes out all these items and puts the money under the control of the board of children's guardians.

Mr. GROUT. But that is not the pending motion.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; but that is the purpose the gentleman announces. Now, I say to my friend from Wisconsin that the very statute which he refers to makes it lawful for this board of children's guardians to utilize this and all other sectarian institutions; so my friend will see that, when it comes to voting upon either of these propositions, so far as he is concerned, he will have to be like the colored man and "take to the woods." [Laughter.]

Mr. RAY. May I ask the gentleman a question? Is there any existing general provision of law for the care of orphan children in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. None except under these appropriation bills—except through the board of children's guardians.

Mr. RAY. And, as I understand, it has been the custom of Congress from year to year to make these appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The gentleman from New York asks whether there is any provision of law. I desire to say that the board of children's guardians that I have been talking about is a Government board and has power, when children are committed to it by the courts, to maintain them.

Mr. RAY. But these children that are cared for by this orphanage association are not committed to the charge of the board of children's guardians?

Mr. CANNON. They are not.

Mr. WASHINGTON. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. These children that are committed to this board of children's guardians, do you know in what institutions they are placed, whether in institutions in this District or elsewhere?

Mr. CANNON. In part to institutions in the District; in part to homes outside of the District; in part to deaf and dumb or insane institutions, in cases where the children are imbecile or need the care of such institutions.

Mr. WASHINGTON. That, I understand, is for the reason that the District has no institutions to which any of this class of children can be committed.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And the children must therefore be committed to some charitable institution, either here or elsewhere?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. And that goes to the very core of this contention, the fact that, as to the great majority of children who are needy and ought to be cared for, there is no law under which they can be admitted to such institutions and no Government institutions to which they can be admitted. Now, pending the enactment of any such law, I say it would be cruelty to split hairs and say: "We will not do anything for these children because we are not ready to do something for them according to our exact views of propriety."

Mr. RAY. May I ask the gentleman one other question?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly.
Mr. RAY. As I understand it, these children who are cared for by this particular church are not exclusively children taken from the families or from the care of relatives of persons who belong to that church.
Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. It is God's poor that need relief and that obtain it there.
Mr. RAY. God's poor from all churches?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly.
Mr. RAY. Or perhaps from no church?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly.
Mr. WHEELER. The report itself states that expressly.
Mr. RAY. And, as I understand, no attention whatever is paid to the church to which the children or their parents belong, or with which they may be connected.
Mr. CANNON. Not the slightest on earth.
Mr. PITNEY. Are the board of children's guardians provided with any building or institution to which they may commit such poor?
Mr. CANNON. Not at all.
Mr. PITNEY. Is there any building or institution in the District of Columbia of a public nature in which the children of the poor may be cared for if these appropriations are struck out of the bill?
Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman mean under this jurisdiction?
Mr. PITNEY. Under public jurisdiction.
Mr. CANNON. None, except the Reform School and other institutions of that character of a quasi criminal nature.
Mr. PITNEY. Do you know whether those institutions are sufficient to care for all the children of the District needing care?
Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. They are taxed now to their utmost limit.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman speaks of the Government accounting officers.
Mr. CANNON. Yes; but my friend says he does not care anything about those.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not, for this reason——
Mr. CANNON. I will hear the gentleman's question.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Has that Government accounting officer under the law, if this bill shall become a law in the form it now stands, any jurisdiction to withhold one penny of this fund from the conductors of this Episcopal institution, they telling him that they wanted to pay debts?
Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Where does he get that authority?
Mr. CANNON. Have I got to open a kindergarten here on Government accounting? [Laughter.]
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I look at the matter, this House, in the provision now under discussion, makes a plain, direct appropriation of a specific sum, without conditions, subject to no authority or revision by any person or persons in or out of Government employ, to a sectarian corporation. This provision does not state the purposes for which the money is to be used nor the persons who are to direct how it shall be used nor the persons who are to receive it, but the money is given to a corporate association; the corporate officers draw it, and no Government officer has jurisdiction over it.
Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, of such criticism comes much of the opposition to this appropriation. I say again, that the whole field of law, so far as it applies to appropriations and accountings, is called into force in the expenditure of this money; and I commend the gentlemen to a study of the accounting system of the Government——
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.
Mr. CANNON. And if it is upon that question that the gentleman again desires to speak, I can not make it any plainer.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman cite the law which confers any authority upon any person, corporate or otherwise, to control the expenditure of this fund, except only the officers of this corporation who get this money by donation from the Government without any qualification whatever?
Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I before called my friend's attention (if he has done me the honor to listen to the earlier part of this debate) to the authority. That authority consists in part of the law creating the superintendent of charities and defining his duties touching these institutions, and of the order of the District Commissioners made under the law requiring the auditing, and the law requiring the final accounting. Now, that tells the whole story to a man who is versed in Government appropriation and accounting; and I can not say anything further about it.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman claim, because this sum of $1,800 must be used under the law he has read for the maintenance of this institution (the point I make is evaded), that this is a direct appropriation for sectarian purposes?
Mr. CANNON. I evade nothing. I say, measuring my words—and my friend must not ask me to stand here and take the time of this Committee of the Whole in making him understand Government accounting—I say again, measuring my words, that no dollar of this money can be drawn from the Treasury except by a disbursing officer, and that such officer can not settle his accounts until he has complied with the law in showing that every cent received by him has been applied for this purpose.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin again rose.
Mr. CANNON. I can not yield further to my friend upon this matter, because I should not feel justified in doing so.
Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me?
Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.
Mr. POWERS. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether the expenditure of this appropriation will pass under the eye of Comptroller Bowler?
Mr. CANNON. Under the Dockery accounting system it is certain to pass under the eye of Comptroller Bowler, just as all other Government accounts do.
Mr. POWERS. Are we not, then, perfectly safe in regard to the expenditure of the appropriation? [Laughter.]
Mr. CANNON. That is what I have been trying to demonstrate.
Mr. POWERS. Let me ask the gentleman a further question—whether in his own State the legislature is accustomed to vote money to different church organizations for charitable purposes?
Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that in my State there are certain charities—those making provision for the insane, the deaf, and dumb, etc.—which are conducted in State institutions. But the poor are cared for by the respective county authorities—boards of supervisors, township officers, etc.; and they are in the habit, in some instances, of building institutions and officering them just as I should be glad to do, if we could, in this case. But if the authorities have not any place in which to care for those persons who need public care, they utilize any agency which may happen to exist, and which they can hire to take care of the poor that they can not otherwise take care of.
Mr. POWERS. I notice that in this bill general provision is made for the poor, the insane, the criminal——
Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.
Mr. POWERS. And in addition to that there are appropriations to specific church organizations by name.
Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.
Mr. POWERS. Now, my question is whether in the gentleman's State the legislature, after providing for the insane, the poor, and the criminal classes, goes a step further and takes upon the State the burden of appropriating money every year to those church organizations?
Mr. CANNON. In most of the counties, wherever it is necessary, we utilize whatever means are at hand to care for the poor when the county has not its own hospitals or asylums to do the work.
Mr. POWERS. I want the gentleman to get my question——
Mr. CANNON. I think I understand the gentleman's question.
Mr. POWERS. It is whether you appropriate specifically to church organizations?
Mr. CANNON. I will answer my friend's question. We appropriate specifically to pay any organization that will do the service if we are not prepared to do it ourselves. For instance, in my county of Vermilion we have been in the habit of sending the poor to the hospitals when they were entitled to relief, because as yet the county has no hospital of its own, and we do not fail to send them to a hospital because, perchance, the hospital is under the care or patronage of a church. And so I apprehend it is everywhere.
Mr. POWERS. Well, I apprehend it is not so, and that the general rule is quite the reverse of what the gentleman has stated.
But what I was getting at is this: What excuse have we for traveling a thousand miles and coming here to Washington and voting public money for purposes of this kind which we would not dare to do in our own State legislatures?
Mr. CANNON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I would dare to vote for anything in my home that I would vote for here. Similar expenditures of money in my own county have been made where it was necessary to make them. And I will ask my friend from Vermont now, Representative as he is here, in the absence of the means to take care of helpless poor children, whether he will let them suffer and refuse to give them care if they can not get that care otherwise than by appropriating $20 per capita to be expended through this association?
Mr. POWERS. I would say in response to the inquiry of the gentleman that I would make the most liberal appropriations for all worthy persons and for all laudable purposes of this kind. But this bill appropriates double the money for that purpose that was ever appropriated heretofore in our own States per capita. It is the extravagance that I am protesting against, and not the principle involved.
I make no war upon any church or any combination of charitable people, but what I do protest against is the amount proposed

We should not appropriate a great deal more money than is necessary to appropriate to take care of these people.

Mr. CANNON. Well, as I understand my friend now, he does not object on the ground of principle, but merely questions whether this appropriation is necessary or not. I have no personal knowledge of the facts, not having been able to investigate for myself personally. But on the best inquiry we could make from all the public reports which came to us, it seems necessary that we should make this appropriation. We are peculiarly situated here in Washington, the gentleman should remember. This is the political center of the Government of the United States. There is a large colored population and many helpless people from all parts of the country who come in here, and I think that it is not extravagant when St. John's Church Orphanage in this city will take care of 100 poor children for $20 per capita per annum.

Now I have done. I have performed my duty as best I could. I have no pride in this bill. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the servants of this House, I have a duty to perform. I have given you the results of my investigation as best I could, and what I believe to be the best interest of the public service here. Now, having given the result of my own investigation, if the House sees proper not to make the appropriation at all, well and good, so be it.

Mr. COLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois how many of these institutions now in receipt of appropriations from the General Government are sectarian in their character?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not know what you mean by "sectarian."

Mr. COLSON. I think the gentleman well understands what the term means.

Mr. CANNON. Well, would you call the Woman's Christian Association sectarian?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is not involved in the question at all.

Mr. COLSON. I am asking the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the gentleman means exactly. We have passed that item, and there is no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to answer the gentleman and tell him that it is not a sectarian institution.

Mr. CANNON. There are several of these institutions that we have already passed—there is the Woman's Christian Association, there is the National Homeopathic Hospital, the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, and so on. We are on page 38 of the bill, and let me say to the gentlemen that there are many charitable associations in this District that are caring for children without one cent of aid, but wholly by private subscription, and they are not referred to at all in this bill. But let me be frank with the gentleman. I would not appropriate one cent to any private institution, for the benefit of the institution, whether it be sectarian or otherwise. But until the Government builds orphan asylums of its own, which I favor, I would have any institution to care for the poor children of this District that will care for them, rather than let the children suffer.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DINGLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be permitted to occupy a little more time than five minutes in this discussion.

Mr. BARRETT. I object.

Mr. SAYERS. I hope the gentleman will not do that. Time was given to that side, and certainly the same courtesy should be extended to this.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to have about fifteen minutes.

Mr. GROUT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have fifteen minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I am entirely content, if it is understood that the previous question is not to be moved.

Mr. GROUT. Oh, there is no previous question here in committee.

Mr. MORSE. Well, or the debate closed. I want five minutes myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to allowing the gentleman from New York fifteen minutes?

Mr. KEM. I object.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire first to express my appreciation of the rare courtesy extended to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I believe.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Since only five minutes have been accorded to me by this rare exhibition of courtesy, I must endeavor to condense my remarks and let them be embraced within the time limited.

Before proceeding to discuss the question before the House, I desire to call attention to a serious misrepresentation made in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] on Saturday last. We can not, under our rules of procedure, always guard against the poisoned tongue of slander. An ordinary attack I should pay no attention to, but when a gross misstatement is made, I feel bound to notice it.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] said:

> The gentleman from New York, however, by his vote and advice, as well as by his actions, which speak louder than words, would send to the poorhouse every old soldier in the land that he possibly could, unless outvoted by the patriotic majority in this House.

This statement, Mr. Chairman, I pronounce to be absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue, and I say that no basis can be found for such a statement in any speech ever made by me on this floor. In the pension debate there were two questions argued. One was purely an administrative question, the question whether the power should be taken away from the Commissioner of Pensions to suspend a pension in case of fraud, and whether that power should be vested in the United States district or circuit courts. That was the first question. Was there any question of poorhouse involved in that?

The other was whether the pension rolls should be enlarged so as to admit widows with an income of $500 per annum. Was there any question of the poorhouse involved in that?

And so I say that any such statement as that which was made the other day must have been conceived in wanton malevolence, and therefore should be noticed.

Now let us see what is the question before the committee. The question is whether this appropriation for the Church Orphanage of St. John's Parish should be stricken out. It is somewhat difficult to follow the trend of the views and of the argument of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER]. On Saturday last he told you he was against all governmental aid, against all State aid, to charity. Then, having made a motion against the Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers, he abandoned and withdrew that motion, and then struck a blow at the destitute children of the District.

Now he comes in and tells us that he abandons the position taken by him on Saturday last—that is, the position that there should be no governmental aid—but that he is in favor of giving all this money, all this fund, to a quasi police board, this board of children's guardians—a board of special jurisdiction, not of general jurisdiction, deriving its powers from arraignment before a magistrate; because that is the basis and the foundation of its authority. The child must be arraigned before the police court, and can only be consigned to the care of this board by order of a judge of the police court or of the criminal court of this District. His proposition is that we give to this board, which, under existing law, has no authority whatever to receive one dollar of the money—that we give all the funds to it and delegate the power of distribution vested in the Congress of the United States to this board, appointed by justices of a police court; in other words, instead of being the almoners of our own charity, that we delegate it to an insignificant local board—a board eager to take all power away from other charities just as worthy and to aggregate all power over this fund in its own hands.

Gentlemen, I say to you this is not sound. If I had been accorded five or ten minutes more, if I had not been deprived by the rare courtesy and good breeding of a gentleman of this House from exercising that privilege, I should have endeavored to enlighten the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the gentleman have an extension of time.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request?

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] have five minutes more time.

Mr. KEM. I object.

Mr. BARRETT. I should be glad to interpose no objection, if the gentleman will allow me one moment to reply to his statement in reference to myself.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KEM].

Mr. GROUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] for a minute.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has alluded to my attitude in regard to the extension of his time, which he regards as discourteous and is pleased to call a sample of impoliteness extended to him. I wish to say to the gentleman that I objected to the extension of his time simply for the purpose of bringing him to a realizing sense that courtesy is not entirely a monopoly of one member, but should be shared by all alike. On the 16th day of January, 1896, the gentleman from New York, the House being in Committee of the Whole on the pension bill, rose and had read, or he read himself, a letter from an anonymous correspondent which was a practical insult to every member of this House, alluding to the House as a "half acre of demagogues." I arose at the time, my attention having been temporarily diverted, having heard a few words from the letter, to ask him to allow that letter to be read again, in order that the House might have a full appreciation of his discourtesy in the deliberate reflection which he had made through an anonymous letter upon the intelligence and patriotism of the members of this House. The gentleman refused to yield, and therefore I objected to any courtesy being extended to him to-day, in the hope that he would learn to appreciate that other members of the House were entitled to the courtesy which he invoked for himself.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Am I to have my five minutes now?

The CHAIRMAN. Objection was made.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think you will bear me out in the view——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROUT. Yes, sir; for that purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think the members of this committee on either side of the aisle, on both sides of the House, will agree with me that I endeavored during a running debate of a week on the pension question to answer every member with courtesy and to give to every member on either side of the House all the chance he could desire. If I failed to afford a chance to interrupt me to the gentleman from Massachusetts it was probably because I had been interrupted four or five times within as many minutes and was endeavoring to preserve the continuity of my thought and to have some symmetry in the line of my argument. I need hardly say that it would be very far from my intention to treat any gentleman representing the State of which I have the honor to be a native with any discourtesy.

Now, to proceed to the consideration of this question of law. As lawyers, it will be necessary for the members of this committee to consider but three statutes. The first is the law of February 13, 1885, which gave to the magistrates in this District power to commit any child who had been subjected to cruel treatment or willful abuse to an orphan asylum or charitable institution. This act is referred to in the act of 1892, to which the existing power of the board of children's guardians owes its existence. The act of 1892 created the board of children's guardians, and it further gave the board jurisdiction over what? Over children who had been committed by reason of the provisions of section 2 of the act of 1885, and over certain other children. That is to say, over all children who are destitute of suitable homes and adequate means, all children abandoned by their parents or guardians, all children kept in vicious or immoral associations. When? Whenever—that is the contingency for which the act provides—"such children may be committed to the care of the board by the police court or the criminal court of the District."

That is, the jurisdictional power is found in their committal by the magistrates. Now, it is manifest, when you consider these two acts—the act of 1885 and the act of 1892, the law of 1892, which created the board of children's guardians, and is the act which may be termed its charter—and when you consider the further fact that in the last section of that act of 1892 the general power of supervision is given to the superintendent of charities over the board of children's guardians, you will see that it was the intention of the lawmaking power to limit the jurisdiction and power of the board of children's guardians, to limit its jurisdiction to the exercise of power only over children committed by the magistrates, and not to give general jurisdiction or exercise of power over all destitute children within the District of Columbia.

On the other hand, if you will examine the appropriation act of 1890, which remains the existing law to-day, you will find that the superintendent of charities of the District, an officer appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, has general power over all charities of the District of Columbia. You are asked now, by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], to take away that power from the superintendent of charities, appointed by the Executive, and confer it solely on the board of guardians, appointed by the judges of the police courts, and to give that board control over all the funds now parceled out through the exercise of our wise discretion among all these various charities.

It would be a mistake. It would be a grave error in legislation to make this change without due consideration and due advisement. From another point of view it would be an equally great error on the merits. I believe that this association connected with the parish of St. John is a most worthy and excellent institution. Out of all the funds which are required for its support only a paltry contribution of $1,800 is asked from the Government——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, it will not, I think, be violative of the confidence of the Committee on Appropriations to say that on the subject of these private charities, many of which, as we have learned, are sectarian, the members of the committee were not entirely agreed. This has already been made apparent by the motion and by the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] who is a member of the committee.

This question was, of course, fully considered in the committee, and when, on the final vote, I found myself in the minority and it was proposed to authorize me to report this bill to the House, I suggested that it might perhaps be better to select some one to bring in the bill who could support every provision in it, stating that, for myself, my position in the committee would be my position in the House. That suggestion, however, was not accepted, and I brought this bill in here upon the order of the committee, with all points as to individual conviction and individual action distinctly reserved.

Now, in behalf of the committee, let me say they gave this question long and patient consideration in a session which ran well into the night, and a majority thought it best—although I feel justified in saying that not a single member of the majority was entirely satisfied—the majority thought it best to bring the bill into the House with the provisions which are found in it, the same provisions that have been found in the District appropriation bill for years past, except that there is an addition of four new institutions calling for an additional appropriation, in the aggregate, of $5,000. Those four additional appropriations will be found on page 39 of the bill.

The majority of the committee, I say, thought it best to report the bill in this form, and under ordinary circumstances I would have subordinated my judgment to the judgment of the committee, because I can not say that it was wholly without reason. There were really certain reasons for it, some of which have been stated by the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON]; reasons growing out of the peculiar nature of the charities in this District, which are anomalous and quite unlike those in other large cities.

But, Mr. Chairman, I felt then and I feel now that this question involves more than mere detail in administration, more than the necessities or convenience of the local situation. My objection to appropriating public money for these private institutions may be briefly stated under two heads. First, as they are purely private institutions, the Government has no power—mark what I say—the Government has no power to visit, inspect, and supervise them or their expenditure of this money, none whatever. I am not unmindful of the act creating the office of superintendent of charities for the District, or of the fact that Congress has undertaken to confer on that officer the right to visit these institutions, to audit their accounts, and so on; but these institutions are corporations, every one of them.

It is true they permit the superintendent of charities to go and inspect them and to report upon them, but he can not do it as a matter of legal right. It is simply permissive. On that point I refer, gentlemen, to the famous Dartmouth College decision in which this principle was established under the advocacy of the great Webster. I say, upon authority of that decision these institutions are not subject to public visitation and inspection. It is a matter of sufferance. Let some question arise in St. Ann's Infant Asylum, for instance—there is such an institution—or, say, in the St. John's Orphanage—for that is the one that is now before us for consideration—some scandal, or some question involving points of moral or religious instruction——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. I should like to have five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleague will be allowed the additional time he desires.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. GROUT. Suppose, I say, that some question should arise in one of these institutions on some point of moral or religious instruction in some time of great public excitement, which the institution did not want looked into, they would have a right to close their doors in the face of the superintendent of charities and of every other comer, and to say to them, "Gentlemen, betake your-

selves into the street." That would be their legal right. There is no question whatever about it. Mark you, I am speaking only of their legal right, for, as a matter of fact, they permit inspection now.

Then there is also the question of accounting, which has been referred to and elaborately explained by my friend from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Now, let us see about that. In this appropriation, which is for "maintenance," it would undoubtedly be the duty of the accounting officers to have some account submitted which would show that the money here appropriated was expended for maintenance. The gentleman told us that he had vouchers here and forms on which the reports of these institutions were made. I have gone through the list, and the only one I find containing any items, all the others being blank pieces of paper, is the one that I hold in my hand, and the items are: "Rent, salaries, all other items of maintenance, including repairs," "Permanent improvements, including purchase of real estate, interest, principal of debt." These are all the items. Now, what do we learn from this report about the expenditure of the money which we appropriate here?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not a thing.

Mr. GROUT. Not a thing, as the gentleman on my right remarks. These reports do not disclose how much of this money goes for the purchase of testaments in Latin, or Greek, or Hebrew, or how much may perchance go for the purchase of beads and crucifixes—because those are articles used in these institutions—not, perhaps, in the one we are now speaking of particularly, St. John's Orphanage, but certainly in those belonging to the Roman Church. These reports, I say, give us no information as to how this money is expended in detail.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the gentleman from Vermont that in one of these institutions $1,200 was spent for rum.

Mr. GROUT. Well, let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that such a statement is liable to be misunderstood, because in the hospitals liquors are used as stimulants for patients, and all of us, including those who believe and practice temperance, believe that such things may be properly done.

Mr. MORSE. But let me tell my friend that the medical attendance is a separate item.

Mr. GROUT. Now, I ask, Mr. Chairman, if this is a proper and suitable appropriation for us to make. Has it upon it proper limitations? Is it a business-like affair? I say no. In passing, I have alluded to the sectarian character of these institutions, and herein lies the second reason why I can not vote for this appropriation. I wish to say I am not a member of the American—"Patriotic," a friend near me suggests—or "Protective" or "Protestant" Association, whatever the name may be. In fact, I know so little about the organization that I do not know the exact word that the "P" stands for. It may stand for every one of the words I have mentioned. All of them are good words. I am not a member of this American organization, but I am an American, and I am also a citizen of the State of Vermont.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. I trust I may have additional time. I find I can not present this matter as soon as I had hoped.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask that the gentleman from Vermont have sufficient time to finish his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I say I am a citizen of the State of Vermont, whose people in 1777—mark that early day—in 1777, at a time when most of the colonies were still existing under their charters from the Crown, and at a time, too, when in every one of the New England colonies except Rhode Island there was such a close union between church and state as to make it uncertain whether the church was the state or the state was the church—I say at that early time, and in the midst of the ideas prevailing more than a hundred years ago, the people of Vermont wrote in their constitution right underneath that famous provision prohibiting, absolutely, human slavery, which, by the way, was the first constitutional prohibition of slavery in the history of the world—I say they wrote an absolute prohibition of the union of church and state and declared for a complete and perfect separation of them as the surest means of preserving the liberty of both.

That provision is in the constitution to-day; and from the day of its adoption until now not a dollar of public money in that State has ever been appropriated to any sectarian use, or, to speak more liberally, in behalf of any religious enterprise whatever. And, gentlemen, I am ready to predict that the day is far distant—indeed, I assert that the day will never come—when among those green hills any different principle will prevail.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. GROUT. Why, sir, a proposition in the Vermont legislature for an appropriation of money from the public treasury to a church or a subordinate organization of a church or any religious organization whatever, in aid of its charities or its educational work, would be looked upon by the people of Vermont with equal astonishment and alarm, as subversive of one of the most important of the fundamental principles on which the State was built. But this is the precise proposition contained in this appropriation. Mr. Chairman, I can not vote for this appropriation and be true to the noble history and the grand traditions of the independent little State from which I come—the very birthplace and the home of the free church and the free school. I can not vote for it without contravening the express letter of its constitution as well as the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which forbids all legislation "respecting an establishment of religion." I shall accordingly vote to strike it from the bill.

Now, this St. John's Orphanage Association is a magnificent charity. Let no one hesitate to believe that it is doing glorious work among the children of the District of Columbia, as undoubtedly, in their respective lines, these other institutions named a little further along in the bill are also doing. The St. Ann's Asylum, these industrial schools, and all these other charities are performing a noble work. God bless them! Their existence, Mr. Chairman, does not depend upon these appropriations. When it is claimed that it does, the charitable and philanthropic purposes of the people of the District of Columbia and of this whole country are, in my opinion, poorly understood.

Now, a word about this particular institution. We find by their annual report that they are by no means poor. They are really in a very good financial condition. This report discloses an endowment fund amounting to $18,900, with notes beginning with one from Abraham Fardon for $1,000, another for $1,000 from another person, one for $2,500, and so on, making up this endowment fund of $18,900. This is a charity, then, which does not depend on appropriations from Congress. It would no doubt gladly accept this appropriation, for it would unquestionably help the institution to prosecute the charitable work in which it is engaged. But it will find that the public hand, the hands of individuals, will be open to all the necessities of this institution. So also will it be found as to all these other institutions.

I have spoken of two kinds of institutions the appropriations for which are, to my mind, objectionable. First, private institutions, over which the Government has no control—institutions simply private. These are 19 in number, including those of a sectarian character. There are, as I am informed (and I believe my information is correct), 6 of the 19 of a sectarian character, beginning with the Church Orphanage Association, which we are now considering, and including the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, the Association for Works of Mercy, the House of the Good Shepherd, the St. Rose's Industrial School, and the St. Joseph's Asylum—6 in all.

For the reasons already given, Mr. Chairman, under no circumstances can I vote for these sectarian appropriations. I must stand upon the doctrine taught me among the hills of Vermont, and must protest against them always.

As to the other private appropriations for the remaining thirteen institutions, I think, after a careful study of the subject, that I can suggest a practical method of solution. Confessedly they are nonsectarian in their character, and they embrace all shades of religious belief and are not open to the objections which have been urged against those to which I have referred, and I offer as a part of my remarks, which in due time I will offer as a concluding paragraph to the bill, that which I send to the Chair, and will briefly explain it after it has been read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any money appropriated by this act for charities or charitable institutions shall be paid to any institution named in this act until the charter or articles of incorporation thereof shall be so amended as to accord to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or to their designated agents, authority to visit and inspect such institutions, and to control and supervise the expenditure therein of all public funds paid out of appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment really explains itself. My programme is this: Strike out every one of these sectarian institutions, and do it squarely on the ground that we can not consistently appropriate money to such establishments.

This provides that no money shall be paid to any of these thirteen nonsectarian institutions till they so amend their acts of incorporation or articles of association as to admit public visitation, inspection, and supervision. In other words, the Government keeps its hand on the money which it appropriates until the institutions grant the power of inspection; and it seems to me in all respects to be a perfectly safe and satisfactory method of dealing with the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word more, and I think I can explain satisfactorily to the committee the attitude of my friend from Nebraska. I did not know that he intended to propose the amendment as a part of his remarks, or I would have conferred with him in advance as to the plan proposed by me. But it can ultimately be offered, and the amendment that I have offered be acted upon also as a substitute; or he can, if he chooses, withdraw his amendment altogether, for I shall insist upon a vote in the committee on the amendment I have offered.

It is true, in disposition of this matter in the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Nebraska and myself stood together in support of substantially his first amendment. But on a more careful examination of the matter I am satisfied it is open to objection.

It will not, for instance, work well with the Destitute Colored Women and Children's Home, which was established by the United States Government, although it is really a private institution. It is almost wholly dependent on the Government for support, and the Government should not fail to provide for it unless it is willing to have it closed.

As to the board of children's guardians, to which attention was paid in the committee, it is not a private organization; it is organized by act of Congress, but the officers do not have succession. The trustees and managers are appointed by the two police judges of the criminal court and the judge of the District court, and they may be removed by the same authority.

This is a public institution, and I first thought it might be utilized in the solution of this problem, but it must be admitted that it is open to some of the objections urged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment which I will offer when the time comes will, I think, work a solution of this whole question, provided the committee are willing to stand with me, first, in saying that to no sectarian institution shall we appropriate money at all under any circumstances, Government inspection or not; and then that as to all these other private institutions, we will let them go on as heretofore, provided they will open themselves to inspection and superintendence, as provided by the amendment.

I do not think of anything more that I wish to say in this connection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, not only in this Congress, but heretofore, when this matter has been considered carefully, for a number of years, I desire, so far as I am able, to give reasons why I think the policy which the Committee on Appropriations has adopted should be carried out.

I hope I may not be guilty of divulging any of the secrets of the committee when I state that the fight upon this appropriation only began at a late hour on the night before this bill was reported. We had been considering this bill for several weeks. Finally, on the very night before we were to report it to the House, when we were considering it for the last time, there appeared before that committee an organization known, I believe, as the A. P. A., which began an attack upon these appropriations, for the reason, as they conceived, that they were made to sectarian institutions. Up to that time I believe there were no dissensions in the committee, but at that point these gentlemen saw fit to begin an attack.

Now, I want to say, if the object of this appropriation is real charity, if it is to aid the weak, the needy, and the unfortunate, the little parentless child and the old decrepit man and woman, that these institutions are the best channels through which we can arrive at that conclusion, the best method of dispensing charity in this District.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that appropriations should be made directly to sectarian institutions for sectarian purposes, and I maintain and hold that these appropriations contained in this bill are not for such purposes. The appropriations which are made by the bill are merely supplemental, in some instances one-quarter of the amount which these charitable institutions dispense. Many of them are almost entirely supported by the charity of good people in this District and in the country at large. So far as I know, and I have been able to look personally into the workings of some of these institutions—so far as I know, there is absolutely no attempt on the part of these institutions to carry out the work of charity in a sectarian way.

Unless we are ready here now to make appropriations for constructing buildings all over this District, unless we are ready to embark in the expenditure of half a million or a million of dollars for the purpose of charity, then, from the standpoint of economy, if nothing else, I believe we should adhere to the old-time principle of this appropriation.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that these institutions furnish to charity more than this Congress appropriates for that purpose. I know that, because of their existence, many of the good people of this District are willing to place in their hands for distribution an amount of money much larger than that which we give. Now, what are the reasons for this appropriation? Charity, it is said. If it be charity, all that we are asked to do is to supplement and assist these institutions in carrying it out, to the greatest degree possible, with the limited amount appropriated.

It has been said that these institutions are not required to report to anyone. Gentlemen can look at the report of the superintendent in charge of charities in this District and they will find that nearly all of them have given to that officer a full and complete account of their expenditures.

I want to say that I am perfectly willing to vote for an amendment which will require that these institutions shall make a report of their financial disbursements to an officer of this Government, if necessary, but I am not willing to admit that simply because an institution is organized under the name of any particular sect the principles of that sect are carried out in the dispensing of charity.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I can define my position in regard to these charitable societies in the District of Columbia in a few sentences. I am in favor of continuing the Government appropriation of money to such of these organizations and charities as are nonsectarian in their character, and quite a number of them are of that character—the Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, the Hope and Help Mission for Fallen Women, which is doing a great and noble work in this city, etc.

To cut off the Government appropriation from such charities would be cruel and uncalled for. This city has a large number of these unfortunate persons to whom these societies afford at least temporary relief.

Many of these societies, those I have mentioned and others, like the Central Union Mission, ask no questions about a man's nationality, creed, or religion, and are supported by Christian people of all denominations. Many of these poor and unfortunate people come from remote sections to this city looking for an office or work in some Government Department.

They are not successful, as there are such positions for only a fraction of the people who seek them. It would be manifestly unjust and unfair to throw all this expense on the charitable people of this city.

Now, on the other hand, there are some of these institutions that are purely religious and sectarian in their character. And it is manifestly contrary to the genius and spirit of our Government to appropriate public money for the support of sectarian institutions, and there are several appropriations of public money for such institutions in this bill.

I say it violates the principle on which this Government was founded—i. e., an entire divorce of church and state—for the Government to appropriate public money for the sectarian schools or charitable institutions.

One of these charities—the one now under consideration—is an Episcopal charity, another is a Lutheran, and quite a number of them are Catholic. I will vote against every one of those items in this bill.

Now, as an illustration of several of the nonsectarian charities for which I shall be glad to vote to continue Government aid, I call attention to the "Hope and Help Mission," whose report will be found on page 298, to the superintendent of charities of the District of Columbia.

This is an entirely nonsectarian charitable society, the officers of which belong to many different Protestant denominations in this city, and I believe that it is doing a great and good work among the fallen women in this city. It maintains a home in this city for their reformation. As its name implies, it opens a "door of hope" to these unfortunate people.

It is presided over by some of the first ladies in this city. Large public meetings have been held in the interests of this work, one of which I attended in the Congregational church.

The Star of this city recently described a visit of some of these ladies to some of the disreputable houses in this city and their successful efforts to induce some of the unfortunate inmates to abandon their wicked life and enter this door of hope.

I ask the Clerk to read the portion which I have marked, and I certainly hope only the sectarian and none of the nonsectarian appropriations like this will be stricken from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Our beneficiaries are largely women who are broken in health and unable to earn their own living by any employment which could be secured for them under the circumstances. Many of them have been betrayed, and going from us in due time to the city hospitals have become mothers. We have again cared for them after confinement, with their children, until we could secure homes for them or send them back to friends in the city or adjacent States. Others have been led to abandon vicious lives, and have been converted to new and better ways of living through the motherly advice and counsel of the ladies of the board through faith and prayer.

All have willingly taken part in the general work of the home, and it is the veriest exception where one has not been deeply grateful for the help she has received.

Many worthy but destitute women have been sheltered at the home for days or months, and the usefulness of the home has been thus largely increased, while the demand upon it is greater.

We ask for a larger appropriation next year, feeling that we should secure a larger building, as the drain upon our charity is far greater than ever before. We ask the Commissioners to aid us in securing such an appropriation.

We, the board of managers of the mission, appeal for a direct appropriation from Congress of $1,000 in lieu of the $500 now received from the poor fund of the District, the latter being entirely inadequate for the needs of the work. We feel fully justified in making this appeal by the practical benefits which are being derived by the city from this work.

As to statistics, in addition to the large number of meals and lodgings already enumerated and of a temporal nature, we can testify that at least 14 women and girls have been clearly converted and fully redeemed from sinful lives during the past six months, and the aggregate for the year is at least 25. Our board, which is nonsectarian, is composed of Mr. James T. Petty and Mr. Thomas Jarvis, of the Southern Methodist Church; Mrs. Mary E. Catlin, of the First Congregational Church; Mrs. L. D. Luckett, of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church; Mrs. E. K. Knowles, of Vermont Avenue Christian Church; Mrs. M. M. Mitchell, of Waugn Methodist Episcopal Church, and Miss Mary Rector and Mrs. S. D. La Fétra, of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church. All of these are actively engaged in systematic work in their own churches, and all testify to the statement that this work pays as good a percentage in practical results as any other work they do for humanity.

The rule of the mission is to enable the mothers to be true to their children, for it is believed this is a strong factor in the redemption of the woman. It gives them a strong motive to try to redeem the past, that the innocent victims of their fall may not also be the sufferers for their guilt. We plead for this appropriation because we desire to open a nursery, well-heated, lighted, and well ventilated, where we can have competent nurses and proper food, and where these mothers may leave their children when they go out to service to earn an honest living. We want to "make it easy to do right and hard to do wrong," if possible.

Respectfully submitted.

SARAH D. LA FÉTRA,
President Board of Managers.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to close debate if I can upon this subject. I find that that is the general feeling.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to have five minutes. This side of the House has had very little time.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would like to have a few minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. I want about two minutes.

Mr. GROUT. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendment be limited to twenty minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, when in my speech last Saturday I presented figures in order to compare the expense of maintaining by the board of children's guardians with the expense to the Government of the orphans' cared for by St. John's Parish Association, it was done without any intention to criticise the board of children's guardians, for whom I have the most profound respect, but it was simply to illustrate; for the figures given us by the reports of that board show that if the beneficiaries in St. John's Asylum should be taken therefrom and the extra expense of their maintenance cast upon the District of Columbia, it would tax the Government about $157.01 for each child, and the necessary appropriation to maintain these children would be $15,000 instead of only $1,800, and the appropriation for the ten institutions would be $157,112.73, instead of $30,800, as proposed by this bill, and the figures were cited simply to show that these institutions contributed four-fifths, and in some cases even more than four-fifths, of the amount which it really costs to support the orphans and other unfortunates committed to their care.

Certainly no one will question but that the bill as it now stands is in the strict line of economy. The St. John's Orphanage is educating, clothing, feeding, and sheltering from 95 to 115 children, every dollar of the expense being met by the charitable people except $18 per year for each child. Now, the letter which the gentleman from Nebraska had read from that excellent lady, Mrs. MacFarland, the vice-president of the board, shows that the very minimum cost of the board of children whose expenses are paid by the board is $96 per capita; and it also shows that children who are bound out or adopted in families and are entirely supported by those families cost $12.71 per annum for the expenses of the agents who merely visit and supervise them. Therefore it will be seen that the cost to the Government simply for visiting and supervising the children who are bound out, and for their labor are being entirely supported and clothed, is almost as great as the total expense of the Government for the children in St. John's Orphange.

These orphans are visited and supervised by the best ladies of this city who receive no compensation whatever, but are only too glad to do this Christian work, while I observe that the board of children's guardians pay an agent a salary of $1,800. This is no doubt wise and necessary, as this board work in a very different sphere from the one occupied by the managers of the St. John Asylum.

Now, another thing to be considered is that these charitable associations are already the owners and in possession of costly buildings for sheltering these children. If all the beneficiaries of these institutions were dependent on the District of Columbia and appropriations from Congress, we would be compelled to appropriate a sum of not less than $500,000 to erect the necessary buildings. Therefore, we find ourselves confronted with this situation. Compelled as we are to provide for the feeble, the insane, the orphans, and other unfortunates, we are confronted with the question of how best to do it. We see these good women and good men contributing their money toward expenses which would otherwise devolve upon the District of Columbia, and all they ask is that this little supplemental appropriation of $30,000 should be made for a cause which would otherwise cost the Government at least $500,000.

There is another phase of this question which we must consider.

The report of the superintendent of charities and all the evidence before us show that the board of children's guardians is not provided with facilities for taking care of the children who are now inmates of the charitable institutions.

Section 2 of the bill which creates this board says:

That the members of the board of children's guardians shall be appointed by the judges of the police court and the judge holding the criminal court of the District of Columbia, met together for that purpose.

Section 4 states the character of children which under the law can be committed to this board. This section is as follows:

That said board shall have the care and supervision of the following classes of children: First. All children committed under section 2 of the act approved February 13, 1885, entitled "An act for the protection of children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes." Second. All children who are destitute of suitable homes and adequate means of earning an honest living, all children abandoned by their parents or guardians, all children of habitually drunken or vicious or unfit parents, all children habitually begging on the streets or from door to door, all children kept in vicious or immoral associations, all children known by their language or life to be vicious or incorrigible whenever such children may be committed to the care of the board by the police court or the criminal court of the District; and power is hereby given to these courts to commit such children when not over 16 years of age to said board: *Provided*, That the laws regulating the commitment of children to the reform schools of the District shall not be deemed to be repealed in any part by this act. Third. Such children as the board of trustees of the reform school for boys or the reform school for girls may, in their discretion, commit to the board of children's guardians, and power is hereby given the board of trustees of the said reform school to commit any inmate of their respective institutions to the said board of guardians, conditionally upon the good behavior of the child so committed. Fourth. Under the rules to be established by the board children may be received and temporarily cared for pending investigation or judgment of the court.

It will be seen that the children which the law proposes to place under the care of the board are all or nearly all of that class which are brought to the attention of the public by the criminal courts. Page 269 of the Report of Reformatory Institutions shows us that even this class shrink from being placed under the board under any of the heads such as "Children abandoned by their parents," "Children of habitually drunken parents," "Children habitually begging on the streets," "Children kept in vicious or immoral associations," "Children known by their language or life to be vicious," "Children known to be incorrigible," and yet these are the character of children that seemed to be considered when the board of children's guardians was created.

I most earnestly protest that we should not place the children of St. John's Orphanage, or any of them, in association with the class of children referred to in the act creating the board of children's guardians, and yet the gentleman wishes to invade the homes of St. John's Orphan Asylum and take out these children and put them, or at least classify them, with those children that are sent to the board by the police court for the various reasons which have been read to you in this debate. Do not, I pray you, associate the children of the charitable societies of this city with the class mentioned in the law to which reference has been made in this debate.

The children cared for by the charitable societies are not what are designated as a reformatory class. Many and probably most of them were taken in tender years, and anything that is not good and pure is utterly unknown to them. Some of them have become orphans by the death of good and refined parents. In this city clerks and other employees of the Government live up to their salaries, and if they die in this city their children are often left without any means of support. It is often that such tender charges fall into the hands of the St. John's and similar associations.

The ladies devote themselves to the elevation of these little children. These societies and associations have one sphere of duty, and the board of children's guardians have quite another. The former take tender children and raise them to useful womanhood and manhood. The latter, by the very terms of the law to which they owe their existence, have a duty which must very largely be devoted to reforming those who have become victims of bad associations, or have been abandoned by intemperate parents, or those who have become destitute of suitable homes, or those who are before the courts, or those sent to the board by the Reform School.

The important duties of the board of children's guardians can not be too highly estimated. Their duties are of the greatest importance, and I believe the personnel of the board is all that could possibly be desired. No doubt the good they accomplish is very great, but my contention is that we should not without great necessity mix the children being reformed by them with the children who are being raised and educated by the St. John's and other similar asylums.

The gentleman who is pressing the amendments admits that the board of children's guardians are not provided with building or other facilities to care for children.

These are a few of the reasons why the law should stand as it has stood for many years.

There is another assertion by the gentleman from Nebraska to which I desire to call attention. He said that Congress had never appropriated money unless it was to be disbursed by an officer of the Government. He is greatly mistaken about that. Congress has often appropriated money to be expended in infected districts and places that were flooded where there was no disbursing officer; but it simply went to the mayors or other officials of the cities, and no question was ever asked as to what was done with the money.

I will also inform the gentleman that the Senate has passed a bill three separate times, each time appropriating $100,000,000 to aid in education in the States, and those bills provided that the money should be sent to the educational officers of those States, who were authorized to disburse it without any Federal supervision whatever, the only requirement being that the State officials should report to the Secretary of the Interior how the money was expended; and bills of a very similar character have passed this House; one such bill, I believe, as late as the Fifty-first Congress.

Here the various associations which receive these small pittances of $1,000 or $1,800, etc., from the Government make detailed reports not only of how they spend it, but they go further and itemize their expenses. The gentleman from Vermont sent an amendment to the Clerk's desk which prohibited giving any money to any institution which was sectarian in its character. He said he did this because the Constitution of the United States prohibited legislation upon religion. I insist that this bill does not legislate upon religion, it is peculiarly exempt from any such objection, but I insist that his proposed amendment does legislate upon religion, and if adopted will be in direct violation of the Constitution.

The words of the Constitution are:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I insist that the proposed amendment does seek to prohibit the free exercise of religion.

It proposes to require charitable institutions to refrain from teaching religion in order to avail themselves of an appropriation to take care of poor orphans.

When you ask this St. John's Orphanage what it has done with this money they point to the fact that they have an average of 95 and sometimes 115 children, who are receiving the very best care and the best support and good education, and to aid in this work the association only receives $18 per capita from the Government.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the appropriation of all the money necessary for charities in this District, but I am opposed to this Congress appropriating money to sectarian institutions. Now I want to caution the members right here, Mr. Chairman, that there is no proposition to reduce this appropriation. I understand the proposition of those who are opposing this plan is that this money shall be disbursed by an officer appointed by Congress, the body which rules this District. You have no more right to appropriate this money for the various sectarian institutions here than you have to appropriate it for St. John's Guild in the town in which I live, which maintains an orphanage and home for poor people. You have no more right, I say, to appropriate the money contemplated here in this District than you have in my town. The question is, whether you shall appropriate money to sectarian purposes over which we have no control, where you do not know where the money goes or what is to be done with it; but if we do make any appropriations, they ought to be under the control of our own officers.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me for a moment.

Mr. BOWERS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. You would not do me an intentional injustice?

Mr. BOWERS. Certainly not.

Mr. CANNON. I say that there is no such danger. The committee does not propose any such thing.

Mr. BOWERS. You have named on page 38 the sectarian institutions to which these appropriations are to be made, have you not? They are named right there, and the expenditures for these sectarian institutions are set out there. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is dangerous to enter upon that line of business. It is forbidden by the Constitution; it only leads to trouble; it is only the beginning, the entering wedge, of trouble. We must keep church and state apart. The churches have their privileges, all of them, to go on and do as they see fit, but let them keep their hands off the Government. We are here simply to legislate for the people, not to appropriate money to sectarian institutions. When you do that you open a Pandora's box, and no man can tell the evils that will come out of that box when you do open it. I say again, that we, all of us, are willing to appropriate money for our own people here. The poor of this District are under the care of Congress, because we are the guardians and the governors of this District, but the money we appropriate should be distributed by officers appointed or authorized by Congress.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer in the principle that there should be no union between church and state, nor indeed any partnership between them in the expenditure of public money for any purpose whatsoever, so far as it is possible to prevent it. Sir, the present relation existing between the charitable institutions in the District of Columbia and the Government, it is but just to say, has been in vogue for some years and has grown out of the fact that there are in the District no public charitable institutions of the kind named in this bill in which this class of unfortunates could be cared for. Hence, it has been necessary heretofore to appropriate considerable sums of public money to assist these private institutions in caring for the orphaned and abandoned children, for the indigent sick, and for the unfortunate ones who have become stranded in this city.

I for one am ready now to inaugurate a change in this order of things. I would gladly vote for any measure that would look to the erection, at the public expense, by the people of this District of suitable institutions, asylums, and hospitals of their own for the care of orphan children and of other afflicted persons, just as the insane are now cared for. But pending the consideration and enactment of such a bill we must not leave this class of helpless people totally dependent upon private charity. To do so would be cruel and inhuman. I can not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] because I believe it would have that effect.

The board of children's guardians created under the law of 1892 has not, in my judgment, the authority to take care of the orphans and of the children who are left destitute except such as by regular judicial proceedings have been intrusted by the courts to the care and custody of the board. Without further amendment of the law the board could not take charge of any of the adult cases requiring charity. I will, however, gladly support the amendment offered by my friend from Vermont [Mr. GROUT], which goes, I think, about as far as we can properly go at this time, and which clearly announces the right principle, namely, that we will not give public money to absolutely sectarian institutions, but that we will appropriate public money only to such private charitable institutions as are nonsectarian, and require that money to the last dollar to be supervised in its expenditure by the Commissioners of the District or their duly authorized representatives. Not a dollar of public money should ever be appropriated for any purpose without the right being reserved by Congress to supervise and control its expenditure.

The condition which confronts us at this time makes it imperatively necessary, in my opinion, that we should continue to use these private nonsectarian charitable institutions until we can by law provide others, which belong to the public and can be entirely supported and controlled by the public. If this be done, let no one think that private charity in the District will cease. By no means. The orphan and foundling asylums, the hospitals, and homes that are now owned and controlled by private subscription and enterprise will continue to flourish then as now.

Before we cut loose entirely all public aid from these charities let us provide suitable and sufficient buildings at public expense for the public to properly care for and keep such persons and children and charities as are properly a charge upon the public.

Many of us remember a debate similar to this which occurred in the last Congress on the Indian appropriation bill in regard to providing for the education of Indian children. It was maintained that no money ought to be appropriated to any Indian school of a sectarian character, and that contention was supported by the same reasons that have been advanced in this debate. But the condition that confronted us was, that if we did not continue to aid many of the Indian schools under sectarian control on the reservations until Government schools could be erected we would be compelled to turn several thousand Indian children out of doors for from three to five years, until the Government could provide its own schools in which to educate those Indian children. Practically a similar condition confronts us in this matter.

Let us abolish the present system root and branch, but let us not be too precipitate. I will vote for a bill appropriating any reasonable sum to erect the necessary buildings, and I will vote for an annual appropriation far in excess of that carried in this bill in order that the public money spent in public charity shall be expended and controlled solely by public officials and for public purposes. I think the amendment of my friend from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] a step in the right direction, and hence I shall vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, strike out all of lines 8 and 9: "For the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish, maintenance, $1,800."

The question being taken, the Chairman declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 120, noes 33.

Mr. WHEELER called for tellers, but withdrew the call, and the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the German Orphan Asylum, maintenance, $1,800.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

Mr. GROUT. On what ground does the gentleman move to strike out this paragraph?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I make the motion by way of an amendment.

Mr. GROUT. But why? This is not one of the sectarian institutions.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It is, for all practical purposes, a sectarian institution.

Mr. GROUT. It is not in the least so; everybody says it is not. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment offered to perfect the bill in accordance with the ideas of the gentleman from Nebraska. My idea is that we should leave in the bill this institution and every other one that is not sectarian. I want all the sectarian institutions to go out, and then, when that is done, the House can choose between the idea of the gentleman from Nebraska and mine. I think mine is a sensible, practical solution of this question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I speak to the motion to strike out. I think the sensible thing for us to do at this time—and I say it with all the lingering prejudices and predilections and preconceptions concerning this matter of sectarianism that can reasonably and decently subsist in the human mind [laughter]—the sensible thing for us to do at this time, it seems to me, is to defer this radical measure of iconoclasm, this thorough uprooting of the existing system of charities in the District of Columbia, until we can put something at least as good, if not better, in its place. [Laughter and applause.]

There are a great many people who do not believe in the Bible, but until they can furnish a better Bible than the one we have, they had better hold their peace. [Laughter.] And with regard to these charities, I will say that I will vote for a system of legislation so comprehensive and complete as will antedate for at least a year any such movement as seems to be indicated to-day. I will vote to establish a preparatory system, putting under the control of a commission or a board of trustees such a system of charity as will effectively meet the demands of this District under the circumstances; and when that is accomplished I will vote with other gentlemen here to wipe out all private and sectarian institutions so far as Government appropriations are concerned. I think this policy is one of common sense and humanity. I would rather sacrifice $1,000 than see a little child suffer. And if I am not able to take care of a suffering child, while my neighbor is, I will let him do it.

I know that it is reasonable to object to certain phases and systems of sectarianism. Out of all the eleven hundred creeds that this world has been furnished with by the theologians, I would not know which one to choose, if I were called upon to select one as superior to all the others. And it is claimed by many of these church organizations that they have a "corner" on salvation, the consequence being that men become prejudiced to an illegitimate extent. But here is a question of common humanity; and we had better stand still and see the salvation of the Lord before we move a step farther. [Applause.]

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, evidently the "salvation" of good judgment is very much needed by some gentlemen. Now, in this matter I desire that there shall be no confusion of ideas. My judgment is that this item should go out—if for no other reason, that it is a child-caring institution. All the institutions of that class should stand together. A wise administration demands it. My proposition, which has been read at the Clerk's desk as part of my remarks, would remit this institution, with all the children under its care, to the board of children's guardians; and the superintendent of that board is the superintendent of this German Orphan Asylum. Gentlemen need not get behind the small children when they propose to leave in this bill a lingering trace of the demon we are trying to cast out. These children's institutions ought to stand together. They should be cared for and they will be cared for if my amendment prevails, because every dollar that is reported in this bill for the care of children will be appropriated to this board of children's guardians, of which, as I have said, the superintendent is also the superintendent of this German Orphan Asylum.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the gentleman's proposition be adopted will the institution receive the private contributions of wealthy German-Americans?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Why not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It will not.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. German citizens certainly will not withhold their contributions simply because the Government chooses to give its aid in a different direction.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I venture to say in reply to the gentleman that all the wealthy people of this District will stop contributing for the care of the insane, the sick, the orphans of the District as soon as you put these institutions under public control. The German Orphan Asylum of this city is for all practical purposes a public institution; it is not private. It is public in its character, and it is nonsectarian. It receives the children of Catholics, Protestants, Jews—adherents of every denomination. For that reason I say it is nonsectarian and public in its character.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Missouri evidently labors under the impression that the purpose of this amendment is to place the German Orphan Asylum under public control. In that he is entirely mistaken. No such purpose as that is contemplated by my motion, which is simply to strike out the appropriations for this institution, and instead of appropriating money to the institution directly to place all children properly a public charge under the control of the board of children's guardians, who, if they see fit to place children in this institution, can make arrangements with the asylum for doing so for a definite time, making fair payment therefor.

I apprehend the fact that this institution is thus patronized by the board of children's guardians will not cause the philanthropic German-Americans all over the country to withhold the hand of charity. Is it possible that any man will withhold one dollar from a charitable institution because the Government no longer appropriates to it directly?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly not. There is no good reason why it should be so. If that were so, then the spirit of those people whom I have always cherished is certainly petty and mean beyond all possible expression. [Applause.] But, sir, they will not withhold their hand; they will bestow on this institution in the future as they have done in the past a liberality which is only measured by the capacity of the people contributing. Charity will yet abide in the land and be made practical by the application of right principle. Let private institutions be supported by private means; public institutions by public funds. Let the two classes be kept distinct—no intermeddling of one with the other; let there be no divided responsibility or divided control. What we seek here is to carry these child-caring institutions together in one body over to the board of children's guardians, and let the Government control the expenditure of Government money.

Mr. MEREDITH. And the children must go through the criminal court before they can get any benefit from our appropriation.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the appropriation of $1,800 for the German Orphan Asylum. The gentleman is logical. We have already struck out the appropriation for the Church Orphanage Association of St. Johns Parish, $1,800. As the gentleman from Nebraska claims, the action of the Committee of the Whole in striking out, by a majority of 100, the item just voted on shows clearly the purpose of the committee to strike out all appropriations of this class.

Now, the gentleman from Nebraska is further logical by saying that later on, when we reach the board of children's guardians, he will move to increase that appropriation and give them the money to care for such children as they can get jurisdiction of; and it seems to me that if it is our purpose to take out these provisions, as is indicated by the action of the committee on the last vote, that his motion is apt and proper, because the board of children's guardians is one that abounds in law. You may ask me if I think it will take care of all the children that ought to be taken care of. I answer, I do not; but that it will take care of a part of them; and we had better do a part of a good thing than to do it all wrong.

That is all I desire to say about it. I might add further, however, that along the line of sectarian institutions the gentlemen run from a shadow. This is not appropriating for sectarian institutions, but it is the Government of the United States, pending the time it builds its own schools and hospitals, hiring those who have the equipment to care for helpless poor children. The Committee of the Whole House, however, is evidently in the mood for striking them out, and that being the case, let us do the next best thing. When you strike out the paragraphs, as we have already done in one instance, let us proceed to provide for the children according to the conditions that exist, as far as we can do so.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Are you able to point out in the bill which of these particular institutions are denominational in their character?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know whether this particular institution which we have now under consideration is Lutheran or not. I am informed, however, by those around me that it is.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. But are you able to point out those that are denominational in this paragraph?

Mr. CANNON. No; I am not——

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Is there any gentleman on the Appropriations Committee prepared to give us that information?

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And I will say to my friend that I did not inquire about the denominations of these various insti-

tutions, because I could not find anybody else who had the means to care for these children during the coming year except the institutions that have cared for them heretofore. The Committee of the Whole House, however, seems to be desirous of taking another position in regard to the matter; it has voted down the proposition of the Committee on Appropriations, and now I think it is our duty to do the next best thing we can.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will allow me, I think I can point out the denominational institutions in this bill. If he will begin with line 8 of page 38, down to line 24 on the same page, all of them are denominational—from and including line 8 to the bottom of the page.

Mr. BARTHOLDT was recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman allow me a single remark?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. The gentleman from Illinois stated that the majority of the committee are for striking out all of the appropriations to institutions other than that known as the board of children's guardians. I deny it. I think this majority have only so far gone as to commit themselves to the proposition of striking from the bill all the appropriations to denominational or sectarian institutions.

Mr. GROUT. That is right, exactly.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. And that these nonsectarian institutions are proper channels for the distribution of public funds where we have no other means to accomplish that end.

Mr. MEREDITH. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to know which of these institutions are sectarian? Do they not all stand on the same footing?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not at all. There are a number of them that stand on an entirely different footing from the one now under consideration.

Mr. MEREDITH. Will the gentleman please explain which?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Take the item on page 39, at the top of the page, for instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in this discussion. I am entirely unprepared for it, but I feel obliged to give expression to some feelings and some ideas that I entertain on this question.

I am in favor of a general provision striking out all appropriations, whether they may be made by the nation, by the State, or by a municipality, in favor of sectarian or private charitable institutions, and I held that view long before what is known as the A. P. A. was organized. But in this instance I desire to call the attention of the committee first to the fact that what is everybody's business is nobody's business; and I presume the majority of the members would feel just as I do in a matter of this kind. If we transfer these institutions from private care and control to public care and control, every taxpayer of the country—and certainly we as their representatives should feel the same way—would say that he pays taxes for the support of public institutions and does not feel called upon to contribute privately to the charitable institutions of any denomination to which he may belong.

So it is with this German Orphan Asylum. This institution is maintained by the private contributions of wealthy citizens of this city and the surrounding country. The very moment you transfer it to public control those private contributions will cease, for the reason that all these charitable and philanthropic people will say that they as taxpayers should not be called upon to contribute to private objects. Therefore I appeal to this committee that in a matter where no sectarian purposes are served this action should not be taken on the ground of sectarianism. This institution is nonsectarian. The question has been asked by my friend from Ohio [Mr WILSON] whether it was Lutheran or Catholic. As one who has visited that institution and talked to the manager of it, I say to you that I know, no matter whether a child is Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Mohammedan, or heathen, the child is admitted to that institution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I apprehend what the gentleman has said about this German Orphan Asylum applies with equal truth to St. John's Orphan Asylum, which a moment ago was stricken out of the bill. There has never been a claim made but that the doors of St. John's Orphan Asylum have been open to children of all denominations, with parents of all creeds, just as in this case. But the objection which the majority of the House took to it was that it was sectarian, meaning by that that it was under sectarian management, not that it closed its doors to any particular sect. Understand me, I am not committing myself to sympathy with the views of the majority, but merely trying to get this bill upon some logical footing of some kind, and to show the gentleman that all he is now saying for the German Orphan Asylum could have been said with equal truth for the orphan asylum for which the appropriation was just now stricken out.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I think the gentleman from Mississippi is mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not mistaken in this matter. I know I am not.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman allow me to answer him? St. John's Orphan Asylum, which has just now been stricken out, is under the control of a specific religious denomination, while the German Orphan Home is not. That is the difference.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is it not a German institution?

Mr. KIEFER. German-American.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. German-Americans of all denominations are in control of that institution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a private institution, is it not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. With a public purpose.

Mr. MEREDITH. I want to call the attention of this committee to one fact that seems to have been overlooked. The question which should address itself to this House is, how can we do the most good with the sum of money which this committee has determined to appropriate for charity? How can we do the most good with the sum which has been determined upon by the committee, whether we shall appropriate it as supplemental to these institutions which are already in existence, or whether we shall give it to the board of children's guardians, as some of my friends think we ought.

Mr. Chairman, there is very much in what has been said by my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT]. As he has suggested, when we undertake to place these institutions under control of the Government, they will withhold the contributions which they have been in the habit of making. I think, so far as I am concerned, that all these institutions ought to stand or fall together. Which are sectarian and which are not, I can not determine; but I do not care whether they are sectarian or not. I believe that by supplementing the funds of those institutions with contributions from the Government we can do more toward alleviating the suffering of these insane and these orphan children than we can by putting the whole of this amount in the hands of the board of children's guardians; and it is for that purpose that I opposed, as I did a few moments ago, the vote by which one of these institutions was stricken from the benefits of this appropriation.

I believe in separating church and state, for I come from a State in which is inscribed upon the monument of the author of the Declaration of Independence these words, suggested by himself:

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, author of the statute of religious freedom, and founder of the University of Virginia.

I say I believe, with him, that church and state should be separated; but when we have been in the habit, year after year, of making appropriations toward the charities of this city, the only question which can control me is, how can we do the most good with the money which we propose to appropriate?

Believing that by supplementing these institutions we can do the most good in that way, I shall vote to prevent the striking out of any one of these institutions, and shall stand by the report of the committee.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, as to this motion of the gentleman from Nebraska to strike out this German Orphan Asylum, I want to say what I need not repeat at length, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON] said what was on my mind as to the statement by the gentleman from Illinois, setting forth his understanding of the last vote. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], when upon the floor, said something about the management of this German Orphan Asylum. If it is really in charge of any one church it may fairly be called a sectarian institution; and if it is, I am with the gentleman from Nebraska, and shall favor it being stricken out. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he said it was under control of a single church?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I did not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; tell the committee all about it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Chairman, I will state that the board of trustees of the German Orphans' Home consists of representatives of all denominations. I am personally acquainted with Catholics and Protestants on that board of trustees; and let me say, in addition, that one gentleman, a Hebrew, who is well known to all of you, a gentleman who was consul-general to Egypt under General Grant's Administration, and who now lives in this city, saw me this morning personally and asked me to use what little influence I may have for the retention of this item in the appropriation bill.

Mr. GROUT. Well, let me ask the gentleman one further question, and that is, whether the president of that institution is not himself a Jew?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, sir; the last president was a Hebrew.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, clearly this does not fall in the list of sectarian institutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can I ask the gentleman a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the gentleman from Vermont to state that his objection is that these institutions are sectarian?

Mr. GROUT. That is the objection to those that I would strike out absolutely. The amendment I propose to offer will reconcile me to the others if it should be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask you this question in that connection: Is there any sound political principle underlying the idea—in which I fully agree and sympathize—that no public fund ought to be given to sectarian institutions except this, that sectarian institutions are always private institutions and not public institutions and the principle underlying is that public funds ought not to be devoted to any other than public purposes?

Mr. GROUT. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a much broader principle; because any institution that is sectarian is not only private, but it is sure to inculcate the principal dogmas or points of religious belief which it entertains, and I say that the public money should not be appropriated for that purpose. That is my answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the gentleman this question: Do you think, it being granted that a given institution is a private institution, and that it does not exist for public purposes, that that institution is any better than it would be to have some religion of some sort or even a medley of religions?

Mr. GROUT. Yes and no, is my answer to that question. A charitable institution in this country without any religion would indeed be a rarity. Religion is one of the great bulwarks of this free country, and really so because our religion is free. The American people as a people are religious and devotional. They believe in a Supreme Being. They may differ on points of belief; they do; and they quarrel over those points sometimes in a most ungracious way.

If the gentleman's question calls for my reason for discriminating against a charity under the exclusive control of a single church, I answer it is because in that case the church left to itself would be sure, so zealous is every Christian organization to strengthen its numbers, to employ proselyting influences with those under its control, whereas if the charity were founded on humanitarian lines rather than religious, and under control of different creeds, the different dogmas would neutralize each other, sectarianism would become silent, and the only thought would be how to help humanity. And in this work the different creeds would rival each other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROUT. I would like a minute to explain the extent of this amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBERT addressed the Chair.

Mr. GROUT addressed the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, before he takes his seat, I would suggest to him, if it meets his view, to try and secure a limit of debate to ten or fifteen minutes, and let us vote on this amendment.

Mr. GROUT. A wise suggestion. I will ask unanimous consent that debate close in ten minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion upon this question, and it seems to me that that discussion has been entirely in the wrong direction. Here we have seven or eight or a dozen institutions which are enumerated in this bill that are either public or private institutions. They are denominational, and thereby sectarian, or they are not; and the question is whether this body shall appropriate public money for private uses.

Now, according to the theory of the Government under which we live and by which we are governed, it is wrong in practice for us to appropriate public money for private uses. These being private institutions, it is against the theory of our Government and against our idea of what is right that we should appropriate money to maintain them. The question is not whether they are good and moral institutions. The question is not whether they are doing good or not. They are doing good. But the question that we should settle by our action here is the question of principle which is involved. That is the question, whether it is right or whether it is wrong to appropriate public funds for private purposes. I, believing that it is wrong, shall vote against appropriating money for any one of these institutions. If it is wrong to appropriate for one it is wrong to appropriate for any or for all of them.

My friend from Virginia [Mr. MEREDITH] has said that almost from time immemorial, from the first establishment of these institutions, these appropriations have been made. That does not make any difference, Mr. Chairman. If we have been going wrong, let us say right here and now that we will begin to right that wrong. It is never too late to turn around and retrace your steps and right a wrong that you have been doing in the past. Therefore if the American Congress has been doing wrong by appropriating public money for private uses, let us turn around now and undo that wrong.

I shall vote against the appropriations contained in this bill for every one of these sectarian institutions because I believe such appropriation of the public money to be wrong in principle, wrong in theory, and wrong in practice. We are going on here headlong, like greyhounds leaping a fence, appropriating the public money regardless of what is right or what is wrong, regardless of the interests of the great mass of the people, and I for one think it is time that we should call a halt and at least consider for a moment what we have been doing, and, if we find that we have been doing wrong, put a stop to that wrong by wiping from the pending bill these appropriations for private institutions.

Mr. MEREDITH. I understand that my friend from South Carolina is opposed to appropriating any money for this purpose?

Mr. TALBERT. To these institutions.

Mr. MEREDITH. Do you agree that money should be appropriated to public institutions for these purposes?

Mr. TALBERT. If there was any public institution of this kind here I would be willing to appropriate for it, but I am not willing to appropriate for these private institutions. Gentlemen say they are not sectarian institutions, but they are private institutions, and the distinction is only that between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. MEREDITH. Let me get through with my question, if you please.

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. MEREDITH. If this money is to be appropriated at all, does it not strike my friend that we ought to consider what good is to be done by the appropriation, and how best we can do it?

Mr. TALBERT. I do not deny that a large amount of good is being done, but there is a principle involved.

Mr. MEREDITH. But if we can do the most good by supplementing in this way these charitable institutions which have been in existence for years; if we can do more good with the same amount of money in this way than in any other, is it not better for the unfortunates, for whose benefit we make the appropriation, and better for the Government that we should do that?

Mr. TALBERT. Let us do right, my friend, though the heavens fall. Let us stick to the right. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to ask my friend from South Carolina one question.

Mr. TALBERT. All right, though I do not know that I want to stand a civil-service examination here to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of striking out this paragraph because it appropriates public money for a private institution. Private institutions should be sustained by private charities and private money and not by public appropriations. A great deal of argument has been brought to bear upon this question, tending and undertaking to show that the private institutions mentioned in this bill will be closed up if these appropriations are not made. Mr. Chairman, I deny that any such state of facts will exist. I point you to the fact that in almost every city throughout the United States that is anywhere near the size of Washington institutions of this character are kept up from year to year and are doing just as much good as they do in the city of Washington, without receiving one cent of public money.

Do gentlemen undertake to tell me that this Orphanage Asylum Association, for instance, supported by St. John's Episcopal Church, which, as I understand, is the richest church in the District of Columbia—do gentlemen undertake to say that the doors of that institution will be closed and that its good work will be stopped simply for the reason that this amount of public money is not appropriated to it? It does not seem to me that any gentlemen will claim any such thing as that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman tell us how he voted on the paragraph making an appropriation for the Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors?

Mr. MILNES. I do not know that I voted at all.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. There was no vote taken on that paragraph.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But it was adopted by the House, and I simply wanted to call the attention of the House to the fact that that is a private institution——

Mr. MILNES. There has been no vote on the question at all.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But in passing the item we were appropriating money for private purposes.

Mr. MILNES. I hope the gentleman will let me occupy a moment or two without interruption.

I now come to the item we are considering, this German Orphan Asylum, supported by rich Germans in the District of Columbia and, as my friend says, throughout the surrounding country. Does the gentleman undertake to make us believe that that insti-

tution is going to be closed up simply because the Government refuses to appropriate money for its support? Not by any means. The people who have been supporting that institution are not that kind of people. The same may be said of every other institution named here. As I have said, there are similar institutions throughout the United States in every city of considerable size that are supported by private charity and do not receive one cent of public money, and there is no reason why these institutions should receive any.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman allow me one more question?

Mr. MILNES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not a fact that any private institution caring for the sick, for the insane, for orphans, is practically doing public work?

Mr. MILNES. It is doing public good.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not a fact that the sick, the insane, and the orphans should be and must be cared for by the public at large; and if there are private institutions caring for them, irrespective of religion, is it not right that they should be maintained and encouraged, unless we are willing to appropriate as much out of the public funds as is now contributed to these institutions by private philanthropists?

Mr. MILNES. Not from public appropriations.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not right that nonsectarian institutions might be partly supported by public appropriations?

Mr. MILNES. My simple answer is that this good work will be carried on by these charitable institutions without one dollar of public appropriation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, it was agreed to; there being—ayes 130, noes 45.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next paragraph of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Will not the gentleman in charge of the bill move now that the committee rise? The House does not seem to be in a frame of mind for deliberate and calm legislation. [Laughter.]

[Cries of "No!" "No!"]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, maintenance, including repairs, $9,900.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the paragraph just read. In explanation of this motion I wish to say it will not be claimed, and is not claimed, that the institution here appropriated for is a sectarian institution. It is, however, private; and the motion of which I have given notice, to be made at the conclusion of these various items, will provide for taking care of destitute children by an appropriation for the board of children's guardians. The entire appropriation will be carried over to that paragraph. My only purpose in moving to strike out this item is that all child-caring institutions should be coordinated and treated alike.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If we strike out all these items and if the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer later should be adopted, appropriating, I understand, about $61,000 to be placed in the hands of the board of children's guardians, and if it should subsequently be held that the law is not broad enough to authorize the board of children's guardians to take charge of this class of children, then they will not receive any part of this money, will they?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I wish to say——

Mr. NORTHWAY. I ask the gentleman that question: If it should be held that the law in existence is not broad enough to reach this class of children, then they will not be benefited at all by the appropriation of $61,000, will they?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is true.

Mr. NORTHWAY. And is it not also true that the law is not broad enough to reach them?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No, sir.

Mr. NORTHWAY. And is it not true that the Senate has invariably held that the law does not apply to this class? Is not that true?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I can not comment on what the Senate may or may not have done. For the benefit of the gentleman let me read from section 4 of the act approved July 26, 1892:

The said board shall have the care and supervision of the following classes of children: First, all children committed under section 2 of the act approved February 13, 1885, entitled "An act for the protection of children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

That includes the incorrigible.

Second, all children who are destitute of suitable homes and adequate means of earning an honest living; all children abandoned by their parents or guardians; all children of habitually drunk or vicious or unfit parents; all children habitually begging on the streets or from door to door; all children kept in vicious or immoral associations; all children known by their language or life to be vicious or incorrigible, whenever such children shall be committed to the care of the board by the police court or the criminal court of the District.

Now, I ask the committee and every member of it, is there any other child that may properly be called a subject of public charity?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Here is the point. The gentleman knows I agree with him on this matter, provided the law is broad enough to reach all these children.

But is it not clear that the law reaches only such children as shall be committed to the board of children's guardians by the court? If it is not perfectly plain, then I am mistaken. I would amend the law, if it be not plain, so that the board would have charge of all of these children. But if it shall be held that the law is not broad enough to reach them, then it seems to me that we are striking out from this provision of the bill this unfortunate class of people without giving them any other relief in the premises.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I know of no children, Mr. Chairman, who are proper subjects of public charity who are not included here. I know no reason why there should not be a determination of the fact as to whether a child is really a public charge. Nor do I know any good reason why that question should not be determined by some court of competent jurisdiction. If any person desires to be supported by public funds, he should prove his status in some court of competent jurisdiction.

And further, if the law is not broad enough, as I stated before, this session of Congress is still young, and we can so widen and broaden it as to make it comprehensive enough to cover all these cases. But there will be no widening or broadening of the law if you make appropriations to all of these institutions, for they will come and say, "Oh, no; you have appropriated already for private institutions, and there is no necessity for further action."

Mr. LACEY. I would like to know, if the gentleman will permit me, whether under his proposition, the incorrigible children——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. LACEY. If I can be recognized in my own right, I will yield to him to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. LACEY. What I wish to know is, whether incorrigible children, and wicked and vicious children, who may be poor, and must necessarily be cared for in some of these institutions, whether they are all provided for in the same place or in the same institution?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no; they are entirely separated by law, and these children, such as the gentleman describes, are sent by the board of children's guardians to the Reform School. They are not kept together at all.

Mr. LACEY. Just another question. This proposition in the bill seems to include also destitute colored women. Your proposition would strike out that portion of the bill. Would not that be a very great hardship upon these people who have no other source of support?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is a private institution, and I apprehend that they have resources enough to support them and take care of these people who are not included in the terms of my proposed amendment.

Mr. LACEY. But suppose it is not true? In other words, is it not true that about the only revenue they have for the support of this institution is that which is derived from appropriations by Congress? Is it not true also that the negro throughout the United States since the war, especially in the District of Columbia, is placed at a disadvantange in seeking employment? He is not given any vote except at primary elections, and that is sometimes not accorded to him; and this provision, as I understand it, is intended to aid an institution which protects the widows and orphans in a separate establishment of this class of people. Ought not it to be made an exception from the gentleman's motion? It is not denominational in any sense of the word, but applies to the particularly unfortunate race who are in a transition state.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. They are entitled, of course, to all possible consideration. They are the wards of the nation, and properly so. But I apprehend in a provision, in a subsequent amendment that I shall offer, all these children can be taken care of just the same. They may be sent to this or some other institution, where they will be cared for under the control of the board of children's guardians of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Well, I am occupying the floor in the time of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman state how large a proportion of the total income of this institution the sum of $9,900 appropriated by this bill represents? The motion now pending would strike out the sum fixed in the bill——

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I can not.

Mr. PITNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I can answer that question. This appropriation carries $9,900 for the coming year. There were in the fiscal year 1895 other sources of revenue, amounting in all to $2,557, of which $2,404 were received from the board of children's guardians under the District of Columbia appropriation act. Practically the institution is supported entirely from the public Treasury.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Then it is supported by the Government?

Mr. PITNEY. Almost entirely.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Then I see no reason for circumlocution. This is a Government institution. If it is a Government institution the Government ought to provide the money to support it and make the necessary appropriations. I do not think we violate any principle in making an appropriation in this case.

Mr. PICKLER. As I understand it, if the gentleman from Nebraska will permit me, you only take care now of the criminal orphans and pauper orphans, do you not, by the board of children's guardians, which has only jurisdiction of that class?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Well, destitute children, particularly of that kind.

Mr. PICKLER. Are there not many worthy orphan children that ought to have some help, and upon whom the brand or stigma should not be placed that they are paupers or criminals?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have already called attention to the fact that the law provides arrangements for all children who are destitute or who have not sufficient means of support.

Mr. PICKLER. Do they not have to go into court?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly they do.

Mr. PICKLER. Are there not a great many worthy poor people who have children that need some help, but whose children ought not to be adjudged criminals and paupers before they can have that help?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have called attention to the fact that in the first item of charities there is an appropriation of $13,000 for general relief of the poor, and for the Freedman's Hospital and Asylum there is an appropriation of $22,500, and other large sums are appropriated in the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Will that help these institutions that are stricken out?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly it will not.

Mr. PITNEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children was incorporated in the year 1863?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have some little general knowledge of it. I understand so.

Mr. PITNEY. Under an act of Congress signed by President Lincoln?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I understand so.

Mr. PITNEY. And that it has no means of support except from the National Treasury?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No; I have not that information.

Mr. PITNEY. Gentlemen are voting here on something which they do not know anything about.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, this is an exceptional item, wholly so, and my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY], is asking some questions which will bring the facts to the understanding of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PITNEY. I did not desire to say anything at this time, Mr. Chairman, but I will state for the information of the Committee of the Whole that the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children was incorporated in 1863, under an act of Congress signed by President Lincoln, for the care and maintenance of destitute women and children of the colored race in the District of Columbia; that for the fiscal year 1895 they expended $12,457, of which $9,900 was appropriated directly to that association in the District of Columbia appropriation bill; $2,404 was taken from the appropriation for the board of children's guardians, and the trifling balance of $153 was from miscellaneous sources. This institution is a home in which aged colored women and destitute colored orphans are cared for, and if this appropriation is struck out, unless the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] will offer some other substitute for it, that home will have to be closed. I am opposed to this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, that is a very good speech, and unless the committee are going to follow my friend from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] with his battle-ax indiscriminately, certainly this item stands on exceptional ground. The gentleman has given the date of the incorporation of this institution, and has stated that it has no source of supply except from the Government, and in the very nature of the case it must be so. The colored people of this country are poor, and whatever may be done by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] with these other institutions, he should spare the ax on this one.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Why this one more than others?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is a Government institution, is it not?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. GROUT. It has been fostered and supported by the Government, although it exists under a private charter. But in that very charter permission is given, for the time being, to occupy any of the public grounds free of expense, and for a time they used the barracks. When it became necessary to change the location, the Government appropriated money to buy ground and erect a building, and from that day until now an appropriation has been made every year, and only a very few dollars come from any private source.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GROUT. Yes.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Has the gentleman looked up this matter and does he know that this institution has no other source of supply except the Government appropriation? Does the gentleman personally know that?

Mr. GROUT. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If that is the case, I have no objection to voting down this proposition.

Mr. PITNEY. It is not a private institution in the same sense as the others.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly it is; but I wish to say that my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY] has explained the situation with reference to it——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I want to ask my friend another question. Is it not true that many of the others are equally dependent on appropriations of the Government?

Mr. GROUT. No; this is exceptional.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that this board of guardians have appropriated over $2,000——

Mr. PITNEY. If I had the floor I should be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman yielded to me for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you allow me a question? I want to ask for information. I understand——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Nebraska to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that the board of children's guardians appropriated over $2,000 for this colored home.

Mr. PITNEY. That is not the correct way to state it. Mr. Chairman, the board of children's guardians placed in this colored home all those colored children who had been committed by decree of the court to the care of that board, and for the care of those children who were so committed to the colored home $2,404 was paid; but there were other children in the colored home besides those sent there by the board of guardians.

Mr. THOMAS. And if this is stricken out is there anything to prevent this board from appropriating more?

Mr. PITNEY. They can only appropriate for such colored children as are sent by them to the home—the board of children's guardians can not provide for the aged colored women who are in the home, or for the other children there.

Mr. THOMAS. And they can not make any appropriation for any other person.

Mr. GROUT. Does the gentleman from Nebraska withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Vermont give the Chair his attention?

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We are unable to hear what is being said, there is so much confusion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one point of order already pending.

Mr. FOOTE. I make the point of order that we can not hear on account of the confusion in the Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. All gentlemen will be seated and cease conversation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My point of order is to inquire if the Chair stated that the gentleman from Nebraska had withdrawn his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska does not withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GROUT. I yielded to permit a question to be asked and then I was drifted away from the reason which I was about to give why this should not be put in the hands of the children's guardians. It is true if you send children there, as suggested by the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, if it were under their control, as stated to me by an officer of that institution, if they

were put under the children's guardians, it would be a complete disturbance and disorganization of the institution. They send these boys and girls—or rather boys; I am not certain that it included girls—but these boys, who had been committed by the courts, who were sent to that institution produce disorder in the institution that nullify the discipline and good management, and that is the reason why it should not be remitted to the children's guardians. I wanted the committee to understand that.

Mr. PITNEY. Permit me one question. Is it not a fact that the Home for Destitute Colored Women and Children does take care of aged colored women?

Mr. GROUT. There are twenty-odd of them there.

Mr. PITNEY. Then, if this appropriation is voted down in accordance with the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska, will there be any fund from which aged colored women can be cared for in that institution?

Mr. GROUT. Not as this bill will then stand, and not unless the House makes some other provision.

Mr. HARDY. I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if it is not a fact that at the close of the war a great many colored women whose husbands had been sold into slavery farther south came to the city of Washington as a refuge and have lived here ever since, and that some of them are to-day in that institution?

Mr. PITNEY. I was not in the city of Washington at the close of the war, and have not been here ever since; but my information is that the gentleman is correct in his statement. [Laughter and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CRAIN. I have an amendment I desire to offer to the amendment, Mr. Chairman. Strike out of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska the words "including repairs."

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me every proposition which has been advanced this afternoon in relation to striking out items of this appropriation bill has been supported by arguments which are equally applicable to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. The underlying principle of all these appropriations, according to those who have supported those amendments, has been the antagonism of the gentlemen making them to the appropriation of public money for private purposes.

Now, no man who has taken a position favorable to this amendment has advanced a solitary argument that has not been advanced in support of the other amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska. I understood that gentleman to say a few moments ago, in response to a statement made by the gentleman from Vermont who has charge of this bill, that because of the paucity of private charity extended to this institution, as suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY]—that because of the paucity of private charity extended to this institution he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no.

Mr. CRAIN. I thought I overheard the gentleman say something like this to the gentleman from New Jersey: "Is it true that only $157 has been contributed? Do you state that on your own information and belief?" The gentleman from New Jersey replied "Yes," and then the gentleman from Nebraska said: "Then I withdraw my amendment."

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. CRAIN. Possibly, but I think I understood the gentleman correctly.

Mr. SAYERS. He was just wavering then. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAIN. Wabbling, was he? Well, however that may have been, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Nebraska stands now by the logic of the situation and by the consistency of his position.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. CRAIN. I have only five minutes. At the close of my five minutes I will give the gentleman all the time he wants, either by moving to strike out the last word or by offering a substitute for his amendment. I do not wish to be discourteous, but my time is very limited. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me strange that at this late day we should find Southern Representatives standing here and advocating the retention in an appropriation bill of a provision appropriating $9,900 for the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children. It is equally strange, sir, that gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, who have voted for the striking out of these other items from this bill, should suddenly lose sight of what they call the great underlying principle, and should vote for this item upon the paltry pretext of the paucity of private charity in this case, as if that could be an excuse for losing sight of their "great underlying principle." If that be the guiding motive for your votes, gentlemen on the other side, I would suggest to the beneficiaries under the remaining appropriations in this bill that after we adjourn to-day they unite and send up statements that hereafter they will accept nothing from private charity, and will thus qualify themselves to be the recipients of your bounty. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROUT. I hope we shall have a vote now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, this item in the bill illustrates a thought that I would impress upon the committee, and that is, that this is practically the administration of a charity rather than an appropriation for it, for the appropriation is to be made anyway, and, permit me say, it is very small for charities; in other words, that the sanction of the Committee on Appropriations is the best justification for making this appropriation. The position of the committee in its relation to the public of this District is, that it is the initiatory legislative body of the District, and what I want to impress upon you is that that committee, with the sanction of this House, is as competent to administer of this charity as the board of children's guardians of orphans or any other officials who may be selected to administer it.

If I understand correctly, there is a reserve motive to appropriate for these charities the sum called for by this bill—the gentleman from Nebraska makes war upon the sum total of the appropriation—but my idea is that if this committee, in its wisdom, after the full hearing and consideration it has given to the subject, chooses to say that this church or that church can do the best service in one field, that another church can do the best service in another field, that one society can do the best service in another field, and another society in another field, then we here ought not to make open war against the churches and say that they are incompetent to administer the charities that we desire to have administered in this District.

Again, I desire members to understand that the church in the District of Columbia bears the same relation to the country and the general public that the District itself bears. You come here, representing your constituencies; you spend your money, you leave behind you orphans; you leave behind you inmates of asylums. In other words, by your presence in this national capital you increase the charge of the local churches which ask to have aid extended to them in the field of charity, and the church here stands upon the same high plane that a private individual in the District of Columbia does, and asks the General Government to assist in bearing the burden which you help to bring upon them. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me only right and proper that a due share of these burdens should be borne by the Government, and the channels through which most good can be accomplished ought to be those through which your charity should operate. I think, therefore, that the gentleman from Nebraska has made a mistake in attempting to wipe out any of these appropriations.

Yet there can not be drawn a distinction between the church and a society that wants to care for the colored people. This committee has said that according to their information one church can administer charity in one quarter and another church in another. When they come to the colored people they say that this relief association can administer this charity. So, Mr. Chairman, I do declare that this committee is as competent, with the sanction of the Committee of the Whole and the House of Representatives, to administer this charity as it is possible for it to be administered by any new organ——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I had thought we might be able to close the debate and have a vote on this question to-night; but I find there are other gentlemen who want to speak, so I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5210) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

KILLING OF ITALIAN LABORERS IN COLORADO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress:

In my last annual message allusion was made to the lawless killing of certain Italian laborers in the State of Colorado, and it was added that "the dependent families of some of the unfortunate victims invite by their deplorable condition gracious provision for their needs."

It now appears that, in addition to three of these laborers who were riotously killed, two others who escaped death by flight incurred pitiable disabilities through exposure and privation.

Without discussing the question of the liability of the United States for these results, either by reason of treaty obligations or under the general rules of international law, I venture to urge upon the Congress the propriety of making from the public Treasury prompt and reasonable pecuniary provision for those injured and for the families of those who were killed.

To aid in the consideration of the subject, I append hereto a report of the Secretary of State, accompanied by certain correspondence which quite fully presents all the features of the several cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 3, 1896.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

BILL AND AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following bill with Senate amendments was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DALZELL. I move that the House adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LOCKHART, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUFF, for to-morrow, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOODARD, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. ELLETT of Virginia, for ten days, on account of illness.

To Mr. TYLER, for three days, on account of sicknsss in his family.

The motion of Mr. DALZELL, that the House adjourn, was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for lands, "Fort Ethan Allen Military Reservation"—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting an estimate of an additional appropriation for construction and repair of naval vessels—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4148) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 224); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRODERICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred House bill No. 1237, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5379) making it unlawful to shoot at or into any railway locomotive or car, or at any person thereon, or to throw any rock or other missile at or into any locomotive or car, and for other purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 225); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MEREDITH, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred House bill No. 1671, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5380) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the endowment and support of mining schools in the several States and Territories, for the purpose of extending similar aid in the development of the mining industries of the nation as already provided for the agricultural and mechanical arts, accompanied by a report (No. 226); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PENDLETON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 227); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 228); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5360) to increase the circulation of national banks and to provide for the retirement of United States legal-tender notes and Treasury notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5361) granting a right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma and Galveston Railroad Company through the reservation of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma Territory and through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 5362) making an appropriation for a light-house on what is known as Peshtigo Reef, near Peshtigo Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) making an appropriation for a fog signal on the north pier of the entrance to Menominee Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) making an appropriation for a fog signal on what is known as Ottawa Point, Tawas Bay, near East Tawas, Mich.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) making an appropriation for a light-house on what is known as the Whalesback, near Cedar River, Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5366) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal station at or near Point Gorda—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5367) to aid the public-land States and Territories in the reclamation of the desert lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5368) to establish an assay office at the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 5369) granting pensions to widows who have been the widows of soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5370) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to ascertain and report facts concerning the taking of property for the use of the Army of the United States and destroyed at Cynthiana, Ky., on June 11, 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 5371) to amend section 1791, Revised Statutes United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5372) regulating the instructions of Federal judges in the trial of jury causes in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 5373) to establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 5374) to refer to the Court of Claims the claims of the Confederated Peoria, Piankeshaw, Wea, and Kaskaskia tribe of Indians against the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 5375) to amend section 2117 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5376) granting condemned cannon to the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5377) to provide for the improvement of the building of the United States court and post-office at Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5378) to amend the law establishing a port of delivery at Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5381) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to erect and maintain flushboards on the Menasha Dam in Fox River, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5382) to authorize the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company to extend its line of railroad into the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 5383) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Mrs. Dolly Madison, by E. F. Andrews—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5384) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange, in behalf of the United States, the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., now belonging to the United States and held for light-house purposes, with the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company for any other tract or parcel of land in said county equally well or better adapted to use for light-house purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5473) concerning delivery of letters in towns, villages, and other places where no free delivery exists—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CORLISS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 106) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAIN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 107) requesting the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made, and a report thereon to be furnished to the Fifty-fourth Congress, for a ship channel from Brazos Santiago to Isabel, in Cameron County, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A resolution (House Res. No. 150) to authorize the employment of a stenographer and typewriter by the Committee on Banking and Currency—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A resolution (House Res. No. 151) for the appointment of a committee to investigate infractions of the civil-service law, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Mrs. Mary J. Secrest, and the same were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 5385) for the relief of Hiram Kinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) for the relief of Hiram A. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 5387) to increase the pension of Henry Hoehle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of F. Alberts & Co., Muskegon, Mich.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Robert Kennish—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) for the relief of George W. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5391) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen E. Spalding, widow of the late B. J. Spalding, lieutenant-colonel Thirty-seventh Kentucky Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) for the relief of Henry J. Hewitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) for the relief of Lucinda Rickards, widow, and the minor children of John D. Rickards, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) granting an increase of pension to W. D. Sigler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) to correct the military record of Dunkin McCoy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of Martha E. Fleschert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) granting a pension to Mrs. Katherine Ogden, widow of Second Lieut. Charles C. Ogden, Company E, Thirteenth Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5398) to restore a pension to Mary J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 5399) for the relief of Lieut. Herman M. Lillie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5400) to increase the pension of Mary L. Bacon, widow of the late George B. Bacon, late lieutenant-commander of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5401) granting a pension to Elizabeth Beesley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 5402) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5403) granting a pension to Catharine Hey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) granting a pension to Francis M. Cain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of Mary E. Buckey, of Randolph County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) for the relief of Thomas D. Hawker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5407) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Oscar A. Bulette, late private in Company E, Fifty-second Illinois Infantry Volunteers, during late war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 5408) for the relief of James P. Chase—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5409) for the relief of J. T. Taylor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 5410) to correct the military record of Albert S. Emerson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5411) to increase the pension of Howell Furguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5412) for the relief of W. M. Starks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 5413) for the relief of the settlers on the Rancho Corte De Madera Del Presidio, Marin County, Cal.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5414) to remove the charge of desertion against Patrick Cassidy, of Amboy, Ill., late private Company C, Thirty-fourth Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 5415) to increase the pension of James M. Derby, of Latrobe, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5416) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Decator Dakin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) for the relief of Anderson P. Trout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) granting an increase of pension to George Roney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of S. M. Fudge for compensation for the loss of wheat in the year 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) for the relief of Margaret M. Stitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) granting a pension to W. F. Randolph—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) granting a pension to John O. Sullivan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5424) granting a pension to Robert A. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5425) to grant a pension to Charlotte O. Van Cleve, widow of Gen. Horatio P. Van Cleve—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5426) granting a pension to Mary Ann McElhenny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5427) removing charge of desertion from military record of Charles M. Lewallen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) to complete the military record of James Hicks, formerly captain Company M, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) removing charge of desertion from military record of William Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) for the relief of Frank Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) granting a pension to William Beard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) granting a pension to Franklin S. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5433) for the relief of John G. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5434) for the relief of certain persons residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation of Arkansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of Frances P. Trumbull, widow of Matthew M. Trumbull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of John C. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of Herman Wirth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of the estate of John W. Montgomery—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of John R. Fortner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 5440) for the relief of Ernest Schmedlen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) for the relief of Susana Marion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONEY: A bill (H. R. 5442) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against William Knight, late a private in Company K, Twenty-third Missouri Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5443) granting a pension to John H. Curnutte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) for the relief of George W. Taylor's administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) for the relief of Ann Stewart, administratrix of William Stewart, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) for the relief of James S. Frizzell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) for the relief of Joseph B. McClintock—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of Thomas V. Stirman's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Marcus L. Broadwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5450) for the relief of Thomas C. Isgrig—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) granting a pension to James C. Buckley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5452) to remove charges of desertion from the military record of Martin Lunsford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER (by request): A bill (H. R. 5453) to pension Taylor Triplett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 5454) for the relief of C. D. Hottenstein—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) granting a pension to Annie J. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5456) to increase the pension of Henrietta A. Lewis, widow of Capt. F. R. Lewis, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5457) to increase the pension of John Yahne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5458) granting a pension to Mary Allard, widow of John Allard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) granting a pension to Alexander E. Ingraham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 5460) for the relief of James Lindsay—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TRACEWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 5461) granting a pension to Silas Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5462) to relieve Jacob Findley of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) granting a pension to Joseph Verney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5464) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Beeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5465) granting a pension to Emma Swift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) granting a pension to Philip Deuser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) granting a pension to Robert B. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5468) to grant a pension to Mary E. Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) to grant a pension to Amon Gross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) for the relief of James W. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5471) to grant a pension to William Cecill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) to grant a pension to William B. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC,

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: Petition of the city council of Spanish Fork City, Utah, asking for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of Eugene J. Doody, A. Halsey, and 65 other citizens of Philadelphia, asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition of Joshua Wheeler and others, of Nortonville, Kans., against House bill No. 167—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BULL: Letter of Hon. Charles W. Lippitt, governor of Rhode Island, relative to the improvement of the Great Salt Pond, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of W. J. Phelps and others, of Cleveland, Ohio, in support of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4479, for the relief of Thomas K. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Petition of B. M. Hummel and several hundred other citizens of Clinton, Iowa, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Ottawa County, Kans., asking that the internal-revenue laws of the United States be amended so as to prohibit the issuance of license to sell intoxicating liquors in the State of Kansas except to those who hold a permit under the laws of Kansas—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of J. W. Adams and others, J. W. Maroney and others, E. J. Knight and others, C. H. Leeper and others, M. Bane and others, M. A. Price and others, Nathan McMasters and others, F. B. Thompson and others, C. I. Pentoney and others, all of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the West Virginia Academy of Science and citizens of Monongalia County, W. Va., in mass convention, urging the improvement of the Monongahela River, and the making of said river for free navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle, Wash., favoring the passage of Senate bills Nos. 1172 and 1292—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution adopted by the town council of Kalama, Wash., urging such legislation as will result in the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 900 residents of the city of Tacoma, Wash., in favor of the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany memorial for the construction of a Government telegraph line from Neah Bay to Grays Harbor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Two petitions of J. W. Register, R. C. Logan, and others, of Williamsburg County, S. C., asking that Winyah Bay bar improvements be placed under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of W. A. Patch and 75 others, of St. Paul, Minn., and vicinity, favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GIBSON: Resolutions of citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., in favor of the recognition of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of the Fairfield County Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, urging the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of United States pensioners at Fitch's Home, Connecticut, asking for the passage of Senate bill No. 1292—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: Petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, asking for early legislation in behalf of the Hawaiian cable—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Oakland (Cal.) Board of Trade, asking for the immediate improvement of Oakland Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Patrick Cassidy, of Amboy, Ill., late private Company C, Thirty-fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, for the removal of the charge of desertion from his record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: Six petitions of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegany and Cattaraugus counties, N. Y., asking for the passage of a measure forbidding the sale of fermented and spirituous liquors at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in support of House Bill No. 306, providing pensions for soldiers and sailors who were prisoners of war during the late rebellion; also resolutions of Col. Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, in favor of said bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: Memorial of the Silent Army, deaf soldiers, sailors, and marines, praying for increase of pensions for total deafness from $30 to $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the New York Produce Exchange, asking for the passage of House bill No. 3010, providing for the regulating of the manufacturing and sale of an article called "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, adopted at a meeting at Champaign, Ill., asking for the passage of the pending bill to regulate the number of officers in the engineering corps of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Immigration Restriction League, asking for the further restraint of immigration, and, as an important means thereto, the exclusion of all persons between 14 and 60 years of age who can not both read and write the English or some other language—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of C. Fuller and 33 others, of Oklahoma Territory, asking for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Clintondale, Shokan, and Madalin, N.Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffiic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clintondale, against the sale of cider to boys and young men, and to include it in the list of intoxicants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEWIS: Evidence supporting and to be filed with House bill No. 5050, for the benefit of Ransom C. Hazelip—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the appropriation of $10,000 to continue the resurvey of San Francisco Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging an appropriation for increased coast and harbor defense—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: Paper to accompany House bill No. 5346, for a pension to F. M. Kirby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of J. B. Davis, A. F. Bee, and 58 other persons, of Ritchie County, W. Va., against House bill No. 167, entitled "A bill to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Mississippi, for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Susan S. Fessenden, president of the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking Congress to take action in regard to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of 68 citizens of Roanoke, Va., asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of P. D. Inman, of Grinnell, Iowa, in support of House bill No. 1429, to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in them—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Col. C. E. Foster, in opposition to House bill No. 2294—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Lestershire, Groton, Norwich, Vestal Center, and Sidney, N. Y., against the sale of liquor and cider at Ellis Island and Bedloes Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Preamble and resolution of Col. Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of citizens of Coatesville, Chester, and Delaware counties, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Toughkenamon Council, No. 996; Rockdale Council, No. 803; Goshen Council, No. 607; John Martin Council, No. 738, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, praying for the recognition of belligerent rights for the Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, praying for the passage of such legislation and appropriations as will adequately protect our seaboard cities from alien attack and despoliation in time of war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Secretary Wilmerton, of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of the Erdman bill for industrial arbitration and for the passage of the Phillips bill for a labor commission—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 600 members of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of bills establishing industrial arbitration and a labor commission—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 600 members of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of laws raising the age of consent and improving Territorial divorce laws—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of 600 members of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of the Sunday-rest law and the enforcement of compulsory education in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Resolution of Col. Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Philadelphia, urging the passage of House bill No. 306, concerning pensions for Union soldiers confined in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Ellen A. Giles and others, of Clayville, N. Y., asking for legislation to prevent the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of the Dayton City Union of Christian Endeavor of Dayton, Ohio, for the enforcement of compulsory education at the capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Dayton City Union of Christian Endeavor for the enactment of a law forbidding Sunday labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Dayton, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Erdman bill for the arbitration of railway strikes—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Dayton City Christian Endeavor Union of Dayton, Ohio, urging the passage of the Phillips bill providing a commission to investigate the labor problem—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Dayton City Union of Christian Endeavor for the repeal of the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma and of Arizona, and to substitute the stricter divorce law of the District of Columbia by extending it to the Territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of 74 ex-Union soldiers and 50 other citizens of Shippensburg, Pa., in favor of the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of numerous citizens of Pennsylvania, asking for the removal of obstructions to navigation in the Allegheny River at Merritt's Island and Tubb's Run Riffle—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Walter E. Mitchell and 53 other citizens of Belle Center, Ohio, for the passage of the bill to secure a better grade of immigrants, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLER: Petitions of citizens of East Liverpool and Stark County, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Papers in support of House bill No. 3518—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 3527—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Attica, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of the Central Trade and Agricultural Union of Piqua, Miami County, Ohio, asking for the passage of a bill "to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes," introduced by Mr. WOODMAN—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of C. D. Hull and 16 other ex-Union soldiers, asking for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 4, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of section 232, Revised Statutes of the United States, an abstract of the militia force of the United States according to the latest returns received at the Office of the Adjutant-General of the United States Army for the year 1895; which, with the accompanying abstract, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 14, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office containing certain information relative to the lands constituting the beds of Cross Lake, Soda Lake, Clear Lake, Ferry Lake, and Caddo Lake, extending from the Texas State line to or near the city of Shreveport, La.; which, on motion of Mr. BLANCHARD, was, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney-General of the 3d instant submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for "Defending suits in claims against the United States" for the current fiscal year, $7,500, and requesting that it be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying letter, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia, praying that an investigation be made of the abuses alleged to exist in the Post-Office repair-bag department, and for the passage of a law prohibiting the purchase of any goods produced in whole or in part by convict labor for any department of the Federal Government; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a joint resolution of the general assembly of Ohio, urging the enactment of legislation ceding certain lands to the State of Ohio; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in securing the passage of an act ceding certain lands to the State of Ohio.

Whereas the Ohio canal commission in the prosecution of its work of investigating the titles of State lands finds that section 7, town 6 south, range 4 east, Auglaize County, Ohio, is the property of the United States; and

Whereas said section 7 is wholly within the limits of the Mercer County reservoir, and therefore a part of the public works of Ohio, and any disposition of it to private parties or corporations would work great injustice to the public works of the State; and

Whereas the canal commission having made application to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for a patent to the land in said section 7 under the swamp-land act of 1850, and said application having been rejected and the application is now pending on an appeal before the Secretary of the Interior: Therefore

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their good offices in securing the passage of an act ceding the land in question to the State of Ohio, and that the governor be requested to forward to our Senators and Representatives of Ohio a certified copy of this resolution.

CHARLES H. BOSLER,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted January 29, 1896.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 29th day of January, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 29th day of January, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 78 citizens of Beloit, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting appropriations for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Black Top Spanish Merino Sheep Breeders' Publishing Association at its annual meeting held at Washington, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the substitution of shoddy and other cheap materials for fleece wool in the manufacture of woolen goods, and also praying for the passage of the pending revenue bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the National Association of Manufacturers at a convention held in Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the pending revenue bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Xenia, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 1055, providing for military education in the public schools; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of McDonaldsville, Canton, Geneva, Gnadenhutten, and Springfield, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Niles, Ohio, and a petition of the Board of Trade of Warren, Ohio, praying for the construction of a ship canal from Lake Erie to Pittsburg, Pa., through the Mahoning Valley; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Warren, Ohio, praying for the construction of a ship waterway connecting the Great Lakes with the rivers dividing that part of the continent south of these lakes to the Gulf of Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Cincinnati, Dayton, and Troy, in the State of Ohio, and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Deposit, N. Y., praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma and Arizona Territories and for substituting in its stead the stricter divorce law of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing an impartial commission for the investigation of the labor problem; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enforcement of the compulsory education law in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Erdman bill, substituting voluntary arbitration for railway strikes; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of the eastern portion of the Heidelberg classes of the Reformed Church of Bucyrus, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interests of morality, education, labor, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Galion, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality, for a Sunday-rest law, for the repeal of the Oklahoma divorce law, for compulsory education, for the arbitration of labor strikes, and for investigation of the labor problem; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition numerously signed by citizens of De Soto, Mo., praying for the passage of what is known as the Stone bill, which was pending in the Fifty-third Congress, in regard to securing a better grade of immigrants. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I also present a petition in behalf of the Missouri Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kansas City, Mo., praying relief for those who are suffering in Armenia. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Granbury, Tex., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of Mrs. M. E. Griffith, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, and sundry other citizens of the District, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the charwomen of the Departments in the District; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of Robert Miller and other citizens of Livingston County, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent unwholesome and unreasonable immigration to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Society of Christian Endeavor of Lexington, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation by Congress to prevent Armenian outrages; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of Marion Roberts Post, No. 41, Grand Army of the Republic, of Asheville, N. C., praying that section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be repealed; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of William A. Streeter Post, No. 145, Grand Army of the Republic, of Attleboro, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Haines bill to give pay and pension to those soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons during the war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of Rev. J. B. Tuttle and 197 other citizens of Muncie, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent from 16 years to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Fairfield County (Conn.) Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Mineral Point and New Freedom, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the New York Produce Exchange, praying for the passage of House bill No. 3010, regulating the manufacture and sale of an article called "filled cheese"; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DAVIS presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of St. Paul, Minn., favoring an active interference on the part of the Government for the redress of injuries to American citizens resident in Turkey; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of James D. Woodruff and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure a better class of immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2673, abolishing compulsory pilotage; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the New York Produce Exchange, praying for the passage of House bill No. 3010, regulating the manufacture and sale of an article called "filled cheese"; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of Benjamin Reynolds and 34 other citizens of Lumberton, N. J., and the petition of Charles H. Westcott and 27 other citizens of Salem, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a memorial, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the refunding of the indebtedness of the subsidized overland railroads. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads. It is very short.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, January 21, 1896.

RESOLUTION—THE FUNDING BILL.

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, having under consideration all the conditions involved, and having reference to the message of the President of the United States to the Fiftieth Congress, recommending the Government to secure itself by legal process against financial loss in its relations with the subsidized overland railroads, urgently protests against the refunding of the indebtedness of these railroads by legal enactment.

Resolved, That while the question of the management of railways by the Government admits of a fair discussion, the obligation of a corporation to pay its debts is as binding as that of an individual debtor, and when unable to do this the ordinary process of law should prevail, otherwise our people have a right to complain that, while citizens generally are made to obey the law, rich corporations and millionaires are exempt.

Resolved, That the people dependent upon the line of the subsidized defaulting railroads, in the case of their debt being refunded, must endure the burden of excessive cost of transportation for the many years of the extension demanded, an obvious injustice, which will retard the development of the dependent territory, whereas a change of management, either directly by the Government or by lease, under proper restrictions, will develop the territory and increase the value of the railway itself. For these valid reasons this chamber of commerce favors foreclosure by the Government as the result of default in the payment of the debt owing it.

Resolved, That attested copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Pacific Coast delegation in Congress, and to the Committees in the Senate and House of Representatives having the measure under consideration; also, that copies be furnished the public press, requesting its support.

HUGH CRAIG, *President*.

Attest:
WILLIAM L. MERRY, *Secretary*.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation of $10,000 be made for the completion of the resurvey of San Francisco Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 334, to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of a cable between the Pacific coast and the Hawaiian Islands; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Grange No. 70, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stockton, Cal., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the bar of San Diego, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for holding stated terms of the United States circuit and district courts of the southern district of California at San Diego; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of P. A. Patch and sundry other citizens of St. Paul, Minn., and the petition of A. W. Bainbridge and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mapleton, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting appropriations for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCBRIDE presented a petition of Camp No. 13 of the Indian War Veterans of the Pacific Coast, praying that pensions be granted to the Indian war veterans and their dependent widows; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CANNON presented a petition of the city council of Spanish Fork City, Utah, praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Remi A. Daigle and sundry other citizens of Aroostook County, Me., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River at the towns of Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, New Brunswick; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Jacksonville, Fla., praying that the United States Government take steps to recognize the Cuban revolutionists as belligerents; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Charles T. Carroll and 35 other citizens, of Monticello, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South for the use, consumption, and destruction of the property of that corporation by and under the authority of the United States during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PALMER presented a petition of the delegated representatives of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, praying for the arbitration of national controversies and deprecating war; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VOORHEES presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of leading business men of Madison, Ind., in favor of an appro-

priation of $25,000 for the purpose of dredging the Ohio River opposite that city; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1671) for the relief of Julius R. Frederick, heretofore introduced by me. I move that the papers be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. I present resolutions adopted by the Virginia State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of equitable protection. I have been asked to request that these resolutions, in view of their presentation of a question somewhat new, be printed in the RECORD. They are not very lengthy, and I hope this privilege may be accorded them.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, at its twenty-eighth annual session, did direct its legislative committee to invite a conference of the industrial interests of the country to consider the tariff question with a view to eliminating this vexed matter from politics, and thus save the regular biennial and quadrennial disruption of the business interests of the country by which millions are lost to the American nation without gain to anyone, in the hope of arranging a compromise alike satisfactory to all classes of the people; and

Whereas the legislative committee did issue invitations to the commercial, manufacturing, and shipping interests of the United States to assemble for this purpose in the city of Worcester, Mass., on November 14, 1895; and

Whereas in response to said invitation there did assemble in said city at that date the following gentlemen, representing the various interests named: J. H. Brigham, Leonard Rhone, John Trimble, H. O. Devries, Aaron Jones, representatives of the National Grange; David Lubin, of California; R. G. F. Candage, National Farmers' Congress; Hugh Craig, vice-president Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal.; W. H. Llewellyn, representing Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash.; Oliver Wilson, Illinois, and J. L. Minton, Missouri, Farmers' National Congress; W. W. Bates, ex-United States Commissioner of Navigation, representing the shipping interests; W. F. Leonard, New York, American Masters and Pilots' Association; G. C. Thayer, Pennsylvania, Cramp Ship Building Company; Alfred E. Cox, Massachusetts, Atlantic Iron Works, Boston; S. B. Ascher, Tariff Commercial League, New Jersey; A. R. Smith (editor of The Seaboard), New York, representing the shipping interests; U. P. Curtis, Worcester, National Association Manufacturers Implements and Vehicles; and

Whereas said conference did adopt the following resolutions and address:

"EQUITABLE PROTECTION.

"*To the American People and the Congress of the United States:*

"At a conference of the representatives of chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and delegates of the Farmers' National Congress, and other commercial organizations from the various sections of the Union, and delegates of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, under the auspices of the National Grange, Worcester, Mass., November 14, 1895, the following resolutions were adopted:

"'Whereas agricultural staples, being exports, can not be protected by a tariff on imports, as are manufactures, and American ships in the foreign trade, being built by partly protected material and under protection wages, are at a disadvantage in the world's competition with ships constructed and operated in cheap-labor or free-trade countries:

"'*Resolved by this conference*, That this depressed condition demands the enactment of such legislation as will put both these great industries upon a footing of equality with those now specially fostered by the Government.

"'*Resolved*, That we call upon Congress to equalize the protective system by extending to agricultural staples and American shipping in the foreign trade that just measure of protection to which they are entitled so long as protection is the controlling and public policy of the nation.

"'*Resolved*, That we recommend to the consideration of the Congress of the United States and to the American people what is known as the "Lubin proposition" for the protection of American agriculture and shipping in the foreign trade.'

"The same resolutions, in substance, have been recently adopted by the chambers of commerce of San Francisco; Seattle, Wash.; Portland, Oreg.; the Board of Trade of Bath, Me.; the leading Atlantic Coast shipbuilders at a meeting in Philadelphia, and the Farmers' National Congress at Atlanta, Ga.

"THE 'LUBIN PROPOSITION'

"is for the protection of American agricultural staples, a portion of which are exported, by the payment of a bounty by the Federal Government upon such exports and the protection of American shipping in the foreign trade, to the end that all industries in the United States which in any manner compete with the cheaper labor of foreign countries may be protected equally with such industries as are now protected by a tariff on imports.

"For seventy-six years a similar policy was in successful operation in Great Britain, and it only ceased when that nation no longer exported agricultural staples, after which the tariff upon imports protected her agriculturists until the repeal of what are known as the "corn laws."

"It is believed that the enactment into laws of this proposition will have the effect of making steadily profitable the pursuit of agricultural employment and replace present threatened disaster to our farm-owning population by prosperity, the result of which would have an equally beneficial effect upon our great manufacturing industries, which are so vitally dependent upon our farming population for the purchase of their products. And it will effect for shipping in the foreign trade a stimulus to shipowning and shipbuilding to such an extent that our own home-built, home-manned, and American-owned vessels shall once more carry the larger share of our foreign commerce, thereby creating a much greater home market for American farm and factory products among those engaged in shipping, and the retention in the United States of the many millions of dollars which we now expend annually to enrich foreign shipowners and shipbuilders.

"We earnestly urge upon the American people and the Congress of the United States the early and favorable consideration of such measures on the lines here indicated as shall give prosperity to all American industries by equitable protection.

"Unanimously adopted.

"J. H. BRIGHAM,
"*Chairman, and Master National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry.*
"HUGH CRAIG,
"*Vice-President, and Vice-President San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.*
"ALEX. R. SMITH,
"*Secretary, representing leading Atlantic Coast Shipbuilders.*"

Whereas at no period in the country's history has a more important assemblage been held of the great industrial interests, at which, outside of the agricultural interest represented, there were present representatives of our greatest manufacturing, commercial, and shipping interests, representing hundreds of millions of dollars of capital, coming from all sections of this country, who unanimously demanded of our lawmakers equal protection for agriculture and shipping with other interest: Therefore

Resolved by the State Grange of Virginia in regular annual session assembled in the city of Richmond, 1896, That we congratulate the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, upon the success of its efforts to bring together the leading interests of our country for the purpose of harmonizing differences of opinion and building up the material interest of all classes, as enunciated and demanded by our declaration of purposes as far back as 1873.

Resolved, That we readopt the resolutions and address of the Worcester conference, and urge the Senators and Representatives from Virginia in Congress to use their best efforts for the passage of laws to secure the ends therein set forth.

Resolved, That the legislative committee of this grange present a copy of these resolutions to each Senator and Representative from Virginia, and request that they present the same to Congress.

THOS. S. STADDEN,
Secretary Virginia State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry.
ALEX. J. WEDDERBURN,
Master Virginia State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry.

Mr. DANIEL presented a petition of the general assembly of the State of Virginia, praying for the passage of the bill providing for the construction of a bridge from Washington City to Arlington, in that State; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of T. J. Doyle, W. J. McFarland, C. B. Smith, and sundry other citizens of Culpeper, Va.; of C. H. Beasley, William Earnest, S. C. Purvis, and sundry other citizens of Lynchburg, Va.; of J. C. Phillips, W. A. Floyd, H. W. Cooper, and sundry other citizens of Madison Court-House, Va.; of W. S. Watts, J. H. Featherstone, S. L. Crute, and sundry other citizens of Roanoke, Va.; of Richard Jones, C. E. Hunt, W. J. Luke, and sundry other citizens of Norfolk, Va., and of J. O. Wiggs, W. F. White, J. L. Lawrence, and sundry other citizens of Berkley, Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of John Arthur Lynch, a citizen of the United States, praying that misstatements in publications of the Government be corrected; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER. In behalf of my colleague upon the Committee on the District of Columbia, the chairman of that committee [Mr. MCMILLAN], I present a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the extension of the Metropolitan Street Railway in East Washington. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. MCMILLAN) presented a memorial of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation granting to the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia the authority to extend their tracks on certain streets, avenues, and roads in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. MCMILLAN) presented a memorial of the East Washington Citizens' Association, relative to the reclamation of the flats and the improvements of the channel of the Anacostia River; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TILLMAN presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Georgetown, S. C., and of sundry citizens of Marlboro, Berkeley, Williamsburg, Marion, and Clarendon, all in the State of South Carolina, praying that an appropriation be made to deepen Winyah Bay bar, in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WETMORE presented resolutions of the general assembly of Rhode Island, urgently requesting Congress to make the necessary appropriation for the completion of a harbor of refuge in Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[State of Rhode Island, etc. In general assembly, January session, A. D. 1896.]

Resolution concerning the construction of a channel into Great Pond Harbor, Block Island, R. I.

Whereas, believing that a harbor of refuge for general commerce and navigation in Block Island, R. I., would be of incalculable value to the coastwise trade of the North Atlantic States and of the thousands of lives engaged in navigation; and

Whereas the State of Rhode Island and the town of New Shoreham have appropriated $100,000 to construct a channel into the Great Salt Pond, Block Island; and

Whereas a channel about 400 feet wide and 12 feet deep has been cut from the ocean into said pond, which has an area of about 800 acres of tide water available and suitable for the safe anchorage of ships during storms; and

Whereas by the report of the United States Engineer it is estimated that by an additional appropriation of about $97,567 a permanent ship channel, with a central depth of 25 feet, can be constructed, connecting this large body of water with the ocean; and

Whereas the development of this project would afford the revenue cutters in the coast protection a commanding position of the entire coast of southern Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and the Navy, in case of

foreign war, a key to Long Island Sound and Narragansett Bay and the rivers and tributaries thereof:

Be it therefore resolved, That the general assembly of Rhode Island respectfully and urgently request the United States Government to protect the interest of the State and town by completing this project of national importance, and to appropriate the necessary amount therefor.

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State be, and they hereby are, requested to use their best efforts to secure the development of this project, and to procure the necessary appropriation by Congress for such purpose.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to forward a copy of the above preamble and resolutions to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
Office of the Secretary of State:

PROVIDENCE, *January 28, 1896.*

I certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a resolution passed by the general assembly of said State on the 28th day of January, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid the date and year first above written.

CHARLES P. BENNETT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CALL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a petition numerously signed by citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for the passage of a law securing to the manufacturers of the Northwest the patronage of the United States for all goods used by the Government in each and every department on the Pacific Coast. The petitioners call attention to the fact that there are no goods used at any of the Indian agencies or at any of the Government posts but which can be, as a matter of fact, manufactured on the Pacific Coast and purchased there at a lower figure than many of such supplies which are now being purchased in the Eastern market. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a memorial of sundry brewers of the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the increasing of the tax on malt beer; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of aldermen of Hood River, Oreg., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Republican Club of Clatskanie, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Clatskanie River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Scappoose, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting appropriations for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Davenport, Iowa, praying for the speedy construction of the Hennepin Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa Academy of Science, praying for the enactment of legislation which will protect our forests from destruction and secure them for the use of the people of the United States in the present and in the future; which was referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented the petition of Samuel Strauss and sundry other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and a petition of sundry citizens of Missouri Valley, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the memorial of John Cowdon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation appropriating money to test the plan for arch bridges 300 or more feet long; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oneida, Ill., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Sarah D. La Fetra, president, and 300 other members of the Help and Hope Mission of Washington, D. C., and a petition of the Ministerial Association of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent from 16 to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the city council of Puyallup, Wash., and a petition of the city council of Centralia, Wash., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the New York Produce Exchange, praying for the passage of House bill No. 3010, regulating the manufacture and sale of an article called "filled cheese"; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

TRANSPORTATION OF MEN IN THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE presented a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, dated January 27, 1896, requesting that a clause be inserted in the naval appropriation bill amending the act of March 3, 1879, for the transportation of men in the Army over certain land-grant and bond-aided railroads, so as to make its terms applicable to the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. MORRILL. I am instructed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency, to report it with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italics, and also to amend the title so that it will read as follows: "An act to provide for the free coinage of silver, and for other purposes."

Mr. President, I am disposed to say somewhat, as the proclamations in Massachusetts end, "God save the Commonwealth." I will add what perhaps it is unnecessary for me to say, that I was not in favor of the action of a majority of the Committee on Finance. I shall endeavor to bring up the bill to-morrow, unless it shall interfere with appropriation bills.

Mr. QUAY. I ask that the amendment be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported as a substitute by the Committee on Finance will be read.

The SECRETARY. The committee report to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coined value; and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. QUAY. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I second the motion.

Mr. SHERMAN and others. Question!

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, are we not upon the order of the presentation of reports in the morning business? The question might come up on motion when we reach the order of resolutions, but not at this particular time.

Mr. QUAY. Do I understand that the Senator from New York objects to my motion at the present time?

Mr. HILL. I was suggesting a parliamentary inquiry as to whether it is in order.

Mr. QUAY. Of course it is in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point made by the Senator from New York, that the motion can not be entertained at this time.

Mr. QUAY. Then I understand distinctly that the Senator from New York makes the point that the motion I have just now made is not in order.

Mr. HILL. The point has already been made and sustained by the Chair, and I decline to discuss it further.

Mr. QUAY. Then I ask unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

Mr. HILL. There is objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. HOAR. May the request be stated before objection is heard? I have not yet heard the request. I should like to have it stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania state his request in full?

Mr. QUAY. I request the unanimous consent of the Senate to entertain a motion to recommit the bill as reported from the Committee on Finance with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions.

Mr. HILL. To that I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1693) for the rebuilding or repair of the public wharf at Sitka, Alaska, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1865) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls in their respective Departments, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1480) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1106) to place Lieut. Col. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to John Nichols, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 522) for the relief of George Hughes, of Portland, Oreg., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Joseph R. West, brigadier and brevet major-general, United States Army Volunteers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WILSON. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation, to report it with an amendment, and submit a report thereon.

The bill is the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs; it is favorably recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. It is a local matter of great importance to my State; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be now put upon its passage.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall have no objection to its consideration after the morning business is through.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. WILSON. I shall seek to call up the bill for consideration as soon as the morning business is closed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Meanwhile the bill will lie upon the table.

Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Quin ne mo se, an Indian, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1631) granting a pension to Emeline Filgate;

A bill (S. 1787) granting a pension to Nancy T. Duncklee;

A bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Bradford;

A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Rhoda Chick;

A bill (S. 651) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham; and

A bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Ellen Ewing, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Ewing.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus C. Ingalls, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Hans Johnson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. MCMILLAN), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1247) to establish and provide for the maintenance of a free public library and reading room in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. MCMILLAN), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1513) to regulate the use of the public parks and improved reservations in the District of Columbia under the charge of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. MCMILLAN), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1780) to provide for the erection of a wall around the jail of the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1279) granting a pension to Richardson M. Penn, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 616) granting a pension to Matilda Gresham, widow of the late Walter Q. Gresham, at the rate of $200 per month, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 612) for the relief of William Van Dresser, alias James Johnson, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1825) to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TELLER. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, to report it with amendments and to submit a report thereon. I give notice that I shall call up the bill for action to-morrow if practicable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments and submit a report thereon. I desire to give notice that at an early day I shall ask the consideration of the bill by the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 646) for the relief of Francis Brown, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Catherine Smith, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 705) granting a pension to Emily B. Muncey, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1012) to prevent the desecration of the national flag, to report it back favorably, with an amendment. I desire to be permitted to say for myself that while

I voted in committee for this report in order that the matter, which is interesting so many people, might come before the Senate, the more I think of it the more there seems to be in the way of objection to any legislation upon the subject. I do not wish to have it understood that I shall support the bill even in its amended form in the Senate. It is a very difficult thing to deal with, and whether it would not be better to leave it to the good taste and good sense of private citizens I very much question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. McBRIDE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 509) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 306) for the relief of Thomas Chambers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 72) for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Choteau, Harrison & Valle, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1846) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon to Custer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Leavenworth, Kans., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 246) granting a pension to Nancy Carson Blunt, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 247) granting a pension to Wallace McGrath, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 728) to compensate Elihu Root for services rendered by direction of the Attorney-General, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 718) subjecting national banks to the usury laws of the States where they are located, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance; which was agreed to.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TELLER. That is a House bill, and I ask unanimous consent to put it on its passage. It has the approval of the Department.

Mr. TURPIE. I prefer that we shall proceed in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1013) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, to report it favorably with an amendment. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this House bill. It relieves some settlers upon the public lands of South Dakota, and the time will expire this month for many of them unless the bill becomes a law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

Mr. TURPIE. I very much prefer that we shall proceed in regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Humphries, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 719) to restore a pension to Harriet M. Knowlton, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 819) granting a pension to Catherine O'Leary, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893, reported it without amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3265) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Stone River Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3982) granting to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hope Valley, R. I., one condemned cannon; also, to the Woman's Relief Corps, of Taylorville, Ill., four condemned cannon and four condemned cannon balls for the purpose of decorating a soldiers' monument lately erected there by said corps; and, also, to the town of Newton, in the State of New Jersey, four pieces of condemned cannon and twenty cannon balls for the decoration of the new soldiers and sailors' monument in that town, reported it without amendment.

ADALINE V. BASSETT.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution submitted by Mr. GORMAN on the 21st ultimo, reported it without amendment:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Adaline V. Bassett, widow of Isaac Bassett, deceased, late assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's salary at the rate allowed by law to said assistant doorkeeper, out of the "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate; said payment to be considered as in lieu of all funeral expenses or other allowances.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER on the 23d ultimo, reported it without amendment:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, in making the inquiry concerning the prices of armor for naval vessels under the resolution of the Senate of December 31, 1895, be authorized to employ stenographers and to send for persons and papers, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid upon proper vouchers from the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

IMPRISONMENT OF EUGENE V. DEBS.

Mr. HILL. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] in reference to imprisonment for contempt. The committee report in favor of the passage of the resolution as amended. If there is no objection, it might as well be acted upon now as at any other time.

Mr. VOORHEES. When we get through with the morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. Not now; I will wait until further on.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. CALL that a special committee of seven Senators be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs, etc.

Mr. GEORGE and others. What is the amendment?

Mr. HILL. Several Senators ask that the amended resolution be read. It is presented as a substitute.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred Senate resolution No. 83, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to report the following amendment as a substitute therefor, namely:

"*Resolved*, That the Judiciary Committee is hereby directed to investigate the law upon the whole subject of 'contempts of court' as enforced by the Federal courts, and report to the Senate whether any additional legislation is necessary for the protection of the rights of citizens; and if so, to report such legislation."

And that the same, so amended, ought to pass.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1867) granting a pension to Jesse L. Knight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1868) granting a pension to William S. Hinckley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1869) granting a pension to James Radley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1870) granting a pension to Lewis Hans; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1871) to provide for the punishment of offenses on the high seas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 1872) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange in behalf of the United States the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., now belonging to the United States, and held for light-house purposes, with the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company for any other tract or parcel of land in said county equally well or better adapted to use for light-house purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 1873) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CANNON introduced a bill (S. 1874) to annex a certain portion of Arizona Territory to the State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1875) for the relief of Edward A. Foote, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Artillery; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1876) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1877) for the relief of Bvt. Capt. James D. Vernay; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1878) for the relief of Benjamin F. Fox; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1879) for the relief of Martha E. Flesschert; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1880) to increase the pension of Thomas J. Haughey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1881) granting a pension to Lydia Chapman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1882) granting a pension to Mary Selbach, widow of John Selbach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1883) to grant a pension to Charlotte O. Van Cleve, widow of Gen. Horatio P. Van Cleve; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1884) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1885) for optional and compulsory retirement of Government employees of Executive Departments in the classified service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PRITCHARD (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1886) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1887) granting a pension to Minerva Sample; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to William T. Walker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1889) granting a pension to Matthew C. Read; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Williamson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1891) for the relief of James Petty; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1892) granting increase of pensions to Wilson W. Brown and others; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1893) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Shepherd King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1894) removing the charge of desertion from the name of William Wickham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1895) for the relief of George H. Wells; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1896) granting a pension to S. W. Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1897) to establish a classification division in the United States Patent Office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1898) granting a pension to Mrs. Marietta Hayes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1899) granting a pension to F. F. Callender; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1900) for the relief of Richard E. Hayden; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1901) to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to control sleeping cars, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1902) granting a pension to Jennie E. Burch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1903) for the relief of Louis Mazawakinyena, Louis De Coteau, and James W. Lynd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1904) to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1905) for the relief of George F. Anderson, of Jefferson County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1906) in relation to the pay of Rear-Admiral Roger N. Stembel, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1907) for the relief of William L. Orr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1908) for the appointment of Frank M. Marshall as lieutenant on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1909) to provide for permanent fortifications and a system of torpedo defense at Cape Henry, Virginia, and Cape Charles, Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1910) to authorize the admission into the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of veterans of the war of 1812 and of the Mexican war who subsequently entered the service of the Confederate States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1911) to fix the salary of the collector of customs for the district of Newport News, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1912) to widen, deepen, and improve the channel of Elizabeth River, Virginia, from Hampton Roads to the Norfolk Navy-Yard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1913) for the relief of Louisa S. Guthrie, widow and executrix of John J. Guthrie, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1914) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a public building in

the city of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia," approved January 2, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1915) for the relief of the residuary legatees of Mark Davis, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1916) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of William B. Isaacs & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 1917) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Bridge, of Pasco County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1918) granting a pension to John White; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1919) to relieve vessels from seizure in admiralty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1920) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1921) granting a pension to Jerusha H. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1922) creating an art commission of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1923) granting to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., the right to lease and use for public purposes Sibley Island, an island in the Missouri River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1924) granting a pension to Carrie L. Yeaton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1925) authorizing a special election to be held by the citizens of the District of Columbia to determine whether the present municipal government shall continue or whether there shall be established in its place a representative form of government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. MCMILLAN) introduced a bill (S. 1926) to abolish grade crossings in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. MCMILLAN) introduced a bill (S. 1927) to increase the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1928) to create a second division of the southern district of California for judicial purposes, and to fix the time for holding court therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1929) for the relief of William H. Crook; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1930) for the relief of the personal representatives of James Rhodes, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1931) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph Sierra, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1932) for the relief of William H. Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1933) granting a pension to Margaret Hoctor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1934) granting an increase of pension to Henry Slaughter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 1935) providing for a commission to negotiate with the Crow and Flathead Indians for the cession of portions of their respective reservations in the State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 1936) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1937) for the relief of Capt. George W. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1938) allowing Isaiah Mitchell, of Denver, Colo., ten years within which to make a final homestead entry upon certain land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1939) to provide for the allotment of lands to Indians without changing their tribal relations, and to authorize the leasing of Indian lands in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CALL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1940) to retire certain army officers, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1941) to continue the navigable inland waterway along the Atlantic coast to Florida as a coast defense in time of war and a safe and convenient channel for our domestic commerce at all times; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 66) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of the several States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TURPIE. I give notice that upon Thursday next, immediately after the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour, I shall ask, by the courtesy of the Senate, to submit certain remarks upon the subject-matter of the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 67) providing for the printing of 15,000 copies of the Bulletin on Apiculture; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 68) for the relief of James P. Veach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CALL (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 69) authorizing the preparation of a subject catalogue of the books in the law library; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 70) authorizing the preparation of a subject catalogue of the books in the law library; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DUES TO ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1198) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE AT 2 O'CLOCK.

Mr. HALE. I intended to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill at the close of the routine morning business; but I have been appealed to by several Senators who desire to go to the Calendar. I therefore give notice that at 2 o'clock, or about 2 o'clock, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of that appropriation bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to give notice that at 2 o'clock I shall ask the Senate to consider the resolution which is on the table proposing to distribute the appropriation bills of the Senate among various committees of the Senate.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. QUAY. I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The resolution will go over, under the rule.

PURCHASE OF ANALOSTAN ISLAND.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, directed to inquire into the propriety of purchasing Analostan Island for the erection of a contagious hospital, and for such other purposes as the Government may require.

PROPOSED TARIFF RATES.

Mr. STEWART. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the Senate an estimate of the probable increase of the revenue if bill H. R. 2749, entitled "A bill to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency," should become a law; and what would be the duty per pound in United States money on the different grades of imported wool according to the present market price; and is the proposed duty on wool provided for in said bill sufficient to compensate for or correspond with the increased duties proposed on woolen goods.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the information asked for?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not understand the first part of it. I ask that it be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the resolution will go over, under the rule.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.

Mr. PROCTOR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

Mr. WILSON. If in order, I renew my request for unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1591.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator later. Resolutions, concurrent or other, are still in order.

PENSION STATISTICS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a series of resolutions of inquiry, and as I think there will be no objection to them I will ask for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Whereas there are certain pension measures now pending before the Senate Committee on Pensions upon which such information as can be furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions should be placed at the disposal of Congress, and in order that there may be established from the records of the Pension Office some reliable estimate of the mortality rate of pensioners: Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to furnish the Senate, at the earliest possible moment, the statistics and information which the records of the Pension Office disclose, from the 1st day of July, 1895, to the 1st day of January, 1896, of invalid pensioners pensioned under the general law, showing the total number of names on the roll July 1, 1895, and January 1, 1896, and the number of deaths which have occurred during that period in each classification or grade of such pensions.

Second. The same information relative to pensions granted under the act of June 27, 1890.

Third. The same information relative to widow pensioners under each act, which latter shall include under a separate classification all extinctions of title for pensions from death, remarriage, or abandonment.

Fourth. The same information as regards dependent pensioners under each act except that of June 27, 1890.

Fifth. Statistics with regard to each class of pensioners under acts granting pensions to survivors and their widows under Mexican and Indian wars and the war of 1812.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate, at the earliest possible moment, a statistical statement, showing the number of pension certificates issued during the six months ended January 1, 1896, classifying the same as originals of each class and reissues of each class, showing whether increases or reductions, increased pensions or any other classification usually observed, and also statistics showing the suspension and other stopping of pensions from causes other than deaths or extinction of title by remarriage, covering each class of pensions under each class of acts separately.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that his resolutions are in an unusual form, in the fact that they require the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the information to the committee. Let them require the Secretary to furnish the information to the Senate for the use of the committee, and then they will be in accordance with the uniform rule on the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will accept that suggestion. While I am on my feet, I will state that I observe the last resolution requests the Secretary. I ask that the word "requested" be changed to "directed."

Mr. HARRIS. Let it read "directed."

Mr. GALLINGER. I will likewise accept the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolutions as modified?

Mr. PALMER. As the resolutions are somewhat complex and cover a great deal of ground, I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions to allow them to lie over and be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF MAIL BAG REPAIR DIVISION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. KYLE January 28, 1896:

Whereas the character of the wages, work, discipline, and hours of labor in the mail-bag-repair division of the Government Post-Office Department have been severely condemned by the Washington Times, a reputable newspaper published in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is also alleged by this newspaper that Government mail bags are made by contract convict labor, and that there are also various irregularities in the fulfillment and payments of awards as well as irregularities in other contracts pertaining to the work of this division: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby directed to investigate these charges and report thereon to this body at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is not a matter of very great importance, but on Thursday last the Senate in the morning hour was considering a joint resolution in regard to the distribution of seeds. I asked before the expiration of the morning hour that it might go over without losing its place, in order that I might speak upon it to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Missouri to ask unanimous consent that that joint resolution be taken from the Calendar for consideration?

Mr. VEST. I have no disposition to take any advantage or to displace the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KYLE. I believe my resolution has the right of way.

Mr. VEST. I have merely called attention to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to make some remarks upon the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I had hoped that the Senator from South Dakota, who offered this resolution, would have somewhat changed its form before he asked the Senate to pass upon it. As I understand the Senator in his remarks, the facts which he submitted to the Senate to justify its action in passing the resolution directing an investigation of the indefinite and uncertain allegations made in the resolution, were based not upon any information or personal knowledge possessed by him, but entirely, and almost exclusively, I may say, upon rumors which were embodied in articles appearing in one of the newspapers in the city of Washington, and I believe some letters which he had received from persons claiming to be employees of the repair bag shop of the Post-Office Department. I had hoped that he would change the form of the resolution so that it would simply call upon the Post-Office Department for information as to these allegations, and make the allegations themselves more definite and specific than they appear in the resolution.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator agree to the resolution with a modification?

Mr. FAULKNER. I think it would be proper for me to agree to it, for I am satisfied, after a most thorough investigation, that if such a resolution were passed by the Senate the official information which would be conveyed to this body from the Post-Office Department would settle completely, finally, and definitely every allegation set forth or charged by inference or otherwise in the resolution as drawn and offered by the Senator from South Dakota. With reference to the question of wages, to the question of work, of discipline, and of the hours of labor, every one of them, in my judgment, would be answered officially by the Department, showing conclusively that nothing which has been stated in the press or in the letters addressed to the Senator has any real foundation in fact.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he knows, as a matter of fact, that the Post-Office Department has investigated the charges made in the resolution, independent of the officer or officers who are chiefly in charge of the mail bag repair shop?

Mr. FAULKNER. I will state to the Senator from Nebraska that some of the charges contained by inference in the resolution, I believe, at one time were perhaps to a limited extent justified; but that was years ago, prior to the time when the present Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Nielson, came into office.

I will further state, in reply to the question of the Senator from Nebraska, that in July, 1894, when the present Second Assistant Postmaster-General entered upon the discharge of his duties, he found many things of which to complain as to the administration and discharge of the duties of the persons connected with the repair bag shop of the Post-Office Department, so much so that he at once conferred with the Postmaster-General, Mr. Bissell, then in charge of the Post-Office Department, and recommended the appointment of a commission of the most skilled and experienced officers of the Department to go into the whole subject and to make a thorough investigation as to what he considered bad administration in that particular bureau of the Department.

As soon as that commission was appointed, consisting of the best and most skilled and experienced men in the Department, it made a most thorough investigation of all the workings of the repair

shop and recommended a great many modifications in the operation and the administration of that particular bureau. For example, the commission found that it had been the custom to furnish the ladies who were working in that bureau with tea and crackers and cheese at lunch, the amount for those articles being paid from the fund which is derived from the sale of the old material in the office.

While the Second Assistant Postmaster-General was anxious to do everything he could to ameliorate the condition of labor in that office, he, at the same time, submitted to the officers of the Department who had charge of the question, and of the passing of vouchers, whether or not that was a proper legal expenditure under the law, and he was notified by the accounting officers that such an expenditure was entirely illegal and unjustifiable, and ought not to be permitted. He found that there was no one at that time who was responsible for the sale of old material. The head of the bureau would dispose of such material and account for it, of course—at least so far as the commission on investigation could trace it was properly accounted for; but it was an improper administration of the funds of the Government to allow anyone who was not a bonded officer of the Government to handle the public funds.

The commission of investigation appointed by the Postmaster-General reported to him that the only person who could make sales of this waste or worthless material was the disbursing bonded officer of the Department, who should do it in accordance with the provisions of law, after full advertisement, and be accountable under his bond for the amount received and for turning it properly into the Treasury, as the law required.

I can say to the Senator from South Dakota that since September, 1894, every dollar's worth of waste material from the bag repair workshop has been sold under the authority of the Post-Office Department, and been disposed of by the disbursing bonded officer of the Department after advertisement and at auction, the accounts being properly kept and the money turned into the Treasury.

Mr. President, what may have occurred prior to that time it is impossible for the officers now in charge of the Department to give any information about, but these irregularities in the administration of the bureau certainly existed in July, 1894, and have been corrected by those now in charge and responsible for the performance of the duties of the officers of the Post-Office Department from that time to this.

One thing that struck me as very surprising, and I admit it is a matter which should have been investigated if there had been any truth in it, was the statement by the Senator from South Dakota that the persons employed in the mail bag repairing shop of the Post-Office Department were receiving but from 40 to 60 cents a day. If that were so, it would not be fair compensation for a fair day's labor; some one was to blame for it; and certainly there should be a public exposure of such low wages paid by the Government for such disagreeable work. I am frank to say, as I stated, that it was a serious question, and one that should be looked into by the Senate. But I find that my friend from South Dakota is entirely mistaken in reference to that question. Up to September, I think, of the past year there were but five or seven—I do not remember which—sewing machines in the mail bag repair division.

They were put on as a matter of experiment. The Post-Office Department, in the investigation of the bureau, found that as to the patches sewed by hand the thread would ravel, the stitches at least would average some half an inch long, and the patches were very roughly put on. The Department was seeking some method by which it could have the patches put on more securely and at the same time could have the work coming from the bag division look better. The Department therefore introduced five or seven of these machines as an experiment. It was found that they did the work most admirably, and so in the latter part of last year the Department introduced 46 more of those machines. The ladies had been doing hand work, and they did not like to be transferred to the sewing-machine work, but they started in, I believe, on the 1st of last January, and the average work done by them was most excellent even from the very introduction of the experiment.

When the experiment was started, basing the wages upon what they considered fair, the Department fixed that the sewing-machine women should have 2 cents a bag for patching and 1 cent for darning, making 3 cents for the complete repair of a bag. That seemed to go along very well until about the middle of the month, when a committee of ladies waited upon the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Neilson, and urged him to do away with the machines. He told them that he did not think it was a fair test for the Department to stop so soon the experiment which had been made, and that he felt it was proper to continue the experiment longer to see how the work would turn out, say, to the end of the month. For three days after the visit of that committee, by some concert of action, the work of the mail bag repair division fell off to one-third of what had been the average work from the first to the middle of the month.

Nothing, however, was said in the Department in reference to this, and gradually the work reached the ordinary number of bags which it had been shown the machines and the employees were capable of doing in the first part of the month. So we find that from the 1st day of January the average number of bags repaired by a sewing-machine woman was 64 a day. At 2 cents a bag that would be $1.28 a day. We find at the end of the month that the average ran up to 80 bags a day, which would be $1.60. That is much larger wages than these ladies were getting under the former system adopted by the Department. The pay of the ladies in that bureau had been $35 a month. Some of them did a full day's work, some of them went beyond what would be a fair average amount of work, some of them who were being paid by the month fell off to a very small average of bags because they were not paid for the actual amount of work done, but by the month. In order to place all of these ladies working in the same room, in the same bureau, on a perfect plane of absolute equality, so that each could earn according to her own desire to labor, the system was changed to the piece system, so that those industrious, skilled, or otherwise could earn compensation for what they were able to do, and those who were not quite so skilled, or were new hands, would not of course receive the full compensation received by the best hands in the bureau. But their work will average fully up to 65 or 70 bags throughout the entire month, which gives a compensation which certainly is not one that can be excepted to by any Senator or by the country.

In order to satisfy myself, I went to the Post-Office Department and required the pay roll and the account of the work done per day to be shown to me personally, and when I saw the evidence of what those ladies were making daily and monthly and compared it with the compensation paid to the hard-worked women who are standing in the stores of this town at $3 or $4 a week, I felt, although that was not a very agreeable shop to work in, that I was glad that there were some women earning decent wages for the amount of labor which they were giving. I know nothing so hard upon the females in this town as standing for twelve hours behind the counters of the great stores at a compensation of from $3 to $4 a week.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to inquire if it is a fact that able-bodied, full-grown women are working in stores in this District for $3 or $4 a week?

Mr. FAULKNER. I have been so informed, and I will say, and the Senator will perhaps remember that we received the information when he and I at the same time were members of the committee who were making an investigation of the number of hours that women stood behind counters in the stores, and a bill was reported and passed the Senate—whether it became a law or not I do not remember—requiring employers to furnish stools to be used by the women behind the counters, so that they might rest themselves during the hours when they were not actively employed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I think that very beneficent measure did become a law. It was opposed by some of those very men who are now oppressing these women, as the Senator suggests. I do not know whether or not the statute is being observed, but I fear not. Matters are worse than I supposed as regards women employed in stores in this District. I did not imagine that any merchant in the city of Washington could ask or would ask a woman to work for $3 or $4 a week. If it is so, certainly some means ought to be adopted to make it otherwise, if possible.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will simply say, in conclusion, on the question of wages, that if the Senator would so modify or change the resolution as to call for the information from the Department, he would find that the amount of compensation paid those ladies this month, when the experiment has actually been made, is better on an average than the amount paid under the old system of $35 a month. It has worked out in that way, and it is demonstrating its effectiveness, both in the amount paid to the wage earner who is willing to work and in the interest of the Department.

A great deal has been said about the bags being in an uncleanly and filthy condition, having cats, etc., in them. Mr. President, that is utterly impossible under the system adopted there, and I saw the operation of it. The bags are all thoroughly inspected before they are sent to the repair shop, where these ladies are at work. One of the recommendations of the commission appointed in July, 1894, to which I have referred, was that the Government was being imposed upon by requiring bags that were almost absolutely worthless to be patched, which was a loss to the Government itself. The result was that the commission recommended to the Postmaster-General to appoint more inspectors as to the character of the bags that were sent to the repair shops where the patches were put on by these ladies. The result of that recommendation was that additional inspectors were put on, and they

eliminated from the bags that had previously been required to be patched thousands of bags which they regarded as too thoroughly destroyed by decay or filth to be sent into the Department, and for that reason indirectly enabled these ladies, by giving them bags requiring less repair, an opportunity to repair more bags than they could have done under the old system.

If the Senator had read the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General to the Postmaster-General, filed in July, 1895, he would have found there a recommendation for the appropriation of $40,000 additional, with a view not only to meet the increased demand of the Post-Office Department for bags, but that more of the thoroughly worn-out bags, which the Department had been patching, even when they were almost falling apart, might be destroyed. I believe in the House of Representatives the Postmaster-General has succeeded in getting that additional appropriation.

Another thing I wish to state to the Senate, and I think it is well the Senator should know it if he has not gone through this bureau. I thought there might be a hardship on the part of these ladies working the sewing machines until I ascertained that the power applied to the working of the machines is steam power. I found long arms arranged on the machines so that the ladies do not have to hold the bags up, but they are held up by mechanical appliances, and the entire power applied to the machines is steam; so there really is nothing to do but to put the bags upon this arm, and even the pieces for patching are brought to the ladies without their moving from the position they occupy in doing the work, not of the exact size, it is true, but small pieces from which they cut the proper sizes to patch the holes. It is true they have very disagreeable work to do, but I think it is but fair, after all the discussion which has taken place with reference to this matter, that these statements should be made.

This is not a very cleanly occupation for anyone; it is intensely disagreeable. Everyone who has watched the great, fast lightning express trains going through this country, with the system they have at inferior stations of throwing off the mail by hand, will understand that the mail bags must become dusty and filthy; it is utterly unavoidable; and we shall either have to establish a laundry here in Washington for the purpose of washing the bags, or those who are engaged in patching them will necessarily have to be subjected to some inconvenience and discomfort. Everyone is informed of that when applying for one of these positions.

I wish to state from my inspection of the building that it is perhaps as good a building, as well arranged with all the appliances that could be suggested for the comfort of persons engaged in an occupation so disagreeable, as could well be devised. The plumbing, I think, is almost the best I have seen in the city of Washington, or as good as any, and I may say it has just recently been completed. There are nice retiring rooms for the ladies to change their street costumes for those in which they work during the hours that the Department requires them to be engaged in this business. That is for the purpose of not taking a nice, good, presentable dress that the ladies wear upon the street and bringing it in contact in any way with the dust and dirt incident to this occupation. They have retiring rooms now to change their apparel, so that when they go out in the evening they go out with their fresh dresses looking as respectable as I have no doubt all the ladies are. Every suggestion that I have been able to think of for the comfort of the ladies engaged in such an occupation has been furnished by the Department.

There was some remark made with reference to indignities heaped upon the ladies. I can find nothing suggested in the articles quoted by the Senator from South Dakota or in any remarks he has made that implies any indignities whatever, and therefore I shall merely pass over that suggestion in the resolution, because nothing has been said or could be said, in my judgment, in reference to heaping indignities upon those ladies.

With respect to the question of hours, I will state that there is a law which fixes that. The hours of labor in the Departments are eight, and they are eight in this bureau. Under the law they have no right to work beyond eight hours, and during that time the employees of course have a half hour for the purpose of obtaining lunch.

The only other proposition which I remember to have been stated by the Senator from South Dakota is with reference to convict labor. In the remarks of the Senator he seemed to imply that the Department employs convict labor in the making of these bags, but of course I suppose it was merely a slip of the tongue, as the authority upon which he bases his statement distinctly stated that the contractors with the Department employed convict labor. Every contract for bags that is being carried out under this Administration was made under a former Administration. I do not mean to criticise the Post-Office Department under the former Administration in making those contracts, because I assert, as a question of law, that the Post-Office Department could not have controlled the question even had the officers known the fact that the lowest responsible bidder employed convict labor.

Sir, four years ago this question was brought to the attention of Congress. A resolution was brought into Congress urging the proposition that in awarding contracts after advertisement the officers of the Department should refuse to give the contract to the lowest responsible bidder even, if credibly informed that he contemplated using convict labor in the execution of the contract. Congress, for some reason, did not deem it proper to pass the resolution and embody it in the form of a law, but left standing upon the statute books the sole and only limitation or control, at least, of the officers, which requires that they shall advertise for a given length of time and then shall give the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.

Although those contracts were made under a former Administration and run for four years, I can not say that I could even cast any reflection or utter any criticism upon the action of those officers in the execution of the law. It is for Congress to determine the question, and Congress is the forum where that question must be determined and instructions given in reference to it. I think that is recognized even by the paper which makes this attack. It makes no criticism upon the Department in making the contract, but appeals to Congress, which is the proper forum to which the appeal should be made, that a law shall be passed governing and regulating and controlling this matter.

I would have no objection whatever to a resolution, if it is deemed proper by the Senator from South Dakota, asking for official information in relation to all these questions. If not, and he would force the Senate to pass a resolution giving directions, I would feel it my duty to go further than I have gone and to lay many facts before the Senate that I thought proper not to do when merely making a brief, but as I hope complete statement upon the different points suggested by the Senator in his remarks, with the hope expressed at the time that the resolution would be so modified as to call for this information officially from the Department.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, as it now lacks but five minutes till 2 o'clock it is impossible for me to reply to the Senator from West Virginia. He has certainly made a very plausible statement from his point of view.

I wish to state that I have no criticism whatever to make of the present Postmaster-General, who is a man held in the highest esteem by all parties in both branches of Congress; but I believe there is something wrong in the mail bag repair bureau of the Post-Office Department. There can not be so much smoke without some fire. When all those girls come by committees to members of the Senate and implore us to take up the matter, there must be something wrong.

I have letters from numbers of the girls. Of course the Senator from West Virginia presents here, by way of rebuttal, the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. He gets the report from Mr. Tyler, his next assistant, who gets information from the superintendent of this bureau, whoever he is.

I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the reliability of the evidence, but I do not think I will take the statements of the present superintendent of that department. I have a statement, Mr. President, from the forelady in charge of all the girls, which directly contradicts the statements made by the Senator from West Virginia, and this woman is nearer to the hearts of the girls and knows more of their complaints than any other person in the office.

The Senator has stated a good deal about the sanitary condition of the building and the pleasant surroundings of the girls, etc.; does he know of the fact that it is a common occurrence to have the police patrol wagon driven to the back of the building for the purpose of receiving fainting working girls? I have letters here stating that that is a common occurrence—a regular sweat-shop practice.

Mr. FAULKNER. I can only state that the records of the last month do not show that to have been the case, because I do not find that any of the ladies have not made day's wages. I do not know what it was before, but I have the pay roll for this month, and I do not find that any of them have lost a half day.

Mr. KYLE. I will read a part of the letter of the forelady of the shop. She says:

After the bags were inspected for repairs the select work was given to the women to be repaired, and they made about 80 cents per day, but since the exposure in the Times of this terrible sweat shop and its cruelties they yesterday increased the pay of the darners one-quarter of a cent.

That is since the discussion in the Senate.

Mr. FAULKNER. I neglected to state that the pay of the darners was increased some four days ago, and it was based upon the fact that the experiments demonstrated that the darners were not getting so much wages as they did under the former system. In order to give them the full wages that they received under the former system the wages were increased, this simply being an experiment during the present month to test the fact as to what is the proper wages to pay.

Mr. KYLE. I will read the rest of the letter.

The rest of the workers get about the same as they have been getting. Remember, also, that up to the time of the exposure they only had a limited amount of work, which reduced their pay to 70 or 80 cents per day. Now they

make some more. Yesterday some of the most expert women employed there, stick as hard as they were able, could not, with all their skill, earn $1.50 per day, and the majority of them much less, and so it goes.

I have numbers of statements from those women. There are a few who I am informed are very strong and able-bodied women. These are able to do an extraordinary amount of work, which makes the average much greater. The majority of the girls, and they are very respectable girls, are not able to earn more than $26 or $27 a month, according to their own testimony.

Mr. FAULKNER. I should like to know the name of any one of those ladies.

Mr. HARRIS. Inasmuch as there seems to be a difference between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from South Dakota as to the exact facts in the case, each Senator doubtless and unquestionably stating the facts exactly as he understands them, had not the Senator from South Dakota better reform his resolution so as to require the Postmaster-General to give to the Senate the precise facts in respect to these matters?

Mr. KYLE. Not if he allows the superintendent to make the report. I believe it would be entirely an ex parte report.

Mr. HARRIS. I should be glad to know of the Senator how we are to get facts in respect to departmental services unless we take them from the heads of the respective Departments. We can not go into the details as to how the head of a Department is to ascertain every detail of the service, but when we have the assurance of the head of the Department it would be a state of facts upon which I at least would base my action.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to see an investigation by the Post-Office Committee, and the report brought before the Senate. It is stated upon the authority of one of the members of the House of Representatives, who is interested in an employee in that office, that the boss there chased him around the room with a razor in his hand.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator permit me to explain that matter?

Mr. KYLE. I do not presume the Senator knows anything about it.

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, I do. I inquired about it, because I saw that the Senator from South Dakota had so stated in an interview; and I have the official statement in reference to it.

Mr. KYLE. I presume that is on the books.

Mr. FAULKNER. No; but I have the names of four witnesses to prove the correctness of my statement. The foreman of that bureau is somewhat of an actor, and during the lunch recess he had a sword in his hand, and I believe he went through some of the actions of a theatrical character, which he assumed at the time for the amusement of those ladies. A colored preacher from Georgia, who was appointed as a messenger or a laborer in that office upon the recommendation of the gentleman to whom the Senator refers, became very much frightened when he saw him in this attitude, and he at once ran away. But two days afterwards, with the distinguished gentleman who had secured his appointment, he came back and said that he wanted to go home to preach the gospel, and asked that his son should be substituted in his place, which was done. That is how the story originated, and all these statements are based on about the same evidence.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived——

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. KYLE. I ask what becomes of the resolution?

Mr. FAULKNER. It goes to the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the Calendar under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;*

A bill (H. R. 1691) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 2917) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay, from their own funds, for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians; and

A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Maine to allow me to ask unanimous consent that the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations may be made the regular order for to-morrow. They can be laid aside temporarily whenever appropriation bills are presented.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to that course. I do not want to make any agreement, however, that will in any way interfere with the appropriation bills which have the right of way. It is very desirable that we shall go on and consider the urgent deficiency appropriation bill and pass it. The Committee on Appropriations now have four bills before the Senate, and we desire to pass them all this week. I wish to get the urgent deficiency appropriation bill out of the way to-day or to-morrow; perhaps to-day. If the Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent it must be subject to the appropriation bills.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

Mr. CALL. I make the request in that way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GRAY. I ask the Senator from Florida whether, if unanimous consent is granted, it will displace the appropriation bill to which the Senator from Maine refers?

Mr. CALL. Certainly not.

Mr. HALE. Subject to appropriation bills.

Mr. GRAY. Or whether upon the determination of that matter the appropriation bill will resume its place?

Mr. HALE. Subject to all appropriation bills. Let the Senator from Florida make his proposition subject to all appropriation bills.

Mr. CALL. That is the proposition I make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. DUBOIS. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Idaho will withdraw his objection.

Mr. DUBOIS (to Mr. HALE). Allow me to make a statement.

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for a statement.

Mr. DUBOIS. I trust the Senate will not take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill at this time. There is a resolution pending to distribute the appropriation bills among the various committees of this body. I desire to make that resolution the unfinished business. If the motion of the Senator from Maine is voted down and the resolution to distribute the appropriation bills to committees is taken up and made the unfinished business, I shall at once yield to him in order that he may secure the passage of the urgent deficiency bill. But what I desire is to have a vote of the Senate as to whether they wish to have the appropriation bills distributed among various committees of the Senate.

I think the Senate is entitled to have a vote on that question, and that is the reason why seemingly I antagonize the appropriation bill, although, as I said, I shall yield at once after my resolution is made the unfinished business. I think no one cares to debate it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The debate is proceeding by unanimous consent. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine to proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. I will take the sense of the Senate on proceeding

to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. If the Senate votes that motion down after the statement of the Senator from Idaho that he desires the other matter, the distribution of appropriation bills, to be made the unfinished business, then, of course, his matter will come up and we shall have a vote upon it. But I will take the sense of the Senate now upon proceeding to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. I call for a division.

Mr. HALE. We may as well have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH answered to his name.

Mr. PEFFER. Allow me to ask a parliamentary question. What will be the business next in order if the motion is voted down?

Mr. ALDRICH. Debate is out of order.

Mr. MORRILL. There has been a response to the roll-call.

Mr. PEFFER. I simply ask what will be the next business in order if the motion is voted down?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar under Rule IX will be the regular order. The roll call will be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. ELKINS's name was called). I am informed by the Senator from Vermont that were my colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] present, he would vote "nay" on this question. I am paired with him on this proposition, and therefore withhold my vote. I should vote "yea" were I at liberty to vote.

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. Does his colleague know how he would vote on this question if present?

Mr. QUAY. I really have no authority to state my colleague's position. I presume that he would vote "yea," but I have no authority to say so, and I can give no assurance.

Mr. WALTHALL. I should vote "yea" if I were at liberty to vote.

Mr. WHITE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] to the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN (after having voted in the negative). I would not imagine that this is a question upon which Senators need pair at all, but as Senators seem to be regarding their pairs and as I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], I withdraw my vote, because I do not know how the Senator from Nebraska would vote if present.

Mr. FRYE. I am informed that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], with whom I am paired, would vote "yea" if present. Therefore I shall vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Aldrich,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Vest,
Allison,	Gray,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Call,	Hale,	Perkins,	Warren,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Platt,	Wetmore.
Cullom,	Hoar,	Quay,	
Frye,	Lindsay,	Sherman,	
Gear,	Mitchell, Wis.	Teller,	

NAYS—44.

Allen,	Carter,	Kyle,	Pettigrew,
Bacon,	Chilton,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Baker,	Clark,	McBride,	Pugh,
Bate,	Davis,	Mantle,	Roach,
Berry,	Dubois,	Martin,	Sewell,
Blanchard,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Smith,
Brown,	George,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Burrows,	Gordon,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Caffery,	Hill,	Pasco,	White,
Cannon,	Jones, Nev.	Peffer,	Wilson.

NOT VOTING—20.

Blackburn,	Elkins,	Jones, Ark.	Squire,
Brice,	Faulkner,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Murphy,	Tillman,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	Walthall,
Daniel,	Irby,	Shoup,	Wolcott.

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. DUBOIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution on the Table Calendar numbered 2.

Mr. CALL. Before that motion is put I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho, if he will allow me——

Mr. DUBOIS. I should like to make the resolution the unfinished business, and then I will yield very cheerfully to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HALE. It becomes the unfinished business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state the motion of the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Florida can then be heard. The title of the resolution indicated by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Table Calendar, Order of Business 2. Amendment proposed by Mr. DUBOIS to paragraph 1, Rule XVI, of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. DUBOIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has addressed the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the resolution be read for information.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to request the Senator from Idaho to allow the Cuban resolution to come up, inasmuch as the resolution he has moved will provoke a great deal of discussion.

Mr. DUBOIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which has just been stated.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the resolution be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Pending that, the Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. What is the request?

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. DUBOIS December 5, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the words "All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce," and inserting the following:

"The general appropriation bills shall be referred to committees as follows:

"To the Committee on Appropriations: The bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, and for all deficiencies;

"To the Committee on Agriculture: The bill for the Agricultural Department;

"To the Committee on Foreign Relations: The consular and diplomatic bill;

"To the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill for the military establishment, including the Military Academy;

"To the Committee on Naval Affairs: The bill for the naval establishment;

"To the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads: The Post-Office appropriation bill;

"To the Committee on Indian Affairs: The bill for Indians and Indian tribes;

"To the Committee on Commerce: The bill for rivers and harbors;

"To the Committee on Coast Defenses: The fortifications bill;

"To the Committee on the District of Columbia: The bill making appropriations for the District; and

"To the Committee on Pensions: The pension appropriation bills."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which has been read.

Mr. QUAY. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. ALLISON answered to their names.

Mr. VEST. What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution which has been read.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Idaho if, in the event this motion prevails, he intends to go on with the consideration of the resolution to-day?

Mr. DUBOIS. I am very glad to answer that question. I stated before the Senator came in, I think——

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I think all this proceeding is out of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is out of order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BERRY. The Secretary had begun to call the roll and responses had been given.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

Mr. DUBOIS. I should like to make a statement, if the Senator will allow me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That can only be done by unanimous consent. Objection is made, and the roll call will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when his name was called). I am paired with

the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP]. I will transfer my pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] is paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]. I think both my colleague and the junior Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 24; as follows:

YEAS—49.

Allen,	Chilton,	McBride,	Pugh,
Bacon,	Clark,	Mantle,	Roach,
Baker,	Daniel,	Martin,	Sewell,
Bate,	Davis,	Mills,	Sherman,
Berry,	Dubois,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Gallinger	Morgan,	Turpie,
Brown,	George,	Nelson,	Vilas,
Burrows,	Gordon,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Pasco,	White,
Caffery,	Hill,	Peffer,	Wilson.
Cannon,	Kyle,	Pettigrew,	
Carter,	Lindsay,	Pritchard,	
Chandler,	Lodge,	Proctor,	

NAYS—24.

Aldrich,	Frye,	Harris,	Quay,
Allison,	Gear,	Hoar,	Teller,
Call,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vest,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Walthall,
Cockrell,	Gray,	Perkins,	Warren,
Cullom,	Hale,	Platt,	Wetmore.

NOT VOTING—16.

Blackburn,	Hawley,	McMillan,	Squire,
Brice,	Irby,	Murphy,	Thurston,
Elkins,	Jones, Ark.	Shoup,	Tillman,
Faulkner,	Jones, Nev.	Smith,	Wolcott.

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. Dubois December 5, 1895.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask that the pending resolution, which is the regular order, be temporarily laid aside in order that we may proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, if the Senator from Maine so desires.

Mr. HALE. The Senate has taken its ground advisedly, and I think that this matter had better be settled at once. The Committee on Appropriations is very desirous of knowing if it is to be submitted to the censure of this body and is to report no more appropriation bills. It has already reported bills, and if this resolution passes, instead of the committee attempting to pass them through the body they ought to be referred again to the committee and by them reported back, to be referred to the several committees covered by the resolution.

I do not claim to speak for the committee, as the chairman himself is here; but I have been alluded to by the Senator from Idaho as having charge of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and for my part I am entirely willing that the Senate shall dispose of this matter now. I sought to antagonize the resolution by the ordinary motion to proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. That motion has been voted down by the Senate. The Senate has decided to take up as of more importance a resolution proposing to dismantle the Committee on Appropriations. If the Senate is to do that, as appears to be indicated by the vote just taken, the sooner the committee knows it and the sooner the committee cuts its garment according to the cloth that the majority of the Senate vouchsafe to give to it, the better. I for one am desirous that the matter shall be disposed of, so that hereafter the members of the Committee on Appropriations may have more leisure than they have had heretofore, and may attend to other business, if such is the will of the Senate.

Mr. DUBOIS. I have no idea that any Senators care to debate this question. They are thoroughly familiar with it. Therefore I ask that a vote be taken, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask, for information, whether the first clause of Rule XL has been complied with in regard to this proposed amendment of the rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Rhode Island indicate his inquiry more specifically?

Mr. ALDRICH. This is a proposition to amend the rules of the Senate, I understand. I ask whether the provision of the first section of Rule XL has been complied with?

Mr. HARRIS. Requiring written notice?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution was introduced and has gone over one day and more under the rules.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is not advised that any formal notice has been given other than he has indicated.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the provision of the rule may be read. It seems to me if we are to make such an important change in the rules as this proposes it should certainly be done in accordance with the rules of the Senate. I take it for granted that there can not be so much haste required in regard to it that we can not follow the plain and explicit rules of the Senate when changes are to be made. I make the suggestion that the rule has not been complied with, that no notice has been given.

Mr. BATE. As this seems to be a matter that calls for some investigation, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HILL. I hope that motion will be voted down. We may as well fight this out now as at any other time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to make a suggestion to my friend from Rhode Island, in the light of the two yea-and-nay votes we have had, which show a majority of about two to one in favor of the policy indicated by the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. I am quite in sympathy with the views of the Senator from Rhode Island, and have voted with him upon these two questions; I am quite clear in the opinion that this resolution is not in order as it now stands; but I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will not raise the question of order. Let us determine the question now and at once upon its merits and be done with it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no disposition to antagonize the plain will of the Senate as expressed by the votes which the Senator from Tennessee has mentioned, but it does seem to me that in a rule which changes vitally the practice of the Senate, and whose consequence for good or for ill must be very far-reaching, the rules of the Senate should certainly be complied with. I see no reason at present why I should withdraw the point which I have made that the resolution is not now in order, and will not be in order until the proper notice has been given.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I make a point of order against the point of order that is raised that by the proceedings which have already been had upon the resolution the point of order made by the Senator from Rhode Island has been waived; that the resolution occupies the position to-day that it holds on the Calendar by reason of the debate and proceedings that have been had upon it, as though the notice required under the rule had been given.

Mr. DUBOIS. I rose to suggest that the resolution is in order, it seems to me, by the vote of the Senate just taken, which does away with any requirement of the rule as to previous notice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island calls the attention of the Chair and of the Senate to Rule XL, which reads:

> No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof.

Mr. ALDRICH. Upon the point made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], if the Chair please, I take it any Senator has a right to offer a resolution here, whether it is in order or not. There is no way of preventing the offering of a resolution; and the resolution, if no action is taken upon it, goes to the Calendar without any action of the Senate whatever. It has been the custom of the Senate for a great many years to allow resolutions to be offered and go to the Calendar for the purpose of having speeches made on them. There was no time at which this point of order could have been made except when the resolution was taken up for action, and the minute it was taken up for action I made the point which I have now suggested.

Mr. STEWART. I think that the point made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is perfectly correct. If anything is settled, it is this matter of notice. In all proceedings before the courts and otherwise, such a point must be taken advantage of before action is had. You can not take advantage of it after the case has gone to trial.

Mr. ALDRICH. When could I have made the point of order?

Mr. STEWART. The Senator could have made the point of order when the motion was made to take up the resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon; nothing was in order then; no debate was in order.

Mr. STEWART. A point of order can always be made. If it was not in order to consider the point of order then it was not in order to vote to take up the resolution. If, when you reach a case in court, parties stand by and let the case be taken up and proceeded with and do not make an objection, an objection falls altogether. The proposition to take up the resolution was distinctly made and perfectly understood, and the Senate having voted to take it up, that act waives all preceding requirement as to notice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to determine the question of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire, with the permission of the Chair, simply to make one observation. It seems to me that the point of order might have been properly made against the resolution when the motion was made. Furthermore, it strikes me it is a common-sense conclusion that when the resolution itself was offered proposing to amend the rule, and definitely calling attention to it, and the resolution remained on the Calendar of the Senate for over a month, it was a notice of the change of the rule, and it ought to be so construed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Notice in writing?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; the resolution is in writing.

Mr. HILL. This is not a motion to suspend any rule. It is not the case of a formal notice to do that. It is simply a proposition to amend the rules. When the Senator from Idaho rose in his place in December last and proposed an amendment to the rules and asked that it lie upon the table, and afterwards made a speech upon it, and it went over, and has been here upon the table during all this period, that is ample notice within the rule.

In the second place, if any point of that character was to be made it should have been made before we proceeded to consider the resolution. The Senate deliberately voted, by a large majority, to proceed to the consideration of this proposed amendment of the rules, and we had entered upon its consideration before the point was raised. Therefore, upon that point alone the question of order is not well taken.

But I do not place it upon any such narrow ground. I place it upon the ground that under our rules the Senator from Idaho made a distinct proposition by the resolution. Is not that a notice to the Senate within all the forms of parliamentary procedure? Certainly it is. All that is required is that the Senate shall not have sprung upon it at a moment's notice a proposition to amend the rules. This is ample notice within the rule, and it is the best way to proceed because it is the fairest. The resolution has been here. Every Senator has made up his mind in regard to the resolution, and the majority ought to be permitted to pass on the resolution if it sees fit. As the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] suggests to me, what better notice could have been given?

Mr. MILLS. It is the only way to get it.

Mr. HARRIS. I simply desire to say that the Senator from Idaho has introduced a resolution that is now pending, which in effect changes at least one of the standing rules of the Senate. The introduction of that resolution is not the notice that Rule XL requires and demands. Rule XL requires that in addition to the resolution he shall give notice of the rules or the precise parts of rules that are to be modified, suspended, or changed by his resolution, and that written notice must be upon the table at least one day before the consideration of such a resolution.

In respect to the other point, I venture to say that no Senator can find a single instance in the whole history of this body where the point of order may not be made at any stage of the proceeding. The point of order is never waived, but it may be made by a Senator at any moment from the beginning of the consideration to the final disposition of the proposition.

Mr. HILL. As an elementary proposition, I should dissent from that view. When a Senator makes any of the divers motions that he can make in the Senate a point of order must be made at the time. A Senator asks unanimous consent. Consent must be given or refused then. After a Senator has been speaking for some length of time a Senator can not rise then and say, "I withdraw my consent; I raise a point of order; there is nothing before the Senate."

Let us see where this new argument would leave the Senate? The proposition is made to amend the rules. A resolution is a notice. It is a notice to the Senate within any fair construction of the rules. What follows? If, after debate, this resolution should now be referred to the Committee on Rules, and after due deliberation upon the question the Committee on Rules should report it, with its sanction, for adoption, then would Senators say that there had not been a day's notice of the resolution, and would we not act upon the report of that committee? Certainly we would have acted upon it. There is no rule that requires a resolution proposing to amend a rule to be referred to the Committee on Rules. That is a question purely within the discretion of the Senate. If the point made be held to be true, it must be for the purpose of preventing the majority here from doing what they want to do. If that be carried out to its legitimate end, then, even if this resolution had been referred to the Committee on Rules and the Committee had reported it, it would have to stop until some Senator should give one day's notice of this proposition—a most ridiculous and absurd conclusion, in my humble opinion.

Technical notice must be given, I suppose, that a Senator intends to make a motion. In substance in this case the Senate was notified—notified by the formal introduction of the resolution, which specified the particular points that were to be amended.

December 5, 1895, Mr. DUBOIS submitted the following amendment:
"That paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the words," etc.

That was laid on the table and notice of not only one day was given, but it has been here since the 5th day of December. The Senator from Idaho subsequently made a speech upon the proposed amendment and now calls it up for action. It is just as properly before the Senate as if the Committee on Rules had reported divers amendments.

Have not all the propositions to amend the rules been in just this form? Have they not all been submitted to the Committee on Rules? Are not these various amendments before the Committee on Rules? That committee could have reported, and this is just as much in order as if presented by the report of the committee.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make one suggestion for the consideration of the Chair, and that is, if the construction of the rule which the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] insists on be correct, what is the use of the rule? There is a general rule that all resolutions shall go over one day if a single Senator demands. So it seems very clear that the introduction of a resolution—which, of course, is in writing, as they all are—and its going over one day is not a compliance with the rule, because that is the universal rule as to all resolutions which must be considered first by unanimous consent. Therefore this rule was certainly intended to accomplish something else than that. It means that there must be some other notice in writing by the Senator desiring to amend or suspend a rule a day beforehand than the mere introduction of a resolution for that purpose.

Mr. DUBOIS. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. Would the Senator from Massachusetts think my statement a sufficient notice? On December 11, among other things, I said:

I trust that the proposed amendment will not be referred to the Committee on Rules until such reference is accompanied with an instruction from the Senate as to the decision of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Did the Senator say that in writing?

Mr. DUBOIS. I spoke it.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it is a sufficient "notice in writing" for the Senator from Idaho to say something orally.

Mr. DUBOIS. It is very evident that the Senator from Idaho intended to give notice to the Senate that he intended, if possible, to have a vote upon the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I rather hesitate taking any part in this matter, because it seems to me of the most trifling importance just now. The Senator from Idaho has his resolution up and consents that it may go over until to-morrow, if any other business is desired to be taken up by the Senate, and he made the suggestion to the Senator from Maine that he might go on with the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am willing to yield for an appropriation bill, but not for any other purpose.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; the Senator consents that the Senator from Maine may go on with the appropriation bill. So it is of the smallest possible consequence, so far as the debate is concerned, whether the Senator gives his notice now and the resolution goes over until to-morrow, or goes over under a vote.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I was not aware until this morning that it was the intention of the Senator from Idaho to bring forward this resolution. I had supposed that the Senate would adhere to the custom which has hitherto prevailed in this body since I have been a member of it, to give way to appropriation bills when presented and in order for consideration. Especially had I supposed that would be so as to an appropriation bill which comes to us under the title of "urgent deficiency," providing for deficiencies pressed upon the Senate and the House of Representatives by the executive department of this Government. So I had taken no particular interest in this question. I take no special interest in it now.

It is true that I am chairman by resolution of the Senate of the Committee on Appropriations. I have some opinions and beliefs respecting what is the easiest and best method of dealing with the question of appropriating public money for the purposes of the Government. I had expected, if opportunity should be given, which I think it will be before this matter is concluded, to say a few words as to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, and especially to call attention to some statements made by him on the 11th of December, when he addressed the Senate upon the subject, which are wholly erroneous. Among other reasons given for the transfer of the appropriations to the several committees named in the resolution he impliedly, if not directly, attributed to the Committee on Appropriations carelessness and worse than indifference as to some matters which came before that committee, having been referred to it by the Senate.

Lest another opportunity shall not occur, I shall now occupy a few moments. I supposed I had some papers here which would elucidate more fully what I propose to say. I find among the observations made by the Senator from Idaho his statement on

page 133 of the RECORD of December 11, 1895, as a reason why this change should be made, the following:

A provision was slipped into that bill—

Meaning the sundry civil appropriation bill—

by the conferees, withdrawing all the public lands which were embraced within the arid region of the country from settlement until certain impossible conditions were complied with. The representatives from that section, and the Congress generally, were not aware of this provision of the law until instructions were received by the various land officers, issued by the Secretary of the Interior, some months later, to carry the law into effect.

Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Idaho is wholly at variance with the facts in the case. The provision to which he here alludes was a provision inserted in that bill in the House of Representatives—I have not the data before me and speak from recollection—after two days' debate, the Senator from Idaho then being a member of that body. Although it has been pending for days I can find no evidence of his making any observations upon the subject, though he did deal with another amendment immediately preceding it. That measure was fully considered and debated in the Senate.

It finally became a subject of controversy between the two Houses, and the Senate conference committee, representing the sentiments of the Senate, insisted that that provision should go out of the bill. We had at least three conferences upon that subject, and it was the last subject considered by the conference committee. I have not now the papers before me, and do not remember who were my associates in that conference. I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] was one, certainly either the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. Finally the provision was agreed to in this body, although the bill was delayed some weeks on account of it. The Senator from Nevada who is in my eye [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] were both consulted as to that provision. I have now in my own handwriting in the room of the Committee on Appropriations an amendment which was put on in that conference, limiting and minimizing the power of that provision, which I submitted to the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Colorado, and other Senators interested in that great question. So before I vote upon the resolution I desire at least to have it understood by the Senate that so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, it has with fidelity represented the interests of the Senate as manifested by votes here upon this subject.

I called the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the mistake he had made, and asked him to read the debate and make the correction. I have waited, and no correction has been made. I should not allude to it now but for the fact that a vote is asked upon this question without debate.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, with the kind consent of the Senator from Iowa, I wish to make a statement at this point. He called my attention to what he considers a misstatement on my part, and I looked up the RECORD very carefully, and I find the RECORD bears out what I said in my speech of December 11. No one can find a word in my remarks reflecting upon the Appropriations Committee. I did say that we did not have time in which to carefully consider matters coming before the Senate; that most of the work was done in conference, and that we could not change any portion of a conference report without changing it all.

The facts in regard to the matter to which the Senator from Iowa alludes are these: A very full debate was had in the Senate on a motion of the then Senator from Colorado, Mr. Bowen. All the Senators from the Western States sustained Mr. Bowen's amendment to the appropriation bill, and it was put in. The bill then went to the House of Representatives, and that House added an amendment which practically withdrew our public lands from settlement. As the Senator from Iowa has said, he added in the conference committee a provision that the President could release those lands on his order; but that provision of the House of Representatives came to the Senate in conference, and therefore the Senate had no opportunity to discuss the conference report in regard to those public lands of the West. That is the complaint I was making. The matter went through here as a conference report and was never debated in the Senate. The first proposition of the then Senator from Colorado and the proposition which came here from the conference were very different, and my point was that we could not, under the present conditions, properly consider these matters. I did no injustice to the Senator from Iowa, and I intended to do none.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to ask a parliamentary question. I ask what is the question before the Senate? Is it the point of order or the merits of the case?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the point of order made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], on which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is recognized.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, if I am debating out of order, of course I shall wait until the point of order is decided.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to say that anybody was out of order, for I am not sure that anything is ever out of order in the Senate. So far as I have been able to observe, the use of the rules is simply to delay or defeat the will of the majority when it is so desired. If they are for any other purpose, I have been unable to discover it.

I simply called attention to the fact that there was a point of order pending, on which the Chair had stated that he was prepared to rule, I supposed, of course, general debate was in order. Everything seems to be in order here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I only called attention to this question in order that it might be known what imperfect statements are often made here. The Senator from Idaho says that after a full examination he finds that the facts stated by him are borne out by the RECORD. The amendment which was offered in the Senate by the then Senator from Colorado, Mr. Bowen, was sent to the House of Representatives; it was debated by and large for two days, Representative CANNON, who was then chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and other leading members of the Committee on Appropriations taking an active part in that debate. The House of Representatives inserted a provision after debate and upon a vote of the yeas and nays either twice or thrice taken. It was the subject of open debate in this body. It was also a subject of frequent consultation between members of the Appropriations Committee and the Senators who were especially interested in the public lands. I consulted personally every Senator then upon this floor from that region, at least all who could possibly be reached, and we undertook to save the provisions, so far as we could save them, of the amendment originally inserted by the Senate. Therefore the gravamen of the charge made by the Senator from Idaho that an amendment was slipped into an important bill affecting the public lands of the United States by a conference committee, so far from being sustained by the record, is shown to be absolutely without foundation in fact.

So I repeat that as to the conduct of the Committee on Appropriations upon these public questions they have dealt with them as best they could under the circumstances surrounding them. I do not wish to debate this question at length now. If the vote which has just been taken is any indication of the judgment and sense of the Senate upon the subject, it is probably not worth while to debate it further.

It is important, however, that this question should be settled within a reasonable time. Appropriation bills which are covered by the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho are coming now with frequency from the House of Representatives, and if those appropriation bills are to be properly considered in the judgment of the Senate by committees other than the Committee on Appropriations it is wise that that question should be disposed of at an early day.

For myself I should be glad if other business could intervene for a day or two at least, until we can have an opportunity of presenting such arguments as may occur to us looking to the retention of the appropriation bills by the Appropriations Committee. So if the Senator from Idaho will allow the resolution to go over for the present, I hope the Senator from Maine will call up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and get it out of the way.

Mr. HALE. As suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel that that matter rests largely now with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS].

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask first for the decision on the point of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before that is done there will certainly be some discussion——

Mr. DUBOIS. I was willing to yield, and I offered to yield as soon as the resolution was made the unfinished business. I stated that I would do so, and I did. I hardly feel as though it rested entirely with me now, and unless we can make some agreement to conclude it——

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Idaho allow me?

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. What reason is there why the resolution can not be disposed of this afternoon? I understand that all Senators agree that the Committee on Appropriations should know precisely the status of affairs.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow a suggestion from me?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has indicated that this question was brought up unexpectedly, and he was thereby taken by surprise. He desires that it shall go over for a day or two, so that he and others may be prepared to make such remarks as they see proper on the subject. It seems to me, under the circumstances, when the chairman of the committee makes such a request, it is only reasonable that the Senate should grant it.

Mr. MILLS. Why not let the Chair decide the question of the point of order, and then we can take up that matter?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know that I have any objection to that.

Mr. MILLS. That might come up to-morrow. Let us have the question of order decided now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to determine the question of order, but is willing to hear the suggestions of Senators. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is important, it seems to me, that this question, if it is to be decided, should be decided properly for the future guidance of the Senate.

I remember on a notable occasion, when I was in charge for the Committee on Rules of an amendment to the rules closing debate, and while a resolution for that purpose was pending, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], representing his side of the Chamber, raised the question that the notice given by me, which was given in writing, stating specifically the items required by the rule which I have read, was not explicit and definite enough, for the reason that it did not set forth the purposes for which the amendment of the rules was to be adopted, and his claim in that regard was sustained by the unanimous vote of every Senator sitting upon the other side of the Chamber. His claim was that that resolution was not in order because the notice which I had given in writing was not sufficiently explicit in regard to the purposes of the amendment to the rules.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. There is no question but what this resolution is amply specific. It covers every portion of the rule desired to be amended.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the Senator fails to understand this question or this rule.

Mr. HILL. I think I understand it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator seems to think——

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me a moment, a Senator proceeds, in writing or otherwise, to give notice that on a certain day he intends to make a motion to amend a rule of the Senate, and if he does not specify particularly in advance the precise amendment to be offered, so that Senators may understand it, of course when it is brought up it is subject to the objection that it must be specific and show the precise rule to be amended. That is an entirely different proposition from this. Here the notice is in the form of a resolution, a solemn notice given, specifying particularly the precise rule and all the details of it, so that anyone may perfectly understand it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from New York is talking about a question that is not before the Senate. He is talking about something which I can not comprehend.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator is giving us a precedent which he wants the Presiding Officer to follow, he should give one that is analogous to the point, not a defective notice that did not sufficiently specify the rule, and that was ruled out substantially by a unanimous vote, and has nothing to do with this question, which is a formal resolution containing the notice specifically of the thing to be amended.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from New York fails to understand me and fails to understand the rule, which seems to be very plain and explicit in its nature. In the case to which I have alluded there was no question of a notice, because the notice was filed, and it was filed in writing. It stated explicitly the rule that was proposed to be amended, and stated the purpose of the amendment. That is an entirely different question from this, where no notice whatever has been filed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will excuse me while I state my own position.

In this case no notice whatever has been given, as was plainly required by the rule. Let me read the rule to the Senator from New York:

> No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing—

What? Not an ordinary notice of an amendment to be proposed, but—

> specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof.

Has any such notice whatever been given in this case?

Mr. HILL. About sixty-one days' notice has been given.

Mr. ALDRICH. Where has any such notice been given?

Mr. HILL. In the resolution itself.

Mr. ALDRICH. The rule requires notice to be given outside of the resolution itself.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator answer this question——

Mr. ALDRICH. I should prefer to go on for at least one minute consecutively and state my own position.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island declines to be interrupted.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have other rules in this body which provide that no resolution or motion shall be in order on the day when presented, if objected to. We have other provisions in the rules requiring unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of questions at various times; but this is an entirely different rule, and applies only to one class of motions and resolutions, which is amendments to the rules themselves. We have a rule which provides that one objection shall carry a resolution over to the succeeding day, as the Senator from Massachusetts has already well said. If that were the only purpose of the rule, it would be entirely useless; but this rule has another and an entirely different reason. A motion, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, can never be its own notice, but there must be, in addition to that notice, in addition to the language of the resolution itself, a notice in writing setting forth specifically the rules to be changed and the purpose for which they are to be changed.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask whether it is not true that the rules have been repeatedly amended where the motion to amend being put in and laid over one day was its own notice?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have never heard, during my fourteen years' service in the Senate, of a single instance of that kind.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield to me to ask one question for information?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. More than a year ago I offered an amendment to the rules, which was sent to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HILL. And is there yet.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if it is not competent for that committee to report that amendment back and take action upon it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not for the committee to take action.

Mr. GALLINGER. For the Senate to take action. If so, what becomes of the notice in writing?

Mr. ALDRICH. The motion which the Senator made a year ago was in another Congress, and would not apply now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Suppose it had been offered on the first day of the present Congress, might not the Committee on Rules report that back to the Senate and act upon it?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think the Committee on Rules or a Senator could make a motion to suspend the rules without giving the notice required by the rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offered an amendment to the rules and it went to the Committee on Rules. Is it not competent for the committee to report that back to the Senate, and competent for the Senate to take action upon it without other notice?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think not. It would be a plain violation of the rule to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a most extraordinary thing.

Mr. CHANDLER. I differ with the Senator in what has taken place, and in nine cases out of ten, in all cases, so far as I remember, a resolution to amend the rules has been its own notice. It has gone over one day and the rule has been complied with.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator had been as observant about this as about many other things, he would have known that no such action has ever taken place.

Mr. CHANDLER. I place my recollection against that of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the mere matter of the passage of a resolution in the shape of an amendment to the rules in this body, covering the points it does, is a very serious matter, and ought not to be adopted by the Senate without due deliberation. Such a rule is not for to-day, nor to run through this Congress, but in all probability to establish the rule of government of this body, which ought to be thoroughly deliberated upon before we adopt it. Such a rule has been tried elsewhere, and it has been discussed not only here, but elsewhere. It is a very serious matter, one that will deeply affect the interest of the country in all probability, and there are strong reasons which ought to be presented to the Senate, and properly weighed, before we act upon this proposition.

But aside from that, Mr. President, the question now pending, in the shape of a point of order before the Chair, is one of greater consideration than the resolution itself. The proposed amendment to the rules would involve dollars and cents and probably extravagance in the expenditure of the people's money; but that could be corrected. The other question that is pending for your decision, sir, is one of greater importance. Our rules have been made for the purpose of protecting minorities and checking majorities in this body, and preventing them from trampling on the rights of individual Senators and of the rights of States of the Union.

There is scarcely a rule from the beginning to the end of our code which has not been framed with a view to restrain hasty action. Those rules have been tested in the past in times of excitement. There never has been up for consideration a question where section was involved, where great interests were involved, that the majority of this body has not attempted to change the

rules, precisely as is being attempted now upon this proposition, and there never has been a case, no matter how great the excitement and how sharp the division, where the Presiding Officer of this body and the majority of the Senate have not agreed that as to a change of the rules, written notice is a necessary prerequisite to such resolutions, and they have never been considered until that notice has been given in writing.

There was a time within the past four years when there was not a member of the Senate upon this side of the Chamber who was not prepared to stay here until the end of the Congressional term and obstruct every item of business in Congress rather than to have a rule adopted in the shape in which this rule is now proposed to be adopted. When that excitement was at its height, with a majority on the other side of the Chamber, by the action, as it was understood, of a caucus or a conference, an attempt was made to change the rules so as to stifle debate, and yet even in the midst of that excitement, with the desire which prevailed to cut off debate and to force party measures through, there was no Senator on the other side who would go so far as to attempt to change the rules without the written notice required, and there is not an instance in the history of the Government where it has been attempted.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], who is recognized as the best parliamentarian in the body and one of the best in the country, made for us on this side of the Chamber a written argument, the clearest that has ever been presented to the Senate of the United States, so clear that there was no partisan on the other side who would attempt to controvert it, and it was in that great hour of excitement and distress admitted on both sides that he was right. The precedents of the Senate are all one way. The Senator from Rhode Island, who had been given charge by his party friends of an attempt to force a change of the rules, gave notice in writing, as will be found in the Journal of the Senate of December 29 of that year. The notice was full, but when it came up for consideration the Senator from Tennessee raised the point of order for us, every Democrat sustaining him, that even that notice, full as it was, was not sufficiently specific to give every Senator notice of the change that was proposed, and on that we fought. The Chair decided that, the notice having been given, in his judgment it was all that Rule XL required, and we divided on party lines in the discussion of that question, but not as to the notice itself, for there never has been any serious question in this body that the notice in writing was not required. It was only upon the minor point of whether it fully complied with Rule XL.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HILL. The Senator cites that precedent, as I understand, simply for the purpose of showing that a notice is one way to suggest an amendment, and the ruling was that the notice was defective. Has not the Senate entertained resolution after resolution, discussed them, and referred them to the Committee on Rules for the purpose of having the committee act upon them? Does the Senator now mean to state that if the committee should, in its wisdom, see fit to report another amendment than the one now before it, the Senate could not take up that report and act upon it? I should like to hear an answer to that question.

Mr. GORMAN. The rule is intended, and has been so construed from the beginning, and no parliamentarian has ever questioned it, to restrict Senators like the Senator from New York and myself, who are somewhat impulsive, from introducing to-day a resolution to amend the rules, and by getting up an excitement to-morrow induce the Senate to vote to pass it. That rule is intended to prohibit such action.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I ask if all the excitement could not be gotten up as well by a notice as by a resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. Possibly, but that is the rule.

Now the Senator propounds another question to me. He wants to know if this resolution had gone to the Committee on Rules whether, if it had been reported back, it could have been acted upon by the Senate. This comes in on a different rule. There is a general law that governs this body—deliberation and time for consideration. It goes to one of the eyes of the Senate, a committee, and they report it back, with the reasons for the proposed change, after notice and fair consideration.

Mr. HILL. Did they give any reasons?

Mr. GORMAN. As a matter of course, they gave reasons. The Committee on Rules of the body reported an entire change of the rules. That has been the custom of the body, and there is sound reasoning for it.

As to the mere matter of getting charge of appropriation bills and distributing them among various committees, I care nothing, except as affecting the general interests of the country. That is a matter which I think ought to be discussed, and fully and fairly discussed, after proper notice given.

The decision of the Senate, if it is otherwise than I have indicated, will make a precedent that will come home to Senators on both sides of the Chamber to trouble them. To-day we are in the minority in this body and may be in a smaller minority in the next Congress.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me, is the minority any better protected by the giving of a notice than by the offering of a resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. I think so.

Mr. HILL. In what respect?

Mr. GORMAN. And the history of a hundred years has taught us so. I believe there is something in the history of the past. I believe that a rule or a law which has operated fairly to protect the minority ought not to be changed hastily. But, Mr. President, if this rule be established here to-day, the mere desire to get the control of appropriation bills for some other committee than the Committee on Appropriations, it will plague the Senate and plague the country. I am one of those who believe that this body, constituted as it is, with its rigid and restrictive rules, as they are, is the only security for legislation which will protect the interests of the minority in the country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to ask the Senator if I understood him correctly to say that it is competent for the Committee on Rules to report back an amendment offered in open Senate and for action to be taken upon it?

Mr. GORMAN. I think that that question has never been raised.

Mr. GALLINGER. But I think the Senator expressed the opinion very definitely that that could be done.

Mr. GORMAN. I say that in my recollection it has been done. I think an entire change of the rules of the Senate has been reported by the Committee on Rules, possibly without the written notice required.

Mr. GALLINGER. The only other point I desire to make is that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maine say that it can not be done; so even those who are arguing for this strict construction of the rules do not agree.

Mr. GORMAN. I do not care to express an opinion beyond what I have stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it can be done.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Maryland will allow me, I desire to say that there has been one general revision of the rules since I have been a member of the Committee on Rules. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] was then chairman of the committee; and, speaking now from a memory that goes back quite a good many years, my recollection is that he submitted, many days before the revision was taken up for consideration, a written report showing precisely what changes had been proposed, or why proposed to be made, and the various rules then in existence that were proposed to be modified, changed, or abandoned.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, upon reflection I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I was a minority member of the Committee on Rules at the time the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] was the chairman. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] and Senator (afterwards President) Harrison were members of the committee, as I now remember. I believe the Senator from Tennessee is correct. The report was made.

I trust the Senator who has charge of this important matter—for it is a very important matter—and all Senators will agree that it is better in every instance that we shall comply with the rule requiring notice. That will only cause the Senator one day's delay. Then the rule can come up upon its merits for discussion. This will save the danger of making a precedent which will in all probability trouble us on both sides hereafter. Then this matter can come up for proper discussion and deliberation. There are reasons which may be urged on both sides, but let us determine the question as it ought to be determined in the interests of the Senate and in the interests of the country.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the objection raised by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr ALDRICH] puts both the Senate and the Chair in a very awkward predicament, as I understand it, one from which the Chair has no power to relieve the Senate, or the Senate to relieve the Chair, except by a reconsideration of the vote which has just been taken that we will consider the motion for amendment. The Senate has just voted, on a yea-and-nay vote, that it will proceed to the consideration of the resolution for the amendment of the rules.

Who is going to reverse that action? Who is going to hold that it is illegitimate, that it is null and void, and that a rule of the Senate, subject, as we see here, to various interpretations, can be so construed now that the Chair is obliged to hold, or will hold, that the vote just taken by the Senate on a call of the yeas and nays, more than two-thirds, I believe, voting for consideration, shall be annulled and held for naught and that we shall stand where we stood at the time this motion was introduced? Now,

from that category there is no escape at all except that the Chair shall be held to have power to annul and set aside a vote of the Senate or else, through a motion, to reconsider our vote.

At the time this motion was brought up for consideration it was open to any Senator to make the objection which the Senator from Rhode Island makes after the consideration has been agreed to. Whose fault is it that no objection was made to the consideration of the motion to amend the rules? It is the fault of every Senator on this floor who feels any interest in the question, and even those who do not, for it is our duty to stand upon the rules, and to be vigilant in seeing that they are not violated or set aside upon any occasion.

The Chair could not raise the question for two reasons. First of all, it is not the province of the Chair, perhaps, without a suggestion, he not being a member of this body, but only the President of it, to suggest to Senators what their duty is in regard to the management of the business on the floor of the Senate. The second reason is that the proposition to amend the rule itself contains substantially a notice of what is intended to be accomplished by the action of the Senate. Scarcely anything could be more specific than that, and it would be a work of supererogation if not of folly by a written notice to announce in the Senate that "on a certain day, or hereafter when the Senate will give its consent, I shall proceed to ask the Senate to pass the amendment," two papers giving notice when only one is necessary.

Now, if the motion itself which is made to amend the rules contains the precise designation of the part of the rule which is intended to be changed, then that, I understand, is a compliance with Rule XL of our standing rules. This motion does contain all that, and puts in quotation marks the parts of the rule intended to be changed.

Who can be mistaken as to the intention of the mover of the resolution? Who can be misled at all in regard to the motion he intends or the particular language of the rule that is proposed to be changed? Nobody. So take it as an open question, if you please, if the question were now for the first time suggested, the rule is not violated, but it is complied with substantially and fully by the form of the motion which the Senator from Idaho has submitted here. But when the Senate neglects to make an objection when the question is laid before the body, as to whether or not we will proceed to the consideration of the resolution, and a vote by yeas and nays is taken upon it, and it is agreed to, it certainly is too late for anybody to undertake to reverse the action of the Senate by a mere decision. There is no power in this world which can reverse that action except the Senate itself, upon a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me that there are two phases of this matter, wholly distinct. What is the true rule, if all possible objections are made at the proper time, and can any objection be waived. The first question involves a construction of Rule XL as it is written.

Now, I will say preliminarily, that I see no danger in adopting the rule contended for by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] and those upon this floor who concur with him. First, what is the object of Rule XL? It is that every Senator shall have at least one day's notice of a proposed change in a definite certain rule. He shall not only be informed that an amendment is proposed to Rule I, II, or III, but he shall be advised of the particulars of that amendment. That is the object. That notice has been given; that knowledge is had. There is not a Senator upon this floor who does not know the specific object had in view by the Senator from Idaho, because the resolution embodies each particular and places it in language so clear that misapprehension is entirely impossible.

In the next place, it can not be that the safety of the Senate or of the country depends upon the mere question whether notice is given by resolution or by a notice which is called a notice. As the Senator from New York has well said, one day's notice in writing is admitted to be enough, and why is there any safety in a particular form of notice, so styled, and why is it that there is no safety in a resolution which contains every essential of a notice?

Why did the Senator from Idaho present to the Senate a resolution, "*Resolved*, That so and so be done," unless it was that he sought the approval of the Senate upon that resolution? Is it not peculiar reasoning, to say the least, that the Senate supposed that the Senator from Idaho did not intend to ask for a change of the rules of the Senate? Is there anyone who has read the resolution or has heard it read whose intellectuality is in such condition that he did not understand the object of the Senator from Idaho? Can it be that our rules, in which are supposed to be embodied the wisdom of the ages, are so framed that they compel us to admit that we did not understand this plain language proffered here by the Senator from Idaho and remaining upon our desks for perhaps two months? The Senator from Idaho went so far that before the adjournment of the last Congress he told us what he intended to do or would try to do; and he has simply followed out his programme.

Now, outside of that proposition, outside of the fact, as I believe, that the Senator from Idaho has complied with Rule XL, there is the question of waiver. Does anyone contend that when a provision of law is made for his benefit as to a notice, he can not waive that notice? Does he pretend that if a certain time is prescribed, given him as of right, within which, if he sees fit, he may not appear before a judicial tribunal, his earlier appearance and submission of himself for judgment would not be a waiver of that notice?

Now, what could the Senate do here to-day? Let us take the common-sense view of the situation, if we possibly can under our rules. We were confronted with this condition of things. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] rose and stated that he desired to have the Senate consider the urgent deficiency bill. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] stated that he wished the Senate to take up his resolution. We learned, as the result of some talk between Senators, that the Senator from Maine conceded that if a vote were taken at once the whole matter might be submitted to the sense of the Senate. No one dissented. The question whether we would take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was submitted to a vote, the yeas and nays were called upon it, and taken; and the Senate rendered its judgment against taking it up. With equal solemnity and without the slightest objection upon the part of anyone, we proceeded to vote upon the proposition whether we should take up the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. The Senate voted upon that issue, and by more than a two-thirds vote, as stated by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], it decided to take up the resolution.

Where were the objectors then? When the question was submitted to the Senate whether or not it would take up the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, who raised any objection? No one. By unanimous consent that question was submitted to the judgment of the Senate. No one objected; the Senate voted upon it; and having voted upon it, and agreed to it, the Senator from Idaho, turning to the Senator from Maine, stated that he would yield the floor to the Senator from Maine in order that the urgent deficiency appropriation bill might be taken up, the resolution of the Senator from Idaho remaining the unfinished business. The Senator from Maine stated that he did not wish, under the circumstances, to follow out that idea, but preferred that the whole subject should be determined then. So the Senator from Idaho proceeded to present his resolution; and there we are.

Now we are told that although we voted, without a solitary question being raised about it, on the question whether or not we should go on, having decided by a two-thirds vote of this body that we should go on, we shall have a ruling that we shall not go on, and that although two-thirds of this body have so decided without any antecedent objection, we are powerless to proceed.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator from California, as he has referred to what I stated, that I had no disposition to debate the question. The matter came up hurriedly. I had the same feeling then that I have now, but as I stated, I was not speaking for the committee. I was not speaking for any other person. I had no desire to debate; I do not have any desire to debate now. Members of the Committee on Appropriations, its chairman and others, have expressed a desire to debate the question. What I said for myself ought not in any way to be taken as concluding them.

It is a great subject; it is involved with great consequences, deep, profound consequences; and if other Senators wish to debate it not unreasonably—not in any way for delay, but simply to express themselves—certainly they ought to have that privilege. I do not think the Senator in charge of the resolution has any desire to cut off debate.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Maine surely has not so misconceived my remarks as to infer that I deny the right of Senators to discuss this question. I certainly could not cut them off if I desired, and I have no such wish. I was not discussing that question at all.

Mr. HALE. I did not want the Senator to quote me as concluding anybody else in a disposition to come at once to a vote. I said then that I spoke for nobody else.

Mr. WHITE. As we say when we quote a judge whose opinion is not conclusive or an eminent man whose judgment is not determinative, I referred to the Senator from Maine merely because of my respect for him and the knowledge I have that he stands well in the Senate, deservedly, as a judge of such a situation.

The reason which the Senator gives for his course in the matter explains his own action, but every other Senator did the same thing. There is such a thing as estoppel by conduct. We all sat here and agreed that the question should be submitted to a vote, and now we are to say that we have no power under that agreement. Mr. President, I deny that any such conclusion is justified by the rules of this body.

Now, the remark of the Senator from Maine calls to my mind another subject. There is no fear of curtailment of debate upon this question. The simple issue is, shall we proceed to consider the

subject? We can consider it, and consider it, and consider it; we can deliberate, and deliberate, and deliberate, according to the immemorial customs and usages of the Senate, until the proposed rule shall have passed away into the obscurity to which has been condemned many a similar effort of those who have sought to bring about needed changes in the procedure of this body.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in the course of the debate a matter has come up with regard to the conduct of the Committee on Appropriations upon a very memorable occasion, and as I have been alluded to and as I know the facts intimately, I wish to say a word as to the matter.

The Bowen amendment provided an appropriation for irrigation. It was put on the bill in the Senate, and it went to the other House and was there amended. A provision was inserted which conferred upon the Department power to withdraw practically all lands from sale. I was over in the other House at the time the debate took place there, and I was very much opposed to such an amendment; but it was passed. It came into conference, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. ALLISON, invited myself and several other Senators from the Pacific Coast—I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] was one—before the committee of conference. We were very much opposed to it.

They delayed it for a considerable time. Finally there was a slight modification, which we thought would be conceded, requiring the Department to reverse the drastic method which the language of the bill as it came from the other House would warrant. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] did all he could to relieve the amendment of what we feared would be the construction of it, and we got a slight amendment; but when the Department came to construe it they tied up the lands, closed up the land offices, and created a great deal of trouble. After that we had a very great contest to open the land offices again, lasting here for a week or two and resulting in a very warm debate.

I say this in justice to the Appropriations Committee, and particularly to the chairman. He did what he could to relieve us from a very awkward and injurious situation.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the decision of the Chair, but as it is appropriate that I should speak now, if at all, I wish to state that the charge made against the Committee on Appropriations is without the slightest foundation in the world.

The amendment complained of was put on in the other House, as stated by the chairman of the committee, after an extended debate. When it came here the Senate refused to accept the amendment, and the matter went to a conference committee. When the conference met I went in person before the committee to protest against the House provision. Other Senators who were interested in the Western country also went before the committee. None of us, however, at that time believed it possible to give the House provision the construction that was afterwards given to it and which, in my judgment, was a forced construction and an improper one. After some considerable time, and after two or three meetings of the conference committee, the House of Representatives insisting upon their amendment, they finally consented to a modification, and we believed then that with that modification, if the Department itself had any desire to enforce the then existing law, there would be no trouble about it.

But when the matter got into the Department, unfortunately the Department was imbued with the idea that the thing for the United States Government to do was to maintain and keep the title of all its public lands; that the Government had been giving away land to people who had been getting rich on the public lands in the West by making farms, which after a lifetime had become worth, perhaps, ten or fifteen dollars an acre; that it ought not to be done any more; and that they would give the law a construction which would practically and effectively repeal every one of the settlement laws. And that is what they did.

There was nobody in this body who was responsible for that condition. The Senate knew what was being done, and it sustained the committee so long as there was any probability that we could get a concession from the House; and when we could not get that concession we thought we had a modification that would let us out. The Department then put this construction upon the law, and one hundred and twenty-eight or one hundred and thirty thousand people attempted to enter lands before the next meeting of Congress. They were told by the Department, after the offices had been opened and they had been allowed to make their claims and settle on the land, that they could get no title whatever.

Then there began a controversy again between the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the matter. We could not secure such legislation as was required except we secured it on an appropriation bill. An amendment was put upon one of the appropriation bills that would validate all of those entries and, I will say, compel the administration of public affairs to recognize their right under the theretofore existing law. That became then a matter of controversy between the two Houses. I state what is pretty well known by members of the committee when I say that the Senate was held here at that time for two weeks to settle the question.

I went before the conference committee repeatedly, and so did other Senators. We represented the great harm that was being done to settlers in the West, but the other House, or at least some members of the House, had got an idea that that was a great thing to do in order to preserve the forests and the lands for the next generation. They adhered to the condition that existed, and declined to accept the Senate amendment. When it was evident to the members of the other House, and only when it was evident to them, that an extra session would be called if that provision was not allowed to remain in the appropriation bill, did they allow it to remain.

That can not be charged against the Appropriations Committee, Mr. President. I do not now believe that any other committee could have done more service for the people of the West than that committee did. Great pressure was brought to bear on the committee to waive the objection and leave us in that condition, but the committee, I am glad to say, with one voice, supported always by an overwhelming vote of the Senate when the question was presented to this body, insisted that the restriction or the forced interpretation should be waived by a provision of law or there would be no appropriation bill and an extra session would be called. Under that threat, that feeling, with that knowledge, and with that alone, we did secure such legislation as validated the 120,000 or 130,000 entries and prevented that rule from being applied thereafter.

Mr. DUBOIS. I hardly think Senators are fair to me. They have not heard the debate.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know what the Senator from Idaho said. I admit that I was not present when he spoke, and I mean no reflection upon the Senator. I was merely stating what I know to be the fact.

Mr. DUBOIS. If there is anything contained in these remarks——

Mr. TELLER. Wait a moment. I do not know that the Senator has reflected upon the committee. Only I supposed he had from what I heard here. I wish to state that there is no reason why anyone should reflect upon the committee, whether the Senator did or did not.

Mr. STEWART. I have no intention to reflect upon the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], and I am in the same position that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] occupies. I did not hear what the Senator from Idaho said, but from the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] I supposed that he had been wrongfully accused in this particular case. I thought if there had been any blame attached to him in this particular case a statement ought to be made.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that the line of argument now being followed would come properly upon the resolution rather than upon the point of order.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to make a personal statement. I was trying to show in my argument that too much was left to the conferees in the closing days of the session. I will read from my own language:

> In the hurry and rush of the closing days it is almost impossible to tell what a conference report includes or means, and it is practically impossible, through fear of an extra session, to prevent the adoption of the report of the conferees.

We have to accept the whole report or none of it. I was speaking to that point solely.

Now, the conferees of the Senate put in the sundry civil bill the provision which withdrew those lands from settlement. The Senate did not do it; it refused to do it.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Idaho is wrong about that matter. The House of Representatives put it in.

Mr. DUBOIS. I understand.

Mr. TELLER. It was not done by the committee in the House, but by the House itself.

Mr. DUBOIS. I understand distinctly that the other House voted it in. The Senate never voted it in, but the conferees of the Senate agreed to its staying in the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say to the Senator that it was submitted to the Senate——

Mr. DUBOIS. But they would not have it; they refused it.

Mr. TELLER. No. The Senate refused to accept it as long as they could. When it was found that the other House would consent only to the modification that the committee did make (I was not then a member of the committee), the Senate consented to it. There was full knowledge on the part of every Western Senator, no matter what the others may have known, as to what was in the bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. There is no question about that at all; but we were then confronted with an extra session or we had to let this go. I was speaking in this connection about the conferees.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Idaho allow me? I do

not wish to prolong the debate, but the Senator will observe that the statement in his remarks to which he refers is that the conferees, without the knowledge of the two Houses, stealthily put into the bill a provision which withdrew all public lands from settlement. That is the substance of it.

Now, all I desire is that it shall be shown, as it can be, that the particular amendment to which the Senator alludes was one that was well known in both branches and largely discussed in both Houses, and never was agreed to by the conferees until all those Senators who were interested in the subject agreed that it should go in, for the reason that it was a question whether that provision should be put in or the appropriation of $250,000, or whatever it was, should be stricken out of the bill. So I submit to the Senator from Idaho that it is fair at least to the conferees on the part of the Senate that the facts should be known in the face of the statement of the Senator made on the 11th of December last.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to state that I had no intention whatever of reflecting upon the Appropriations Committee. In fact, I was very careful in my remarks to disclaim any such intention, and I did not have that purpose in mind in making those remarks. I was speaking to the point that the conferees were charged with most of the legislation on appropriation bills. I wish it distinctly understood that I intended no reflection upon the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, the argument on the point of order is the refinement of technicality, and it is therefore necessary that the nicest attention should be given to the words employed in the rule. I desire to point out that Rule XL has no application to the question now under consideration, and because we have no motion to change the rules pending before us.

The rules draw a distinction, which I think every parliamentarian will recognize, between a resolution and a motion. This is the case of a resolution. The rules provide that every resolution must lie over one day before it can be considered unless there be unanimous consent to its immediate consideration. When a resolution has gone over it comes up for consideration on the next day, and if not disposed of it goes to the Calendar like a bill or joint resolution, and then must be taken up on a motion for its consideration.

Now, this is not a resolution. It is a motion. But for this rule a motion to change the rules might be made before the Senate at any time. Various motions are made from day to day before the Senate. The rule interposes then with reference to a motion to change the rules the same necessity for delay that is interposed in the case of a proposal for action or change of the rules by resolution. Thus, therefore, this rule, which relates only to motions, has no reference to the proceeding now before the Senate, which is the consideration (and the Senate upon a yea-and-nay vote has voted to consider it) of a resolution which, since a resolution must be in writing in order to lie over, must, from the very nature of the case, contain all that a notice of a motion could contain or would be required to contain under the fortieth rule.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Wisconsin be good enough to state again his distinction between a motion and a resolution?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I rose to ask him. I hope before he gets through he will state where a motion stops and where a resolution begins.

Mr. VILAS. The distinction is plain. A resolution is submitted in writing and must lie over in its form of a written proposal for action one day.

Mr. ALDRICH. Can a motion be submitted in writing?

Mr. VILAS. A motion may be verbal. A motion is not necessarily submitted in writing. A motion being made is for immediate consideration, unless there be some rule of the Senate which requires its consideration to be delayed. Every day motions are addressed to the Chair. They are recorded by the clerks. Of course, it would be entirely competent for a Senator to put his motion into written form before he makes it, but it is not necessary that it should be so. It was the purpose of the fortieth rule to provide that if any Senator chose to attempt to amend the rules by a verbal motion for that purpose, it should be preceded by a statement of the purpose and of the details of particulars of the proposed amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the twenty-first rule, which says that—

> All motions shall be reduced to writing, if desired by the Presiding Officer or by any Senator, and shall be read before the same shall be debated.

A motion would cease to be a motion and become a resolution, according to the Senator's argument, if the President of the Senate or any Senator should require the mover to reduce it to writing.

Mr. VILAS. Not at all. That rule shows that what I stated in respect to a motion is true. It is to be made presumptively in the first place verbally, ore tenus. If the Presiding Officer or any Senator, in order that there should be no mistake about its terms, requires it to be put in writing, then the Senator moving must put it so; and here comes this rule with respect to a motion to effect a change or amendment in the rules and requires that it always shall be so, or at least if not so that it shall be preceded by a formal notice specifying the exact particulars of the proposed change.

I am only speaking of this, Mr. President, as a mere question of law, and interesting for the extreme refinement of argument to which the discussion has gone.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope before the Senator from Wisconsin sits down he will state just what the difference is between a resolution and a motion if both were in writing. Suppose a resolution is written out and a motion is written out, where does the difference come in?

Mr. VILAS. We all know perfectly well that a resolution begins in a certain form. If it is a concurrent resolution it has a certain form of words; if it is a joint resolution it has certain other forms of words; if it is a resolution for the action of the Senate alone it may be simply a resolve. A written motion is but the expression in writing of a motion that could be made verbally, and it would be enough to say, "I move that such and such an act be done, or that such and such an order be made by the Senate."

Mr. ALDRICH. A resolution may be changed into a motion, then, by leaving out the word "resolved" at the beginning, or, vice versa, a motion can be made into a resolution by writing the word "resolved," and the rules could be evaded, according to the notion of the Senator from Wisconsin, by changing the form.

Mr. VILAS. So far from that being true, if a Senator chooses to make his proposal for an amendment of the rules of the Senate, as did the Senator from Idaho, in the form of a resolution, he necessarily complies with the full purpose of the fortieth rule, because, if any one objects, his resolution must lie over for a day. It does lie over for a day, under the rules, unless there is unanimous consent. Upon the very face of the resolution every object of the fortieth rule is particularly carried out by the precise specification of what has been done and the purpose of the motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not propose to speak any further upon the question of parliamentary law involved. It has been sufficiently elucidated. I think it must be clear that the Senate has a right to proceed to do precisely what it is now doing, to consider the pending resolution on its merits.

Allow me to say, in the first instance, that I shall support this resolution not because of anything done or omitted to be done by the Committee on Appropriations. Neither should the distinguished chairman, for whom we all have great respect, nor any other member of the committee construe this proposition as any reflection upon the committee. It is not, any more than it could be said an enlargement of a committee was a reflection upon any member of the committee. The majority of this body proceeded to enlarge several of the committees. Was it any reflection upon the past actions of the committee? None whatever. It is simply in pursuance of a general policy.

Mr. President, this proposition is not a new one. It has been suggested many times before. It is simply following out the precedent set in the House of Representatives. We heard the same dire predictions made years ago that it would increase appropriations and that calamity would befall the country if the various appropriation bills were diversified and distributed to the appropriate committees. I appeal to history to show that those predictions have not been fulfilled.

I have listened in vain for any argument against this resolution on the merits, stripped of the suggestion that it is to be construed as a reflection upon this committee. Laying aside that proposition, what argument has been advanced? I read the speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], made on the very day the Senator from Idaho advanced this proposition in the Senate. He had been a member of the Senate for a long number of years, and he listened to that speech holding this proposition in his hand. He simply pointed out two particulars in which he thought it might be well enough not to allow the resolution to apply, namely, to the Army appropriations and to the naval affairs. If a Senator who has been so long a member of this body, when a proposition of this kind has been proposed, can point to simply two changes that he thought might be required to be made, I think the resolution is pretty well founded, and that we can with great appropriateness proceed to adopt it.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is in charge of the whole subject of agriculture. It knows its wants; it knows its requirements; its members have given all their time to that subject; they know the moneys necessary for it. Will some one tell me why that committee is not as competent as the Committee on Appropriations to tell what amount of money the Department of Agriculture should have? It strikes me all the argument, all the reasoning, is with this resolution, namely, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be the committee to say what appropriation shall be made for the Agricultural Department.

Take the Committee on Foreign Relations. Are not the members of that committee engaged in the very subject of investigating what should be done in reference to our foreign affairs, our

consular affairs? Is not the whole question of salaries of our representatives abroad a question for that committee? Ought not the subject of appropriations to be referred to that committee? What argument, what point can be made against it? It does not require, let me tell you, days of consideration to enable Senators to antagonize this proposition. If there is any argument against it it ought to occur to them the very moment the proposition is submitted.

Mr. President, there is none. The suggestion of delay is simply a part of the tactics by which to defeat the resolution. We might as well be plain about it. All this question of parliamentary law, all the suggestions that have been made are simply for the purpose of delay, in my humble opinion, because the question is so clear.

Take the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, of which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is chairman. We have with us as a member of that committee an ex-member of the Cabinet, a man who was for nearly four years Postmaster-General, and is familiar with the whole subject of post-office matters, and the moneys required for that service. That committee can more appropriately than any other committee dispose of that question. Why can not that committee be trusted? Why should that committee be simply confined to the confirmation of post-office nominations? All other bills relating to post-offices go to that committee. Why should not the moneys necessary to be appropriated go to that committee, too?

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Why not?

Mr. HOAR. I do not rise to interfere with the Senator from New York because he has gone on so far in his argument, but I desire to give notice that after he concludes I shall insist upon the discussion being confined to the question of order until that is settled. I did not rise to interfere with the Senator, but I give notice that after he gets through I shall make the point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will proceed further with my argument. I have already said that I regard the question of order as substantially disposed of. The propriety of this resolution is now the only question involved here, in my judgment.

There is a committee established on coast defenses. It is proceeding to consider all the bills relating to coast-defense matters. Yet do you say that that committee ought not to have before it the appropriation bill which determines the amount of money that shall be expended for fortifications? That committee gives its entire time to that subject. How can the Committee on Appropriations, able as it is, and composed of some of the ablest and most experienced members of this body, know more upon this subject than the members of that committee can know?

Take the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] said—of course there was no question about it—that the Committee on the District of Columbia ought to have charge of the question of appropriations for the District of Columbia. Who can make an argument upon the other side of this question? There is none. All the bills relating to sewers, the opening of streets, and the civil government of the District of Columbia belong to that committee, because the Congress is substantially the common council of the District of Columbia. That is what it is in fact; and yet when it comes to the appropriation of moneys, the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has had all these subjects before it, has nothing whatever to say, but the Committee on Appropriations determines that question. Take the Committee on Pensions. Who can argue that that committee should not have charge of the moneys necessary to appropriate for pensions? It will not take them very long.

Mr. President, there is no reflection upon the Committee on Appropriations intended. Have we forgotten the speech of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] when he expressly disclaimed that there was any reflection intended upon the committee. Let me read from the speech of the Senator from Idaho when he first presented this proposition. He said:

> A reference to the personnel of the Appropriations Committee as at present constituted will convince any unprejudiced mind that other duties demand so much of their time and thought that they can not do justice to the country, the Senate, or themselves in attempting to supervise all the appropriations of the Government. They are the foremost men of the Senate, as I have stated, and the country looks to them as leaders in debate. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is the chairman. No matter what subject of importance is under consideration, the country and the Senate expect them to participate. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] are universally recognized as among the ablest debaters on this floor, and their attention and services are required at all times. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] are so conspicuous for their ability and eloquence that the country has a right to expect and does receive the benefit of their counsel on all general legislation. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is conceded to be among the best equipped men in public life, and in addition he is the recognized leader of nearly one-half this side of the Chamber on the currency question, if not of the entire Senate. His judgment is always in demand. And—
>
> Last but not least—
>
> so it is with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]; they are expected to and do take an active interest in all general legislation.

Mr. President, there was certainly no intention to cast any reflection upon these distinguished gentlemen. They are conceded to be among the best equipped men of the Senate. Their time is greatly occupied in the transaction of the business of that committee, and therefore it seems proper that the appropriation bills should be distributed through the various committees, that we may facilitate the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not care how long the discussion may be protracted, in my judgment it will not change men's opinions upon the merits of the question. There is only one side to it.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I think it is proper that I should say one word upon the point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Florida upon the point of order.

Mr. CALL. It is not a question in regard to the merits of the pending resolution. It is not a question in regard to substantial notice given. It is not a question in regard to the power of the Senate. We all know that it is in the power of the majority of the Senate to do anything. But the rule under consideration has been construed. In the case of the force bill precisely this question was raised, whether it be a resolution in writing or a motion. On the question of a change of the rules without a literal, strict, technical compliance with the requirement it was unanimously decided by this side of the Chamber, and I think by some votes on the other side, to be necessary.

Now, that had this effect: It postponed the consideration of what was regarded by a very large part of this body as a very important act of legislation. It gave time for reflection. And the object in view was never carried out because the majority of this body, composed of members of both parties, held that not a substantial, but a literal, strict, technical compliance with the rules was required. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] advocated that interpretation and he was sustained. That is precisely this case.

Mr. FRYE. Now, let us have the decision.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has no difficulty in determining this question. The Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote, has determined to proceed to the consideration of the pending resolution. No point of order was made prior to that determination upon the part of the Senate. The Chair can not sustain the point of order made after the Senate has taken this deliberate action.

That is one phase of the case. As to the other, the object of Rule XL is to prevent the Senate from being taken by surprise in an attempt to change the rules of this body. For that reason it is provided that—

> No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof.

On the 5th day of December the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] submitted a proposed amendment to the rules of the Senate. It was laid upon the table and ordered to be printed. From the 5th day of December until the present time that resolution has been before the Senate. It seems to the Chair that that is a compliance with the rules of the Senate. For that reason the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HILL. Now I ask that the question on the adoption of the resolution be submitted to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is upon the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is a subject that has excited my attention for several years. I have formed some very definite opinions upon it, but I do not intend to delay the Senate by expressing them at length. I think the work thrown upon the Committee on Appropriations at the closing period of a session is far beyond the possibility of its correct performance by the ablest committee that can be found among the membership of the body. The appropriation bills come to us generally at a late period in the session. I believe they are coming here at this session earlier than usual, but in the short session they are all lumped together during the last month, the month of February, the shortest month of the year, and the Committee on Appropriations is expected to go through all the items of appropriation that are made for the support of the National Government, amounting in the aggregate to $400,000,000.

When I first entered the House of Representatives nearly all the powers of appropriation, together with the power of framing tariff laws and all laws relating to money, was devolved upon one committee, the Committee of Ways and Means. Shortly afterwards, and during my term of service, that committee was deprived of several of its important functions, and new committees were created. From that time until the present the process has gone on in the House of Representatives to divide the labor of the appropriation of money and the various subjects connected with the appropriation of money among several different committees of the House. That I think we ought to have done.

It was in 1867 or 1868, I think, that the first division was made in the Senate. Up to that time the Committee on Finance had practical control of all financial legislation. It had control of the national banks. It had control of all funding laws. It had control of all the appropriation bills. In that small committee, composed I think then of seven members, all the vast work was done in respect to appropriations during the civil war. It was found probably that the work was hastily done. Mr. Fessenden, who was chairman of the committee for the greater portion of the period, himself complained of the labor imposed upon him as chairman of that committee, that it would break down his health, and I have no doubt it did largely contribute to the indisposition which followed his severe labors and which soon led to his, I think, premature death. Then the Senate began to divide up this work among other committees, and there were several committees that performed the duties of the Committee on Finance. Then the Committee on Appropriations was created, and other committees were from time to time added.

Now, it seems to me that in the proposition now made to us we have gone too far in that direction. In my judgment the Committee on Appropriations ought to be confined to the appropriation of moneys provided for by existing law. It ought not to deal as a rule with the new subjects of appropriations that are brought up from time to time. It seems to me that if the Committee on Appropriations were confined to departmental expenditures, as they are properly called, they would have enough, and more than enough, to do, probably more than any other committee of this body would have to do. As the committees are classified here in the resolution they are given the bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, and for all deficiencies. To that ought to be added the various departmental expenditures. For instance, the bill for the Agricultural Department it is here proposed to transfer to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In my judgment that would not be a wise disposition. The Department of Agriculture, like any other Department of the Government, makes its annual estimates. They are submitted to the Treasury Department and they are there reexamined and finally sent here and placed before the proper committees of the Senate and the House. I think that the departmental appropriations ought to be provided for and passed upon by the Committee on Appropriations. I think that ought to be continued, because those expenditures, with some rare exceptions, are fixed by definite laws, and it is not very difficult to make up the appropriations.

So with the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I have now the honor to be chairman. I think it would be better that the Committee on Appropriations should prepare the appropriations for expenses in our foreign relations, because those expenditures, the salaries of our ministers and consuls and consular agents, are fixed by law. Indeed, all the expenses of our foreign service consist in the payment of salaries, and those salaries are fixed by law. I see no reason whatever why the Committee on Appropriations ought not to continue to make up the estimates for that Department.

There has been no difficulty at all between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations about these matters. When we have recommended an increase of a consul or other officer in that service or have endeavored to raise the pay in various contingencies we have never had any difficulty in dealing with the Committee on Appropriations; they have generally conformed to our wishes in that particular. If these matters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations probably the work would not be better performed than it is now, simply because all the expenditures, I may say with scarcely an exception, are provided for by existing law and the amount is fixed, so that there is very rarely any controversy in regard to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

In regard to military affairs the appropriation for the expenses of our Army is purely a matter of computation. The pay of our soldiers is fixed, the pay of every officer is fixed. There are but few if any contingent expenditures; they are mainly fixed by existing law; and all the Committee on Appropriations have to do is to see that the appropriations conform to the existing law. If any new items of appropriations are proposed for the Army they would naturally come from the Committee on Military Affairs, and upon being reported from that committee be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and I have no doubt readily acquiesced in by that committee when they are so reported. The same might be said in regard to naval affairs. As to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, there is nothing in the expenditures of the Government for post-offices and post-roads except what is fixed by existing law. All the contracts are made by advertisement upon bids rendered and competition had. The pay of the postmasters is fixed according to the amount of their receipts; and as the duty of the committee is only to see that the appropriations conform to existing laws, I do not see any reason why they may not discharge those duties.

There is another class of duties that I think the Committee on Appropriations ought to be relieved from. Wherever the great body, or a considerable part, of the appropriations to be made are to be made by Congress from time to time, then I can see no reason why in such cases the appropriations for moneys so proposed to be expended and authorized by law should not be provided for under the charge of the different committees. For instance, take the pension appropriation bill. That bill provides for the appropriation of a gross sum. We can not tell how much it may be. The Commissioner of Pensions can generally tell about what amount will be required, and if the law is changed by the Committee on Pensions, that committee can better tell than any other what appropriations should be made. I can see no reason whatever why the Committee on Pensions should not have charge of the pension appropriation bill, because they are better informed, more familiar with the new laws, and have better opportunities for wise and proper action.

So with the other bureau expenditures. I can see no reason in the world why the Committee on Indian Affairs should not deal with the bill making appropriations for that Bureau, for it is a Bureau and not a Department of the Government, and the expenditures are uncertain. No doubt most of the expenditures are fixed by treaty, but there are constant disturbances in Indian affairs, and sometimes large sums of money have to be appropriated that can not in all cases be foreseen. The Committee on Indian Affairs, therefore, ought to be charged with the duty of taking care of that bill.

So with the Committee on Commerce. It would be perfect folly to send to the Committee on Appropriations the immense bills that are passed upon by the Committee on Commerce for internal improvements. The Committee on Appropriations would not have time to ascertain how much should be expended on the Ohio River, how much on the Great Lakes, and in different parts of the country. To properly act upon that bill requires a character of information which the Committee on Appropriations does not possess. Therefore righteously and properly that appropriation bill heretofore has been withdrawn from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it properly belongs. I see no reason whatever why all the appropriations made for commerce, which must vary from year to year, and which must depend upon the existing state of the Treasury Department and the amount of surplus revenue, as well as upon the various places where the money is to be expended, and which require yearly a new estimate of the amount needed for each particular place, should not be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

So I should favor that all appropriations hereafter to be made for coast defenses should be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, for the same reason that I gave in regard to referring the river and harbor bill to the Committee on Commerce. The amount needed for coast defenses would naturally be estimated by the committee having charge of that subject, and it seems to me that such a bill ought to go to the Committee on Coast Defenses. What is the use of having a Committee on Coast Defenses unless you refer to that committee the expenditures which are necessary to fortify and protect our coasts?

I have no doubt the experienced Senators who are now members of the Committee on Appropriations will admit that they have not the local information that is necessary to pass upon the bill providing for the expenditures of the District of Columbia. My honorable friend from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], who is a member of the District Committee, knows more already in his short term of service in the Senate as to the conditions in the city of Washington, and the necessity for expenditures, and where the money should be expended than the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I myself know more, perhaps, than most of the members of the Committee on Appropriations on that subject, because I have been here longer and have seen the city rise into its present condition.

It seems to me that the Committee on the District of Columbia ought to pass upon all the questions that affect the expenditures in the District. The people of the District pay one-half of all that is expended. Many, many persons, leading citizens of the District, have called upon me to right wrongs, injustices, or inequalities they suffer, and I have said to them to "go at once to the Committee on Appropriations." But they do not know anything about the Committee on Appropriations. The members of that committee have no special intercourse with them, while the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia are constantly brought into knowledge of the condition of affairs prevailing here, and therefore, as a matter of course, the bills providing for the expenditures of this District, one-half of which, as I have said, are to be paid by the Government and the other half by the citizens of the District, ought to be prepared by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I do not think there ought to be any feeling about this subject. No one underrates the high character and standing of the gentle-

men who compose the Committee on Appropriations, and no one would desire to wound their feelings. We know they are able men; but in devising and dividing the various duties that are put upon our different committees, it is but just and fair that we should regard the public interests and the interests of the people who are especially affected by these appropriations. While the departmental expenditures might be left to the charge and care of the Committee on Appropriations, these other matters, which depend upon annual appropriations, ought to be distributed among the various committees which have charge of that character of business.

If the opportunity shall offer, I shall vote for the last five clauses of the resolution, and against the clauses preceding them. That is my view of what is best to be done. If, however, the Senate should take away from the Committee on Appropriations all the departmental expenditures of the Government, they might as well dismantle and discharge that committee, for all that would be left to them under the resolution would be:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations—

That is pretty sweeping—

except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and inserting the following:

"The general appropriation bills shall be referred to committees as follows:

"To the Committee on Appropriations: The bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, and for all deficiencies."

The legislative, executive, and judicial expenses are the very expenses that are provided for and referred to other committees. The resolution says:

The bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses.

That would include the salary of the President and a few other officers of the Executive Departments, the salaries of the judges, and the judges are very few in number, and bills for the pay of the Senate and House of Representatives, and then "for sundry civil expenses," which are not named, but, as a matter of course, as bills for civil expenses are referred to other committees, they would not be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and then "for all deficiencies."

This would leave to the Committee on Appropriations less important duties than are conferred upon the Committee on Military Affairs, or the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and the amounts that the Committee on Appropriations would deal with would not compare with the amounts which are provided for these great Departments of the Government. I think, therefore, my friend from Idaho, in endeavoring to bring about a very sensible reform and a very proper distribution of labor here, has gone a little too far, and I hope that he, or the Senate for him, will correct these errors if possible, and will leave to the Committee on Appropriations the charge of all the departmental expenses of the Government, including the legislative, executive, and judicial.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, the first inclination of my mind was in favor of the general scheme of the project of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], but consideration of the measure which has been proposed and the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] convince me that it goes too far, and that it will not do, in the interest of the Government, to scatter the appropriation bills among so many committees.

There is one reason that I have not yet heard advanced against the proposition to divide these appropriation bills among a number of committees, and to my mind, the more I think of it, the more potent and real that objection seems. It is this: If these appropriations were divided under the scheme proposed by this resolution, each of these committees would have one subject committed to its charge. The Committee on Naval Affairs would have the one subject, a large one of course, of the expenses for the naval establishment; the Military Committee would have that for the military establishment; the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads the post-office establishment, and the Committee on Foreign Relations the foreign service; and so on.

We know that each committee would have its attention concentrated upon its own particular jurisdiction, and would necessarily, in confining its attention to the items of appropriation which belonged to its department, so called, lose sight of all other departments, and therefore we should lose the benefit, which I am convinced must be a very great one, and one which we have enjoyed in the past, in committing to one committee the large amount of these departmental appropriations; and that is, that they shall keep in view the state of the Federal Treasury and the aggregate of all appropriations. The danger would be that the Military Committee or the Coast Defense Committee would, in considering their jurisdiction and the object for which they were constituted, necessarily come to consider that they have the whole Treasury of the United States at their service, and they would minimize the importance of all other appropriations in comparison with those which they had in charge. Therefore this distribution, as proposed in the resolution, would be, it seems to me, to promote extravagance, and not be in the interests of that economy which is so important in spending the money which we take from the pockets of the people.

I therefore think that a scheme much less comprehensive than the one proposed by the Senator from Idaho ought to be substituted for it, certainly before I vote for it, and that we ought not to lose sight of the advantage that we have had all along from this concentration of the minds of a large committee upon the aggregate of appropriations and upon the whole field of governmental expenditure.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I was simply going to suggest that if the same argument were carried to its legitimate conclusion, would it not compel the Senate to prohibit the Commerce Committee from taking charge of the river and harbor bill?

Mr. GRAY. I think not. Perhaps that is one exception to the rule. It has peculiar considerations belonging to it, and it is a very long and intricate bill. It is an intermittent appropriation. There are certain years in which no appropriation at all is made, and the amount of the appropriation varies from year to year very extensively. Of course, I admit the principle would apply, but one exception is not so bad as a great many.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has just been predicting what the result of this would be. My service in the House of Representatives has been comparatively very recent, and I can speak of what is likely to be and what is under the system there employed. The same predictions were made there as to the great increase of appropriations. I took some pains in the other House, when it was proposed to take two other appropriation bills from the Committee on Appropriations, to look into that matter a little, and I could not find that there had been any sudden increase of appropriations owing to the distribution of the bills. I know from service on one committee—I was on the Naval Committee which prepared the naval appropriation bill—how it worked in practice.

In the first place, a committee having only one appropriation bill gives great attention to it, and I think it prepares a better bill than can be prepared by a committee which has fourteen bills. When an appropriation bill comes into the House from the Naval Committee, or any other committee which has a single appropriation bill to consider, it is subjected to the watchful and very jealous scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations, who follow everything the other committee undertakes to do. That is one reason, I think, for this arrangement having worked so well in the House of Representatives.

Further, those bills were distributed in the House of Representatives, and there is not a suggestion or a thought in that House of going back to the old system. It is universally conceded that the new system has worked well. I think it is a much better system than the old. I think it is fairer to the committees. I think we get more intelligent bills, from the simple fact that no committee can give to the fourteen appropriation bills the consideration which they deserve.

We could not have an abler or more efficient Committee on Appropriations than we now have, but it is a physical impossibility, in my judgment, for that committee to perform the work, and I think the experience of the House of Representatives has demonstrated it.

I observed the Senator from Ohio, when he was speaking, advised the withdrawal from the Committee on Appropriations of two appropriation bills which the House of Representatives have left with its Committee on Appropriations, the pension and the District of Columbia appropriation bills. I always thought when in the other House that those bills also should be taken away from the Committee on Appropriations, and I think it was illogical to stop where the House did. I never could see any good reason for it, particularly in the case of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, where I think the argument is exceptionally strong against it remaining with the Committee on Appropriations. As for this proposed distribution, the Committee on Appropriations will have the two great appropriation bills, the ones in which the new appropriations are made, the largest and the most important of all the bills. They have, through those and the deficiency bill, a survey of every appropriation for the Government. I think this change would probably increase their power in the long run over the general course of appropriations, and, far from leading to extravagance, I think, if anything, it would tend to better bills, and that the money appropriated would be expended to greater advantage.

There is another point, Mr. President. Our Committee on Appropriations, as the Senator from Ohio has said, has a tremendous burden to carry at the end of every session. It is more, I think,

than almost any men can sustain. At the close of a short session they are obliged to be in conference on half a dozen bills, and they have to supply all their conferees from one committee. The House of Representatives sends three fresh men to every conference on an appropriation bill, with nothing but that one bill to attend to, which gives the House, in my judgment, a very great advantage in conference, merely a physical advantage, but I think it is one to be considered.

Mr. President, these are the reasons—and they are drawn from experience—which lead me to favor this change. So far as the actual condition here goes, it seems to me that it would be better for the Senate to give to some of the large committees which now exist, and have little to do, duties which are important to be performed. I do not believe this proposed change is going to do any harm; on the contrary, I believe it is going to be a very beneficial measure.

It is hardly necessary for me to disclaim any personal feeling in the matter toward the members of the Committee on Appropriations. So far as I am concerned, I have never received anything but the most generous and considerate treatment at their hands, as I presume all Senators have. I do not think that it is quite fair to put it on personal grounds. It gives it a disagreeable aspect, which none of us like to feel. I think this is a necessary change in the rules, and I hope, now the Senate has taken it up, now that it has manifested by a large majority its desire to make this change, we shall continue until we vote upon the resolution and decide definitely upon this change.

Mr. MILLS. May I interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to appeal to the memory of both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], who, like myself, have recently come from the House of Representatives. It has been charged that the distribution of these bills among the different committees will lead to more extravagant appropriations. I wish to ask the two Senators—because they are familiar with the matter, having served on committees which have had charge of appropriation bills in the other House—if it has not been a uniform fact that the bills have come back to the House of Representatives increased by the Senate? Was not that their experience in the other House?

Mr. LODGE. They uniformly came back to the House largely increased.

Mr. MILLS. In the Senate there is but one committee having charge of appropriation bills, while in the House there are twelve or fourteen.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senate will bear me out in what I have said, that the effect of a distribution of the bills in the House of Representatives was that we thereby got not only the supervision of the committee to which they were immediately taken, but a very close and jealous scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it not notorious and well known that the House Committee on Appropriations places appropriations at the very lowest estimate, far below anything that they know will do, and compels the Senate to increase the appropriations or cripple the public service?

Mr. LODGE. I think that may be true.

Mr. COCKRELL. And is it not true that very frequently they only appropriate for three-fourths of the year and inquire of the heads of Departments how much it will take to run the Departments up to a certain time—nine months of the year?

Mr. LODGE. I think that may all be true, but I do not think it touches the question of increasing appropriations by the proposed distribution.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, it is sought by this resolution to change the distribution of power in the Senate, to emancipate the Senate from the monopolistic dominance of about 20 men here who compose the two leading committees, those of Appropriations and Finance. It is the same struggle that was had in the House of Representatives in 1885. Prior to that time in the House all the appropriation bills intended to provide funds for the support of the Government originated in the Committee on Appropriations. It was an undue deposit of power in one committee, of authority in the hands of a few gentlemen who composed the committee. The same is true of the Senate of the United States to-day. There is too much power lodged in one committee, when to that committee all the appropriation bills designed to support the Government are referred after reaching this body from the House. The object of the pending measure is to change that, and to bring about a more equitable distribution of the power of the Senate among its committees.

The same objections which are now urged to this resolution here were urged at great length in the debate which ensued in the House. After an elaborate discussion, every reason that was possible being urged by its opponents against the proposed change, the matter came to a test vote in the House of Representatives on the 18th of December, 1885. It came on an amendment offered by Mr. Hammond of Georgia to the pending proposition, the effect of which was, if adopted, to leave all the appropriation bills in the hands of the Appropriations Committee, as theretofore. The vote stood in favor of the Hammond amendment, to retain the old order of things, 70, and against it, 227. By a great majority the House of Representatives determined upon a change similar to the one which the Senator from Idaho proposes to make in the Senate now.

In the House of Representatives at that time there were seven gentlemen who now occupy seats upon this floor. Six of the seven voted for the change alluded to, and the seventh, now the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], is recorded as absent, but he informs me had he been present he would have supported the proposition then as he is supporting it now. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] who is before me was one of the gentlemen in the House of Representatives who supported the proposition. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] was another, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] was another, the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] was another, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON] was another, and I was the sixth.

We all voted then for a change which we believed was in the right direction, and I submit that time has justified the action then taken. More than ten years have elapsed since the change was effected, and, as was stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], there is no suggestion from any quarter that it was one not to the advantage of the Government, or to the proper conduct of legislation. If the proposition were presented now in the other House to overturn the present condition of affairs, as respects the distribution of powers among the committees, and to go back to the old order of things, by which one committee was the depositary of nearly all the authority of the House of Representatives, it would not command a corporal's guard of votes there in its favor.

It is nowhere alleged, or, if it be, it is not susceptible of proof, that the appropriations designed to meet the expenses of the Government are any more extravagant now than they were prior to the time of the change. What increase there has been in aggregate appropriations is only such as was required by the growth of the country. The principal argument made by Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania, and by other leading members of the House of Representatives against the charge, was that once divide the appropriation bills among several committees and it would tend to extravagance in the appropriations. Sir, it was tried, and the prediction has not been fulfilled. It did result, however, in a better consideration of the ten or twelve appropriation bills of Congress than was possible at the hands of one committee.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate is composed of a set of gentlemen industrious as well as able, but when you send to them a dozen appropriation bills, carrying in the aggregate appropriations of from three hundred and fifty to four hundred million dollars per annum, it is impossible for the committee to give full and complete consideration to such bills and then find time for other work. But if they are divided up, if, for instance, to the Committee on Naval Affairs there be sent the appropriation bill for the naval establishment, with only the one bill of the kind before it, that committee can give fuller and more enlarged consideration to the measure than it is possible for the Committee on Appropriations to do with all the other appropriation bills likewise to handle.

Mr. President, I look upon the pending measure as one of reform. Every year the expenditures of the Government are increasing, and in proportion as they increase additional labor is imposed upon the Appropriations Committee under the present system. If it was a good change to make in the House of Representatives ten years ago, I submit it is a good change to make now in the Senate of the United States.

I do not doubt that such a change would find welcome in the country. There is no sentiment anywhere of which I am aware, unless it be among the older members of this body, opposing this reform and objecting to this change.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Louisiana let me ask him a question before he sits down?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator was for a long time a member of the House of Representatives, and was there when this radical change was adopted by the House. If the Senator has not already told the Senate—having invoked the example of the other House—will he tell the Senate now what appropriation bills in that movement in the other House were left to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BLANCHARD. As I recollect, there were left to the Committee on Appropriations the sundry civil appropriation bill, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, all the deficiency appropriation bills, and one or two others I do not now recall.

Mr. HALE. I am sorry the Senator, so lately from the other House, has forgotten that in that measure, adopted after great

discussion and objection, the House did not pretend to go to anything like the extent that the pending resolution does, but left to the Appropriations Committee, no question being made, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, the sundry civil bill, the deficiency bill, the great pension bill, which is the largest of all in the Government, the fortifications bill, the District of Columbia bill—half of the bills, and no further than that did any member of the House ask to go.

But this resolution drives ruthlessly way beyond, double what the House of Representatives determined upon, and leaves to the Committee on Appropriations only the appropriations for the running of the Departments, deficiencies made by other committees, and the sundry civil bill. I thought that the Senator, who was invoking the example of the other House, would have a clear recollection of what was done there and, after producing his arguments in favor of the salutary nature of the House proposition, would tell us how far the House of Representatives went. Senators do not realize that this proposition goes a great way beyond what the House of Representatives then attempted or has since attempted to do. It is a fact that in the other House out of the twelve or thirteen bills, six of them were left to the Committee on Appropriations without objection, including the largest bill of the entire number, the great pension bill with $140,000,000 on it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The reform which was instituted in the House of Representatives ten years ago was a movement in the right direction. Perhaps it did not go so far as the pending resolution designs to go. Perhaps it did leave (and about that I did not recollect) in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations the pension appropriation bill. But why should that bill be left in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations? Why is not the Committee on Pensions of this body as competent to handle it as is the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HALE. Why is not the Committee on Pensions of the other House as competent as the Committee on Appropriations of this body?

Mr. BLANCHARD. There are two pension committees in the House—one known as the Committee on Pensions, the other as the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I said the action of the House of Representatives was a reform going in the right direction. Perhaps it did not go far enough, and now after an experience of ten years of what the other House did, as far as it went, the Senate takes up the proposition, and proposes to go even further on this line of reform. What objection can the Senator from Maine find to the Committee on Pensions of the Senate having charge of the pension appropriation bill?

Mr. HALE. Now, will the Senator answer me, taking that argument, why, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] said, he should be left out? If the pension appropriation bill goes to the Committee on Pensions, why should not the patent appropriation go the Patent Committee? And the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] says, then, why should not the appropriations for the courts and the judicial department of the Government go to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. PLATT. And the public-lands appropriation go to the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Louisiana say why, in his reform march of destruction, the Senator from Idaho, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, has failed to follow the argument of the Senator from Louisiana and has neglected to send the public lands appropriation to the Committee on Public Lands? I do not know why the light-house appropriation should not go to the Committee on Commerce.

The truth is, the movement is revolutionary, and when you begin you may as well deprive the Committee on Appropriations of its entire jurisdiction. There is not an argument which the Senator has given about the Committee on Pensions that does not apply to the Committee on Patents, to the Committee on the Judiciary, to the Committee on Public Lands, and to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The Committee on Pensions ought to have charge of the pension appropriation bill, because for a long time past it has been made a separate bill in itself, and, as the Senator from Maine says, the largest of all the appropriation bills, involving from one hundred and forty to one hundred and fifty million dollars annually. Now, when the Senator speaks of the appropriations for the courts, they are a part of the judicial expenditures of the Government. When he speaks of the appropriations for patents, the Patent Office is one of the bureaus in the Interior Department. It is true that so is the Pension Office a bureau in the Interior Department; but we can properly segregate the appropriation for it from that of the other bureaus because of its magnitude.

The appropriation bill known as the legislative, executive, and judicial bill carries appropriations for the support of the courts, the Patent Office, the Land Office, the light-houses, mentioned by the Senators, and for the other bureaus of the Government, and the necessity does not now exist to multiply the number of appropriation bills. When the other House came to distribute the appropriation bills it did see proper, as I am reminded by the Senator from Maine, to leave the pension appropriation bill in the hands of the regular Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me?

Mr. BLANCHARD. In one moment. But that is no argument against the reform which was carried out at least in part at that time by the other House, and it is no argument against the reform which is now sought to be carried out in the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether the advent of the billion-dollar Congress, of which we have heard a great deal in various ways for a number of years, was after this magnificent reform of which the Senator is speaking took place in the House of Representatives?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The change took place in the House of Representatives in 1885; and the Senator from Rhode Island knows that the "billion-dollar Congress" held forth in 1890. I now recall that some very eminent gentleman in the Republican party, in which organization the Senator from Rhode Island is a shining light, speaking of the billion-dollar Congress said, "Begad, this is a billion-dollar country"; and I presume to that observation the Senator from Rhode Island will subscribe.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my apology for saying a word on this occasion is that I have experienced the beneficence of the new system inaugurated in the other House. It is unparliamentary, of course, to refer to the proceedings of the present House of Representatives, but not to what has transpired in the past. I went into the other House in 1883. At that time all the appropriation bills with but one or possibly two exceptions were dumped into the hands of the Appropriations Committee. The question came up for consideration, and the result was as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] has stated. Our experience after that change was made, so far as I know, and I was on one of the committees that was affected by the change, the Committee on Indian Affairs, was considered by everybody beneficent and good.

I know that our Indian appropriation bills after that time were repeatedly and in many particulars increased in the Senate. I know of my own knowledge that claims which I regarded as having no place on the Indian appropriation bill were put on in the Senate, and were on the bill when it came back to the House.

But, Mr. President, there is one point that lies at the root of the whole matter which has not been mentioned, and to it I wish to call the attention of Senators. We are here as States on a parity with each other. Nevada and Delaware stand here on an equal parity with New York; and Senators are here on a parity with each other. The most important legislation before the Senate are the appropriation bills. There is no set of bills and legislation so important as those bills. To segregate all that class of legislation and put it into the hands of one committee and exclude all the others is not putting Senators or committees on a parity. It is assuming that a select body of 13 men are the only ones competent to deal with the subject and that the other Senators and the other committees are incompetent.

What I have said here I have said in the utmost of Christian spirit. I have the highest regard for the members of the Appropriations Committee as Senators and as individuals. If the practice of dumping all the appropriation bills into one committee is to prevail, I do not know that if I had the selection I could pick a better or more worthy set than the gentlemen now on the committee; but I suggest to them that in fairness to other Senators and in fairness to other States they ought to be willing to consent to a measure for the distribution of this important legislation among the different committees of the Senate.

Mr. SEWELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HARRIS. I did not know that the Senator from New Jersey had taken the floor.

Mr. SEWELL. I have the highest regard for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe I will ask the Senator from New Jersey, if it is agreeable to him, to yield to a motion to adjourn at this time.

Mr. SEWELL. If the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to submit an amendment to the resolution, I will accede to his suggestion.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly, and if we adjourn at this time the Senator will be upon the floor when we meet again.

Mr. SEWELL. So I understand. For fear that a point of order might be made against it, I have reduced to writing the amendment which I propose.

Mr. GORMAN and Mr. HALE. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. CULLOM. Let it be read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Amendment intended to be proposed to Senate resolution No. 6: Insert in line 17, after "Military Academy,"

the words "and the National and State Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed.

Mr. CALL. I submit an amendment to the pending resolution, which I ask may lie upon the table and be printed.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the resolution the following:

After the appropriation bills shall be reported to the Senate by the several committees, they shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and report to the Senate the total amount of the appropriation and such recommendation in relation to the total amount of such appropriations and necessary changes in such bills as may be necessary to keep them within the revenues of the Government and adequate for its requirements.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to submit an amendment at this time, which may be printed. After the word "following," at the end of the sixth line, I propose to insert the words "after the close of the present session of Congress."

Mr. BATE. I had intended, and so stated, to move an executive session this afternoon, but it is now so late that I shall not do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate bills from the House of Representatives for reference.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 1691) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 2917) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay from their own funds for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians.

The bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the bill may lie on the table. It is a bill similar to one already reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will lie on the table.

AMERICAN REGISTERS FOR BARKS MINDE AND JOHAN LUDWIG.

The bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig* was read twice by its title.

Mr. PASCO. That bill is identical with one which has been recommended by the Committee on Commerce, and is now on the Calendar. I ask that the House bill may be taken up by unanimous consent and put upon its passage. It will take but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read, so that we may know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. SEWELL. I should like to have the Senator from Florida inform the Senate as to the reason why these vessels are to be admitted, upon what expenditures made, and their value.

Mr. PASCO. I will state that the case comes within the general law except in a single particular.

Mr. SEWELL. Is there a report in the case?

Mr. PASCO. There is a written report in the case, and the bill comes——

Mr. SEWELL. I should like to have the report read, or let the bill lie over.

Mr. PASCO. A bill identical with this has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that one of these vessels was built originally in an American shipyard. It is a small vessel. On the other one there was expended considerably more than the amount required by the existing law; but they were not wrecked within 3 miles of the shore.

Mr. SEWELL. That is a sufficient explanation.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PASCO. I move that the bill (S. 677) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig* be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. VILAS. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will give way for a motion that we may have a brief executive session for the consideration of business not contested, but which ought to be disposed of.

Mr. HARRIS. If it is the wish of the Senate to consider non-contested cases, I shall not interpose. I withdraw the motion to adjourn.

Mr. VILAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 5, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1896.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Ignacio Sepulvida, of California, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at the City of Mexico.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Hiram A. Seymour, of Florida, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John W. Judd, of Utah, to be attorney of the United States for the District of Utah.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

John A. Marshall, of Utah, to be United States district judge for the district of Utah.

MARSHALS.

William H. Cannon, of Wisconsin, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Wisconsin.

Nat M. Brigham, of Utah, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Utah.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

John M. Lenihan, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa.

William H. Anderson, of Maine, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Portland, in the State of Maine.

POSTMASTERS.

Edwin S. Ames, to be postmaster at Hot Springs, in the county of Fall River and State of South Dakota.

J. R. Lynch, to be postmaster at Lindsborg, in the county of McPherson and State of Kansas.

Martha Brown, to be postmaster at Fort Valley, in the county of Houston and State of Georgia.

James A. Hall, to be postmaster at Irvington, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Edward E. Miles, to be postmaster at Onancock, in the county of Accomac and State of Virginia.

Lizzie C. Yates, to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia.

Franz F. Metschan, to be postmaster at National Military Home, in the county of Leavenworth and State of Kansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 4, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report back the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, with an amendment of the Senate in the nature of a substitute, with the recommendation that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment and insist upon the bill as it originally passed the House.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I only desire to state that that report is not unanimous. The minority report will recommend concurrence.

The SPEAKER. The report will be placed on the Union Calendar.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to give notice that I will call up the bill which has been reported, with the Senate substitute, for consideration immediately after the District of Columbia appropriation bill shall have been disposed of.

INDIAN HUNTING GROUNDS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4444) providing for commissioners to treat with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied domain of the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint commissioners to treat with the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians now located on the Shoshone Reservation in Fremont County, Wyo., and with the Shoshone and Bannock Indians, located on the Fort Hall Reservation in Idaho, for the surrender or modification of any rights which they may claim under the treaty signed July 3, 1868, to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States. The commissioners so appointed may treat with the said Indians, either for the complete surrender of all rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied lands of the United States off of their respective reservations or for the modification of the rights claimed by them to such an extent that they shall be amenable to State game laws end regulations.

SEC. 2. That to carry out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommend the adoption of the following amendments:

Strike out the word "treat" where it occurs in the bill and insert the word "negotiate" instead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendments recommended by the committee agreed to, and, as amended, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed. The title of the bill was amended to read:

A bill providing for commissioners to negotiate with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States.

FOUNDRY BUILDING, WASHINGTON NAVY-YARD.

Mr. HILBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution No. 23, which is on the Union Calendar, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for a new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled an "Act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to use such part of the $33,000 appropriated for new iron roof for foundry in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," under the caption "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, navy-yards and stations, Naval Academy, and New Naval Observatory," and under the subhead "Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.," as may be necessary for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CRISP. I would like to ask the gentleman if this has been reported by a House committee?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes, sir; and carries no appropriation.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman please explain it?

Mr. CANNON. What is this matter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is trying to get order on the floor so the gentleman may find out.

Mr. HILBORN. What is the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CRISP. I understand from a gentleman sitting near me that he has examined the matter and it is satisfactory, and being satisfactory to the committee, I have no further inquiry to make.

Mr. HILBORN. I ask the reading of the letter from the Navy Department attached to the report, which fully explains it.

The letter was read, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *December 11, 1895.*

SIR: In the naval estimates for the year ending June 30, 1896, under the heading "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, navy-yards and stations," etc., and subhead "Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.," one item was, "For new iron roof and repairs to walls of foundry (submitted), $33,000."

When the appropriation bill passed it read, "For new roof for foundry, $33,000"; as the repairs to the wall were not mentioned, we have been unable to use any of the money appropriated, as the walls must be repaired before the new iron roof can be put on.

It is respectfully requested that the accompanying joint resolution may be passed at once, in order that the necessary steps may be taken toward putting on the new roof appropriated for.

Respectfully,

H. A. HERBERT,
Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Who reports this resolution?

Mr. HILBORN. The House Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. Then the House Committee on Naval Affairs wrongfully got jurisdiction of it. It is a mere deficiency.

Mr. HILBORN. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it is to make a deficiency appropriation available.

Mr. HILBORN. As I understand it, in the last estimate for naval repairs there was an estimate of $33,000 for two purposes, one to strengthen the wall of the new foundry——

Mr. CANNON. I understand.

Mr. HILBORN. And the other for the roof of the building—an iron roof—both appropriations being contained in one bill. When the bill came to be prepared, all allusion to the walls was left out, and $33,000 was left for the roof, which is more than is necessary. You have, therefore, an appropriation to build a roof and nothing to suport it. The appropriation, as I have said, was made for both purposes, both for the walls and roof. Now the Department wants permission from the House to use a portion of the $33,000 to carry out the intention of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. The Senate passed this bill?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And it also received the indorsement of the Naval Committee of the House?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And you report from that committee favorably?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Well, in my judgment, the committee has no jurisdiction, but I do not care about splitting hairs in regard to the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF RAILROAD LANDS, ETC.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, which is on the Union Calendar.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1887, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That where such purchasers, their heirs or assigns, have paid only a portion of the purchase price to the company, which is less than the Government price of similar lands, they shall be required, before the delivery of patent for their lands, to pay to the Government a sum equal to the difference between the portion of the purchase price so paid and the Government price, and in such case the amount demanded from the company shall be the amount paid to it by such purchaser."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ELLIS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FRANCES R. JACK AND OTHERS.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack the sum of $298.10, on account of rent of building in the city of Roanoke, Va., for use as post-office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for an explanation.

The SPEAKER. Subject to the right of objection, the gentleman will be allowed to explain.

Mr. OTEY. I ask that the report may be read.

The report (by Mr. HUTCHESON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 573) entitled "A bill for the relief of Francis R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack," respectfully report the same as amended and recommend that it do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

After the words "sum of," in the sixth line, strike out "ninety-eight dollars and ten," and insert in lieu thereof "fifty-nine dollars and twenty-two," thus eliminating the interest charged from July 1, 1893, amounting to $38.88.

The facts are these, as gathered from the First Assistant Postmaster-General, as well as the applicant:

On March 5, 1893, the premises occupied by the post-office in the city of Roanoke, Va., were destroyed by fire, and the post-office was removed across the street to the building owned by the Misses Jack. A lease was entered into with the Misses Jack for a term of years from July 1, 1893. The appropriation was exhausted, so that the rental could not be paid except from the 1st of July, 1893, and the Misses Jack agreed that they would accept payments from the 5th of March to the 1st of July, as far as the appropriation would permit, without prejudice to their claim for the regular rental. So the account, briefly stated and admitted as correct, the details of which, with the statements of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, are on file with the committee, is as follows:

From March 5 to July 1, 1893, rental due	$387.00
By amounts paid by the postmaster at Roanoke during the months of March, April, May, and June, 1893	127.78
Balance due	259.22

As stated, interest was added to this, which the committee eliminated.

The claim is a just one and should be paid, and your committee therefore recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendment recommended by the Committee on Claims, set forth in the report, was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO PATENT LAWS.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to move the reference of the bill (H. R. 271) to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the Committee on Patents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

EFFICIENCY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged resolution. I am directed by the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to call up for consideration the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolution (No. 148) in lieu of resolution No. 108.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Public Printer, the Civil Service Commissioners, the Commissioner of Labor, and the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries be requested to furnish the House of Representatives with the following information, namely: The number of employees there are in their respective Departments, and the salaries of each, who are below a fair standard of efficiency, together with the cause of their inefficiency; and if inefficiency is caused by age, state the age at which they became inefficient.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BROSIUS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MICHAEL RYAN.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to revoke the order dishonorably discharging Private Michael Ryan, Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, on September 20, 1865, and to issue to him an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States as of that date.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the report be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has this bill been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes, favorably.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. It has been reported by our committee.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask for the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report, if there be no objection.

The report (by Mr. GRIFFIN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan, have had the same under consideration, and find that the soldier enlisted in Company I, Fifth United States Infantry. At the end of his first term of service, September 20, 1862, he reenlisted for three years, and served faithfully and with credit through the entire war.

In the summer of 1865 his regiment was sent to New Mexico, and while at Fort Sumner, near the end of his second term of enlistment, he was one night detailed to guard artillery on the parade ground. Where the detail was formed some old arms were piled, among which he observed an old Colt's revolver, which he picked up and put in his blouse pocket. A noncommissioned officer saw the act and preferred a charge of theft of the property of the United States against Ryan, who was tried by court-martial, which convened August 17, 1865, and found him guilty, notwithstanding his statement that he took up the pistol with the intention of keeping it during that night on guard, and also the fact that his first lieutenant testified that he had known Ryan since July, 1862, and had always considered him a very good soldier; that he had never known him to be accused of theft until that occasion.

A bill identical with this (H. R. 8391) was introduced in the House of Representatives, third session Fifty-third Congress, and also during the same session a similar bill was introduced in the Senate, known as Senate bill 2510. The House Committee on Military Affairs of the Fifty-third Congress reported on H. R. bill 8391, in part, as follows:

"This soldier served the United States from 1857 to 1865. The facts in this case are fully set forth in a letter directed to Hon. LOREN FLETCHER, a member of this Congress, from Hon. William Lochren, Commissioner of Pensions, concerning Senate bill 2510, identical with the House bill, which letter is herewith appended and made a part of this report.

"The committee have examined the proceedings of the court-martial which tried Private Ryan, and to which reference is made in the aforesaid letter, and find that the facts, as proven at the trial, are correctly set forth by the Commissioner of Pensions."

The bill (H. R. 8391) passed both Houses of the Fifty-third Congress, but failed to reach the President in time to receive the Executive approval.

Your committee would therefore recommend that H. R. 1816 do pass.

The following is a copy of the letter from the Commissioner of Pensions above referred to:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, February 7, 1895.

MY DEAR SIR: I am quite desirous, as I have stated to you, for the passage of the bill (S. 2510) for the relief of Michael Ryan, late private Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry. It will be an act of justice to a deserving soldier and good citizen of our State, and constituent of your own, with whom you have, as I believe, some personal acquaintance.

Michael Ryan, when a youth and before the late war, enlisted in that company and regiment. At the end of his first term of service, September 20, 1862, he at once reenlisted for another term of three years, and served faithfully and with credit through the entire war. In the summer of 1865 the regiment was sent to New Mexico, and while stationed at Fort Sumner, near the end of his second term of enlistment, he was one night included in a detail to guard artillery upon the parade ground. Where the detail was formed some old arms were piled, among which he observed an old Colt's revolver, which he picked up and put in his blouse pocket.

The act was noticed by a noncommissioned officer, who, finding that he had put the revolver in his pocket, arrested him and preferred a charge against him of theft of property of the United States. Upon this charge he was tried by court-martial, convened August 17, 1865, and found guilty, notwithstanding his statement that he took up the pistol with the intention of keeping it during that night on guard, and notwithstanding the fact that the first lieutenant of his company testified, "I have known Private Ryan since sometime in July, 1862, and have always considered him a very good soldier; never have known him to be accused of theft until the present occasion." He was sentenced to be kept at hard labor in charge of the guard for the remainder of his term of enlistment, and to be then dishonorably discharged, with forfeiture of all pay and allowances, except the just dues to the laundress and sutler. This sentence was approved September 2, 1865, eighteen days before the expiration of his second term of enlistment.

Mr. Ryan has related the matter to me several times, and I have examined the original record of the court-martial in the office of the Judge-Advocate-General, and have a copy of the same, kindly furnished me by that officer, which I will transmit, if desired. But there is no question as to the simple facts as I have briefly stated them. The only matter in doubt is the intent with which he picked up the old revolver and put it in his pocket, when going out at night on guard, whether from curiosity to examine and return it in the morning, or to keep it. Had he been at that place—not going on guard—and picked it up and examined it from curiosity and laid it down, nothing wrong could be charged. It was not an infantry arm with which he was familiar, and he might have had some curiosity to examine it. Going out on guard for the night, whence he would return to the same place, his statement is by no means incredible—that he took it with him intending to return it.

But even if at the end of two terms of faithful service, including the whole period of the war, on seeing this old pistol he formed the purpose of taking it as a souvenir of his service, it seems to me a venial offense, no more than numberless good soldiers did, and that the sentence of dishonorable discharge, in view of his military service and good character as a soldier, was cruel and undeserved. The other parts of the sentence were much more than adequate punishment.

Mr. Ryan has been my neighbor ever since the war. He is an honest, respectable man, who has the warm regard of all who know him. For nearly twenty years he has been a member of our city police, and I know that all of our citizens who have had anything to do with our municipal government would commend him in the highest terms.

As age is approaching and children and grandchildren are growing up about him he feels keenly the disgrace and, as he thinks, injustice of resting under the stain of a dishonorable discharge from his military service, so long extended and creditably performed. If I can interest you in this matter, so as to secure what I think is but tardy justice, I shall be extremely gratified.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. LOCHREN.

Hon. LOREN FLETCHER,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLETCHER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals for the eighth judicial circuit be, and is hereby, extended to all suits at law or equity now pending therein upon writ of error to or appeal from the United States court in the Indian Territory in all cases wherein such writ of error or appeal would have vested jurisdiction in said circuit court of appeals but for the act of Congress approved March 1, 1895, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is this reported from the Committee on the Judiciary?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it is.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should like to hear the report read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. TERRY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary have had under consideration the bill (S. 1547) entitled "An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeals and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory," and beg leave to report the same to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

The act of March 1, 1895, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," organized a court of appeals for said Territory, to have jurisdiction of certain cases theretofore appealable to the circuit court of appeals of the eighth circuit, but omitted to insert a saving clause on the subject of appeals and writs of error sued out before the passage of said act to said court of appeals of the eighth circuit. The present bill is designed to remedy such omission and to apply to all cases now pending in said eighth circuit court of appeals upon writ of error to or appeal from the United States court in the Indian Territory in all cases wherein such writ of error or appeal would have vested jurisdiction in said circuit court of appeals but for the passage of said act of March 1, 1895.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TERRY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ST. LOUIS, OKLAHOMA AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the Territory of Oklahoma, be, and the same is hereby, authorized and invested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, owning, equipping and operating, using and maintaining a railway and telegraph and telephone line through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, beginning at a point to be selected by said railway company at or near the town of Claremore, in the Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory, and running thence in a westerly and southerly direction, over the most practicable and feasible route, through or near the Cherokee, Creek, Seminole, and Chickasaw Nations, Indian Territory, and Pottawatomie Reserve, Oklahoma, to a point on the Red River at or near Willis, Ind. T., and from thence through the State of Texas to a point at or near Aransas Pass, State of Texas, with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings, and extensions as said company may deem to its interests to construct and maintain along and upon the right of way and depot grounds herein provided for, with the right also of locating, constructing, owning, equipping and operating, using and maintaining a branch line of railway from a point on the main line to be selected by said company over the most practicable and feasible route southwesterly through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, to a point at or near Purcell, Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory, thence southwesterly to the northerly side of Wilbarger County, State of Texas, and from thence to the east line of the Territory of New Mexico, and thence through New Mexico to a point at or near El Paso, State of Texas, with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings, and extensions as said company may deem to its interests to construct and maintain along and upon the right of way and depot grounds herein provided for.

SEC. 2. That said corporation is authorized to take and use for all purposes of a railway, for its main line and branch line, and for no other purpose, a right of way 100 feet in width through said Indian territories and Territory of Oklahoma, and to take and use a strip of land 200 feet in width, with a length of 3,000 feet, in addition to right of way, for stations, for every 10 miles of road, with the right to use such additional ground where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 100 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*, That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein authorized to be taken shall be sold by the company, and they shall not be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railway, telegraph, and telephone lines; and when any portion thereof shall cease to be used, such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall have been taken.

SEC. 3. That before said railway shall be constructed through any lands held by individual occupants according to the laws, customs, and usages of any of the Indian nations or tribes through which it may be constructed, or by allotments under any law of the United States or agreement with the Indians, full compensation shall be made to such occupants for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of such railway. In case of failure to make amicable settlement with any occupant, such compensation shall be determined by the appraisement of three disinterested referees, to be appointed one (who shall act as chairman) by the President, one by the chief of the nation to which said occupant belongs, or, in case of an allottee, by said allottee or by his duly authorized guardian or representative, and one by said railway company, who, before entering upon the duties of their appointment, shall take and subscribe, before a district judge, clerk of a district court, or United States commissioner, an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appointment, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award to and filed with the Secretary of the Interior within sixty days from the completion thereof; and a majority of said referees shall be competent to act in case of the absence of a member, after due notice. And upon the failure of either party to make such appointment within thirty days after the appointment made by the President, the vacancy shall be filled by the district judge of any United States court in the Indian Territory, or the Territory of Oklahoma, upon the application of the other party. The chairman of said board shall appoint the time and place for all hearings within the nation to which such occupant belongs. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each day they are engaged in the trial of any case submitted to them under this act, with mileage at 5 cents per mile. Witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed by the courts of said nations and the courts of Oklahoma Territory. Costs, including compensation of the referees, shall be made a part of the award and be paid by such railway company. In case the referees can not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award. Either party being dissatisfied with the finding of the referees shall have the right, within ninety days after making the award and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to any district court in the Indian Territory or Oklahoma Territory, which court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the subject-matter of said petition. If, upon the hearing of said appeal, the judgment of the court shall be for a larger sum than the award of the referees, the cost of said appeal shall be adjudged against the railway company. If the judgment of the court shall be for the same sum as the award of the referees, then the cost shall be adjudged against the appellant. If the judgment of the court shall be for a smaller sum than the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages. When proceedings have been commenced in court, the railway company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of the railway.

SEC. 4. That said railway company shall not charge the inhabitants of said Territories a greater rate of freight than the rate authorized by the laws of the State of Kansas for services for transportation of the same kind: *Provided*, That passenger rates on said railway shall not exceed 3 cents per mile. Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for freight and passengers on said railway, and of messages on said telegraph and telephone lines, until a State government or governments shall exist in said Territories within the limits of which said railway, or a part thereof, shall be located; and then such State government or governments shall be authorized to fix and regulate the cost of transportation of persons and freights within their respective limits by said railway; but Congress expressly reserves the right to fix and regulate, at all times, the cost of such transportation by said railway or said company whenever such transportation shall extend from one State into another, or shall extend into more than one State: *Provided, however*, That the rate of such transportation of passengers, local or interstate, shall not exceed the rate above expressed: *And provided further*, That said railway company shall carry the mail at such prices as Congress may by law provide; and until such rate is fixed by law the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation.

SEC. 5. That said railway company shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the particular nations or tribes or individuals through whose lands said line may be located, the sum of $50, in addition to compensation provided for in this act for property taken and damages done to individual occupants by the construction of the railway, for each mile of railway that it may construct in said Territories, said payments to be made in installments of $500 as each 10 miles of road is graded: *Provided*, That if the general council of either of the nations or tribes through whose land said railway may be located shall, within four months after the filing of maps of definite location as set forth in section 6 of this act, dissent from the allowance provided for in this section, and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, then all compensation to be paid to such dissenting nation or tribe under the provisions of this act shall be determined as provided in section 3 for the determination of the compensation to be paid to the individual occupant of lands, with the right of appeal to the courts upon the same terms, conditions, and requirements as therein provided: *Provided further*, That the amount awarded or adjudged to be paid by the said railway company for dissenting nation or tribe shall be in lieu of the compensation that said nation or tribe would be entitled to receive under the foregoing provisions. Said company shall also pay, so long as said Territories are owned and occupied by the Indians, to the Secretary of the Interior the sum of $15 per annum for each mile of railway it shall construct in the said Territories. The money paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act shall be apportioned by him in accordance with the laws and treaties now in force among the different nations and tribes according to the number of miles of railway that may be constructed by said railway company through their lands: *Provided*, That Congress shall have the right, so long as said lands are occupied and possessed by said nations or tribes, to impose such additional taxes upon said railway as it may deem just and proper for their benefit; and any Territory or State hereafter formed through which said railway shall have been established may exercise the like power as to such part of said railway as may lie within its limits. Said railway company shall have the right to survey and locate its railway immediately after the passage of this act.

SEC. 6. That said company shall cause maps showing the route of its located lines through said Territories to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and also to be filed in the office of the principal chiefs of each of the nations or tribes through whose lands said railway may be located; and after the filing of said maps no claim for a subsequent settlement and improvement upon the right of way shown by said maps shall be valid as against said company: *Provided*, That when a map showing any portion of said railway company's located line is filed as herein provided for, said company shall commence grading said located line within six months thereafter or such location shall be void; and said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in sections of 25 miles before construction of any such section shall be begun.

SEC. 7. That the officers, servants, and employees of said company necessary to the construction and management of said railway shall be allowed to reside, while so engaged, upon such right of way, but subject to the provisions of the Indian intercourse laws and such rules and regulations as may be established by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with said intercourse laws.

SEC. 8. That said railway company shall build at least 50 miles of its railway in said Territory within three years after the passage of this act, and complete the remainder thereof within five years thereafter, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion not built; that said railway company shall construct and maintain continually all fences, road and highway crossings, and necessary bridges over said railway wherever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way or may be by the proper authorities laid out across the same.

SEC. 9. That the said St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company shall accept this right of way upon the express condition, binding upon itself, its successors and assigns, that they will neither aid, advise, nor assist in any effort looking toward the changing or extinguishing the present tenure of the Indians in their lands, and will not attempt to secure from the Indian nations or tribes any further grant of land or its occupancy than is hereinbefore provided for: *Provided*, That any violation of the conditions mentioned in this section shall operate as a forfeiture of all the rights and privileges of said railway company under this act.

SEC. 10. That all mortgages executed by said railway company, conveying any portion of its railway, with its franchises, that may be constructed in said Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, and the record thereof shall be evidence and notice of their execution and shall convey all rights and property of said company as therein expressed.

SEC. 11. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, or alter this act; and the right of way herein and hereby granted shall not be assigned or transferred in any form whatever prior to the construction and completion of the railway except as to mortgages or other liens that may be given or secured thereon to aid in the construction thereof.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

On page 1, line 11, strike out the words "or near the town of Claremore," and add the following: "and between Claremore and Sapulpa, on the St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad."

In line 12, on page 1, after the word "Cherokee," add the following: "and Creek"; also in line 12, change the word "nation" to the word "nations."

On page 2, line 14, before the word "the" add the words "or near."

On page 2, line 15, after the word "Territory," add the following: "to a point at or near Stonewall"; also on same page, in line 16, strike out the following words: "and Pottowatomie Reserve, Oklahoma"; and on same page, line 27, after the word "route," add the following: "between Okmulkee and Sasakwa and running."

Line 27, strike out "Territory."

Page 2, line 29, insert after "Territory" "or to intersect the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad at some point between Norman and Ardmore."

On page 3, line 5, substitute the word "one" for the word "two," and in line 6 strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

On page 3, line 10, strike out the words "one hundred" and add the word "fifty."

On page 8, line 42, after the word "act," add the following:

"*Provided further*, That a map showing the entire line of the road in the Indian Territory shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before the work of construction shall commence."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the vote last taken was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to present a report and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to visit Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution just reported to the House?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for an explanation.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. For the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will state that this is the usual resolution. For the last four or five Congresses it has been customary for the Committee on Immigration, when called upon to suggest new legislation, to make a trip to New York and visit Ellis Island and the immigration station there. This resolution is presented in accordance with that custom. Its object is to enable members to familiarize themselves with the workings of the present system, the operation of existing laws, and to ascertain, by personal observation, what changes, if any, of the present laws and methods of enforcing them are necessary for the protection of our country against what is termed undesirable immigration.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What is the amount of the appropriation you ask?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The appropriation is the same that was asked for by the committee in the last Congress, $560. We ask for that amount because I know that the chairman of the committee in the last Congress said that it was just sufficient to defray the expenses of the trip.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to know why it should cost $560 to go to New York?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It may be that not more than $300 may be necessary, but it is not to be expected that the members of the committee should go into their own pockets to pay the expenses of the trip.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Is there any minority report against this?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, no. This is a unanimous request of the committee—a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Then I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AGRICULTURAL AND MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS EXPORTED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report a resolution and to ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which will be reported to the House.

The resolution directing the Committee on Ways and Means to prepare a report showing in what countries discriminations are made against our agricultural and manufactured products exported to foreign countries was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman will strike out the provision for an expert I shall have to request that it take the usual course.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am unable to hear what the gentleman has said.

The SPEAKER. The House must be in order.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I was stating, Mr. Speaker, that unless the gentleman from Minnesota would consent to strike out that portion of the resolution which provides for the employment of an expert I shall have to ask him to let it take the usual course.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can not consent to that. I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report the substitute in the form which I have presented it to the House. If the gentleman from Georgia objects to the present consideration of the substitute, I then ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts, for the reason that it involves an expenditure from the contingent fund of the House, which, I think, could not be made without unanimous consent unless that committee had first considered the resolution. I therefore ask that it be referred to the committee.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will ask the gentleman if it would not suit him just as well to put this on the Calendar. Is the gentleman's object in referring the resolution to the committee to make it privileged?

Mr. TAWNEY. My object is this: When the resolution comes up for consideration, not having been considered by the Committee on Accounts, I think an objection to its consideration would then lie, no matter where it went, if it had not been considered by that committee; and if it is referred to that committee and reported upon then it can not be subject to that objection when it does come up for consideration; and, therefore, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that that is not the only objection that can be raised to the matter, and that is not the objection I had in mind. I merely desired, Mr. Speaker, to enter a sort of protest here against the inauguration of a system of procuring experts to do our work. I have, of course, no objection to the gentleman sending the resolution to the Committee on Accounts, which, doubtless, he can do without my consent, but I do object to its being considered in this form and shall oppose it at any time it may come up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Accounts, unless there is objection.

There was no objection, and it was so referred.

NEW POST-OFFICE, WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House what progress has been made in the erection of the new post-office at the city of Wilmington, in the State of Delaware; what amount of the appropriation has been expended therefor; what amount, if any, has been used in the payment of salaries to superintendents, clerks, supervisors, or others; also, whether the work is now in progress or in a state of suspension, and, if the latter, whether any of these salaries were continued to be paid during such suspension, and what are the reasonable probabilities as to the time of the completion of the aforesaid building.

The resolution was adopted.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to ask that the memorial which I send to the desk be read to the House and then referred to the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The memorial urging legislation in favor of the early construction of the Nicaragua Canal was read, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LAND-GRANT PATENTS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report on H. R. 5474, and ask that it be printed and recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands, retaining its privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the subject of the report?

Mr. LACEY. It is in regard to extending the limitation as to suits to cancel or annul patents for land grants.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the pending appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the pending bill. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, beginning on line 12, strike out the words "For the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, maintenance, including repairs, $9,900."

Amend the amendment by striking out the words "including repairs."

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, it is desirable that we should

come to some understanding at this time as to how much longer the pending motion shall be debated before we take a vote.

Mr. STEELE. Let us vote now.

Mr. GROUT. I want to say a few words myself before the vote is taken, and for the purpose of ascertaining what other gentlemen may desire to be heard I now ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending amendment be limited to twenty minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I may as well submit at this point what I desire to say on this subject. I hope I shall have the attention of the committee, because I wish to speak of facts that are already before us. It has been stated distinctly to this committee that the board of children's guardians have no control by law over any children except such as have been committed to their care by the courts. Gentlemen will please bear that in mind. Now, it is moved to strike out this item for destitute colored women and children, for the purpose of later putting this institution, with others, into the hands of the board of children's guardians.

When that motion is made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], as I understand it will be, if this motion includes this provision of the bill I shall raise the point of order, because the 100 little colored waifs that are cared for in this institution have never gone through the courts, and you can not put them into the hands of the board of children's guardians until you have run them through the courts. There is no authority of law for it. Therefore, this motion contemplates an absolute absurdity, and an impossibility so far as regards this item in the bill, and I repeat, that when the motion is made, if it includes this institution, I shall make a point of order.

But there is another question to be considered. Why remit these various institutions to the board of children's guardians? Who asks it? The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] asks it, but who else asks it? This committee heard a labored and convincing argument from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] on yesterday against the proposition, and in that argument he read certain statements made by the president of the board of children's guardians. Did you learn from that gentleman's statement that he wanted this done? No; you learned from him that he did not want it done. Let me remind the committee of what he said:

STATEMENT OF MR. SIMON WOLF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE GERMAN ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Mr. CANNON. In the present condition of charitable work in the District and of legislation covering the power of the board of children's guardians, what would be the practical effect for this fiscal year of a failure to appropriate for the utilization of the various private charities?

Mr. WOLF. A calamity for those institutions without conferring adequate authority upon the board of children's guardians. Before any such radical step could be taken further legislation is indispensably necessary—

Further legislation necessary. Can we provide it here? Confessedly not. We are engaged upon an appropriation bill. We must take the laws as they are and make appropriations accordingly—

as the board is in a state of evolution. It has to propagate its ideas by practical work, and while we have accomplished much, and while primarily we claim that all appropriations given by the Government for the care of indigent children in the District of Columbia should go through us, we are not so blind as to ignore the tradition, sentiment, and feelings of a large number of well-disposed, well-meaning, kind-hearted, and charitable people.

Mr. CANNON. What would be the effect (without further legislation) upon the children who will be really entitled to relief, of the withholding of appropriation from the various private institutions?

Mr. WOLF. I think it would cripple private institutions and prove a great harm to many deserving people who, from a feeling of religion, habits, or traditions, do not like to have their misfortunes dragged into the public courts, and thus, while a principle would be observed, much practical harm might ensue for the present.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I understand you, from the standpoint of complete administration, through strictly governmental agencies, or Government appropriations, under existing conditions, without further legislation, such appropriations are not desirable.

Mr. WOLF. Not at present.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER. I ask that the gentleman from Vermont be allowed to go on without limit.

Mr. CANNON. I will rise to oppose the pending proposition, and yield my time to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GROUT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Now, this Committee of the Whole is, I feel, under a misapprehension and somewhat in a state of confusion as to these amendments, and may not do exactly what it wants to do. Let us, in a practical way, find out what we want to do. Let me say to gentlemen of the committee, if you want to strike out all the institutions that are strictly sectarian, which have been designated in number as six, then vote to strike them out. You have done so with one already—the St. John's Orphanage. You have also struck out an institution which is nonsectarian—the German Orphan Asylum. This Mr. Wolf, from whom I have just read, who is a Jew, and was formerly president of the German Orphan Asylum, now either its treasurer or secretary, I have forgotten which, says:

Every safeguard is thrown around the children of the German Orphan Asylum, which institution is strictly nonsectarian, having all shades of religious opinion represented on the board.

Now, if you want merely to strike out sectarian institutions, do so on motions which will be submitted; if no one else submits them, I will do so. Mr. Chairman, I think I know what they are.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I should like to understand the position of the gentleman on the motion now pending. Does he object to striking out the institution to which the motion applies?

Mr. GROUT. I do, most certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And the gentleman does not object to the others?

Mr. GROUT. As to certain others I do. I would have the German Orphan Asylum restored to the bill. It is wholly unsectarian. Then, as to the other thirteen charities which are private institutions, if you are willing to appropriate public money to them provided they open their doors by a change of their articles of association or their charters so that the public can as a matter of right enter and inspect the institutions and supervise the expenditures—I refer to institutions which are confessedly nonsectarian; that is, not made up of persons of any particular form of religious belief—then leave them in the bill, including the German Asylum, which can be left in the bill in the House by refusing to agree to the amendment of the committee.

If, on the other hand, you want to confuse the question as much as possible—if you want to make a great noise and really accomplish nothing—vote for the Hainer amendment. It will leave the whole business in a magnificent muddle, which will be discreditable to the intelligence of this House. If also you should not want to strike out these sectarian charities, then vote not to do so and leave them in the bill. In this way the whole matter can be practically and fairly disposed of.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask my friend whether or not in principle this German Orphan Asylum and the Colored Home are not substantially in the same category with the Smithsonian Institution?

Mr. GROUT. Practically they are, especially the Colored Home, because it has been the special care of the Government from the first. It could not have had an existence except by act of Congress. It can not subsist for a day without the help of the Government. It has no contributions from wealthy friends elsewhere. From the very nature of the case it can not have. It is practically on the basis that the gentleman suggests, although technically still a private institution. I must confess that for one I would bring them under this amendment which I propose; which is, that before they can touch a dollar of the money appropriated in this bill they shall open their doors to inspection; there shall be no technical barrier to full Government supervision of every feature of the administration and every item of expenditure.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this item for the Home for Aged Colored Women should be seriously considered by this committee. As was well said by a gentleman on the floor yesterday, this is a national trust. It is a trust, too, established by the loving hand of the immortal Lincoln, whose undying memory we are about to celebrate throughout this broad land. It is an institution that grew out of one of the great classic and heroic struggles of our history. No shrine established by the hands of Lincoln, no charity recommended by his name, should ruthlessly be assailed. Nothing he loved was born of sectarianism, but of the mighty religion of humanity, the kindly impulse of a mighty heart. I cordially hope that this committee will leave unspoliated this item with reference to the Home for Aged Colored Women. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. GROUT] for his explanation of this matter. If the gentleman would read the letter of Dr. Mackay Smith he would reiterate what he said about restoring in this bill the appropriation for St. John's Orphanage.

Now I will send to the desk and have this letter from the Rev. Dr. Smith read.

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman will permit me, I said nothing about restoring St. John's Orphanage and the appropriation for that.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, I understood the gentleman to say St. John's Orphanage, but regret to find he did not mean it.

Mr. Chairman, I will read this letter myself. It was written by the very eminent divine, the pastor of St. John's Parish, Dr. Mackay Smith. The writer says:

EDITOR POST: So much misapprehension was shown in the debate in Congress regarding St. John's Orphanage that it seems proper to correct several of the statements by giving the exact facts. The authorities of St. John's parish have no power over or responsibility for St. John's Orphanage. It is a corporation entirely independent of the vestry.

This shows that the orphanage is not what can properly be

called a sectarian institution, and further evidence of this will be seen as I read. The writer further says:

Although supported mainly by members of St. John's Parish, it yet draws contributions from Christian men and women of other parishes. While its officers come from St. John's, it is more than a parish institution and makes larger claims on the community.

It rightly does this, for it throws its doors open to receive inmates of all nationalities and creeds.

I think this fact is conclusive evidence that the orphanage is by no means a sectarian institution. Dr. Mackay Smith then says:

It makes no distinction between Protestant, Roman Catholic, or infidel, but asks only what is the need of each, and whether there is room to receive any needy case.

I beg to ask the House if these facts would indicate that St. John's Orphanage is of a sectarian character?

Dr. Smith then corrects a wrong impression regarding the income of the orphanage. He says:

It has no regular income of $10,000 or half that sum. Last year the income included a bequest from Mr. B. H. Warder of $5,000, but this, of course, was not used as income, but mainly applied to the reduction of debt.

The writer then tells us of the commendable economy with which St. John's orphans are maintained and educated. He says:

It claims to support its inmates in health and happiness on less money per capita than almost any institution of a similar kind in the country. It costs less than $50 a year to support an orphan.

Showing that the cost of educating, maintaining, and clothing the children in this orphanage is less than one-third the cost under the board of children's guardians. Dr. Smith then explained how this economy is possible. He says:

Few institutions, if any, can show such a record; and as the children are well fed and contented, it is obvious that only the most rigid economy can effect such a result. I might add to this that the orphanage could not produce such a record had it not at its head a lady who gives her services free of charge, devoting her life to these children and acting toward them as a true mother. She supports nearly 100 boys and girls on a sum that in most institutions would keep hardly 50.

Mr. BRUMM. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama from what he is reading?

Mr. WHEELER. I am reading a communication from the Rev. Mackay Smith.

Mr. BRUMM. Who is he?

Mr. WHEELER. The pastor of St. John's Parish.

Mr. BRUMM. Oh! Good authority!

Mr. WHEELER. Further he says:

We claim, therefore, that St. John's Orphanage is a blessing to this city, being a model in the way it is conducted, the economy of its management, and the devotion of its head. Without it scores of poor children, many of them from States or towns remote from Washington, would be destitute. That such an institution should be singled out for attack in Congress is certainly very strange.

These facts should appeal to every man in the United States and certainly to the Representatives upon this floor. It is shown that St. John's Parish extends its generosity to poor children, many of whom, as Dr. Smith tells us, comes from States and towns remote from Washington, and he also tells us that were it not for this orphanage many of them would be destitute.

If the appropriation to St. John's is denied, the children now in their charge, or a part of them at least, will have to go unprovided for, unless the patrons of the home who have poured out their bounteous generosity are able to contribute still further for this praiseworthy object. If they are unable to contribute to the full amount required for the best care of these children, the little orphans will be compelled to suffer, or else they will have to be sent through the police courts and remitted to the board of children's guardians. In that event the least possible cost for their board would, as Mrs. MacFarland told us, be $96 a year, and other expenses would amount to $157 a year, while under the present system the entire cost of each of these orphans to the Government is but $18 per year. I appeal to reason and beg Congress to remember that upon our action depends the welfare of all the orphans, the indigent, and unfortunate in the District of Columbia. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on yesterday there was some suggestion made by members on the floor about an "underlying principle" in connection with this matter, and the members of this House who were prepared to vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] as to the provision in this bill for the Colored Home, and had voted and were prepared to vote against other institutions referred to in the foregoing and the following paragraphs of the bill, were taunted with inconsistency. Now, I voted for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska that struck out the provision for St. John's Parish Orphan Association and also that which struck out the provision for the German Orphan Asylum. I shall vote, however, against his amendment to strike out the provision for the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children. In doing so I am convinced that I am adhering strictly to the underlying principle to which reference is made, and that there is no inconsistency whatever in my attitude or in my vote.

In the first place, I was astonished when I found that in this appropriation bill there were contained provisions carrying appropriations for sectarian institutions. It was news to me that the United States Congress had ever violated the spirit and the principle of the United States Constitution by making any provision whatever for sectarian institutions. The underlying principle, admitting of no exception in any case whatever, is embodied in the spirit of our Constitution, and is that no appropriation of public money should be made for sectarian institutions.

As to private institutions other than sectarian, the principle is almost as broad, but it admits of exceptions; and it is an exceptional case where a national association has been incorporated by United States charter for the purpose, and only for the purpose, of receiving these various bounties from the United States Government that it has received from the time of President Lincoln up to the present time for the purpose of taking charge of the wards of the nation who have sought refuge here. It is an exception to the general rule which should meet with our approval, for such an institution approaches closely to a quasi public corporation. The colored people having been freed by the National Government and placed upon the world without money, without education, and in abject want, a duty devolved upon the National Government. At the close of the war the capital city of the nation had become a place of refuge for the destitute colored women and children made destitute and kept in ignorance by an institution fostered by the laws of the nation. If it was right when Lincoln was President of the United States that we should adopt such a provision as was adopted in chartering this association, it is right and proper that we should appropriate the money to continue its operations. It receives no other than Government support, and it would be a crime to close its doors. The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska will therefore not have my vote, although I shall vote for every amendment that strikes out appropriations for sectarian institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The twenty minutes allowed for debate have expired.

Mr. GROUT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be heard.

Mr. CANNON. Five minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of the committee for five minutes, while I inquire "where we are at." The gentleman who last addressed the committee [Mr. FAIRCHILD] announced before he sat down that he should vote against every sectarian appropriation in this bill, but he stated substantially that he would vote against the amendment to strike out this particular appropriation for colored children. I say to my friend there is no sectarian appropriation in this bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. That is a fact.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, that is so. I will put into the RECORD the text of the law that creates the superintendent of charities. I referred to it yesterday, and I will quote it in full, as follows:

For the purpose of securing a more equitable and efficient expenditure of the several sums appropriated "for charities" there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as soon as may be after the passage of this act, some thoroughly experienced or otherwise suitable person, not a resident of the District of Columbia, whose duties shall be to formulate for the purpose of the expenditures for charities in said District such a system or plan of organized charities for said District as will by means of consolidation, combination, or other direction, in his judgment, best secure the objects contemplated by the several institutions and associations for which such appropriations are made, and for the other charitable work of the District, with the least interference each with the other, or misapplication of effort or expenditure and without duplication of charitable work or expenditure; and all such appropriations shall be expended for the purposes indicated, under the general direction of said superintendent, and in conformity, as near as may be, with such system or plan, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. And it shall also be the duty of said superintendent to examine into the character of the administration of said institutions and associations, and the condition, sufficiency, and needs of the buildings occupied for such charitable purposes, and also to ascertain in each case the amount contributed from private sources for support and construction, the number of paid employees, and the number of inmates received and benefited by the sums appropriated by Congress, and to recommend such changes and modifications therein as in his judgment will best secure economy, efficiency, and the highest attainable results in the administration of charities in the District of Columbia. And said superintendent shall, from time to time, report in detail to the Commissioners of the District, who shall communicate the same with their estimates for appropriations to the next session of Congress, his doings hereunder, together with such estimates and recommendations for the future as in his judgment will best promote the charitable work of the District. All estimates submitted hereunder shall be included in the regular Annual Book of Estimates.

(Act of August 6, 1890.)

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1891.

Ordered, That hereafter all vouchers for expenditures of appropriations for charitable and reformatory institutions and purposes which receive aid from the District of Columbia shall be submitted to the superintendent of charities for review and approval, and when so examined and approved be transmitted by that officer to the auditor of the District of Columbia.

By order.

WM. TINDALL, *Secretary.*

Under that law all these charities are superintended. There is power of visitation and report, under the commission, with full accounting for all expenditures, and it comes to this, that this class of children that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] so feelingly alluded to this morning, the poor colored waifs, will be turned out under the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER]. God knows I have as much sympathy for them as anybody, but it is also true that the poor white waifs will be turned out. Now, I believe in fair play to the man and brother. I will give to the man of African descent just as fair play as to the Caucasian, but I will hold them equal before the law.

I said there is no sectarian appropriation here. We have no Government orphan asylum to house this class of people. The Government, in conscience and in right, must support these helpless people; and as we have no hospital, pending the time that we get a place, owned by the Government, we hire these people who have the hospitals to do certain work, namely, to help take care of these children, under the superintendence of United States officials, supervised by the District Commissioners, accounted for under the strict accounting systems of the Government; and yet gentlemen are flushed by the speeches of individuals who talk about sectarian appropriations.

They run from a shadow when there is no substance to make the shadow. They create a shadow in the mind, and then flee from it, and vote upon a speech, instead of upon a reality. They come around with bated breath and say: "Why, you must not strike these poor colored children out." No, I do not think you ought to strike them out. But somebody else says with bated breath: "Why, you have stricken out the German Orphan Asylum. You must not strike that out, because you will antagonize all the Germans, and you will jump out of the frying pan into the fire." Oh, for the spirit of God to put a little backbone and common sense into this House! Quit fighting the shadows and come up and look at the substance. Under the law creating the children's board of guardians, they are getting ready to take care of a large share of this work. Simon Wolf says: "We are not ready yet, we are not equipped, and it would be a calamity, a mistake akin to a crime, to refuse to support these children." That is what he says. What else do you want? Why, if one were risen from the dead you would not believe him, however wise and just he might be, if you refuse now to look into the facts. Gentlemen, I think I am as cowardly as anybody, perhaps. I am too much of a coward to do wrong here and be chased by a shadow, when in God's justice and chancery there is no sectarian appropriation in this bill anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this amendment, by order of the committee, is exhausted.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for just a very few moments. It is hardly fair to take up the entire twenty minutes on that side.

Mr. GROUT. I hope the gentleman may have the time. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I do not care for more than five minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want five or ten minutes myself.

The CHAIRMAN. If somebody will make the proposition the Chair will put it to the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will ask for ten minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] wants time on this amendment. Several other gentlemen want time, and it seems to me it would be better to conform to the agreement. I see the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY] also wants to be heard.

Mr. CANNON. Extend the time twenty minutes.

Mr. GROUT. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. What division of that twenty minutes do you want?

Mr. CANNON. Make it half and half.

Mr. GROUT. One-half in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] and the other against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] asks that the time for debate upon this paragraph be extended for twenty minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] and the remaining half by those opposed to his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, as I desire to close debate in favor of the amendment, I suggest that the opposition take their ten minutes now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to speak against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pained to find it necessary to participate in this debate; but I would be cowardly, indeed, knowing what I do of these institutions and the law governing them, if I did not take a part in this discussion.

Until this Congress I had been for ten years a member of the subcommittee that framed the District of Columbia appropriation bills, and have visited nearly every institution in the city of Washington, some of them several times. If I were a Catholic, which I am not; if I were an A. P. A., which I am not; if the thunders of the Vatican or of the Inquisition of Spain, or any other secret organization, tried to chain my lips I would speak out now, because I believe it is my duty, and would vote against those amendments.

In the first place, when the act of 1892 was passed creating the board of children's guardians, concerning which I have no unkind word, a bill that passed both Houses of Congress without debate, not one member of the House Committee on Appropriations had any knowledge of its existence until our attention was brought to it when we went to make up the District of Columbia appropriation bill. When that law confronted us, every lawyer on the committee, without reference to politics, said it is our duty to put this in bulk, under our rules, under the board of children's guardians; but we also agreed that the board of children's guardians, under that law, as I pointed out to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] yesterday morning, could not be expended on these children. We gave it in bulk, and it went to the Senate.

The Senate saw the same difficulty, and they amended our bill, giving 70 per cent directly to the institutions and 30 per cent to the board of children's guardians. When we met in conference that was changed, so that we gave 60 per cent directly to those institutions having children in care and 40 per cent to the board of children's guardians. Under that arrangement, so absolutely right were we, it turned out that it could not be expended by the board of children's guardians, and that over $7,000 remained in their hands at the end of the fiscal year, which they could not, under the law, apply to the use for which it was appropriated by Congress. We have let it run along at 60 and 40 per cent, hoping that in time all would come within the control of the board of children's guardians.

The Committee on Appropriations has all the time desired to let this come into the hands of one board but for the reason that I explained yesterday; and no man respecting his certificate as a practicing lawyer in any court of this country dare say that under that law of 1892 and the facts, if all of this money had gone to the board of children's guardians, that it could be expended under the act for the benefit of those orphans. Why? Because the law provides that it shall be applied to certain ones named in this act of 1892, sent there in a particular way by a court. When the law was passed hundreds of children never sent there by a court, were taken there by a father when the mother was dead, taken there by a guardian when both parents were dead, brought there by the police—children who had neither father nor mother, and children who will never know who mother or father was.

These children could not be reached by the law creating the board of children's guardians. They are sent by no court, as they are brought to these institutions, and children go by order of a court under the law of 1892, when the board of children's guardians can take them up and care for them; but until that is done the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] strikes with an iron hand these orphans and insults these God-anointed institutions, each and all of them, who are caring for these little children. [Loud applause.] Gentlemen of the American Congress, when I see a helpless child, not cared for, on the ground or in the gutter, and kindly women, whether in white garb or cowls, or whether infidelity has stooped down to lift it up and clasp it to his or her breast, as I have said in another place, God give me a conscience that will keep me from looking up to see whether he or she is doing it under the cross or under the crescent.

My warrant for sanctioning such an act was planted here in my breast, not by priest, not by oath-bound associations, but by my Maker and my mother. [Loud applause.] Strike if you will, gentlemen, but strike knowing what you are doing. My eloquent friend from New York speaks about the American Congress doing this. Gentlemen, you are not the Congress now. You are the Washington city council appropriating this money, half of it out of its treasury and half out of the Treasury of the United States, the District's portion under the law. We are acting as the council of a city that has no orphan asylum, has no house or building to take care of them. We are sitting here together saying that we will appropriate this money and give a little here and there to these institutions that are taking care of these children. I have no purpose to serve in this, gentlemen, but to do my duty.

I know what these institutions are doing without reference to creed, and I wish that those gentlemen who are rushing here before an imaginary whirlwind would go and see these orphans and other destitute persons as they are being cared for. When you do that, gentlemen, you will tread gently in sacred places and will hesitate long before you strike down as with bludgeons those who should have the approval of the hearts and consciences of every man here to protect and sustain these benevolent institutions. [Applause.]

Until buildings are erected to care for them you have no other remedy, and you only force the Senate to save what you would destroy.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish this committee to understand that the gentleman, be he from Iowa, from Illinois, or from any other State, has no monopoly of all the goodness and conscience in this House. He is not the only person who is not a Catholic or a member of any secret association. I want to say to my friend now, as I have already stated, that I am not here as the advocate of any secret cabal. I am not a member of any so-called patriotic order or association. I am not a member of the Catholic Church, although I was baptized in it and have for that church and its good works the highest and deepest reverence, neither am I now, nor have I at any time, been a member of the American Protective Association nor of any kindred society. But, Mr. Chairman, neither the impassioned eloquence of my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] nor the calling up of the shroud of the sacred and martyred President of the United States, should divert this committee from its plain duty or from the facts.

Gentlemen say that we ought to vote against striking out the provision in the bill for this institution because the bill incorporating it was signed by President Lincoln. President Lincoln signed many a bill for the incorporation of institutions; shall we therefore vote the money of the people to those institutions indiscriminately? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says there is no sectarian appropriation in this bill, and he tells us that we are going through an evolution. I ask him whether he has not gone through a process of evolution himself, since only a short year ago, under his leadership, we made a gallant though unavailing fight against similar appropriations contained in the Indian appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have but ten minutes and the gentleman had twenty. In that Indian appropriation bill, Mr. Chairman, there was carried nearly a half million dollars for sectarian Indian schools, and it was urged as a justification of that appropriation that the Government had no schools of its own. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois the fight against those sectarian appropriations was made. Has the gentleman gone through a course of evolution since that time?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield now for an answer to that question?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to my friend that the two cases are not similar, as he very well knows, and in the case he speaks of, that of the Indian appropriation bill last year, I neither sought nor advocated interfering with existing schools except as the Government should gradually be able to supply schools of its own.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman was not restricted then by the rule which he observes now. He fought then for the principle for which I am contending here, and for which he ought to be contending by my side to-day. Then, again——

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield again, and if necessary I will ask to have his time extended?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I am for the principle that the gentleman advocates by his speech to-day, but there is nothing in this bill to apply the principle to. That is the difference.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no distinction between the two cases. Neither the gentleman from Illinois nor any other gentleman here, be his tongue gifted with all the logic and the lore of all the ages, can distinguish between appropriating for a Catholic school teaching Indian children and appropriating for one of these institutions, for instance, St. Ann's Infant Asylum, which teaches white children in this District. He can not distinguish between the two cases, and I appeal to the gentleman who insists that he has such wonderful courage to stand up here before the American people and face the consequences of his acts. Do not undertake for one moment to hoodwink any portion of the people of the United States. You can not do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I yield again.

Mr. CANNON. In reply to the gentleman's appeal I have to say that we still utilize the Catholic Indian schools, though less and less every year, as we are able to supply Government schools to take their place, and I think that is the proper course. I will say to him now that we only hire these private institutions to care for these orphans because we have no institutions of our own in which to care for them, but we are following the policy as rapidly as possible, through the board of children's guardians, of supplying a Government service for this purpose. As to one class of these children the board of children's guardians does supply that service now, but we have not evolved that board sufficiently to take care of all these children, and, rather than turn the children out, I will hire an Episcopal institution or a Catholic institution, or an infidel institution, if you please, that will take charge of them and care for them. [Applause.]

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not the question. There is no question here of turning out these children. There is no such proposition as that presented by this amendment—absolutely nothing of the kind.

Mr. WHEELER. Your proposition will practically result in that, though.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Illinois says that he is in favor of extending the power of the board of children's guardians. Now, my amendment proposes to give that board the money, which is the real power in the case, and there is absolutely nothing to prevent the board from placing these children where they will. They can place them in this institution or in that institution, and they can pay those institutions for the care which they give to the children. They can take the children out whenever they please, as they have absolute control of children in their charge.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend say that these children that are in this Colored Home and in other homes, children not committed by the court, are under the jurisdiction of the board of children's guardians?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I say that those children can be committed upon a finding of the facts.

Mr. CANNON. But I ask the gentleman whether they are.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The finding has not yet been made.

Mr. CANNON. Oh!

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. But I ask the gentleman in turn, why should there not be a finding by a competent court that they are children who are destitute, or, using the exact language of the statute, "destitute of suitable homes and adequate means of earning an honest living"? Can any good reason be given, either in the name of sentiment or of practical fact, why there should not be such a determination by competent authority before you spend the public money in the support of these children?

Mr. CANNON. And are no others to be cared for except those who pass through the courts?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That cares for one class mentioned in the act creating the board of children's guardians.

Mr. CANNON. But it does not provide for the other class whom we are seeking to provide for in this very item which the gentleman moves to strike out.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I ask the gentleman to show me a single class of children not contemplated by section 4 of the act providing for the board of children's guardians who are at the same time proper subjects of public charity.

Mr. CANNON. Substantially all the children that are in the various institutions——

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Not so.

Mr. CANNON. Including this one, the Colored Home.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Not so.

Mr. GROUT. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Going right to the motion under consideration, would the gentleman put the children who are now at the Colored Home—over 100 of them—through the courts in order to give the board of guardians control over them?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I would if necessary, certainly. The very fact they are in such an institution is prima facie evidence of the fact they should be under the control of the board of children's guardians and any reasonable court would so hold.

Mr. GROUT. What would you do with the old ladies who are there—20 of them?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Only 11.

Mr. GROUT. Well, 11. What would you do with those old ladies?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I would either have those 11 old ladies taken care of under this appropriation of $13,000, the first item, or I would place them in the Freedman's Hospital, an asylum for which we have already appropriated $22,500. Certainly they can take care of those old ladies with the $35,000 we have appropriated.

Mr. GROUT. Is it not a fact that the board of children's guardians have charge only of children——

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. GROUT. Not old ladies?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN rose.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I now yield a moment to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CRAIN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether under the provision for the board of children's guardians he proposes to appropriate for all these beneficiaries now covered by this appropriation bill?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I propose that every dollar included in these appropriati ons be carried over to the appropria

tion for the board of children's guardians, to be expended by them in caring for children who come under the law.

Mr. CRAIN. The gentleman has answered me very frankly. Now, upon what basis shall this board of children's guardians distribute this fund?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. They will expend it under the law which I have quoted.

Mr. CRAIN. The gentleman will pardon me; I did not hear him refer to it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The law provides that this board of children's guardians shall have committed to them—

All children who are destitute of suitable homes and adequate means of earning an honest living; all children abandoned by their parents or guardians; all children of habitually drunken or vicious or unfit parents; all children habitually begging on the streets or from door to door; all children kept in vicious or immoral associations; all children known by their language or life to be vicious or incorrigible.

Now, I say there is no class of children not included in these several classes that are entitled to be a public charge.

Mr. CRAIN. How will this appropriation be apportioned—upon what basis? Shall it be upon the basis of the number of inmates of each hospital or asylum?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The board of children's guardians has the right to make contracts for the care and custody of the children under their charge.

Mr. CRAIN. But I respectfully submit to the gentleman that he is not curing the defect for which he assumes to provide a remedy.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CRAIN. I will take the floor in my own time.

Mr. PITNEY. I ask that the gentleman from Nebraska be allowed ten minutes more.

Mr. CRAIN. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto was limited to twenty minutes, of which there remain two minutes, to be occupied by those opposed to the amendment.

Mr. CRAIN. I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. As the gentleman from Nebraska, my colleague on the committee [Mr. HAINER], was interrupted a number of times, I ask unanimous consent, as I agreed to do, that he be allowed ten minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I thank the committee for this courtesy.

Mr. CRAIN. One question before the gentleman proceeds. The evil of which he complains, as I understand, is that this money is given to private institutions; and instead of appropriating specifically by this bill for certain institutions, he proposes, as I understand, that we give a sum in the aggregate to be distributed as this board of children's guardians may see proper. Now, if that be the fact, where does the gentleman's remedy come in?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman has evidently misunderstood my motion. I have made no such proposition as that.

Mr. CRAIN. But you said you were going to.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If I may kindly be permitted to proceed——

Mr. PITNEY. Let me ask one question. The gentleman has read from the law providing that the board of children's guardians may take care of poor children, friendless children, and also children who are incorrigible.

Treating now of the colored children who come under the control of the board of children's guardians, let me ask the gentleman if it is his proposition to mix together in this Colored Home the incorrigible with the merely indigent, unfortunate, or poor children?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Certainly not.

Mr. PITNEY. Then let me ask what is your proposition?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have explained it several times, but it is, in brief, to turn all of the money appropriated for these purposes over to the board of children's guardians, an association which is accountable directly to the United States, and empower it to make proper arrangement for the care and custody of these children, allowing them to put the children where they should be placed, where they can be constantly under their control and subject to their supervision. They may place, under this provision, some of them in one institution of this character and others elsewhere in other institutions. The welfare of the child ought to be, and doubtless will be, considered by this board of children's guardians as of the first consideration.

Mr. PITNEY. Are you aware of any institution in the District of Columbia which is at the disposal of the board of children's guardians, and to which they may send incorrigible colored boys?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Why, they may be sent to the Reform School of the District of Columbia.

Mr. PITNEY. I am informed this morning by one of the trustees of the Colored Home that colored boys can not be placed in the Reform School, and there is no institution in the District where incorrigible colored boys can be placed.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Then, if that be true, it is clearly the duty of Congress, and promptly, to provide a place.

My proposition is simply that there should be no such thing as mixing up Government and private institutions, or Government and private charity. They should be kept separate and distinct at all times. There should be no intermingling one with the other. I hold that Government money should be appropriated only for public purposes and let private institutions subsist by private aid.

Now, the gentleman from Iowa said that no gentleman who prizes his certificate as an attorney will state that any part of this money can be expended by the board of children's guardians. I refer him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who contends they have already expended 40 per cent of the money appropriated each year with the exception of the first year. I ask this question, then, of plain, practical lawyers who have not practiced in as high courts as the gentleman from Iowa, but real courts, where causes are actually tried—I do not know what courts he has practiced in for the last two or three years, but I ask common, everyday lawyers, who are not boasting about their practice, if this board of children's guardians, under this law, has been able to expend 40 per cent of the appropriation, why has it not the power to expend in a proper case the other 60?

The board complained in the last report that they had not money enough to do the work. There is no such dilemma as the gentleman thinks confronts us, and whatever there is of dispute on this proposition I suggest these joint champions settle it according to the rules of the Marquis of Queensbury, if they prefer it. When they have reached a conclusion among themselves, I will try conclusions with the survivor.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRAIN. You do not dispute the proposition that these appropriations are necessary?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no, of course not; that these worthy dependents must be cared for.

Mr. CRAIN. Well, the gentleman accedes to that statement that the appropriations are necessary. Now I want to ask him simply this: How does he provide for these appropriations at all, if he cuts them out here? He simply moves to strike them all out, although acceding to my statement that they are necessary. If they are necessary, why strike them out? That is a fair proposition.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the country ought to understand exactly what is involved here. My position in reference to the matter is not due to any animosity against any particular institution. I have cheerfully conceded, and concede now, that they may be doing a good work, and that they may be doing all that they claim to be doing. I have no knowledge to the contrary, and therefore make no charge against them.

But gentlemen insist that in all cases there have been full reports. I desire to send to the desk one of their reports, found on page 310 of the Report of the Bureau of Education for 1895, which gives a fair illustration of the "satisfactory character" of these reports; and this, too, made by an association for which large appropriations have been made.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT OF THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 21, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: Your communication, with inclosure, of June 13 duly received and contents noted.

We herewith beg to state that our established principle is to provide for a limited number (200, more or less) of aged inmates of both sexes, without distinction of color or creed.

We solicit and collect from private parties ample food required daily, and in case of deficiency, which often occurs, such is bought out of the funds also collected daily. Clothing is obtained the same way, repaired if necessary, and kept in readiness when wanted.

The daily money collection is mainly to defray expenses, viz, insurance, fuel, gas, medical supplies, beer and liquor, groceries, meat, ice, etc., and for general repairs, done by outside mechanics.

We do not pay wages or hire for inside labor, all performed by ourselves.

Our approximate expenditures yearly are as follows:

Beer and liquor	$1,200
Coal	1,000
Groceries	1,000
Butchers' bills	500
Medical supplies	300
Undertaker's bill	300
Miscellaneous	600
Total yearly	4,900
This year we had to pay insurance for five years	1,096
The approximate valuation of property and buildings, including furniture and fixings	200,000
Moneys received from United States through Congress	42,500
From the District	12,500
Total amount received	55,000

Total number of inmates July 1, 1894		200
Deaths from July 1, 1894, up to June 30, 1895	36	
Left of their own accord during the year	15	
		51
Remaining		149
Inmates admitted from July 1, 1894, up to June 30, 1895		48
Total inmates July 1, 1895		197

Hoping our above statement will prove satisfactory, at the same time we would be highly pleased should you call to see the progress of our labor.

We remain, with high esteem, your most obedient and humble servants,

LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR.
By Sister ST. DOSITHEE, *Superior.*

Col. JOHN TRACEY,
Superintendent of Charities.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a sample of the reports which have been made. Gentlemen insist that since appropriations have been made in times past that we have recognized a divided responsibility, the Government partnership with private corporations. The Smithsonian Institution has been mentioned as one of that class.

I grant, Mr. Chairman, that such arrangements have been made, but every one of these arrangements is fraught with a principle of great danger. If we have made mistakes in the past, let us rectify them. We ought certainly to stand on the principle that public funds should be appropriated only for public purposes. We ought not to deviate from that principle one hair's breadth. When we stand on that ground we are impregnable.

If there are any indigent poor or unfortunate in this District, care for them properly. They are proper subjects of public charge; but I oppose, and am unalterably opposed to, the delegation of that high function of government to any sisterhood or brotherhood on the face of the globe. Let us face this matter fairly and squarely; let no man skulk behind our backs here and say that we are opposed to charities. Nothing is further from the truth. But we say that the Government should expend its charities directly; that accountability should go with every dollar of appropriation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. CRAIN. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. FARIS. Let it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, beginning with line 12, strike out the words:
"For the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, maintenance, including repairs, $9,900."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HAINER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 51, noes 74.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska demanded tellers, but subsequently withdrew the demand.

Accordingly, the amendment of Mr. HAINER of Nebraska was rejected.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is it necessary to announce in the Committee of the Whole a demand for a yea-and-nay vote in the House upon any amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly not.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For St. Ann's Infant Asylum, maintenance, $5,400.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the item just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER].

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard upon that motion. Just as I spoke yesterday in behalf of the appropriation for the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish, I rise now to speak in behalf of this Roman Catholic charity. I for one am not afraid to take my stand in behalf of all these charities, whether they be for white or colored, whether they be for Jew or Gentile. I am in favor of each and every one of these appropriations, whether the institution be under the management of Roman Catholic or Lutheran or Calvinist. I believe that we have the power to give the Government aid which we vouchsafe to these charitable institutions, to the managers of these institutions for apportionment, and I say that the sectarian spirit is manifested by opposition to these appropriations and not by those who favor the giving of this money.

Under the specious plea of being opposed to sectarian institutions, these gentlemen make the most vigorous and persistent attacks upon these charities because they happen to be controlled by particular societies. It is the anti-Catholic spirit, it is the spirit of the A. P. A. which is controlling our deliberations in this committee. For a moment look at the consistency of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], who has been wielding his battle-ax so vigorously for the last few days. He passes by an appropriation for the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, an appropriation of $6,000 for about 35 inmates, amounting, if I mistake not, to a per capita appropriation of $171.42; but now, because this other charity is said to be Roman Catholic in its management, although it has 135 inmates, at a per capita cost of $41.42, he asks that this appropriation be stricken from the bill.

Why did he not make his opposition to the Washington Home for Foundlings? Why did he hesitate about persisting in his opposition to the Home for Destitute Colored Women and Children? It is true he did not withdraw his formal opposition to that appropriation, but I presume that he felt that for the sake of consistency he must insist upon his motion to strike out that specific item.

I have been asked by one or two gentlemen as to the constitutionality of these appropriations. There was an evident confusion in the mind of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] when he said that we had not any right to appropriate public funds for what he denominated private purposes. He was evidently thinking, Mr. Chairman, of the law of eminent domain, and of the general theory of the law of taxation—the law of eminent domain which provides that private property can only be taken for public use or a public purpose; the general theory of taxation, which is that the sovereign power of government, that is, the sovereign power of taxation, or its incipient stage, the loaning of money or credit, should never be exercised except for a public purpose.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should not ask this indulgence if I were not on the subcommittee which framed this bill, and therefore I desire to make a few additional remarks.

It is true that the general theory of taxation is that the public moneys can not be taken for a private use. The question always arises, then, whether the legislative power of taxation has been properly exercised, every presumption being in favor of the validity of the assumed prerogative, and it only being decided by the court when appealed to that the exercise is improper when the case is clearly made out. So it has been held that the public funds can not be loaned, that the power of taxation can not be exercised in favor of private manufacturing corporations or in favor of the construction of a railroad, like that of the Niagara Whirlpool Company, where the design was rather the amusement of travelers and pleasure-seekers—that is, to give them a better opportunity to visit the falls—than the ordinary purposes of a railroad.

But I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that from day to day and from week to week in this House we appropriate the public funds, without the slightest hesitation, for purposes which are purely private; and I notice the gentleman from Nebraska has introduced bills which clearly provide for the appropriation of public moneys for private purposes. There are, as I have said, certain exceptions to the general theory of taxation. What are they? The most striking exception is the law as to the granting of pensions; and in reference to that the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the general power of giving or withholding pensions is vested in the Congress of the United States, and that a pension is in reality a bounty or gratuity. We also exercise the power in reference to certain claims, not legal in their nature, against the Government.

It was only yesterday that we received a message from the President of the United States asking that an appropriation be made for the families of laborers who were ruthlessly slain in Colorado. That was not strictly a public purpose; that was not strictly a public use; and it is only by virtue of our general moral and equitable jurisdiction that we make appropriations for the payment of such claims. But on this specific question of charities and charitable purposes let me call your attention to the fact that we are sitting as the legislative body of this District; that as to this District we are simply the common council; that we do not propose in the disposition of this charitable fund to legislate on any of the topics committed to us under the general scheme of Federal legislation. We are merely in the place of a local body, of a local legislature, or of the common council of a municipality, which under the laws of the State of New York, as under the laws of many of the States of this Union, legislates for the State, or for a municipality, and which has the right to parcel out and apportion the general charitable fund intrusted to its care and control.

I do not take this position blindly, but in support of it I cite the greatest authority on the question of taxation in the United States, and that is Judge Thomas M. Cooley. He tells us that a man would be bold indeed who in these days, at this stage of the history of the country, should question the public right to make provision for these benevolent objects. He goes further and lays down the principle, as a matter of law, that public charity, even when the delegation of the power of distribution is given to a private corporation, is a public purpose; that the maintenance and

support of these charities through private individuals or private corporations is a public purpose; and he says that by the common consent of all civilized countries it has always been so held.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us have a vote.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that I know of my personal knowledge that this institution is one which needs money as much and possibly more than any other in this city. At St. Ann's the average daily number of inmates is 130. Children of all nations and creeds, white and colored, are admitted and cared for. The expense per capita for the support of the inmates was $8 per month, except for the infants who are boarded out, this being necessary in many cases in order to preserve the lives of very young infants. The asylum has no revenue except the bequests of charitable benefactors, and on account of the utter helplessness of the orphans the expenses are very heavy, amounting to many thousands of dollars. There are no salaried officers, the only compensation paid out being to the servants absolutely necessary to assist in the work entailed by care of so many helpless infants. The sisters devote their whole time night and day to the care of the children, and have endeavored, by sewing and by personal appeals to the charitable in addition to the appropriations hitherto made by Congress, to enlarge the asylum and properly care for its numerous inmates.

I desire to call special attention to the fact that no discrimination is shown on account of nationality, creed, or color, but all are cared for in the broad spirit of Christian charity, whose only limit is the want of greater facilities. I will not detain the House further than to call attention to page 191 of the report which informs us that the rights, duties, and privileges of St. Ann's Asylum were provided by an act of Congress, approved by President Lincoln; and I ask can any Republican in this House strike down an institution which owes its creation to the hand of Abraham Lincoln?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. One word Mr. Chairman. St. Ann's Infant Asylum was incorporated in 1863, like the institution in the item which precedes it in the bill, and its charter, like the charter of the other, was signed by President Lincoln—if that makes any difference. It cares for children until they are 7 years of age; they can not stay there after that time. It receives both white and colored children, Christian, pagan, German, Irish, American, Jew, without distinction. All that is required to entitle them to admission is that they shall be needy and helpless. Now, under these conditions, and in view of this state of facts, I think this appropriation ought to be made. It is not a sectarian appropriation. I have already put into the RECORD the proof of that. It is a mere employment of this institution to care for these 130 children, black and white, Protestant, Catholic, or what not, because the District of Columbia has no place of its own in which to care for them, and until we provide a suitable place it seems clear that we ought not to turn these children out. That is the substance of this proposition. But my friend from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] says that this appropriation is sectarian, and my friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] also says it is sectarian. They agree about that, but one of them wants to make the appropriation because it is sectarian and the other wants not to make it because it is sectarian.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I assumed, for the purposes of the argument, but I did not say, that it was sectarian.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I say it is not; and I am glad that the gentleman makes this correction, because when he was talking I felt that this worthy measure, the best measure that we can adopt for the care of these children in the absence of a suitable institution of our own, was likely to be sacrificed, like Christ, between two parties that did not otherwise agree. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Are there any officers, attendants, or other persons connected with St. Ann's Infant Asylum, except the infants, who are not Catholics?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I do.

Mr. CANNON. And for the purposes of this appropriation I do not care. There are 130 children there for whom we have no place, wards of this District, and until we get a place of our own to shelter them I am willing to hire these institutions to care for them for the coming fiscal year rather than turn them out into the streets.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is all right; but I simply wished to show that the institution is sectarian.

Mr. CANNON. I am not speaking about the institution. I am speaking about this appropriation, which can only be expended under the eye of a Government officer, which can be expended for this purpose and for this purpose alone, and which must be accounted for.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois is certainly a very remarkable one. We have a right to expect a reasonable degree of candor in the discussion of facts. Now, I wish to call attention to page 190 of the report of the institution for 1895. This is the report made by the sister who is president of this institution, under date of July 23, 1895, to the superintendent of charities. I read:

Col. JOHN TRACEY,
Superintendent of Charities.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with the request contained in your communication of the 3d ultimo, I respectfully submit the following report of St. Ann's Infant Asylum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, which is now and has been for a quarter of a century under the charge of the Sisters of Charity of the Order of St. Vincent de Paul——

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, I ask the gentleman if that is not a Catholic institution?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. And is not the Catholic Church a sect?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The case is made out, then.

Mr. CANNON. Go on, now, to your next question.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Illinois says that he knows of no reason why we should not employ these people to take care of these children. Neither do I. But that is not the question. The question is, shall we appropriate here a lump sum to enable those who control these institutions to carry on the business and take in whoever they desire? My proposition is that we ought to make the appropriation to the board of children's guardians, United States officials, who, if they desire, can place these children in this institution, where they can be taken care of; but the proposition of the pending bill is to appropriate a lump sum for these people and allow them to spend it as they choose. That is the question pure and simple, and it is not worth while, even for a man of the ability which I concede to the gentleman from Illinois, to any longer dodge the question.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, one word in reply. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not reply, because I have explained the matter three times, and the gentleman from Nebraska will not hear or understand. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, speaking in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska, I congratulate him on the fact that the committee has at last come to a realization of the truth that the administration of these charities is not religious in its character, or private in its conception or consummation. I base this statement upon the vote which has just defeated the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska which was designed to keep out of this bill an appropriation for the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children.

Every man, Mr. Chairman, who voted in favor of the retention of this appropriation asserted by that vote his belief that whether this appropriation was private or otherwise, he was in favor of it. That being the case, how can such a man vote against the provisions in the subsequent paragraph, and how can he consistently and logically vote against the reconsideration of the vote which struck out the preceding paragraphs from this bill? Having kept in that proviso, having retained that paragraph for the maintenance of the Home for Destitute Colored Women and Children, how can my Republican brethren vote to strike out the provision which, according to the statement of the venerated and honorable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, carries with it an appropriation for colored children—I emphasize the words, colored children? And, Mr. Chairman, those children, it appears by the statement, are under 7 years of age.

Now, according to the precepts of the church to which I belong, no child under 7 years of age is recognized as other than a noncommunicant, and according to the precepts of the logicians from Aristotle down to that erratic individual, Jeremy Bentham, no individual is recognizable as a creature amenable to the laws of morals or society or religion or human law who has not the use of reason, and before a child attains the age of 7 years he certainly is not susceptible to the precepts and inculcations of religion. That being the case, the institution now under consideration is certainly not a religious association, and, as my friend from Illinois has said, both races being accepted within the precincts or realm of that institution, there is no color discrimination. Consequently I can not see how my friends on the other side can make political capital by voting against or for these colored people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, proceeding from the assertion of these propositions, which I think are irrefragable——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, going back thirty or thirty-five years, a war was waged for the dissolution of this Union. Soldiers innumerable on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line flocked to the standards of what they considered right. The reverberations of cannon echoed down the valleys of Virginia. Swords and muskets asserted their supremacy. Brother fought against brother; soldier on one side against soldier on the other. As the soldiers went down on the side of the Union, there came upon the battlefields the white-winged messengers of peace, robed in the raiments of mercy and charity, and many a parched tongue and parched throat accepted the ministrations of those pure, beautiful creatures, who, protected by soldiers and officers, as well as by the President of the United States, the great, grand, and lamented Lincoln, came and ministered to them. Was there any question then on the part of the gentleman from Nebraska as to granting those emissaries of mercy a commission to fulfill their errand to those soldiers? Did he then, or did those whom he now represents, rise in their might and protest against the charitable work of those angelic forms in human shape? No, Mr. Chairman, not one word of protest was uttered then. Yet the representatives of the descendants of the men who were assisted by those lovely women come here to-day and protest in the name of what? Infidelity against religion.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this committee has put on record its vote in favor of the appropriation for the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children (for which I voted); in view of the fact that that is an assertion on our part that the institution is not private in its character and is nonsectarian, although, according to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations it is in no wise different from the one now before us for consideration, I fail to see how our Republican brethren can vote against the appropriation.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to these appropriations is urged upon the basis of two principles, both of which I recognize as correct in the abstract. The first is that this Government, having no alliance with religion or sectarianism in any form, ought not to appropriate public money for the establishment of religion, for the teaching of religion, or for the promotion of religion or sectarianism. That is right. The other principle is that public functions should be performed through public agencies, and should not be devolved upon private institutions or individuals, and that, therefore, public money should not be donated to private individuals or institutions upon the pretext that they are performing public functions.

Those principles are right in the abstract, and we should seek with all reasonable diligence to give them practical effect. But it is sought here to suddenly apply them to conditions in which a great wrong would result from their immediate application. There is no need of making a juggernaut of progress. There is no need of crushing out the lives of public charges who are now being cared for in private, even in religious, asylums and hospitals merely because we have determined that hereafter such charges must be cared for in public institutions. Confessedly we have no such public institutions now, and we are therefore unprepared to immediately change our system of caring for the poor and the sick and the wayward.

We have for more than a century gone on intrusting the care of the sick and the destitute to private institutions. The helplessness of these fellow-beings, white and black, their poverty, their inability to care for themselves, appeal to us in the name of humanity, and in the name of our civilization, of which this nation ought to be the highest type and leader. They demand at our hands not religious instruction, but food, clothing, and shelter. They should, as brethren, be provided with these things through public institutions, if we have them. If we have not such institutions our duty to these unfortunates is not thereby changed, and that duty must be performed through such private instrumentalities as may be at hand and as shall seem best for the time being.

In the absence of such public institutions the means that are proposed in this bill to be continued for at least another year seem to be the best available, and in spite of the fact that we should make proper provision for adhering to both of the principles asserted on the other side these appropriations, and all of them, should now be made. These principles can be best and most humanely asserted by making provision for the proper care of all public charges in the future in institutions that are both public and nonsectarian.

Indeed, I am inclined to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that these appropriations are not sectarian. These appropriations are not made for the purpose of promoting any religion or sect. They are made for the purpose of procuring food, clothing, and shelter for the helpless and destitute, whose misfortunes make them, in some sense, wards of the nation. How is it ascertained that any of these appropriations has the color of sectarianism? In order to find it you must look beyond the purpose for which the institutions are employed—beyond the purpose for which the appropriations are made—and you inquire what, if any, religious belief these people or these institutions have or hold. The answer coming that they belong to or uphold some particular religious creed or doctrine, you say: Then they should not be hired to give food and shelter and clothing to these wards of the nation, because, whenever it appears that they profess some religious creed, their employment becomes a devotion of the public money to sectarian purposes.

But the institutions named in the bill are private institutions, and they come within the other objection, provided we are in a position otherwise to do our duty to the public charges now cared for in such institutions. Confessedly we are not in that position.

Now, sir, the Constitution of the United States forbids Congress to establish religion—commands that it "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Let me suggest to my friends who are so eager to divorce church and state—and none favor it more strongly than I—where a first step should be taken in putting this provision of the Constitution into operation——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I would like to have a few minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGUIRE. There is an establishment of religion right here in this House, and repeated appropriations of public money for the establishment and promotion of religion here, which, in my judgment, we ought to stop before we take up the subject of charitable appropriations to sectarian hospitals and asylums. The election of a Chaplain of this House is an act respecting an establishment of religion. You can not select a Chaplain to pray for heavenly guidance for this House without having first determined that he is a minister of the true religion. How worse than useless, nay, how terrible it would be to select a minister of a false religion to serve as a medium of communication between this House and the Almighty. His appointment would be an insult to Divinity, and his prayers would be blasphemies, bringing curses instead of blessings. We do necessarily establish a religion in the election of a Chaplain to conduct religious services for the House, and we do it in defiance of the constitutional provision which absolutely forbids it. We have no right to do it, and no right to appropriate a dollar of public money for that purpose.

Now, let those who object to sectarianism in our laws and in our appropriation bills—in which I quite agree with them in principle—do away with this unconstitutional establishment of religion and put a stop to this unconstitutional appropriation of public funds to pay for sectarian teaching and sectarian religious ceremonies. I will go as far as any of these gentlemen in supporting the spirit of our institutions as embodied in that provision of the Federal Constitution; but let us commence where no harm and no wrong can be done. If principle be the sole motive of the objections to these appropriations, and I assume that it is, here is a grand and conspicuous field for patriotic effort. Let our national church establishment be disestablished and leave these minor violations of principle until the Government is better prepared to substitute public care for private care of its charges.

I make these suggestions in no spirit of hostility to the churches nor to any church. I recognize their great power for good among men. I believe they will be stronger and greater when they shall be entirely separated from the state, and I believe that the state will be likewise made stronger and better and purer by such separation.

This is a civil government, deriving nothing from the church and capable of giving nothing to it. It should be strictly nonsectarian—professing no religion, but respecting and equally protecting all.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentlemen who have debated this question for nearly two days past have been confusing the legal aspects of it, or placing them upon a false basis.

It has been said repeatedly by gentlemen, during the discussion, who oppose the appropriation that the provision in the bill was objectionable in that it appropriated public money for private use, and secondly, that it appropriated money for sectarian purposes. Now, sir, I think that this proposition is entirely fallacious. The true reason why this appropriation is objectionable has not yet been touched upon in my judgment. It is quite true, as a general proposition, that public money should not be appropriated for a private use; but that question is not involved in this discussion. Gentlemen fail to distinguish clearly between the character of the object to which the money is appropriated and the instrumentality that shall administer that fund. An appropriation of public money for purposes of charity, for the care of the poor and destitute, is an appropriation of money for a public use and not an appropria-

tion for a private one, and has always been so held by lawmakers and lawgivers.

Now, the appropriation of money for this German Lutheran Orphan Asylum and for the Catholic institution in this city is not an appropriation of money for private use simply because it is to be administered by a certain class of officials. The character of the appropriation depends altogether upon the use to which the money is to be put, and not at all upon the character of the instrumentality that shall have the right to administer it. An analogous case, and one which is familiar to every lawyer, is the case of a grant of public aid for the construction of a railroad. A railroad company is a private corporation; but the use to which it is to be put is a public one. Notwithstanding that distinction legislators throughout the entire world have been appropriating money in aid of building railroads on the ground, and it is so justified by the courts, that the expenditure of money for the building of the railroad is the expenditure of the money for a public use, even though the money is to be handled and administered and disposed of by a private corporation. So it is here. The appropriation of money, therefore, for a charitable object, as in this case—that is, to maintain the poor—is an appropriation public in its character nothwithstanding the fact that it is to be administered wholly by a private association.

Now, I think the true ground for objection to this appropriation should not be placed here. Gentlemen are failing to distinguish between the quality of the use and the character of the instrumentality. My objection to it is this, that it is an appropriation by the people of the United States to do a charitable work, to take care of the poor, in another municipality; that is to say, in the District of Columbia.

We have in our several States to take care of our own poor. Why should not the people of this District take care of theirs? We have in our own States to administer to our own charities. Why should not the people of the District of Columbia administer theirs and pay for them, as we have to at home? We are taking money out of the people of all of the States in order to help the people in the District of Columbia take care of their own poor and administer their own charities, which is an act of injustice to your people and mine at home, who have work enough of that kind on their hands already.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it were permissable, I should move an amendment that this expenditure of money shall be chargeable wholly to the revenues of this District.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. I should like a little more time.

Mr. GROUT. I ask that the gentleman have what time he desires.

By unanimous consent, the time of Mr. POWERS was extended five minutes.

Mr. POWERS. The objection to the amendment of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] is that he saves no money to the Government. He proposes, when we reach the amendment he offered on yesterday, to make this same appropriation of money for this same purpose, but to have it administered, not by these particular church organizations, but by a public organization, so that we come to the same evil result in the end. We are appropriating the money of the people of the United States to help the people of the District of Columbia take care of their own charitable institutions.

It is all wrong, Mr. Chairman. The Government of the United States to-day is paying half the ordinary expenses of the local government of this District. The taxes that are imposed upon the people of this District are not half as great as the taxes imposed upon my people at home; and still they are asking us here, in addition to all that, to help them carry on such charitable organizations and carry out such charitable objects and purposes as the ingenuity of their leading men may prescribe. It is all wrong, sir. The objection to this proposal is that it is being paid for by the wrong class of people, and if an amendment would be in order to make this expenditure chargeable solely to the revenues of this District, so that the District of Columbia would pay their own bills for such purposes as your people and mine have to pay, then I should be heartily in favor of it.

Now, upon the other branch of the proposition, it is said that it is an expenditure of money for a sectarian purpose; and I was somewhat amused to hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], in defense of the appropriation for the German orphanage, insist that that institution was not sectarian. Why? He says these other schemes are sectarian, because the pastor of one single church heads the administration of the trust, but that his is not sectarian because two ministers head that, as if that alters the character of the appropriation in the least.

All of them, Mr. Chairman, are organizations fostered and encouraged by particular sectarian churches. They are under their control just as much as a ladies' aid society of the Congregational Church is under its control, or a ladies' aid society of some other church is under its control. They are all specifically and definitely sectarian in their management. It is true that all of them will come before Congress and maintain that they are not sectarian, because they say, "We will take the children of all denominations; we will take the child of the Catholic, the child of the Presbyterian, the child of the Methodist, the child of the Hebrew. We will take them all in."

They will say that when they are asking for money, but when they get the money they will administer it for their own private purposes. In that sense they are sectarian.

Now, I would not appropriate a cent of public money to foster and encourage the funds or the work of any church on earth. I do not care whether it is Catholic or Protestant, I would do it as quickly for a Catholic as for a Protestant, but the principle is wrong. It is an appropriation of the people's money for a purpose for which the Government was never organized.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy the time of the committee but a moment. I shall not stop to answer the argument of the gentleman last upon the floor [Mr. POWERS] as to the propriety of saddling this whole cost upon the people of the District of Columbia. I would say that such a motion here would be out of order, but if the gentleman is sincere in his belief that this relation, which the people of the whole country sustain to the people of the District, does not justify the present system, then let him bring in a bill to reform the present system and we will discuss that question when it comes up.

I want to say that I am a little astonished at the statement of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], that this institution is not sectarian, and that this is not a sectarian appropriation. It was quite fully explained by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] that it is in charge of the Sisters of Charity of the Order of St. Vincent de Paul.

I find from the report on the page following that read from by the gentleman from Nebraska that St. Ann's Infant Asylum keep these children until they are 7 years of age, and then I find, when we turn to St. Rose Industrial School, that the girls at 14 come from the Order of St. Vincent to the St. Rose Industrial School, an institution to which you will have your attention called in a moment, and that they there remain until their education is completed.

Now, you have here the course of a complete educational system for the support of two links, of which, viz, St. Ann's and the St. Rose School, there are appropriations asked from this Congress. The Order of St. Vincent does not apply for aid.

It seems to be the intermediate link in this chain of instruction, and the whole business seems to be under the order of St. Vincent de Paul.

But it is perfectly clear that if these appropriations be made for these two institutions, that the public money will be used for the beginning and the rounding out of the physical, moral, and religious training of these young ladies up to the time when they are ready to go forth in the battle of life, or themselves become Sisters of Charity. If this would not be the use of money for sectarian educational purposes I do not know what would be.

As to the appeal of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to the sympathies of members, lest, if this appropriation should fail, these children would be uncared for, let me say, borrow no trouble.

There are already in the District of Columbia many institutions of a similar character not asking aid. St. Ann's Infant Asylum will go on with its work just the same though this appropriation should be withheld. If you will turn to page 47 of the report of the superintendent of charities you will find a list of all the charitable institutions of the city—51 in all—and you will find in that list 32 in number which are not asking for Congressional aid, and, I presume, all doing good work. Had I the time I would read the list. It is full of instruction. Of these institutions that are asking aid, 19 in all, 6 of which are clearly, as has been already shown, strictly sectarian, these institutions, every one of them, would continue their work, though possibly on a more limited scale.

Mr. HERMANN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him if it is not a fact that within the last few years there has been a very great augmentation so far as our beneficiary acts are concerned as to these objects, and if this Congress should now continue to encourage it will not there be an additional increase in the future?

Mr. GROUT. That is the fact; and if you will recall what I stated on the floor yesterday you will have in mind the augmentation of it as shown in this bill. There are four new charities put in here which, by the way, are meritorious and to which I make no objection. Now, I am willing, and indeed, Mr. Chairman, I think it good policy, provided that an amendment be adopted such as was read yesterday in the body of my remarks, bringing these institutions under public supervision, to appropriate for them. I believe we are not going amiss in appropriating for them where they are unsectarian. I believe that if the $70,000 or $80,000 that goes for this purpose to-day, to help out the charitable and philanthropic purposes of the people of the District

through the medium of these charities, were withdrawn, and the Government were to take entire charge of these needy classes, it would cost not $70,000 or $80,000, but $700,000 or $800,000, but the other is a different question.

Mr. Chairman, we are brought face to face with the proposition to appropriate the public money for the use of these private sectarian institutions where complete intellectual, moral, and religious training of the inmates is all the time in sectarian hands, and I must draw the line here. I do not care whether the institution be Catholic or Protestant. The same principle applies. We applied it yesterday to a Protestant school, and let us without flinching apply it to-day to this Catholic school, and then to the next item but one. There is, in fact, no other safe course for the American people.

If free government is to be preserved to the future dwellers of this continent, and at the same time free religion is to make bright their hopes of a life beyond, that government and that religion must be kept absolutely separate. The moment you join the two that moment the freedom of both is gone. From that very moment each will strive to tyrannize over the other—the church over the state and the state over the church, and both together will be sure to tyrannize over man.

The religious sentiment is strongest of any in the human breast. The affections perhaps come next; but never have we heard of but one war on account of love, the one in which figured Helen and Priam and ancient Troy. But the page of history is red with the blood of religious wars. Let us, then, in administering the affairs of state, let religion entirely alone; and let us at the same time insist that religion shall not meddle with the state. Let us hold inviolate all public funds for public use only, including public schools. This, faithfully and resolutely done at all times and on all occasions, may save us from the burning question as to the rights of parochial schools, which to-day agitates our neighbor on the north, and over which a whole province is well-nigh in revolt.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The amendment was read, as follows:

For St. Ann's Infant Asylum, maintenance, $5,400.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the merits of the proposition advanced here that public money should not be appropriated for sectarian purposes, and however fully the principle may be conceded by all of us that there should be a complete separation of church and state, I can not see how either one of these principles apply to a proposition to appropriate money in aid of an orphan asylum in the District of Columbia.

The Congress of the United States is, so far as the District is concerned, the State legislature and the town council. Its authority is supreme, subject to no limitations whatever, and being under the same responsibility that ordinary municipal and State governments are to take care of the orphan, the helpless, the dependent, it has the right to utilize any instrumentalities that it sees fit to carry its charitable purposes into effect. I can not understand how anyone can contend that the appropriation of money for the support of orphans is the appropriation of money for a private purpose. Neither can I understand how the appropriation of money in support of a charitable institution, which may be taken care of by one religious association or another, can be held to be an appropriation for sectarian purposes.

If associations organized for the purpose are not to take care of these orphans and other dependents, who is to take care of them? Who are so well able to disburse wisely the money which is given for this purpose in support of helpless orphans as those who have devoted their lives to the work? Further, Mr. Chairman, I am told that in this particular case the institution is under the control of officers who are bonded, who render regular accounts of their expenditures, and who are practically, therefore, under the supervision and control of the public officials of the District, if such control is necessary.

In this connection I wish to call attention to an incident which came under my personal observation a few years ago. We have there what I believe to be the noblest institution of its kind in the United States, the Charity Hospital, in which the wounded and the sick and the distressed of all nationalities can find refuge and succor, where they receive medicine and clothing and support free of any charge whatever. I was once invited to go through that institution with one of its officers and found that the same class of people who are in control of the institution now under consideration, the Sisters of Charity, were taking care of that great hospital—that is to say, they were doing all the work which was necessary to carry the charitable purposes of the institution into effect.

It is true they were acting under the supervision of State officers, but they were the instrumentalities by which that great charity was doing its beneficent work. So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be coming down to a very low plane to refuse an appropriation to this orphan asylum, an institution erected and maintained for the care of children under the age of 7, on the ground that the appropriation is for sectarian or private purposes. In my judgment it is for neither the one nor the other.

Mr. GROUT. Let us have a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The question being taken on the amendment, the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 93, noes 25; so the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Association for Works of Mercy, maintenance, $1,800.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. I hope we shall have a vote.

The question being taken, the Chairman declared that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 100, noes 28; so the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the House of the Good Shepherd, maintenance, $2,700.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the paragraph.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, this House of the Good Shepherd——

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Alabama proceeds, I ask consent that all debate upon this paragraph and amendments be limited to ten minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the House of the Good Shepherd was established in this District by the daughter of an eminent naval officer. She gave her entire fortune and the efforts of her life to build up the institution. It has had a few donations, and now it is almost entirely supported by the efforts of the Sisters and the beneficiaries, who endeavor by their labor in taking in plain sewing and other work to, so far as possible, defray the expenses and take care of the poor people under their charge. The report shows last year they earned $2,366.15 in this manner, almost as much as was appropriated by Congress.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman say that there are any children kept in this institution?

Mr. WHEELER. I think there are some. The report speaks of work by children, and my information is that children of 14 years and upward are cared for there.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No, sir; it is for white adults, erring white women.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman is mistaken. Not only does the report of the sisters, page 229, speak of children, but also on page 42 they refer to some of their inmates as small children, showing that they must have children there under 14.

The gentlemen who have stated that this institution is sectarian are certainly ignorant of its organization. It is true that the Sisters of the Good Shepherd are Catholics, but one of the leading managers of this institution for many years was the very distinguished Presbyterian divine, the Rev. William Alvin Bartlett, so long the rector of New York Avenue Church. This most certainly classifies the House of the Good Shepherd as absolutely nonsectarian, and this fact deprives those who are striking at our charitable institutions of any excuse for voting against the appropriation for the House of the Good Shepherd.

Now, the gentleman from Vermont said in his speech that this Government never appropriates money for any purpose to be disbursed by other than Government officers. Sir, he himself voted in this Hall to appropriate $100,000,000 to be used in educating the illiterate in the various States of the Union; and that bill provided that the money should be apportioned by the Secretary of the Interior among the various States according to the number of illiterates and should be paid over to the officers of the respective States, who were not required to be bonded at all, and upon whom no other requirement was imposed than that a report should be made to the Federal Government as to the manner in which the money had been expended. In this case we do not go as far as that. We have these institutions under our eye, under our control; and we require by law that the officials of these institutions who expend the money should be bonded and return an official report showing just how the money is expended.

The House seems to have been misinformed upon this important point, and I find this wrong impression has influenced many members in their votes. I stated yesterday what the law was, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] read the law again this morning, which clearly states that the law absolutely prohibits the payment of any of this money except to an officer who is bonded, and also that full reports of expenditures are required.

The Committee on Appropriations know, and all who have taken pains to investigate these matters know, that the proposed appropriation for the House of the Good Shepherd is absolutely necessary for its maintenance.

As the gentleman who just took his seat well said, we stand

here not as Congress; we stand here as the legislature of this District; we stand here as a commom council, and it is our bounden duty to do all that may be necessary to take care of the needy and unfortunate in this community, over which we have exclusive jurisdiction.

I was sorry to observe that the gentleman from Vermont seemed to argue and by his amendment yesterday to insist that no money should be given to any institution that teaches the religion of God Almighty. Sir, institutions of mercy must be under religious control; they must be under some religious denomination; and it makes no difference to me whether they are under one denomination or another. All I want is that they do as these institutions do; ask only if the unfortunates brought to them need their care; ask only, "Do these people come under the head of those whom Christ in His Sermon on the Mount told all Christians to care for?"

These institutions have their doors open, and seem to say, almost in the language of Christ:

Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. * * * Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

I ask Congress if they wish to close the doors of such asylums, controlled by people whose entire lives are devoted to obeying the admonition of Christ?

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, it was agreed to, there being—ayes 95, noes 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the St. Rose Industrial School, maintenance, $4,500.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the paragraph just read. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. SORG. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on striking out these other items I wish to say there are many members of this Committee of the Whole who are entirely in the dark as to the nature of these various institutions; and as long as gentlemen have seen proper to make explanations in regard to other items which have been stricken out, many of us would be very glad to have some member of the Committee on Appropriations explain the nature of the particular institutions we are now voting upon. Otherwise we are obliged to vote blindly. I hope we may have some explanation either from the chairman of the committee or from the gentleman who makes this motion to strike out.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, it was agreed to; there being—ayes 88, noes 15.

The Clerk read as follows:

For St. Joseph's Asylum, maintenance, $1,800.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to amend by striking out the paragraph just read. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Young Women's Christian Home, $1,000.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read, and I desire to offer a word of explanation, if I may be permitted.

We have reached now the conclusion of these several sectarian institutions. There remain only to be considered the item for the Young Women's Christian Home (an institution, I will say, for young women seeking employment while temporarily in the city); the Industrial Home School, which is located on Government property and which it was proposed in 1894 to make public, but which has not yet been made public—this is not sectarian; the Hope and Help Mission——

Mr. CRAIN. That is private.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. These are all private institutions. The Hope and Help Mission is a nonsectarian mission for the relief of fallen women; the Newsboys and Children's Aid Society is of the character indicated by the title. It is of course nonsectarian, as is the Eastern Dispensary, a hospital, as well as the Washington Home for Incurables, provision for which is made at the top of page 40. I shall move to strike out each of these items simply for the reason——

Mr. CRAIN. I object. I make the point of order that the gentleman's motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has moved to strike out the pending paragraph.

Mr. CRAIN. I understood his motion to go further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will please be in order.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have made explanation of what my purpose is so as to avoid any further discussion on my part with respect to these paragraphs. It is evident to my mind that the temper of the House is opposed to striking out any of these additional paragraphs, against which I will direct my motions. I desire simply to have a vote, that the record may be made. I now ask for a vote on the motion to strike out the pending paragraph.

Mr. CRAIN. I rise to a parliamentary question. I may have misunderstood the gentleman from Nebraska, but I believe he referred to these various paragraphs, going down to the Newsboys and Children's Aid Society, and said that it was nonsectarian, not private.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It is private.

Mr. CRAIN. Do you mean to jump from that point down to this?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no. I said when we reached the paragraph I would make the motion.

Mr. CRAIN. Because I have a point of order against the other.

Mr. GROUT. Let me appeal to the gentleman from Nebraska not to insist on the motion, but to withdraw it. I can not see what possible good it will do, according to his own statement.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Well, let us have a vote on it.

Mr. GROUT. Very well, then, let us vote it down.

The question was taken; and the motion to strike out was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Industrial Home School: For maintenance, including repairs, $9,900.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAIN), there were—ayes 24, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding after the word "dollars," in line 4 on page 39, the following:

"For the support and medical treatment of medical and surgical patients who are destitute in the city of Washington, under a contract to be made with the Providence Hospital by the Surgeon-General of the Army, $15,000.

"For Garfield Memorial Hospital—for maintenance to enable it to provide medical and surgical treatment to persons unable to pay therefor, $15,000."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order. This amendment changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the question of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is virtually conceded, with reference to all amendments of this character, that there is no provision of existing law for them.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. If the gentleman from New York will permit me at this stage, I will say that it is almost in the identical language of the appropriations made for years and years past, but which is ordinarily placed in the sundry civil appropriation bill; and I wish to make some remarks in reference to the propriety of the change which this amendment contemplates.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. And I make the further point of order that it increases the appropriation, and is therefore out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That point of order is not well taken. There is nothing in the rule to prevent such an amendment.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, these two institutions, the Providence Hospital and the Garfield Hospital, have been in existence a number of years, and Providence Hospital is the older of the two. They have been annually appropriated for for a great many years past, and the only object of this amendment is to change them from the sundry civil appropriation bill to the District of Columbia bill; and the special object in that change is this: As they are now appropriated for, the Government of the United States pays the entire amount. If appropriated for in the District of Columbia appropriation bill the District will pay one-half of the amount, which, it seems to me, is entirely proper and appropriate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to ask if the amendment of the gentleman does not limit patients who may be received to persons who enter from the city of Washington? Should it not read the District of Columbia?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. There is no limit in regard to it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the amendment limits it to the city of Washington entirely; at least I so understood the reading of it.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. No, sir; it is just as broad as the others contained in the bill, which provide for the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then I misunderstood the amendment as it was read to the House. It seemed to me that it limited the patients and persons who might enter the hospital to patients from the city of Washington.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is not the intention and is not the language of the amendment, and I wish to call the attention of the committee and the Committee on Appropriations to this proposed change.

It is not an attempt to defeat an appropriation for either of these

hospitals, or really to diminish the appropriation for either of them, although such is the fact in the present appropriation. The appropriation in the last Congress for each session was $19,000 for each hospital. I have cut it down to $15,000, as it seems to me that is sufficient for them. Again, in the appropriation for Providence Hospital I have found that it has been limited by making an appropriation for 95 medical or surgical patients at and for the gross sum of $19,000, which in itself does not permit any discretion upon the part of the Surgeon-General in regard to the amount that he shall pay. These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, and now I should like a vote upon the proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, one word in response. The gentleman by his argument has conceded that the existing law will be changed. Half of this fund, by the insertion of this provision in this bill, will be paid by the taxpayers of the District, and that is in itself a change of existing law, by taking it out of the other bill and putting it into this bill.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. There is no law on the subject to apply to the year ending June 30, 1897. It is simply in an appropriation bill, where it always has been for years and years. This simply changes it from the one appropriation bill to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire if these are public institutions of charity, controlled in whole or in part by the District of Columbia?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. They are not. They are exactly in the same category as the appropriations which have already been made here for the Washington Homeopathic Hospital and for the other institutions which are appropriated for by this bill.

Mr. GROUT. And the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is no law for the appropriation proposed to be made out of the joint fund of the District and the Government is the very reason why this is subject to the point of order. This amendment will change that liability. Now, these hospitals are sustained wholly by the General Government in another bill. If admitted to this bill, one-half of the expense is put upon the District, which can not be done except by new legislation, and this of course makes the amendment subject to the point of order.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the whole object and intent of this amendment is to put these institutions exactly where kindred institutions are in the District of Columbia, and where they ought to be, namely, in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, where the revenues of the District of Columbia shall be chargeable with one-half of their expense. To do otherwise has been always inequitable, always improper, and always unjust, and I call the attention of the committee especially to this fact, that they are making fish of one and fowl of another, and all to the detriment of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, that is not the case——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAYNE). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

In the opinion of the Chair it is no answer to a point of order that the amendment changes existing law to say there is at present no statute law upon the subject. In the absence of statute law there is still a rule established by custom. That is the law, and any proposition which enacts positive law is a change of existing law in that respect. The enactments of law where none now exists is a change of existing law. It is acknowledged by the mover of this amendment that it does enact positive law where none now exists, and in that it changes existing law, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Board of children's guardians: For the board of children's guardians, created under the act approved July 26, 1892, namely: For administrative expenses, including salary of agent, not to exceed $1,600, expenses in placing and visiting children, and all office and sundry expenses, $4,000.

For care of feeble-minded children; care of children under 3 years of age, white and colored; board and care of all children over 3 years of age, and for the temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, $23,400; in all, $27,400.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to amend by offering the amendment which has already been sent to the Clerk's desk, to strike out certain words beginning in line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 39, in line 16, after the words "place to place," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert "$63,200; in all, $67,500: *Provided*, That the institutions for children, including industrial and reformatory, namely, the Church Orphanage of St. John's parish; the German Orphan Asylum; the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, including its care of colored foundlings; the St. Ann's Infant Asylum; the St. Joseph Asylum, the House of the Good Shepherd; the Association for Works of Mercy, and St. Rose's Industrial School, heretofore receiving aid by specific appropriation, are hereby remitted, except as herein specifically appropriated for, to the appropriation herein made, and to the said act of July 26, 1892, to provide for the care of dependent children in the District of Columbia, and to create a board of children's guardians, for all rights and benefits which they may have under the provisions of the said act."

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAIN. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] will state his point of order.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Before the point of order is stated I wish to perfect the amendment. It was prepared before the vote was taken on the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children and on the Industrial Home School. The amount, therefore, is too large. I ask the Clerk to make the necessary subtraction, and to strike out the words "National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children and the Industrial Home School."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that modification will be made.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, the point of order I make is that the board of children's guardians have control, as all gentlemen have agreed in this debate, only of such children as have been assigned to them by the courts—none other. They have no control or right whatever with reference to the children of these other institutions named which have not been through the courts, and this amendment confers new power upon the board of children's guardians in the matter of disbursing this money. By authority of law they can not now pay out a penny of money except in behalf of those children that have been committed to them by the courts. I would like the gentleman to tell the Chair and the committee how this board can disburse for those charities (any of them) unless the children have been committed to the care of the board of children's guardians by the courts, and none of them confessedly have been, except such as the board already have charge of. It is very clearly a change of existing law, conferring upon the board power to pay out money for that which now they have no power to pay it out.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Nebraska allow me? I hold in my hand, if the gentleman has it not, the act creating the board of children's guardians.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I have it.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to section 5, if he is not familiar with it. And I would like to have the attention of the Chair. I desire to ask the Chair if he has before him the act constituting the board of children's guardians?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will read from it, and then forward my copy to the Chair. Section 5 of the act that created this board of children's guardians referred to in the appropriation is as follows:

The board shall be the legal guardians of all children committed to it by the courts and shall have power to board them in private families, to board them in institutions willing to receive them, to bind them out or apprentice them, or to give them an adoption to foster parents, etc.

Under that clause this appropriation is in order and the amendment is in order.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is not well taken; neither is the objection urged by the gentleman from Illinois of any force.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am with you; it is not an objection.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I understood the gentleman to base his objection on the amendment which I have offered——

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary, I say, having stricken out this appropriation, there is nothing left us but to avail ourselves of the board of children's guardians. It will not do complete justice, but partial, and is better than nothing.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I misunderstood the gentleman, and his presentation of the matter leaves me nothing to say.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I am astonished at the confidence displayed by my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in saying that section 5 of the act of 1892 makes it in order to put this amendment into the bill and to remit all these institutions to this board of children's guardians for their disbursements, as it is a confessed fact that the children therein have not been committed by the courts. It passes all human comprehension. Now, my friend from Illinois could have said so to the Chair. But I fear the trouble with my friend is that he is disappointed with the action of the committee with reference to some of these items in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, just at that point. He entirely mistakes me. We have stricken out the clause in the bill that provides for these classes of children which were not committed by the court. Now, then, this amendment——

Mr. GROUT. But the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CANNON. Well, substantially so, as to these sectarian institutions. Now, then, the board of children's guardians has the right, as to all children they have jurisdiction of, to board them in a private family or in any institution.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, this appropriation should be increased to enable them to exercise that right; and while they can

not board any children that they do not have any jurisdiction of, yet I presume that some of these children that they have not jurisdiction of they will get jurisdiction of through orders of the courts.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, every one of these institutions that have been stricken out as sectarian are named in this amendment and remitted to this board for their money; and confessedly in these institutions there is not a child that has been committed there by any court, and if there is it is an exception.

Mr. CANNON. But there are children that have been committed to them.

Mr. GROUT. Well, there may be some, but very few. The children are provided for in these institutions all over the city wherever the sisters and others looking for objects of charity can find them, wherever, in short, charity finds opportunity for expression. Now, I say that the board of children's guardians can pay no money out except to the class of children committed to it by the court, and to say that these institutions may be remitted, under this amendment, to them and they be entitled to pay money out to them, seems to me a perfect absurdity.

This amendment really puts these same institutions that we have stricken out back into the bill, and undertakes to pay them through the board of children's guardians; though I do not think the board could pay them, because it has no power under the law. The children in these institutions might, perhaps, be ground out through the courts and committed to the board of children's guardians and then the board could pay for taking care of them; but that is a condition that does not now exist. I do not say that it might not be arranged so that the board could pay for the care of these children, but then the very purpose of striking out these sectarian paragraphs would be defeated, because the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, the St. Rose's Industrial School, the St. Joseph's Asylum, the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's, the House of Mercy, and all these other institutions are included in this amendment, which undertakes to confer larger powers on the board of children's guardians. It does that, if it does anything.

Mr. HERMANN. I have voted all along with the gentleman in favor of separating these sectarian appropriations from the secular ones, and I want to continue in that course, but I wish to understand further what the relation of this board of guardians is to the General Government.

Mr. GROUT. They are a public board, appointed by the judges of the police court and of the criminal court, having certain powers conferred upon them by the act which has been read here, authorizing them to take charge of children that are committed to them by the courts, but of no others.

Mr. HERMANN. Then the gentleman's position is that all disbursements made through this board are substantially made through governmental agencies?

Mr. GROUT. That is so, and I am for the board of children's guardians as it stands in the bill. Every dollar estimated for was appropriated it; but here is a proposition to enlarge the powers of this board and to authorize them to employ these institutions that have been stricken out of the bill and to pay them out of the money which we appropriate here. Mr. Chairman, is not that an enlargement of the law creating this board? Most clearly it is. The power of the board is limited to taking care of children committed to them by the courts, but this amendment would permit them to disburse to other institutions the money which is appropriated here, thus contravening existing law.

Mr. HERMANN. Have not the board of guardians any discretionary power within themselves?

Mr. GROUT. None whatever, except to exercise their discretion in the care and management of children sent to them by the courts. When the court has committed a child to the board the board has power to take charge of that child, but not before.

Mr. CANNON. And that is the very object of this appropriation, to give this board money to provide for the children that are committed to them by the court during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. GROUT. Ah, but this would give them authority to pay these institutions which take care of children that are not committed by the court.

Mr. CANNON. Under existing law the board of children's guardians can not pay to an institution or anybody else any money out of these appropriations except for the support of children sent to them by the courts. They have a right to pay for the support of the children wherever they choose, in the exercise of a sound discretion, and I will say to my friend that of the children that have been committed to them for the present fiscal year they are placing a portion in private families in Pennsylvania, a portion in Maryland, and a portion in some of these institutions.

Mr. GROUT. That may be all true. They have authority now to do that, because those children have been committed to them by the courts; but if this amendment is adopted it will give them new powers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one point of order already pending.

Mr. CRAIN. Well, I have a new point. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will deal with one point of order at a time.

Mr. CRAIN. I rise to ask a question for information. Will the Chair please tell me what point of order was raised by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont raised the point of order that this was a change of existing law.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the Chair hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but if the gentleman from Texas desires to debate the question further the Chair will hear him for ten minutes.

Mr. CRAIN. I do not exact it as a matter of courtesy, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman if he desires to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. I simply wish to fortify the argument of the gentleman from Vermont, and if the Chair does not desire to hear me I will ask that my argument may be printed in the RECORD, as I do not wish to inflict any remarks unnecessarily upon the committee or the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, the act of 1892, establishing the board of children's guardians, was amendatory of the act of 1885, and was followed by the act of 1895. The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska is designed to put under the control of the board of children's guardians the various beneficiaries contemplated by the several paragraphs which, on his motion, have been stricken out, and which he now practically incorporates in his motion, notwithstanding the arguments of himself and gentlemen who have concurred with him. These beneficiaries include men, women, and children. Now, the act of February 13, 1885, declares as its object the care and maintenance of children under the provisions of the act providing for the prevention of cruelty to animals. I incorporate in my remarks the first section of that act:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals for the District of Columbia shall be known as the "Washington Humane Society," and shall be authorized to extend its operations under this act to the protection of children as well as animals from cruelty and abuse. In pursuance thereof the said society may cause its proper officers or agents to prefer complaints before any court in the District of Columbia having jurisdiction for the violation of any law relating to or affecting the protection of children in said District, and by its proper attorney may aid in bringing the facts before such court in any proceeding taken.

Now, the gentleman from Nebraska, whose motives I do not question, has seen fit to argue in behalf of a distribution of this fund under the care of the officers originally appointed for the purpose of preventing cruelty to animals. Well, I admit that man is an animal.

Animal est id quod movet. An animal is that which is capable of moving. Consequently man is an animal. But he is a rational animal, and should not be placed in the same category with a brute. I want this Committee of the Whole to know what it is doing. Whether it is Republican or Democratic in sentiment, I do not think it ought to be asinine in its movements.

The act of February, 1885—

An act for the protection of children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—

declares, I repeat, that its object is to put children in the same category with dumb animals. The act of 1892 simply remits the appropriations to the act of 1885; the act of 1895 remits the appropriations to the act of 1892; and the proposition of the gentleman from Nebraska is simply a remission, or, if I may use the word, a remittitur, back to the act of 1892. Now, Mr. Chairman, every paragraph of the act to which the gentleman's proposition refers has for its object, with one or two exceptions, the care and maintenance of adults, not of children. Therefore the provisions of that act would not be applicable to the beneficiaries included in the several paragraphs of this bill. Consequently the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, would be nugatory, and therefore not one of these persons for whom we are undertaking to provide would receive any benefit. That being the case, in my judgment as a lawyer—a very modest and humble one I confess—the point of order of the gentleman from Vermont seems to me well taken. If the amendment should be adopted, the appropriation would simply lie in the Treasury and could not be utilized.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska proposes to remit the several institutions named in the bill, except those specifically appropriated for, to the general appropriation under this bill and to the act of July 26, 1892, to the terms of which act these several institutions must conform. This provision is a limitation upon the appropriations, but is in conformity with existing law—the law of July 26, 1892. Though the provision, if adopted, may result, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] argues, in cutting off certain institutions from the benefit of the appropriation, still it is a limitation which may properly be

made in conformity with existing law. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order. The amendment is before the Committee of the Whole.

The question being taken on the amendment, there were—ayes 89.

Mr. GROUT (before the negative vote was taken). Mr. Chairman, is it in order to say a word on the amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. GROUT. Well, I hope it will not be adopted. It will throw the whole bill into confusion.

The negative vote having been taken,

The CHAIRMAN announced the result—ayes 89, noes 11.

Mr. GROUT. I call for tellers.

Tellers were not ordered, only 12 voting in favor thereof.

So the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Hope and Help Mission, maintenance, $1,000.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to amend by striking out this paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word on this question. I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska will not prevail. Let me read from the report of this Hope and Help Mission. After speaking of the many worthy and destitute women to whom the institution has given shelter and succor, the report continues:

We ask for larger appropriations. * * * As to the statistics, in addition to the large number of meals and lodgings already enumerated, of a temporal nature, we can testify that at least 14 women and girls have been clearly converted during the last six months, and the aggregate of the year is at least 25. A board which is nonsectarian is composed of Mr. James T. Petty and Mr. Thomas Jarvis of the Southern Methodist Church; Mrs. Mary E. Catlin, of the First Congregational Church; Mrs. L. D. Luckett, of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church; Mrs. E. K. Knowles, of Vermont Avenue Christian Church; Mrs. M. M. Mitchell, of Waugh Methodist Episcopal Church, and Miss Mary Rector and Mrs. S. D. La Fétra of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church. All of these are actively engaged in systematic work in their own churches, and all testify to the statement that this work pays as good a percentage in practical results as any other work they do for humanity.

That is all I want to say. How much that differs from the items which we are speaking of and which were stricken out it is not for me to determine. They are doing good work. They have converted people and redeemed them from sinful lives.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. You concede that it is a private institution.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have shown how it was organized. I do not think it ought to be stricken out, although every person connected with it, as is shown by the report, let me say, is doing active work in the various churches. But we have no other institution to take care of these fallen women but this and two other institutions which we have already stricken from the bill.

But I only wish to call the attention of the committee to it, and the committee can do as they will. I shall vote as I did in the other cases—vote against striking it out.

Mr. GROUT. I hope it will not be stricken out. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] says that it is a private institution. So it is. But we have retained other private institutions, with the understanding, I suppose, that when we are through with these different items an amendment will be offered, in substance that which I read in my remarks of yesterday, which provides that the appropriations shall not be made available until these institutions open their doors to public inspection by changing their articles of association, incorporation, or charter, as the case may be. When that is done, as I said once before this afternoon, there can be no objection to appropriating the money to these private institutions.

I also suggest that it will be economical to take care of the poor in that way, and the seventy or eighty thousand dollars which goes to these private institutions would, if the same number of beneficiaries were taken care of by the Government, cost probably seven or eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. CRAIN. Does the gentleman think that this is any more deserving than those which have been stricken out?

Mr. GROUT. Not probably on charitable grounds alone, but it is not a sectarian institution.

Mr. CANNON. What is it, then?

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman from Illinois asks what it is. It is a nonsectarian institution, because, on his own statement, the Christian women from the different churches in this city are interested in it and carry it forward. What I understand to be a sectarian institution, and what I think the gentleman ought to understand it to be, is an institution which is exclusively under the control of some one of the religious sects.

Mr. CANNON. Does it help it any—and I am in harmony with my friend——

Mr. GROUT. No; I am afraid you are not in harmony with me.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am glad that the gentleman has come to my way of thinking.

But let me ask him, does it help it any for a half dozen churches to have charge of the institution instead of one? And let me ask him further, if this is not a religious institution, what is it? Will he say that it is not a religious institution when I read this:

We can testify that at least fourteen women and girls have been clearly converted and fully redeemed from leading sinful lives during the past six months.

And then, in connection with that, when I read the names of the different churches, the members of which constitute the corporation, does the gentleman not think that it is a religious institution under those circumstances?

Now, I am with the appropriation, but if it is not a religious institution, then what is it?

Mr. GROUT. Very well; I am glad the gentleman is through with his question at last. It is principally argument and but little question. He asked me a question and was not enough under control of himself to allow me to answer. I say there is this difference where several religious organizations are interested in these matters, because there they neutralize each other, and these girls that are converted—as the gentleman seems to have forgotten he read a second time—may have gone to the several churches.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the question of sectarianism, the managers of this institution—being some of them Presbyterians, some Episcopalians, and some Baptists, and yet all Protestants—in the distinction between Catholicism and Protestantism, are not sectarian.

Mr. GROUT. I do not understand that the word "Protestant" indicates a sect. I do not so understand at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROUT. Not now. There is the Protestant Church—if I must discuss theological distinctions—and there is the Catholic Church. There are the Jesuits. There is the Order of St. Vincent de Paul that we have heard about to-day. There are more that could be enumerated if I had the time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Old Catholics and Roman Catholics.

Mr. GROUT. Old Catholics and Roman Catholics. The word "Protestant" does not indicate a sect. Under that general head come in many, many sects. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. This Hope and Help Mission is doing a great and good work in this city in rescuing fallen women. I believe it is doing a great and good work for God and humanity. It is enabling some of these women to lead respectable and proper lives, and I am here to say, from personal knowledge, that it is an entirely unsectarian institution. It is supported by all the Protestant churches in this city, and I agree with the definition of the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] in regard to what constitutes sectarianism. Surely any institution supported by the different denominations of this country is not a sectarian institution. I hope the gentleman's amendment will not prevail, and that this appropriation for the Hope and Help Mission will remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GROUT. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 48.

Accordingly, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For Newsboys and Children's Aid Society, maintenance, $1,000.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—— [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For Eastern Dispensary, maintenance, $1,000.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put—— [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Gentlemen, it is the wrong time to cry "Vote!" "Vote!" That ought to have been the cry long ago. I want to direct the attention of this committee to a few little inconsistencies about this matter.

Mr. GROUT. I hope the gentleman will have a chance to be heard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the gentleman is going to be heard.

There is not the slightest doubt about that. I wish to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER] why it was that he failed to move to strike out the words contained in lines 16 and 17 on page 36, the lines which make an appropriation for the Woman's Christian Association?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I do not recognize the right of the gentleman from Mississippi to catechise me. I simply did not choose to do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, the gentleman declines to make an explanation.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I simply did not choose to do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to a most curious condition of things. Standing here as a Democrat, I felt a very unusual feeling yesterday when I saw a Republican rise to his feet and assert the good old Democratic principle that public money ought not to be devoted to private institutions. For a little while I thought that "a Daniel had come to judgment," and I felt that for once I was with him.

Then the gentleman from Nebraska was met by a snag in the very forefront of this bill, viz, the appropriation for the "Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic," and before he got through he dropped his "great principle" that "public money should not be devoted to private purposes and to private institutions," and having a recollection of a Grand Army of the Republic vote behind him somewhere probably, he found it expedient to withdraw that motion from before this House; and then when the next clause struck him, for the "Woman's Christian Association, maintenance, $4,000," clearly a religious association, clearly a sectarian one, because no Jewess and no Catholic ever joins it, and can not join it consistently with their religious belief, he did not take a running start like he did on the other and stop before he jumped over, but he just jumped over it while nobody was watching and went on until he came down here to the little Episcopal Orphanage of St. John's.

Understand me, if there is a man in the world who believes in the principle that public money under no circumstances ought to be devoted to any purpose except a public purpose it is he who now addresses you. He goes on then and strikes that little orphan asylum. There are no votes behind that anywhere in the world. Consequently that is struck out by this Republican House. And then we go on a little further and we come to "Hope and Help Mission." I believe it is admitted that no Catholic or Jew aids in the management of that institution. And, again, lest there should be any possible mistake about my position in this matter, I desire to say that I am the farthest possible removed, religiously speaking, from a Roman Catholic. Then, when you struck that, although it is admitted that half of the Christian world, namely, the Roman Catholic part of the Christian world, has no part or parcel in it, and that therefore it is not omni Christian, but part Christian, sectarian Christian, this majority fails to agree with him.

Then you strike in another place in the bill the "wards of the nation," the colored citizens—and, by the way, I thought that phrase died about twenty years ago. There, again, this Republican majority finds out that it is running up against "practical politics," and the "wards of the nation" are left provided for, although that is an association not open to the entire people, but open only to colored citizens, and is therefore not a public institution. Now, my friends, you have made your own bed; you have received no hindrance from our own side; lie in it. There have been men making A. P. A. capital on your side, and all sorts of capital out of this bill. Just mark the situation into which you have thrown yourselves and see later if there is any "capital" in it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The speech to which we have just listened illustrates the caliber of some gentlemen and measures high-water mark with them. There are some gentlemen who believe no person can take a position except it be with a view of securing the support of votes. That may be the measure of consistency and honor which prevails in the State of Mississippi. I deny the right of the gentleman to speak for anybody else except himself. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Now, he has asked the question why it was I did not make a motion to strike out certain paragraphs where I did not make the motion. The same question might be asked of him, why did he not make such a motion, if his answer were at all material and would be of the slightest importance or interest to this committee. It makes absolutely no difference. The question is, what is the right thing and practical thing to do about this matter? It was evident from the temper of the House from the very commencement that it would vote in favor of striking out all paragraphs which related to sectarian institutions, and it would not strike out any other.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. And therefore, as a person who has some idea of the practical side of things, I began my motions at the very first point where the sectarian question could be fairly raised.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I decline to yield. Now, my views on this matter are well known. My utterances on this subject are a matter of public record here, as they are at my home. I lived for over forty years before I ever asked the suffrages of anybody for an office, and I will perhaps live for forty years after going out of public service. That is a matter which concerns no one except myself and my constituency. I make my account to them and do not recognize the gentleman from Mississippi or any other individual in this House to call me to account for it. His remarks are without point, as he is a stranger to every question involved in this discussion.

Mr. MILES. The gentleman can not fix the period of his own longevity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I was not arraigning the gentleman from Nebraska individually. I was arraigning as a type. I was arraigning the action of the House. But I call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska, since he has chosen to take it all on himself, to the fact that I have asked him a question which he has not yet answered; and that is, why was it that when he encountered the very first sectarian appropriation upon the bill he did not make the motion to strike it out? That is the item contained in lines 16 and 17, page 36, for "the Women's Christian Association, maintenance, $4,000." I challenge the RECORD to show that he did not make a motion in that case.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is not a sectarian institution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Women's Christian Association?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No; it certainly is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not! No Jewess could belong to it by its very terms, and certainly no Catholic could consistently belong to it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman say that no Roman Catholic could join a Christian association?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are not in it.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it because they just choose to stay out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is an "Evangelical Protestant" body, as I understand it, and a Jewess can not join it, nor a Roman Catholic consistently with her creed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I can answer that question. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union includes every Protestant denomination, and is entirely nonsectarian.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read the amendment of Mr. GROUT, as follows:

Insert on page 40, after line 2, the following:

"That no part of any money appropriated by this act for charities or charitable institutions shall be paid to any institution named in this act until the charter or articles of incorporation thereof shall be so amended as to accord to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or to their designated agents, authority to visit and inspect such institutions, and to control and supervise the expenditure therein of all public funds paid out of appropriations made by Congress."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment changes existing law.

Mr. GROUT. I do not think it is necessary to say anything on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. This is simply a limitation on the appropriation, and it has always been held that a mere limitation is always in order. It does not contravene any existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have the gentleman from New York inform him what existing law this amendment would change.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I understand that there is no existing law giving this power of visitation.

The CHAIRMAN. But this amendment simply provides that "no part of any money appropriated by this act for charities or charitable institutions shall be paid to any institution named in this act until the charter or articles of incorporation thereof shall be so amended," and so on. It does not purport to amend any charter, but simply provides that the money here appropriated shall not be paid to any institution until its charter is amended as specified here. The amendment is simply a limitation upon the appropriation. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. LINTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 40, line 2, after the words "thousand dollars," insert: "*Provided, however*, That no money herein appropriated is to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill by paragraphs.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report this bill——

The CHAIRMAN. One paragraph was reserved for consideration until the conclusion of the bill. The Clerk will report the amendment on which the point of order was reserved.

Mr. GROUT. I was about to ask unanimous consent to return to that paragraph if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] is ready to dispose of it now.

The pending amendment by Mr. DE ARMOND was read, as follows:

Amend by adding the following at the end of line 25, page 31: "To be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. Against this amendment the point of order was reserved that it changes existing law. The Clerk will read the paragraph to which the amendment applies.

The paragraph was read, as follows:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, exclusive of water bonds, $1,213,947.97.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition of the amendment is that this sum shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia. The Chair has been cited to a number of laws regarded as relating to this matter. He has examined all of them carefully, and, in the opinion of the Chair, none of them are applicable to this question except what is contained in the law of 1878 and the law of 1879. The law of 1878 is the law which provides that the expenses of the District of Columbia shall be reported by the Commissioners to the Secretary of the Treasury, and his estimates shall be sent to Congress. Then follows this provision:

To the extent to which Congress shall approve of said estimates Congress shall appropriate the amount of 50 per cent thereof, and the remaining 50 per cent of such approved estimates shall be levied and assessed upon real and personal property in the District of Columbia other than the property of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

In this same act there is a reference to the expenses of the District of Columbia in these words:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the interest on the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia issued in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 20, 1874, when the same shall become due and payable, and all amounts so paid shall be credited as a part of the appropriation for the year by the United States toward the expenses of the District of Columbia as hereinafter provided.

The Chair thinks that provision makes the interest due upon these bonds a charge against the appropriation which the United States makes toward the expenses of the District of Columbia, and it is to be credited upon the amount of that appropriation. Of course, if the appropriation is such that it shall equal the amount raised by taxes on property in the District of Columbia, it will result in the United States paying half of this interest and the District of Columbia the other half. But, however that may be, here is a positive enactment by statute that the interest shall be paid by the United States and credited by the United States upon the appropriation of one-half the expenses of the District of Columbia.

In the following year, the year 1879, a similar provision was made, which includes both the interest on the bonds and their principal. It is in these words:

And there is hereby appropriated out of the proportional sum which the United States may contribute toward the expenses of the District of Columbia in pursuance of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1878—

The act from which I have just read—

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and annually thereafter, such sums as will, with the interest thereon at the rate of 3.65 per cent per annum, be sufficient to pay the principal of the 3.65 bonds of the District of Columbia issued under the act of Congress approved June 30, 1874, at maturity.

In other words, it is provided that out of this appropriation made by the Government of the United States toward the expenses of the District of Columbia there shall be paid an amount equal to the interest on the bonds and also an amount which will provide for a sinking fund to pay their principal. The Chair is therefore of the opinion that the amendment would change existing law and is subject to the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we go back to page 38, line 10, and reconsider the vote striking out the German Orphan Asylum.

Objection was made.

Mr. GROUT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before that motion is made, I wish to ask unanimous consent to recur to the paragraph on page 10 relating to "plats of subdivisions outside of Washington and Georgetown," to which I wish to offer an amendment which I will ask to have read, after which any gentleman who is unwilling to recur to the paragraph can object.

Mr. GROUT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I know what it is——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to have the amendment read. The gentleman is no doubt familiar with it; but I think the amendment is necessary. After it is read any gentleman who desires to do so can object.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the expenses of completing a map and of such surveys as may be necessary to enable the Commissioners of the District to determine whether plats of subdivisions of land within said District offered for record have been made in conformity to the "Act to regulate subdivision of land within the District of Columbia," approved August 27, 1888, $14,500.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, this proposition is so intermingled with a question which the committee has had under consideration and which refers to a matter in the estimates which the committee struck out, it is thought on hasty conference with members of the committee here that we can not consent to go back to the consideration of this proposition now.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is objected to.

Mr. GROUT. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House as amended.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Vermont so as to provide that the committee rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to strike out all paragraphs making appropriations to purely private charitable institutions and objects, and to insert a provision appropriating an amount equal to the sum of the appropriations stricken out to be expended under the direction of the board of children's guardians. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that it is not competent for the Committee of the Whole to instruct the Committee on Appropriations. It is competent for the House to do so. When the bill gets into the House, even after the previous question is ordered, a motion to recommit will be in order. But I make the point that it is incompetent for the Committee of the Whole to adopt such a motion.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not see why the Committee of the Whole may not recommend that the House recommit this matter to the Committee on Appropriations. My motion does not propose that the Committee of the Whole recommit. It is a recommendation to the House that it recommit. Can there be any question about the competency of the House to recommit this bill? Can there be any question about the competency of this Committee of the Whole to make a recommendation to the House? It seems to me the point of order of the gentleman from Georgia is not well taken.

Mr. CANNON. I will suggest, if the Chair will permit me, one other point of order.

It seems to me that the resolution is broad enough, in the shape that it is now presented, to authorize legislation to be reported, in the event it is concurred in by the House, on the general appropriation bill. If so, it is not in order. You can not do anything by way of a motion to recommit that would impair the jurisdiction of a committee of the House. In a certain event I would have no objection to the Committee on Appropriations having the plenary power to originate legislation, but I suspect the District Committee would probably object.

Mr. HEPBURN. The objection of the gentleman seems to be that this resolution would authorize the Committee on Appropriations to do a forbidden thing. I have no doubt of the potency of the House and that that forbidden thing is so forbidden because of the rules. But has not the House power to change its own rules? This would be, for that purpose, simply a change in the rule; that is, if the gentleman's position is correct, and I am not at all sure that it is; but if correct, it is simply an objection because the House has no power to change its rules—a proposition that I deny.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon the question. The Chair reads from the digest:

A recommendation reported from the Committee of the Whole which, if carried into effect, would change a rule of the House is not in order.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont that the committee now rise and report the bill to the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. May I have a single word?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. The Chair has decided the proposition to be not in order, but has not indicated what rule of the House will be changed by it. The gentleman from Illinois only suggested that it might possibly authorize the committee to do something that might be construed as forbidden by the rules. Is not that a very violent presumption? Suppose the committee simply adopted

the language of the resolution, declaring that the appropriation should be expended under the direction of the board of children's guardians—suppose that should be their action—what rule of the House is thereby violated? I would like to know, if any. What new legislation is in that, Mr. Chairman? Is that not now the law, as far as they have control of the appropriation? Certainly there is no violation of any law or rule that I know of.

What, then, would be a change of existing legislation? If it were a provision enlarging the powers of the board, stipulating what their duties should be, putting limitations on them, requiring bonds, for instance, to be given, that might possibly be a change of existing law. But if they did simply what the resolution requires them to do there would be no change of existing law or any violation of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule again.

The resolution as drawn would authorize the board of children's guardians, if adopted, to expend all this fund as they please. It would enlarge their powers and would be a change of existing law without question in the mind of the Chair; and the point of order is sustained.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont that the committee now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER accordingly resumed the chair; and Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, and, as so amended, that it do pass.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, a separate vote is desired on the amendment striking out the German Orphan Asylum, on page 38, and upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER].

The SPEAKER. A separate vote is asked on the two amendments which the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to ask the attention of the Committee on Appropriations for one single moment, as I wish to make a suggestion. Some of the amendments which have been adopted have provoked very much discussion, and it has been stated repeatedly by gentlemen in the discussion that the condition of the bill is illogical in its present form. I suggest, therefore, whether or not it would not be wise to let the bill be printed over night, with the previous question demanded, and let us see what there is in the bill at the present time.

I do not want to urge that, but only make the suggestion whether it would not be a wise precaution to take under the circumstances, and in view of the statements that have been made.

Mr. CANNON. Of course it is for the gentleman in charge of the bill to suggest such action as he sees proper.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We can not hear the gentleman from Illinois. We should like to hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. If my opinion is of any account, I will say to the gentleman in charge of the bill, and in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], that we have had this bill under discussion now for two or three days. It is a printed bill, of which there are plenty of copies. Everybody can get possession of it and follow it. It does seem to me that we can and ought to pass this bill, with the amendments, before adjournment.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I will say it is stated to me by several gentlemen that they want to see this bill printed before they vote upon it.

Mr. CANNON (holding a copy of the bill in his hand). Here it is.

Mr. GROUT. I know, but gentlemen want to see these amendments. It is now almost 5 o'clock, and it seems to me the better way would be to adjourn until to-morrow morning.

Mr. CANNON. I will not antagonize the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; in deference to the evident desire of the chairman of the Committee on Approprions, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WHEELER. I rise to answer your inquiry; to say what paragraphs we wish a yea-and-nay vote upon. We want a yea-and-nay vote upon the paragraph for the Church Orphan Asylum of St. John's——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order. The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendments, except those on which a separate vote was asked for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On what are separate votes asked?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments on which separate votes are demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, lines 10 and 11, strike out the following:
"For the German Orphan Asylum, maintenance, $1,800."

Also the following:

On page 39, in line 16, after the words "place to place," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert "$43,200; in all $47,200: *Provided* That the institutions for children, including industrial and reformatory, namely, the Church Orphanage of St. John's Parish; the German Orphan Asylum, including its care of colored foundlings; the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, the Association for Works of Mercy, the St. Joseph Asylum, the House of the Good Shepherd, and St. Rose's Industrial School, heretofore receiving aid by specific appropriation, are hereby remitted, except as herein specifically appropriated for, to the appropriation herein made, and to the said act of July 6, 1892, to provide for the care of dependent children in the District of Columbia, and to create a board of children's guardians, for all rights and benefits which they may have under the provisions of the said act."

Mr. WHEELER. I ask for a separate yea-and-nay vote upon lines 8 and 9, page 38, "for the Church Orphanage of St. John's Parish, maintenance, $1,800"; also upon lines 12, 13, and 14—no, Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for a separate vote upon that; but upon lines 15 and 16, "for St. Ann's Orphan Asylum, maintenance, $5,200"; also lines 19 and 20, "for the House of the Good Shepherd, maintenance, $2,700."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for a separate vote upon those propositions which he has named.

Mr. GROUT. Lines 12, 13, and 14 were not changed.

Mr. WHEELER. I withdrew that. I inadvertently mentioned the wrong lines.

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MILNES. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. In what state will the bill be left if we adjourn now?

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, it will be the first thing in order, the Chair thinks.

Mr. CANNON. I hope we may have a vote, at least on the matters that are not in controversy.

Mr. MILNES. I hope we will adjourn until morning. Let us think it over.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the House will not adjourn until we dispose of this.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MILNES] that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MILNES) there were—ayes 100, noes 80.

Mr. MILES. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES] calls for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, 22 members, not a sufficient number, rising in support of the demand therefor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, pending the announcement of the vote, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ODELL, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOY, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. UPDEGRAFF, for this day, on account of sickness.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRAIN. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote. Has the House adjourned?

The SPEAKER. It can not be done pending the announcement of the vote on the motion to adjourn, which is deferred simply for the purpose of laying before the House the requests of members for leave of absence.

Mr. CRAIN. The Speaker will take care of me——

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and accordingly the House stands adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, replying to the House resolution of January 21 relative to the erection of a public building at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting an abstract of the militia force of the United States—to the Committee on the Militia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, replying to the House resolution of January 7 in regard to the lease of the seal islands and the policing of Bering Sea—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Wareham Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mobile Harbor, Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4963) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims for the use and occupation of church and school buildings and grounds for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials in said class of buildings, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 240); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ODELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred House bill No. 2656, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia, accompanied by a report (No. 244); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TERRY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2178) to amend section 864 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to taking depositions de bene esse, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 248); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2672) concerning tonnage tax, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 249); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1206) for the erection and completion of a monument to the memory of the victims of prison ships at Fort Green, Brooklyn, N. Y., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 250); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of John T. Brown. (Report No. 229.)

By Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (No. 153) in lieu of the bill (H. R. 2722) for the relief of Louis Levy, of Jefferson County, Tex. (Report No. 230.)

By Mr. HURLEY, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 5477) for the relief of Thomas Stack, in lieu of House bill No. 1833. (Report No. 231.)

By Mr. LESTER, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1077) for the relief of Alfred B. Carter. (Report No. 232.)

By Mr. HURLEY, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 4824) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims. (Report No. 233.)

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1773) for the relief of D. W. Boutwell. (Report No. 234.)

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of the Odd Fellows' Hall Association. (Report No. 235.)

By Mr. AVERY, from the Committee on War Claims:

A bill (H. R. 5478) for the relief of Richard W. Johnson, in lieu of House bill No. 1318. (Report No. 236.)

The bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of H. E. Tower, late captain Company E, Sixth Michigan Cavalry, now of Ionia, Mich. (Report No. 237.)

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims:

The bill (H. R. 1840) for the relief of Mrs. Telisse W. Wilson. (Report No. 238.)

The bill (H. R. 1938) for the relief of the heirs of Sterling T. Austin. (Report No. 239.)

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 2940) for the relief of James and Emma S. Cameron for occupation and damages to property and for fuel taken and used by the United States Army during the war. (Report No. 241.)

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3218) for the relief of William D. Matthews. (Report No. 242.)

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3833) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers. (Report No. 243.)

By Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The bill (H. R. 83) for the relief of John C. Cutter, late first lieutenant, Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. (Report No. 245.)

The bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864. (Report No. 246.)

By Mr. NEILL, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1052) for the relief of Thomas J. Harris and others, heirs of Manning Harris, deceased. (Report No. 247.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5475) to provide for the punishment of offenses on the high seas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 5476) to provide for the incorporation of associations for the improvement of the breed of horses, and to regulate the same and to establish a racing commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 5479) regulating the compensation and duties of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, marshals, deputy marshals, clerks, commissioners, and other court officials, and to enlarge the jurisdiction of United States commissioners, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5480) to encourage silk culture, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5481) to restore the lands embraced in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, in the State of Colorado, to the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5482) authorizing the Cleveland Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River between Pawnee County, Okla., and the Osage Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5483) to amend section 17 of chapter 180 of the Revised Statutes, relative to rates on third-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 5484) to accept, ratify, and confirm certain agreements heretofore concluded with certain Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5485) to divide the State of Kansas into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 5486) to authorize the Muskogee, Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a line of railway through Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 5487) to allow superintendents of national cemeteries to keep domestic animals for their own use and benefit—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5489) to authorize purchase of lot for dispensary and hospital in District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 5546) donating 2 condemned cannon and 48 balls to Antietam Post, No. 64, Grand Army of the Republic, Parsons, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5547) donating 1 condemned cannon and 24 balls to John C. Culver Post. No. 345, Grand Army of the Republic, Cloverdale, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5548) to annex a certain

portion of Arizona Territory to the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 5549) to prevent discontinuance of pensions, to restore pensions discontinued, to establish uniform rates of pension, to facilitate the allowance of pensions in matters of proof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 108) directing the Secretary of War to submit estimates for work upon Newtown Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A resolution (House Res. No. 152) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to deliver certain cannon and cannon balls to the Sons of Veterans of Chillicothe, Ohio—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A resolution (House Res. No. 154) relative to payment of House employees—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STRONG: A resolution (House Res. No. 156) to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to employ an additional clerk and an additional laborer—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HYDE: Memorial of the Washington State legislature, indorsing the bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Washington State legislature, urging a strong maintenance of treaty rights relative to the Alaska boundary—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Washington legislature, asking an appropriation of $150,000 for the construction of a fresh-water harbor at Olympia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Washington State legislature, urging that the Government work on the ship railway at The Dalles of the Columbia River be placed under the contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Washington State legislature, favoring the enactment of a national bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Washington State legislature, urging the immediate improvement of the Okanagon River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Washington State legislature, asking Congress to prohibit immigration for a period of ten years—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 4904) for the relief of L. J. Smith, executor of Elbert Gantt, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4879) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth P. Layne—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2073) for the relief of Emanuel Faust, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Illinois Infantry—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2064) for the relief of Charles Harkins—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 5491) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Bedell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5492) for the relief of Alexander Cawood, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5493) for the relief of Caty Jones, administratrix of William Irvin, New Canton, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5494) for the relief of Lincoln S. Jones, of Tennessee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of the heirs of William Wallace, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5496) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Hughes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Leonard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 5498) to pension Catherine B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELKNAP: A bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of Patrick Clabby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5500) for the relief of Bernard J. D. Irwin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) for the relief of W. P. Marshall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5502) granting a pension to Reuben Balinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5503) granting a pension to Henrietta S. Cummings, widow of James P. Cummings, late lieutenant of Company E, Eighth Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of James Lawson, of Polk County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5505) granting a pension to George M. Horning, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) to pay David Overmyer, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $2,733—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 5507) for the relief of D. W. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 5508) to correct an act entitled "An act to pension George Hunter"—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5509) donating section 16, township 7 north, of range 5 west, of Indian meridian, in Grant County, Okla., to school district No. 54, in said county, to aid in maintaining an academy or college—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 5510) for the relief of Foster W. Van Kirk—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5511) for the relief of Thomas B. Briggs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (by request): A bill (H. R. 5512) for the relief of Gilbert H. Ferris—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5513) to amend the military record of Levi G. Fessenden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) for the relief of James E. Ragland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of Isaac H. Lynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5516) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Bernard Quinn for compensation for the loss of dwelling houses, fencing, stable, and other property in Dalton, Ga., by order of General Sherman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5517) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Martin V. Gates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5518) to correct the military record of Patrick McGeeney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5519) granting a pension to Theodore Stillwell, late captain Company F, Second Battalion Kentucky Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Leander J. Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of A. D. Patton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of Frances C. Broggan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 5523) granting a pension to Mrs. Clara L. Harriman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5524) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Otis Staples for money expended while employed in the service of the Government—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5525) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas J. Allen, of Cloverport, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5526) granting a pension to Abby Wyman, widow of Capt. J. Henry Wyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5527) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Abel R. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) for the relief of Francis Corberant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) for the relief of Harvey Howard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5530) to increase the pension of Agnes B. Collins, widow of late Maj. Joseph B. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 5531) for the relief of David W. Robbins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 5532) to increase the pension of Josephine Glover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5533) granting a pension to Capt. Charles E. Pettis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5534) granting a pension to Daniel A. Stoke, late a private in Company D, One hundred and third Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) granting a pension to Gust Spitznagel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5536) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry Ickes, alias William H. Burket—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) granting a pension to Abraham Geiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5538) removing charge of desertion from military record of Jasper L. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 5539) for the relief of John W. Arnold—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5540) for the relief of Richard Hawley & Sons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5541) for the relief of the executor of William Dillon, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5542) granting a pension to Mathias Mueller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 5543) granting a pension to Elizabeth Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Heniff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5545) for the relief of James A. Doughty—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Resolution of the Illinois chapter of American Institute of Architects favoring the passage of House bill No. 1470—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Resolution of Council No. 40, American Protective Association, of Amethyst, Colo., for the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Council No. 14, American Protective Association, of Pueblo, Colo., for the adoption of joint resolution (H. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of H. R. Loofboro and others, of Calhan, Colo., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of A. W. Ward and others, in support of joint resolution (H. Res. 11) to amend the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. W. Ward and others, in support of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of C. E. Leer and others, of Vernon County, Mo., in reference to joint resolution (H. Res. 11) to amend the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: Petition of T. G. Slaughter and others, of Camp Hill, Ala., and vicinity, for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Memorial of the various transportation companies and others connected with the river interest at Cincinnati, Vicksburg, Memphis, and New Orleans, in opposition to House bill No. 2698—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Silent Army Deaf Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines, in favor of legislation to increase pensions for deafness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, indorsing House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Odd Fellows Association of New Orleans, La., in favor of payment of certain judgment of Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petition of James F. Gossett and other citizens of Cedar County, Mo., for the relief of D. W. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Two petitions of citizens of Richland County, S. C., in behalf of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous-contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the board of health of Charleston, S. C., against the passage of House bill No. 4242, relative to inspection of naphtha launches—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARIS: Petition and papers to accompany House bill No. 2378, for the relief of Elizabeth A. Bamford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition to accompany House bill No. 5320, for the relief of Edwards & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., in the interest of the suffering Armenians, transmitted to the House by Mayor Robert Pratt and Professor Northrup—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of settlers in Noble County, Okla., praying for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOOTE: Four petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of French Mountain, Warren County, N. Y., and Malone, Franklin County, N. Y., against the sale of beer and spirituous and fermented liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HANLY: Memorial of James H. Smart, president of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., and others, concerning House bill No. 3618—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 5411, for the relief of Howell Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 3683, for the relief of George W. McKinsey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART: Petitions of citizens of Hellerton, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Butler, Freeport, Kittanning, Pa., and vicinity, favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petition of B. De Long and 6 other residents of Buchanan County, Iowa, praying for the passage of a bill granting a pension of not less than $8 a month to every man who served in the Army or Navy not less than ninety days during the war of the rebellion and who were honorably discharged, and also a pension of not less than $12 a month to the widows of such soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Falconer, Chautauqua County; Little Genesee, Allegany County, and Cattaraugus, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., against the sale of beer and liquors at Bedloes Island and at Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HOWE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of a bill forbidding the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of John T. Crawford, John Corzatt, and others, for a law to pay every soldier who served not less than ninety days a pension of $8 per month, and $12 per month to widows of such soldiers—to the Committtee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HYDE: Resolutions of the Washington Commandery, Military Order Loyal Legion, Port Townsend, Wash., favoring the revival of the grade of Lieutenant-General in the Army for Gen. Nelson A. Miles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the city council of Hoquiam, Wash., favoring legislation providing for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of M. R. Hathaway, of Vancouver, Wash., a soldier in the Indian wars in Oregon, for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of South Bend, Wash., extending sympathy to the Cuban revolutionists—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the citizens of Spokane, Wash., in mass meeting assembled, expressing sympathy for the Cuban belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from residents of cities on Grays Harbor, asking for the improvement of the entrance—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Indian war veterans of the Pacific Northwest, for pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Vancouver, Wash., for a special pension for Frances C. Broggan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolutions passed by the people of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., against the merciless cruelties of the Turkish Government in the wholesale slaughter of Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of J. C. Hamilton and 23 others, of the Territory of Oklahoma, asking for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petitions of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brewsters, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, and at Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island; also, against the sale of beer and all fermented and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LOUD: Resolutions of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of the Nicaragua Canal bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE: Petition of Dr. B. F. Coen and 50 others, of Gnadenhutten, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of I. N. Montgomery, to accompany House bill No. 5438—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: Petitions of citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the passage of House bill No. 58, regulating immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ODELL: Petition of David W. Robbins, of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, for a special act of Congress amending his military record in the War Department, to accompany House bill entitled "A bill for the relief of David W. Robbins"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Barryville, Chester, Stony Point, Long Eddy, Haverstraw, Montgomery, and Sullivan County, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of Joseph Sevenson and 22 others, citizens of Dell Rapids, S. Dak., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of the Ministerial Association of Dayton, Ohio, for the passage of the Phillips bill for the appointment of a nonpartisan commission and the Erdman arbitration bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition signed by 42 citizens of Hooker, Butler County, Pa., favoring a bill to amend postal laws so as to allow a small salary to fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POOLE: Petitions of citizens of Marcellus, Syracuse, and Eaton, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of citizens of Liverpool, N. Y., favoring service pensions for veterans of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: Petition of the officers and members of G. W. Berry Post, No. 98, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kelat, Ky., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY: Two petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lestershire and West End, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of South Otselic, Chenango County, N. Y., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Apalalachin, Columbus, Deposit, Ithaca, Masonville, Oswego, Richland, and Stamford, N. Y., favoring a bill to prohibit the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, and at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Pickering and other places in Chester County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John B. Neal and 160 members of Col. David F. Houston Council, No. 739, Junior Order American Mechanics, Thurlow, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cedar Hill, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and at Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of E. O. Stickler and 37 other citizens of Logan County, Ohio, for the passage of the bill introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLER: Petition of H. B. Stradling and other residents of Beloit, Ohio, praying for the passage of House joint resolution No. 11—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Resolutions adopted by Merchants and Manufacturers' Club, of the city of Madison, Ind., in favor of an appropriation for the removal of a sand bar in the Ohio River near that city—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper in support of House bill No. 5462—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper in support of House bill No. 5463—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 5464—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 5465—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper in support of House bill No. 5466—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 5467—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 5487, relating to the practice of keeping animals and fowls near national cemeteries—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of J. L. Potter and other citizens of Lockport, Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ransomville, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Lewis G. Spohn, W. J. Clark, Ralph N. Warner, and other citizens of Lower Merion, Montgomery County, Pa., for the passage of the Stone bill respecting immigrant inspection—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 5, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

CORRECTION OF THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. HOAR. In the statement in the Journal of the ruling of the Chair yesterday on the point of order that the proper notice had not been given of a proposed change of the rules, I observe that the Journal represents the Chair as stating that the Senate, "by its deliberate action," had waived the necessity of notice. I do not conceive that the phrase "by its deliberate action" is appropriate to an action of the Senate where no debate is possible. A motion to take up any subject is not debatable under the rules. I think the Chair did not use the phrase "by its deliberate action" in his decision, but that it is an inadvertence of the clerks and had better be stricken out, and the statement made that the Chair ruled that the Senate by its action had waived the necessity of a notice, without using the phrase I have indicated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal will be corrected in the manner suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, and as corrected it stands approved.

KILLING OF ITALIAN LABORERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress:

In my last annual message allusion was made to the lawless killing of certain Italian laborers in the State of Colorado, and it was added that "the dependent families of some of the unfortunate victims invite, by their deplorable condition, gracious provision for their needs."

It now appears that, in addition to three of these laborers who were riotously killed, two others who escaped death by flight incurred pitiable disabilities through exposure and privation.

Without discussing the question of the liability of the United States for these results, either by reason of treaty obligations or under the general rules of international law, I venture to urge upon the Congress the propriety of making from the public Treasury prompt and reasonable pecuniary provision for those injured and for the families of those who were killed.

To aid in the consideration of the subject, I append hereto a report of the Secretary of State, accompanied by certain correspondence which quite fully presents all the features of the several cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 3, 1896.

COAST DEFENSE ESTIMATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a

resolution of December 31, 1895, a statement as to the amount of money which can be advantageously used for the purpose of coast defense prior to July 1, 1897, and the amount which should be made available during the present fiscal year, also an estimate of what portion of the amount is required for sites for fortifications, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1247, providing for the establishment and maintenance of a free public library in the District of Columbia; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials, in the form of telegrams, from sundry owners and agents of vessels of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the construction of bridge piers in the Detroit River; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of the Sandusky County (Ohio) Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clarksville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ishpeming, Mich., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a memorial, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the outrages committed in Turkish Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the affidavit of R. M. Box, of Boston, Mo., to accompany the bill (S. 400) granting a pension to Johnson Hays; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present sundry memorials from different parts of the United States, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 214, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of that county. The bill has already been passed by the Senate. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Merchants' Club of Madison, Ind., praying that an appropriation of $25,000 be made to thoroughly dredge the Ohio River at that point; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia, praying that an appropriation of $12,000 be made for the purchase of a site and the erection of a school building for the Langdon school district in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DANIEL presented the petition of Mrs. H. A. Wood, Hettie Wilkerson, Mrs. W. H. Shepherd, and sundry other citizens of South Boston, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ashland, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of Mrs. Elizabeth D. Marthon, of Washington, D. C., widow of Lieut. Commander Joseph Marthon, United States Navy, praying that she be granted an increase of pension. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions to accompany the bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Marthon, widow of Lieut. Commander Joseph Marthon, which will be introduced by me when that order is reached.

The motion was agreed to.

CLAIM OF CHEROKEE COMMISSION.

Mr. TURPIE. I present a communication from Warren G. Sayre, of Wabash, Ind., transmitting a statement of facts relative to the claim of the Cherokee commission against the Government for unpaid services. I move that the communication and accompanying statement be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I introduce a paper which I suppose should be presented as a memorial. It is very brief. It was addressed to me, and is as follows:

Whereas E. O. WOLCOTT, the junior Senator of this State, has on the floor of the United States Senate stated that the "Monroe doctrine" has been misapplied, and made statements un-American and in contradiction to the feelings of the people he should represent:

Resolved, That the Denver Trades and Labor Assembly do repudiate his proclamation made in the Senate Chamber; and we declare our support to the President and Congress in their attitude against the British Government and the Government's position applicable to the Monroe doctrine.

JOHN W. BRAMWOOD, *President*.
HARVEY SCHARREL, *Secretary*.

A similar copy was sent to the Secretary of the Senate, and the Trades and Labor Assembly evidently desire that the paper shall receive some official recognition. I have taken the liberty, therefore, of presenting it as a memorial, and ask that it be placed on the files.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will lie on the table, the resolution having been reported.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1464) for the relief of the estate of Michael Knight, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 74) for the relief of William Wolfe, of Shelbina, Shelby County, Mo., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 93) to permit Anna M. Colman, a widow, to prosecute a claim, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1085) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 92) for the relief of Calvin Gunn, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1767) to provide for subports of entry and delivery, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 479) to make Anclote, in the State of Florida, a subport of entry, to report it adversely, the matter being provided for in the bill which I have just reported favorably. I move that the bill adversely reported be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1573) for the relief of Dr. S. A. Brown, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 690) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 862) for the relief of the receivers of the Towboat Association of New Orleans, La., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLARK. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 331) providing that no person shall be eligible as assignee or receiver of a bankrupt corporation engaged in interstate commerce who shall have been a director, officer, or employee of such corporation at any time during the three years next preceding such bankruptcy, to submit an adverse report thereon. I should ask for the indefinite postponement of the bill except that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] desires to have it placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to inquire of the Senator who reports the bill whether it was considered by the Judiciary Committee? I make the inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether that committee has given careful attention to the questions involved, in the belief that there ought to be some legislation looking to restrictions of the courts of the United States in reference to the appointment of receivers of corporations.

Mr. CLARK. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the bill was considered by the subcommittee individually and as a subcommittee, and their report was made to the full committee, which authorized the adverse report.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask, instead of an indefinite postponement, that the bill be placed upon the Calendar, as I may desire to make

some remarks upon it at some time during the session. I think something ought to be done in the matter.

Mr. CLARK. That course is satisfactory.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 895) for the relief of Christopher Ellis, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1712) granting to the First Regiment North Carolina State Guard two condemned cannon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1180) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $48,858.03 for labor and material furnished for the gunboat *Dolphin*, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 67) for the relief of E. R. Shipley, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 66) for the relief of Moses Pendergrass, of Missouri, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

ELECTRIC WIRES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. On the 12th day of December last I introduced resolutions relating to placing telegraph, telephone, and other wires in the District of Columbia under ground, and they were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am directed by that committee to report a substitute resolution for those then offered, and as it is a simple resolution of inquiry I will ask that it may be immediately considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution reported as a substitute will be read.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether, since the 15th day of September, 1888, any permits have been issued for the construction or erection of additional overhead wires in the District of Columbia, and if so, to whom such permits were given and under what authority of law the same purport to have been issued, together with a list of such permits, and whether thereunder any additional overhead wires have been erected in said District, and if so, where and by whom the same have been erected. Also, whether under the said act of March 3, 1891, or under any other act, any permits have been issued by said Commissioners for placing underground, in any of the avenues, streets, alleys, sidewalks, footways, or other public ways in the District of Columbia, any conduits or subways for electric wires which were not an addition to or extension of a previously existing conduit or subway established under previous existing law, and if so, the names of the persons or corporations to whom such permits have been issued, the avenues, streets, alleys, footwalks, or other passageways covered by such permits; also, what work, if any, has been done under such permits, and by whom, and under what authority of law said permits purport to have been issued and said work performed.

SIOUX LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 417) to perfect the title of the United States to the tract of land lying on the west side of Lake Pepin and the Mississippi River, in the State of Minnesota, which belonged to the half-breeds or mixed bloods of the Dakota or Sioux Nation of Indians, and that it be indefinitely postponed. The whole question has been adjusted by the Interior Department.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee will be discharged and the bill indefinitely postponed.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. MORGAN. On the 29th day of January I had the honor to report certain concurrent resolutions from the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to Cuba. That committee now direct me to report a resolution as a substitute for the previous report. I take the liberty of saying that I concur in the substitute of the committee, which I ask to have read.

The concurrent resolution reported as a substitute was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. The report heretofore made as a declaration of facts, of course, will remain as a part of this report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What disposition does the Senator from Alabama ask to have made of the resolution now reported?

Mr. MORGAN. I merely ask that it be placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CALL. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take up for consideration the report made by the Committee on Foreign Relations in regard to Cuba as soon as I can get the attention of the Senate to the matter.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1942) to amend sections 713 and 714 of the Revised Statutes, title Judiciary, chapter 12; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1943) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to state in connection with this bill that I have just received the draft of it, and I shall not be prepared to say that I am in favor of it until I have had an opportunity of examining the question. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1944) to provide for the further distribution of reports of the Supreme Court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to have printed a letter from the Secretary of the Interior relating to the subject of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An order to print will be entered.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 1945) granting a pension to Joseph Porter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1946) granting a pension to Elijah N. Parkhurst; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1947) granting a pension to Sarah V. Lothrop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1948) granting a pension to Col. James C. Robinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1949) granting an additional pension to Capt. Bradbury W. Hight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1950) for the relief of Enoch Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1951) for the relief of Robert McFarland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1952) granting a pension to Thomas L. Crowell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1953) for the relief of the workmen employed in the construction of Poverty Island Light-House, Lake Michigan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1954) for the relief of George W. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1955) for the relief of Jennie E. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1956) granting a pension to Jerome H. Loveland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Nancy J. Dunaway; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1958) for the relief of J. A. McCreary, late of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1959) to restore John F. Lewis to the United States Army, with the rank of captain of infantry, and place him upon the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Ord Mason; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1961) to authorize the purchase of the property known as the Corcoran Art

Gallery, in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1962) for the erection of a public building at the city of Jamestown, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1963) to provide an American register for the steam yacht *Ellida;* which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1964) for the relief of James P. Chase; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BROWN introduced a bill (S. 1965) to amend section 14 of an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," and to attach Utah to the ninth judicial circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1966) for the relief of W. T. Fitzpatrick, of Bedford City, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 1967) for the relief of Juan S. Hart, administrator of Simeon Hart, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1968) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1969) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association, of Mobile, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1970) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Marthon, widow of Lieut. Commander Joseph Marthon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 1971) granting a pension to C. L. Nixon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1972) to provide for the carrying out of the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3010) defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of "filled cheese"; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, and to have printed the reports of such hearings as the committee may determine, the expenses of the same to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

MRS. SARAH TAYLOR.

Mr. ROACH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriation for miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mrs. Sarah Taylor, mother of James Taylor, deceased, late a Senate laborer, the sum of $360, being an amount equal to six months' salary as laborer aforesaid, the said sum to include all funeral or other allowances.

POST-OFFICE MAIL BAG REPAIR DIVISION.

Mr. KYLE. In view of the discussion had previously in this Chamber regarding the mail bag repair division of the Post-Office Department and following the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to furnish the Senate the following information relating to the mail bag repair department of the division of mail equipment:

First. The number of men and women employed in the repair of mail sacks during the months of December, 1895, and January, 1896, together with the wages paid per month, or, if employed on piecework, the kind of work assigned to each employee, with the average number of sacks repaired and the wages earned by each person for the two months indicated.

Second. Whether proper care is taken as to the comfort and health of employees, and whether employees are restrained from making complaint by fear of dismissal.

Third. The method by which discarded mail sacks are disposed of and whether the purchasers of such sacks make their checks payable to the Government or to the superintendent of the mail bag repair division.

Fourth. Whether the mail sacks used by the Government are manufactured by convict labor. If so, where and under what contract.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President——

Mr. FAULKNER. I hope that the resolution will be passed. There can be no possible objection to it.

Mr. QUAY. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. QUAY. I have no objection if it will provoke no debate, but I wish to reach the resolution offered by me yesterday, and if this resolution leads to debate I shall be compelled to object to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have the resolution again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution, and was interrupted by—

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is sufficient.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF REINDEER INTO ALASKA.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to transmit to the Senate the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon "The introduction of domestic reindeer into the District of Alaska, for 1895."

Mr. TELLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 35,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 92, third session of Fifty-third Congress, relating to the introduction of reindeer into Alaska, be printed, of which number 5,000 in paper covers shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 in paper covers for the use of the House of Representatives and 20,000 in cloth for the use of the Bureau of Education.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to state that on Friday of this week, after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to make a few remarks upon the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations declaratory of the scope and purposes of the Monroe doctrine.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. QUAY. If in order I desire the Senate at the present time to proceed to the consideration of the resolution offered by me yesterday in relation to the financial bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the resolution indicated will be laid before the Senate when that order is reached. Are there further resolutions, concurrent or other?

Mr. VEST. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Did not the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania go to the Calendar yesterday?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It did not.

Mr. QUAY. It went over under the rule one day.

Mr. HALE. It comes up this morning in regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution went over under objection.

Mr. VEST. I thought it went to the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It did not go to the Calendar, the Chair will state. If there are no further resolutions, concurrent or other, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. VEST. I forget the exact date, but I think upon Thursday last the resolution of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] was before the Senate, and the morning hour lacked ten minutes of expiration. I took the floor upon that resolution and asked unanimous consent that it should go over as unfinished business in the morning hour without losing its place, and that understanding was had. Without pretending to be an expert on parliamentary law, I do not understand how a resolution subsequently offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania now takes precedence in the morning hour.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that that is the understanding I had of the matter, and I think if the Senator from North Dakota desires to call up the resolution he has a right to do so. Being a prior resolution, it has precedence. I have not understood that the Senator from North Dakota has called it up. If he intends to do so, now is the time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state, in reply to the Senator from Missouri, that the resolution to which he refers was

a joint resolution and was under discussion and the morning hour expired during the time——

Mr. VEST. I beg pardon. The morning hour did not expire, for I looked at the clock and it lacked ten minutes of 2. I called the attention of the Senate to that fact, and I said then that I was prepared to go on with the few remarks I intended to make, but that it would be unpleasant to be cut off by the expiration of the morning hour. Therefore I asked by unanimous consent that it should go over without prejudice, not losing its place, to be taken up in the morning hour the next day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. VEST. That it be taken up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. QUAY. What is the request?

Mr. VEST. To call up the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] in regard to the distribution of seeds.

Mr. QUAY. I will object if it is the understanding of the Chair that the resolution offered by me is in order.

Mr. VEST. Then I move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. FAULKNER. I should like to make a statement, after which I am satisfied that the Senator from Pennsylvania will recognize the propriety of the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri. That Senator was just about to open his remarks upon the joint resolution——

Mr. QUAY. I will say, if the Senator will permit an interruption, that I could not hear what was said by the Senator from Missouri, and I do not understand exactly his request.

Mr. FAULKNER. I was just about to state what took place, for I was present when it occurred. The Senator from Missouri was about beginning his remarks on the joint resolution, when he looked at the clock and found it was within a few minutes of 2. He said he would not like to be cut off in five or ten minutes, and he asked unanimous consent, as I understood him at the time, that the joint resolution should be passed over and take its place the next legislative day in the morning hour, so that he could deliver his remarks. That was on Wednesday, and as I understood at that time his request was agreed to. The joint resolution was not called up on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday, because there was no morning hour on those days, the Senate having taken a recess from Wednesday evening until Thursday, and on from that time until Saturday, so that Tuesday was the next legislative day.

Mr. QUAY. On that statement of the case I withdraw my objection, with the understanding that my resolution shall come up when the Senator from Missouri concludes his remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. I do not want any misunderstanding about this matter. The Senator from Pennsylvania says he withdraws his objection with the understanding that his resolution shall come up when I conclude my remarks.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Missouri can not control that matter.

Mr. VEST. Of course not; I would not undertake to do it; but I do not want any misapprehension about it. I would not agree to that.

Mr. MILLS. Let the Senator from Pennsylvania make a motion to take it up if he wants to do so.

Mr. VEST. He can move to take it up; but I will not agree that it shall come up as a matter of course. I ask that the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. ALDRICH. Before this arrangement is concluded we had better understand definitely what the agreement is.

Mr. VEST. There is no agreement about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw his objection with the understanding that his resolution should come up after the Senator from Missouri concludes his remarks.

Mr. VEST. There was no such understanding.

Mr. QUAY. Then I will modify my suggestion to this extent: I will withdraw the objection with the understanding that my resolution suffers no prejudice by the withdrawal.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am quite sure that the consideration of the joint resolution can be concluded within three-quarters of an hour, if there is no objection to going on with it. If the Senator from Missouri is permitted to proceed we shall get it out of the way and the Senator from Pennsylvania will have the right of way immediately thereafter.

Mr. GRAY. I merely wish to say that the joint resolution moved to be taken up by the Senator from Missouri is one that is important and excites some interest, and I would not want to be concluded from saying something in regard to it if I feel that it is right to do so, and get the floor upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is important to the Senator from Pennsylvania and this side of the Senate that we shall understand exactly what this arrangement is to be.

Mr. VEST. There is no arrangement about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Missouri now goes on, does the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania yesterday retain its place in the morning hour, and is it to be laid before the Senate to-morrow morning or whenever this order of business is again reached?

Mr. FAULKNER. The rules of the Senate govern this matter without any trouble. If the consideration of the joint resolution is concluded——

Mr. ALDRICH. I was addressing my remarks to the Chair, and I should like to have him answer the question if he will.

Mr. FAULKNER. That may be true, but I want to give my view of the matter. I say if the joint resolution upon which the Senator from Missouri will speak is concluded before the morning hour expires, then the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. But suppose it is not concluded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair can answer the inquiry of the Senator from Rhode Island. The resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania comes over from a previous day, and it is entitled to be laid before the Senate as a part of the morning business. At the conclusion of the joint resolution called up by the Senator from Missouri, unless the morning hour has expired, the resolution will be laid before the Senate, and if not, it will be laid before the Senate on the next legislative day.

Mr. QUAY. That is satisfactory.

COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. WILSON. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me a moment to ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of Senate bill 1591, which is a bill of local character to my State, and it is of very great importance that it should pass Congress at an early day? It has the favorable recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and will cause no debate, I apprehend.

Mr. VEST. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation.

Mr. WILSON. The bill was reported by me yesterday from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The Secretary read the amendment reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, which was to add the following at the end of the bill:

Provided, That the land used and occupied for school purposes at what is known as Tonasket school, on Bonapart Creek, and the site of the sawmill, grist mill, and other mill property on said reservation, is hereby reserved from the operation of this act, unless other lands are selected in lieu thereof as provided in section 6 of the act which became a law, without the approval of the President, July 1, 1892, entitled "An act to provide for the opening of a part of the Colville Reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes."

Mr. PALMER. I wish to ask the Senator from Washington in what manner the rights of the Indians are preserved in this bill? I understand that it is to extend the mining laws over an Indian reservation, or a part of it. I want to know, if I can, how it affects the rights of the Indians in that reservation.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, some four years ago Congress passed a bill opening the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation, and providing for a survey and allotment. The Indians are all located upon the south half of the reservation, having now about a million and a half acres. An appropriation was made for a survey, but owing to the vast amount of work before the Commissioner of the General Land Office he never has been able to examine and approve the surveys which have been made.

Upon the discovery of valuable mineral lands in what is known as British Columbia, it was supposed that the mineral zone extended across into this reservation. No Indian can take up and develop mineral land unless he is a citizen of the United States.

The proposition now is, and it has been favorably reported by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, to allow the prospectors to go in there and locate those lands; and unless they are permitted to do so at an early day, it will take the Army of the United States to keep them out, and ultimately result in no good. The passage of this bill is desired by all the people in the West. It does the Indian no harm. I should be as quick as any Senator to protect every right the Indian has, and in trying to get him to locate upon agricultural land; but this land is abso-

lutely valueless, except for mineral purposes. It never can be surveyed, being a mountainous country. There is no objection to the passage of the bill on the part of any of the Departments who have fully examined the matter.

Mr. PALMER. Have the Indians been consulted about this, and are their rights in any manner secured? Do they receive any compensation whatever for the privileges proposed to be granted to miners by this bill?

Mr. WILSON. The Indians have no right whatever to this land. This is an executive order reservation. Before the bill passed Congress there was struck from it that portion recognizing the rights of the Indians upon the Colville Reservation and of any ownership in this land. Congress then established by law that the Indians had no title to the land in question.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to ask the Senator another question. If that is so, why is this legislation needed? This is an Indian reservation, and if the Indians have no rights there, what is the necessity for the extension of the mining laws over this particular territory? I am always suspicious of all legislation which affects the rights of Indians. I can understand how these lands may be exceedingly valuable to others, and of no value to the Indians; I can understand how it is that the Indians may or may not have rights to the lands proposed to be subjected to the operation of the mining laws; but still there is something suspicious about this whole matter of appropriating lands in which the Indians may have an interest, without any provision whatever being made for the protection of their rights, or without any compensation for any loss they may sustain.

I know the Indians have been driven from the valuable lands of the West to the mountains, and sometimes I know that they have been driven from the mountains, and then it has been claimed that the mountain lands were of no value to them. One pretext is that the valley lands are too good for them, and then that the mountain lands are not suited to their condition. It seems to me it is like saying they have no rights.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is mistaken. The Indians who are on that portion of the reservation, numbering about 2,000, have a million and a half acres of land left. There are no Indians upon the portion of the reservation which we are seeking to have opened.

Mr. COCKRELL. And they have no claim there?

Mr. WILSON. No, they have no claim there, and could not take up any mineral lands unless they declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. The land is only valuable for mineral purposes. No Indians are there, and our citizens are not seeking to take advantage of any Indian. In every case the Indian is to be protected in all his rights.

The bill is of great importance to the white people of my section of the country and it will be ultimately impossible to keep them out of there, for as soon as the weather grows warmer they are going in. I have endeavored to hasten the passage of the bill upon the floor of the Senate, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question. Is it the whole of the reservation which is proposed to be opened, or only a part of it?

Mr. WILSON. It is only the half which, by the Senator's assistance, we opened four years ago.

Mr. CALL. The north or south half?

Mr. WILSON. The north half.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

Mr. VEST. I ask that the joint resolution, with the amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as proposed to be amended, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years, and as the public exigency requires that the valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, to be purchased under the authority of the said act and by the said appropriation, may be ready for distribution at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to procure them by open purchase or contract at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold: *Provided*, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them: *And provided further*, That he shall not be required to expend all the appropriation available for said purchase, but only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects of this joint resolution.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I assume that the amendment proposed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has practically eliminated the very learned argument of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] in regard to the Senate constituting itself a court and issuing a mandamus upon the Secretary of Agriculture, and also in regard to the other point, that the Senate in passing the original resolution would infringe upon the functions of the Chief Executive, whose duty it is to see that the laws are faithfully enforced. As amended, the joint resolution simply directs, as we unquestionably have the right to do, the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute gratuitously seeds, as had been done in preceding years.

I am not prepared to say that with what I believe to be the opinions and purposes of the Secretary of Agriculture, he will not undertake to nullify even this joint resolution. I am satisfied that his intention, if he can possibly avoid it, is not to distribute these seeds at all. I shall undertake to prove, from his own declaration, his statement that he has not the right by law, and is not empowered to distribute seeds, as has been done for so many years, is a mere pretense and pretext to conceal his settled animosity to the distribution of seed at all, and his intention to accentuate before the public what has been stated by the newspapers, that this is a reckless expenditure of money by Congressmen in order to popularize themselves with their constituents.

All this talk about the Secretary of Agriculture having discovered that he did not have the power to distribute these seeds is simply a sham to cover up his settled determination and purpose not to distribute them at all, and to bring all of us into disrepute who dare to advocate this gratuitous distribution as it has been carried on for so many years. I assume, then, that under this amended joint resolution all the technical arguments and learning of the Senator from Mississippi go for nothing, and that we have the right to direct this executive officer—not to request, but to direct him—to distribute seeds as has been done heretofore. No executive officer of this Government has the right to set up his will and his opinion against that of the legislative department in regard to a question of this kind; and whatever may be his conduct hereafter, if this resolution as amended is passed, it brings him face to face with the legislative will. He can violate it if he chooses, but this resolution will fix his responsibility as the head of a Department under the law and Constitution.

Mr. President, it is a serious statement for me to make that I believe the Secretary of Agriculture has determined not to make a gratuitous distribution of seeds. I have not made that statement recklessly nor carelessly. I have made it because I think I have the proof; because I unquestionably so believe. It is a most remarkable fact that the Secretary of Agriculture boasts in his statement made before the joint Committees of Agriculture of the two Houses of Congress, which I have before me, that during the three years of his administration of the Department of Agriculture he distributed 8,631,000 more packages of seeds than did his Republican predecessor during the last three years of Harrison's Administration. Mr. Morton boasts that he exceeded his predecessor in this "unlawful distribution" by 8,631,000 packages of seeds. Does any Senator believe that he discovered legitimately all at once that this power did not exist?

He says he has exhausted all "the rare and uncommon seeds," in the language of the law originally providing for this distribution. Grant that he did, and that his argument is good that there are no seeds now that can be discovered on the face of the earth which are rare and uncommon as to this country, does he expect us to believe that under the latter clause of the original provision that he should send valuable seed which can be made more profitable by being carried from one latitude or State to another, that he could not have enforced that provision of the law? What intelligent man believes that, with the changing climatic conditions of this country and with the improvements in agriculture and the processes for increasing the productiveness of soil, it is no longer possible to transport seeds from one State to another and make them more profitable?

The Senator from Mississippi aggressively asked us to give a single instance where seeds had been carried from one State to another and made more profitable. The Senator from Illinois answered that question. I answer it again. Within my personal knowledge the farmers of the State of Missouri are under eternal obligations to the Agricultural Department, or rather to the provisions of the law made by Congress requiring the Commissioner then, the Secretary of Agriculture now, to carry seeds from one State to another, because the farmers of Missouri under that provision obtained corn, which to-day is unrivaled upon the face of the earth, from the State of Illinois. The corn was brought to the State of Missouri from what is called Egypt, in southern Illinois,

the culture of which revolutionized the corn culture in my State. But for this provision of law that could never have occurred.

Who does not know that in almost every neighborhood of the West to-day there are seeds and bulbs of incredible value to the people in those vicinities which came from the Department of Agriculture, not sent always in the most intelligent manner—I mean to say the officers did not know what would be the result when they caused this transportation from one vicinity to another—but the result has been to give to the people vegetable food of almost incredible value.

That the Secretary of Agriculture did not really base his objection upon the terms of the law is evident from a statement which he made before the joint Committees on Agriculture. In that statement he said:

> Of the few reports received during the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 all were so vague and indefinite, in a word, so manifestly perfunctory as to give no valuable experimental results or information whatever. It may be safely asserted, from all the evidence available in the Department, that for the $1,100,000 and over expended for seed distribution by the Department in the past ten years no visible practical benefit to general agriculture or horticulture has resulted.

And he goes on to say that even agricultural societies and the agricultural papers have condemned the practice and that no returns have been received, as had been requested when the seeds were sent to the parties who received them.

Mr. President, it is possible, it is probable, that the farmers who receive these seeds have not made reports as requested, because they are not in all cases literary in their tastes or pursuits, but the fact exists, and is known to every one of us who represents a Western State, that the most valuable results have come from this distribution.

The Secretary of Agriculture shows in his statement that his objection to the distribution is not based upon the terms of the law. He makes a general argument against the whole thing, and says the distribution has resulted in no good, and undertakes to prove from agricultural papers and resolutions from agricultural societies, which he does not give, to show that it is a useless expenditure of the public money.

Mr. President, the Democratic party has been most unfortunate, not only in the dissensions which exist in its own ranks, but in the fact that the devil, to use a Western phrase, has owed the party a grudge, and has paid us in a Secretary of Agriculture. [Laughter.] If that officer had taken a contract to make the party to which he ostensibly belongs odious with the farmers of the United States, he could not have carried it out more successfully. This attack upon agriculture commenced in 1884, when the President of the United States, in a formal annual message to Congress, said that the mails were loaded down with seeds for gratuitous distribution, used by Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to popularize themselves at home. This was the first blast upon the bugle, and the Secretary of Agriculture immediately took up the refrain, and has adhered to it ever since.

We are told the Secretary of Agriculture is entirely honest. His honesty is not in issue. It is a question of administration; it is a question of policy. Sir, almost every crime committed in history has been done by honest men. There never was yet a fanatic who howled in ecstasy around his victim burning at the stake who was not honest. I have no doubt the Turks who are now butchering the Christians in Armenia and flourishing their scimiters, dripping with Christian gore, and shouting "Allah Acbar! There is one God, and Mohammed is his prophet," are perfectly honest and think they will reap their reward in the Mohammedan paradise with black-eyed houris around them.

I believe the Secretary of Agriculture is honest enough. I do not attack his honesty; I attack his administration and his policy. He has committed what a great Frenchman said in regard to a public official is not a crime, but, what is far worse, a blunder. He has put the party to which he belongs in antagonism to the great agricultural interest of the country, which has heretofore been peculiarly close to the Democratic organization.

The founder of the Democratic party was the best friend the agricultural interest ever had upon this continent. It is a singular fact that Mr. Jefferson, when minister to France, and watching the great drama of the French Revolution, as he looked upon the French court at Versailles feasting and dancing, as some people are doing now, while the mob surged and roared like a wild beast in the streets of Paris, and while corresponding with the savants of Europe, sent home seeds and plants of all kinds in order to improve the agriculture of this country.

It is a singular fact that he traveled incognito over all the southern parts of France and across the Alps into Italy in order to find out why the planters of South Carolina did not have seed rice equal to that which was produced in Europe. In Italy he found the rice superior to any that had ever been known on this continent. He discovered that by Italian laws it could not be exported, and I am not ashamed to say that in the interests of agriculture the founder of our party turned smuggler and filled his pockets inside and out with the rice which he brought to Paris and shipped to Charleston, S. C., in small packages. It was carefully distributed and attended, and gave us the South Carolina rice which to-day is the finest in the world.

When William C. Rives was minister to France, in 1853, he states that in the rooms of the Royal Agricultural Society of the Seine, he saw the prize plow of Thomas Jefferson, which had received a medal from that society while he was minister to France. The Democratic party has always been peculiarly devoted to the farming interests of this country, and has derived its largest support from that source. It has never been the party of the capitalist and the rich man, but has always depended upon the people, on whom at last the prosperity of the country must rest.

Now comes an Administration which I assisted in putting into power and deliberately attacks that interest. The first thing that the Secretary of Agriculture did was to involve himself in a most unfortunate controversy with the agricultural associations of the United States, when he talked about the walking delegates and had in the newspapers a controversy with some of the leading farmers of the country.

After the President had denounced Congress as demagogues who were using the tax money of the people to popularize themselves at home, the Secretary of Agriculture felt himself authorized and called upon to continue the assault until it has culminated now in the striking down, against the intention of Congress and outside of the law, in my judgment, the objects which we had in view when we appropriated $130,000 for the purchase and distribution of seeds. But the Secretary of Agriculture shields himself behind the plea of economy. He claims that he has saved $1,350,000 to the people of this country in his administration, of which the $130,000 for seed turned back into the Treasury constitutes a part.

Mr. President, I am not here to assail economy in public affairs, but I must express my regret that the economy of the Secretary commenced against farmers when there were such flagrant abuses in the way of extravagance all around him and before him which would have commanded, or should have commanded, the attention of even an unobserving man. It is most remarkable that the Secretary of Agriculture has not one word of criticism for an expenditure of nearly $11,000,000 to a foreign syndicate to sustain the single-gold standard in this country. It is most astonishing that he has never been able to see the enormous expenditure, the profligate expenditure, in the way of public printing.

The basement of the Capitol and the upper rooms of the Capitol and all the spare rooms in the vicinity have been taken up by storing worthless volumes printed from year to year, for which there can be no possible use to any human being. To-day we have almost had a pestilence from the rotting paper in this Capitol, the old bureau reports, and worthless statistics. Yet the gigantic intellect of the Secretary of Agriculture has never been turned to this. He would not shield himself, nor could he shield himself, by pretending that it did not come within his immediate jurisdiction, because from day to day, and almost from hour to hour, he has gone outside the duties of his Department in order to perform gratuitously the functions which are placed upon other Cabinet officers.

He has been Secretary of the Treasury practically, and has flooded this country with pamphlets and interviews and speeches denouncing the silver lunatics and declaring that the single gold standard is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the country.

But let us look further at the question of economy. He overlooked other appropriations made for his own Department, but struck out the $130,000 appropriation for the farmers. I find, from the report of the Secretary of expenditures made in the Agricultural Department for the year 1895, that $23,567.90 was expended upon the conservatories and grounds of the Agricultural Department. For 1897 we find for the Botanical Garden $23,893.75; for the propagating garden for 1897, $9,000; for the gardens and grounds of the Agricultural Department in 1897, improving the lawns, and for trees, water cans, tubs, composts, labor, etc., $25,000, making an aggregate of $57,893.75. For the fiscal year 1897, we find for public grounds and parks in the city of Washington alone an estimate of $81,000 and an actual appropriation of $49,500, making altogether, for these ornamental and luxurious appanages of the Government, an appropriation for that year of $105,393.75.

Will some Senator tell me what human being is fed by this expenditure? Will some Senator point out to me what table of any poor man has been made more comfortable by reason of this expenditure of $105,000? Where does this tax money of the people go under the immediate eye of the Secretary of Agriculture? It goes to the purchase of orchids, lilies of the valley, giant palms, and exotics that grace the banquets and receptions of the President and Cabinet officers in this city. But if we undertake to give a few papers of seeds to some poor farmer who has dragged through a long winter and is barely able to furnish the necessaries of life to the family depending upon him, liberty lies bleeding

in the streets, and the Secretary of Agriculture calls, "To arms! To arms! Congress is throwing away the people's money and ruining the country."

Sir, I know that anyone who dares to make a criticism like this subjects himself to the studiedly graceful assaults of the metropolitan press, and I shall be called a demagogue, pandering to the haymakers of the West. I have been called a silver lunatic, an enemy of the public, a legislative communist, and I do not think I shall lose any sleep because I am called a seed demagogue.

I would rather vote twice the amount of this appropriation to give something to a poor man in a distant county of the West, who is fighting the hard battle of life unaided by Government, that would make his cheerless home comfortable and bring light to his fireside; I would rather put one flower in the sick room of an overworked girl or matron, than to have it said that I had voted a hundred thousand dollars for flowers and exotics for the receptions and banquets of the officials of this Government, where the chandelier flashes its light across the red wine and the air is fragrant with perfume like "the spicy breeze of Araby, the blessed." Just such things as this action of the Secretary have caused the people of this country to doubt whether this is a Government of the people and for the people; whether the poor have any rights except to pay taxes to support the Government of the rich.

No wonder that we hear such threats as this coming from Wall street. I ask the Secretary to read what I send to the desk, to show the spirit that is abroad in this country, not amongst the farmers, but amongst the brokers and speculators and capitalists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAFEGUARD FOR THE TREASURY GOLD.

As we said last week, Congress scarcely cuts any figure in the speculative situation. The only feature of the current proceedings of the National Legislature is that the Senate, which is the real obstacle to currency and other reforms, is sinking lower and lower in public estimation. Everything it does is calculated to bring it more and more into public contempt and to produce that coming explosion for which the people of the country are gradually but surely getting themselves ready. We feel that before the session ends the force of public opinion will make itself felt so strongly that

THE SENATE WILL BE FORCED TO DO ITS DUTY.

If it can not or will not, its members generally will suffer the most humiliating political chastisement that ever overtook a body of recreant legislators.

Mr. VEST. That comes from one of the first banking and brokerage houses in the city of New York, and it is but a sample of what is published every day from like sources. What do they mean by the coming explosion? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has been denounced as a communist because he spoke of an incipient revolution in this country unless there was some legislative redress. Here is a statement from New York, from the capitalists of the country, that unless the Senate does the bidding of those capitalists, unless the Senate of the United States adopts their opinions and policies, a revolution is coming, a convulsion is coming, in the near future.

Mr. President, I must express my regret that if we are to have economy it should commence with a class the most defenseless politically of any in the United States. Scattered over a vast extent of territory with a continent for their scene of operations, the farmers are unable to organize and protect themselves as are other interests. They are of all the classes in this country within my personal knowledge more affected by the existing depression in business than any others.

According to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture himself, which I have before me, and of the Statistician of the Agricultural Department, there was a fall in the price of farm animals between 1894 and 1895 of $351,370,448. With wheat not paying the cost of production, with corn selling all over the West at from 12½ to 15 cents a bushel, with beef under the control of the Chicago syndicate who fix the price at their own will, now we must economize by taking away from the farmers of this country the only thing they receive from this great Government, the only thing that reminds them that the Government knows there is an agricultural class, which supports almost the entire burden of the Government. But I quote higher authority than the Secretary of Agriculture. I ask the Secretary to read from the message of the President of the United States a few years ago the part I have marked.

The Secretary read as follows:

Our farmers, long suffering and patient, struggling in the race of life with hardest and most unremitting toil, will not fail to see, in spite of misrepresentations and misleading fallacies, that they are obliged to accept such prices for their products as are fixed in foreign markets, where they compete with the farmers of the world; that their lands are declining in value while their debts increase; and that, without compensating favor, they are forced by the action of the Government to pay, for the benefit of others, such enhanced prices for the things they need that the scanty returns of their labor fail to furnish their support or leave no margin for accumulation.

Mr. VEST. In view of the statistics of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the official declarations of the President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the most remarkable public document that I have seen in nearly twenty years' service in this Chamber. If this does not make good what I have said in regard to the purpose of the Secretary of Agriculture and the real animus of his attack upon the appropriation of $130,000 for seeds, I am mistaken in regard to logical effect.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his annual report, submitted at the beginning of the present session, undertakes to prove that the farmers are the most wealthy and prosperous class in the United States and that the bankers and capitalists are the most unfortunate. I have spoken of the extraordinary change that came over the Secretary of Agriculture after three years' distribution of seeds, when he discovered all at once that the law did not authorize him to continue the seed distribution.

About that time the silver agitation actively commenced in this country, and the agricultural districts very emphatically declared in favor of the free coinage of silver. The Secretary of Agriculture, instead of devoting himself to the legitimate functions of his Department, has been raiding every portion of the country upon the financial question. He ought to be Secretary of War and Secretary of the Treasury. The idea of his limiting his colossal capacity and analytical inquiries to cabbages, potatoes, beets, and pumpkins! When he sees a silver man he charges, he rushes from his office, reminding us of what Cicero says of Catiline's flight from the Senate, "*abiit, efugit, evasit, erupit.*" [Laughter.] When the Secretary of Agriculture hears of a silver lunatic, like the war horse in Job, his neck is clothed with thunder. You might go further and say:

"He saith among the trumpets, Ha, ha; and he smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting."

Now, will the Secretary read this extraordinary argument, showing that the farmers, instead of being unfortunate and their vocation depressed, are really the wealthy people of this country; that all their complaints are unfounded; that they have no right to say that farming is unprofitable in the United States; and he undertakes to prove it is the most profitable vocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

In the presence of these facts, in the front of these figures demonstrating that agriculture in this Republic has during the year fed itself, supplied all citizens of the Union engaged in other vocations, and then shipped abroad a surplus of over $500,000,000 worth of its products, how can anyone dare to assert that farming is generally unremunerative and unsatisfactory to those who intelligently follow it?

How can the 42 per cent of the population of the United States, which feeds the other 58 per cent and then furnishes more than 69 per cent of all the exports of the whole people, be making less profits in their vocation than those whom they feed when the latter supply less than 31 per cent of the exports of the country?

For the purpose of illustrative comparison, transfer the $4,000 agriculturally invested in each farm of 137 acres to the choicest Wall street investment. Risk that money in railroad first-mortgage bonds, in bank stocks, or any other allegedly safe security which may be found a favorite among shylocks, brokers, plutocrats, monopolists, money-power manipulators, and multimillionaires, and if it returns 6 per cent it is a remarkably profitable investment in the eyes of capitalists. Therefore $240 is the annual income.

Follow the transfer of the farm money with that of the farm family to urban residence. Now, with the same labor in the city or village can they attain by hard work every day in the year, adding their wages to the $240 income, as much of independence, wholesome living, and real comfort as the same amount of money in the land and the same heads and hands working on the soil generously and healthfully bestowed upon them, in the sweet quiet of a home, amid flowers, trees, fruits, and abundance, on the farm?

But the declaimers of calamity declare that the farms of the United States are sadly burdened with mortgages. The census of 1890, however, develops the fact that on the entire valuation returned for farms there is only a mortgage of 16 per cent. It will be borne in mind, too, that many thousands of acres of mortgaged lands of great value which are returned as farms were such only before they were mortgaged. They were purchased to plat as additions to cities like Chicago, Brooklyn, Kansas City, and Omaha, and ceased to be farm lands as soon as mortgages representing part of the purchase price were recorded. Such lands are, therefore, wrongfully included and returned as farms. They show an aggregate of many millions of liabilities.

On each $10,000 of rural real estate there is, then, an average incumbrance of $1,600. And when the fact is recalled to mind that a large part of all farm mortgages is for deferred payments on the land itself, or for improvements thereon, what other real or personal property in the United States can show lesser liabilities, fewer liens in proportion to its real cash-producing value? Certainly the manufacturing plants of this country, neither smelting works, mills, iron and steel furnaces and foundries, nor any other line of industry can show less incumbrance on the capital invested.

* * * * * * *

During the year 1894, according to the five reports made that year to the Comptroller of the Currency, the average indebtedness to their depositors of the national banks was $1,685,756,062.45. Besides the above, State and private banks, loan and trust companies, and savings banks owed their depositors during the same period an average of $2,973,414,101, making a total of $4,659,170,163.45.

And in this year, 1895, by the responses of national banks to the four calls thus far made upon them by the Comptroller of the Currency, their aggregate indebtedness to depositors is shown to be $1,719,597,911.33; State and private banks, loan and trust companies, and savings banks show an aggregate indebtedness to their depositors of $3,185,245,810, making a total of $4,904,843,721.33.

These figures show an enormous and constant indebtedness of the banks

and bankers, alongside of which the money in farm mortgages and the debts owed by farmers are relatively insignificant. The debts of railroads, bankers, manufacturers, and merchants entitle them, and not the farmers, to be called the "debtor class" in America.

* * * * * * *

It will be observed that between 1880 and 1890 the proportion of the people engaged in agriculture declined 2 per cent, and that to-day there are only 42 persons in rural pursuits to 58 in mercantile, manufacturing, and other callings common to the great populational and industrial centers. Fifty-eight per cent of the people can not always be satisfactorily maintained upon the profits of exchanges among themselves in the villages and cities. Food for all must come from the earth—from tilled fields. The population of the United States in 1915—a quarter of a century after the census of 1890—admitting that the increase will diminish very materially as compared with that of each preceding quarter of a century since the Government was established, will, no doubt, number at least 120,000,000.

Mr. VEST. I take it that the farmers of the United States will be profoundly astonished to find that they are the most prosperous class of our people, and that the capitalists and manufacturers are the poor unfortunate bankrupts. A public officer, himself coming from the West, who would dare to make the statement deliberately put before the American people in that paper, possesses courage and hardihood to which I do not aspire. The man who will say to the farmers of the United States that they are the recipients of the proceeds of the $504,000,000 of exports of agricultural products must calculate upon a credulity in the agricultural districts that is not comprehensible to those who have rural constituents.

Does not the Secretary of Agriculture know that the farmers do not receive this money, that it goes to the middlemen and to the exporters, and that, unfortunately, as the autonomy of our Government exists, the Federal Government is unable to destroy the combinations in the great grain markets of the United States which make the farmer the victim and put the proceeds of his toil in the hands of those who "toil not, neither do they spin?"

But there is another statement made in that paper even more astounding. It is the most remarkable I have ever known to come from a Department of this Government. The Secretary of Agriculture says that the banks and savings institutions are in debt over $4,000,000,000. In debt to whom? To their depositors. In other words, they have the money of the people, which they receive without paying interest and which the banks are loaning out at from 6 to 10 per cent and even more, and the Secretary of Agriculture says that this is an indebtedness which shows their most unfortunate financial condition. I have been under the impression that the bank which had the largest deposits was the most fortunate, and although in their bookkeeping the deposits are charged up as an indebtedness of the bank, we know that it constitutes the great desideratum with bankers and gives them their largest profit.

Is it possible the Secretary of Agriculture thinks that the people of the United States are such idiots and dolts as not to understand this? Does he expect us to believe that the manufacturers of the East and the operatives of New England, with their millions and even billions of dollars in the savings banks, are not really the fortunate class in this country but the unfortunate class, and that the farmers, as Mr. Morton says in that report, are deriving larger profits upon their capital than any other portion of the community?

Mr. President, the trouble with the Secretary of Agriculture is that he is a monomaniac on the subject of the gold standard. He sees nothing but gold, red gold, and he believes that every man who can not understand the question as he does is a lunatic and ought to be regarded as a public enemy. I saw it in a newspaper, and I heard it from one of the employees in the Department besides, and I take it there will be no contradiction of the fact, that the Secretary of Agriculture absolutely paid off his employes, men and women, who are supposed to be favorable to the free coinage of silver, with silver dollars, in order, as he said, to give them an object lesson as to the use of silver.

I was abroad at the time, but I saw the publication. It was published in a British newspaper, and I understand it was published all over the United States. I was told by one of the employees that he had received $150, I think it was, in silver dollars, and as he was a little lame and rather decrepit he was afraid he would be compelled to hire a cab in order to get to his boarding house. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] asks me why the Secretary did not give him silver certificates. Because he wanted to give him an object lesson, cynically showing what could come if the silver dollar was coined again in the United States.

In that day of gloom and disaster, when the Democratic party was overwhelmingly defeated at the last election, and true Democrats everywhere through this country were mourning over the result, I saw a carefully prepared interview with the Secretary of Agriculture in which he gloated over it. Io triumphe! he said. Maryland, Kentucky, and Ohio have gone for the Republicans, and the Judases have been struck down who in the Senate opposed the Administration.

Mr. President, I thank God the time has never come, and it never will come, when I will gloat over seeing the Democratic flag in the dust, no matter by whom that banner may have been borne. No true Democrat will ever do that. But the Secretary of Agriculture could see nothing except that men who differed from him have been struck down in public life, and he, a member of the Democratic Administration, came out publicly and gloated over it, and shouted with ghoulish glee over the defeat of members of his own party.

The Secretary of Agriculture delivered a speech in New York on the 19th of January, which was published in the New York Herald, and which any Senator can obtain from the Library, in which he asks, "What do these politicians at Washington know about finance? Why do not you capitalists and bankers and business men demand a monetary commission to regulate the finance of the country, and force Congress to accept its decision? Go to Washington and make them take it. What do these politicians know about finances and gold and silver? What do they know about exchanges, except the exchange of one set of official applicants for another?" And his speech was received with tumultuous applause by the audience before whom it was delivered.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Board of Trade.

Mr. VEST. The Secretary of Agriculture is now devoting himself to sending over this country stereotyped questions to silver men. I have a letter here from the agent of the American Press Association in New York stating that he has received from the Secretary of Agriculture an autograph letter containing the following questions to the silver men of the country which have been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury and pronounced by him to be irrefutable. The agent of the press association asked me, as I am considered quite a silver man, to answer the questions.

The Secretary of Agriculture can not contain himself within the limited functions of his vegetable kingdom. [Laughter.] He has now resumed his old profession of editor, and is filling the country with attacks upon those of us who happen to be unable to see this money question in the same light with himself. Having mentioned these questions, without injecting a silver debate, I will ask the Secretary, in justice to the Secretary of Agriculture and myself, to read my reply.

Mr. GEORGE. The questions should also be read.

Mr. VEST. The questions are included in the paper. Let the Secretary read the questions and then read my answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The questions and replies will be read in the absence of objection. The Chair hears no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

The first question is as follows:

"If by international agreement the price of silver can be fixed and made permanent, in gold, why can not the prices of all other commodities be made permanent and unfluctuating by the same process?"

Commodities such as corn, wheat, iron, lead, etc., can be produced in unlimited quantities beyond the capacity or requirements of consumption, while silver never has been so produced.

This question assumes that silver is always a commodity like corn, wheat, or cotton, and ignores the fact that when made money by law, national or international, it becomes, within the jurisdiction so enacting, not a commodity, but the representative of all values.

To ask why international agreement can not fix the price of commodities is foreign to the issue.

When stamped as money and made full legal tender, silver is not a commodity in the narrow and restricted meaning of that term, but represents the value of all commodities. It may be used for mechanical and manufacturing purposes, but its money function comes from law, and is overwhelming in importance.

Secretary Morton persistently adheres to the fallacy that the commercial value of silver, as caused by closing the mints against its coinage, will not be affected by restoring the metal to its position prior to 1873. The opening of the mints of the world, or even of the United States, to free coinage would give silver equal purchasing and debt-paying power with gold.

What owner of silver bullion, outside of a lunatic asylum, would sell it at the present market price if the mints were open to coinage? The intrinsic value of silver, as of gold, comes almost entirely from their adaptability to the purposes of being used as money, and this use can only be established by law. To attempt an analogy between silver and commodities is illogical and utterly deceptive.

The second question is as follows:

"When the advocate of free and unlimited coinage declares for 16 to 1, does he not give away his case and assert himself for a gold standard as 'the one' by which to measure silver and everything else?"

I must confess my inability to appreciate this question.

Does Secretary Morton mean that no ratio of coinage can be fixed by law between gold and silver, as has been done since civilized governments were established?

If his question means anything, it is that no ratio can be established between gold and silver which recognizes the difference in quantity, texture, and value of the metals and does not preserve exact equality in coinage, without inconsistency in the lawmakers.

If the Secretary is right, the world has been blundering on the subject of coined money through all the ages; and the framers of our Constitution, Hamilton, Jay, and Madison, with all the financiers who succeeded them, have been gabbling like idiots when they discussed the proper ratio between the precious metals.

Secretary Morton is certainly mistaken when he says that Secretary Carlisle declared these questions irrefutable.

No one, who remembers Mr. Carlisle's burning denunciation of monometallism when a member of the House can believe that he now indorses the monstrous proposition that no ratio of coinage can be established between gold and silver.

The third question is as follows:

"Customs dues are based upon the value of imports computed in American or United States currency. The law compels the Secretary of the Treasury at the beginning of each quarter to proclaim value of foreign coins in

United States money. Now, the English pound is $4.866 on a gold basis. Importing £100 worth of merchandise from England to-day, you would pay duty on $486 valuation. But going to a silver basis the English pound would be in United States currency $9.72—doubled. Therefore, the duties on the same goods would be doubled, would they not?"

Imports are paid for in the money of the country where purchased, and the value of such imports is estimated in our units of value—dollars and cents—and not in the commercial or market value of the metal constituting such coined dollars. This has been done ever since 1878.

In this question Secretary Morton again ignores the effect of free coinage upon silver, and falsely assumes that this country would at once go to a silver basis. He adheres to the fallacy that free coinage would add nothing to the commercial value of silver, in face of the fact that when the act of 1873 demonetized silver its commercial value fell and when the Bland-Allison Act provided in 1878 for limited coinage the commercial value increased.

No intelligent man can be induced to believe that the silver dollar, which is a full legal tender, and with which all the products of this great country can be purchased, will be worth only 50 cents anywhere.

If the foreigner can buy our exports for silver dollars, or can invest these dollars in property within our borders, why should he value them at one-half their purchasing power?

The legal-tender money of every country is worth everywhere what the products of that country are worth after providing for its own people. The silver dollar of Mexico is worth only 62 cents outside of that conntry, because Mexico exports some silver, a little coffee, and a few hides, but the silver dollar and silver certificate of the United States are exchangeable for gold all over Europe, because we are the largest exporting people in the world.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I have had read this correspondence, giving the questions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the answers which I had attempted to make, as being just to him and myself. I can supplement the last statement in regard to silver certificates and silver dollars of the United States by a personal experience. I happened to be abroad last summer and found that I had some silver certificates, and I presented them to a banker in Austria to whom I carried my letter of credit. I said, "I assume, as these are silver certificates, there is some discount upon them." "Not at all, sir," he said, "you can have gold for them as you could have it for the pounds sterling."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. VEST. If the Senate will indulge me just a moment I will conclude.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may proceed to the conclusion of his remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. VEST. I was proceeding to state that this banker gave me gold for the silver certificates. I said to him, "Have you noticed that these are simply certificates entitling the holder to receive silver dollars?" "Why, of course," he said; "this is my business, and I understand exactly what I am doing. My dear sir, that silver certificate will purchase anything that is produced by the people of the United States. It is as good to me as gold. I can buy your corn, your wheat, your beef, your oil. Why should it not be as good, coming from a great country like yours, that is feeding half the world?"

Therefore, I say that I speak within personal knowledge when I declare that the silver of the United States is good over the whole world. It is as good as gold so long as we continue to feed our own people and export the enormous amount of five hundred and odd million dollars worth of products, which is referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture in his report. But I do not purpose to discuss now the silver question.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture attacks the distribution of seed, but there is one seed which he is now propagating and distributing most industriously through this country. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] was grimly facetious over the name of some of the botanical products which were offered for sale to the Department. I take the liberty of saying that this seed being now distributed is known by botanists as the *aurifer feniculum canis Mortoni;* in other words, Morton's golden dog fennel. [Laughter.] Under the shadow of this noxious plant he reposes by day and almost dreams by night, occasionally seeking recreation by swinging his golden censer, filled with incense, at the Executive Mansion, and shouting: "Holy, holy, art thou, oh Grover, king of kings and lord of lords." [Laughter.]

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE JUSTICE CLIFFORD.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to submit a report from the Judiciary Committee. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice, to report it without amendment. I ask leave to put the joint resolution upon its passage now. Let it be read for information. If it takes more than thirty seconds I will withdraw it.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have a letter of the Attorney-General printed in the RECORD. It is not necessary to have it read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1896.

SIR: In reply to your note of the 3d instant in relation to the resolution, H. Res. 103, the Attorney-General directs me to say that the late Mr. Justice Clifford during his lifetime had a portrait of himself painted—which is now in the collection of portraits belonging to the Department of Justice—to take the place of an indifferent one theretofore furnished the Department and still remaining here. There is no reason why the resolution should not pass; on the contrary, it is eminently proper that it should.

Very respectfully,

CECIL CLAY, *Chief Clerk.*

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
United States Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack;

A bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan; and

A bill (H. R. 4444) providing for commissioners to negotiate with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution, by Mr. DUBOIS, proposing an amendment to paragragh 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Idaho in charge of the unfinished business consent that it be informally laid aside that the Senate may take up, and I hope finish this afternoon, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. DUBOIS. No, Mr. President; yesterday I yielded to the Senator from Maine as soon as the resolution was up that he might call up the deficiency appropriation bill. Now I think that we can finish the resolution to-day, and under the circumstances I do not think it would be fair to the friends of this measure to yield at this time.

Mr. HALE. Of course I understand that the matter entirely rests with the Senator from Idaho. He did yesterday make that proposition. At the time I did not know that any debate would ensue. I have learned since that there will be more or less extended debate, and I felt the necessity of passing the urgent deficiency appropriation bill as soon as possible. But if the Senator objects, of course there is nothing more that can be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL].

Mr. HALE. What is that amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. SEWELL. I shall forego pressing the amendment at the present time. It may require the joint action of both Houses, and I shall probably bring in a joint resolution.

Mr. TELLER. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. SEWELL. The amendment is to take the Soldiers' Homes appropriations out of the sundry civil appropriation bill and put them into the Army appropriation bill in case the latter bill is to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL. Is the amendment withdrawn, do we understand the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SEWELL. I do not intend to press the amendment at the present time. While I am on my feet I desire to say a few words.

Mr. HALE. I have requested that the amendment be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 17, after the words "Military Academy," insert "and the National and State Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors."

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the time of the Senate. I believe the vote yesterday demonstrated that time taken up in making speeches on this question is practically wasted; therefore I will confine the few remarks that I shall make to the appropriateness of the Committee on Military Affairs having charge of the appropriation bill for the Army. That committee is constituted more nearly to cover technically the duties that it could perform in that respect than any other committee of this body. It is composed of gentlemen who attained high rank on both sides in the late war, who are perfectly conversant with everything that is likely to come up in the Army appropriation bill and could give much time to its consideration, whereas under

the present rule that appropriation bill comes over from the other House with twelve or fourteen others late in the session and is referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I may here say that the work of the Committee on Appropriations was my admiration in my former term of service, and it has not changed, I presume. I have never seen such superhuman labor performed as those gentlemen have accomplished intelligently, justly, and properly. There is no reason that I could offer for taking away appropriation bills from them except the fitness of the other committees named to take them into consideration. They are fully as competent as the Committee on Appropriations; they are more so technically, referring to the Military Committee. I was surprised to hear the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] say that the military appropriation bill is a matter of form and detail, of pay, etc.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator from New Jersey aware that the matter of delay which has invoked the superhuman efforts of the Appropriations Committee in the closing days of a session is almost entirely the result of the late day at which the separate committees of the House of Representatives get their bills through and send them here? The experience of the Senate has been, since the change was made in the other House, that the bills which are delayed and come laggardly here are not the bills from the Committee on Appropriations, although six bills are left to that committee in the House, but the bills from the single committees that dally through the session, the committees having only one appropriation bill to deal with; and they are sent here so late that they crowd the Appropriations Committee. It is fair that the Senator should, if he does not know that——

Mr. SEWELL. Oh, I am perfectly conversant with it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows that. I am very glad that he realizes it.

Mr. SEWELL. But I am also conversant with the general idea that while the bills come in that way they can be taken up and dealt with by five or six committees better than by one.

Mr. HALE. The House experience does not show that. If we are found confronted with long continued delay by the special committees relating to the particular Department in the House, I can not see why the same thing is not likely to occur in the Senate. The committees of the Senate, whichever they may be, will not get the appropriation bills from the several committees of the other House until the last days of the session, and we shall be in a worse condition to deal with the whole subject of appropriations than would be the case when they are dealt with by one committee.

Mr. SEWELL. We have a difference of opinion on that point. The Military Committee would be taking care of the military appropriation bill, and the Naval Committee of the naval appropriation bill, while the Committee on Appropriations would have the sundry civil appropriation bill and the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he expects the members of all these committees named to leave the Senate as the members of the Committee on Appropriations do during the last weeks of a session, and that the committees will sit during the hours when the Senate is in session so as to deal with these respective subjects?

Mr. SEWELL. I do not see why they should not do so just as much as the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HOAR. Then does the Senator expect any sessions of the Senate, a quorum of the Senate?

Mr. SEWELL. Oh, yes; there will be no trouble about that. But I wish to address my remarks more particularly to the fitness of the Military Committee to have charge of the Army appropriation bill. The members of that committee know more of the details than the Appropriations Committee possibly can know. It is in the line of their thoughts and their learning in the service; they take pride in it. A man who served during the war, all the war, on either side, never forgets his military education.

Mr. HALE. Granting all that to be true about the meritorious services of men in the war, does the Senator think that a committee of warriors is really more competent to decide how much money shall be appropriated for military purposes in view of all the appropriations to be made than a committee composed of men of peace?

Mr. SEWELL. Oh, well, the gentlemen composing that committee are now men of peace, and they have been for thirty years. They have not forgotten their education in the war, but they are men who have demonstrated their fitness to live in peace and earn a living.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly, but does the Senator think that that committee, composed, as it is, of able men, patriotic men, competent men, is better able to consider the question of how much money, taking into view the whole condition of the Government, shall be apportioned to the War Department, than a general committee which has no prejudices for or against any Department?

Mr. SEWELL. They are better competent to take up subjects such as they deal with every day and such as the Committee on Appropriations never consider—new inventions, etc. The Committee on Military Affairs have more knowledge of such subjects and of the technical matters regarding the military establishment than the Senator's committee can ever get hold of.

Mr. HALE. The Committee on Appropriations never allows itself to deal with a question of new inventions any more than it would with a question of the future salvation of man. It sends every new invention pertaining to the Army to the Military Committee. It never pretends to consider such questions, though the committee is constantly beset with inventions from the Navy Department as well as the War Department. Whenever such things come to the Appropriations Committee, we send the naval inventions to the Naval Committee and the military inventions to the Military Committee. We never pretend to deal with them, and do not.

Mr. SEWELL. I refer to appropriations for new items, like guns, ammunition, etc., and new inventions. Such provisions get into the Army appropriation bill, and the Committee on Appropriations do not take up those questions from the standpoint from which I speak. The military bills contain a variety of technical questions which can better be administered upon by the Military Committee than they can possibly be by the Committee on Appropriations.

I do not want in this argument to reflect at all upon the Committee on Appropriations, for, as I say, I have the highest regard for them and for their labors, but I do hope particularly that this bill will go to the committee that ought, in my opinion, to have it.

Mr. QUAY. I believe the resolution is still open to amendment, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution is open to amendment. The Senator from New Jersey, the Chair understands, withdraws his amendment.

Mr. SEWELL. I do not intend to press it at the present time.

Mr. QUAY. Then I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to add:

All appropriations relating to the construction, purchase, or maintenance of public buildings and grounds shall be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The Committee on Finance shall consist of 15 members.

Mr. QUAY. The first amendment is in line with the general thought of the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], and I hope he will accept it. The proposition is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds shall report a bill covering appropriations for public buildings and grounds.

Mr. DUBOIS. Of course I will not accept the amendment. As I understand it, it is not in line with my proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no such appropriation bill.

Mr. QUAY. Then, I do not understand the Senator's proposition. I supposed the underlying theory of the resolution to be that the different appropriation bills were to be committed to those committees that were naturally most conversant with the subjects committed to them. That, it seems, is not the thought of the Senator from Idaho.

As to the other amendment, I will say that in allotting places upon the committees to the different members of the Senate upon both sides of the Chamber, I think very different allotments would have been made had it been understood at the time that the resolution of the Senator from Idaho was to be pressed to a conclusion, and if it is passed the committees at the proper time should be recast. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. It was not my special desire to go upon that committee, and I certainly would not have gone there had I known that this resolution was to have been passed.

On the Committee on Finance there are thirteen members; it was increased either two or four at the beginning of the session; but the fact remains that, as at present constituted, when a great revenue bill is to be introduced and perfected in the interests particularly of agriculture and manufactures, in the next Congress the great Middle States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—with all their tremendous agricultural, manufacturing, corporate, and financial interests will be without representation. I simply desire that the Committee on Finance shall be increased so that one of those States and the great interests involved shall have a representative on that committee when legislation is being prepared so vital to the welfare of all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] said yesterday, when I was a member of the other branch of Congress I voted to distribute the appropriation bills, so that I am not at all embarrassed in the position I hold in this body on that question. I believe it is in the line of better legislation, in the direction of expediting the business of Congress, and that there is no danger that the Senate will be any more extravagant under an arrangement of that kind than it has been in the past.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], in which he suggested that he would not voluntarily have taken membership on the Committee on Appropriations if he had known that this resolution was to be pressed. This resolution was on the Calendar of the Senate at that time, and it was perfectly well understood, I think, that it was to be taken up for consideration; and I want to give notice now, Mr. President, that if any member of the Committee on Appropriations desires to retire, I will with great pleasure fill that vacancy if the Senate shall choose to elect me to it. So there will be no difficulty on that score. [Laughter.]

Mr. QUAY. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. I will say if the amendment I offered increasing the number of the Committee on Finance does pass and I can be placed there, the Senator from New Hampshire can have the vacancy on the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. We shall try to adjust that later on.

I think there have been some misapprehensions and some misstatements, through inadvertence, during this debate. Even the distinguished Senator from Ohio yesterday—and I am under obligations to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] for some facts touching this matter—even, I say, the distinguished Senator from Ohio was in error in thinking that the general appropriations for the Departments would be taken from the Committee on Appropriations under the resolution. The appropriations for the State, Treasury, War, Navy, Interior, and Post-Office Departments, and that for the Department of Justice, are on the legislative bill and are not affected by the proposed change.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. What the Senator from Ohio meant when he spoke of the departmental appropriations was not the appropriations for the clerical force in the Departments, but the general appropriations for the work of the Departments. I thought at the time he used the word it might be considered as only referring to the minor appropriations for the payment of the clerical force, which, of course, are in the legislative appropriation bill; but the Senator from Ohio meant to refer to the whole general appropriations for the Departments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I propose to add to that statement the further fact that the Army bill and the Navy bill are not Department bills, but carry only the military and naval establishments, pay of the officers and men, transportation, purchase of supplies, material, etc. There is much in both of these bills, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] has just suggested, that is technical in character, and it seems to me that they should go to the Military and Naval Committees. So far as the pay of the Army and Navy is concerned, it seems of little consequence where it goes, as it is all fixed by law; to pass upon it is a mere perfunctory matter.

This measure is a conservative one in the larger sense. No surer means can be taken to preserve the conservatism of this body than to make it in fact what it is in theory—a Senate of equals, and therefore the duties and responsibilities should be divided as equally as possible. Nothing tends so much to make men conservative as to put responsibility upon them. It is not safe, wise, or just to place the responsibility for legislation in a few hands or to put all the wisdom and conservatism on a few committees. It is the truer principle to make all the committees conservative by giving them the duties and responsibilities that properly pertain to the subject-matter they have in charge. Not only the responsibility, but the equality of duties and honors tends also to conservatism. No community or body of men can be less liable to radicalism and innovation than one of substantial equality. Where every man sees that he is as well situated as every other man there is the least possible temptation to seek for change.

With the proposed distribution minor committees will become important and desirable. Some of the older Senators will stay on them, and there will be a greater sprinkling of new men on what are now leading committees, and in this way the new element, to which I belong, will be under proper influence and instruction. The present method is not a true principle, and that it has given so little trouble is due to the special ability of the committee, but it is not wise to calculate on always having a committee of much more than ordinary capacity. The system should be framed to fit ordinary conditions. The objectionable features of the present system will become more and more apparent with the growth of the country and the necessary increase of appropriations. The work of that committee is now crowded into a short time, and the necessity for haste increases the danger of mistakes. It also affords a greater opportunity for the persistent applicant. The hearings must be very brief, and the committee has not time for careful investigation. The committee will have quite enough to do, more I think than any other committee of the Senate, certainly much more than the average, to give proper attention to the bills remaining in their hands. The last sundry civil bill alone carried 381 different and independent appropriations, none of them fixed by law and all requiring separate investigation. The items are distributed all over the country and are of infinite variety and character. The pension bill now upon the Calender, the largest in dollars of all the appropriation bills, carries only eight items, and the last Post-Office bill, the next largest in point of appropriation, carried only forty-two items.

I have taken occasion to make an examination of the different items in the various appropriation bills, which I desire to present as a contribution to this discussion. The number of items is as follows:

Agricultural appropriation act	50
Army appropriation act	60
Diplomatic and consular	36
District of Columbia	160
Fortifications	35
Indian appropriation act	156
Legislative, executive, and judicial	359
Military Academy	139
Naval appropriation act	83
Pension	8
Post-Office	42
Sundry civil appropriation act	381
Deficiency appropriation	402

So, Mr. President, if the resolution as proposed is adopted in its entirety and without amendment, there will still remain in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations appropriation bills covering 1,142 separate items, and in all the bills that will be distributed to the other committees of the Senate there will be only 769 items.

It seems to me, in view of this fact, Mr. President, that we are not dismantling the Committee on Appropriations, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] termed it yesterday. We are still leaving in their hands almost twice as much in the matter of appropriations as we are distributing to all the other committees of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has quite ingeniously arrayed the number of items and clauses contained in the appropriation bills. Does he not know that in the general bills he proposes alone to leave to the Committee on Appropriations almost all these items are little items fixed by law? Every item that carries a clerk's salary of $1,200 or $1,500 a year is fixed by law, and nobody can change it. Their consideration requires no time, and those items go to make up the 1,142 items to which the Senator refers.

I should like the Senator to tell the Senate, on this important question of the expenditure of the public money and the appropriations, how the aggregate of the three appropriation bills he proposes to leave to the Committee on Appropriations compares with the rest of the appropriation bills? If he does not know, I can tell him that the bills he proposes to leave to the Committee on Appropriations, made up of these little items, aggregate something less than $70,000,000, while the great balance of the appropriations, running up to $300,000,000, are to be taken away from that committee and given to the several committees named. The itemized consideration the Senator is referring to does not in any way measure the responsibility of the committee's action. The Committee on Appropriations, aside from the sundry civil bill, can consider the legislative appropriation bill, and it is one of the shortest bills under consideration in the Senate, and little time is needed to be devoted to it. It is only a schedule of salaries. The deficiency items, four hundred and odd, are almost all of them made up of single estimates of small amounts made to the Committee on Appropriations by the Departments. I have had charge of deficiency bills with 500 items in them which did not carry in all over five or six million dollars, while a single bill, to be considered in all its importance in relation to other bills that are to be sent to these other committees, has on it forty or sixty or seventy or one hundred and forty million dollars. The Senator ought not to stick in the bark in his reasoning, and to conclude, or to ask the Senate to conclude, that this matter is of importance according to the number of items. He might as well say that one work by one author is of more importance than that by another because it has more lines.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can make his speech in his own time.

Mr. HALE. I do not want to take up the Senator's time.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is equally as ingenious as he gives me credit for having been. I open this book of appropriations of the last Congress, and on a single page I find one item of $900,000, another of $425,000, another of $240,000, and another of $200,000, which come under the purview of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator does not do himself justice, so far as his ordinary practice is concerned, in not stating that one single bill, which only carries eight appropriations, and that the pension appropriation bill—to which his committee is welcome, so far as I am concerned, if they prefer to have charge of it—carries $140,000,000

concerning which there can be no controversy, because it is estimated by the Commissioner of Pensions, and we have to appropriate for it whether we will or not.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a suggestion in that line?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maine spoke of the fact that the several items might be simply for the salaries of clerks, the amount for which the committee would be obliged to insert in the bill because the salary was fixed by law. I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that the committee can change the salaries in an appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. The committee can not. The Senator is not familiar with the rules or he would not make that assertion. The committee has no right to change salaries, and it is absolutely precluded from doing so by a rule of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The committee can change salaries.

Mr. HALE. The committee can not.

Mr. HILL. It has been done over and over again.

Mr. HALE. It has been done, then, by unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. That is the way most of the business of the Senate is done, by unanimous consent.

Mr. HALE. I know many things have been done by unanimous consent. Senators have a wrong idea of the scope and purview of the Committee on Appropriations. The committee can not change salaries. Sometimes it has been attempted, but the person whose salary was so reduced has recovered the difference afterwards.

Mr. GALLINGER. Touching upon the matter of salaries, it is a notorious fact that appropriation bills do change salaries.

Mr. HALE. Oh, no.

Mr. GALLINGER. They grant a thousand dollars a year more to one officer, perhaps, than is provided for by the statutes of the United States. They have reduced salaries all along the line to my personal knowledge, because I have been in contests in Congress with a view to increasing those salaries to the point provided by law, by solemn enactment of the Congress of the United States. There is no question but that salaries are frequently changed. Some are increased in value and others are reduced in value by the appropriation bills passed by Congress.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator know of an instance of the Senate Committee on Appropriations reducing salaries?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not say the Senate committee did it. I say committees of Congress.

Mr. HALE. We are dealing with the jurisdiction of the Senate committee now.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would be competent to increase salaries where the House of Representatives had reduced them, or vice versa.

Mr. HALE. During my service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I do not recollect a case where the committee reduced salaries.

Mr. GALLINGER. The fact is notorious that it has been done upon appropriation bills that have become laws, and the cases are so numerous as certainly not to have escaped the attention of Senators.

Mr. HILL. I ask whether the salary of the minister to Mexico was not increased on an appropriation bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Commissioner of Pensions, if I recollect correctly, receives a thousand dollars more per year than is provided by law. I have been always glad to vote for it, but it is not competent to question the fact that the salaries are changed, some increased and some reduced, in almost every appropriation bill that comes before Congress.

I have but a single word more to say. I have no feeling about this matter. If this resolution goes through, the bill in the next Congress providing for appropriations covering the estimates of the Pension Bureau will probably go to the committee of which I now chance to be chairman. I may not then be a member of that committee or of this body, so that I have no personal interest in the matter, and no desire to have this change made from any personal considerations. But some matters have come to my attention that have influenced me in taking the position I have, and I do it in entire good nature and with kindly feeling toward the Committee on Appropriations, every member of which, I trust, is my friend, the great ability of the membership of that committee being recognized to no greater extent by any other member of this body than by myself.

In the last Congress it became my duty to secure legislation overruling a matter that became a law of Congress on an appropriation bill. A certain class of pensioners of the United States who chanced to be resident temporarily or otherwise in foreign countries were denied their pensions, and it was done by the insertion of a clause on an appropriation bill. A poor old woman, whose husband had died in Andersonville, wrote me from Ireland, saying that she had been receiving $12 a month, and that her pension was denied her by the Government of the United States. I thought it was an outrage, and I took steps to have the statute corrected, and it was corrected, and those people are just as much entitled to pensions as any others.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Was that provision put on at the instance of the Senate committee?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know whether it was or not; but it was on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TELLER. I think the Senator ought to know before he charges it on the Committee on Appropriations. As I understand, it was put on in the other House.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am making no charge against any committee or any member of a committee. The Senate Committee on Appropriations could have eliminated that from the appropriation bill. There is no question about that. The Senator from Colorado will not put me in the position of unkindly or unjustly criticising the Committee on Appropriations on this subject. I propose to do nothing of the kind.

Mr. TELLER. My recollection of that provision is that it came from the House Committee on Pensions and was put on the pension appropriation bill there.

Mr. GALLINGER. The House Committee on Pensions has not charge of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. TELLER. But it was suggested by and came from the Pension Committee of the House, which was hostile, perhaps, to some extent.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suppose the Senator means the Invalid Pension Committee. In the House there are two Pension Committees.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know what it is called there. The provision did not come from the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not charging that it came from the Senate. I simply say it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and it was an outrage.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly. I will yield to any Senator for any reasonable question.

Mr. HALE. The question I want to ask is this: The Senator has just said he was simply charging that legislation got on appropriation bills coming from somewhere. I ask the Senator, then—and I know he will give me a candid answer—does he think if the pension appropriation bill should be committed to the Pension Committee that there would be less legislation upon it than there is now or more?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will be candid with the Senator in making my reply, and say that possibly there might be more, but it would be fair legislation. It would not be legislation robbing the widows of men who lost their lives in defense of their country of the paltry pensions they were receiving. The Pension Committee would see that no such legislation as that should become a law if they could prevent it, I can assure the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Then the complaint that the Committee on Appropriations puts legislative items on the appropriation bills falls, and it is only said that other committees in putting on legislation might put on more, but would put on what they thought was right. It is a fact that to the present pension appropriation bill there were three separate and distinctive changes of the law proposed by the Committee on Pensions. The Appropriations Committee considered that those were matters that the Pension Committee should deal with; that, strictly speaking, it ought to report separate bills covering those items, and not load the appropriation bills with them. I have no doubt, if the pension appropriation bill goes to the Senator's committee, that every item of pension legislation that is sought to be enacted will be put upon the pension appropriation bill, upon the theory that an appropriation bill will go through and the legislation will remain on it, and that in that way new legislation will be railroaded through.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator does the Committee on Pensions gross injustice in making that statement. I take it that the Committee on Pensions is composed of equally as honorable and sensible men as any other committee of this body.

Mr. HALE. It certainly is.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Senator misstates the fact when he says that the Committee on Pensions recommended three distinct items of legislation on the pension appropriation bill. They did nothing of the kind. The Committee on Pensions has taken no action on any item, so far as recommending that it should go on the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to conclude this sentence. I will say to the Senator from Maine that I was very courteously invited, in my individual capacity, to appear before the Committee on Appropriations by the distinguished chairman of that committee. I put before them three propositions, and submitted them to that committee, stating that if they saw their way clear to put them on the bill, I thought they would be in the interests of good legislation. The chairman of the committee I know will say, if he says anything, that I did not urge them upon that committee, and did not say that I thought the committee ought to put them on.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly I was mistaken in saying that they had the formal indorsement of the Pension Committee. On reflection, aside from the testimony of the Senator from New Hampshire, I do not think they had that formal indorsement, but they came to the committee through the channel of the Senate, and, it was understood, represented the views of the Senator from New Hampshire, who is the chairman and the organ of that committee, and they had the same force that they would have had if the committee itself had reported them and sent them to the Senate. I do not think the record in any way shows that the committee itself did that.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a new proposition that the individual act of a Senator binds the committee of which he chances to be chairman. Those amendments did not even go through the regular channel of the Senate. They were taken to the committee in my hand. They never were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator any doubt that his committee is in favor of them?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not sure whether it is or not. The amendments have never been submitted to the committee.

Mr. HALE. They were considered by our committee as representing through the chairman its expression, and we supposed that if they were not reported on the bill the Senator, as chairman of the committee, would move them as amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. It may be possible that I will do so. I shall exercise my rights under the rules of this body to do about that what I think is proper. If the amendments do not get the concurrence of a majority of this body, of course they will not go on the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to say a word, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. With respect to those amendments I will state that the attention of the Committee on Appropriations was called to them because they had been offered and considered in the other House. I called upon the chairman of the Committee on Pensions and asked him kindly to examine them and express his opinion to our committee respecting the utility or importance of inserting them in the bill. He subsequently stated to me that he had examined them and that he would put the amendments in form, in order that we might have them in hand should we consider it wise to consider them afterwards.

Having done that, I called the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to those amendments as respects their merits and the propriety of yielding to the Committee on Pensions if they desired to offer them. I believe that some of those provisions are wise and ought to be inserted, perhaps, in some bill at this session. So I acquit the Senator from New Hampshire of any special desire about the matter. I think I am as much involved in it as he is, and perhaps a little more, because I called his attention to it.

I wish to say a few words more, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield for a moment further.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. The provision on the pension appropriation act of some years ago which excluded persons residing abroad from the benefit of the pensions allotted to them was inserted in the House of Representatives and was upon the bill when it appeared in the Senate. It was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, and there was a divided opinion there respecting it, a majority, I think, believing that the provision should stand as it appeared in the bill when it came from the House. I have not had time just now to examine into the question as to whether it was stricken out. I remember very well that it was debated in this body, and of course every Senator who was present when the bill was considered must have known of its provisions.

Having been in force a year or two, this body, I believe, unanimously voted to repeal it, perhaps on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. Of that I am not sure, however. But it was found to work an injustice to worthy people who resided abroad; and they not only have received pensions for the current years, but they have been paid the pensions of which they were deprived by that legislation. So I am sure that that should not be an argument pro or con respecting any matter now under consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have but an added word to contribute to this discussion, having said more than I intended to say when I rose, and that is to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that the Committee on Pensions, and we take this as an illustration, would load down the appropriation bill with new legislation.

I think I am not mistaken when I say that the Senator from Maine is always watchful of legislation in this body, and especially of appropriation bills, and any new legislation that that committee might propose on the pension appropriation bill would be obnoxious to a point of order, and the committee could not control the matter in the least degree. So I think that suggestion falls of its own weight and ought not to influence any Senator either in his opinion on this question or in the casting of his vote.

I believe that a division of appropriation bills, a division of responsibility, should be made in the Senate. I am sure that it will conduce to a better feeling, that it will satisfy to a much larger degree than heretofore the membership of this body, and that the controversy that is raging over this matter to-day will, in the light of subsequent events, be seen to involve a proposition that is dictated by every consideration of good legislation, by every consideration of fair play, and by every consideration of good sense, so far as this body is concerned.

That is all I care to say about the matter. I shall be content whatever the decision of the Senate may be. If the Committee on Appropriations desire to retain the appropriation bill which will come to the committee of which I am chairman, provided this resolution is adopted, they have only to make a request of me and, so far as I am concerned, I shall be very glad to place it in their hands, with its one hundred and forty-odd million dollars, thus swelling the amount that will go to the regular Committee on Appropriations far beyond that which will be distributed to all the other committees of the Senate. That, perhaps, would satisfy the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who dwelt with so much emphasis upon the fact that the Committee on Appropriations, under the provisions of the resolution, will be intrusted with a less amount of appropriations than properly belongs to them.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to the discussion just at this point. Perhaps what I have to say will come in more appropriately in connection with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] who has just taken his seat than at any other time.

My attention was first called to what seemed to me a strange condition in the Senate in the matter of our referring appropriation bills to one committee; and the circumstance I shall state. I will relate an instance of my own. Once when we were considering the District appropriation bill we came to an item of labor for certain employees of the District of Columbia who were then receiving but $25 per month. I felt anxious that their salaries should be increased so as to correspond with the character of the work they were doing, and I proposed an amendment of that character.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Kansas yield to me for a moment when it suits his convenience?

Mr. PEFFER. I will yield now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to correct the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. They both stated that the provision on the pension appropriation bill to which I alluded came from the House of Representatives. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that it was inserted by the Senate committee as an amendment to the appropriation bill as it came from the House.

Mr. PEFFER. I proposed an amendment to the bill to increase the salaries of those employees of the District of Columbia, and a point of order was made against it that my proposed amendment had not been considered by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

During the progress of the discussion on that bill I found a number of other cases like mine. That is the constant practice during the consideration of appropriation bills, and points of order are made upon Senators for the reason that their proposed amendments have not been considered by the appropriate committee. The force of this suggestion lies in the fact that it is expected that all of these different matters, where it is proposed to amend an appropriation bill, shall be referred to the appropriate committee. That being true, why would it not be better to refer the whole bill in the beginning to the appropriate committee?

Take the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. How easy, how natural, how simple, how appropriate in every way it would be for any Senator to go directly to that committee at any time before the bill is reported and in person submit his wish, whatever it may be, to the committee. It would save a great deal of trouble and a great deal of inconvenience and annoyance, as well as difficulty, when the bill gets into the Senate.

I only wish to add, in this rambling way, that the point I desire to present to the Senate now is that if in the matter of submitting amendments we are expected to refer our amendments first to the appropriate committee, it seems to me it would be better to refer the whole subject in the beginning to the appropriate committee; for that reason I am in favor of the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to correct the statement I just made. By inadvertence I got possession of a copy of the wrong bill, and I will state that undoubtedly the statement made by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Colorado was correct in

regard to the matter of legislation on the appropriation bill to which I referred in my remarks.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Virginia will yield to me long enough to say a word.

Mr. DANIEL. With pleasure.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate reported an amendment repealing that provision.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, it has been well said by a leading writer on finance that the fisc is the state. When a committee of thirteen is charged by a large legislative body with the distribution of $400,000,000, involving all the departments of Government and the fiscal affairs of 70,000,000 people, it can hardly be doubted that such a committee of this body is almost, if not quite, the Senate. Modern legislation has been called government by committees. It is necessarily so. The affairs of modern life move so rapidly, are so correlated and complicated, population has so increased that ex necessitate what is done by a committee is in nine cases out of ten determinative of the question.

Most heartily, Mr. President, do I approve of the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. It involves, in my judgment, an important, a most excellent legislative reform. I regretted to hear the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] refer to the proposition as a censure upon the committee, of which he is so useful and so honored a member. He does injustice to himself by that remark. He does injustice to his committee and to its able, faithful, and accomplished chairman by that remark. He does equal injustice to his colleagues, who have not the slightest desire to reflect upon any of the gentlemen who compose that committee, but who, upon the contrary, regard them, one and all, with the greatest respect. But because they regard this committee of thirteen with that respect which is due their character, their public services, and the ability they have demonstrated upon this floor is no reason why they should not also regard with respect the whole body of which they are members and diffuse that respect with equal confidence among those who are the peers of the gentlemen of this thirteen committee.

Mr. President, this movement is an evolution as necessary and as inevitable as almost any of the evolutions in the change of rules of modern legislative bodies. When there were only 13 States in the Union a committee of this size would have had a member from each State, and every section would have been properly and fully represented in the distribution of the money of the people. Taxation and representation must go together, according to the very bedrock definition of republican government. Taxation and representation are divorced from each other when a few men distribute its proceeds and the many are given but little voice therein.

Fourteen general appropriation bills come before this body, and they involve in the aggregate nearly $400,000,000 of public money. There is more than one general appropriation bill for each gentleman on the Committee on Appropriations. In the nature of man, in the limitations of his physical and mental being, it is utterly impossible, it never has been and it never can be, that 13 men, however wise, however gifted, or however diligent, can sift thoroughly the enormous body of fiscal literature that is dumped upon them in the closing months of a legislative session To attempt to do it would be to organize failure. Nor do I imagine that it is attempted. The Senators who constitute that committee are gentlemen of too mature intellect, of too enlarged experience, to attempt it. Out of the necessity of the case the 14 appropriation bills must be divided up and handed over to subcommittees of one or two or three, and the ultima ratio of the system is that two or three gentlemen, a subcommittee, give the cast and character to the measures that come before the committee and the Senate, which it is almost impossible greatly to modify or to change afterwards.

The gentlemen who constitute the Appropriations Committee are Senators of such service, of such experience, and of such leading character in this body that we can not afford to dispense with their services altogether from other departments than those which involve appropriations. If you will look at the list of committees you will observe, for instance, that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is second upon the Committee on Appropriations, is also second on the Naval Affairs Committee and is chairman of the Committee on Printing. In either one of the departments of the administration of this body outside of appropriations he would have enough in other committee duties to absorb the intellect of any well-equipped statesman. Therefore, sir, he must surrender his attention to some one or all these appropriation bills, and to whom can he better surrender them than to the committees of this body, constituted of gentlemen who, like himself, represent equal States and entitled to have an equal voice in the distribution of the public money?

Mr. President, it goes without saying that it is fairer to the body to give, as far as may be within the limits of possible administration, an equal opportunity to every Senator to pass upon the matter of appropriations. It was well said by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] in his philosophical and logical remarks that it is also appropriate to divide the responsibility. What Senator upon this floor who is not upon the Committee on Appropriations can feel that he is properly chargeable with responsibility for the aggregate appropriations of this body? He has small concern in saying what they shall be, nor can he be permitted to say anything until in the closing days of the session, when there is a perfect ice gorge of measures contending for precedence before this body and when the Appropriations Committee comes in and is accorded precedence and dominates the whole theater of legislative action.

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate longer. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] yesterday said that he hoped we would settle this question now. I say amen to that proposition. I hope it may be settled to-day. I believe the great majority of this body feel that this proposed change is in the interest of the fair and unsectional administration of the public business. Let me point out one single fact in respect to the Committee on Appropriations. There is not a single Senator from the Maryland line to the Rio Grande upon the Appropriations Committee. There is not a single Senator from a cotton State—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—upon the Committee on Appropriations. An immense empire of this Union, deeply concerned in all of these fiscal matters, and in the distribution of $400,000,000, has not a hand in the Senate to assist, from the local standpoint, in shaping them.

Mr. GRAY. Is not the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] upon the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir; but Florida is not in the region I mentioned. The distinguished Senator from Florida represents a region entirely distinctive in its geographical relation and in the nature of its products. It is not a cotton State. It is as separate and distinct from the great region of country that stretches from the Potomac to the Rio Grande as would be one of the New England States, because it is a State that juts out into the Gulf of Mexico and is almost in the tropics.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending resolution, I repeat, not in any reflection upon my honored and distinguished colleagues, but Senators here can not feel that they ought to be held, or that they fairly are responsible for fiscal legislation as long as they are outsiders to that legislation, and have not the fair and full opportunity to participate in a just share of molding it.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, before we make this change in the rules I think we ought properly to understand what the rules exactly are, and what are the functions of the different committees. I know of nothing now that prevents any committee of this body from formulating a general appropriation bill. What reason is there why the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may not now report a bill to this body embodying all the expenditures for agricultural purposes without the proposed change? Why is not this also true of the Military Committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the other committees, unless you construe the language of the existing rule "all general appropriations" to mean that a bill introduced here relating to appropriations for the Department of Agriculture must go not to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but to the Committee on Appropriations? Such has not been the construction of the rule. This rule refers to the appropriations coming from the other House. The general appropriation bills that come here are referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Why? Because the committees having charge of agricultural expenses, of military expenses, of naval expenses in the House of Representatives have already considered, in the course of their business, all the items of appropriations that come to the Committee on Appropriations, except those referred to by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], which are permanent in their nature and fixed in the law. That is the theory of the reference of the appropriations to the Committee on Appropriations and is the reason why they are referred in the Senate to one committee. Is there any particular function now conferred upon that committee except to gather together the total amount of the appropriation in the different bills in order that the total amount of appropriations may be confined within the revenue of the Government and some supervision be had over the entire amount of appropriations?

Now, that is nothing more than a summing up of the total appropriations made in any one Congress by the two Houses, coming to us for final decision. Is that a function to be safely dispensed with? Is it a useless one, that some committee of this body shall be charged with ascertaining before it shall become a law that the total amount of the appropriations are within the revenues of the Government and adequate to their purpose? It seems to me that this is a function that can not be safely dispensed with in any legislative body.

As to the idea that the Committee on Appropriations are charged with the entire business of Congress, if it be so, amend your rules in that respect and change the power of that committee so that

it will not be enabled to exercise the functions of any other committee. But, Mr. President, if that be so, it is because the different committees of this body charged specially with the consideration of the expenditures of the several Departments, as of naval affairs, and military affairs, and judicial affairs, have failed to examine into the subject and perform the duties belonging to them. They have the power and are constituted to supervise, appropriate for, and conduct all the business relating to those committees; and this amendment will do no more, when it shall have been passed, than confer upon them that authority and dispense with any final examination of the total amount of appropriations. That is all the function it will have.

I sympathize entirely with the idea, and have repeatedly so stated in the Senate, that every member of this body should have an equal and fair connection with the important business of this body. I sympathize with the idea that the apportionment of business among the committees and the number of Senators on the important committees are not what they might be and what they should be; but are you improving that condition when you confine to a small number of this body, a few here and there, and upon one committee, the entire recommendations and supervision of the appropriations for the subjects belonging to that committee? Is it not true that the Committee on Pensions, for instance, being particularly interested in the subject of pensions, should have some other committee to examine the appropriations for pensions amounting to $140,000,000? Is it not true that the Committee on Naval Affairs, being particularly interested and prejudiced in favor of expenditures of that class, should have its appropriation of money submitted to some other committee before it becomes a law, to supervise its judgment in these matters? Is it not true of each of the committees that its members naturally become especially and unduly interested in appropriations relating to matters referred to that committee?

Shall we then refuse in the appropriations of this vast amount of money to have a separate committee to ascertain that when these different committees, which now have plenary authority to pass bills and appropriate money to any extent they see fit, the Senate sanctioning it, that before that is done their judgment should be supervised by some other committee? If you choose, make it as large as you please, and let every State have a member upon it; but that function should not be entirely taken away; and that the work of these committees should not be final and undergo no kind of examination by some committee which has to report to this body and bring to their attention the fact that these different committees have appropriated a sum of money greater than the revenues of the Government or inadequate to its necessary uses is a fact that ought not to be entirely disregarded. Each committee comes here with its appropriation bill and appropriates a specific amount of money. Another committee certainly ought to collect all these bills and report on their aggregate amount, with such recommendations as may be proper.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Has not the Committee on Appropriations, as now organized, been reporting more appropriations than the amount of the revenues of the Government for several years?

Mr. CALL. That is a question that has nothing to do with what I am talking about. It has nothing to do with the organization of committees.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator says he is opposed to the other system because they may do it. Your committee, I understand, has already done it.

Mr. CALL. I will answer the Senator by saying that whatever may be the revenues of the Government in late years, owing to the public policy, is not a question now to be considered in this connection.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator brought it in.

Mr. CALL. Not for that purpose. There has been a deficiency in the appropriations every year of from $8,000,000 to $13,000,000. Even when the Senate has increased the House appropriations, as it has been obliged to do because of the necessities of the public service, every year there has been a deficiency of from $8,000,000 to $13,000,000 in the amount required to meet the expenses of the Government under existing law.

There has been a great deal of talk here about the action of the other House, and whether the action of the House in distributing the appropriation bills had increased appropriations or not. It has increased appropriations, and notwithstanding that, when a bill comes to the Senate and the public service requires an enlargement of these appropriations, a deficiency every year of from $8,000,000 to $13,000,000 has been reported, and deficiency bills passed. So it will be seen to be very apparent that even with the existing system of massing the appropriations and bringing them to the attention of Congress there has been a failure to meet the exigencies of the public service. And how much greater will it be when there is no consideration of that point whatever?

If we want to reform the service of the Senate, let it not be done by giving to a junta—three or four upon the Committee on Agriculture, or the Committee on Indian Affairs, or the Committee on Military Affairs, or, say, seven out of the largest committees—of seven persons to go through the whole subject of the appropriations for the department to which the work of that committee relates. Let us increase the important committees of this body, if you choose to refer appropriation bills to them when introduced in the Senate or coming from the other House. As I said, it is now perfectly competent for the Senator from Virginia upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a bill covering every item of possible expenditure in that department, and so it is of the Committee on Finance, and of every other committee of this body. It can now, under existing law and the construction of the rules, report bills covering all the items of appropriations to be made for the subjects committed to that committee.

But if you are going to amend the rule, let it be so amended that when these bills have been passed upon by the special committees, having undergone their examination, they shall come to some committee of this body, a new one if you choose, but that somewhere there shall be a function that shall say the total amount of the bill for agriculture, of the bill for naval affairs, for military affairs, for diplomatic affairs, or judicial expenses is either in excess of the revenue or inadequate to these expenditures, and let that matter be brought to the notice of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me ask the Senator from Florida a question. Does not every Senator see that statement in the estimates of the Department, and can not the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, go through that revision?

Mr. CALL. I heartily agree with the Senator that we had better wipe out all these committees. I do not agree in the government of committees. I think the English Parliament, that transacts its business in committee of the whole, is far better for legislation. But if you are to have committees and are to commit the judicial expenses to a few, and the diplomatic expenses to a half dozen Senators, and the naval affairs, and so on, let there be some function somewhere in this body that shall say the whole of these bills amount to such a sum, either above or below the revenues of the Government. That is what the Committee on Appropriations was created for. It was to take the total amount of the appropriations and to show to the Senate where they should be diminished and where increased. For what purpose? That they might be within the revenues of the Government, and for that purpose alone. And that, on the other hand, they may be adequate to the necessary expenses of the Government.

Objection has been made to the manner in which points of order are raised by that committee. Amend your rules, but let it not be that nowhere, if you are to have committees in this body, shall there be a committee—a regular committee—and the Senators on it responsible to ascertain what is the total amount of the appropriations made by these several committees. But the resolution of the Senator from Idaho and the observations of the Senator from Virginia require that each committee shall report the appropriation bill, and the bill shall become a law when so reported, because these committees are the body that will act finally upon the appropriation bills in committee of conference. All these committees will then have their appropriations perfected without any inquiry by this body as to the total amount of the appropriations, and it can not but be otherwise, since each committee must report separately, and each bill must be considered separately and become a law separately.

The resolution of the Senator from Idaho as it stands requires that not more than seven men upon each of these committees shall finally recommend, and that the same point of order and the same absolute processes shall exist as to the appropriations by the different committees, and that there shall be no understanding on the part of this body until the last bill shall be passed as to what has been appropriated and what are their relations to the revenues of the Government.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall offer, when the proper time comes, the amendment which I have before me here.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, just a moment. I do not intend to restate the reasons urged yesterday why the resolution of the Senator from Idaho should be passed. I simply desire to reply briefly to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. It is not the first time that I have differed from him in regard to a question of parliamentary law. I recollect a short time since when I introduced a resolution I was immediately met with an objection by the Senator from Maine that it was absolutely out of order. I asked him to point out the rule. He said he would point it out. It has not yet been pointed out. He asserted to-day that the Committee on Appropriations has had no power to increase the salary of any official of the Government. I ask now what rule

prevents it. I assert the contrary to be the case. I assert that the Committee on Appropriations has the power to increase the salary of any official of the Government except those whose compensation is fixed by the Constitution, if there is any such provision in the Constitution.

Mr. HARRIS. It has the power?

Mr. HILL. I mean the power to report, and that it can not be knocked out upon any technicality. That is the point I make. I hold in my hand an appropriation which increased the salary, among others, of our minister to Mexico. I hold in my hand further the report of a conference committee showing that the salary of the financial clerk of this body was increased $500 by the conferees of the two Houses. Gentlemen say it was done by unanimous consent. Unanimous consent has a great deal to answer for in the Senate, but it is not answerable for that. The report is made; the report is carried; there is not any question of unanimous consent about it. It is put to a vote.

I hold in my hand, further, five pages of increases and deductions of salaries. I am not going to detain the Senate by reading it. I am going to adopt the usual course by asking that it be inserted as an appendix to my remarks. It shows that it is the uniform course of the committee to increase or reduce salaries as they see fit.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New York where those instances are found.

Mr. HILL. In statements of appropriations compiled under the direction of the clerks of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses.

Mr. HOAR. Were they proposed by the committee?

Mr. HALE entered the Chamber.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Maine is now here, so it is not necessary for me to interpose any further. However, I ask, were those amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Salaries were increased and salaries were diminished.

Mr. HOAR. In what? Who did it? Who made the first proposition for it? Who put it on the bill?

Mr. HILL. Where did it arise?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not quite comprehend the Senator's inquiry?

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator will comprehend the force of the inquiry if I state to him the point I had in mind. As I understood the Senator from Maine, he claimed that it was not in order for the Committee on Appropriations, under the rules of this body, to report an amendment to an appropriation bill providing for an increase of salary, on the ground, I suppose, that the permanent salary of an official is general law and that you can not change a general law in that way. Now, it is no answer to that proposition to say that in an appropriation bill brought here from the other House there is found an increase of salary. Undoubtedly the House of Representatives can make any proposition in order that they choose and put it on a bill and send it here. We are limited under our rules in that matter. But I shall not undertake to interfere.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Maine if he desires to make a statement.

Mr. HALE. Here is an instance right in point. In the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which is on the table, and which I hope will be taken up when this matter is finished, the House has placed an increase of salary for an officer in the Department of Justice. I suppose the point the Senator from Massachusetts sought to make, and did make, I thought, very clearly, was that when the Senator from New York reads the list of increases of salary where they arose is a matter to be considered, because if the increases of salary did arise in the House, where almost all the bills are in charge of the several committees, that of itself is an argument why the appropriation bills should not be submitted to the several committees of the Senate, who would undoubtedly aggrandize their own Departments. It is not possible——

Mr. HILL. Unquestionably they were regarded as appropriate and proper, because they were sanctioned by the Committee on Appropriations of this body. It does not lie, therefore, in the mouth of the Senator from Maine or that committee to say that the House was the party that erred. It matters not, if they were distinctive appropriations, in which House they originated. Does the Senator mean to say that the Committee on Appropriations has not within even the last two years reported from its committee any item of increase of salary?

Mr. HALE. I said this——

Mr. HILL. That is the question I ask the Senator. Does the Senator say that?

Mr. HALE. No; I will repeat what I said. It is impossible to remember everything. I do not say it can not be found, but I do not recollect an instance where the Senate committee reported increases of salary, and yet it may be possible that in looking over the hundreds of items we have done so. I know that is the rule the Senate committee sticks to, in and out of season, and while it may not have been followed in special cases, that I do not remember. That is the proposition.

Mr. HOAR. Such an amendment would have been liable to a point of order.

Mr. HALE. It would have been liable at any time to a point of order. Now, I will state the trouble about increases, and I suppose the Senator can see it. A committee that has only one Department under its charge, seeking to aggrandize that Department, necessarily will swell its appropriations and increase them. I know myself, from service on other committees, the tendency and inclination. The appropriations for the Agricultural Department have been from year to year swollen and increased almost entirely by the Agricultural Committee of the other House, which has charge of that appropriation bill. It sees nothing but that one Department.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And when the question comes to a conference committee members of the Appropriations Committee of this body meet the representatives of the Agricultural Committee of the other House, do they not?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. If appropriations are proper they should of course be concurred in; there is no question about that. I have not gone through this list to find what particular appropriations originated with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. When conferees representing the two bodies meet to confer upon any bill, there has to be an adjustment. You can not get all that you want; you have to give up some things. The very object of a conference committee is to confer, to arrange a compromise, to come together, and any committee, whether it be the Appropriations Committee or the several committees referred to, will have to do that. But the thing that will swell appropriations will be the initiative in putting them on appropriation bills, whether in the House or in the Senate. The Senator will find that as certainly as he lives, and it will be worse in the Senate, where the rules are not so strict as they are in the House.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from New York permit me?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, if he chooses to answer, if he remembers an appropriation bill that ever went out of the Senate carrying as small an amount as it carried when it came to the Senate?

Mr. HALE. That really goes to the bottom of this whole question. The bills from the House are almost always increased, I will not say all, but largely, by the pressure in the Senate against the Committee on Appropriations to put items on that the committee has disagreed to, and that is where the trouble is. That is at the bottom of this whole business, and the fault found with the Committee on Appropriations is that it does not stick in conference to the increases that are put on in the Senate, and there is a feeling that the several committees, if they can get these appropriation bills and can manage them themselves, will stick better than the Senate conferees taken from the Committee on Appropriations do, and will thus get increased appropriations. I want to give an instance. The last naval appropriation bill passed at a time when we were rapidly coming to a condition of almost bankruptcy. It was taken by the Committee on Appropriations. The Naval Committee itself was overruled, and the House overruled, and while we gave a respectable addition to the Navy and continued the desirable work of building it, we did cut down several million dollars, because we did not believe that we could make so large a gun as was proposed. That is not the only case, but that occurs to me at the present time.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from New York, who is entitled to the floor, will permit me a moment, there is that one lone example in our legislation; but I fail to see the pertinency of the argument of the Senator from Maine when he arraigns the Appropriations Committee of the House for extravagance and says it is because the appropriation bills are divided among the several committees, when the fact remains that those very bills which he says are extravagant are almost invariably increased by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not follow the Senator in that line of discussion, because I do not intend to argue in regard to the general merits of this controversy. The only point I desired to make when I rose was that salaries are increased by the action of the Appropriations Committee.

I call attention to another argument upon this precise point.

It has been well said that there will be a division of responsibility if this resolution shall pass. There will also be a division of power.

The Appropriations Committee can, of its own volition, increase any appropriation already contained in an appropriation bill, and yet when the bill is reported to the Senate and is under consideration, if a Senator rises in his place and moves to increase an appropriation, he does not stand upon a parity with any member of that committee, or rather with the whole committee. The whole committee can do what the Senate itself can not do, what the whole Senate can not do at that particular time. Then the point is made that the amendment must first have the action of some appropriate committee. I indorse the argument of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER]. We refer the amendment to the particular committee having charge of the general subject-matter for its approval in the first instance, and then refer it to the Appropriations Committee, but the other committee might as well have control of the subject in the first place.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not mean to be wrong, but he is wrong in his statement.

Mr. HILL. I think I am not wrong.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is wrong in the statement that the Appropriations Committee, or any member of it, or all of its members as a body, have any superior right in changing a law over any Senator on the floor. If the Appropriations Committee reports a change of existing law it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HILL. I am not now speaking of a change of existing law. We have disposed of that question. I am speaking of an increase of appropriations, and I suggest that the Appropriations Committee has greater power over the matter than the whole Senate itself.

Mr. HALE. Would not each committee have the same power if the appropriation bills were distributed?

Mr. HILL. But then the power would be diversified. That is the point. There would be a division not only of responsibility, but of power, which we are seeking here. The doctrine of the Senator from Maine is that the wisdom of a part is greater than the wisdom of the whole Senate. I do not believe it.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from New York and the Senator from Maine allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. It is simply this: It has been ruled from that chair a hundred times or more since I have been a member of this body that the Committee on Appropriations has no more right to increase an item of appropriation in a bill or furnish a new item of appropriation that does not fall within the strict rules of the Senate than has any individual Senator.

Mr. HILL. After the bill is reported to the Senate, that is so.

Mr. HARRIS. Nor is its report exempt from a point of order. I have seen the question of order made upon reports of committees, not only reports of the Committee on Appropriations, but of the various committees of this body, and the Senate itself has never hesitated to rule that the committee as a committee must bring itself within the rule of the body before it can increase or put a new item in an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Tennessee allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HILL. Allow me to first ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. Does the Senator from Tennessee mean to say that when the Committee on Appropriations reports an appropriation bill with a proposed amendment increasing an appropriation that the point of order can be made upon it in the Senate?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely, unless the appropriation falls within the rules. which restrict the rights of every Senator upon the floor.

Mr. HILL. There are no rules, Mr. President, to affect it at all. I say there is not a single member of that committee who will question but what they have the right to bring in an appropriation bill, and with it a recommendation for an increase, and a point of order can not be made against it, whereas if any other Senator upon this floor rises in his place and moves an amendment it is subject to the point of order. That is absolutely so.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from New York allow me to make one suggestion? I understand that the report of a committee is nothing more nor less than a motion, and a report of a committee proposing an amendment has no higher or other validity or importance than the same amendment moved by any individual Senator, with the single exception, which is created by the rule, that it shall not be in order for Senators to move a certain class of amendments which have not been previously approved by a committee of the body.

Mr. HALE. Or the estimate of a Department.

Mr. HOAR. Yes; but that is another matter. If the Committee on Appropriations came in here with a unanimous recommendation that an appropriation bill be increased in a certain way or amended in a certain way, that amendment would have exactly the same force, authority, and place in the Senate as if it were the single motion of the Senator from New York or of myself, and no more.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that he is mistaken.

Mr. HALE and Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is not mistaken.

Mr. HILL. I think he is; and for the reason that it then would be claimed that the committee itself had passed upon it, and the Appropriations Committee, being itself a standing committee, its action would have the same effect as if the question had been passed upon by any other committee. Therefore I say, stating my proposition again, that when an ordinary appropriation which comes from the House of Representatives goes to the Appropriations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee simply increase it, not to increase a salary, but to increase something else, it is not subject to the point of order. Does not the Senator agree to that?

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest just what I understand to be the law, and just what is the practice. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, no matter what it reports, and no matter what passes by unanimous consent——

Mr. HILL. Can not the Senator state whether he agrees with the proposition I have just stated?

Mr. HALE. I do not. I agree with the proposition stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and I do not think the Senator from New York quite understands it.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Florida on my right [Mr. CALL] says I am right, and I stand by him.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from New York is altogether mistaken. [Laughter.] The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Massachusetts say exactly the same thing, but the Senator from New York denies it in so many words as soon as he has admitted it.

There is no difference between the Committee on Appropriations or any member of that committee and any other committee of this body in reference to the rules.

Mr. HILL. That is not the question.

Mr. CALL. Yes; that is the question, and that is the only question there is in your whole discussion. The Committee on Appropriations, or the members of that committee, stand precisely in the relation that any other committee or the members of any other committee do in regard to the rules.

Mr. HALE. There is a general idea, Mr. President, that the Committee on Appropriations has the right of itself to increase an appropriation in a bill that comes from the other House. It can only increase such appropriations in two ways. The one must be by an estimate from the head of a Department sent in by the Treasury Department as an estimate, and the other by the approval of a standing committee of the body. That is precisely the situation of an appropriation bill after it is reported here. There is not a single clause that the Committee on Appropriations puts upon these bills which can not be moved by a Senator on the floor under precisely the same rule. That is not generally understood; but that is the scope and the limitation of the Committee on Appropriations. Any Senator may rise in his seat at any time on any provision reported by the Committee on Appropriations and ask if that has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury as an estimate, or if it has received the sanction of a standing committee of this body; and if it has not, it will fall. That is not generally done, but it is because in the way of doing business here Senators do not interpose, and it goes along, but every right, I assure the Senator, which the Committee on Appropriations has as a body is enjoyed by every Senator on the floor under the rules.

Mr. HILL. I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that the rule does not say that the amendment shall have been recommended by some other committee. The Committee on Appropriations is one of the standing committees of this body. The very fact of reporting the amendment is an adoption of it by one of the standing committees of the body. I ask the Senator's attention further, and ask if he can give a single instance in this body, does he recollect one, where that point of order has ever been made in the Senate against any increase of appropriation? I mean a simple increase, not involving the other question about the increase of salary.

Mr. HALE. I will tell the Senator, and I think he himself will recollect it. The point that the Appropriations Committee may, by adopting an amendment, make it in order because it is a standing committee like any other, has never been settled. There are old Senators here, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] and others, who have never assented to that proposition, and it is my belief that in that regard the Committee on Appropriations is on an equality, but no more, with any other committee, and that it has the same power.

Mr. HILL. Then the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. HALE. That question has never been settled in the parliamentary law of the Senate. On the contrary, there have been rulings the other way.

Mr. HILL. When?

Mr. HALE. That the clause must refer when it speaks of an increase of an annual appropriation to the action of some other committee than the Committee on Appropriations. I do not agree to that.

Mr. HILL. I agree now with the Senator from Maine, and I think I have looked up the question a little.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to read the rule?

Mr. HILL. I have the rule before me. I think we are all familiar with it.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator does not seem to be familiar with it.

Mr. HILL. I will allow the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Colorado to fight it out between themselves.

Mr. HALE. I thought the Senator had taken his seat, and I took the floor. There is no question between us.

Mr. HILL. I nave not finished yet.

There does not seem to be any disagreement about it now. The Senator says the question has not been decided by anybody lately.

Mr. HALE. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. But he is inclined to agree with me that the Appropriations Committee, so far as this question is concerned, stands the same as any other committee when an amendment is reported, and it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HALE. It has no more right than any other committee. That is what I called attention to.

Mr. HILL. One right at a time. Let us decide that question first.

Mr. HALE. But the Senator and I can not decide that question. Some of the oldest parliamentarians in the body do not quite agree as to what the Senator and I think is right; but admitting that the Committee on Appropriations has only the same right that any other committee has, any Senator on the floor has the right, on the recommendation of any standing committee, when a bill is pending reported from the Appropriations Committee, to move his amendment, and it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. HILL. We come right back to the point from which we started, namely, that by the change proposed in this resolution there arises a division of power. That is the point involved, and that is the utility of it, that one committee does not have the whole say upon this subject. That is the value of the resolution, that the divers committees can have their say, and we do not have to depend upon one committee.

I simply rose to discuss the question of order, the parliamentary status of the question, and shall not detain the Senate further, because I think we all understand it, with the exception that I desire to add to my remarks a list of the appropriations increasing and reducing the appropriations to which I have referred.

The paper referred to is as follows:

Offices the salaries of which have been increased, with the amount of such increase, and offices the salaries of which have been reduced, with the amount of such reduction. Fifty-first Congress, first session.

[The amount extended in each case of increase or reduction is for one year unless indicated otherwise in the text.]

	Salaries increased.		Salaries reduced.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL.				
(By the legislative appropriation act, pages 83 to 123, inclusive.)				
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.				
Female attendant in ladies' retiring room, from $600 to $720	1	$120.00		
Laborers known as cloakroom men, from $50 per month during the session, 4 months, to $600 per annum	6	2,400.00		
Total, House of Representatives	7	2,520.00		
EXECUTIVE OFFICE.				
Assistant secretary, from $2,250 to $2,500	1	250.00		
TREASURY DEPARTMENT.				
Office of the Secretary.				
Superintendent of paper room (division of loans and currency), from $1,600 to $1,200			1	$400.00
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.				
Superintendent, from $2,000 to $2,200 (reimbursable)	1	200.00		
Bureau of Statistics.				
Chief clerk, from $2,000 to $2,250	1	250.00		
Office of Director of the Mint.				
Helper, from $500 to $720	1	220.00		
Total, Treasury Department	3	670.00	1	400.00

Offices the salaries of which have been increased or reduced, etc.—Continued.

	Salaries increased.		Salaries reduced.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
NAVY DEPARTMENT.				
Office of the Secretary.				
Messenger boy, from $240 to $360	1	$120.00		
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.				
General Land Office.				
Commissioner of General Land Office, from $4,000 to $5,000	1	1,000.00		
Assistant Commissioner, from $3,000 to $3,500	1	500.00		
Principal clerks, from $1,800 to $2,000 each	3	600.00		
Total, General Land Office	5	2,100.00		
Patent Office.				
Principal examiners, from $2,400 to $2,500 each	30	3,000.00		
Surveyors-general.				
Surveyor-general for Oregon, from $1,800 to $2,000	1	200.00		
Total, Department of the Interior	36	5,300.00		
POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.				
Stenographer, office of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, from $1,400 to $1,600	1	200.00		
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.				
Chief clerk, from $2,200 to $2,500	1	300.00		
Clerk in charge of pardons, from $2,000 to $2,400	1	400.00		
Total, Department of Justice	2	700.00		
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.				
(By the Agricultural appropriation act, pages 5 to 11, inclusive.)				
Office of the Secretary.				
Engineer, from $1,400 to $1,600	1	200.00		
Assistant fireman, from $500 to $600	1	100.00		
Total, Office of the Secretary	2	300.00		
Division of accounts and disbursements.				
Chief of division and disbursing clerk, from $2,000 to $2,500	1	500.00		
Document and folding room.				
Superintendent, from $1,400 to $1,600	1	200.00		
Experiments in the manufacture of sugar.				
Additional temporary compensation to the chief chemist, payable from appropriation for experiments in the manufacture of sugar	1	500.00		
Total, Department of Agriculture	5	1,500.00		
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.				
(By the District of Columbia appropriation act, pages 32 to 50, inclusive.)				
Public schools.				
School teachers, from an average annual salary of $680 to $685 each	745	3,725.00		
Janitor, from $1,600 to $2,000	1	400.00		
Janitor, from $250 to $800	1	550.00		
Janitor, from $165 to $500	1	335.00		
Total, public schools	748	5,010.00		
Metropolitan police.				
Lieutenants, sergeants, and privates mounted, at $240 each; the number to whom such allowance may be made is increased from 25 to 30	5	$1,200.00		
For additional compensation for privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, the amount is increased from $1,440 for 1890 to $1,920 for 1891—an increase of $480.				
Total, District of Columbia	753	6,210.00		
SUNDRY CIVIL.				
(By the sundry civil appropriation act, pages 194 to 237, inclusive.)				
LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.				
Superintendent for the life-saving stations, etc., on the coasts of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, from $1,200 to $1,500	1	300.00		

Offices the salaries of which have been increased or reduced, etc.—Continued.

	Salaries increased.		Salaries reduced.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
CUSTOMS SERVICE.				
Surveyor for the port of Columbus, Ohio, from $900 and the usual fees to $1,000 and the usual fees (act March 13, 1890, page 331)	1	$100.00	-----	-----
Collector of customs for the Puget Sound district, Washington, from $1,000 and fees to $3,500 (act August 28, 1890, page 333)	1	2,500.00	-----	-----
Total, customs service	2	2,600.00	-----	-----
WASHINGTON MONUMENT.				
Attendant on floor, from $45 to $60 per month	1	180.00	-----	-----
Attendant on top floor, from $45 to $60 per month	1	180.00	-----	-----
Total, Washington Monument	2	360.00	-----	-----
ELEVENTH CENSUS.				
By the act approved Jan. 23, 1890, the minimum compensation of the supervisors of census, not exceeding 175 in number, authorized by the act to provide for taking the Eleventh and subsequent censuses, is increased from $500 to $1,000 each (page 451)	175	87,500.00	-----	-----
UNITED STATES COURTS.				
District attorneys of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, salary and the fees and emoluments of their office, from $3,500 to $6,000 each (act July 2, 1890, page 514)	2	5,000.00	-----	-----
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.				
(By the diplomatic and consular appropriation act, pages 21 to 31, inclusive.)				
Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Turkey, the Argentine Republic, and the United States of Colombia, from $7,500 to $10,000 each	3	7,500.00	-----	-----
Commercial agent at Boma, in the lower Congo Basin, from $4,000, including expenses, to $5,000, including expenses	1	1,000.00	-----	-----
Consul-general at Mexico, from $2,500 to $4,000	1	1,500.00	-----	-----
Consul-general at Vienna, from $3,000 to $3,500	1	500.00	-----	-----
Consul at Havre, France, from $3,000 to $3,500	1	500.00	-----	-----
Consul at Montevideo, Uruguay, from $2,000 to $3,000	1	1,000.00	-----	-----
Consul at Bordeaux, France, from $2,500 to $3,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Consul at Basle, Switzerland, from $2,000 to $3,000	1	1,000.00	-----	-----
Consul at Aix-la-Chapelle, Germany, from $1,500 to $2,500	1	1,000.00	-----	-----
Consul at Chemnitz, Germany, from $2,000 to $2,500	1	500.00	-----	-----
Consul at Stuttgart, Germany, from $1,500 to $2,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Clerk at consulate at Antwerp, from $800 to $1,500	1	700.00	-----	-----
Clerk at consulate at Shanghai, from $1,200 to $1,600	1	400.00	-----	-----
Clerk at consulate at Mexico, from $480 to $1,200	1	720.00	-----	-----
Clerk at consulate at Belfast, from $640 to $1,000	1	360.00	-----	-----
Clerk at consulate at Dundee, from $640 to $800	1	160.00	-----	-----
Total, diplomatic and consular service	18	17,840.00	-----	-----
MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.				
Additional pay to officer commanding military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $500 (Army appropriation act, page 14)	1	$500.00	-----	-----
George M. Wheeler, captain on the retired list of the Army, authorized to be appointed a major on the retired list, to date from July 23, 1888—increase from $2,100 to $2,625 (act September 27, 1890, page 432)	1	525.00	-----	-----
By the act approved September 29, 1890, it is provided "That whereas since the 1st day of January, 1886, certain officers of the Army, being at the time the senior officers in rank in their respective grades and under the provisions of section 1257, Revised Statutes, entitled to be promoted to vacancies then existent in the next higher grades, were nevertheless placed upon the retired list of the Army without such promotion; the President is hereby authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint all such officers to the respective grades to which they were severally entitled, to take rank and date from the several times when their respective rights to promotions to vacancies became established, and to place them on the retired list of the Army in the grades to which they are promoted" (act September 29, 1890, page 435).				
Total, military establishment, specific.	2	1,025.00	-----	-----

Offices the salaries of which have been increased or reduced, etc.—Continued.

	Salaries increased.		Salaries reduced.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.				
(By the naval appropriation act, pages 132 to 149, inclusive.)				
Bureau of Ordnance.				
Draftsman, from $1,545 to $1,600	1	$55.00	-----	-----
Bureau of Yards and Docks.				
Mail messengers, from $600 per annum to $2 per diem, including Sundays	4	520.00	-----	-----
Messenger, from $1.76 to $2 per diem	1	75.12	-----	-----
Mail messenger, from $2.74 per diem to $2 per diem, including Sundays	-----	-----	1	$270.10
Messengers, from $2.20 to $2 per diem	-----	-----	2	125.20
Quarterman, from $4 to $3 per diem	-----	-----	1	313.00
Total, Bureau of Yards and Docks	5	595.12	4	708.30
Naval Home.				
Chief cook, from $240 to $360	1	120.00	-----	-----
Assistant cook, from $168 to $240	1	72.00	-----	-----
Assistant cook, from $168 to $180	1	12.00	-----	-----
Total, Naval Home	3	204.00	-----	-----
Bureau of Provisions and Clothing.				
Shipping clerk, from $939 to $1,000	1	61.00	-----	-----
Receiving clerk, from $939 to $1,000	1	61.00	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Provisions and Clothing	2	122.00	-----	-----
Naval Academy.				
Professor of chemistry, from $2,200 to $2,500	1	300.00	-----	-----
Clerk to paymaster, from $1,000 to $1,200	1	200.00	-----	-----
Armorer, from $529.50 to $649.50	1	120.00	-----	-----
Chief gunner's mate, from $469.50 to $529.50	1	60.00	-----	-----
Quarter gunner, from $409.50 to $433.50	1	24.00	-----	-----
Total, Naval Academy	5	704.00	-----	-----
Pay of the Navy.				
The President is authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to advance Chief Engineer George Wallace Melville, United States Navy, one grade, to take rank from the same date but next after the junior chief engineer having the relative rank of commander, Sept. 30, 1890, and that he be allowed the pay of a chief engineer as if he had been commissioned on the same date as the junior chief engineer having the relative rank of commander at the date aforesaid; such increased rate of pay to begin from Sept. 30, 1890; the said Melville shall hereafter continue to be next junior to the junior chief engineer having the relative rank of commander on the day aforesaid; and whatever grade he may hereafter occupy shall be increased by one number, but the total number of chief engineers shall not be increased—an increase from $3,200 (sea pay) to $3,700 (sea pay) (act Sept. 30, 1890, page 449)	1	500.00	-----	-----
Asst. Surgs. Thomas Owens and William Martin, not in the line of promotion, from $1,900 each (sea pay) to be surgeons not in the line of promotion at $2,800 each (sea pay) (act Oct. 1, 1890, page 449)	2	1,800.00	-----	-----
Total, pay of the Navy	3	2,300.00	-----	-----
Total, naval establishment	19	3,980.12	4	708.30
INDIAN DEPARTMENT.				
(By the Indian appropriation act, pages 56 to 81, inclusive.)				
Agent at Fort Belknap Indian Agency, from $1,000 to $1,200	1	200.00	-----	-----
Agent at Standing Rock Indian Agency, from $1,700 to $1,800	1	100.00	-----	-----
Agent at Pottawatomie and Great Nemaha Indian Agency, from $1,000 to $1,200	1	200.00	-----	-----
Agent at White Earth Indian Agency, from $1,600 to $1,800	1	200.00	-----	-----
Agent at Green Bay Indian Agency, from $1,500 to $2,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Officers of Indian police, from $12 to $15 per month each	70	2,520.00	-----	-----
Superintendent of Indian school at Chilocco, Ind. T., from $1,500 to $2,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Superintendent of Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., from $1,500 to $2,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Superintendent of Indian school at Salem, Oreg., from $1,500 to $2,000	1	500.00	-----	-----
Agent at Yakima Indian Agency, from $2,000 to $1,800	-----	-----	1	200.00
Agent at Pueblo Indian Agency, from $1,800 to $1,500	-----	-----	1	300.00
Agent at Mascalero Indian Agency, from $1,800 to $1,600	-----	-----	1	200.00
Total, Indian Department	78	5,220.00	3	700.00

Offices the salaries of which have been increased or reduced, etc.—Continued.

	Salaries increased.		Salaries reduced.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
SUMMARY.				
Grand total, offices the salaries of which have been specifically increased, and the amount of such increase	1,108	$141,295.12	-----	-----------
Grand total, offices the salaries of which have been specifically reduced, and the amount of such reduction	-----	-----------	8	$1,808.30

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish to state my understanding of this question of parliamentary law in a single sentence only. If the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], being a member of the Judiciary Committee, gets the assent of that committee to a proposed amendment to a bill, which it is in order to move at all, to increase an appropriation, or any other amendment to an appropriation bill, and comes with it on the floor of the Senate, he has the same right to make that motion, and it stands in all respects with the same advantage, even if the whole Committee on Appropriations were opposed to it, as it would if the whole Committee on Appropriations favored it and the chairman of that committee had proposed it as an amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. Or if it had been put in the bill.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Maine says, "or if it had been put in the bill."

Mr. HALE. As an amendment.

Mr. HOAR. The Committee on Appropriations can not put anything into the bill. The report of the Committee on Appropriations, or any other committee, to a bill in this body, when it comes before the Senate, is simply a series of motions to amend, with no more power or force or weight than if made by individual Senators.

In regard to the matter of the increase of salaries or the diminution of salaries, the provision for the salary of a public officer is in existing law, and therefore, when a committee of this body or an individual Senator is prohibited from moving a change of existing law under its rules, the provision applies equally to that committee from moving increases. They can not, for the same reason, move a diminution of the salary. They may decline to appropriate in any particular year more than half the salary or a quarter of the salary, they may decline to appropriate any part of it; undoubtedly nobody can force them, or the Senate, to put it in. In that case, however, the lawful salary remains, and the lawful claim of the officer remains, and he can go into the Court of Claims and enforce it against the United States, as has more than once been done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is upon the adoption of the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not know exactly what the offense of the Committee on Appropriations may be or what necessity there is for the proposed change. The committee have been charged with some dereliction of duty, it seems to me, by at least two Senators, for allowing certain matters to get into appropriation bills which they should not have done, and in both cases it has appeared that the Committee on Appropriations were not at fault.

It appears that the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] seems to think that the committee has too much power. That is his principal objection. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York if he thinks that the other committees will have any less power when appropriation bills go to them?

Mr. HILL. I have already explained that there would be a division of power. I gave the reasons yesterday, and have given them to-day, why I thought that was appropriate.

Mr. TELLER. The offense that the committee is guilty of, as I understand the Senator from New York, is that they themselves make amendments to appropriation bills. This is the first time that I ever heard that a committee could amend a bill.

Mr. HILL. I hold in my hand several amendments to appropriation bills, made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, increasing the appropriations.

Mr. TELLER. The committee never in its history made an amendment which was an increase.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, of course, is splitting hairs upon that question. I mean proposing and reporting amendments to bills.

Mr. TELLER. That is a very different thing. Does the Senator from New York, or any other Senator, suppose that the Committee on Military Affairs will not have the same right to propose amendments to bills? If that is a vice of the system, it is not to be corrected by this proposed change. The rules of the Senate are explicit, and nobody need misunderstand them. I propose to call the attention of the Senate now to the rule:

RULE XVI.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill, the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce; also amendments to bills establishing post-roads, proposing new post-roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. President, most of this rule will be in force after the pending resolution shall be adopted, if it be adopted, because all that is proposed to be stricken out by the first amendment is this:

That paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the words "All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce," and inserting the following.

That is what I understand is to be stricken out. The remainder of the rule I have read remains and will be in force. I suppose any little technical differences that may arise may be arranged by an amendment to the rule as it now stands. It is not quite complete.

It is apparent to everybody, I think, who has ever looked into it, that that has been the practice of the Senate, and that the Committee on Appropriations has nothing more than an advisory power. That committee could come here and say to the Senate, "We think these appropriations ought to be increased, unless they fall within the rules which are laid down." I have not had a very extended service on the Committee on Appropriations, and I confess that I am not so very much in love with the committee that it would break my heart if the committee should be dismantled and the appropriation bills should be sent to other committees. I shall get along just as well whether I am on the committee or off of it, so far as that is concerned. But I do not believe that there has been any dereliction on the part of that committee in the many years I have served in the Senate.

I do not know what the complaint is. First it seemed to be that there had been careless and hasty legislation on the part of the committee; but it appears that the only cases complained of had been discussed openly in the House and in the Senate, and it was the action of one body or the other or of both, and the committee had no more responsibility than any member of the Senate.

I heard a very remarkable statement by a Senator who was addressing the Senate upon this subject—that because Senators were not members of the Appropriations Committee they did not have any interest in legislation coming from the committee and did not feel any responsibility for the conduct of affairs which were reported upon from that committee. Will not that be just as true hereafter as it is now? If the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] who made that statement is not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs he will have no more interest or feel no more responsibility when the Committee on Military Affairs reports the Army appropriation bill than he had heretofore when the Committee on Appropriations reported the Army appropriation bill.

Every member of this body can not be placed on one particular committee, nor can one-half of them. One Senator said that there are a great number of States that are not represented on the Committee on Appropriations. That must be true of every committee. It is utterly impossible to so divide and parcel the power of this body that every State will have representation on every committee, or that each State will have a representative on a committee that deals with every great subject. The largest committee of this body has not to exceed 15 members, and that is the Committee on Commerce, I understand. You have 90 members in this body. So there can be nothing in the argument that the Committee on Appropriations does not have a representative from every State.

A Senator suggested that the cotton interest does not have a representative on that committee. The cotton interest certainly does have representation on that committee. There are at least two Senators who reside in the region of country where cotton is raised. Until very recently, at least, it might have been said that

some of the greatest industries in the country had no representation on a dozen committees of this body. We have enlarged the committees somewhat, and we have distributed, I think, the power in a little better shape than heretofore; but still it is true that many matters will come before committees on which there are no representatives from the States particularly interested. Take the State of Colorado. It has no representative on the Military Committee; it has no representative on the Public Lands Committee; it has no representative on a great many other committees which consider legislation in which that State is more interested than most of the other States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has no representative on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, the Committee on Indian Affairs, for instance, and various others. Every Senator ought to realize that it is absurd to suppose that each State can be represented on a committee, or that it is an offense against a system, or against a committee, to say "Here is a State that has no representative on this committee, and therefore the Senators from that State have no interest in it, and are not responsible." We are responsible for those things that come before the Senate; we are responsible for the legislation of this body, whether it comes from a committee of which we are members, or whether it does not. If it comes from a committee of which we may be members, we know more about it, but our responsibility is the same in either case.

I do not know that during the time I have been a member of the Senate there has been any just cause of complaint against the Committee on Appropriations. I know they have reported legislation upon some bills, but they have never put particular legislation on a bill that the Senate did not put on. They have recommended it, and the Senate has said it should go on the bill. When the Committee on Military Affairs, for instance, has recommended legislation to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Appropriations may have said, "We are in accord with you, and we will recommend it to the Senate." If the Committee on Appropriations did not recommend it to the Senate, any one of the members of the Senate could move that very amendment, provided it came from a standing committee. So the Committee on Appropriations has not arrogated to itself power to which it is not entitled.

Mr. President, I do not think that the Committee on Appropriations have any greater rights than any other committee. I do not assume that the committee have any greater intelligence than any other committee; but I will assert that most of the members of that committee at this particular time have an acquaintance with the business for which the committee was organized that the Senators who are not on that committee have not had and can not obtain without the expenditure of considerable time and effort upon their part. I do not mean to say that other committees can not learn in a few days all that is to be learned in relation to appropriations, but I will say that I do not believe there is a committee now that is qualified to take up these questions instantly. Of course Senators can set themselves to work, and can soon learn what has been done in former Congresses, what the statutes are, and all the things that have to be considered, and can go on with the work. I do not mean to say that there is going to be any difficulty in these committees doing this work, because if the Committee on Appropriations should be blotted out entirely and dismantled the business of the Senate would go on just exactly as it goes on now, and there would be just the same interest in each committee.

I have had but little experience on the Committee on Appropriations, but I am sure I shall be borne out by every Senator in this Chamber when I say that innumerable amendments are proposed at every session to the various appropriation bills which the majority of the Senate say ought not to go on the bills. They are proposed by the standing committees who have in charge some particular subject. Take, for instance, the Naval Committee. The Naval Committee proposes from time to time amendments which they want made and they are passed through that committee with a recommendation that they be made. They are referred to the Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Naval Affairs have absolutely as much control of them then as the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I do not suppose that anybody will hold that it is any reflection upon the Committee on Naval Affairs when I say that we have had from that committee, ably presided over as it has been, with an able membership, repeated recommendations to which the Senate would not consent, and which it would not approve, and you will find that other committees have made similar recommendations. Each committee thinks that the subject committed to it is of more importance, perhaps, than any other, and while some other committee ought not to press its amendments that their amendments ought to be pressed. Instead of having one committee charged with the duty of making appropriations you will have a dozen committees charged with that duty. You will need to have more than that. If this new system of distribution is carried out there will be a further distribution. The one proposed is not sufficient, it is not logical, it is not equitable and just. When you have the appropriation bills distributed among a dozen committees each committee will say "the subject before us is important; we must have a liberal appropriation; and these other people may wait." So each committee when it reports its appropriation bill will come with an enlarged and an increased amount.

I have no right to discuss the question as to how this plan has worked in the House of Representatives, and I shall not do so. I only know what everybody else knows, that the appropriations in this country have signally, and I may say almost frightfully, increased in the last ten years. I do not know that there is any objection to it. It is possible the appropriations have been proper; but I have discovered when appropriation bills came to the Senate that repeatedly certain things were in that were wanted somewhere else, and certain other things which the law provided and declared should be appropriated for were not appropriated for at all.

As was said yesterday, it is not an unusual thing for the Committee on Appropriations to take up an appropriation bill, and to find, where the appropriation for a particular item is fixed by statute, that the appropriation only carried a sufficient amount for nine months instead of twelve.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Senator frankly and for information. I may be mistaken, but it is my impression that, as a rule, the Senate has increased the appropriations over those made by the other House. That has been especially the case when they differed politically, to speak frankly about it. Is it not a fact, let me ask the Senator, that the Senate has increased the appropriations as they came from the House of Representatives? In the House they have these various subjects referred to different committees. I have heard it stated here repeatedly for ten years past that the division of the jurisdiction in the House of Representatives has increased appropriations. I undertook once to examine that matter, and I was not able to come to that conclusion; but the question I now put is, is it not a fact that, as a rule, the Senate has increased appropriation bills as they came from the House of Representatives?

Mr. TELLER. That is undoubtedly true, and is in line with what I was saying.

Mr. ALLISON. If I may say a word, that, as a rule, is true, and especially is it true as respects bills which come to us from the House Committee on Appropriations. It is not so true as respects other bills which come from the new committees to which the appropriation bills have been distributed.

You will find many cases where the Senate Committee on Appropriations have not increased, and a good many cases where they have diminished, the appropriations proposed to be made.

Later on in the debate, if I have an opportunity, I propose to deal at large with the very suggestion made by the Senator.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to make a statement?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. CALL. Notwithstanding the increase in the Senate, there have been deficiencies every year of from eight to thirteen million dollars.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I was saying. The people who have the first opportunity for providing in an appropriation bill put into it such items as they think they are more in earnest about and as they know might not be got on the bill in the Senate, and depend upon the Senate to make up for those items that are absolutely necessary for the carrying on of the Government. What I say does not refer to this session, because I do not wish to reflect upon the present Congress, but it is a fact well known by my associates on the committee that we have had appropriation bills sent from the other House, and we have seen members of the House committee follow the appropriation bill to the room of the Senate Appropriations Committee and say, "We want you to increase that appropriation we could not afford to put on."

The House of Representatives is the great political body. It is where they make politics in this country, and there has been a great strife to keep down appropriations apparently. There has been heretofore (I think, perhaps, I can reflect upon a dead and defunct House, but not upon a living House) a disposition in that body, I think, to refrain from putting in appropriation bills provisions which they knew were essential, absolutely necessary, so that they might swell some other appropriation; and then if this body happens to be of a different political organization—and it is immaterial whether it is Democratic or Republican; both parties play at that—then charge that the Senate has unduly increased the appropriations.

What is the duty of the Senate Appropriations Committee when

the appropriation bill comes here which provides for the judiciary, for instance? Knowing exactly what it costs to pay the judges and what it cost the year before to maintain the courts, is it not our duty to report to the Senate in favor of such an appropriation as shall not leave a deficiency? We have a standing law that no department of the Government shall create a deficiency, and yet there has not been a year for the last ten years that the deficiencies have not been from six to fifteen million dollars. When those appropriations were passed through the other House there was as great certainty that the deficiency would exist as there was when the deficiency was reported from the Treasury Department to the House of Representatives at the coming session. The Senate being the conservative body, the body that does not appeal to the people for support as the other House does, it was thought the Senate could afford to take the responsibility of keeping the appropriations where they rightfully belonged and of seeing that the Government was not strangled or starved.

If there have been extravagant appropriations it is the fault of the Senate and not of the Committee on Appropriations. I venture to say that rarely ever have we passed a general, great big appropriation bill that the Senate has not put on against the protest of the committee sometimes large sums of money. In some cases I recollect that the Senate has put on very large sums of money. The Senate had a right to put on those sums, and it must not be presumed that the Senate put on anything that ought not to have gone on the bill. The committee might have had different views, but the Senate itself is the determiner of those questions, and it put on the amendments.

I believe that the most economical and logical arrangement that could be provided for now exists. I believe that one body, composed of members of the Senate, ought to have a general supervision and a general care of all the appropriation bills; that the body which recommends the appropriations to the Senate should know exactly what is being appropriated. That can not be known if you have ten or fifteen committees each reporting an appropriation bill. How can any other committee that sit down to consider the question before them know what the other committee is going to do which may not report until after they have reported? When you have one committee you have everything under the eye of the committee. They know first what is the revenue. Then they know what is necessary to the successful carrying on of the Government and for bringing the appropriations within the revenue. You can not know when you have twelve or fifteen committees, as you will have if you commence this new system, because, as I said before, the system will be enlarged rightfully and properly.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] has moved an amendment which is in perfect keeping with the principle that is proposed to be started upon. There can be a half dozen more such amendments moved. There are matters now left to the Committee on Appropriations that do not rightfully belong to that committee if they are not to have general supervision and general direction of all the appropriation bills that come before the Senate. I am confident that it will increase the public expense. I do not see how the Senate itself can be informed properly as to what is the condition of the finances and what is the condition of the appropriations unless there is somebody charged with the duty, as has been done heretofore, and that is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, of informing the Senate, first, what is the revenue, then what can we afford to appropriate and what is necessary to be appropriated, which the committee determine after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the officials charged with submitting reports on that subject.

Mr. President, I do not know, as I said before, that it is of any consequence whether or not the public expenses are increased. We can go on, I suppose, and continue to do what we are doing now—run in debt and borrow money to pay expenses; and as I learn to-day that we have such wonderful credit that we have received bids for our bonds to the extent of $500,000,000, I suppose we will keep right along running in debt. As is suggested to me, the country has got into a condition where there does not seem to be any legitimate business except bond buying and bond selling, and I suppose we need not disturb ourselves, but let the next generation deal with the matter.

Mr. PEFFER. We had better borrow while our credit is good.

Mr. TELLER. Yes. There is one thing on which I should like to congratulate the country, and that is that after all the talk about our lack of credit, if I am not misinformed, when we want to dispose of $100,000,000 of bonds we have more than $500,000,000 bid for—$568,000,000, a Senator says. If those bonds had been offered as they ought to have been offered, if the Secretary of the Treasury had stated, "I will receive bids at a fixed figure," in my judgment the amount of the bids would have been very much larger. I know people who would have liked to have bid upon those bonds, but they did not know how to bid, and were compelled to go to their bankers to bid. This is a little outside of the question before the Senate, except that I think the financial question is one that perhaps is appropriate to debate at all times, because it seems to be so little understood, and there seems to be so little known about it. Especially do I think it is not out of place after the suggestion we had from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] and some others about the extremis that the Government was in a year ago, when it made the wonderful sale to the syndicate.

I remember that then the Senator made the Chamber sound with his doleful cry of the lack of credit; how we had kept the wires hot between here and Europe begging the foreigners to take our securities. I think that some of us then said that if the Administration had turned their eyes inside and addressed themselves to the American people they would have found an abundance of support, and that is shown to be true now. Clumsy and awkward as has been this transaction, miscalled a popular loan, but not a popular loan, yet there has been $568,000,000 bid. I do not know what the average will be, but it will be way above what I understand was proposed to be given by the syndicate.

I will state again that I have before me now the reasoning of several gentlemen upon the question before the Senate, but I do not care to stop to read it. They are men of large experience in public affairs, and they declare that the system under which we are now operating is a proper and safe one, and that the proposed system is a dangerous one. I do not care to read it because I do not suppose it makes very much difference. Each Senator will think for himself upon the question.

Senators who intend to vote for the resolution did not need, so far as I am concerned, to make any excuses as to why they are going to vote in that way. If they think the public service would be better served by the adoption of the resolution, I should have a very poor opinion of them if they did not vote for it. It is a question simply of judgment, I suppose. I do not believe any good will come from the adoption of the resolution. I believe some harm may come from it, and I believe will come from it. But I shall not take personal offense because somebody thinks that I am not so well qualified to discharge the duties on a committee of this kind as he is. Very likely he may be correct. So I shall not go into grief or mourning whatever may be the result.

I shall myself very much regret to see the course that has been pursued here for so many years, and, I think, successfully and satisfactorily, abruptly destroyed practically without any notice at all, and to see the different committees taking up the appropriations bills and reporting them. I imagine that at the present session they will be extremely careful that the appropriations reported are not excessive; they will be moderate and economical now; but I believe you will find that there will be an extension gradually, little by little, and in the end we will all regret that we did not adhere to the old system.

I repeat that that system has really met with no complaint in the Senate until within the past few days, and the specific complaint so far as it has been made, has been shown to be without the slightest foundation.

Mr. BATE. As there seems to be no likelihood that we shall come to a vote on the question to-night, several Senators desiring to speak on the subject, I suggest that we have an executive session. With the consent of the Senator from Idaho, who has charge of the resolution, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. DUBOIS. I have no objection to that course. I trust we can have a vote on the resolution to-morrow, however.

Mr. BATE. I do not want to insist upon my motion at the expense of the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. It will not interfere with the resolution or displace it.

Mr. BATE. Is there any chance to get a vote to-night?

Mr. HILL. If nobody wishes to speak we might secure a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from New York knows very well that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations wishes to submit some remarks, and the Senator from New York can not expect the Senator from Iowa to go on at this hour.

Mr. HILL. I did not understand that the Senator from Iowa desires to speak. If he does, of course he should have the opportunity.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Iowa stated that he desires to discuss the matter fully, and I think he should be accorded an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HALE. There are several Senators who wish to speak.

Mr. HILL. There will be plenty of time.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the

adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills received this day from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4444) providing for commissioners to negotiate with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States.

The bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BATE. Under the circumstances, no one being ready to speak further on the question now pending, I think it is a very suitable time to have an executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 6, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. Daniel J. Ainsworth, of Virginia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George H. Gooding, promoted.

First Lieut. George H. Gooding, of Virginia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of Thomas S. Smyth, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

William A. Bucknam, to be postmaster at Truckee, in the county of Nevada and State of California, in the place of Laura E. Bucknam, whose commission expired January 27, 1896.

Charles Harrington, to be postmaster at Essex, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in the place of Alfred E. Goddard, whose commission will expire February 8, 1896.

Thomas J. O'Sullivan, to be postmaster at Derby, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of Charles N. Downs, whose commission will expire February 8, 1896.

J. L. Fulcher, to be postmaster at Waynesboro, in the county of Burke and State of Georgia, in the place of Pickens B. Hall, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Hoyt H. Harden, to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine, in the place of Augustus R. Devereux, whose commission expired February 5, 1895.

George R. Smith, to be postmaster at Kennebunk, in the county of York and State of Maine, in the place of Charles F. Warren, whose commission will expire February 8, 1896.

Charles A. Wilber, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Somerset and State of Maine, in the place of Kittredge C. Gray, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

George Cushing, to be postmaster at Hingham, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, whose commission will expire February 9, 1896. Reappointment.

Thomas H. Jackman, to be postmaster at Peabody, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts. His commission will expire February 9, 1896. Reappointment.

Alonzo H. Ale, to be postmaster at Cass City, in the county of Tuscola and State of Michigan, in the place of A. W. Seed, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Irving McArthur, to be postmaster at Lapeer, in the county of Lapeer and State of Michigan, in the place of T. Edward West, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Joseph W. Bean, to be postmaster at Derry Depot, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Silas G. Clifford, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Edgar F. Dell, to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey, in the place of Joseph B. Roe, whese commission will expire February 8, 1896.

Patrick Hurley, to be postmaster at Potsdam, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York, in the place of Eunice J. Eastman, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Annie Larrabee, to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, in the county of Queens and State of New York, her commission having expired December 17, 1895. Reappointment.

Henry C. Sargent, to be postmaster at East Aurora, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of Albert H. Lapham, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Theodore Smith, to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of Robert J. Hock, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Charles F. Terhune, to be postmaster at Binghamton, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in the place of Charles A. Hull, deceased.

Christopher Whitney, to be postmaster at Franklinville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in the place of Margaret Andrews, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Leonard W. Young, to be postmaster at Bayshore, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in the place of Josiah Robbins, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

S. Henry Van Dyck, to be postmaster at Coxsackie, in the county of Greene and State of New York, in the place of George H. Scott, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Reuben R. Freeman, to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Ross and State of Ohio, in the place of George H. Tyler, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Selden B. Palm, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Trumbull and State of Ohio, in the place of Frank M. Ritezel, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

Sarah A. Bachman, to be postmaster at Slatington, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Francis A. Bachman, deceased.

J. M. Doolen, to be postmaster at Quanah, in the county of Hardeman and State of Texas, in the place of William M. Griffith, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Peter Bradshaw, to be postmaster at South Pittsburg, in the county of Marion and State of Tennessee, in the place of John I. Ingle, removed.

F. P. Kanester, to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Bradley and State of Tennessee, in the place of Wallace K. Sheddan, whose commission expired January 11, 1896.

Mary W. Chase, to be postmaster at Derby Line, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in the place of Eugene B. Chase, deceased.

A. B. Claytor, to be postmaster at Bedford City, in the county of Bedford and State of Virginia, in the place of William H. Mosby, whose commission expired January 26, 1896.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

Wilbert W. Lewis, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn February 5, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

James M. McQueen, to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, county of Queens, in the State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 5, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PRIZE FIGHTS IN TERRITORIES AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce a bill, and I ask that it be read to the House for information, after which I will make an explanation and then ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report. This bill, the Chair understands, has not been reported by a committee, and the House should pay attention to it.

Mr. CANNON. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Is it a long bill?

Mr. CATRON. No; it has only three sections.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that this is a bill that has not been reported by a committee.

Mr. CATRON. This is a bill to provide for the prevention of prize fights in the Territories and the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope gentlemen will allow this bill to be read. I do not think there is a man in the House who will object to it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say it has been considered by members of the committee informally?

Mr. HENDERSON. It has by individual members.

The title of the bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and the District of Columbia.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask that that bill be sent to the proper committee. I object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that it was submitted to the House without having first received the approval of a committee because of the exigency which the gentleman from New Mexico stated.

Mr. HENDERSON. This prize fight is set for the 14th of this month, and unless the bill is considered now it can not get through both the House and the Senate and to the President for his approval.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. CATRON. I understand, and it is notorious, that a series of prize fights have been advertised to come off at or near El Paso, in the State of Texas.

Mr. SAYERS. Not in Texas.

Mr. CATRON. At or near El Paso, but not in the State of Texas, as they can not come off there; to commence on the 14th of the present month and continue until they are concluded. The New Mexico line is within about 3 miles of El Paso, and can be reached on the Southern Pacific Railroad from that city. The governor of the Territory of New Mexico, as the public prints have announced, has stated that he knows of no law in New Mexico by which these prize fights can be stopped. I believe they could be stopped if the governor desired to stop them; but it seems that he has no such disposition. The Congress of the United States can control these Territories, and can control this District of Columbia. As I understand, the purpose is not only to bring these prize fighters into New Mexico, just across the line from the city of El Paso, where they are now collecting, and have this series of fights for a number of days; but it is also the purpose to import to that town a lot of bull fighters from the City of Mexico, who are now en route from Mexico. The bill I have prepared is an exact copy of the law that has lately been adopted by the State of Texas at a special session of the legislature of that State, except the second section, which provides for the punishment of those who aid, abet, or assist in the matter. Unless Congress can act upon the matter at once, these fights will go on. If this bill should go to a committee to be considered the probabilities are that it will not reach this House in time to pass the Senate and get to the President for his approval before these fights can be had. I therefore ask that we may have immediate consideration of this bill.

Mr. KNOX. I will ask the gentleman a question for information, if he will permit me. Does this bill provide that anybody being present at a prize fight or any personal encounter with fists or gloves, independent of their age, shall be punished by imprisonment of not less than five years?

Mr. CATRON. It provides for the punishment of those who aid, abet, and assist.

Mr. KNOX. It might as well provide for capital punishment. I object to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let the bill be referred to the committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

OUTLETS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reported a resolution, No. 40, calling on the Secretary of War for information, cost, and estimates of making surveys of certain outlets on the Great Lakes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GROUT. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont calls for the regular order, which is on agreeing to the amendments to the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is asked. Are there any amendments upon which a separate vote is not asked?

Mr. GROUT. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, a separate vote has really been demanded on only two amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Alabama requested separate votes.

Mr. WHEELER. Our action will depend upon the vote on this amendment which comes first.

Mr. GROUT. Let me ask the gentleman what amendment he refers to as coming first?

Mr. WHEELER. The German Orphan Asylum.

Mr. GROUT. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "For the German Orphan Asylum, maintenance, $1,800."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, let us take a vote now on the other amendment proposed by the committee, striking out lines 16, 17, and 18 on page 39 and inserting what is known as the Hainer amendment, remitting these several charities to the board of children's guardians.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 39, in line 16, after the words "place to place," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert "$43,200; in all, $47,200: *Provided*, That the institutions for children, including industrial and reformatory, namely, the Church Orphanage of St. John's Parish; the German Orphan Asylum, including its care of colored foundlings; the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, the Association for Works of Mercy, the St. Joseph Asylum, the House of the Good Shepherd, and St. Rose's Industrial School, heretofore receiving aid by specific appropriation, are hereby remitted, except as herein specifically appropriated for, to the appropriation herein made, and to the said act of July 26, 1892, to provide for the care of dependent children in the District of Columbia, and to create a board of children's guardians, for all rights and benefits which they may have under the provisions of the said act."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, that comes after the other.

The SPEAKER. The other amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. WHEELER. But the one that we desire a separate vote upon has not yet been acted upon, I understand.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. WHEELER. We asked for a separate vote on the amendment striking out the St. John's Orphan Asylum, and also on the amendments striking out St. Ann's Infant Asylum and the House of the Good Shepherd. I suppose the action so far taken does not preclude action on those amendments afterwards.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands not. It is the right of any member to have a separate vote upon any amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just reported.

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I ask for a division. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. As I understand it, to vote aye is to vote in favor of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. BRUMM. I should like to have that amendment reported again, if it can be done.

The SPEAKER. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MILES. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 88, noes 51; so the amendment was adopted.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman desire a separate vote upon any other amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire a separate vote on the amendment striking out the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish.

The SPEAKER. Is there a demand for a separate vote upon any other amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I desire to have separate votes also upon the amendments striking out the St. Ann's Infant Asylum and the House of the Good Shepherd.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, lines 8, 9, and 10, strike out the words "For the Church Orphanage Association, St. John's Parish, maintenance, $1,800."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to occupy one minute.

Several members objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRUMM. As I understand, the appropriation that is embodied in the amendment already adopted provides for these institutions, and——

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRUMM. But I have not finished my question. Now, if I am correct in that, would not the retention of this provision in the bill be giving an additional specific appropriation for a purpose that is already provided for?

The SPEAKER. The Chair hardly thinks that is a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know just what is the vote to be taken. My understanding is that the Committee of the Whole House struck out this item—that that is the amendment of the committee—so that now to vote "aye" is to vote in favor of striking out the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. A vote in the affirmative is a vote to sustain the action of the committee. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 99, noes 47; so the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

Page 38, beginning on line 15, strike out the words "For St. Ann's Infant Asylum, maintenance, $5,400."

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote asked upon this amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask a separate vote.

The question being taken, the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

Page 38, beginning on line 19, strike out the words "for House of the Good Shepherd, maintenance, $2,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote asked for upon any of the remaining amendments? If not, the Chair will put the question upon them all together. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire a separate vote upon any of them?

Mr. WHEELER. We will not ask for separate votes on any more of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question, then, is on agreeing to the remaining amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, 47 gentlemen voted in the affirmative, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will take their seats, and the House will be in order, so that the responses of members may be heard.

Mr. HEPBURN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is it competent now to move a recommitment of this bill to the committee that reported it?

The SPEAKER. The impression of the Chair is that it is not.

Mr. HEPBURN. I supposed this was the time when that motion should be made.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the passage of the bill, and the Chair was simply suspending the roll call in the interest of order, so that the responses of members might be heard. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Suppose that on the vote about to be taken the bill should fail to pass; would it then be in order to move to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not like to undertake to answer that question without a little more examination.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think it would be.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the roll call.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 144, not voting 77; as follows:

YEAS—135.

Acheson,	De Witt,	Howe,	Reyburn,
Adams,	Dingley,	Howell,	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Doolittle,	Huff,	Sauerhering,
Allen, Utah	Draper,	Hulick,	Scranton,
Andrews,	Ellis,	Hull,	Shafroth,
Arnold, Pa.	Evans,	Hyde,	Simpkins,
Arnold, R. I.	Fairchild,	Jenkins,	Smith, Ill.
Baker, Md.	Faris,	Joy,	Smith, Mich.
Baker, N. H.	Fletcher,	Kirkpatrick,	Snover,
Barham,	Fowler,	Knox,	Southard,
Barney.	Gamble,	Lacey,	Sperry,
Bartholdt,	Gardner,	Leighty,	Stahle,
Bell, Colo.	Gibson,	Leonard,	Steele,
Bingham,	Gillett, Mass.	Linton,	Stewart, Wis.
Bishop,	Graff,	Loud,	Stone, C. W.
Bowers,	Griffin,	Loudenslager,	Strode, Nebr.
Broderick,	Grout,	Mahon,	Strong,
Bromwell,	Hadley,	McCall, Mass.	Taft,
Brosius,	Hager,	McCall, Tenn.	Tayler,
Brown,	Hainer, Nebr.	McCleary, Minn.	Thomas,
Brumm,	Halterman,	McEwan,	Towne,
Burrell,	Hanly,	Mercer,	Tracewell,
Cannon,	Harmer,	Miller, Kans.	Tracey,
Clark, Mo.	Hartman,	Minor, Wis.	Treloar,
Cook, Wis.	Hatch,	Moody,	Van Voorhis,
Cooke, Ill.	Hemenway,	Morse,	Walker, Va.
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Conn.	Newlands,	Wanger,
Corliss,	Henry, Ind.	Northway,	Washington,
Crowther,	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Watson, Ind.
Crump,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wilson, Idaho
Curtis, Iowa	Hicks,	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, Kans.	Hilborn,	Pickler,	Wood,
Danford,	Hill,	Pitney,	Wright.
Dayton,	Hitt,	Ray,	

NAYS—144.

Abbott,	Denny,	Low,	Settle,
Avery,	Dinsmore,	Mahany,	Shannon,
Babcock,	Dolliver,	McClellan,	Sherman,
Bailey,	Elliott, S. C.	McCreary, Ky.	Shuford,
Baker, Kans.	Erdman,	McCulloch,	Sorg,
Bankhead,	Fischer,	McDearmon,	Spalding,
Barrett,	Foote,	McKenney,	Spencer,
Bartlett, Ga.	Gillet, N. Y.	McLaurin,	Stallings,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Griswold,	McMillin,	Stephenson,
Belknap,	Grosvenor,	Meredith,	Stewart, N. J.
Bell, Tex.	Grow,	Meyer,	Stokes,
Berry,	Hall,	Miles,	Strait,
Black, Ga.	Hardy,	Miller, W. Va.	Strowd, N. C.
Boatner,	Harris,	Milnes,	Sulzer,
Brewster,	Harrison,	Money,	Swanson,
Burton, Mo.	Hart,	Moses,	Talbert,
Calderhead,	Heatwole,	Neill,	Tarsney,
Catchings,	Henderson,	Noonan,	Tate,
Chickering,	Hendrick,	Ogden,	Tawney,
Clardy,	Hooker,	Overstreet,	Terry,
Clark, Iowa	Hurley,	Owens,	Tucker,
Cobb, Ala.	Hutcheson,	Parker,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Mo.	Johnson, Cal.	Patterson,	Turner, Va.
Cockrell,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Payne,	Underwood,
Coffin,	Jones,	Pearson,	Updegraff,
Colson,	Kem,	Pendleton,	Wadsworth,
Cooper, Fla.	Kiefer,	Poole,	Warner,
Cooper, Tex.	Kyle,	Powers,	Wheeler,
Cox,	Latimer,	Pugh,	White,
Crisp,	Layton,	Quigg,	Wilber,
Culberson,	Lefever,	Richardson,	Williams,
Cummings,	Lester,	Robbins,	Willis,
Curtis, N. Y.	Lewis,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, N. Y.
Dalzell,	Linney,	Royse,	Wilson, S. C.
Daniels,	Little,	Russell, Ga.	Woodman,
De Armond,	Long,	Sayers,	Yoakum.

NOT VOTING—77.

Aitken,	Dockery,	Livingston,	Raney,
Allen, Miss.	Dovener,	Lockhart,	Reeves,
Anderson,	Downing,	Lorimer,	Robinson, Pa.
Apsley,	Eddy,	Maddox,	Rusk,
Atwood,	Ellett, Va.	Maguire,	Shaw,
Beach,	Fenton,	Marsh,	Skinner,
Bennett,	Fitzgerald,	McClure,	Southwick,
Black, N. Y.	Foss,	McCormick,	Sparkman,
Blue,	Heiner, Pa.	McLachlan,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Hopkins,	McRae,	Sulloway,
Buck,	Howard,	Meiklejohn,	Tyler,
Bull,	Hubbard,	Milliken,	Walker, Mass.
Burton, Ohio	Huling,	Miner, N. Y.	Walsh,
Clarke, Ala.	Hunter,	Mondell,	Watson, Ohio
Codding,	Johnson, Ind.	Mozley,	Wellington,
Connolly,	Kendall,	Murphy,	Woodard,
Cousins,	Kerr,	Odell,	Woomer.
Cowen,	Kulp,	Otey,	
Crain,	Lawson,	Price,	
Crowley,	Leisenring,	Prince,	

So the House refused to pass the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. If he were present, I should vote "no."

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. MEIKLEJOHN] is paired with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE]. Were my colleague present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. McRAE. And I should vote "no."
Mr. LAWSON. I desire to vote.
The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall when his name was called?
Mr. LAWSON. I was not.
The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman under the rules can not vote.
Mr. LAWSON. If permitted to do so, I should vote "no."
Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have my vote recorded.
The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present during the roll call, and did he fail to hear his name?
Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I was not present.
The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can not vote.
Mr. BURTON of Ohio. If I had been present, I should have voted in the affirmative.
Mr. BARRETT. I desire to give notice that if on this vote the bill fails to pass——
Mr. RICHARDSON. I submit that the gentleman can not debate the question.
Mr. BARRETT. I wish to give a parliamentary notice. I give notice that if on this vote this bill fails to pass I shall to-morrow move to reconsider the vote.
Mr. RICHARDSON. I call for order. We can not hear what is going on.
The following pairs were announced:
Until further notice:
Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. DOCKERY.
Mr. COLSON with Mr. KENDALL.
For this day:
Mr. ODELL with Mr. MADDOX.
On this vote:
Mr. MEIKLEJOHN with Mr. McRAE.
The result of the vote was announced as above stated. [Applause.]
Mr. GROSVENOR and Mr. BARRETT addressed the Chair.
[Cries of "Regular order!"]
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized.
Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to reconsider the vote by which this bill failed to pass.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to pass the bill.
Mr. GROSVENOR. I suppose I may say that if this motion to reconsider prevails I shall move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations without instructions.
Mr. CRISP. I submit that debate is not in order; we are operating under the previous question. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.
Mr. GROSVENOR. I want the gentleman from Georgia and others to know the purpose of my motion.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.
The question being taken on the motion of Mr. CRISP, there were—ayes 71, noes 148.
Mr. CRISP. I call for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered, 61 voting in favor thereof.
The question was taken on the motion to lay on the table; and there were—yeas 86, nays 192, not voting 78; as follows:

YEAS—86.

Bailey,	De Armond,	McCulloch,	Sorg,
Baker, Kans.	Denny,	McDearmon,	Sparkman,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McKenney,	Stallings,
Bartlett, Ga.	Elliott, S. C.	McLaurin,	Stokes,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Erdman,	McMillin,	Strait,
Bell, Tex.	Hall,	Meredith,	Strowd, N. C.
Berry,	Harrison,	Meyer,	Sulzer,
Black, Ga.	Hart,	Miles,	Swanson,
Boatner,	Hendrick,	Money,	Talbert,
Broderick,	Hutcheson,	Moses,	Tarsney,
Buck,	Jones,	Neill,	Tate,
Catchings,	Kem,	Noonan,	Terry,
Clardy,	Kyle,	Ogden,	Tucker,
Clarke, Ala.	Latimer,	Otey,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Ala.	Lawson,	Owens,	Turner, Va.
Cobb, Mo.	Layton,	Patterson,	Underwood,
Cockrell,	Lester,	Pendleton,	Wheeler,
Cooper, Tex.	Little,	Richardson,	Williams,
Cox,	Livingston,	Robbins,	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	Maguire,	Robertson, La.	Yoakum.
Culberson,	McClelland,	Sayers,	
Cummings,	McCreary, Ky.	Shuford,	

NAYS—192.

Acheson,	Baker, Md.	Boutelle,	Cannon,
Adams,	Baker, N. H.	Bowers,	Clark, Iowa
Aldrich,	Barney,	Brewster,	Clark, Mo.
Allen, Utah	Barrett,	Bromwell,	Codding,
Anderson,	Bartholdt,	Brosius,	Coffin,
Andrews,	Belknap,	Brown,	Cook, Wis.
Arnold, Pa.	Bell, Colo.	Brumm,	Cooke, Ill.
Arnold, R. I.	Bennett,	Burrell,	Cooper, Wis.
Avery,	Bingham,	Burton, Mo.	Corliss,
Babcock,	Bishop,	Burton, Ohio	Crowther,
Crump,	Hartman,	McCall, Mass.	Smith, Ill.
Curtis, Kans.	Hatch,	McCall, Tenn.	Smith, Mich.
Curtis, N. Y.	Heatwole,	McCleary, Minn.	Snover,
Dalzell,	Hemenway,	McEwan,	Southard,
Danford,	Henderson,	McLachlan,	Spalding,
Daniels,	Henry, Conn.	Mercer,	Sperry,
Dayton,	Henry, Ind.	Miller, W. Va.	Stahle,
De Witt,	Hepburn,	Milnes,	Steele,
Dingley,	Hermann,	Minor, Wis.	Stephenson,
Dolliver,	Hilborn,	Moody,	Stewart, N. J.
Doolittle,	Hitt,	Morse,	Stewart, Wis.
Draper,	Howe,	Newlands,	Stone, C. W.
Eddy,	Howell,	Northway,	Strode, Nebr.
Ellis,	Hulick,	Otjen,	Strong,
Evans,	Hull,	Overstreet,	Sulloway,
Faris,	Hurley,	Parker,	Taft,
Fischer,	Hyde,	Payne,	Tawney,
Fletcher,	Jenkins,	Pearson,	Tayler,
Foote,	Johnson, Cal.	Perkins,	Thomas,
Fowler,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Phillips,	Towne,
Gamble,	Joy,	Pickler,	Tracewell,
Gardner,	Kerr,	Pitney,	Tracey,
Gibson,	Kiefer,	Poole,	Treloar,
Gillett, Mass.	Kirkpatrick,	Powers,	Updegraff,
Graff,	Knox,	Pugh,	Van Voorhis,
Griffin,	Lacey,	Quigg,	Wadsworth,
Griswold,	Lefever,	Ray,	Walker, Va.
Grosvenor,	Leighty,	Reeves,	Wanger,
Grout,	Leonard,	Reyburn,	Warner,
Grow,	Lewis,	Russell, Conn.	Washington,
Hadley,	Linney,	Russell, Ga.	Watson, Ind.
Hager,	Linton,	Sauerhering,	Wellington,
Hainer, Nebr.	Long,	Scranton,	Willis,
Halterman,	Loud,	Settle,	Wilson, Idaho
Hanly,	Loudenslager,	Shafroth,	Wilson, N. Y.
Hardy,	Low,	Shannon,	Wood.
Harmer,	Mahany,	Sherman,	Woodman,
Harris,	Mahon,	Simpkins,	Wright,

NOT VOTING—78.

Abbott,	Dockery,	Kendall,	Raney,
Aitken,	Dovener,	Kulp,	Robinson, Pa.
Allen, Miss.	Downing,	Leisenring,	Royse,
Apsley,	Ellett, Va.	Lockhart,	Rusk,
Atwood,	Fairchild,	Lorimer,	Shaw,
Barham,	Fenton,	Maddox,	Skinner,
Beach,	Fitzgerald,	Marsh,	Southwick,
Black, N. Y.	Foss,	McClure,	Spencer,
Blue,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCormick,	Stone, W. A.
Bull,	Heiner, Pa.	McRae,	Tyler,
Calderhead,	Hicks,	Meiklejohn,	Walker, Mass.
Chickering,	Hill,	Miller, Kans.	Walsh,
Colson,	Hooker,	Milliken,	Watson, Ohio
Connolly,	Hopkins,	Miner, N. Y.	White,
Cooper, Fla.	Howard,	Mondell,	Wilber,
Cousins,	Hubbard,	Mozley,	Wilson, Ohio
Cowen,	Huff,	Murphy,	Woodard,
Crain,	Huling,	Odell,	Woomer,
Crowley,	Hunter,	Price,	
Curtis, Iowa	Johnson, Ind.	Prince,	

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was rejected.
The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, to reconsider the vote by which the bill was refused passage.
Mr. CRISP. On that I demand the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were not ordered, those rising in support of the demand being less than one-fifth of the last vote.
Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask tellers on the yeas and nays.
Tellers were ordered.
The SPEAKER appointed Mr. CRISP and Mr. GROSVENOR as tellers.
The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes not counted.
Mr. GROSVENOR. I waive further count.
So, no further count being demanded, the yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 82, not voting 86; as follows:

YEAS—188.

Acheson,	Brumm,	Fairchild,	Hemenway,
Aitken,	Burrell,	Faris,	Henderson,
Allen, Utah	Burton, Mo.	Fischer,	Henry, Conn.
Anderson,	Burton, Ohio	Fletcher,	Henry, Ind.
Andrews,	Cannon,	Foote,	Hepburn,
Arnold, Pa.	Clark, Iowa	Fowler,	Hermann,
Arnold, R. I.	Clark, Mo.	Gamble,	Hicks,
Avery,	Codding,	Gardner,	Hilborn,
Babcock,	Coffin,	Gibson,	Hill,
Baker, Kans.	Cook, Wis.	Gillet, N. Y.	Hitt,
Baker, Md.	Cooke, Ill.	Gillett, Mass.	Hooker,
Baker, N. H.	Cooper, Wis.	Graff,	Howe,
Barham,	Corliss,	Griffin,	Howell,
Barney,	Cousins,	Griswold,	Huff,
Barrett,	Crowther,	Grosvenor,	Hulick,
Bartholdt,	Crump,	Grout,	Hull,
Belknap,	Curtis, Kans.	Grow,	Hurley,
Bell, Colo.	Dalzell,	Hadley,	Hyde,
Bennett,	Danford,	Hager,	Jenkins,
Bingham,	Daniels,	Hainer, Nebr.	Johnson, Cal.
Bishop,	De Witt,	Halterman,	Johnson, N. Dak.
Boutelle,	Dingley,	Hanly,	Joy,
Bowers,	Dolliver,	Hardy,	Kerr,
Brewster,	Doolittle,	Harmer,	Kiefer,
Broderick,	Draper,	Harris,	Kirkpatrick,
Bromwell,	Eddy,	Hartman,	Knox,
Brosius,	Ellis,	Hatch,	Lacey,
Brown,	Evans,	Heatwole,	Lefever,

Leighty,	Moody,	Scranton,	Tracewell,
Leonard,	Morse,	Shafroth,	Tracey,
Lewis,	Northway,	Sherman,	Treloar,
Linney,	Otjen,	Simpkins,	Updegraff,
Linton,	Overstreet,	Smith, Ill.	Van Voorhis,
Long,	Parker,	Snover,	Wadsworth,
Loud,	Payne,	Southard,	Walker, Va.
Loudenslager,	Perkins,	Spalding,	Wanger,
Low,	Phillips,	Sperry,	Warner,
Mahany,	Pickler,	Stahle,	Washington,
McCall, Mass.	Pitney,	Stephenson,	Watson, Ind.
McCall, Tenn.	Poole,	Stewart, N. J.	Wellington,
McCleary, Minn.	Pugh,	Stewart, Wis.	White,
McEwan,	Quigg,	Stone, C. W.	Willis,
McLachlan,	Ray,	Strode, Nebr.	Wilson, Idaho
Mercer,	Reeves,	Strong,	Wilson, Ohio
Miller, Kans.	Royse,	Sulloway,	Wood,
Milnes,	Russell, Conn.	Thomas,	Woodman,
Minor, Wis.	Sauerhering,	Towne,	Wright.

NAYS—82.

Bailey,	Denny,	McDearmon,	Sparkman,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McLaurin,	Spencer,
Bartlett, Ga.	Downing,	McMillin,	Stokes,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Erdman,	Meredith,	Strait,
Bell, Tex.	Hall,	Meyer,	Strowd, N. C.
Berry,	Hart,	Miles,	Sulzer,
Black, Ga.	Hendrick,	Money,	Swanson,
Boatner,	Hutcheson,	Neill,	Talbert,
Buck,	Jones,	Noonan,	Tarsney,
Catchings,	Kem,	Ogden,	Tate,
Clardy,	Kyle,	Otey,	Terry,
Clarke, Ala.	Latimer,	Owens,	Tucker,
Cobb, Ala.	Lawson,	Patterson,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Mo.	Layton,	Pendleton,	Turner, Va.
Cockrell,	Lester,	Price,	Underwood,
Cooper, Fla.	Little,	Richardson,	Wheeler,
Cooper, Tex.	Livingston,	Robbins,	Williams,
Cox,	Maguire,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	McClellan,	Sayers,	Yoakum.
Cummings,	McCreary, Ky.	Shuford,	
De Armond,	McCulloch,	Sorg,	

NOT VOTING—86.

Abbott,	Dovener,	McClure,	Settle,
Adams,	Ellett, Va.	McCormick,	Shannon,
Aldrich,	Elliott, S. C.	McKenney,	Shaw,
Allen, Miss.	Fenton,	McRae,	Skinner,
Apsley,	Fitzgerald,	Meiklejohn,	Smith, Mich.
Atwood,	Foss,	Miller, W. Va.	Southwick,
Beach,	Harrison,	Milliken,	Stallings,
Black, N. Y.	Heiner, Pa.	Miner, N. Y.	Steele,
Blue,	Hopkins,	Mondell,	Stone, W. A.
Bull,	Howard,	Moses,	Taft,
Calderhead,	Hubbard,	Mozley,	Tawney,
Chickering,	Huling,	Murphy,	Tayler,
Colson,	Hunter,	Newlands,	Tyler,
Connolly,	Johnson, Ind.	Odell,	Walker, Mass.
Cowen,	Kendall,	Pearson,	Walsh,
Crain,	Kulp,	Powers,	Watson, Ohio
Crowley,	Leisenring,	Prince,	Wilber,
Culberson,	Lockhart,	Raney,	Wilson, N. Y.
Curtis, Iowa	Lorimer,	Reyburn,	Woodard,
Curtis, N. Y.	Maddox,	Robinson, Pa.	Woomer.
Dayton,	Mahon,	Rusk,	
Dockery,	Marsh,	Russell, Ga.	

So the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The question recurred on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reexamine and report a new paragraph of so much of the bill as appears under the subhead "For charities."

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And on that motion I demand the previous question.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope the gentleman will withhold that for a moment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry, and understood that the Chair had already recognized me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to inquire of the Chair whether, under the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to recommit, it will be competent for the Committee on Appropriations, in the event that the motion prevails, to review other paragraphs of the bill than the one specifically mentioned by him, relating to charities?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now I ask the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CRISP. I believe, as there was no debate before the previous question, there is now, under the rule, a certain time allowed for debate.

The SPEAKER. But there was debate on the general question, which the Chair thinks precludes further debate under the operation of the previous question on this motion.

Mr. CRISP. But, Mr. Speaker, that question has been exhausted; the previous question has already operated to a conclusion; and we have now an entirely new proposition, subject to debate under rulings heretofore made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. In the Twenty-seventh Congress, on page 128 of the Journal of the first session, I find the following:

The House having yesterday decided to reconsider the vote of the 7th instant, adopting the said resolution, the amendment proposed by Mr. Rayner to the resolution was read; and, after some conversation as to whether that amendment was in order or not, Mr. Rayner withdrew it, and the question again recurred on Mr. Wise's resolution, when Mr. Barnard submitted a question of order, as follows.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I should like to know what the gentleman is saying, and I can not hear a word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia will be kind enough to suspend for a moment. The House will please be in order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman please refer to the rule again on which he bases his proposition?

Mr. CRISP. I will repeat, so that my friend from Ohio will understand it. The point that I made to the Speaker was that this motion of the gentleman, not having been previously debated and the previous question having been ordered upon it, that under the rules there was a limited amount of debate upon it—fifteen minutes upon a side. The Speaker suggested that the previous question had been ordered upon the passage of the bill, which is true, and which, if not divested by the vote of the House, would cut off all debate upon any collateral motion or any motion that might follow after, and the point that I was proceeding to make was that it had been decided in the Twenty-seventh Congress that the reconsideration of a final vote by the House divested the question of the previous question and left it again open to debate and to amendment, and I was proceeding to relate what took place. It is very short and I will read all that appears in the Journal:

The House resumed the consideration of the questions arising out of the motion of Mr. Fornance, of the 8th instant, to reconsider the vote of the 7th instant adopting the resolution moved by Mr. Wise for the appointment of a committee to report rules for the government of the House and adopting temporarily the rules and orders of the last House of Representatives.

The House having yesterday decided to reconsider the vote of the 7th instant adopting the said resolution, the amendment proposed by Mr. Rayner to the resolution was read; and, after some conversation as to whether that amendment was in order or not, Mr. Rayner withdrew it, and the question again recurred on Mr. Wise's resolution, when Mr. Barnard submitted a question of order, as follows.

To this I desire to call the special attention of the Speaker. It appears that at that time they put their questions of order in writing. This is stated in this way:

The House had passed a resolution adopting certain rules and orders for its own government; this resolution was passed under the operation of the previous question by which the House determined that the question on the resolution should be taken without further debate. Yesterday the House determined to reconsider the vote adopting the said resolution. This restored the question on that resolution to the position in which it stood at the moment of taking the first vote thereon; the previous question still applies, and the question must now be taken without debate or amendment—

That is, the question of order presented.

The Speaker decided that the House having reconsidered the vote adopting the resolution, the proceeding was restored to the precise point at which it was when the question to agree to the resolution was put; that the question, Will the House agree to the resolution? immediately recurred upon the passing of the vote to reconsider, and it was the question now before the House; that, as that question had been decided on the 8th instant, under the operation of the previous question, the previous question now operated upon it, and consequently it was not open to debate or amendment.

From this decision Mr. Wise appealed, on the ground that a previous question expended itself when once put and decided; that having been put on the 8th instant and decided, it could no longer be applied to the present proceeding unless renewed; and, consequently, that the proposition before the House was open both to amendment and debate.

Mr. Proffit moved the previous question on the appeal, and it was seconded by a member.

A call of the House was then moved by Mr. Adams, and was refused.

And the previous question was put, viz, Shall the main question be now put?

And passed in the affirmative.

And the question was put, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

And passed in the negative	Yeas	105
	Nays	112

So that the decision of the Chair was reversed, and it was decided that the previous question, when once put, no longer operated.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, Mr. Speaker, from that day to this there has been no different ruling.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he thinks that is a parallel case to the present? Supposing after reconsideration had been had a motion had been made to amend, and then the previous question had been ordered by the House upon that motion, would the gentleman contend that in this situation of the bill the amendment could have been debated fifteen minutes on either side after the previous question had been ordered?

Mr. CRISP. That is a different question.

Mr. DINGLEY. And does it not apply to the motion to recommit?

Mr. CRISP. Well, that is the real question, whether or not that is the identical question. I should think that if an amend-

ment were offered under those circumstances, and the previous question were ordered upon it, it is likely it would not be debatable.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman from Ohio has moved to recommit, and then has moved the previous question, and the House has ordered the previous question on that motion. Now, on what ground does the gentleman from Georgia claim that this question is open to discussion?

Mr. CRISP. The rule I claim it under I will read to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY. You refer to the fifteen minutes' debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Maine if he understands that the previous question has been ordered generally or only on the motion to recommit?

Mr. DINGLEY. The previous question has been ordered on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Then, if the previous question was divested by the carrying of the motion to reconsider, the motion for the previous question is only upon the present question—that is, the motion to recommit; and the rule of the House says:

And the same right of debate shall be allowed whenever the previous question has been ordered on any proposition on which there has been no debate.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does not the word "proposition" refer to any bill that has been offered, or does it refer to an incidental motion on a bill that has already been considered or being considered? The suggestion I made was: Suppose the gentleman from Ohio made a motion to amend this very bill instead of moving to recommit, and then had moved the previous question and the House had ordered the previous question on the motion to amend, would the gentleman from Georgia contend that because of the rule that has been just referred to that he had the right of fifteen minutes' debate on the motion to amend, the bill having already been considered by the House, and this being merely an incidental matter? Has the gentleman considered as to whether that rule was intended to apply to a proposition of this character?

Mr. CRISP. Here is a distinct proposition, which disposes of the bill. This takes the whole bill from the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. It would no more than a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause, and the motion would be an incidental one arising on a proposition that has already been considered by the House.

Mr. CRISP. I do not see how the gentleman can draw that distinction. Here is a proposition to recommit a bill or to commit a bill, as you please, which bill has been divested of the previous question entirely, and the gentleman makes this independent proposition and the previous question has been ordered upon it.

Mr. DINGLEY. But I want to ask my friend from Georgia is a motion to recommit a bill that has already been before the House any more an independent proposition than a motion to amend would be? He would not contend, surely, that a motion to amend a bill already considered by the House would admit, after the previous question had been ordered, of fifteen minutes' debate on either side. The gentleman from Ohio has moved, and the House has ordered, the previous question on the motion to recommit, which is an incidental motion on a proposition that has been considered and debated by the House.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that the phraseology used there could have no application if it did not apply to a question of this kind. Debate has been provided for under certain circumstances, and then, as if to cover cases of this sort, the provision of the rule which the Chair has just read was incorporated, and it seems to me that it is useless if it does not apply to propositions of this sort. There is no exception to it as read by the Chair.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think the general parliamentary question is a very important one, much more important in its operation upon the future than upon anything in the present, or its operation upon this question.

Mr. CRISP. Before the gentleman proceeds, I desire to say that I agree with him as to its importance. I only want five minutes; and if the gentleman will give me five minutes I will withdraw the point and the Chair can consider it at his leisure.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well; I suggest that the matter be left over. The gentleman can have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor, unless he yields it.

Mr. CRISP. I have stated that I will withdraw the point of order from the consideration of the Speaker, conceding that it is a very important one, if the gentleman from Ohio will simply withhold his demand and let me have five minutes for debate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am willing that the gentleman shall have the same amount of time as shall be allowed on this side.

Mr. CRISP. I only wanted five minutes on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a fair proposition, because the parliamentary question is one that is far-reaching and important. I ask unanimous consent, pending this motion to recommit, that there be ten minutes of debate, five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia and five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. LACEY. Before that is put, I would like to ask a question. This is a parliamentary question that will come up further on.

I would like to ask in this connection, because we want to know what the rule is on this subject——

Mr. CRISP. We are not going to have any ruling until the question has been investigated more thoroughly.

Mr. LACEY. But, Mr. Speaker, I observe that Rule XVII omits any provision for the fifteen minutes' debate which was provided for in the last Congress.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is provided for elsewhere, in Rule XXVIII, paragraph 3.

Mr. LACEY. The question is, whether it is provided for there. That rule provides only for what is to be done on a motion for the suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. No; "And the same right of debate shall be allowed whenever the previous question has been ordered on any proposition on which there has been no debate."

The question seems to turn on the meaning of the word "proposition" in the rule. The Chair has his impression about it, but if the House does not desire to have it decided now, the Chair will put the request for unanimous consent made by the gentleman from Ohio. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is entitled to five minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I desire that five minutes only for the purpose of congratulating the majority in the House of Representatives on their capacity to "transact the public business." [Laughter.] I have been a member of this House quite a number of years; there are other members who have had a much longer service; I have made some inquiry, and I believe that this is the first time in the history of the Government that a general appropriation bill has been brought into the House, duly considered, and, upon a yea-and-nay vote, the House has refused to pass it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a noteworthy event. I recollect that our friend who now occupies the Speaker's chair, in the last Congress and in the Congress preceding, used very often to stand about where my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] now sits, and congratulate this side of the House on their capacity to "transact the public business," and it affords me infinite pleasure now to return the compliment, and to say that whatever our misdoings or shortcomings may have been, we never reached that state of disorganization where we were unable to frame and pass an ordinary general appropriation bill. [Laughter. Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill applies to the District of Columbia. It appropriates for the support of this beautiful city, of which we are all so proud, and we have been told time and time again during the consideration of the bill that we were acting as a board of aldermen or a common council. Now, that being so, I want to say to you, my friends on the other side, with the utmost good nature, that you have written yourselves down, by your action here to-day, as incompetent to discharge the duties of a board of aldermen for the city of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side, and laughter.] You present a bill to make appropriations for the District of Columbia. It is considered in the House, some of our friends earnestly assail it. You amend it, and I doubt whether any of you know now exactly what this mutilated bill is. [Laughter.] The bill is brought to a vote, and a majority of the House vote it down. Then, by a little effort of the leaders on your side, by a little stirring around the edges and lobbies, and by the promise: "If you will vote against this motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table and will help us to reconsider this bill, we will recommit it, and the committee will fix it right" [laughter]—in that way you have got your party, in the main, together; and all that means just this—you confess before the whole country, in spite of all your professions of capacity, that you are incompetent to transact the ordinary public business of the United States. [Laughter. Applause on the Democratic side.] You have not only shown it on this bill, but you have shown it on the bond bill that you have passed; you have shown it on the tariff bill that you passed here some time ago; and, though I am no prophet nor the son of a prophet, I predict that there will hardly come a month or a week from now until the time this Congress adjourns in which it will not be developed by your action here that your majority is utterly incapable of intelligently and properly transacting the public business of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the difference between this side of the House and that side is, that this side of the House is capable of rectifying any mistakes that we may make, while that side of the House is not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That side of the House passed a tariff bill on one occasion, and it came back here with 644 amendments, 644 mistakes, 644 blunders; and what did that side of the House do? They did not have the capacity to extricate themselves out of the mess, but plunged headlong into it, and the people of the United States have punished them and will continue to punish them for their incapacity. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, first, in answer to the leather and prunella which proceeds from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], let me say that substantially this bill which has just been recommitted, or one similar to it, was passed in the Fifty-second Congress, while that gentleman had the honor to be Speaker, by a substantially solid Democratic vote; while as to this bill, which, I repeat, is in substance the same as the bill then passed, there is almost a solid Democratic vote against it. Let that go for what it is worth. This bill was reported to the House with the entire approval of the minority of the committee. It has been developed here for three or four days that the House of Representatives, upon both sides, if we can judge from the votes, has not been satisfied with a portion of this bill, and, as is perfectly proper if the House is not satisfied, it recommits the bill to an organ of the House, a committee of its own creation, with instructions to further consider and report a bill for consideration by the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. A small portion of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. No doubt that committee will proceed to comply with the direction which the House has given. [Applause.]

So far as progress by this House is concerned, and our competency to legislate, never in the history of this country has any House of Representatives made such a good record for action touching important legislation as has been made by this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] And with that fact staring us in the face, we can afford to let the gentleman from Georgia rail. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If this bill shall be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee and reported back from that committee, will the provisions as to charities require consideration in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will decide that question when the bill is reported back.

Mr. DOCKERY. I also desire to ask whether any other portion of the bill than that covered by the motion of the gentleman from Ohio will be open to amendment and consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only give an impression, which is that it will not be, but does not undertake now to give a final decision upon the question.

Mr. HENDERSON. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] to recommit the bill with the instructions which have been reported to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PROHIBITION OF PRIZE FIGHTING, ETC.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning a request was made for unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill prohibiting prize fighting in the Territories and the District of Columbia. Objection was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX], and the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee has considered it, and now I am authorized to report it back and ask its immediate consideration. Various amendments have been made, or rather the bill has been recast or redrafted so as to meet the objections of the objectors. I presume it is necessary for me to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, which I now do.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked for the immediate consideration of the substitute bill, which will now be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals and to provide penalties therefor in the Territories and District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, in any of the Territories or the District of Columbia, shall voluntarily engage in a pugilistic encounter between man and man, or a fight between a man and a bull, or any other animal, for money or for other thing of value, or for any championship, or upon the result of which any money or anything of value is bet or wagered, or to see which any admission fee is charged, either directly or indirectly, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary not less than one nor more than five years.

SEC. 2. By the term "pugilistic encounter," as used in this bill, is meant any voluntary fight by blows by means of fists, or otherwise, whether with or without gloves, between two or more men, for money or for a prize of any character, or for any other thing of value, or for any championship, or upon the result of which any money or anything of value is bet or wagered, or to see which any admission fee is charged, either directly or indirectly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to address an inquiry to the gentleman from Iowa. I do not want to object.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection (and the Chair hears none) the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] has the floor.

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that this bill had been considered and reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has the Judiciary Committee authority from the House to sit during the sessions of the House? If not, I do not see how it is possible that the bill can have been considered by the Judiciary Committee since objection was made this morning to its consideration.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, if the gentleman wishes to raise that point, I will say we considered it in an informal way.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not raised any objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Every member of the committee has been consulted and has assented to the bill as now reported.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It occurs to me that a bill of this importance, making certain acts felonies and prescribing penalties therefor, including punishment in the penitentiary, ought to be very carefully drawn.

Mr. HENDERSON. The bill has been considered carefully, and every member of the committee has given his assent to it and has requested that it be brought up in this way.

Mr. BAILEY. In reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], I want to say that while I agreed that the bill be reported and have no objection to its consideration, I do not want to be regarded as responsible for what the bill contains.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and I gave the measure the closest examination, and we made such changes as to meet the objections. Every member of the committee was consulted.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Does this bill cover cockfights?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, if a cock is an animal it does.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I do not think it is. [Laughter.] Or I will say to the gentleman, as Diogenes expressed it, it is if it has no feathers. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman is a high authority on everything connected with the turf. I do not feel it necessary to reply further.

I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill was strictly a legal objection, and was not made because I was in any way opposed to the principles or purpose of the measure. The second section of the bill, as it was offered, provided, according to the reply made by the Delegate from New Mexico, that any person, no matter of what age or sex, who might be found present at a personal encounter where an admission fee was charged, was to be regarded as guilty of a felony and punished by imprisonment for a minimum term of five years. The third section, which undertook to define a fight with a man or an animal, declared that it meant a personal encounter where blows were exchanged. Clearly that would apply to a football match, and very likely to nearly all the college athletic games. I very much question, if the bill were enacted in that form, whether it might not send to the penitentiary some of the sons of members of this House for a minimum term of five years.

Mr. HENDERSON. Thereby punishing the wrong fellows.

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir. But by the reference to the Judiciary Committee those elements have been eliminated from the bill, and it now applies strictly to a fight between man and man or a fight between a man and an animal. The bill being thus amended, I am heartily in favor of its purpose, and I hope it will be speedily considered and passed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask the previous question on the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question before that?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. According to what statute, or in conformity with what statute, may I ask, has the bill been framed? What has been the model, in other words, on which the committee acted?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we followed more closely the Texas legislation than any other, because that was enacted to catch the same fellows that we were after.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Are the penalties the same in each case?

Mr. BAILEY. No.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What is the penalty in Texas.

Mr. CATRON. Not less than two nor more than five years' imprisonment.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Why increase the penalties in this act?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, in that respect we are acting entirely independently of any of the States. It did not seem to the mem-

bers of the committee any too much of a penalty, because the sentiment of the country is absolutely against this barbarous practice, and if we are going to act let us do it in such a way as to show our determination to put a stop to it.

We left, too, the football playing out, I will say to my friend from New York, although from the exhibitions that I have seen of the game myself I would have been very glad to include it [laughter], but we left it out to please my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX], and other gentlemen.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would ask whether this would not bar out all amateur contests as well?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, it will certainly bar out all prize fighting, whether it be a prize fight for a prize in a college or elsewhere, no matter where. There is no doubt of that. If they are going to have prize fights for prizes, with or without gloves, either in the prize ring or in the colleges, they will certainly come within the provisions of this bill. The bill has been made broad enough to cover all cases of misdemeanor of this character, whether it be by college students, or by the Morrisseys, or anybody else.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Is it not a very much more severe statute than that adopted in any State of the Union?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I do not know as to that.

Mr. KNOX. This bill, as it comes from the committee, does not include amateur contests, such as exhibitions of boxing. The third section provides for that.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I think the gentleman from Iowa will admit that it covers any prize fight or amateur contest in any college or anywhere else.

Mr. MORSE. If it does not it ought to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa whether this would cover fights between the bulls and bears in the bucket shops of Washington? [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I will have to leave that to some one who is more familiar with that branch of the subject than I am. I have no acquaintance with the bucket shops of Washington.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the bill go so far as to prohibit prize fighting on naval vessels of the United States? I remember, according to the public journals last summer, that a prize fight was reported to have taken place on one of the vessels of the United States Navy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the bill reaches that class. We thought we would leave that to the efficient officers of the Navy. We thought that this was a matter which would require very prompt action, and did not want to provoke any trouble with regard to getting it through. The able chairman of the Naval Committee, now sitting before me, can control that matter. I demand the previous question.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Before that, let me make a parliamentary inquiry. Has unanimous consent been given for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it was given. The Chair asked, very distinctly, at the time the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] was occupying the floor, and there was no objection.

Mr. MEREDITH. We did not understand what the bill was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I did not understand that unanimous consent had been given. I thought a discussion took place and that that question was not put to the House at the time.

The SPEAKER. It was submitted.

Mr. MEREDITH. We did not understand that this bill was before the House for consideration, and under the circumstances I think the gentleman ought to withdraw it.

Mr. BOATNER. Before the gentleman from Iowa demands the previous question I would like to make a single suggestion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Everybody is anxious to get on with the bond bill and I do not wish to take up any more time than is necessary, but I yield to my colleague on the committee for a suggestion.

Mr. BOATNER. I would suggest to the gentleman whether the severity of the penalty fixed in the bill might not endanger the conviction of offenders? An imprisonment for five years at hard labor might not be too severe for an aggravated case coming under the provisions of the bill, but cases might arise where there had been an infraction of the law and the juries would hesitate to convict and it would be difficult to obtain conviction under a penalty so severe. I suggest that a reduction of the penalty be made, so that it be not less than one year or more than three, for instance.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the penalty is none too severe. It is unquestionably the judgment of the best people in America that severe penalties should be enforced to break up this practice.

Mr. BOATNER. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the experience of judicial proceedings is that what the public may consider to be a very severe punishment frequently prevents conviction, and that while the public sentiment of the country at this time may and does support this severe penalty, yet that subsequently it may be considered too severe. If we make the penalty not less than one year nor more than five, that would allow the punishment to be graded according to the nature of the offense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman's proposition is to have it not less than one nor more than five years, in the discretion of the court?

Mr. BOATNER. Yes, not less than one nor more than five.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am willing to consent to that amendment.

Mr. BOATNER. I offer that amendment, with the consent of the gentleman.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not understand that this bill has any relation to dueling. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, no; not at all. We can not afford to stop that. [Laughter.] I ask the previous question on the bill and the amendment which has been suggested.

Mr. MEREDITH. Would it be in order to move to recommit this bill to the Judiciary Committee?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order.

Mr. MEREDITH. I make that motion, sir. This bill has not been printed. It has not been read by the members, and we do not know what its effect is.

Mr. HENDERSON. We know very well what its effect is, and we know this fight is coming off on the 14th, and this bill must pass both Houses and get to the President before that time. States have acted quickly, and why can not the American Congress act? [Applause.]

Mr. MEREDITH. I make the motion that this be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the motion at the proper time. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill so that it will read:

And upon such conviction shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary not less than one nor more than five years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill, and pending that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MEREDITH] moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. MEREDITH, and it was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HENDERSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill No. 2904, with Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill, with the amendments of the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2904) entitled "An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue," do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury hall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denomi-

nations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Amend the title so as to read: An act to restore the coinage of silver dollars, and for other purposes.

Mr. DINGLEY Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, under the instructions of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment in the nature of a substitute and insist upon the bill as it passed the House.

If there were no other reasons, Mr. Chairman, for nonconcurring in the substitute amendment of the Senate, it would be sufficient that the Senate has returned to the House not one line or one word of the bill which the House sent to the other body, but a substitute on another subject entirely distinct, which, if it had been moved as an amendment in the House, would at once have been ruled out of order as not germane to the subject which the House was considering.

WHAT THE HOUSE PROPOSED.

The House sent to the Senate two bills. The first provided for an increase of the revenue to the extent of about $40,000,000, to prevent deficiencies and to furnish the Government sufficient revenue to meet its expenses. It also sent to the Senate a second bill—the pending bill—proposing three things: First, authorizing a reduction of the rate of interest and the length of time during which bonds should run, when issued under the resumption act of 1875; reducing the rate of interest from 4 per cent, as provided under that act, to 3 per cent; and reducing the length of time which the bonds had to run from thirty years to five years, with a maximum of fifteen years.

The bill as sent from the House to the Senate also provided that whenever bonds should be issued under the act of 1875 they should be offered first to the American people as a popular loan; and lastly, that the proceeds of the sale of the bonds under the act of 1875 should be devoted exclusively to resumption purposes under that act, and that whenever, incidentally, there should be a failure of revenue to meet the expenses certificates of indebtedness running three years and payable from revenue to accrue should be used instead of the proceeds of the sale of bonds.

The House is entitled to some answer to the propositions in which they asked the concurrence of the Senate. If the Senate had returned the House bill with an amendment, proposing to repeal the act of 1875, there would have been at least some relevancy in their action. But a majority of the Senate distinctly defeated a proposition of that kind, thus practically confirming the continuance of the issuance of bonds under the act of 1875, running thirty years and bearing 4 per cent interest, and refusing to authorize a reduction of the rate of interest to 3 per cent and limitation of time to fifteen years; and doing this, too, when they knew that 4 per cent bonds running thirty years would continue to be issued under the act of 1875 if the House bill should not be concurred in by the Senate.

If the Senate had promptly concurred in this House provision, the hundred million loan for which bids have just been opened would have been made a 3 per cent loan and offered at par to the American people. And the responses made to this 4 per cent loan make it certain that every dollar would have been taken, and the saving to the people in this loan alone would have been at least $80,000,000.

The House, Mr. Chairman, is entitled to a definite answer to the second proposition that it made, that bonds issued under the act of 1875 should be first offered as a popular loan to the American people. The majority of the Senate have struck out that provision of the House bill, and thus has permitted a repetition of the sale of bonds to foreign syndicates at inadequate prices without offering them to the American people.

I take it that the House proposes to insist on these two propositions, and, further, to insist on its third proposition, that when bonds are sold under the act of 1875 the proceeds shall be devoted exclusively to redemption purposes, as provided in the act of 1875, and not to be indirectly used, as they have been practically used during the past two and a half years, to meet deficiencies of revenues.

What has been going on, Mr. Chairman, for the last two and a half years? One hundred and sixty-two million dollars of bonds have been sold, from which has been realized $182,000,000 in gold. One hundred and eighty-two million dollars in greenbacks have been redeemed, and immediately $133,000,000 of the $182,000,000 redeemed have been paid out to meet a deficiency in revenue, and thus made available for a second presentation for redemption.

The House bill proposes to stop that procedure, and to provide that all the proceeds of bonds shall be devoted exclusively to the one purpose of maintaining the redemption fund, and that whenever there shall be a deficiency of revenue that certificates of indebtedness snall be sold, bearing interest not exceeding 3 per cent and payable from revenue within three years. This would have practically separated the reserve or redemption fund from the funds devoted to the payment of current expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the House, I take it, will insist upon all three of its propositions. It will not consent that a bill sent to the Senate bearing upon a distinct subject, to accomplish the three distinct purposes which I have named, shall be returned to this House with every line and every word struck out and an entire measure substituted, not only upon a different subject, but on a subject not having the slightest relation to the three points on which the House asked the concurrence of the Senate.

The propositions contained in the pending measure as it passed the House are so important to a restoration of the Treasury to the sound condition which existed from 1879 to 1893 that the House ought to insist on the action it has already taken.

I might stop here, Mr. Chairman, and not proceed to discuss at all the substitute that has been proposed by the Senate. I might be and every gentleman here might be in favor of every line of the Senate substitute, and yet this House would have a right to demand of the Senate that it should either concur in our action or present an amendment repealing the act of 1875—leaving legislation on another subject to come up in an orderly way. One or the other horn of this dilemma, if the majority of the Senate choose to call it a dilemma, the Senate ought to be required to take. Either authority should be given to reduce the rate of interest and to require public loans, or else the act of 1875 should be repealed.

THE NATIONAL CREDIT.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to stop here. I desire to discuss, as briefly as possible, the character of the substitute which the Senate has presented; a substitute, be it remembered, on an entirely different subject. What is that substitute? It consists of three parts. The last proposition (for I will consider them in inverse order) authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem greenbacks or Treasury notes, at his option, in either standard silver dollars or gold.

Now, what is the object of that proposed legislation? If it does nothing except simply authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, at his option, to select either form of money in redemptions, then it is merely the law as it exists now and has existed for years. But no doubt it will be claimed—and I am not sure but with good reason—that inasmuch as this legislation reaffirms the existing law and omits the parity provision of the act of 1890, it would repeal this provision. Perhaps it was intended to do that. What was that parity provision of the act of 1890 which limited, or at least indicated the direction of the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury? It was the declaration that it is—

> The established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law.

Is it the object of this substitute to repeal the parity provision of the act of 1890 by this legislation, so as to give some basis to the claim that it was intended to mean that if gold and silver coins should part, then the Secretary of the Treasury should pay for redeemed notes in the cheaper money? And is it intended to follow this up with other legislation which will break the parity between gold and silver?

Mr. Chairman, whether that was intended or not, if this substitute should become law there is not a man in this country who has money to loan to the Government but would take alarm if such legislation should be had at this time, fearing that the Government of the United States had reached the point where it desired to break the parity between the two metals, and that therefore this legislation was to be taken as notice to all the world that at an early date it was proposed to have such further legislation as would make our gold and silver coins part company.

For if it is proposed not to have them part company but to maintain silver and gold at a parity—for everybody knows that our standard silver dollars were coined on the account and for the profit of the Government, and are therefore maintained at a parity with gold by limitation of the amount and indirect redemption by receiving them for gold duties—then what would be gained by a declaration which would serve only to increase distrust?

The suggestion that France compels the holders of the French paper currency to sometimes accept silver in part payment at least of notes presented for redemption, and yet preserves the parity of these notes with gold, overlooks the fact that it is not the Government of France that issues circulating notes, but a corporation distinct from the Government, known as the Bank of France, which maintains a coin reserve of nearly six hundred and thirty-four millions (of which nearly three hundred and eighty-five millions is gold) against a note circulation of only six hundred and seventy-five millions, and which as a bank of discount can protect its reserve by raising the rate of discount and other means not available to a government that issues its own notes without any assets except revenue derived from taxation. Moreover the Gov-

ernment of France does not permit the free coinage of silver, and maintains her full legal-tender silver at a parity with gold precisely as the Government of the United States maintains our silver.

There is no doubt of the power of the United States to redeem greenbacks or pay any Government obligations in any kind of money that it chooses, or even to repudiate the entire debt. A Government can not be sued or its assets attached. A Government note or bond is a debt of honor, and the only assurance the holder of a Government note or bond has that he will receive what he or the creditor who sold him such promise loaned to the government, is his confidence in the good faith of the nation which gave it.

The only question for the nation which gave the promise is not one of technical power to discharge the debt in inferior money, for it has that power, but one of honor and good faith. And even this question must be considered in the light of the fact that the life of a nation is not limited like that of an individual to a few brief years, but will probably go on for many generations and centuries. It is certain that any nation will sooner or later come into straits where its reputation for good faith in the payment of its obligations will not only secure for it credit which would have not otherwise been granted, and credit, too, on terms far more advantageous than would have otherwise been possible. Whatever may happen, I feel assured that the people of this country will see to it that every dollar of the money which they have borrowed and for which obligations are now outstanding, all of which has been gold or its equivalent, will be paid in money of equal value to that which we have received. [Applause.]

And when nothing is to be gained by any other course, wisdom, if nothing else, would dictate that we talk very little about expedients which would be regarded by the world as looking to repudiation. For so long as we maintain the policy of preserving the parity between our gold and our silver coin—and we can not have both gold and silver at the same time as money unless we do preserve that parity,—so long as we do preserve it not one farthing is to be gained by forcing upon any unwilling creditor a kind of money which, for any reason, he may distrust.

In fact, if we would drop that kind of talk and speak boldly and honestly of our intention to maintain our good faith, all kinds of money would be accepted without the least question by anyone. Why, sir, I am informed that until 1893 the bondholders accepted, even in payment of bonds, the current currency of the country without any question, in large part because there was no reason to distrust our good faith and our purpose to maintain the two kinds of money at a parity.

THE SILVER DOLLARS IN THE TREASURY.

Mr. Chairman, judging from much that I have heard here and elsewhere, there is an impression that we have in the Treasury of the United States a large mass of silver dollars belonging to the Government that could be used for the purpose of redeeming the greenbacks. But where are they, Mr. Chairman? I have here the report of the Treasury Department for yesterday. How many silver dollars are there in the Treasury? Three hundred and fifty-three million dollars, besides the fund set aside for the redemption of the Treasury notes. What is the condition of that $353,000,000? Three hundred and forty-six million dollars of silver certificates are outstanding against them. Who owns the 346,000,000 silver dollars deposited, represented by $346,000,000 of silver certificates outstanding? Not the Government, but the people of this country; there is scarcely a citizen of the United States who does not own some of them by having in his possession a silver certificate. Only 7,000,000 of silver dollars outside of the fund under the act of 1890 are in the Treasury to-day, belonging to it in such a way as to be made available for the redemption of the greenbacks. Therefore what is proposed is to disturb confidence in this country still more—to create the impression that we propose to repudiate something whether we do or not,—all because of simply $7,000,000; and every one of these silver dollars can be used for other purposes, instead of greenbacks, and thus maintain the confidence which existed from 1879 to 1893.

There is no excuse in the present condition of the Treasury for parading abroad throughout this country again what is already the law, unless you propose to repeal the parity act of 1890 and increase a distrust which already exists. The end of using these $7,000,000 for redemption purposes does not justify the means.

Mr. McRAE. I ask the gentleman to tell us how much silver bullion there is in the Treasury purchased under the act of 1890, and why that should not be coined into silver dollars and used to redeem the Sherman Treasury notes, and thereby to that extent relieve the drain upon the gold reserve?

THE TREASURY BULLION AND THE CERTIFICATE DEVICE.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am coming to that. My friend from Arkansas asks, why not use the silver bullion which was purchased under the act of 1890 by the use of Treasury notes? We are using it every day, gradually and safely, under the operation of the unrepealed provisions of the act of 1890, for the redemption and cancellation of these Treasury notes. But should it be used for the redemption of the greenback? Are you not aware, my friend, that there is a redemption going on every day—a redemption of Treasury notes with silver dollars coined from the fund of silver bullion that was purchased under the act of 1890?

Mr. McRAE. To what extent?

Mr. DINGLEY. More than $18,000,000.

A MEMBER. Nineteen million dollars.

Mr. DINGLEY. Nearly $19,000,000 has been redeemed, and most of it in the past year and a half.

Now, let us consider what the process is that is going on, and going on safely, at the present time. We have in the Treasury as a redemption fund under the act of 1890 silver bullion that cost $124,000,000 and $13,000,000 of coined silver dollars, against one hundred and thirty-seven millions of Treasury notes. Under that act it is provided that this silver bullion shall be coined as fast as it may be required for the redemption and cancellation of Treasury notes that may be presented for redemption in silver dollars. How does it happen that while this volume of Treasury notes was originally over $155,000,000 it is to-day only $137,000,000? There is going on a process of redemption and cancellation of Treasury notes by the substitution of silver certificates, gradually and safely, as business demands. This comes under a provision of the act of 1890, which provides that the volume of outstanding Treasury notes shall at no time exceed the silver dollars coined from the bullion purchased under this act and the cost of the uncoined bullion; so that when a Treasury note is redeemed in silver it must be immediately canceled, as the silver dollar or silver certificate representing the silver dollar goes into circulation in its place.

Now, this fund of silver is being constantly used in this way. Holders of Treasury notes are voluntarily presenting them every day at the Treasury for redemption in silver dollars. Why? Because the policy of the Treasury Department is to gradually place the smaller denominations of our paper money in silver certificates. Whenever it is desired to obtain a larger amount of ones, twos, or fives, the way in which they can be most speedily obtained is to ask for the redemption of the larger denominations of Treasury notes in silver dollars, and the immediate issue, on the deposit of those, of silver certificates in the denominations of ones, twos, and fives.

Now, when this process is going on safely, why propose by one bold stroke to increase rapidly and illegitimately the distrust that exists in this country and to put into circulation a larger volume of these notes than can be used in the ordinary transactions of business, causing them at once to be presented at our custom-houses for the payment of customs duties. What is gained by such a process? If you force these notes out quickly, as proposed by the provision of the Senate bill, every dollar of them will within six months be back, being paid in for customs duties in lieu of gold. Then gentlemen will wonder why we do not receive more gold from customs duties.

If, on the contrary, the act of 1890 continues to be executed as it is being executed to-day, within a comparatively few years, as business revives, every dollar of the $124,000,000 of silver bullion that is now in the Treasury belonging to that fund will have been coined and used in redeeming and canceling Treasury notes, in lieu of which will have gone out silver certificates, gradually as business desires them, and whatever profit may have accrued from the coinage will have been covered into the Treasury. That is the safe way of using the bullion in the Treasury and converting it into money and at the same time eliminating the Treasury notes from our currency.

Now, what is proposed by this measure which has come from the Senate? It is proposed to make one grand grab; to violate the good faith pledged by the act of 1890, and alarm the business public. But what is really proposed? Look for a moment at it. It proposes to direct the issue at once of about $40,000,000 of silver certificates, representing, as it is said, the seigniorage or profit that would accrue after the $124,000,000 of silver bullion is coined—although not a dollar of it has been coined. Now, what is a silver certificate? Take one out of your pocket, if you please, and read it. "This certifies that there have been deposited in the Treasury of the United States" $5, $2, or $1, as the case may be, "payable to the bearer (or holder) of the certificate on demand."

Now, what does the Senate substitute propose? It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates certifying that $40,000,000 silver dollars have been deposited in the Treasury for their redemption, when, as a matter of fact, there has not been one dollar deposited or even coined. Why, such a proposition has never before been heard of in finance outside of the Congress of the United States. [Laughter.] Direct your Secretary of the Treasury to certify to a falsehood, and then wonder why anybody distrusts the good faith of the Government of the United States!

But what is gained? If you will only consider a moment, and wait, and allow the act of 1890 to work its own salvation, you will have obtained and covered into the Treasury every dollar of the seigniorage or profit, and done it without violating the good faith of the nation and in a way that will not disturb public confidence. The road of good faith is straightforward in this matter;

the road of bad faith is tortuous. Honesty, Mr. Chairman, straightforward dealing, is not only the right thing but is good policy for a nation as well as an individual.

I am sure that the House, when it comes to consider what is proposed to be accomplished here, will see that the proposition can only increase the distrust that already exists, and will make the road to recovery longer and more difficult. But even if we should concur in the Senate's proposition, how would it help us in the redemption of the greenbacks? Will some gentleman please tell me how the Senate provision, which directs that silver certificates, which are to be issued on a pretense that they represent deposited dollars not yet coined, shall be used in meeting current expenditures, not devoted to redemption purposes—and this, let me say, is the reply to the gentleman who asked a few moments ago, "Why not use the $124,000,000 of silver bullion which was purchased under the act of 1890 to redeem greenbacks and Treasury notes?"—will some gentleman please tell me how this provision can add anything to the redemption fund?

Mr. TERRY. I understand you to make the point that if the certificates are issued now there would be no silver dollars to meet them?

Mr. DINGLEY. There would be no silver dollars that had been deposited as against certificates issued in this way.

Mr. TERRY. I understand that; but do you make the point that if a silver certificate were issued, and the holder should take it to the Treasury for redemption, and demand his silver dollar, that he could not find a dollar there?

Mr. DINGLEY. If he found any he would have to take somebody else's dollar——

Mr. TERRY. Now right at that point——

Mr. DINGLEY. I must decline to yield, as my time is rapidly passing. I say that we have 346,000,000 of silver dollars in the Treasury, against which there already exists $346,000,000 of silver certificates, certifying that these dollars have been deposited to their credit—silver dollars which do not belong to the Government, but to the holders of the certificates; and if any more silver certificates are issued without depositing new silver dollars to represent them they are based upon a fund that does not exist.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that although nothing will come for greenback-redemption purposes, either from the silver dollars that could be availed of to-day in the Treasury or from the fund which remains as against the Treasury notes, purchased by the issue of Treasury notes, yet, somehow or other, by the adoption of free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 we will furnish a fund for redemption. How, pray? What is the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1? It is authorizing the individual owner of silver to go to our mints and have there 371¼ grains of fine silver converted into a silver dollar at the expense of the Government. And who gets the dollar? The owner of the silver bullion gets it—a silver dollar for every 50 cents' worth of silver so long as the parity is preserved—and the Government gets not a cent of it. How are you going to get silver dollars for the greenback-redemption fund out of the free coinage of silver? The Government gets nothing by such coinage. It loses, on the contrary, the cost of coinage, whatever it may be. Even with such coinage, the only way the Government can get such silver dollars for its greenback-redemption fund is by issuing bonds to buy them, and if silver and gold are to be maintained at a parity, certainly the Government will have to pay the same for coined silver as for gold.

Where, then, is the advantage to the Government and to the people who do not own silver bullion? It is replied that it will be found in the restoration of silver to its former place as a yokefellow of gold, by which this country will have both gold and silver freely coined and permanently concurrently in circulation as the money of the people, or, in other words, full bimetallism.

If it be true that opening of the mints of this country alone to the free and unlimited coinage of private silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 would give this country the permanent concurrent coinage and circulation of both gold and silver as money, which is the popular understanding of the meaning of bimetallism, then such coinage would be welcomed.

SOME CONCEDED PRINCIPLES.

But what is the evidence, Mr. Chairman, that the opening of the mints of this country to the free and unlimited coinage of private silver on the basis of regarding 16 ounces of silver the equivalent in coinage of 1 ounce of gold would result in bringing gold as well as silver to be coined and permanently concurrently circulated, when in every market of the world 32 ounces of silver is now the equivalent of 1 ounce of gold?

It must be conceded that under free and unlimited coinage of private silver bullion after a sufficient time had elapsed to give an opportunity to get into full operation, there could be no material difference in market value between 371¼ grains of fine silver in the form of bullion before coinage and 371¼ grains of silver coined into a standard silver dollar; for no owner of silver, here or abroad, would sell 371¼ grains of silver bullion materially less than he could dispose of a silver dollar coined from such silver, when he could have his bullion converted into such dollar without cost to himself. This is exactly what is found to be the case under the free and unlimited coinage of gold. The gold bullion required to mint a gold dollar is worth the same before coinage as after.

It follows from this that gold would not be brought to our mints for coinage on the basis of regarding 1 ounce of gold as the equivalent in coinage of only 16 ounces of silver unless such opening should change the absolute and relative value of gold and silver bullion in the markets of the world from the ratio of 32 to 1, as now exists, to the ratio of 16 to 1; or, in other words, should practically double the value of silver as measured in gold. For unless this miraculous change in relative value should be worked by opening the mints of this country alone, gold would not be taken to our mints for coinage, and even that already coined would be withdrawn from use as money, and both gold bullion and coined gold would become merchandise and be sold and exported as such. In other words, we should be left with only silver as our metallic full legal-tender money and should become a silver monometallic nation on a silver basis.

THE REAL ISSUE.

Mr. Chairman, the issue between those who hold that free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by this country alone would result in giving us the permanent concurrent coinage and circulation of gold and silver—for I am not addressing myself to those who desire silver monometallism—is thus narrowed down to a consideration of the question as to whether such coinage would so change the relative value of gold and silver in every market of the world as to make 16 ounces of silver the equivalent in value or purchasing power of 1 ounce of gold, when now it requires 32 ounces of silver to be such equivalent. Those who favor such coinage must demonstrate that this marvelous change would be wrought by it before they can reasonably ask the people of this country to take the enormous risk of its failure.

I trust, therefore, that in the discussion which is now opened those who advocate the adoption of the policy of opening the mints of this country alone to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will not spend their time in mere assertions and declamation about the importance of bimetallism, which the country understands to mean the permanent concurrent coinage and circulation of both gold and silver full legal-tender money, and the disadvantages of monometallism, but will present to the House and country the grounds on which they assume that such coinage would result in giving us such bimetallism rather than silver monometallism.

For myself, I never was more confident of any fact in finance than I am that such coinage of silver as is proposed would speedily drive gold from its use as money in this country and leave us with nothing but silver—in other words, silver monometallism—precisely as such a policy has resulted in Mexico. I shall listen attentively and with a receptive mind to any facts and arguments which may be adduced to maintain otherwise, for the reason that I heartily welcome the use of silver as full legal-tender money in any manner and to any extent which will preserve the parity of gold and silver and give us both metals as our property money. By the action of our Government in the past, by the declarations of both the great political parties in 1892, and by the enactment of a law with but few dissenting votes by the last Congress, we have declared our purpose to steadily seek the concurrence of a sufficient number of leading commercial nations in an international agreement for the free coinage of silver which would make permanent full bimetallism possible. Under that law we are standing to-day in the attitude of asking other countries to cooperate with us in this movement.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. What is the condition of the people of Mexico to-day?

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not discussing at present the question as to what would be the results of silver monometallism. I am discussing simply the question as to whether with free coinage of silver in this country alone we can secure the concurrent circulation of both silver and gold. I am not discussing the question of whether it would be wise to drive out gold and have nothing but silver, which the gentleman wants to discuss. That is another question.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Then, may I ask the gentleman if I am to understand from his argument, and I do not wish to put a wrong interpretation on it, he would rather have gold monometallism and distress than prosperity and silver monometallism?

Mr. DINGLEY. Whatever impairment of prosperity there may be here from causes very different from what my friend assumes, even the adversity of the United States is prosperity such as Mexico never dreamed of.

Let it be kept steadily in mind, however, while we are steadily looking to a solution of this problem by an international agreement, the only way in which, in my judgment, full bimetallism can be secured and maintained, that what we, as well as France, now have—for France and the United States are maintaining tentatively precisely the same coinage policy—is not gold monometal-

lism, but limited bimetallism, under which we carry about five hundred millions of silver, nearly four hundred and twenty-five millions of which is full legal tender, and about five hundred and seventy-five millions is gold, but every dollar, together with every dollar of our paper, maintained at a parity of value.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does not the gentleman believe that it would be safe for the Government to coin at once all the silver bullion remaining in the Treasury?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have given my reasons for entertaining the belief that so large coinage at once would increase the distrust; but to issue silver certificates on the profit of coinage not yet undertaken would be in the highest degree unwise.

Mr. TERRY. Did we have bimetallism under the act of 1792?

Mr. DINGLEY. We had an approach to it.

Mr. TERRY. We did not have concurrent circulation then, did we?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we had it part of the time, and the variation never exceeded 2 per cent. But I must decline to take up time in answering questions that are outside of the particular point I am discussing, because if gentlemen concede that we are not to have concurrent circulation of the two metals under 16 to 1 free coinage, then that is all I am arguing. I think we should have silver monometallism as the result of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 by this country alone. That is all I am endeavoring to demonstrate, and if that is admitted, then my object is secured.

THE ARGUMENTS FOR 16 TO 1 FREE COINAGE.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to examine as briefly as may be the arguments presented by those who hold that the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will give this country full bimetallism, or the concurrent coinage and circulation of gold and silver as full legal tender money.

The argument on which the friends of 16 to 1 free silver seem to more especially rest is that the opening of our mints to such coinage will create an unlimited demand for silver at a fixed price of $1.29 per ounce—the price demanded by this ratio—and this would make the market price of silver bullion in every market of the world.

This would be the case if it were true that free coinage by this country alone would create an unlimited demand for silver at the fixed price of $1.29 per ounce. The fallacy of the whole argument becomes apparent when it is considered that the demand for silver by our mints alone would not be unlimited, but restricted to the demand of purchasers of silver dollars, and that the price received by the owner of silver for each 371¼ grains is not a fixed price, but what a stamped standard silver dollar will exchange for in the markets under free and unlimited coinage. Those who accept this argument unconsciously accept the "fiat" idea that whatever the Government stamps $1 is thereby given an exchange value to that amount, regardless of its intrinsic value or its redeemable promise to pay such value—a theory which went down in disgrace under our greenback experience until specie redemption was established in 1879.

An absurd exaggeration of the theory of the bimetallic tie, as held by the scientific advocates of bimetallism, and in which I concur, has been adopted by some of the advocates of 16 to 1 free silver, to which I desire to refer. This theory holds that where the unit is measured in two metals at their commercial ratio at the time this ratio is fixed, then when one metal begins to rise there is an increased demand for the other metal which tends to restore the equilibrium so long as the conditions of production of either metal remain substantially the same. But no scientific advocate of bimetallism ever held that this alternating demand could successfully operate except within narrow limits and when the coinage ratio had been established at the commercial ratio.

It must be evident that the bimetallic tie is very weak when only a single nation has opened its mints, and that its power rapidly increases as the number of nations uniting in maintaining a common coinage ratio is enlarged. It is for this reason that international free coinage of silver becomes the hope and safety of full bimetallism, while independent free coinage, especially at a ratio widely different from the commercial ratio, must inevitably lead to disorder and silver monometallism.

Again, it is contended that the sole cause of the decline of silver was the closing of the mints of Europe and of the United States to its free coinage, and that if the mints of the United States shall be reopened immediately silver will assume its old relative value to gold.

But do not those who present this argument see that even if it be conceded that the sole cause of the decline of silver has been the closing of the mints of Europe and of the United States to its free coinage, the remedy would be not the opening of the mints of this country alone, but the opening of the mints of Europe also—in other words, international free coinage.

THE EXAMPLE OF FRANCE.

Mr. Chairman, it is also argued with great confidence that the poen mints of France alone maintained the relative value of gold and silver at the ratio of near 15½ to 1 for the first seventy-four years of this century, and therefore that the opening of the mints of the United States alone to the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 would also change the commercial ratio of silver and gold bullion to 16 to 1, notwithstanding it is now 32 to 1.

It is sufficient to say in reply that when France adopted the coinage ratio of 15½ to 1 this was the commercial ratio of silver and gold bullion; that not only France, but every country in Europe maintained substantially the same coinage ratio; that during the first sixty years of this century the annual production of silver never rose above 29,000,000 ounces per annum; and that soon after 1865 the annual production of silver began to rise abnormally, reaching 55,000,000 ounces in 1874, when not only France, but the other countries of the Latin Union, to wit, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and Greece, which had joined France in opening their mints to silver nine years before, were forced to close them, and have kept them closed against the free coinage of silver ever since.

Surely what France, aided by the other countries of the Latin Union, was unable to do in the face of the rise in the annual production of silver from 29,000,000 to 55,000,000 ounces, and a decline of only 3 cents per ounce in the price of silver, it would be absurd to expect the United States could do single-handed in the face of a rise of the annual production of silver from 55,000,000 ounces in 1874 to 160,000,000 in 1893, and a decline of 50 cents per ounce in its price.

THE OVERSHADOWING CAUSE OF SILVER DECLINE.

It is this abnormal increase in the production of silver in the face of a constantly declining price—indicating beyond question such a change in the conditions of mining that has greatly reduced the cost of producing silver, after making due allowance for the effect of the closing of European mints to silver—that has been the chief factor in causing the remarkable decline of silver in the past twenty-two years; and unless these conditions of silver production materially change, it is idle to claim that if the mints of the United States could be opened to the free coinage of silver on the basis of 16 to 1, the old relative value of silver and gold which existed before these new conditions came in would be restored.

The assertion so frequently made that the mere legislative suspension in 1873 of a law authorizing the free coinage of silver caused the decline of silver, when for twelve years prior to that time almost no silver had been coined by our mints for circulation, affords a most remarkable illustration of the potency of a persistent iteration of an absurdity.

The only way, Mr. Chairman, in which the closing or opening of mints to the coinage of silver can bring about a rise or fall of the metal is through a diminution or an increase of the demand for silver bullion. It is significant in this connection to recall that the United States has used five times as much silver as money in the seventeen years since 1878 as it used in the first seventy years of the existence of this Government under the Constitution. And it is worthy of note also, as an indication of the comparatively small influence of a demand for silver by the United States alone, that notwithstanding this country purchased, between 1890 and 1893, 54,000,000 ounces of silver per annum—substantially the American product, and one-third of the product of the world—yet after a temporary boom silver began to fall more rapidly than before, undoubtedly for the reason that the small increase of price at first so increased the profits of silver mining as to stimulate production more than ever.

The fact must not be overlooked also that while it is probable that the value of gold, which had declined somewhat under the large Californian and Australian production from 1850 to 1865, rose again as the production declined after 1865, yet since 1890 the increase of production has been greater than ever before, rising from $118,000,000 in 1870 to $205,000,000 in 1895, with the probability that the production this year will reach $250,000,000, which is almost twice the production of any year of the Californian period.

THE "DOLLAR OF THE FATHERS."

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to say that nothing can be more illogical and mischievous than the constant assertions which are being made, if men would but stop to think, about restoring what they call the dollar, the silver dollar of "the Fathers." What do you mean by that? Do you mean to say that the coinage ratio of 16 to 1 is a Divine ordination? Do you mean to say that it is something that has been established by the Divine will and is to be continued for all time? What do you mean? Why, when Christopher Columbus discovered America 10½ ounces of silver was the equivalent of 1 ounce of gold, and that being the commercial ratio, the coinage ratio was made the same in those countries which maintained the two metals at a parity.

Did the fathers in 1792 proceed to say, "Oh, let us restore the dollar of Christopher Columbus"? [Laughter.] "Let us adopt a ratio of 10½ to 1 in our coinage; because when the venerable Christopher discovered this country that was the ratio of Divine ordination." [Laughter.] They did not do anything of the kind. They treated the subject as common-sense business men; and Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, proceeded to do

what? From an investigation in every market of the world he ascertained what the commercial ratio of gold and silver was, and he found that his investigation showed that it was 15 to 1.

So the fathers adopted that ratio. In other words, they adopted the dollar unit, and measured this unit in the two metals at a ratio of 15 to 1 by weight, on the supposition that this was the commercial ratio, and therefore that both would be the same. What took place? In process of time it was discovered that this ratio that had been established departed slightly, less than 2 per cent, from the commercial ratio, and that after a time very little gold (gold being undervalued) came to the mint. So in 1834 the sons of the grandfathers came forward and changed the ratio to 16 to 1, supposing that to be the then commercial ratio. They made a mistake of a very small fraction and undervalued silver. The result was that by 1840 very little silver was brought to the mint; and in 1853 we were obliged to reduce the weight of silver in our fractional silver coins to prevent them from going out of circulation and into the melting pots.

So it seems that "the fathers" of that day did not conceive the notion that there was a divinely ordained ratio of any kind. In adopting a ratio they were simply following the commercial ratio, and, so long as the commercial ratio varied but slightly, the bimetallic tie held the two metals together. There was less than $15,000,000 of full legal-tender silver in circulation in 1860. Less than $15,000,000! Simply from the fact that we had undervalued silver by our ratio of 16 to 1. From 1862 to 1873 not a dollar of either gold or silver was in circulation as money. Why? Simply for the reason that we had established another legal-tender dollar, the greenback, which depreciated, and cheaper money always drives out the more valuable. That is sometimes called Gresham's law, but it is simply the law of business common sense.

Mr. McMILLIN. If it will not interrupt the distinguished gentleman, I would like to ask him one question at this point. If I understand his argument the whole tenor of it is that the increased production of silver made necessary the action taken by the nations of the world against the coinage of silver.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have not said that. I have not undertaken to say what influenced Germany. There are different theories about it, and I can not decide between them. But we do know that at the time Germany closed her mints to the free coinage of silver the silver dollar was worth 3 cents more than the gold in the gold dollar, and that is a sufficient answer to the assumption so often made that some people who were creditors procured in 1873 the suspension of the coinage of silver in this country in order to increase the value of their loans. If they were going to do that I should think they would have made silver the metal to be coined and would have demonetized gold.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman, in this connection, whether it is not true that at the time of the passage of the demonetization act of 1873 silver was still at a premium, as it was when Germany demonetized it?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly. But the premium was very small, and in 1874, when the Latin Union closed their mints, silver had declined nearly three cents.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then the depreciated value of silver could not have been the cause of its demonetization.

Mr. DINGLEY. In 1873—of course not.

Mr. CLARK of Iowa. Did not Germany go to the gold standard because of the forty-seven different kinds of silver money that existed in that country?

MEXICO AS AN OBJECT LESSON.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we need not, however, rest the case on reason and past experience alone, for we have at our doors an object lesson of the results of 16½ to 1 equal and unlimited coinage in Mexico. For years Mexico has tried such coinage. She avoided what is facetiously called "the crime of 1873." Her laws to-day permit the coinage of both silver and gold at the ratio of 16½ to 1, and yet not a dollar of gold is taken to her mints or is found in use as money. She has only silver as her metallic money, and is to-day a silver monometallic country. Notwithstanding she coins a large amount of silver—$29,000,000 in 1893—for the reason that her coins have been for many years current in China, thus making her experiment that of 400,000,000 of people, yet Mexico's open mints and Mexico's demand for silver do not seem to have the slightest effect in raising the price of silver or preventing its fall.

THE OPINION OF SCIENTIFIC BIMETALLISTS.

There is not a scientific bimetallist outside of politics in the whole world who believes that under the present conditions any country in the world can establish, and open its mints at the ratio of 16 to 1, and secure the concurrent coinage and permanent concurrent circulation of the two metals. In the French Chamber of Deputies last winter, when this question was discussed, the French minister of finance declared that France stands ready, when a sufficient combination is made among the nations of the world to show that such a ratio can be maintained, to open her mints to free coinage; and when a member of the Chamber of Deputies further questioned the minister of finance, he replied that France was ready to unite in any movement that gave promise of bringing the two metals together as yokefellows under free coinage; but, added the French minister, it is not in the power of France alone nor in the power of the United States alone to secure full bimetallism unless a sufficient number of commercial nations shall enter into the combination to so increase the demand for silver as to bring the two together on a ratio that shall take into account the existing situation.

Let us take up this question as a practical and scientific one, and, while temporarily using all the silver we can carry in parity, seek to secure such concurrence of nations as will bring about permanent bimetallism that will give us both gold and silver as our money. I am with you heart and hand in that effort, but I can not consent as a representative of the American people, having no personal interest at stake in this matter one way or the other except the common interest of a citizen of the United States—I can not consent to shut my eyes to facts that every intelligent man, if he will only open his eyes and observe them, must take into careful consideration.

Let us assume that the closing of the mints of Europe has had some effect in causing the depreciation of silver; but let us concede that the increased production of silver at a constantly reduced price has had more effect. Let us consider this question in a business way and then we shall not err. I know of no question that it is more dangerous to commit to the stormy and changing sea of politics than this question of money; and I deplore beyond expression that such a question as this should have been dragged into ward caucuses and conventions and treated on a purely partisan and political basis.

Mr. Chairman, while the people of this country generally desire to secure a restoration of full bimetallism whenever it can be accomplished, and maintain the parity of the two kinds of money, yet I believe that our people never will consent to any policy which it is believed will cause the two metals to separate, will drive out gold and make us a silver monometallic country. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Mr. WHEELER obtained the floor.

Mr. CRISP. Before the gentleman from Alabama begins his remarks, I want to give notice, in response to the notice given by the gentleman from Maine, that at the end of this debate I shall move that the House concur in the Senate amendments. I merely make this announcement so that it may be a basis of the argument which may be made on that side of the question.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before moving that the committee rise, I wish to say that there are many gentlemen who desire to make remarks upon some phases of the question before us, and it has been thought wise that we should have, during the time of this general discussion, upon which I will not at present undertake to fix any limit, though I hope we may see our way clear to do so to-morrow—it has been thought best that there should be evening sessions for discussion only. There are gentlemen who are ready to speak in the evening——

Mr. CRISP. To-night?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have understood there are gentlemen ready to speak to-night. Of course we do not expect that the gentleman from Georgia will be ready to go on to-night.

Mr. CRISP. It seems to me that the gentleman ought to have suggested this arrangement earlier in the day if he proposes it to take effect to-night. I do not know of anyone who will be ready to speak to-night.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are three hours that might be occupied in debate this evening; and if not occupied, some gentlemen who desire to speak must inevitably lose their opportunity, because this debate can not be prolonged to a very great extent.

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman from Maine does not realize how unjust his suggestion is. He has himself occupied nearly two hours. If when the debate began he had suggested that there would be a session for debate this evening, gentlemen would have been prepared to go on to-night. But it is now within five minutes of 5 o'clock, and gentlemen can not be expected to be ready.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there are some gentlemen who are ready to speak this evening.

Mr. DINGLEY. In view of the suggestion of the Chair, it seems to me that gentlemen who desire to speak this evening ought to have the opportunity to do so. I think the time ought to be occupied.

Mr. JOHNSON of California addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I rise because I have a right to rise as a member of this body. I rise to speak upon this proposition to close debate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to be heard upon that proposition, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say in reply to the remark of the gentleman from Maine that he did not think general debate on this question would be allowed much beyond to-morrow——

Mr. DINGLEY. I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to say that for one I protest against any such proposition.

Mr. DINGLEY. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is the most important question that can come before us; and there are many of us who desire the opportunity to debate it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I simply said I hoped we should be able to determine to-morrow when the debate will close.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Maine might accomplish his object by giving notice that there will be evening sessions for debate, beginning with to-morrow evening.

Mr. BRUMM. That would be fairer.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think it has been understood there would be evening sessions on this bill. It is my desire that we may have evening sessions for debate, and a number of gentlemen have said to the Chairman that they would be ready to speak in the evening.

Now, the Chairman informs me that other gentlemen are ready to proceed to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some gentlemen who have expressed a desire to speak to-night.

Mr. DINGLEY. That being the case, I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. BRUMM. Before that, if the gentleman will permit me, there are a number of amendments, as I understand, that will be offered when the proper time comes to the bill, and I ask leave that they may be offered now, simply for information, and printed in the RECORD, so that members may have them before them in discussing the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. There is no objection to the printing of the amendments for information in the RECORD, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BRUMM. I ask unanimous consent, then, that members who may desire to offer amendments may have them printed in the RECORD for the information of the House, so that they may be before the members as the debate proceeds.

Mr. DINGLEY. Merely for information, of course.

Mr. BRUMM. Certainly; merely for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that amendments to be proposed to the bill may be printed in the RECORD for information?

There was no objection.

Under the consent given, Mr. BRUMM submitted the following as an amendment to be proposed to the bill:

At the end of line 16, section 2, insert:

"*Provided*, That when the commercial value of either gold or silver bullion shall be less than the coinage value of the same, then the seigniorage upon all coinage of gold or silver bullion shall be retained by the United States equal in amount to the difference between the coinage value and the commercial value of the same when presented at the mint."

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire submitted the following amendment, to be offered at the proper time:

Strike out all after the enacting clause in the bill and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase, from time to time, at the market price thereof, not exceeding $1 for 371.25 grains of fine silver, such quantities of silver bullion which is the product of the mines of the United States as its mints can coin in connection with its other necessary coinage, and to pay for the same with the coined silver of the United States, and a sufficient number of silver dollars to carry into effect the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated, out of any of the coined silver in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and for this purpose, and to supply any deficiency in the coined silver held by the Treasury, caused by the payments herein authorized, the Secretary of the Treasury may coin the whole or any part of the silver bullion owned by the United States.

"SEC. 2. That upon the request of the party selling the said silver bullion the Secretary of the Treasury, at his discretion, may pay for the said bullion in silver certificates authorized by the act of February 28, 1878, as amended by the act of March 3, 1887, and the coined silver dollars in lieu of which the certificates are paid shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand.

"SEC. 3. That no silver bullion shall be purchased under the provisions of this act unless the owner thereof shall prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that it is wholly the product of the mines of the United States.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the preceding sections of this act to be coined into silver dollars, of the weight and fineness now provided by law, as rapidly as the capacity and general business of the mints will permit, and if at any time the quantity of such bullion, purchased as aforesaid, shall be equal to the ordinary mint capacity for six months, no more silver bullion shall be purchased until the bullion on hand shall have been reduced below such limit.

"SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, and as frequently as once a month, shall cancel and destroy of the United States notes in the Treasury issued under the authority of the acts of February 25, 1862, July 11, 1862, and March 3, 1863, or of the Treasury notes issued under the authority of the act of July 14, 1890, an amount equal to the silver dollars coined under the authority of this act for which notes had not previously been canceled, and no new notes shall be issued to take the place of the notes thus destroyed. Whenever the face value of the said notes in the Treasury is less than $25,000,000, none of the said notes shall be used or paid for any purpose, but when paid into the Treasury shall be held for cancellation as is herein provided, and the coinage of silver dollars shall in no month exceed the value of said notes awaiting cancellation.

"SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall first cancel all of the said notes in the Treasury of the denomination of $5 or less, and shall not issue any new notes of a less denomination than $10 to take the place of any of those destroyed because worn or mutilated.

"SEC. 7. That hereafter no notes of a less denomination than $10 shall be issued to or by any national bank.

"SEC. 8. That nothing herein contained shall be held to limit or prevent the issuing of silver certificates on the silver dollars coined under this act. Such issues are hereby expressly authorized in the manner now provided by law, and the Secretary of the Treasury may issue them in such denominations, not less than $1, as he may deem most convenient and appropriate for circulation.

"SEC. 9. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. That this act shall take effect sixty days from and after its passage."

Mr. SPALDING submitted the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That a monetary commission be, and the same is hereby, constituted, to consist of 21 members, who shall be appointed as follows: Seven members shall be appointed by the President of the United States, 7 members by the Senate of the United States, and 7 members by the House of Representatives of the United States. The persons appointed to this commission shall be selected for their familiarity and well-known ability in monetary matters and shall be as far as possible nonpolitical.

"It shall be the duty of said commission, when appointed, to inquire into the whole subject-matter of coinage, ratios, currency schemes, and such other subjects which directly or indirectly affect the monetary affairs of the United States, and said commission is hereby advised and instructed to use their utmost endeavors to procure reliable information on this subject.

Said commission shall sit from time to time, after the passage of this act, until the 1st of December, 1896, at such times and places as they shall elect, and shall as soon as possible after the sitting of Congress in December, 1896, submit a report of their investigations to Congress, with such recommendations and observations as they may deem fit and proper.

The amount of $100,000 is hereby appropriated out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expenses of said commission.

Mr. TOWNE submitted the following amendments:

Amend section 1 of the Senate amendment by striking out the words "passage of this act," in line one, and insert the words "1st day of January, 1899," and by adding at the end of said section the following: "*Provided*, That the number of grains of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, contained in each dollar herein authorized to be coined may be changed before this act goes into effect, as hereinafter provided."

Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. That the President is hereby requested and authorized immediately to extend to such of the leading commercial nations as have closed their mints to the free coinage of silver an invitation to send commissioners to meet, as early as practicable and at some convenient place, five commissioners to be named by the President on behalf of the United States, of which commissioners he shall appoint not more than two from any one political party, for the purpose of agreeing upon a ratio at which the free and equal coinage of both gold and silver shall be authorized by the several nations becoming parties to such agreement; and that upon the report of said commissioners of such an agreement, the President shall make proclamation of the fact and of the ratio of coinage so agreed upon, and thereupon the first section of this act shall be deemed to be so changed as to authorize the number of grains of silver in the dollar therein provided for to be fixed at the number properly expressive of such ratio. The sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this section."

Amend by striking out sections 1 and 2 and inserting the following:

"SECTION 1. That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive at any United States mint, from any citizen of the United States, silver bullion of standard fineness, and coin the same into silver dollars of 412.5 grains each, which shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private. The seigniorage on the said bullion shall belong to the United States, and shall be the difference between the coinage value thereof and the market price of the bullion in New York on the day the deposit is made, and all expenditures for coinage done under the provisions of this act shall be paid out of said seigniorage; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the depositors of such bullion either standard silver dollars equal in amount to the price thereof as aforesaid, or Treasury notes of convenient denominations promising to pay an equivalent number of dollars."

To substitute for the Senate amendment the following:

"SECTION 1. That any person may deposit for coinage in any mint of the United States gold bullion or silver bullion not less than $50 in value, and sufficiently pure not to require refining before being coined; and the same shall be coined free of charge, the gold into the coins authorized by existing law, and the silver into dollars containing fifteen and a half times as many grains of pure silver as there are grains of pure gold in the gold dollar, and nine-tenths fine, being 359.91 grains of pure silver and 39.99 grains of alloy, a total of 399.9 grains of standard silver.

SEC. 2. Said depositor, in exchange for such bullion, shall receive, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, either coins similar to those into which the metal deposited is coined, or Treasury notes of convenient denominations promising to pay an equivalent number of dollars, which notes upon presentation for redemption shall be payable in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. The gold coins, silver dollars, and Treasury notes herein provided for shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private. The existing silver dollars shall be retired and recoined according to the ratio herein provided, the profits accruing therefrom to be applied to the expenses of maintaining the mints.

SEC. 3. This law shall become operative when the Governments of France and Germany shall have adopted laws under which gold and silver, at the ratio of 1 to 15½, shall have equal access to their mints, and the full legal-tender function be conferred upon the gold and principal silver coins; and upon the passage of such laws by said Governments of France and Germany, the President of the United States shall make proclamation of the fact, and thereupon this law shall take effect and be in force.

Mr. CORLISS submitted the following proposed amendment to the bill:

Refer the bill, with Senate amendments, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with instructions to prepare and submit to the House a bill that shall provide a currency for the United States to be composed of both gold and silver as standard money, without regard to the currency laws of any other nation, and with such restrictions and under such provisions as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker accordingly resumed the chair, and Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration House bill No. 2904, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the understanding that there would be evening sessions for debate to-day and to-morrow at least; and while I will move presently that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, I shall ask that the evening session begin to-morrow at 7.30, in order that gentlemen who desire to speak may have an opportunity to do so and be in readiness.

Mr. CRISP. Will my friend from Maine, in the same connection—as it may relieve the pressure somewhat—also ask unanimous consent that gentlemen be permitted to print remarks in the RECORD, for, say, a period of ten days, on this question?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will do so. I ask unanimous consent, also, that gentlemen may be permitted to print in the RECORD speeches on this question for the period of ten days, with the understanding that they shall be such speeches as would ordinarily be delivered, if an opportunity had occurred, on the floor of the House, and not be a compilation of chapters from books and essays, and from magazines, which shall be excluded under this consent. I make this suggestion because once before, when similar consent was given, members immediately began to reprint in the RECORD all the books in the library. [Laughter.] With the understanding, therefore, that it is to be such speeches as may ordinarily be delivered in the House, with such extracts as are usually read and belong to a speech, and not chapters of books or magazines and matters of that kind, I make the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. I now ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be for debate only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask unanimous consent also that the debate take place in the House to-night as in Committee of the Whole—the general debate only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;* and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory;

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. Before announcing the recess, the Chair desires to suggest the passage of an order which the Chair will read:

Ordered, That the bill (H. R. 5210) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, be printed as it passed to be engrossed and was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

This request was made, there being some doubt whether it could be properly printed under the rule. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KULP, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LEISENRING, indefinitely, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. PAYNE to preside as Speaker pro tempore during the session of this evening; and then (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House was declared in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by Mr. PAYNE as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The special order to-night is the bill H. R. 2904, and the session is limited to general debate only. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2904) to restore the coinage of silver dollars, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] for thirty minutes.

Mr. BELL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I very much dislike to take the floor so early this evening, especially as I did not expect it and have made no ar rangements for a discussion. However, it is well known that this discussion is not intended to change votes for or against this measure. Every Representative on this floor was tabulated for or against this overshadowing question before he took his oath of office. The mere fact that the bonding and gold-standard interests have an overwhelming majority in this House is not direct evidence that the great majority of the American people whom we are presumed to represent are in accord with this view. The Government, in fact, has gotten away from the people and political manipulation and false issues have secured Representatives for the gold standard for many bimetallic constituencies. As the silver question has been, is being, and will be thoroughly discussed in all of its phases, I will devote the most of the short time allotted to me to the history of parties and the objects of this contest. It seems to me that on all occasions the history and aims of the parties destroying a part of the currency should be burned into the minds of the people as a pertinent fact in every monetary discussion.

The first great contest between capital and labor in the United States had the banks, bondholders, and money dealers upon one side and the great masses of the people upon the other. It took the extreme nerve and determination of a Jackson to break the shackels of the banking power when our country had but a few people. We were then admonished by the incisive Benton that "the royal tiger has gone into the jungle and crouched on his belly, he awaits the favorable moment of emerging from his covert and springing on the body of the unsuspicious traveler." He did emerge in 1862, when the Government was floundering in the throes of a great internecine war. Hon. E. G. Spaulding, chairman of the subcommittee of Ways and Means, father of the greenback, and author of Spaulding's Financial History of the War, says at page 18 et seq:

After the legal-tender bill was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Spaulding, and published in the newspapers of the principal cities, opposition to it manifested itself in various ways. At first the New York press were generally opposed to the legal-tender clause. * * * Delegates from some of the banks in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia appeared in Washington to oppose the bill. * * * They organized by appointing Mr. Singleton A. Mercer, of Philadelphia, as chairman, and invited the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House to meet them at the office of the Secretary of the Treasury on Saturday afternoon, January 11, 1862. The invitation was accepted, and the convention assembled accordingly at the Treasury Department. * * * Mr. James Gallatin, of New York, made the principal speech against legal tender, and on behalf of himself and the bank committees from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, and members from boards of trade associated with them, submitted the full plan for raising money to carry on the war, namely:

"First. A tax bill to raise, in the different modes of taxation, $125,000,000 over and above duties on imports.

"Second. Not to issue any demand Treasury notes, except those authorized at the extra session in July last.

"Third. Issue $100,000,000 Treasury notes at two years in sums of $5 and upward, to be receivable for public dues of the Government except duties on imports.

"Fourth. A suspension of the subtreasury act, so as to allow the banks to become depositories of the Government of all loans and to check on the banks from time to time as the Government may want money.

"Fifth. Issue 6 per cent twenty-year bonds to be negotiated by the Secretary of the Treasury and without any limitation as to the price he may obtain for them in the market.

"Sixth. That the Secretary of the Treasury be empowered to make temporary loans to the extent of any portion of the funded stock authorized by Congress, with power to hypothecate such stock, and if such loans are not paid at maturity to sell the stock hypothecated for the best price that can be obtained." * * *

The subcommittee of Ways and Means, through Mr. Spaulding, objected to any and every form of "shinning" by Government through Wall or State street, to begin with; objected to the knocking down of Government stocks to 75 or 60 cents on the dollar, the inevitable result of throwing a new and large loan on the market without limitation as to price; claimed for Treasury notes as much virtue of par value as the notes of banks which have suspended specie payments and which yet circulate in the trade of the North, and finished with firmly refusing to assent to any scheme which should permit a speculation by brokers, bankers, and others in the Government securities, and particularly any scheme which should double the public debt of the country and double the expense of the war by damaging the credit of the Government to the extent of sending it to "shin" through the shaving shops of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia.

The bankers and bondholders then made a most vigorous fight against any money being issued by the Government that could not be shaved by them or any other governmental policy which did not assure them interest-bearing bonds for a safe investment for their money. The House passed a bill making the greenback a full legal tender, which met the approval of the whole country, excepting this very small class. These banking committees and their allies induced the Senate to make them partial legal tenders, not receivable for import duties or the interest on the public debt. This gave the dealers in ready money the object sought; that is, gave them a forced market for their gold and enabled them to run gold to a premium. Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, said:

I have a melancholy foreboding that we are about to consummate a cunningly devised scheme which will carry great injury and great loss to all classes of people throughout this nation except one. With my colleague I believe that no act or legislation was ever heralded with as much joy throughout the length and breadth of this nation by every class of people, without exception, as the bill which we passed and sent to the Senate.

Congratulations from all classes—merchants, traders, manufacturers, mechanics, and laborers—poured in upon us from all quarters. * * * It is true there was a doleful sound came up from the caverns of bullion brokers and from the salons of associated banks. Their cashiers and agents were soon on the ground and persuaded the Senate with a little deliberation to mangle and destroy what had caused the House months to digest and consider and pass. * * * It makes two classes of money, one for the bankers and brokers and another for the people. It discriminates between the rights of different classes of creditors, allowing the capitalists to demand gold and compelling the ordinary lender of money on individual security to refuse notes which the Government had purposely discredited. * * * And that favored class is the bankers and brokers and nobody else.

The money dealers secured, in part, in 1862, their old demands that had been frustrated by Jackson. In 1870, when they prevailed upon Congress, in the name of patriotism and the public credit, to make their bonds payable in coin instead of legal-tender money, they made another valuable gradation. In 1873, when they demonetized silver, they intended to double the value of their securities, and their intentions were largely realized. When the people afterwards discovered that silver had been secretly destroyed they became determined to reinstate it. On the 5th day of November, 1877, in the House of Representatives, by a vote of 163 for to 34 against, a free-coinage bill passed. The sentiment then in the United States was overwhelmingly in favor of reinstating the standard silver dollar. The people everywhere denounced its demonetization as a crime and a theft. On the same day that the bill passed the House August Belmont wrote Senator SHERMAN, in the name of the public credit, to resist and stay the hand of the silver forces, and wound up his letter with this paragraph:

Sound financial policy and love of our country's fair name alike demand from those to whom the administration of its affairs have been intrusted the most uncompromising hostility to the blind and dishonest frenzy which has taken hold of Congress, and I sincerely hope that you will be seconded in the task before you by the support of the President and your colleagues.

On the 9th, two days afterwards, August Belmont & Co. wrote Senator SHERMAN that they would not call for bids on bonds, as such action would be held by those advocating legislation in favor of silver, as proving that such legislation was not prejudicial to the national credit and the refunding of our national debt. On the 10th, Mr. F. O. French, of New York, wrote Mr. SHERMAN as follows:

Our business people are very much alarmed at the rumored strength of the silver people, and as they apprehend the gravest disasters from the success of the Bland bill, a committee of gentlemen connected with insurance and trust companies, as well as with the banks, go to Washington to-morrow to present their views to the Finance Committee.

On the 29th of November Mr. Belmont again wrote Mr. SHERMAN, among other things—

The bonds are selling at ninety-nine to one-fourth in gold in open market, and it seems to me very doubtful policy to offer bonds by us to the public at this moment and thus assist the advocates of the old silver dollar by our apparent indifference to the injustice and dishonesty of the Bland bill.

In the second volume of Mr. SHERMAN'S Recollections, at page 603 et seq., he gives this correspondence in full, and it is the only correspondence exhibited upon this subject except Mr. SHERMAN'S replies confidentially assuring them that everything will come out all right.

Mr. SHERMAN also writes to Senator W. B. ALLISON, appealing to him to so amend the silver bill—

that we can have all that is good out of it without the folly that might come from it if it resists our funding and resumption operations.

In answer to this, Mr. ALLISON, in the Senate, put on what is known as the Allison amendment, reducing silver to a commodity, in the Bland-Allison Act.

The point I wish to make here and to impress upon the public is the fact that in 1862 the money changers were trying to accomplish the same object that they are trying to accomplish to-day; that in 1877, with the country overwhelmingly in favor of the free coinage of silver, the bankers and brokers were the only men who were consulted by the Secretary of the Treasury, and their views were forced upon the country against its avowed will. Think for a moment of the familiarity and confidence that must have existed between Secretary Sherman and August Belmont & Co. to justify the latter in referring to Congress as being in the possession of a blind and dishonest frenzy.

Continuing this history, second volume of Sherman's Recollections, at page 1069, Mr. SHERMAN'S connections with the act of 1890 are given in his own language, namely:

The authorship of this law has been generally credited to me, and it was commonly called the Sherman silver law, though I took but little part in framing the legislation until the bill got into conference. The situation at that time was critical. A large majority of the Senate favored free silver, and it was feared that the small majority against it in the other House might yield and agree to it. The silence of the President on the matter gave rise to the apprehension that if a free-coinage bill should pass both Houses he would not feel at liberty to veto it. Some action had to be taken to prevent a return to free silver coinage, and the measure evolved was the best obtainable. I voted for it, but the day it became a law I was ready to repeal it if repeal could be had without substituting in its place absolute free coinage.

The act of 1890 was not an act of the silver people, but a law of the gold-standard people, the intention being to destroy silver by degrees and as rapidly as possible. The bankers and money changers had full possession of the friendly ear of the Treasurer in those days, have it to-day, and have had it for the past twenty years.

The Secretary and Comptroller of the Treasury have spent much of their time during this Administration in appearing before bankers' associations and organizations, have been extolled and toasted at their banquets, indicating that the Government only recognizes the views of money dealers in all governmental financial operations. These financial syndicates have had constant access to the President and the Secretary and Comptroller of the Treasury officially, socially, and in every other way. The Washington Star of January 3, 1896, in offering an apology for these manifest connections with the Government, said:

It is said at the White House that the presence in the city last night of Messrs. J. A. Stewart, J. F. Woodward, and E. R. Bacon, of New York, has no connection with the financial situation. They came in response to an invitation to attend the Cabinet dinner given by the President and Mrs. Cleveland last night, which invitation was extended, so it is said, long before there was any talk of any issue of bonds. Mr. Stewart and Mr. Woodward were members of the syndicate which floated the last Government loan, and consequently their presence here at this juncture was naturally regarded as significant.

These influences have been the real financial cabinet of the Government for a quarter of a century.

Unquestionably the original intention was to allow a private syndicate to enrich itself again at the Government expense. Public sentiment forced an apparent popular loan, which was but a popular banker's loan. There can be no such thing as a popular or public loan for gold. Gold is now the bankers' money. The people have no gold. As greenbacks or gold is deposited with the banks it is sorted out, laid away, and never paid out over the counter except as customers purchase it at a premium. I know of numerous individuals who desired to bid for some of these bonds but could not get the gold without going to the banks and paying a premium therefor. We have two kinds of money to-day, the bankers' money and the people's money. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and others insist that where we receive gold for bonds we are in duty bound to repay in gold, but these gentlemen are not willing to say that where we sell bonds for silver or other forms of money the bondholder should be repaid in the same kind of money that he furnished.

Section 3 of the syndicate contract of February, 1895, is:

The Secretary of the Treasury hereby reserves the right within ten days from the date hereof, in case he shall receive authority from Congress therefor, to substitute any bonds of the United States bearing 3 per cent interest, of which the principal and interest shall be specifically payable in United States gold coin of the present weight and fineness, for the bonds herein alluded to, such 3 per cent bonds to be accepted by the parties of the second part at par, i. e., at $18.6046½ per ounce of standard gold.

The President, in his message of February 8, 1895, stated to Congress:

The arrangement just completed, which after a careful inquiry appears, under present circumstances and considering all the objects desired, to be the best attainable, develops such a difference in the estimation of investors between bonds made payable in coin and those specifically made payable in gold in favor of the latter as is represented by three-fourths of a cent in annual interest.

In the agreement just concluded the only saving in interest to the Government if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege preserved would be $539,159, amounting in thirty-six years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to $16,174,770 in addition to the millions he gave them on the undervaluation of the market price of the bonds.

Congress refused to grant the privilege to issue gold bonds. The President therefore sold these bonds on a silver basis with the direct understanding that they were payable in silver dollars at the option of the Government, and his private bond syndicate charged him, according to his own language, $16,174,770 therefor.

After paying his select syndicate this sum for the privilege of paying in silver, he and his Secretary persist in giving them gold interest and refuse to pay in silver, thus giving them this additional $16,174,770.

No one can thoroughly examine the official records without concluding, first, that silver was demonetized by and in the interests of the bond syndicates and money dealers of the world without the knowledge or consent of the American people. The history of the transaction since conclusively shows that the same power that destroyed silver in 1873 has controlled every President of the United States and every Secretary of the Treasury from that time until this and has managed and controlled the Senate or the House of Representatives at every session of Congress in its own selfish interest.

I know this history is old to many, but in my experience converts to this cause can only be made by inducing the people to read and examine the facts for themselves.

The present Banking and Currency Committee in the House and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures have been made up in favor of the single standard and bank rule. What is the significance of the condition in the Senate? These powers only operate upon one House at one time. To give some indication of the idea of the Banking Committee in the House, I here append an interview purporting to have been with the chairman of that committee, as follows:

BALTIMORE, *January 30, 1896.*

Hon. J. H. WALKER, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, in an interview upon the financial situation, printed by the Manufacturers' Record, says:

"There never was a body of legislators more anxious to know what ought to be done under the circumstances and more anxious to do the right thing than the House of Representatives to-day. Congress will enact any measure that the bankers are agreed among themselves will relieve the United States Treasury. That is what we want, and Congress will enact no measure themselves, in the very breath they ask for it, say will not relieve the Treasury, and will only allow the banks to issue more money and still further embarrass the Treasury in redemption and only increase the bank dividends. Congress will gladly pass any measure to make banking more profitable if the bankers themselves will say it will at the same time relieve the United States Treasury situation. If this session Congress adjourns without passing some comprehensive measure to compose the finances of the country, the bankers will be wholly to blame for its failure in standing off and refusing to come to the assistance of the Committee on Banking and Currency while the committee is begging them to come to its relief with their councils and support. The committee will give most diligent heed to any suggestion they may make that has the slightest chance of passing the House, but it will not consider old schemes that have failed in every Congress for twenty years and if passed the bankers themselves say would not relieve the Treasury."

I am sorry that the people have not yet learned that this and all other great questions must be settled by the electors. No man in this House is open to a change of action should a change of conviction take place. It is the voter in the conntry that we must address and convince before this great question can be settled. When Coxey's army was marching on Washington the people and the railroads were blocking the way. A great divine interrupted and said, "All of our woes came from Washington, and it is meet that they should return to the place of their birth; let them go." But it was the voter that sent the woe makers to Washington. It is the electors that continually send them, and it is with the people first and Congress afterwards that this great question must be settled. It is a most rare thing that a member of this House knowingly contravenes the wishes of the vote-controlling influences of his party at home. The only new argument made this year over those of a quarter of a century ago is that we have now reached such a depth in the mire of the gold standard that we can not now safely extricate ourselves.

This has been the apology of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Secretary of the Interior, and will be the apology of all those changing from the advocacy of a double standard to that of the single gold standard. It must be borne in mind at all times that the money dealers of New England and of the Middle States and of nearly every large city in the United States now have complete control of the election influences and safely select and tabulate representatives of their own conviction at the election primaries. They have an overwhelming majority in this House that are ready to deny the truth of demonstration, yes, as it has been said, of the reliability of the laws of gravitation even, in support of the gold standard.

A few days ago I heard a Western Republican, a Populist, and a Southern Democrat in this House comparing notes. They agreed that they all believed the money question the overshadowing issue of the age. They agreed that their votes had always been cast in unison on this great question, and yet these three Representatives were divided and in three different political parties. It is safe to say that a decided majority of the American people believe that the money question is of overwhelming importance and must be settled in favor of the double standard, and that a sufficient amount of full legal-tender money must be issued as a foundation for prosperity, and without this that the people can not become prosperous. They are educated upon the necessity of the measure. Where they are greatly deficient is in a tactical education. The people at large have learned to despise what they call party machinery. They regard it as beneath them, and yet it is by and through a great machine that one-eighth of the people control the other seven-eighths directly against the interests and wishes of this great majority. The people must learn that they must unify, concentrate, and build up a good machine of the people and for the people for the purpose of destroying the great machines of the few that operate against the wishes of the many. The people are constantly wondering why it is that the few control the many. It is because the few are organized and concentrated on a fixed purpose and the many are disorganized and their influences divided. The great generals that have succeeded in the past in conquering superior numbers always attributed their success to a complete discipline and fortunate attacks on a disorganized and straggling enemy.

While our forces are so disorganized many votaries of the cause let the parade and cry of high tariff or low tariff, or some local measure, divert them from the cause for the time being. This is done at the ballot box. Immediately after the independent silver men met in Washington and determined to make this the overshadowing issue of future campaigns old party managers at once became alarmed, fearing the disintegration of the party machinery that put them in power. They at once began to connect a high tariff or a low tariff with the silver issue, some claiming that a high or a low tariff was more important in their States than financial reform. The New York Mercury of January 27, 1896, sums it up in this language:

Considerable anxiety and uneasiness exists in political circles at Washington concerning the ulterior purposes of the silver men in the ensuing Presidential canvass, as matured at their recent convention here. Hitherto the efforts of ultra silver men to accomplish anything definite politically in their several meetings and conventions at the National Capital have failed. All they could do was to secure the attendance of a small number of leaders, and, under the auspices of Senator STEWART of Nevada and General Warner, President of the American Bimetallic League, fulminate resolutions and protests and send them out through the country broadcast. The last convention, however, was quite an important meeting, numerously attended and particularly enthusiastic, in which Republicans, Democrats, and Populists fraternized on silver and apparently pooled their issues on that question, eliminating all others.

The trouble hitherto with silver leaders has been that they would not "fuse" with Populists because of their advocacy of various impractical propositions, such as were enunciated in the Ocala platform. The situation now has materially changed, since the peculiar contentions of the Populists have been laid aside temporarily, if not abandoned entirely, and their leaders, especially such men as Senator BUTLER, of North Carolina, and those of similar caliber, are now willing to join hands solely on the silver and other financial issues. It is this fact which seems to disturb the politicians, since, if this movement can be so manipulated, Republican supremacy in Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Washington, Oregon, the two Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and possibly elsewhere may be jeopardized and the silver States of the South may follow suit. In this event a square-out silver party can be formed, and a Presidential ticket nominated upon an agreed platform. The result of such a combination, if effected, would necessarily impair, if not destroy, party lines, and, if not successful, might operate to throw the election of the President into the House for lack of a majority of the electoral college for either candidate.

In view of these facts belief is expressed that the particular strategy of the manipulators of the convention was to bring about this very condition of affairs, and they have high hopes of success.

It will be remembered that this is but a sample of the views of the gold press of the East.

Immediately after the silver meeting old party managers began to claim that other subjects, such as the tariff on lead or wool, were more important to their respective States in the West than the silver question, and started the cry for a union of the two interests, notwithstanding the fact that they have been claiming for a quarter of a century that the money question was the overshadowing issue of the age. This is another question that must be settled by the voters. While they permit those in office and those expecting to control patronage and expecting benefits therefrom to load down this overshadowing question with issues that will inevitably prevent a union of the forces of the South and West, the only feasible opportunity for a successful determination of this issue, just so long will a settlement of this question be delayed.

It seems to me that it is worse than folly, it is criminal, for the voters of the United States to further delay aligning themselves according to their convictions on this great question. The voters must have it seared into their minds that every man who advocates international bimetallism, high tariff or low tariff and bimetallism, or the union of the money question with any of the old threadbare political issues, advocates further delay, and if not an intentional enemy to monetary reform is, nevertheless, as potent for harm as he could be if his intentions were genuine.

As I was leaving my home in Colorado in November, a good silver man at heart and a late arrival from the State of Nebraska assured me that our Senators would be heartily seconded in the silver cause by Senator THURSTON, of the State of Nebraska. He said he had been a follower of him in the campaigns last year, and he was one of the most able advocates of silver in the United States. He did not make the distinction that he was only an international or an American-product bimetallist, which, in effect,

means an indefinite continuance of the gold standard. At every opportunity the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] has voted against the silver cause. It must be seared into the minds of every advocate of monetary reform that those advocating international bimetallism, coinage of the American product, or anything other than the unqualified return to the bimetallism of the Constitution as it existed from the foundation of the Government down to 1873, is, in effect at least, a deadly enemy to the success of the silver cause.

It is not now a question of maintaining our financial liberties. They have been lost, and the potent question now is to recover them. As long as members of Congress owe allegiance to political caucuses; to some other issue, they will be diverted at every session of Congress; and this is a practical redemonstration of the fact that the people at home and at the ballot box must divide upon this great question. In fact, the time has come when some means must be adopted whereby all of the overshadowing national issues shall be submitted to a direct vote of the people and let them divide upon these questions, rather than into political parties. If not, our Government will be but Republican in form.

The desk of every member in Congress from the great labor districts of the country is swelled to overflowing with petitions for some device or plan by which the people may be permitted to vote upon all-controlling governmental questions of the age, uninfluenced by party politics, prejudices, or party expediencies. The silver-producing States have had numerous opportunities since 1873 to dictate the rehabilitation of silver. At one time a single vote for party instead of for the cause laid it aside. At other times two or three votes withheld from the great Eastern question of tariff could have secured it. But representatives from silver States, instead of subordinating all other issues to the success of this one, have voted for it and then obeyed the will of the Eastern manufacturers and voted for their chief industry without requiring a compensating vote for our absorbing interest.

This short-sighted and one-sided policy has continued until the East has secured the laws about as they desire. This is the first session of Congress that the Eastern Republican has felt independent. It is the first time in twenty years that he has felt safe in defying and ignoring his Western Republican brethren. Is it now too late to save this long neglected cause? Has the West trifled with this all-important question until the great South, which has been true to the cause, has lost all hope and will despair? I hope not. The task will be tenfold harder than it would have been in 1890, when the McKinley tariff was threatened. It will be tenfold more difficult than it would have been at any time prior thereto.

This House thoroughly understands the question. The people of the South and West understand the question, but with the great moneyed influence of Europe and the East thrown against it, they must subordinate every other issue to its success or the fight is now lost. It has been repeatedly demonstrated in this House that the prices of products all over the civilized world have kept a uniform pace with the price of silver.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated here and abroad that the divergence between gold and silver operates as a bounty of at least 100 per cent in favor of the silver-using countries.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that with a fixed par of exchange between gold and silver America would control the wheat and cotton markets of the world. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that with the mint of one of the great commercial nations of the world thrown open to free coinage it would furnish such a demand for silver that it would pull down the price of gold and raise the price of silver, making a parity at the fixed legal ratio.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated here that it is not the relative quantity of the metals in existence, but the legal ratio and open mint of a great nation, that fixes the value.

It has been repeatedly shown on this floor and in the country that every gold-standard country has been gradually and constantly embarrassed ever since 1873, and that every silver-using country has been phenomenally prosperous and progressive from that date.

The history of the past thirty years is but a tale of hardship, increasing debt, increasing poverty, and declining hope in all gold-standard countries.

Work is required among the people. It is futile here. We need organizers, rather than educators. The people have always been educated upon this subject, but uneducated in feasible methods of making their will potential for results.

Subordination of party, subordination of all other interests, organization, and singleness of purpose will yet prevail and give us gold and silver and full legal-tender money and a Government by and for the people.

Mr. PENDLETON. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the privilege accorded to members, to print in the RECORD the following speech, delivered by Hon. J. W. BAILEY, at Sherman, Tex., on the 11th day of last June:

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF GRAYSON COUNTY: I have come, upon your invitation, to speak to you upon one of the most important questions that can engage your attention or the attention of your Representative in Congress. It appeals directly to the personal interest of every citizen, whatever may be his station or pursuit in life; it concerns alike the accumulations of the rich and the daily wages of the poor; it affects the relation of every debtor and creditor in the land; it largely determines the profits of our merchants and manufacturers; and upon it in a great measure depends the prosperity of our agricultural classes, the products of whose toil constitute three-fourths of our annual exports.

Certainly no thoughtful man can approach the discussion of a question so important and so far-reaching as this without a sense of grave responsibility. He must feel that if, consciously or unconsciously, he aids in the dissemination of false doctrines he does his countrymen an incalculable harm, while, on the other hand, if he can help them to a better understanding of it, he will render them a permanent and valuable service. Deeply impressed with this view, I have exercised the best faculties of my mind in a long and patient study of the subject, and though, of course, I do not hope that all of you will agree with me in my conclusions, I am certain that those of you who know me will concede that I have sincerely desired to ascertain the truth. Whether I have succeeded or not, is for you to judge; and without intending to flatter you in the least I beg to say that I consider you entirely competent to form a correct judgment. I am not one of those who believe that the money question is beyond the comprehension of the people. I belong neither to that class who seem to think that anybody can understand it without any study at all, nor to that other class who seem to think it so hopelessly abstruse that no ordinary man can understand it with any amount of study. The truth in this case, as in all others, lies between the two extremes. No man, however gifted he may be, can understand it without studying it, but any man of common sense who will study it can understand it.

Before entering upon the reasons which have induced me to favor the immediate restoration of silver to the position which it occupied in our financial system prior to the act of February 12, 1873, I desire briefly to remind you of the origin, the uses, and the qualities of money. To some of you it may seem unnecessary to occupy your time in restating such elementary ideas, but it is especially true of the science of money that unless we keep constantly before our minds a clear and definite conception of its first principles, we can never hope to comprehend it.

THE ORIGIN OF MONEY.

All of the great economists agree that money originates in the necessities of commerce and civilization, and that without it neither could advance beyond a very imperfect state. Without it exchange would require as much or more effort than production, thus entailing such a loss of time as would discourage that diversity of occupation which enables labor to acquire skill and to obtain its best reward. To make my meaning plain by illustration, let us suppose that a tailor should need a pair of shoes; it might take him longer to find a shoemaker who needed a coat than it would to make the coat after he had found him. He might find shoemakers who wanted hats, or bread, or meat, but he might not find one who desired a coat. The shoemaker himself, in his turn, might go hungry before he could find a baker who needed his shoes. To secure themselves against such mischances the tailor would be his own shoemaker and the shoemaker, his own baker. But under such a system neither commerce nor the mechanic arts could flourish, and agriculture would be subjected to even greater inconveniences.

Suppose a farmer desired to exchange one of his surplus cows for cloth. His first difficulty would be at home in finding a cow of the size to fetch exactly the amount of cloth he needed, and he would perhaps find it necessary to take one which was worth a little more or a little less. That difficulty would be a troublesome one, but it would not be the most troublesome one which the farmer would encounter. When he had selected the cow which would most nearly bring him the cloth he wanted, his next and greatest difficulty would be to find somebody who had the cloth he wanted and who wanted his cow. He would not be apt to find a butcher who kept cloth. Indeed, there would be no such business as that of a butcher in a community where all transactions were conducted by barter and exchange, because butchers could not maintain shops where the hardware merchant could only take meat of them when they were willing to take nails of the hardware merchant, or where the lumber dealer could only patronize them when they wanted lumber, and it would be a little awkward, to say the least of it, to exchange steaks for shingles every morning. What is true of the farmer's cow is true of his cotton and wheat, and the only way to overcome such difficulties was to find some one thing that would be accepted in exchange for all things. This one thing is called "money," and

it has enabled society to subdivide its labors so that each man, by devoting himself to some one employment, can become an expert. Thus, and thus only, was it possible for mankind to achieve material progress.

THE USES OF MONEY.

The uses of money flow naturally from the origin of it, and therefore it is precisely as we might expect that its first or primary use is as a medium of exchange—as the one thing which will be accepted in return for all things. But after we have agreed to receive money for goods we still can not execute the agreement until we have also agreed upon the relative values; that is, how much money for how many goods.

The gradation from this point to the next is easy. Nothing can be more natural than that this one thing which is given and taken for all other things should become the one thing according to which the value of all other things should be estimated; and hence money becomes, in its second use, what is generally but loosely called a "standard of value." Eminent scholars have affirmed that society could better dispense with money as a medium of exchange than as a measure of value. They reason that, if there were no money, business could still be conducted by barter; but if there were no measure of value, each commodity would have to be compared with every other commodity, and as between any hundred articles there are 4,950 possible ratios of exchange, the price list would be an endless document. Under such a condition nobody would ever attempt to deal in anything except the commonest necessaries of life.

As commerce expands and industries multiply men enter into contracts for payments to be made at future times, and in such instances money serves a third use, as "a standard of deferred payments." Among a progressive and highly commercial people this third function of money is perhaps more important than either of the other two, and it grows more important with each succeeding year; because as a nation grows older and richer it increases the number and length of its time contracts.

QUALITIES OF MONEY.

The uses of money very clearly indicate the qualities which it ought to possess. Being intended as something which all men will accept for their property, it ought to be something which, like their property, has a value, an intrinsic value, if you please, And as it must perform so many different exchanges it ought to be easily susceptible of division into parts suitable for small transactions, and yet so valuable that its bulk will not encumber larger ones. Again, as the value of all other property is to be fixed by comparison with money, it ought to be as steady as possible in its value, because its variations can not fail to introduce uncertainty and confusion in all business. If the variations should happen to be rapid or violent merchandising would become a mere gamble, or else the storekeeper would be compelled to mark new prices on his goods with the beginning of each new week.

Important as stability in the value of money is in reference to our daily purchases and sales, it is incomparably more important when considered as "a standard of deferred payments." Here alterations not only confuse the trader, but they work an inevitable injustice—an injustice against which no caution and no wisdom can provide. If the value rises, the debtor suffers a hardship; and if it falls, the creditor suffers a loss. Of course I know, and every other thinking man knows, that absolute fixity in its value is unattainable so long as the great law of supply and demand continues in operation, and therefore in choosing a substance out of which to coin money we do not strive to find something invariable; because we know that it can not be found, but we choose that which varies the least, both in frequency and extent.

The earlier economists took corn as their measure of value, but it does not require very long nor very profound thinking to perceive their error. The annual production of corn is intended to meet the annual consumption, carrying only a small surplus from year to year, and consequently a short or an abundant crop must produce an immediate and great effect on its value. If a drought one year cuts the yield one-half, the price will double in six months, while if favorable seasons the next year produce more than a usual crop, another twelve months will witness another sharp movement in its price. No perishable commodity of which the annual production is intended to meet the annual consumption can be safely established as "a measure of value," or as "a standard of deferred payments." If a bushel of wheat were now our unit of value instead of the gold dollar, the man who promised on the 1st day of January to pay a thousand units on the 1st day of June would have found it necessary to part with twice as much property to have procured the thousand units when the debt matured as when it was contracted.

To guard against an injustice like this we must adopt as a unit of value something which is not consumed in its use, and which will go on accumulating through the ages until the annual supply will bear but a small proportion to the existing stock and will for this reason but slightly affect its value. The precious metals alone answer this requirement together with the requirements of intrinsic value and divisibility. Gold and silver, each and both, possess the qualities which fit them for use as money in such a degree as almost to persuade us that they were designed by an All-wise Creator for this special service of man. The question, then, presents itself, if both metals possess all of the attributes essential for their use as money, why shall we not use them both as such?

OBJECT OF DEMONETIZATION.

In the beginning of this controversy between the advocates and the opponents of a single standard there was no attempt to conceal the fact that the only object in demonetizing one of the metals was to increase the value of the other. The struggle began almost immediately after the gold discoveries in California and Australia, which were followed by a fall in the value of money and a rise in the price of property. During the ten years succeeding those discoveries, as compared with the ten years preceding them, the price of agricultural products and all other property rose 25 per cent. Few men in this day would be willing publicly to avow that this was a condition calling for the interposition of the law-makers. But it was different then.

The monometallists of that time openly proclaimed it to be an evil, and, without perplexing the public mind over ratios and parities, they boldly declared that inasmuch as the fall in the value of money had resulted from the enormous yield of the newly discovered mines, it ought to be counteracted by demonetizing one of the metals. But our friends on the other side disclaim all responsibility for the argument of their predecessors, and bitterly resenting the assertion that they favor increasing the value of money, they retort with the counter assertion that we are endeavoring to debase the currency. Either it is true, as we charge against them, that they advocate a policy which has constantly appreciated the value of our monetary unit, or else it is true, as they charge against us, that we advocate a policy which will depreciate it, because if our dollar is an honest one their dollar is too dear, while if their dollar is an honest one our dollar is too cheap. The core of this whole question is bound up in this statement, and I hope you will hear me attentively while I carefully consider it.

Perhaps we can obtain a clearer view of it if, instead of thinking about dollars, we will think of the bullion which composes the dollar. It has become such a settled mental habit to regard the dollar as fixed and unchangeable in its value that, although we all know that it is not fixed and that it does change, yet it is not always easy to avoid a confusion of thought when we undertake to point out its changes. Not only will it be conducive to clearness on our part to consider the bullion rather than the coin value, but our opponents can hardly object to this method of argument, because it is their principal insistence that the coin value and the bullion value ought to be identical. I do not disagree with them on this point; and, furthermore, it will not be amiss for me to say in this connection that I subscribe fully to the doctrine that the law can add nothing to the value of any article except by affecting the supply of it or the demand for it. But it is precisely this qualification, so indispensable to a correct statement of the economic principle, that our opponents always omit.

HOW LAW AFFECTS VALUE.

To exemplify the importance of this qualification let us imagine that to-morrow the law should forbid every person to eat bread made of wheat. The price of wheat would immediately fall, and why? Not because the law said that men should not eat wheat bread, but because, the law having said that, the demand for wheat would diminish and its price would fall in consequence of the diminished demand. To prove that this is not a distinction without a difference, if the day after the use of wheat as bread had been prohibited a new use for it could be found equal in value and extent to its bread use, its price would remain the same, although the law discriminating against it would still be on the statute books, because the diminution in the demand for it for one purpose would be neutralized by an increased demand for another purpose.

There is another and unanswerable proof of the soundness of this distinction in the fact that the price of corn would necessarily rise, though corn would not even be mentioned in the law against wheat; but there would be an increased demand for it to supply the want formerly supplied by wheat, and this increased demand would increase its price. It is as true of gold and silver as it is of wheat and corn that the law can affect their value by affecting the supply of them or the demand for them. The intelligent friends of silver do not expect that free coinage will add anything to the value of silver bullion or take anything from the value of gold bullion except in so far as it may affect the conditions of their supply and demand.

I am sometimes asked if the law can add 50 per cent to the value of silver why can it not add 100 per cent to the value of paper, as the Populists claim it can. I could answer that an increase in the demand for one article might be able to raise its price 50 per cent

and still be utterly unable to raise the price of another article 100 per cent. But the true and better answer is, that it is not incumbent upon us to prove that free coinage will make the silver bullion in the present silver dollar equal in value to the gold bullion in the present gold dollar; provided we can prove that the silver in the silver dollar is worth as much to-day as it was in 1873, when the present unit of value was established, and that the gold in the gold dollar is worth double as much now as it was then. Can we prove this? Let us see.

WHICH IS THE HONEST DOLLAR?

In 1873 the 412½ grains of standard silver in the silver dollar were worth a fraction more than the 25.8 grains of standard gold in the gold dollar. In the next year the 25.8 grains of gold became a fraction more valuable than the 412½ grains of silver, and the divergence has grown wider with the years. This far we all agree. No man disputes their relative value in 1873, or their relative value in 1895.

Our disagreement begins when we attempt to account for the great difference which has occurred between these two dates. Our adversaries insist that this difference is attributable entirely to a fall in the value of silver, and we insist that it is due to a rise in the value of gold. This is purely an issue of fact, and a dispassionate investigation of it ought to bring reasonable and disinterested men to a somewhat similar conclusion. Comparing gold with silver and silver with gold will not aid us in our inquiry. Such a comparison will simply show that a great difference exists, but will still leave one side to ascribe it to a fall in the value of silver and the other side to a rise in the value of gold. This method of argument could be continued until the end of time without leading us any nearer to the truth.

MEXICAN DOLLAR ARGUMENT.

This is the vice of the Mexican dollar argument which some gentlemen seem to think so conclusive and over which they exhibit such a peculiar satisfaction. A very warm friend of mine a few days ago asked me how it was that twenty years ago a Mexican silver dollar would buy as much as our silver dollar, and that now our dollar will buy as much as two Mexican dollars. I told him that it was simply because the Mexican dollar passed at the bullion value, while our silver dollar passed at the value of a gold dollar, gold being our unit of value and the Government receiving the silver dollar the same as the gold dollar. He replied that he understood that, but what he wanted to know was, if the Mexican dollar, which passes at its bullion value, is only worth half as much as our dollar, did that not prove that the value of silver had fallen? I answered that the only thing which his comparison proved was that there is a difference between our dollar and the Mexican now that did not exist twenty years ago, but this difference might be due either to a fall in the value of the Mexican dollar or a rise in the value of ours; and to prove which it is it was necessary to introduce another element in the comparison. I said to him, "Suppose we state the proposition in this way: Twenty years ago a Mexican dollar would buy as much as our dollar; now our dollar will buy twice as much as a Mexican dollar, but the Mexican dollar will still buy as much as it would then, and our dollar will buy twice as much." I asked him if he did not think that the trouble was in our dollar rather than in the Mexican dollar. My answer satisfied him and I believe that it will satisfy all who weigh it.

THE TRUE TEST.

Instead of comparing gold and silver with each other we must compare both of them with other things if we expect to demonstrate a rise in the value of one or a fall in the value of the other. In this comparison we must take 1872 as the initial point, because, our purpose being to ascertain whether the ratio between gold and silver has been dislocated by the upward movement of gold or the downward movement of silver, we must base our comparison upon conditions which existed before this dislocation began. Beginning with 1872 we must first ascertain the relation which gold and silver bore to the various kinds of property at that time, I have here a book published by the Treasury Department which gives the price of our principal agricultural products. On page 408 it gives the New York price of cotton from 1848 to 1894, and the price for 1872 is given as 22.19 cents per pound. According to this table 25.8 grains of standard gold in 1872 would buy 4½ pounds of cotton, and 412½ grains of standard silver, being worth 3 cents more than 25.8 grains of standard gold, would have bought a fraction more than 4½ pounds of cotton.

Now, let us compare gold and silver with cotton since 1872. I will not take a single year to suit my purpose in the argument, but I will take the average price for the twenty-two years from 1872 to 1894, and I will show that during all these years 25.8 grains of gold would buy double as much as it would in 1872, while 412½ grains of uncoined silver would buy more than it would have bought then. During these twenty-two years the average price of cotton was slightly less than 11¼ cents per pound, and therefore 25.8 grains of gold would buy nearly 9 pounds of cotton. Since 1872 the average price of 412½ grains of silver, measured in gold, has been slightly over 80 cents, and therefore during this time 412½ grains of silver would buy nearly 7 pounds of cotton, showing that gold has doubled its purchasing power over cotton, and that silver has not lost, but has actually increased its purchasing power. What is true of cotton is also true of wheat. In 1872 the farm price of wheat was $1.24 per bushel, and 412½ grains of silver would buy a fraction more than eight-tenths of a bushel of wheat. The average price of wheat for the twenty-two years from 1872 to 1894 has been 85 cents per bushel, and the average price of 412½ grains of silver, measured in gold, has been slightly over 80 cents; therefore 412½ grains of silver would purchase during all this time over nine-tenths of a bushel of wheat, or 10 per cent more than it would in 1872.

If we go from the farm to the factory or the storehouse we shall find the same story repeated. I can take the silver dollar and, passing it at its bullion value, I can buy across any dry goods counter in Sherman to-night more calico, more linen, and more domestic than I could have bought twenty-two years ago. I can take 100 silver dollars and drop them into the melting pot and, after the stamp and superscription of the Government have been burned off them, I can take the metal to any hardware establishment in Texas and buy more nails, saws, hammers, axes, plows, and more of all other implements of labor than I could have bought in 1872. Not only this, but every man, woman, and child in this audience to-night knows that 25.8 grains of gold will buy twice as much from the dry goods merchant, twice as much from the druggist, and twice as much from the hardware dealer as it would twenty-two years ago.

With these undisputed and indisputable facts before us, it is no wonder that even the most extreme advocates of the single standard have been compelled to admit that, as compared with these great commodities, the value of silver has not fallen and the value of gold has risen. But to avoid the force of this admission, it is alleged that silver has actually fallen and that gold has not actually risen, and that the appearance to the contrary is due to the fact that there has been an improvement in the method of producing manufactured goods and an enormous increase in agricultural production. That the cheaper production of goods will culminate in a lower scale of prices no sensible man can doubt; nor will any candid man deny that an increase in the production of cotton and wheat will lower their price, unless there is a corresponding increase in the demand for them. I think it unquestionable that these agencies account for a per cent of the decline in prices, but that they account for all of it, or for the greater part of it, I believe to be susceptible of overwhelming disproof.

My judgment is that the fall in the price of goods resulting from improved methods of production has not been greater than the increase in the purchasing power of silver. I am confirmed in this belief because if new and cheaper processes of production had caused the present prices, these prices would have followed close upon the introduction of the new and cheaper processes of production, but such has not been the case. The decline has been gradual and constant, and must have been produced by some cause like the constant and gradual appreciation in the value of money. Moreover I know that there were great improvements in making goods from 1848 to 1873, and yet the scale of prices from 1848 to 1873 was a rising one, notwithstanding the improvements in production owing, as everyone admits, to the increased supply of money. From 1873 to 1895 the processes of manufacturing goods have been improved, but not at a greater rate than from 1848 to 1873, and yet the scale of prices from 1873 to 1895 has been a falling one, because the demand for money has increased more rapidly than its supply.

But even if I should be wrong in this supposition, and if improved methods of production have exerted a more powerful influence over prices than I think they have, it does not follow that I am wrong in my complaint against the increase in the purchasing power of the dollar. The position that the merchant has no right to complain about the lower price of his goods if they will procure him the same quantity of other commodities, is equivalent to saying that no improvement in the methods of production shall inure to his advantage. If you tell the farmer that he must be satisfied so long as his produce will buy as much cloth as formerly, and you tell the manufacturer that he must not complain so long as his cloth will buy as much produce as ever, you deny both of them the benefits accruing from the inventions of genius, and reserve their blessings for the money lender, half of whose dollars will buy as much of the farmer's produce and as much of the manufacturer's cloth, while it will take twice as much of the farmer's produce and twice as much of the manufacturer's cloth to buy the same number of the money lender's dollars. If the exchangeable value of all property falls together, no man will be able to procure more of what he wants with what he produces than before, and

the producers will not be benefited. The only man who will find his purchasing power increased will be the man who owns dollars.

COTTON AND WHEAT.

In his Memphis speech Mr. Carlisle attempted to account for the fall in the price of wheat and cotton on the theory of their increased production. This is what he said:

The production of cotton in this country in 1872–73 was 2,974,351 bales, containing an average of 439 pounds net weight, while the production in 1893–94 was 7,549,817 bales, containing an average of 474 pounds net weight, or an increase of nearly 200 per cent in this country alone, besides the great increase that has taken place in competing countries; and in 1894–95 the production here was much larger, being nearly 10,000,000 bales. According to the statistics of the Agricultural Department the production of wheat in this country in 1872 was 249,997,100 bushels, and in 1894 460,267,416 bushels, or nearly twice as much, and there has also been an enormous increase of production in competing countries.

You will observe that he gives the cotton crop of the United States for 1872–73 as 2,974,351 bales. If he intended to give the crop of that year he understated it nearly a million bales, but as the figures he gives are exactly the crop for 1871–72, I assume that the date was an inadvertence. But giving him the benefit of this presumption, he is still amenable to the charge of unfairness in taking for his comparison the crop of 1871–72, which was 1,377,966 bales less than the crop of the preceding year and 956,157 bales less than the crop the following year.

Mr. Carlisle knows as well as any man how unsafe it is to generalize from particulars which are too narrow. He knows that the conditions of supply and demand with reference to a single article in any single year might be such as entirely to mislead us. It is only by taking a series of years or a number of articles that any general rule can be safely deduced. But, ignoring this plain principle, Mr. Carlisle takes the cotton crop of 1871–72 and comparing it with the cotton crop of 1893–94, declares that there has been an increase in the production of nearly 200 per cent; whereas if he had taken the crop of 1870–71 he would have found the increase to be less than 75 per cent, and if he had taken the crop of 1872–73 he would have found it to be less than 95 per cent.

This is not the only fair criticism of his speech on this score. He gives the increase in the production without intimating in the remotest way that there has been any increase in the consumption, and yet Mr. Carlisle must have known that the increase in our population exceeds the increase in the production of cotton in 1894 as compared with 1870–71, and nearly equals it as compared with 1872–73. Nor is this all. Every man who is familiar with the history of cotton culture and cotton manufacture knows that the increase in population does not fully measure the increase in the consumption of cotton, because it is now used in making many of the finer fabrics for which it was once supposed to be unfit.

PRICE AND PRODUCTION OF COTTON.

There is still another and a conclusive answer to Mr. Carlisle as to cotton. If, instead of taking a single year, as he did, we take a period of years, we can completely refute his argument. I have here a table giving our production of cotton for each year since 1838. In that year the crop was 1,363,000 bales, and it increased each year until the average annual production for the ten years from 1838 to 1848 was in round numbers 2,000,000 bales. The average crop for the ten years from 1849 to 1858 was 3,000,000, an increase of 50 per cent. But notwithstanding this increase of 50 per cent in production, the price rose from an average of 9¼ cents per pound for the first period to 12 cents per pound for the second.

Now let us compare the series of years immediately before and immediately after 1873—we can not take a period of ten years, for that would carry us back into the war, but taking five years each way we find that the average production for the five years from 1867–68 to 1871–72, inclusive, was 3,085,000, while the average production for the five years from 1873–74 to 1877–78 was 4,390,000 bales, an increase of 40 per cent. The average price for the five years from 1867–68 to 1872–73 was 28 cents per pound, and for the five years from 1873–74 to 1877–78 it was 14 cents per pound, a decrease of 50 per cent. And so it is that for the decade from 1848 to 1858 we find an increased production of 50 per cent, with an increase price of 25 per cent, while for the five years from 1873 to 1878, with an increased production of only 40 per cent, we find a decrease in price of 50 per cent.

How will our friends explain that during one period there was a rise of 25 per cent in price, notwithstanding an increase of 50 per cent in production, and in the other, with only 40 per cent increase in production, there was a fall of 50 per cent in price? There is but one explanation. It is simply because the first period coincides with the gold discoveries which began in 1848, and which, by increasing the supply of money, reduced its value, while the five years from 1873 coincides with the adoption of the single gold standard, which created an additional demand for gold greater than the additional supply, and this increased its value.

PRICE AND PRODUCTION OF WHEAT.

In the extract from the Memphis speech which I have read, Mr. Carlisle says:

The production of wheat in this country in 1872 was 249,997,100 bushels, and in 1894 it was 460,267,416 bushels, or nearly twice as much.

Here, again, Mr. Carlisle takes a single year and compares it with another single year, giving the increase in production without a single word about the increase in consumption. Fair-minded men who earnestly desire to know the truth might well distrust a teacher who states one element of value and suppresses the other, which is just as important. It appears from Mr. Carlisle's own figures, however, that the increase in our production of wheat in 1894, as compared with 1872, was 83 per cent, and this increase in the production of wheat was met and nearly counterbalanced by an increase of nearly 80 per cent in our population; and the growth of population has been much less than the increase in the consumption of wheat; for it is within my memory when many industrious families only used flour once a week, while now they use it daily.

If we accept Mr. Carlisle's explanation that the difference in production explains the difference in the price of wheat in 1872 and 1894, how will he explain that the wheat crop of 1890, which was only 399,262,000 bushels, was worth less per bushel than the crop of 1882, which was 504,188,470 bushels, or why the crop of 1893, which was 396,131,725 bushels, was worth 40 per cent less per bushel than the crop of 1891, which was 611,878,000 bushels. It will not suffice to answer that the production of other countries made this difference, because the world's crop in 1882 was larger than it was in 1890, and the world's crop in 1891 was larger than it was in 1893.

A comparison of these four years might be misleading, and so let us subject the world's crop for a period of years to this test of overproduction. Beginning with 1882, when the crop was 2,258,982,485 bushels, and taking the ten years up to and including the unprecedented crop of 1891, we find that only three out of the ten crops exceeded the crop of 1882, and the average was in round numbers 2,180,000,000 bushels, or nearly 80,000,000 bushels less than the crop of 1882. But in the face of this lower average production, and in spite of the fact that the world was increasing its population and its consumption of wheat, the price steadily declined. No reasonable man can believe that the difference in production has made the difference in price, for there is practically no difference in production. The conflict between the Secretary's theory and the cold matter of fact is irreconcilable, and his theory must be rejected. There being no difference in the conditions of supply and demand, nothing can explain the difference in price except the increase in the value of money.

THE PRECIOUS METALS.

I now desire to invite your consideration to some facts which must have affected the value of money. It must be remembered that gold and silver are articles of commerce, and are bought and sold like everything else; and that, like everything else, their value is determined by their supply and demand. This being true, it could not be otherwise than that the value of gold has enormously increased since 1873, because the demand for it since that time has increased out of all proportion to the increase in its supply. Since then Germany, Holland, and Austria-Hungary, which had been silver-standard countries, have adopted the exclusive use of gold, and the United States, France, Italy, Belgium, and several smaller nations, whose mints had stood open to gold and silver alike, have passed to a single gold standard.

In order that you may form some idea how this increased demand has been proportioned to the increased supply, and how it must therefore have affected its value, I will call your attention to three tables which appear in this book published by the Treasury Department. On page 95 you will find a table giving the world's production of gold and silver from 1792 to 1892. If you will make the addition you will find that the world's production of gold from 1879, the year we resumed specie payments, up to and including 1892, when the table concludes, was $1,535,000,000. On page 106 is another table exhibiting the amount of gold and silver in the United States on the 1st day of each July, from July, 1870, to 1893.

By reference to this table you will see that in 1878 we had only $25,000,000 of gold, and even this amount included the subsidiary silver coin then in circulation. Beginning the fiscal year 1879 with only $25,000,000 in gold, we increased our stock to $664,000,000 in 1892. On page 149 of this same publication is a table which shows that the United States consumed $192,000,000 of gold in the arts and manufactures from 1880 to 1892. Subtracting the $25,000,000 with which we began the fiscal year of 1879 from the $664,000,000 with which we closed the fiscal year of 1892, we have $639,000,000 absorbed in our monetary uses; and adding to this the sum of $192,000,000 consumed in manufactures and in the arts, we have

$831,000,000 as the total increased demand of the United States for gold from 1879 to 1892, while the increased supply of the whole world was only $1,535,000,000.

With this increased demand on the part of this one country, equal to more than 55 per cent of the increased supply of all the world, and with an increasing demand on the part of other nations to meet the needs of their expanding commerce and population, I submit to your common sense, my countrymen, if there is any escape from the conclusion that the value of gold has been vastly augmented. If there is still a doubt in your minds, that doubt must be dispelled when I show you from this same Treasury publication that while the gold production of the world from 1873 to 1892 has been $2,210,961,206 the gold coinage for the same time has been $2,787,714,679, an excess in the coinage over the production of $576,943,469. Some part of this excess represents recoinage; but after making proper allowance for that, the world has been compelled to lay its plate and jewelry under contribution to meet its increasing demand for money.

SILVER SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

The defenders of a gold standard point to the greatly increased production of silver as an evidence that its value must have declined. I would be the last man here or elsewhere to deny that an increase in its production, unless accompanied by an increase in the demand for it, would produce a fall in its value. If, however, the increase in the demand has kept pace with the increase in its supply, its value must have remained stable, for it is not supply alone nor demand alone, but supply and demand together, which regulates value.

With this criterion in our minds we can pursue our investigation with a reasonable hope of arriving at the truth. Our starting point, of course, must be 1873, because whatever may be the change in the value of silver growing out of its production, it must be explained by the difference between its production then and its production now. From 1873 to 1892 the entire silver production of the world was $2,400,000,000, and during that time silver constituted the only money of over 800,000,000 people, to say nothing of the amount required by gold-standand countries for subsidiary coinage. If every dollar of silver produced in the world had been employed by countries which use it exclusively as their money it would have provided an increase of less than $3 per capita in the twenty years. Fortunately we are are not left to guess about the demand for silver as related to its supply.

The mint reports of the various countries show that the world's silver coinage from 1873 to 1892 was $2,322,000,000, leaving only $78,000,000 for use in manufacture and in the arts. That this amount was grossly inadequate will appear from the report of the Director of our Mint, which shows that from 1880 to 1892 this country alone consumed in manufactures and in the arts $91,000,000 worth of silver, or $23,000,000 more than the entire world's surplus. And, moreover, though we have been a gold-standard country since 1873, from 1879 to 1892 we have absorbed over $700,000,000 worth of silver, while the entire world's production was only about $1,800,000,000, showing an increased demand on the part of this one gold-standard country equal to over 40 per cent of all the silver produced in the world. It is certain that the consumption of silver since 1873 has exceeded its production, and that to supply the coinage demand, together with the demand for manufactures and the arts, we have encroached upon the accumulations of former years.

There have been so many and such inexcusable misrepresentations as to the output of the silver mines in the last twenty years that many intelligent men believe that the production of silver has been three or four times as much as the production of gold, and that it will admit of indefinite extension, and yet the Treasury statistics show that, while the production of silver since 1873 has been $2,400,760,533, the production of gold for the same time has been $2,210,961,206, or a difference of less than $191,000,000 in twenty years. A successful business man said to me a few days ago that the increased production of the silver mines in the United States alone since 1873 was enough to overstock the world, and he was astounded when I presented him with a Treasury report showing that our increase in silver production has been but slightly greater than our increase in population. The world's highest production of silver in any one year from 1792 to 1892 was $196,000,000, which was less than 2½ per cent of the stock on hand. It is incredible that an increase of 2½ per cent in any one year could seriously impair the value of a great mass of any article. An increase of 2½ per cent in the annual production of corn or cotton or any perishable commodity would not seriously affect its price.

But, fellow-citizens, I must not detain you longer on this branch of the question. Nine-tenths of the men on the other side are estopped from denying that monometallism has depreciated the price of property and appreciated the value of money, because they profess themselves intensely desirous of restoring bimetallism through an international agreement; and they can not be so anxious to restore the double standard unless the single standard is an evil. But when driven to acknowledge the insufficiency and injustice of monometallism they resist the restoration of bimetallism upon reasons which it will be interesting for us to examine. The three principal objections which they offer are:

First, that silver is cheap money; second, that the free coinage of silver will derange our foreign commerce because our dollar will not be worth 100 cents in all the markets of the world, and third, that free coinage does not mean bimetallism, but simply means a substitution of silver monometallism for gold monometallism. I have already disposed of the first objection in considering another aspect of the question, and I trust that I have made it plain that instead of the objection being against the cheapness of silver it is properly against the dearness of gold.

INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE.

The objection that free coinage will derange our foreign commerce because our dollar will not be worth 100 cents in the markets of the world is based upon a misconception of the nature of international trade and of the function which the precious metals perform in such trade. Two years ago when I declared in a public speech that money is not used in the settlement of international balances, but that they are settled with bullion, and that even if coin is used at all, it is used as bullion and at its bullion value, I was viciously assailed. I did not reply. Knowing perfectly well that I was right, I was content to abide my vindication, but I hardly expected my critics to be rebuked by having my statement repeated by the Secretary of the Treasury in so short a time; and yet this is exactly what has come to pass. In his Memphis speech, Mr. Carlisle lays down the doctrine in these words:

> There is no legal tender in international trade. Whether payments are made in gold or silver coins, or in gold or silver bullion, actual intrinsic value determines the amount or quantity to be delivered, no matter what may be the legal-tender laws of the different countries, and no matter though they may have the same or different ratios of value between the metals within their respective limits.

It is true that he made this statement for the purpose of enforcing his opinion that the coin value and the bullion value of the metals ought to be the same—a proposition from which I do not dissent; but whatever may have been his purpose in stating the fact, that does not alter or qualify the fact itself, and hereafter when gentlemen talk about wanting a dollar worth 100 cents in all the markets of the world they must be reminded that Mr. Carlisle himself has said there is no such thing as a dollar in the markets of the world, and that when you take a dollar into those markets it ceases to be a dollar and becomes a mere commodity, to be sold according to its weight and fineness. With this fact admitted, the catch phrase of a dollar worth 100 cents in all the markets of the world becomes utterly meaningless and can not be imposed upon intelligent men much longer. It is difficult to see how any sensible man can deceive himself or be deceived about this matter. The least reflection upon it must convince him that nothing but our domestic trade can be affected by the legal value of a dollar, because in our trade with other countries we do not use dollars.

We give and receive goods in exchange for goods, and the balance of trade, whatever it may be and whoever must pay it, is, as Mr. Carlisle himself affirms, paid in the metals at their bullion value. So far from hindering our commerce with foreign nations, nothing could be better calculated to promote it than a return to the coinage system under which we could trade with all nations without those disturbances in the par of exchange which embarrass trade between countries using different metals. If we could resume the use of both metals, we could say to gold-using countries that we would trade with them, buying what we wanted of them and selling what they wanted of us, the balance to be paid or received in gold. We could also say to the silver-using nations that we would buy their goods and sell them ours, receiving or making payment of the balance in silver. Under a system like that, this Republic could carry her commerce into all the regions of the earth and drive the merchantmen of Great Britain from the high seas of the world.

SILVER MONOMETALLISM.

The third objection, that free coinage will simply substitute silver monometallism for gold monometallism, is as untenable as the first and second objections. In the first place, to give it even the semblance of correctness they are compelled to reject the long-established definition of bimetallism and to set up a new one which has no sanction in reason or authority. Bimetallism, as every student of the question knows, means no more than that the mints of the country shall be open to the free and unlimited coinage of both metals into standard money of legal-tender quality; and it does not require the concurrent circulation of both metals. The scientific truth which underlies and supports the theory of bimetallism is that by allowing the people a choice between the two metals, whenever one unduly increases its value they will abate their demand for it, which will tend to counteract the increase in its value, and will increase their demand for the

other, which will tend to increase its value, thus preserving their equilibrium.

The fear that if we resume the free coinage of silver our gold will all immediately leave the country is groundless. This same prediction was made with equal confidence before the Bland law was passed in 1878. It was freely asserted that if we entered upon even the limited coinage of silver it would only be a few months until our only metallic money would be a debased and mutilated silver coin. I remember well that a great man, whose fame is a part of the history of my native State, was so certain of this result that he refused to obey the instruction of the Mississippi legislature, and in a speech replete with evil prophecies, not one of which was ever fulfilled, he worked out the problem just as his successors do to-day. After estimating the gold in the country at between $150,000,000 and $200,000,000, he argued then, as Secretary Carlisle argues now, that the coinage of silver was tedious and slow; that it would require many years to coin as much silver as the gold we had; and that as the beginning of silver coinage would immediately expel all of the gold, there would be a great contraction of the currency.

Despite these predictions of disaster, the Bland bill became a law, being passed by Democratic votes over the veto of a Republican President, and instead of losing our gold the stock of it continued to accumulate until within ten years after its enactment we had over $700,000,000. These gentlemen seem to think that if we did not use silver we would have no trouble in keeping all the gold which we produce. They forget that during the eleven years from 1848 to 1859 we produced $595,000,000 worth of gold, and yet in 1859 we had only $250,000,000 in the country, which shows that during a time when the silver question was not an issue we were able to keep only 45 per cent of our gold. The only effect which the legal ratio has on the exportation of the metals, where both are used and one is undervalued, is that whenever it is necessary to send either abroad to settle balances or make purchases the undervalued one, being worth more relatively as bullion than as coin, will be sent, because in foreign markets it is treated as bullion and not as coin.

But aside from making purchases and paying balances neither metal will ever be exported unless it becomes more valuable in other countries than in this; and whenever an ounce of gold is worth more elsewhere than it is here and the difference in its value above the cost of transportation will net a fair profit to the exporter it will be exported, whether we use one metal or both. Nothing obeys the law of attraction so certainly and so quickly as the precious metals. They always go, and go speedily, to the markets where they sell for the highest price; and it is the special virtue of bimetallism that when one of them is in such demand as to greatly enhance its value it can be relinquished and the other used. The delusion that gold must be kept at any price is a relic of what is known in the history of political economy as the "mercantile theory," which dominated the business and economic thought of Europe until exploded by Adam Smith more than a century ago.

THE RATIO.

The gold expulsion argument proceeds upon the assumption that the ratio of 16 to 1 is not correct and that, though it is incorrect, the friends of silver will not correct it. This is purely gratuitous and unwarranted. The intelligent advocates of bimetallism insist as sincerely and as strenuously as anybody that all dollars in this country shall be of equal value, and we have over and again pledged ourselves that if we can restore silver to its equal privilege with gold both at the mint and before the law we will make the silver bullion in the silver dollar worth the gold bullion in the gold dollar. What we protest against is the folly and injustice of judging the relative value of the two metals while one of them is money and the other a commodity. We know that it is impossible to institute a true comparison under such circumstances. If you desired to compare the height of two men you would not stand one on the roof of this opera house and the other on the sidewalk, but you would take the man on the sidewalk up to the roof of the opera house or you would bring the man on the roof of the opera house down to the sidewalk before you would undertake to tell exactly what was the difference in their height.

If you were intelligent, after you had stood them side by side, the first thing you would do would be to look at their feet and see if they were on a level, because you would perfectly understand that the difference in their heads might be produced by the difference of the levels on which they stood. But when you had put the feet of both on the same level, you would know that the difference in their heads measured the difference in their height. That is precisely our position on this question. Before we compare these two metals we desire to put them on the same plane, and this can only be done by resuming the free coinage of silver. Of course we can not resume without a ratio, and as we must begin somewhere, I prefer to begin where we left off. After we have done this, and have ascertained what the difference is, it then becomes our duty to consider the cause of that difference. If it has been caused by a fall in the value of silver, we must put more silver in the silver dollar in order to preserve the stability of the unit; if it has been caused by a rise in the value of gold, we must take some gold out of the gold dollar in order to preserve the stability of the unit.

This suggestion is neither novel nor dangerous. We have a precedent for it, and a precedent, too, established by the second founder of Democracy. During President Jackson's Administration the parity of our gold and silver coins was displaced, but the statesmen of that generation did not propose to demonetize either metal on that account. They simply recognized the necessity of readjusting the ratio, and carefully weighed the matter to see whether the displacement had been caused by the depreciation of silver or the appreciation of gold. Their conclusion was that the trouble lay in the appreciation of gold, and they corrected it by taking some of the gold out of the gold dollar, thus equalizing the value of the two coins and preserving the stability of the monetary unit. Why can not we do the same thing? There is nothing sacred either about the ratio between the two metals or about the quantity of metal in either coin. The sacred thing, against which no Congress ought to legislate, is the value of the coin.

THE DOLLAR AND THE YARDSTICK.

I often hear men say that the dollar ought to be as fixed and unchangeable as the yardstick, and though I thoroughly agree with what they say, I doubt if I agree with what they mean. The analogy between the yardstick as a measure of length and the dollar as a measure of value is imperfect, for the reason that the yardstick is simply and only a measure of length, while the dollar is not only a measure of value, but is also a medium of exchange and a solvent of debts, and it is for these latter uses that it is sought. Nobody ever buys or sells a dollar to be used as a measure of value. In fact, though the law now decrees the gold dollar to be the unit of value, the coinage of it is expressly forbidden, and all which have been coined have been called in to be recoined into pieces of other denominations.

If dollars were not needed to pay debts and perform exchanges there would be no demand for them and their value would be inconsiderable. But they are needed for these purposes, and in this fact lies the impossibility of making the value of the dollar as invariable as the length of the yardstick. You will instantly perceive the difference. The demand for yardsticks can have no possible effect upon their length. If there was but one in America to-night and every merchant in the land was bidding for it, the price might be $1,000, but its measure would still be the same; or if there were 100,000,000,000 yardsticks in the country, with every merchant supplied and no man wanting to buy one, the price of the yardstick might be less than a hundredth of 1 cent, but every yardstick of the 100,000,000,000 would measure exactly 36 inches.

The dollar is altogether different in this respect. If there was only one dollar in this country it would be difficult to compute its value, and it is certain that if there were one hundred billion here every one of them would be worth less than 5 per cent of what they are to-day. Nothing can be surer than that the length of the yardstick is not in the least affected by the number of them in existence, and it is equally certain that the value of each dollar is largely governed by the number of them in circulation.

If the yardstick were made of a material that would extend and contract its length as the demand for it increased or decreased, then we would have a yardstick analogous to the dollar. Suppose we had such a one and suppose the demand for it had been steadily increasing for twenty years, and that with the increasing demand of each year it had been growing longer until it was now 72 inches long instead of 36. Would any man venture to say that it would be an honest measure of length? And yet it would be just as honest as a dollar which has doubled its value. Perhaps the apologists of the lengthened yardstick would contend, as do the apologists of the more valuable dollar, that the yardstick had not grown longer, but that everything else had grown shorter, and, though we could show that it had formerly been the length of an ordinary man's arm, and that it was now twice that long, they would insist that the yardstick was all right, but that in consequence of the overproduction of men their arms had grown shorter.

THE BEST MONEY.

Our opponents tell us that they favor the gold standard because gold is the best money in the world. If they mean by this that gold is the dearest money in the world, I will grant it; and I will also grant that if the dearest money is the best, then gold is not only the best money now but it is getting better all the time, because it is constantly growing dearer. But, my countrymen, we do not think that the dearest money is necessarily the best money. We believe that the best money is the money which is the most unchangeable in its value. We do not differ with the advocates of the gold standard in our desire for the best money,

but we differ with them as to what constitutes the best money. They consider that the best which possesses the highest value, while we consider that the best which possesses the greatest stability of value.

I am as much in favor of an honest dollar as any living man, but I am as much opposed to one which is too dear as I am to one which is too cheap. I want a stable dollar, and a stable dollar neither goes up nor down. I am so much in favor of stability in the value of the dollar that I would not hesitate to change the metal in it in order to preserve its value. If a man who knows nothing about the money question will listen to the superficial declaration about the dishonesty of changing the bullion in the coin he will conclude that the important quality of our dollar is not its value, but the quantity of metal in it. The absurdity of this contention is palpable. We all affirm that the most desirable quality in a dollar is invariability.

What do we mean by invariability? Do we mean invariability in the amount of the metal which it contains, or do we mean invariability in value? The question answers itself. The unit being one of value and not of quantity, the invariability which it ought to possess is the invariability of value, and the metal in it ought to be changed whenever a change is necessary to preserve its value. Under the operation of a single gold standard our money has lacked the essential quality for twenty years, and the lack will probably be intensified in the years to come. Indeed, it must be, because after the demand for gold to be used in the manufactures and the arts has been supplied the annual addition to the money of all the world is less than $80,000,000, and this sum is scarcely sufficient to repair the waste of existing stock. With a volume of trade enlarging faster than the volume of money, the value of the dollar must continue to increase.

DEBTS ABSORB PROPERTY.

But what is the harm, I have heard it asked, if the dollar does increase the value? If it takes twice as much property to buy it, will it not buy twice as much when you get it? This statement of the question is not broad enough. It presupposes only the buyers and sellers of property and does not embrace the buyers and sellers of money. A large majority of our people use borrowed capital, and from time to time are compelled to buy money with which to discharge their obligations, and it is upon them that the misery and injustice are inflicted.

To-day we own $70,000,000,000 worth of property and we owe $35,000,000,000, the dollars which we owe being equal to one-half of the property which we own. If the value of these dollars increases during the next twenty years as it has during the past twenty years, in 1915 the value of the dollars which we now owe will equal three-fourths of the property which we now own; and if in another twenty years a similar increase in the value of the dollar occurs, in 1935 the value of the dollars which we now owe will be equal to all of the property which we now own. Thus the owners of our present indebtedness can sit idly down, and, living upon their current interest, they will see the silent and pitiless accretion in the value of their dollars absorb the property on which they hold their mortgages.

No business can survive this ceaseless grind. In the end, the active users of capital will be crushed and all enterprise will be discouraged; the profits of merchandising will be absorbed by the growing burden of debt and merchants will be forced into bankruptcy; the progressive men who have borrowed money and built cities will find their property eaten up by an unearned increment and their families impoverished; mills will pass out of the hands of their owners into the hands of their mortgagees, and we shall have a state of society in which no workingman prospers and no prosperous man works. It is this unspeakable calamity which I entreat my countrymen to avert.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my very brief remarks I should like the Clerk to read two extracts from the newspaper which I send to the desk, the leading Democratic newspaper in the State of North Carolina, the Charlotte Daily Observer.

The Clerk read the following from the address of the national executive committee of the People's Party:

The line of battle has already been drawn. In the coming fight every voter must be on one side or the other. He must line himself up with the gold combine, with trusts, monopolies and British tories, or he must line himself up with the people in support of the candidate who will be nominated at St. Louis on July 22.

The Democratic wing of the gold party and the Republican wing of the gold party will nominate candidates who belong to the British gold trust and who stand for the same evils that now curse humanity.

The Clerk also read the following from the Washington correspondence of the Charlotte Daily Observer:

I quote the written words of an intelligent and responsible man who has talked with some of the silver Republicans in Congress within two days:

"The silver Republicans realize that they have no chance of getting what they want from the Republican national convention. They are now fully determined not to support a gold candidate for the Presidency nor to accept any but a plain silver platform. This means that when the time comes they will have to break with their party on the national ticket and vote for a silver candidate if any is in the field, other than a Populist. If the Democrats will come out for silver the support of these Senators will be given to the Democratic ticket."

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe that many gentlemen to whom I desired especially to address myself to-night are not here. Some of them, I dare say, are in their rooms; some at the theater; some at the Princeton alumni dinner, and a great many of them are in North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have only two things to say, one that will perhaps occupy three minutes and the other about seven minutes; and but for the declarations which the Clerk has read I should not have undertaken to tax the attention of the House to-night.

When this bond bill was introduced and forced through the House with so much haste that the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] did not give us any chance to be heard, and did not give us a chance even to "kick," I stated the reasons for my opposition to that measure in the RECORD. I undertook there to say that the measure would not pass the other branch of this Congress, and that certainly it would not pass the White House. And I am here now to say that the measure which has been declared here as the voluntary policy of the Republican party is one of which I challenge the wisdom, of which I challenge the Republicanism, of which I challenge the necessity. And without being a soothsayer, I shall venture to say that when the grand quadrennial assize of the Republican party meets on the west bank of the Mississippi River, as it will in June next, this voluntary declaration will not be incorporated as a plank in that Republican platform. I deny that the Republican party is willing to go upon record declaring that it favors a policy of borrowing money rather than of earning money. [Applause.]

In this connection I wish to say that whatever that grand tribunal may do and whomever it may nominate—whether it be that leader of leaders from the State of Maine, Hon. THOMAS B. REED, or whether it be that spotless statesman who sits in the other wing of this Capitol and whose whole life has been a synonym of purity and of faithful service to his country, Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON, or whether it be that magnetic son of the State of Ohio whose name is synonymous with the bed-rock principle of the Republican party, the principle of protection—whoever may be the nominee of that convention, he is going to get my vote. [Applause.]

In the deliverance which the Clerk has read I am classed as a silver Republican. He did not read the whole of that deliverance, but only as much as I could allow time for in the limited period accorded me. There have been two deliverances recently upon the subject of what is called the new silver party. One is in that paper, addressed to the voters of my State; and it is an invitation to all of us Republicans, Populists, and Democrats to break up the old party lines and go into the silver party. I am glad to recognize that a distinguished representative of that party, and the only one named as such in the Congressional Directory [Mr. NEWLANDS], sits before me. With great respect to him and to the purpose that he has in view, I say now that I take the earliest opportunity to decline the invitation which the leader of the Populist party has framed in the letter which has been read. I decline it not only in my own name, but in the name of 125,000 true Republicans in the State of North Carolina to-day. We are not going to break the ranks; and we are not going into a new party which has one single idea, and which will not receive 50 electoral votes in the next Presidential contest, as we know and as they know. [Applause.]

But I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the eloquent and the very closely knitted speech that we listened to this afternoon from the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DINGLEY] has not done so much damage to the cause of silver as a certain other pronunciamento which has shattered all the traditions of a century, and which has astounded the old fathers, whom we recognize and honor here in this Congress—a pronunciamento which was uttered under such circumstances, with such intemperance of language, with such ferocity of threats, that it reminded me of the dreadful images in Calphurnia's dream, where she sees in fancy—

Fierce, fiery warriors, fighting upon the clouds,
Which drizzled blood upon the capitol.

We heard there of agrarian joining with communist; we heard of tramps moving on the Capitol; we heard of dynamite; we heard of anarchy; we heard of shotguns; and we heard of pitchforks. I desire to say to my silver friends that I as much as any of them desire the restoration of silver to its dignity and functions as a money metal, but that their cause is not going to be advanced by any such language as that. Their cause is not going to be advanced by hoisting the red flag of anarchy or the black flag of dynamiters in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Republican party will solve this question in such a way as to give the very largest possible coinage of silver that is consistent with the credit of this Government. The Republican party stands for the credit of this nation; it stands for the honor of the country; it stands for the glory of the American flag; it stands for freedom to all men.

And now, one word more in reference to that pronunciamento, that invitation to carry us over into a new secession movement, you may call it. We have tried that in the past. We tried it at the instance of South Carolina some thirty-six years ago. She invited my State to join her in the secession movement and we declined, and continued to decline, until we were driven or rather dragged into that horrible conflict and South Carolina got thoroughly whipped.

Mr. TALBERT. I deny it; and she is not ashamed of the act. She would do it again under like circumstances.

Mr. PEARSON. I am ashamed of the fact and ashamed of any man who would indorse secession or the motives which lead to it. [Applause.]

Mr. TALBERT. I do. I indorse it, and every word of it.

Mr. PEARSON. I have heard it said that if hell ever breaks loose in this country it will be in South Carolina, and I believe that is true, from the exhibition made here to-night. [Laughter and applause.]

This autocrat, who has built up his power partly on class prejudice and partly by the nullification of the Constitution of the United States, may mark your State with ruin, but fortunately his control stops at the line of South Carolina. [Applause.]

Mr. TALBERT. The Republican party has ruined the whole nation.

Mr. PEARSON. We might not have regretted so much the whipping received by South Carolina, but unfortunately we got whipped ourselves.

Mr. TALBERT. South Carolina never was whipped and never will be. She got tired of whipping the other fellows. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEARSON. It is proposed now to draw a new line—not a Mason and Dixon's line, but a kind of northwest and southeast line. I do not know where the termini may happen to be placed, but I thank God the Mason and Dixon line has been obliterated from the map and is only a memory in the minds of such men as my honorable interlocutor. [Applause.] Thank God, we have no more sections, and I believe the Republican party, standing as it does for the honor of the country, the glory of the flag, the doctrine of protection to every section of the Union, is the party to which every honest silver man should belong; because, while other parties may have something to say about it, the Republican party is the only party that will have anything to do about it. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. TALBERT. We have very few such men in South Carolina and do not want them.

Mr. PEARSON. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I append extracts from various State Republican conventions in condemnation of bond issues, which I commend to the careful consideration of the House.

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTIONS CONDEMN BOND ISSUES.

[Massachusetts Republican, October 5, 1895.]

The last Congress provided a revenue shamefully inadequate, and by the issue of bonds shifted on to succeeding Administrations the burden of their outlay.

[New York Republican, September 17, 1895.]

We denounce the Democratic Administration for its gross mismanagement of the finances of the nation. It already has added more than $165,000,000 to the national debt and the burdens of the people, and there is every evidence that this increase is to be continued.

[Kentucky Republican League clubs, May 1, 1895.]

We believe in the doctrine of protection to American labor, American industries, and American homes; and we attribute the unparalleled business depression of the country to the utter failure of the Democratic Administration in its management of both foreign and domestic affairs, which has created national distrust and general paralysis, has driven capital from the factories and labor into the streets, reduced the revenues of the Government, and increased its bonded indebtedness.

[Ohio Republican, May 28, 1895.]

We denounce the present Democratic Administration, whose vicious and vacillating course has brought us distress at home and humiliation abroad. It has inaugurated a policy looking toward ultimate free trade, which has deranged business, crippled our industries, distressed our homes, and dealt labor a serious blow. With deplorable incompetency it has failed to raise revenue enough to run the Government and has had to borrow, in less than two years, $162,000,000 mainly to pay ordinary running expenses, selling in secret to favored foreign syndicates the bonds of the Government at prices far below their actual value.

[Pennsylvania Republican, August 28, 1895.]

Charges upon the Democratic party the fault for a constantly growing deficit in receipts, as compared with expenditures, thus compelling the borrowing of money in large amounts at exorbitant premiums in time of peace to maintain the credit of the Government. For the failure of the Democratic Administration to provide sufficient revenue to meet the wants of the Government "its responsibility is absolute, and it has exhibited to the world such inability and faithlessness in the discharge of the high trust committed to its care that its history continues to excite the contempt and distrust of all thoughtful citizens."

[Utah Republican, 1895.]

The first State Republican convention of Utah was held at Salt Lake City, August 28, 1895. The platform adopted was as follows:

"We condemn the action of the present national Administration for issuing Government bonds in time of peace to meet a deficit caused by unwise and un-American legislation, and for its unprecedented and unpatriotic coalition with a syndicate of foreign money lenders to procure the sale of Government bonds adversely to the interests of the people."

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on the threshold of my remarks upon this question I desire to say in behalf of the constituency I have the honor to represent in this House that it is not selfish interest which controls their opinions upon this subject, as has been so repeatedly charged by the advocates of a single gold standard. Neither is it the poverty of our people which causes them to seek for an enlargement of our primary money. In verification of these expressions it is only necessary to refer to the statistics of the last census report, from which it appears that the per capita wealth of the people of the Pacific Coast States and Territories is more than twice the per capita wealth of the average of all of the Eastern States. The State of Idaho stands fourth in the Union in per capita wealth, and the individual citizen of that State, as shown by this census report, is three times wealthier than the individual citizen of Maine and twice as wealthy as the average individual citizen of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York. The per capita wealth of our population, as shown by these statistics, which are undisputed, must be proof positive that our people are not so poverty-stricken that they are therefore unreasonable in their demand for more metallic money.

The silver in our State is found either in conjunction with gold or lead in almost every instance, and the mines are of value because these combined products can be marketed at a profit. The fact that our people have been interested in the production of silver has perhaps caused them to give this matter more investigation than the agricultural population of the United States; but I make the assertion, and in so doing believe that I am clearly within the facts, that the agricultural population of the United States has suffered infinitely more from the demonetization of silver than have the silver-producing States and Territories of the Pacific Coast, and the record I have above referred to abundantly proves it. The fact that we are producers of silver has caused our people to investigate the subject and therefore to be more earnestly concerned about it and interested in it than would otherwise be the case. The result of this investigation has convinced these people that the demonetization of silver in 1873 was a national mistake and that no permanent prosperity can come to the United States until our country has returned to true bimetallism.

The conclusion arrived at by our people on this subject after such investigation is not new or original with them, but is the same conclusion that has been reached by the ablest statesmen of our nation since the adoption of the Constitution. It has been the habit of the advocates of a single gold standard, and especially the metropolitan press, to ridicule the financial theories adopted by the advocates of bimetallism, and especially those advocates coming from far Western States. Ridicule needs no reply, for it is not argument. It may be worth while, however, to refer to the fact that such illustrious men as Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Robert Morris, Jackson, Webster, Clay, Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, Thurman, and Blaine have advocated, in the halls of Congress and elsewhere, the free coinage of silver and gold as basic money. The records which these statesmen have left can be produced to substantiate the truth of this assertion. The gold advocates do not question their patriotism on other matters and have always been the first to refer to them and their records on other questions. It would seem, therefore, that the advocates of bimetallism are not without support in their advocacy of this idea from the statesmen of our country who have gone before.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of my remarks to, as briefly as possible, give reasons for the faith which is in us, and, in order to do this, it is necessary to briefly refer to some historical facts which bear upon the question.

From time immemorial silver and gold have been the money metals of the people of the world. The earliest records of history find them in use, side by side, in all stages of civilization. Until 1816 silver and gold continued to be used as primary money by all civilized nations. During that year England, then the greatest commercial nation in the world, demonetized silver. This was followed by similar legislation in the United States in 1873, Germany in 1874, and shortly thereafter by France, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, Italy, and Greece.

For a fair consideration of this subject it is necessary, however, to briefly review the legislation of our own country thereon and the status gold and silver occupied at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

THE UNIT OF ACCOUNT.

Bimetallists contend that gold and silver is the money of the Constitution, and that all legislation since that time until 1873 has been enacted with that understanding uppermost in the minds

of the legislators. In this connection it may be proper to consider the much mooted question as to what was, at or about the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the monetary unit of account. A representative of the gold-standard people on the floor of this House pretends to believe that gold was the unit of account, or at least that silver was not expressly declared to be this unit by act of Congress. From the best evidence attainable, from the discussions of the question at that time by eminent statesmen, and from contemporaneous history, as well as legislation, it seems to me it is conclusively proven that the silver dollar was the unit of account, and was intended so to be by the early financiers of our Government. All the information on the subject certainly goes to prove that gold was never by anyone at that time considered the metal out of which was to be coined the unit of account. The most that the present friends of a single standard can contend for is that this unit must have been based on both metals. There is so little to verify the correctness of this view and so much to prove the truth of the silver unit, that I shall ask the indulgence of the House to briefly go into the history of the origin of the unit of account.

The friends of silver maintain that the unit of account adopted in the coinage act of 1792 was the Spanish milled dollar, containing 371¼ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver, and in support of that contention I will refer to the positions taken thereon by representative financiers and statesmen of that day.

Robert Morris, a man of great learning, and who had devoted much time and labor to the investigation of financial questions, made a report to Congress in 1782. That report urged the necessity for the establishment of a unit of account in our monetary system, and argued that the same was as necessary and essential as other units adopted in the commercial world for the determination and measurement of commodities which were the products of human labor. He discussed at some length the advisability of whether the unit ought to be affixed to gold and silver or to either of them alone, and finally arrived at the following conclusion:

There can be no doubt, therefore, that our money standard ought to be affixed to silver, for the demand which commerce might make for either of the precious metals in preference to the other would vary this real standard from time to time, and in every payment a man would get more or less of real value for his debt, according as he was paid in the coin of greater or less value in relation to the real standard. The purposes of commerce require that the lowest divisible point of money, or what is more properly called the money unit, should be very small.

Mr. Morris measured a unit so small that its practical value was open to very serious question. It appears to have been so infinitesimal that the statesmen of his day did not favor the adoption of it, and it did not meet with the approval of the people. It appears conclusively from the record which he has left us that he personally favored a silver unit.

Thomas Jefferson, in his Notes on the Establishment of a Money Unit and of Coinage for the United States, which appeared at the same time with Mr. Morris's report, and was communicated to Congress in 1782, takes the position that the unit suggested by Mr. Morris would be entirely too small for practical uses, and gives very substantial and conclusive reasons why it ought not to be adopted. After enumerating the requirements which the unit of money ought to possess, Mr. Jefferson says:

The Spanish dollar seems to fulfill all these conditions.

It is apparent from Mr. Jefferson's statement that the contention of the gold-standard advocates of to-day, to wit, that he did not advocate a silver unit, is entirely without foundation, for he plainly advocated the adoption of such a unit and that to correspond in weight with the Spanish milled dollar. Mr. Jefferson further recommends in this communication—

That the money unit of these States shall be equal in value to a Spanish milled dollar; that it shall be divided into tenths and hundredths; that there shall be a coin of silver of the value of the unit, another of the same metal of the value of one-tenth of a unit, one other of copper of the value of one hundredth of a unit; that there shall be a coin of gold of the value of ten units.

It is observable that Mr. Jefferson entirely sustained Mr. Morris on the decimal feature of our notation of money, and that he advocated a silver unit, differing only with him as to the amount of silver which that unit should contain. There was no Spanish milled dollar of gold; there was no dollar of gold in circulation anywhere at that time; there was no piece of gold money which corresponded to the value of the Spanish milled dollar which was then suggested as the unit. In fact, it is not intimated, inferentially or otherwise, by any statesman of that day who gave any consideration to this subject that gold was intended to be the unit of account.

The "Grand Committee on the Money Unit," appointed by Congress in 1785, reported July 6, 1785, to Congress "That the money unit of the United States of America be one dollar," and its report was unanimously adopted.

The Treasury board reported to Congress on the 8th day of April, 1786, recommending as a money unit the silver dollar; and in August of that year Congress adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the money unit of the United States, being by the resolution of Congress of the 6th of July, 1785, a dollar, shall contain of fine silver 375.64 grains. And that there shall be two gold coins, one containing 246.268 grains of fine gold, equal to ten dollars, and to be called an eagle; one containing 123.134 grains of fine gold, equal to five dollars, and to be called a half eagle.

It seems to me that it is conclusively apparent from these references that up until this time there had been no assertion or desire for the double unit of account or for a gold unit.

Alexander Hamilton, perhaps the greatest financier of his day and one of the greatest statesmen America has ever produced, in his report on the establishment of a United States mint, presented to Congress in April, 1791, says:

Contrary to the ideas which have heretofore prevailed in the suggestions concerning a coinage for the United States, though not without much hesitation, arising from a difference from those ideas, the Secretary is, upon the whole, strongly inclined to the opinion that the preference ought to be given to neither of the metals for the money idea. It seems to be the most advisable, as has been observed, not to attach the unit exclusively to either of the metals, because this can not be done effectively without destroying the features and character of one of them as money and reducing it to the situation of mere merchandise. * * *

The conclusion to be drawn from the observations which have been made on the subject is this: That the unit in the coins of the United States ought to correspond with 24¼ grains of pure gold and with 371¼ grains of pure silver, each answering to a dollar in the money of account. * * * On this plan the unit in money of account will continue to be a dollar and its multiples—dimes, cents, and mills, or tenths, hundredths, and thousandths.

It will be observed from the foregoing that the ratio which this report established was practically 15 of silver to 1 of gold.

The coinage act of 1792, which was adopted by the Congress, reads as follows:

SEC. 9. That there shall be, from time to time, struck and coined at the said mint coins of gold, silver, or copper of the following denominations, values, and descriptions, viz: Eagles, each to be of the value of ten dollars or units, and to contain 247½ grains of pure or 270 grains of standard gold; half eagles, each to be of the value of five dollars, and to contain 123⅝ grains of pure or 135 grains of standard gold; quarter eagles, each to be of the value of two dollars and a half dollar, and to contain 61¼ grains of pure or 67½ grains of standard gold; dollars or units, each to be of the value of the Spanish milled dollar, as the same is now current, and to contain 371¼ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver.

While Mr. Hamilton may have inclined to the belief that there should be two units of account, a gold dollar and a silver dollar, each of specified weight, or, to express the same thing in another way, one unit the material of which was to be silver and another unit the material of which was to be gold, and while his report would tend to show that this was his view of the matter, nevertheless we must not lose sight of the fact that Mr. Jefferson, the grand committee referred to, the board of Treasury report, and many of the statesmen of that day had given this matter careful consideration, that it was a question of vital importance to the whole people and must have been considered by them and by their representatives generally at that time. It is, therefore, only fair to assume that other influences besides those of Mr. Hamilton—which we will admit must have been powerful—had to do with concentrating the opinions and thought of the day on this question into the statute of 1792, and that those opinions, except Mr. Hamilton's, were unquestionably in favor of a silver unit of the weight of a Spanish milled dollar. When we consider that Mr. Hamilton was not averse to this unit, but in fact approved of it, while insisting on the gold unit as well, it is only fair to assume that the coinage act of 1792 reflected the sentiments of the statesmen of that day and meant just what it said, although in this reflection and meaning it may have necessitated a compromise of Mr. Hamilton's views to some extent. That act does not declare that there is a gold unit or that any piece of gold money shall constitute a unit; it never refers to the gold unit in any way except to say—

Eagles, each to be of the value of ten dollars or units—

While it does say that there shall be coined—

dollars or units, each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same is now current, and to contain 371¼ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver.

In other words, the positive and unequivocal requirement of this statute is that there shall be established and created a silver dollar which shall be the unit of account, while the statute nowhere says, inferentially or otherwise, that such a gold dollar shall be created. On the contrary, it simply measures the value of that gold dollar in units, and these units are silver dollars created by the same act. How any friend of the single gold standard can deduct from history and the record of this legislation the conclusion that—

This act was intended to attach the money unit to gold and silver alike—

is past finding out. Moreover, if the position which the gold advocates take on this question were true, it certainly does not help their cause, for it would simply establish a bimetallic union or standard, which the friends of silver now contend for. It is plain, however, that this was not the intention of the fathers of our country in framing financial legislation for the people; that it was not the result of their best thought and investigation.

I have therefore gone into this question of the unit of account with this detail for the purpose of showing that the much-despised white metal of to-day was good enough to be made the unit of

account by our forefathers, who were considered to be the wisest statesmen of their day and generation, and who have not had superiors in the flight of time since.

REVIEW OF OUR FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. Speaker, the next legislation in our country succeeding the act of 1792, creating the mint, was the act of June 28, 1834, which reduced the quantity of gold in the gold coin, and made the ten-dollar piece contain 232 grains of pure gold, one-tenth of which would be 23.2 grains as constituting the gold dollar. This act therefore changed the ratio from 15 to 1 to practically 16 to 1.

The act of January 18, 1837, made the coins nine-tenths pure and one-tenth alloy; the silver dollar 371¼ grains of pure silver, or 412½ grains of standard silver.

The act of February 21, 1853, reduced the amount of silver in subsidiary coin, so that the half dollar contained 192 grains of standard silver and the other subsidiary coins in the same proportion. By the same act the legal-tender quality of the subsidiary coins was limited to $5, but the silver dollar was yet of full legal tender.

The act of February 21, 1857, authorized the recoinage of all foreign subsidiary coin and repealed prior acts which made them legal tender.

The act of February 12, 1873, omitted the silver dollar from our coinage laws and made the gold dollar of 23.22 grains of pure gold, or 25.8 grains of standard gold, the unit of account.

The act of Februry 28, 1878, known as the "Bland-Allison Act," provided for the purchase of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver monthly, and that such silver should be coined into standard dollars of 412½ grains each of standard silver as provided in the act of January 18, 1837.

The act of July 14, 1890, known as the "Sherman law," authorized the purchase by the Government of 4,500,000 ounces of silver monthly and the issuance of Treasury notes in payment therefor. These notes were redeemable in coin at the discretion of the Secretary and were legal tender. It also required the Secretary of the Treasury to coin each month 2,000,000 ounces of silver so purchased into standard silver dollars until the 1st day of July, 1891, and after that time to coin as much as might be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes therein provided for. The purchasing clause of that act was repealed November 1, 1893, and we have had no legislation affecting silver since, so that to-day we are on a single gold standard and silver is practically without legislation in this or any other great commercial country making it primary money.

TRUE BIMETALLISM.

Mr. Speaker, the true bimetallists contend for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 16 by the United States, acting independently of all other nations.

As the opponents of this doctrine practically all admit that the great commercial nations of the world, acting together, could coin these metals without limit, it is unnecessary for me to go into a discussion of the advisability of free coinage in this manner. I will, therefore, chiefly confine my remarks to the propriety of this country entering upon the free and unlimited coinage of both metals independently.

RATIO.

First let us consider the ratio. While the matter of the ratio is not one that goes to the principle of bimetallism, nevertheless some fixed ratio must be agreed upon by the friends of free coinage, and by almost universal consent the ratio of 16 to 1 (exact mint ratio, 15⅝⅝ to 1) has been considered the proper one for adoption. In support of the contention that this has been substantially the commercial ratio prior to 1873, financial statistics establish beyond doubt that for all the time during which the world took a careful account this ratio was practically maintained. It is noticeable that a marked change took place in the commercial ratio with the demonetization of silver in 1873, and that silver has been falling in value ever since as compared with gold, until the ratio is now about 30 to 1. We maintain that this record subsequent to 1873 furnishes absolutely no criterion by which to judge the merits of either metal as basic money, because during this latter period silver was denied its proper mintage rights by the United States and every other great commercial nation.

It is unfair, unjust, and illogical to criticise the white metal for its failure to maintain its ratio with gold after all of the great money-using nations of the world had destroyed it and taken away its function as money. The law of supply and demand controls the value of gold and silver as it does every other product of human industry. Half of the world's demand for gold and silver is now and always has been created by the laws which attach a money function to these metals. On the other hand, half of the demand has been given to them by virtue of their use in the arts; and when we take away 50 per cent of this demand for one of the metals, and the supply thereof remains practically the same, manifestly it must fall as compared with the other, for which there is a constant limited demand in the arts and an unlimited demand at the mints of the world. If gold had been demonetized in 1873 and silver had remained basic money, it must be apparent to even the unthinking that the ratio between silver and gold would have been inversely as much disturbed.

NO DEMAND FOR THE DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

Aside from the evils of the demonetization act, it may not be inopportune to say that there was absolutely no demand for such legislation in 1873 or at any time prior thereto from the American people, and had the people understood that their representatives were attempting the enactment of such a law there would have been a protest against it from the entire country. The time selected for this legislation was peculiarly opportune. There was practically no metallic money in circulation at that time. The paper circulation, issued of necessity during the war, had prevented our return to specie payments until 1879. Moreover, the Congress itself did not understand that any such legislation was being attempted. The most conspicuous members of Congress in 1873 have so stated, and it may be proper to refer to some of them now.

Senator Thurman, on February 15, 1878 (volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1064, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), said that he thought the bill in question was simply a bill to reform the mint laws.

Senator Conkling's inquiry in the Senate on March 30, 1876 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 3, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 2062), established that he had no conception of such legislation at the time. Senator Hereford said in the Senate, February 13, 1878, that he did not so understand the bill; likewise Senator Howe, February 5, 1878, and Senators VOORHEES and Blaine on February 15, 1878.

In the House it may be said that the true meaning and purport of the bill was likewise not understood. General Garfield did not so understand it. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 989.)

Neither did Mr. Bright. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, second session Forty-fifth Congress, page 584.)

Nor Mr. Holman. (CON GRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Appendix, page 193.)

Nor Mr. CANNON. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, Appendix, page 197.)

Nor Mr. Burchard. (Ibid, page 4560.)

Nor Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605.)

It therefore appears from the record that not only did the people fail to understand what their lawmakers were doing when silver was demonetized, but that their representatives in Congress did not understand it. It seems incredulous that an act so far-reaching as this, which was not demanded by the people, nor approved by the people, and not even indorsed by Congress knowingly, should yet remain upon the statute books to disgrace the methods of legislation in the United States. Nevertheless, so far it has been impossible to secure its repeal. The same influences which forced England to demonetize silver in 1816 have been producing their effects in our country.

ENGLAND'S REASONS FOR THE GOLD STANDARD.

In this connection it may be interesting to know the reason England's greatest statesman gave why that country could never consent to a return to bimetallism. Mr. Gladstone, in a speech delivered in Parliament on a motion to reconvene the International Monetary Conference in March, 1883, said:

I suppose there is not a year which passes over our heads which does not largely add to the mass of British investments abroad. I am almost afraid to estimate the total amount of the property which the United Kingdom holds beyond the limits of the United Kingdom, but of this I am well convinced, that it is not to be counted by tens or hundreds of millions. One thousand millions of pounds ($5,000,000,000) probably would be an extremely low and inadequate estimate. Two thousand millions ($10,000,000,000), or something even more than that, is very likely to be nearer the mark.

I have a profound admiration for cosmopolitan principles. I can go a great length in moderation, in recommending their recognition and establishment, but if there are these two thousand millions ($10,000,000,000) or fifteen hundred millions ($7,500,000,000) of money which we have got abroad, it is a very serious matter as between this country and other countries.

We have nothing to pay them; we are not debtors at all; we should get no comfort, no consolation out of the substitution of an inferior material, of a cheaper money, which we could obtain for less and part with for more. We should get no consolation, but the consolation throughout the world would be great.

The foregoing utterances give a complete exposition of the views entertained by those controlling national affairs in creditor England and of those individuals who constitute the creditor class in this country, although they are rarely uttered with the same frankness.

ENLARGEMENT OF OUR BASIC MONEY NECESSARY.

Mr. Speaker, bimetallists contend that there is not enough basic money in the United States to do the business of our country. Basic money practically measures the value of all things and determines prices of all staple products, because all other money issued must be redeemed in it. It is a well-recognized

principle of finance that the aggregate of money in circulation determines prices.

It therefore follows of necessity that a decrease of our primary money is simply a contraction of our currency of the very worst kind and must result in lowering prices. It is advisable here to consider a feature of this question which has seriously vexed bimetallists from time immemorial, to wit, the clamor for irredeemable money. Theoretically, silk-ribbed paper may be a perfect money, but practically it has always resulted in disaster to the nation which issued it, unless its redemption in coin was provided for. The reason for this is that the financial world lacks confidence that there will be a limit to an issue of this kind of money.

Legislative bodies are prone to an overissue, and the success of a limited issue has uniformly brought about an overissue sooner or later. This is the experience of all nations where this experiment has been tried. The Creator of the universe has placed a limit upon the production of the precious metals. This limit is fixed by nature, and it is not given unto man to pass it or disregard it. The precious metals are concealed in the unyielding rock in the bowels of the earth, and are only wrested therefrom by man's energy under great privation and toil, and in limited quantities. The experience of ages teaches, therefore, that it is safer to trust to the limit placed upon the production of money material by nature rather than to the limit which the judgment of finite man would prescribe in legislative bodies. It is this principle which underlies the theory of metallic money made out of the precious metals.

From the earliest record in the world, by universal consent, the nations of the world have recognized the virtues and the necessities of this metallic money. The production of these metals has kept pace with the wants of man throughout Christendom from the time he first began to barter until to-day, and judging the future from the past, it is fair to assume that their production will continue to supply his wants in the matter of a proper medium of exchange. For the foregoing reasons true bimetallists can have no lot or part with those who believe in irredeemable paper money. I will therefore refer briefly at this point to our Populist friends, who have under false pretenses secured some recognition as bimetallists.

THE RECORD OF THE POPULIST PARTY ON THE MONEY QUESTION.

The honest advocates of bimetallism in the United States have been seriously handicapped by the advocates of irredeemable paper money in the past. The Greenback party had an ephemeral existence, and did what harm it could in this respect, but it has long since taken the course of all political organizations advocating the creation of irredeemable paper money by the National Government. The organization most conspicuous along these lines now is the so-called Populist party or People's Party. This party has had a more or less precarious existence for four or five years, but has never attained standing in the great centers of population in the United States. Judging from the votes it has polled at the elections for the last three or four years, it is not destined to become a national party. It is not so strong to-day in the Eastern States as the Prohibition party, and if the claims of the Western members of the Populist party—to wit, that it is a free-coinage party—are true, there would be no hope of its ever accomplishing this purpose, because it has had sufficient trial now to demonstrate that it will not become a national political organization of strength sufficient to enable it to enact its theories and ideas into legislation.

In the middle West it had a temporary success, particularly in Kansas and Nebraska, where its calamity incantations brought to the surface some unique characters. Its greatest success has been in the area of country between the Mississippi River on the east and the Rocky Mountains on the west. If it has any claim to existence as a national organization those claims must be based on the record and accomplishment of this party in the area last designated. If the advocates of bimetallism hope to receive aid and assistance from this political organization, it is fair that they should judge it from the record which its members from this district have made, because this district practically includes all of the area where that party has been successful.

POPULISTS IN FAVOR OF FREE TRADE.

In the Fifty-third Congress this party had 10 members in the lower House. All of these members voted for the Wilson bill as it originally passed the House of Representatives. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-third Congress, second session, volume 138, page 1796.) That bill practically destroyed the sheep industry and the lead-mining industry of the Rocky Mountain region, because it practically put lead and wool on the free list. It injured every other industry of the people which I represent, yet every Populist member supported it. This bill was materially modified in the Senate and many of the fangs of the monster were there extracted by Democratic assistance, and I therefore assert that the Populist party is now, and from that record was, more of a free-trade party than is the Democratic party.

Now, is its claim to be a free-silver party worthy of consideration, and by virtue of that claim is it entitled to receive support from a people profoundly confident of the correctness of that principle? To this I answer, "No." The Populist party is not now and never has been a believer in the principle of bimetallism; it is not now and never has been a believer in metallic money of ultimate redemption; it does not believe in a metallic basis for our money issue. On the contrary, it is a fiat money party. It is a political organization which believes the United States should issue irredeemable paper money; that the edict of the Government alone makes money, and that there is no necessity for the use of gold and silver as money. I make the assertion that the Populist party has advocated the free coinage of silver solely because it would increase our circulating medium; in other words, that it would make more money; that it would take in a commodity out of which more money might be made, and not from an honest desire for true bimetallism. In support of these statements I refer to the records of the leaders of the Populist party, because it is from these records that we have a right to judge that political organization, and not from what may be proclaimed by some individual members of it who have never had an opportunity to make a record for or against anything.

Senator PEFFER of Kansas is unquestionably the leader of the Populist party in the United States, and is so recognized in the Senate and out of it. He has introduced a number of bills on the money question, which show what he and his party would do if they had the power. I will mention a few of them.

August 14, 1893, Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill "to increase the circulating medium by issuing Treasury notes payable in lawful money of the United States." The Secretary, under that bill, is directed to prepare irredeemable Treasury notes aggregating $300,000,000, and they are declared to be full legal tender.

On the 16th of August, 1893, Mr. PEFFER introduced "A bill to authorize the issue of $600,000,000 of money, and for other purposes." Under that bill the Secretary is directed to prepare $600,000,000 of declaratory legal-tender money made of aluminium or silk-threaded paper. There is no redemption provided for.

On August 21, 1893, Mr. PEFFER introduced "A bill to provide for the immediate issue and circulation of Treasury notes." The Secretary, under this bill, is directed to prepare immediately Treasury notes to the amount of $250,000,000. They are made payable in lawful money, and are declared to be of full legal tender. No redemption.

On October 1, 1893, Mr. PEFFER introduced "A bill to provide for the employment of labor and the prosperity of the people of the United States, and for other purposes." Under this bill the Secretary is directed to have prepared and issued six thousand millions of dollars and cover the same into the Treasury. The bill also appropriates $600,000,000 to be loaned to the States and Territories in proportion to the inhabitants thereof, to be expended for the improvement of public highways, etc. There is no redemption for this vast issue of money provided in the bill.

On the 19th of March, 1894, Mr. PEFFER introduced "A bill to provide for the improvement of public roads, and for other purposes." This bill authorized the Secretary to have engraved five hundred millions of Treasury notes; they are declared to be full legal tender, and no redemption is provided for; said notes to be expended for the improvement of public roads.

On the 13th of April, 1894, Mr. PEFFER introduced "A bill to provide for the issue of Treasury notes to be loaned to States, counties, townships, municipalities, villages, and individual citizens." This bill instructed the Secretary to have engraved two thousand five hundred millions of dollars, Treasury notes; declared them to be full legal tender, and provided for no redemption in coin or otherwise. This money was to be loaned to the people on mortgage security. In this bill land was declared to be of no value and free of any price whatever, the buildings and improvements alone being declared of value.

This makes an aggregate issue, if the bills of the Populist Senator had become law, of ten thousand one hundred and fifty millions of dollars of irredeemable paper money. This is $145 for each man, woman, and child in the United States, more money than the whole world possesses to-day. There is absolutely no suggestion in any of these bills that a dollar of this vast issue shall ever be redeemed in gold or silver or anything else; but it is fiat money pure and simple.

Mr. ALLEN, of Nebraska, a more conservative member of the Populist party, introduced February 6, 1894, in the Senate "A bill authorizing and directing the issue of an increased volume of constitutional legal-tender money." Under this bill the Secretary was directed to prepare $500,000,000 legal-tender notes, which were to be redeemed in lawful money of the United States in ten years. In other words, they were redeemable in this or any other issue of irredeemable money which might be made, which must be apparent to even the unthinking is not redemption at all.

That these bills reflect the sentiments and wishes of the Populist party is proven by the declarations of the representatives of that

party in various speeches which were delivered both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States. I shall now refer to some of these declarations, which can be verified by a reference to the RECORD:

Senator PEFFER said, in a speech delivered June 13, 1892, that "paper money was just as good as any other money."

Mr. PEFFER also said in a speech in the Senate, printed in the RECORD under date of August 24, 1893:

So far as I am concerned, I had rather see all of our coinage laws wiped out, place gold and silver on the markets the same as we do wheat and corn and cotton; let the Government purchase every dollar's worth of both metals which is offered, and as long as the people want silver and gold to rest their paper upon, lay it away and let it rest as a basis without abrasion, and without counterfeiting, and without any sort of change whatever. The time is not far distant when the people will discover that they do not need any gold or silver to base their paper upon.

Mr. PEFFER introduced an amendment to the bill for repeal of the Sherman law October 29, 1893, which directed the Secretary of the Treasury to have prepared $250,000,000 of Treasury notes, declaring them to be legal tender and lawful money, but not providing for any redemption of them in gold or silver. In advocating this amendment, as appears by the RECORD of that date, he said, in answer to a question from Senator HOAR, that this proposed issue of money was redeemable in lawful money, whether that money was irredeemable paper money or any kind of money, and in support of that amendment, providing for the issue of irredeemable paper money, all of the Populist Senators, to wit, ALLEN, IRBY, KYLE, PEFFER, and STEWART, voted "aye."

August 21, 1893, Mr. Davis, a Populist member from Kansas, during the discussion on the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, said:

Mr. Speaker, I have shown that gold is not a "sound and stable currency." I have shown that silver is less fickle and far safer than gold. I have shown that bimetallism is a better basis for a "sound and stable currency" than either gold or silver alone, and finally, I have shown you a still safer, sounder, and more stable money system, not based on gold alone, or silver alone, or even on gold and silver combined, but on all commodities of commerce.

He further says in said speech:

It is not possible for a great and growing nation to depend with certainty on the irregular and declining productions of the gold and silver mines of the world for "a sound and stable currency," which shall maintain a full and even flow of prices, subject only to the supply and demand of commodities. A metallic currency, for the sake of argument, may be reckoned sound, but if it can not prevent the perpetual decline of prices it can not be rightfully considered stable.

He also says in said speech:

All things considered, no material seems so well adapted to practical business purposes as well executed paper notes. The material is easy of procurement, reasonably durable, and easy to transport, count, and handle in large or small amounts. It is easy to conceal about the person, being small of bulk and light of weight. * * * Intrinsic or commercial value in the material which is endowed with the monetary function is not only unnecessary, but it should be further stated that such intrinsic value is a great and sometimes fatal objection to the money material.

Senator JAMES H. KYLE, of South Dakota, in a speech delivered in the United States Senate October 2, 1893, said:

Along the highways of history are finger boards pointing to the folly of a currency dug out of the ground at a great expense and so scarce as to cause stagnation to all lines of industry. There is a growing sentiment, Mr. President, among the people of our nation that we may readily discard both gold and silver and adopt a new circulating medium which is more convenient, and it will not, like the present standard, be currency only in name. Very little business is done with gold and silver. If we were limited to-day in our currency to gold and silver every branch of business from coast to coast would be in stagnation. A metal basis is a delusion calculated to blind the masses and enrich the few. Treasury notes are the people's money, based not upon the output of this or that mine, but on the wealth of the nation. All this goes to prove that money is money if the creation of law, no matter of what material made, so long as a strong Government is behind it. I am not able to discover why we should be compelled, in order merely to procure a circulating medium, to search the bowels of the earth and tax the resources of our people, when a most excellent and desirable article is at hand.

He further says in said speech:

Exchange of dollars is not redemption and never can be. A dollar is redeemed when it is received in revenue by the Government issuing it, and not otherwise.

In speaking of this plan, he further says in the same speech:

It is the economic system of the future by which financial standards will be solved when legislators and nations have become enlightened and when we have become tired of quarreling over these so-called precious metals, which are but one degree removed from the cowrie shells of the barbarian.

Jerry Simpson, the most conspicuous apostle of Populism who has yet served in the House of Representatives, stated in a speech printed in the RECORD, under date of August 20, 1893, that—

Those who believe with me and my party hold the position that it does not matter what material your money is made of. We hold to the position that money is the representative of the value of all things, and so long as society—and I take it all gentlemen here understand the Government to be a mere cooperative society—so long as society agrees by statute law to select one of these things as money and receive it in payment of all debts, public and private, it will pass for money. That is what we understand it to mean; and so whether you select gold or silver, or any other commodity, you are sure to have a fluctuating currency, because the article that it is based upon will fluctuate according to supply and demand.

Mr. Simpson, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives February 15, 1894, on the seigniorage bill, said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am for the passage of this bill, first, because it is a step in the right direction, because it takes in another commodity to stand behind your currency. I am one of those old fiat greenback lunatics that you used to hear about. I believe that this Government, with all its wealth and resources, can issue a currency based upon the entire wealth of the people that will be more secure than any currency based on either gold or silver, and I am for silver coinage because it takes in another commodity.

January 5, 1892, Mr. Simpson introduced in the House "A bill (H. R. 135) to establish a department of finance and commerce, and for other purposes." This bill, after providing for Government grain warehouses and the loaning of Government money on grain and other agricultural products and on farm lands at 2 per cent per annum, further provides as follows:

SEC. 15. One year from and after the passage of this act the coinage of gold and silver coins above the denomination of 25 cents shall cease, and three years from the date of the passage of this act such coins shall no longer be a legal tender, and the United States shall provide for the redemption of all such coins at their face value by exchanging them for legal-tender paper money, and manufacture them into bars and keep the same on sale.

Mr. Hudson, a Populist member of the Fifty-third Congress, from Kansas, in speaking on the bill to repeal the Sherman law, August 19, 1893, referring to the Populists, said:

While they do not believe that the free coinage of silver will give them the immediate relief which is now needed, they believe that it will gradually but certainly give them more money. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-third Congress, first session, volume 133, page 511.)

The foregoing is a partial record which the Populist party has made on the money question in Congress, and it must be apparent to the most casual observer that this record proves beyond the possibility of a doubt that this political organization has no use for a metallic basis for the money issues of our Government, but, on the contrary, is absolutely committed to the idea of an irredeemable paper currency.

As an evidence of what might be expected from some of the political freaks who belong to this party in the East, if it ever met with success there, I shall refer to an interview with the so-called Gen. Jacob S. Coxey, of Commonweal fame, published in the Washington Star, under date of November 26, 1895, when Mr. Coxey was in this city. In response to the question whether he was affiliated with the Populist party, he responded in the affirmative, stating:

My chief desire is to get the idea—

Referring to his bond bill—

in the platform, and if the man goes with it, all well and good. The old leaders of the Populist party are not, I am sorry to say, entirely favorable to the bond bill, and, in my opinion, are wasting time figuring on the silver question. My investigations have led me to the belief that the rank and file of the party are with me. They want more money in circulation, and they do not intend to wait for the slow process of the mine. They demand that the printing presses be put to work, and the quicker the wheels begin to turn the better they will be suited.

Mr. Coxey was the Populist candidate for Congress in his district three years ago, and last year was the nominee of that party for governor of Ohio and received 52,000 votes, so it is fair to assume that he voiced at least the Eastern sentiment of his party on the financial question.

It therefore follows that the advocates of bimetallism have nothing to expect from a party controlled by a leadership whose sentiments on this question are those outlined above. Nevertheless, there will ultimately come such a profound awakening on this subject that the people will force the issue of the free coinage of silver to such an extent that it will finally triumph.

CAUSE OF DISPARITY.

Mr. Speaker, the friends of a single standard cite the market price of gold as stationary, and the market price of silver as fluctuating, in order to show the fallacy of attempting to use both of these metals as basic money. The statement of a proposition so absurd as that should need no refutation. Gold to-day enjoys an unlimited market. The law of the United States makes 25.8 grains of standard gold a dollar, and this dollar measures the value of everything produced in the United States, including silver bullion. Given an unlimited demand for an article at a fixed price with a limited supply, and it necessarily follows, as the night the day, that the price so fixed will be maintained.

Silver enjoys no such advantage as this. We have a constantly increasing supply of silver and a limited demand in the arts and practically no demand for it as a money metal. Its value, therefore, is fluctuating, as is the value of every other staple product under like conditions. Abandonment of silver and the substitution of gold alone as the primary money of the world was not the result of the application of the law of natural selection known as the "survival of the fittest," but was the result of concerted action of those whose interest it was to contract the volume of primary money throughout the world. Notwithstanding the demonetization of silver, its value has remained practically stationary compared with all staple products of human toil. It has not decreased when measured in wheat, corn, cotton, or any other staple product; but gold, when measured in these products, has doubled in value since that time.

THE HISTORY OF FRANCE PROVES THE BIMETALLIC PRINCIPLE.

When England demonetized silver she was the greatest money-using and commercial nation in the world. Yet even that terrible

blow at the white metal did not result in its destruction. The commercial ratio existing throughout the world between gold and silver was scarcely disturbed by that legislative enactment. The stability of the value of silver and the advisability of its use as a money metal could not have received better indorsement than the result of that action has established for it. For almost sixty years thereafter the ratio between gold and silver was maintained throughout the world. Our country was not then ranked as a great commercial nation; it was not ranked as a great money-using nation. France, however, at that time enjoyed that distinction preeminently, and it is to the action of the French people that we are indebted for the most positive proof of the stability of silver as a money metal. France accorded silver equal rights with gold to entry at her mints during this long period, and France, by virtue of her unlimited mint demand for silver, maintained its ratio with gold notwithstanding England's antagonism. There is no fact better established in history than this. No other nation aided France in doing this, for the reason that the French ratio differed from that of other nations, and it was their ratio which controlled the market price of silver.

The people of France did not demand cooperation from other countries in order to maintain silver as basic money, and yet in 1874, when the interest gatherers and money changers of that nation had secured such power that they compelled the overthrow of silver there, France had in metallic money $900,000,000 of gold and $700,000,000 of silver in circulation. Bimetallism had not driven gold from France, but, on the contrary, had secured for her a bounteous supply of both metals, gold in greater abundance than silver. If France could accomplish this during more than a half century of time, when her population was less than 35,000,000 souls and her wealth and resources infinitesimal when compared with ours, then we contend that this nation, with a population of more than 70,000,000 people, with an area of more than 3,600,000 square miles, and with resources, production, and consumption greater than any other people on the earth, can surely do the same thing.

The vastness in area has much to do with the wants of the people, so far as primary money is concerned. A dense population congested in a small area of country, with effete notions and fixed habits, does not demand the circulating medium that the same population would in a country of vast area whose resources are largely undeveloped. It is contended by the gold advocates that the business of the world is done by checks and that a very small per cent of it is done with actual money. This is true, to a limited extent, in the great centers of population. The exchanges in London and New York are unquestionably performed in this way, but in all fairness these clearing-house exchanges do not represent the business of the world. The vast daily transactions among the people, in which an exchange of commodities is brought about, constitute the business of a nation.

This business is done not by checks, but by actual money. It is not checks which move the crops, but actual money, as is well known and appreciated by all financiers. When this season is on there is always a scarcity of metallic money; checks do not answer. The great wealth-producing sections of our country, notably the Mississippi Valley, the granary of the world, require actual money in the daily transactions of life. Therefore I say that if France, during that long period of time, with a dense population and a limited area of resources which were developed, could alone maintain the parity between gold and silver by independent coinage at her mint ratio as against all the world, then the United States, occupying its vantage ground in the financial world and with its unlimited resources, can certainly accomplish the same end.

SILVER MONOMETALLISM NOT THE RESULT OF BIMETALLISM.

Mr. Speaker, it is contended, however, that if our country adopts bimetallism, independently, that the result must be silver monometallism, because gold will be higher valued than silver and will leave the United States for Europe by virtue of the operation of the so-called Gresham law. The experience of France, just referred to, proves the incorrectness of this assertion, but for the purposes of this argument alone grant for a moment that the claim of the gold advocates is true. We have, according to the last mint report, about $600,000,000 in gold in the United States. If a return to bimetallism will drive this amount of money out of our country it surely must increase correspondingly the quantity of the world's money in Europe, where we find a market for our surplus staple products, wheat, cotton, petroleum, etc. This would nhance the value of these products enormously abroad, and consequently at home, bringing increased prosperity to all of the people of the United States, a calamity surely not to be dreaded by the American people.

The large exportation of these products necessarily following as a result of this, and the limited importations which it is claimed would take place by a refusal of foreign countries to accept our silver, must certainly result in an immense balance of trade in our favor, which balance would either have to be settled in gold or silver. If settled in silver, it would consume all of the surplus silver of Europe, and more, during a single season; if settled in gold, it would of necessity bring our gold back, and sooner or later much more would follow it. This, it seems to me, would be the logical result of such a condition, even if the worst should come and gold should leave us as predicted by the enemies of bimetallism. However, there is nothing to base such a prediction on. The lessons of history are against it. The clear understanding and logic of the situation is against it. Moreover, under bimetallism the United States could protect its basic money constituting its reserve, as the Bank of France has uniformly done, if that became necessary, by paying in that coin of which its Treasury was most extensively possessed at the time the demand was made and by refusing to pay in gold when the demand for that coin was made for the purpose of export.

It is further claimed by the gold advocates that the world's production of silver and gold has varied so much in the past, comparing one with the other, that it is unsafe now to return to bimetallism. They especially cite the variance existing since 1873. Let us examine the situation and see if it is reasonable to have any fears from this source. What is the light of history on this feature of it?

In the year 1818 the world's production of silver was forty-six times the world's production of gold; yet France coined seven times the amount of gold that year that she did silver, and France was the only great nation on a bimetallic basis.

In 1852 the world's production of silver was four and one-half times that of gold; yet France coined five times as much silver as gold during that year, and the French mints were open to the unlimited coinage of both metals.

From 1821 to 1830 the world's production of silver was thirty-two times that of gold, yet France controlled the world's price of silver, maintained the parity, and made identical the commercial and mint values of these metals by her open mints. If she could do this single handed and alone when the production of silver as compared with gold was as 32 to 1, is it unreasonable to suppose that the United States could have accomplished the same thing in 1894, when the production of silver as compared with gold was as 19 to 1? In 1853 French financiers became alarmed at the enormous production of gold in the world, and especially in the United States, and feared that the parity could not be maintained between the two metals; yet the result shows that it was so maintained, and the commercial and mint ratio of both metals was that year, and remained until 1873, practically 15½ to 1, the mint ratio established by France.

NO FEARS OF A DELUGE OF SILVER UNDER BIMETALLISM.

Mr. Speaker, if this nation adopted independent bimetallism, the coined silver of France, England, Germany, and other European nations would not leave those countries to settle affairs of trade with us which would necessarily result, for the reason that the coined silver of France is overvalued at 3 per cent as compared with our silver at the contemplated ratio of 16 to 1, while the silver coin of Germany and the other nations is about the same as that of France, and that of England is 13 per cent higher than ours. It is therefore absurd to say that the coined silver of European nations would be shipped here as a result of bimetallism. Some alarmists claim that their plate and manufactured articles would be melted and dumped upon us in the shape of bullion. If such an absurd statement needs any reply, it is simply to say that the silver in the plate would be more valuable than silver bullion here, because it would possess the mint value there, plus transportation charges here and the value of the labor which fashioned it into the works of art.

IS SILVER MONEY UNPOPULAR?

Bimetallists are sometimes confronted with the statement that the people will not use silver on account of its bulk and the inconvenience of carrying it, and consequently it is unfit for use as standard money. History does not bear out the truth of this statement, but on the contrary very substantially controverts it. Silver has always been popular with the people. The silver dollar has been uniformly known as the "dollar of the people." Their transactions in life are usually small and the dollar is useful as a medium of exchange for most of them. It therefore has uniformly been popular and never has been rejected by the people, so far as history goes. But if the demonetization of silver almost a generation ago has prejudiced the masses of the people against silver to such an extent that they prefer to use paper money, there unquestionably would be no objection from bimetallists to the gratification of the people's desire in this respect, if it existed, both as regards gold and silver.

Bimetallists do not contend that there shall be no other money in circulation under a bimetallic standard except gold and silver. On the contrary, I think they all advocate the issuance of certificates redeemable in coin for every dollar deposited with the Treasury, when the same is demanded. In other words, the money of the country under bimetallism would consist of every dollar's worth

of gold bullion brought to the Treasury coined at the rate of 25.8 grains standard gold for a dollar, and every dollar's worth of silver coined at the rate of 412½ grains standard silver for a dollar, and the issuance of this money, either as gold and silver coined or in the shape of coin certificates, as above stated.

I have given you some of the reasons why we believe in bimetallism, as I promised. Let them be met and controverted by argument and not by vituperation and abuse. The people are alive to the issue and will force it to a settlement. I congratulate the country that the advocates of a gold standard have been deployed into the open and are not longer permitted to masquerade as bimetallists. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS] is recognized.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House certainly under very exceptional circumstances, to say nothing about the principle upon which it depends. After a careful examination and a fair amount of discussion the House sent over to the Senate Chamber a bill calculated to meet the requirements of the Government as to the loan of money and as to the means of supplying deficiencies in the revenues of the United States. It was intended and expected that this bill would receive the approval of the Senate, as being well adapted for the production of those results; but it comes back to us with a line drawn through every word of the bill, and an entirely new bill added to what was supposed and believed to be so thoroughly adapted to the situation of the country at the time of its passage here.

This bill as it now comes before the House is substantially one of those sporadic efforts that have been so frequently made by which silver is to be coined without limit or restriction upon a ration of 16 to 1. At no time, when a similar proposition has been brought before the House of coining silver upon this ratio, has silver found so low an estimate or price in the commercial operations of the world. It has sunk step by step from the time when it began to fail to keep up its ratio to gold as a money metal until to-day its relation commercially with the gold coinage of the United States is about 50 cents on the dollar; and it is with this commercial valuation, and that is the only thing in its favor, that is now proposed by the Senate of the United States and recommended to this House that a policy shall be adopted of providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon this ratio.

It might be very well, to meet the exigencies of business and the progress of affairs in this country, to provide from time to time for the coinage of a certain amount of silver coin, more especially that of a subsidiary character, bearing a fair relation to the commercial value of the bullion itself; but no proposition has been made to meet the exigencies or to supply the people with circulating coin under circumstances of this character and of this description. On the other hand, a proposition is made, and insisted upon without qualification, and under no circumstances apparently to be abandoned, that we shall resort again to the coinage of the silver dollar without reference to any other form of silver coinage upon this ratio of 16 to 1. We are asked through the instrumentality of this bill to provide for the coinage of silver of this proportionate valuation, notwithstanding the fact that when the dollar is coined and placed before the people for use and circulation it is worth but 50 cents in amount.

Now, at no time within the history of this country has such an effort been attempted with the hope that it could successfully be attained through the legislation of the two Houses of Congress. It is true that the assertion has been made from time to time that silver coinage should proceed upon this basis and upon this basis alone; but it has failed to secure the approval or the approbation of the people. I am satisfied, for my own part, that an American policy would be just and judicious in reference to the coinage of silver; that so much of it should be coined as will meet the requirements of the business and commercial operations of the people of the country; but that is not what the silver advocates desire. They do not desire the coinage of a proportionate or fixed amount of silver that may be adapted to the wants and the requirements of the business interests of the country; but they require that every possible amount that can be placed in the Treasury of the United States shall be coined into silver dollars upon this exceptional ratio.

Now, suppose this bill shall be passed and this result shall be attained by means of its operation. Then every silver dollar that may be produced from silver in this country or brought here from a foreign country may be taken to the Treasury of the United States and there coined for the benefit of the owner of the bullion. Where will this bring us? What effect will it have on the business interests of the country? It necessarily will not meet the requirements of that business; but by adding so large an amount to the silver coinage of the country it must necessarily inflate the currency and produce a speculative condition, instead of a firm, stable advancement of business. It is inevitable that this should be the result. So that there is danger that lurks in the path, even if this silver coin could be made acceptable to the people and they would take it out and use it among themselves.

But the bill does not contemplate, as the act of 1878 did not contemplate, that the amount of silver coinage shall go into circulation and be used in the business of the country. On the contrary, it is provided in this bill that whatever silver may be coined under the extensive authority of this bill may be taken to the Treasury in sums of not less than $10, and the amount shall be evidenced by the fact of a silver certificate issued to the person who deposits the silver. Now, what will be the result in case this bill should become a law in this respect? Will it be to even send the silver among the people of the silver States for use and circulation, or will it be to deposit it and pile it up in the Treasury of the United States? We can better determine what the result must necessarily be by looking back and seeing what did occur under a similar provision of the law which was enacted in 1878.

At that time it was provided that the Treasury should buy not less than 2,000,000 ounces of silver every month, and should coin not less than that amount into silver dollars, and that those silver dollars, together with the preceding silver dollars coined by the Government, should be a legal tender for the payment of debts between individuals unless it was otherwise stipulated in the contract.

It would be expected, where provision was made by these generous means for the coinage of silver if the people were willing to support this system of coinage, that when the money was created, when the silver was coined, that they would be willing to take it out of the Treasury and use it in their business and employ it in the operations of their domestic affairs. How has the fact turned out to be? Why, under the provisions of the law of 1878, instead of taking out and using silver in the business operations of the country, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the 1st of February, 1896, in this respect similar in its character to earlier reports from time to time made by the Secretary of the Treasury, shows that the coined silver has remained in the Treasury. Has it gone into circulation? Have the people desired it? Have they obtained it and used it? By no means, but the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that there is now in the Treasury, of standard silver dollars, the sum of $366,659,953 of this silver coinage.

This of itself demonstrates the fact that the people have no friendship for the coinage of the silver dollar, as this bill has provided in terms it shall be made, if it becomes a law. On the contrary, their preference is in favor of the silver certificate, although that certificate is not a legal tender and can only be used for the purpose of paying debts and obligations due to the Government. If occasion arises for the payment of a debt due to an individual, and he objects to taking the silver certificates, the party holding those certificates must go to the Treasury and get his silver dollar to be used for the purpose of making a tender. The silver certificate is of no possible use for this purpose, but it may be used for the object of obtaining from the Treasury an equivalent amount of silver dollars, which may be used in tender and satisfaction of debts between individuals.

The circumstance that silver has remained in this manner as so much dead property in the Treasury of the United States, and that these silver certificates, which are payable only in silver, are preferred to the silver dollar itself, demonstrates the inclination on the part of the people of the United States to abstain from the use of the silver dollar and to prefer in all their operations the silver certificate, although it may not be a legal tender for the payment of a debt.

Similar results followed the issuing of the Treasury notes under the act of 1890. It is true there was no provision there made for the immediate coinage of the silver bullion that should be bought by issuing these notes, and they were made payable at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, either in silver coin or gold. Yet a large amount of this silver, in fact the greater part, if not the entire amount, of the silver still remains within the Treasury of the United States. There is no disposition either to coin it or to take that coin and put it into circulation; but the people are more than satisfied with the Treasury notes, issued under these circumstances, as a substitute for the silver.

It is apparent, sir, from these facts that the people have no desire for the general coinage of silver. They certainly have no desire for the coinage of silver on the basis of 16 to 1; but if the silver is to be coined at all, that it shall be coined in such a manner as to receive their confidence and their approval by making its valuation, as nearly as may be, when coined, of the commercial value of the silver itself.

Mr. LINNEY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question for information. Is it not true that under the construction placed upon the act by the Secretary of the Treasury and the President these silver certificates are now paid in gold?

Mr. DANIELS. No, sir.

Mr. LINNEY. Does not the President speak of them as gold obligations?

Mr. DANIELS. No, sir; not the silver certificates.

Mr. LINNEY. Then it is another class of silver notes?

Mr. DANIELS. The Treasury notes. Under the construction of the Administration the Treasury notes are payable in gold or silver. Those are the notes that were issued under the act of 1890, but the silver certificates issued under the act of 1878 are payable only in silver coin.

Mr. LINNEY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. DANIELS. That is the situation, and that is the difference between them.

Mr. COX. Suppose you take these silver certificates which you are talking about, based upon the purchase of bullion under the act of 1890, and carry them to the Secretary of the Treasury and demand gold upon those certificates, what ought he to do?

Mr. DANIELS. Well, the Secretary of the Treasury has concluded, under the authority of the Administration, that he must pay those Treasury notes in gold; but he never has concluded and never has been required to pay the silver certificates in coin of that description.

Mr. COX. The Treasurer has paid a considerable amount of those certificates in gold.

Mr. DANIELS. Silver certificates?

Mr. COX. Yes, silver certificates. He has paid them in gold.

Mr. DANIELS. I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. COX. No, I am not in error.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman may be right on the subject, but my recollection is otherwise.

Mr. COX. But if he declines to pay the silver certificates in gold, while paying the greenbacks in gold—if he does that, has he not destroyed the parity between the two kinds of paper money?

Mr. DANIELS. Well, that will depend upon the manner in which the paper continues to circulate between individuals in the transaction of their business. They have usually accepted these certificates as the fair equivalent of the silver dollar, which is a legal tender for the payment of debts, and in that manner the silver certificates have been kept and maintained in circulation. Now, it has been the claim of the advocates for the issuing of silver coin of this description that they are following out the theory and the laws of the early period of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, when this Government was formed the men concerned in its formation had passed through a sea of tribulations arising out of the depreciated and worthless money that had been issued by the Government of the Confederation, and they were disposed—indeed, that was one of the objects of the formation of the Federal Government—to put an end finally and forever to the issuing of paper of this description, so that when the consideration of Congress and of the Treasury Department was directed to this subject it was determined to issue gold and silver coins upon substantially the basis of 16 to 1. But at that time gold and silver bore such a relation to each other that that was their intrinsic commercial value, and it was not intended, nor was it advocated by any person at that time, that depreciated silver should be put in circulation, silver coin bearing a deficient relation to the actual value of the metal.

The purpose, then, was to place the coinage of the two metals upon substantially the same relative footing, to coin gold of the quality and description defined and provided for in the act, and to coin silver on the basis of 15 or 16 to 1, because that was the fair commercial relation that those two metals bore to each other, they being the metals most useful and best adapted for the purpose of creating a circulating medium. That relation, however, was established not because the fathers were wedded in any respect to or had any special preference for the ratio of 16 to 1, as is the case with the silver advocates of the present day, but it was because the ratio then established expressed the existing commercial relation between the value of the two metals.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Will the gentleman kindly explain what made that particular relation as to value between the two metals in 1792, when it was determined to establish a ratio of 15 to 1?

Mr. DANIELS. It was the commercial value that each metal held in the market, the metals bearing that relation one to the other, and it was for the purpose of maintaining that commercial relation in the coinage that that ratio was established.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. If the gentleman will excuse me, I fear he did not quite understand my question. The question was: What was it that produced that relation between the two metals at that time?

Mr. DANIELS. The probable production of the two metals themselves, by which they sustained in the market substantially that relation to each other. At least that was the relation accepted by the Government of the United States in providing for the system of coinage, and it continued after that down to 1878, without substantial variation, silver bearing substantially the same relation to the gold bullion of the United States that was established in the early history of the Government. It is true that changes did take place, but they were of an insignificant character; they simply related to a small percentage upon which the coins were attempted to be equalized.

Silver became more valuable than gold in the market as a coin metal, and consequently it went out of the country, and it became necessary either to reduce the quantity of silver in the dollar or to increase the quantity of gold in the gold dollar in order to keep silver in the country. The effort of the Government has been from time to time, under all circumstances, to maintain this fixed relation as far as possible between the two kinds of coin, and to see how successful they have been in this respect we need only go back to the history of our currency and note the attention and the caution that have been exercised and that have found their way into the laws of the United States, securing this result of a stable and uniform currency for the people of the United States. It is to the credit of the Government of the United States that no effort has ever been made to impose upon them a spurious or depreciated currency by the Federal Government.

A different result has arisen in some measure, at times, from the very liberal legislation of the different States providing for their banking systems, under which bills were issued without adequate security, and the people from time to time became involved in tremendous losses; but from the Government of the United States no such source of peril has ever emanated. On the contrary, the effort has always been to provide the people with intrinsically as fair, as stable, and as honest a currency as was possible under the existing circumstances. The Government has always exercised the greatest wisdom and the greatest care in this respect. It was not until the civil war that any departure was made from the established course of procedure, and even then it was not for the purpose of giving the country a depreciated currency, but for the purpose of issuing a paper currency to meet the special exigencies of the situation, with the promise, with the determination, with the provision made by law, that in the end that paper should be redeemed in gold or silver coin.

The faith of the Government was pledged to the maintenance of that system and to the redemption of that paper, and while the paper did depreciate because of the fact that so large an amount of it was necessarily issued in order to carry on the functions and meet the obligations of the Government, people never lost sight of the fact that this paper was secured; that it had behind it not only the property but the good faith of the people of the United States. Under these circumstances, while the money ran down in its actual value, there never was a doubt on the part of the patriotic people of this country that the time would arrive when the war would cease and this money would be redeemed in the substantial coin of the country similar to that which had characterized its history from the formation of the Government down to the time when the war began. And their faith has been justified by the occurrences which have since taken place. The act of 1876 provided a redemption fund for this paper, by which it has been brought up to such a standard of value that it is recognized as a safe, stable, and perfectly reliable currency, not only in this country but in European countries, wherever this money may by chance be taken.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TERRY. I understood the gentleman to say, in response to the inquiry of my friend on the right, that the reason the commercial ratio of the two metals was about 16 to 1 in the early days of the Republic was the relative production of the two metals.

Mr. DANIELS. No; the substantial, the commercial value of the two.

Mr. TERRY. But the gentleman stated in reply to the inquiry of my friend on the right that the commercial ratio was about 16 to 1 on account of the relative production.

Mr. DANIELS. I said nothing about relative production; but that probably contributed very much to the establishment and maintenance of this system of value.

Mr. TERRY. Is it not true that from 1801 to 1840 the output of silver and gold was more than 71 of silver to 28 of gold, and that the present comparative output is about 20 of silver to 15 of gold?

Mr. DANIELS. I presume the gentleman is correct in his statement as to the relation that one metal bore to the other. But the relative production of the metals was, until recently, of such a character as not to excite any possible fear, because of their equal and unlimited coinage and their ability to maintain, in the judgment of the people, the valuation that was given them by the impressions put upon them at the mint.

Mr. TERRY. But the point is this: That at a time when we were getting a much greater silver output relatively to gold than we are now silver was worth more than it is now, and that hence the widening in the difference of the commercial ratio is not due to an increased output of silver.

Mr. DANIELS. Because the growth of the country required the use of this additional amount of coin, the gold production was

unequal to the demands and requirements of business, and it was supplemented by the production of silver. But what have we before us now? Have we any such expectations, in view of the present situation and of the future which may be expected soon to dawn upon us if a bill of this character is to become a law? Instead of having simply so much silver coin as would be required by the people for the transaction of their business, the currency would be inflated by free silver coin, and speculative tendencies would be developed in business occupations and pursuits to the detriment of business interests, followed finally by the insolvency of a large portion of the people of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman, but I am anxious to learn. I spring "from the alkali," as the New York World puts it, and I want to get some new ideas, if possible. The gentleman says that he is in favor of a stable basis to our currency. I should like to ask him what he means by that?

Mr. DANIELS. Such a well-supported currency as will be safe, adequate, or commensurate to the transaction of the business of the country. That is what the Government is really under obligation to provide—a perfectly safe currency adequate to the business transactions of the people of the country.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not think the gentleman understood me. My question is, What is a stable basis for our currency? Is it one that does not change? Is it one which, relatively to the price of all other products of human toil, becomes less in value, or is it one that constantly increases in value when measured in all the other products of human toil?

Mr. DANIELS. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that every form of currency which may be devised will change more or less under different circumstances. But what I mean by a stable currency is a currency thoroughly well sustained in its real value, intrinsically equal to its coined or face value, capable of being safely used in the system of business exchanges in the operations of human affairs. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has expired, and the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the large attendance upon this House and in the galleries convinces me that the people still love the Constitution and their country. In my opinion the burning issues which now confront the American people are more portentous in their ultimate effects upon the people of this nation and of the world than has at any time in the past demanded their attention; and these questions must be settled for weal or for woe by the sovereign electors of this nation at the ballot box, or else we must go on in the struggle for the rights of the masses against the encroachments of organized wealth and corporate greed until the conflict grows so sharp that we will find our country in the midst of a ceaseless conflict, and the institutions we so much love go down in the struggle.

Viewed from a financial standpoint, there are two distinctive forms of government, or, in other words, two distinctive financial systems and each formed to suit its peculiar kind of government.

The one system is suited to all forms of government where the industrial masses or the plain laboring people have no voice in governmental affairs, where the people do not rule, but are ruled by a king or monarch, or by an unsympathetic and arrogant aristocracy.

The other is suited to a government where the people are the masters; where no ruler is known except the law; where every man has an equal show in the eventful race of life.

The one system consists in bimetallism—gold and silver money and paper convertible into gold and silver on demand, coined and issued by the Government for the benefit of all the people, and in sufficient quantities to meet the demands of trade and commerce, and thereby to so energize business as to furnish employment to all our laboring people at reasonable wages and to afford them opportunities to become independent, home-owning, liberty-loving, patriotic citizens, surrounded by the comforts of life and blessed by all the incentives and hopes that animate the human heart, inspiring them to build up and maintain a Government for the common good of all the people.

The other system, and the one we oppose and shall continue to oppose as long as we have a voice in the councils of the nation, and the one that should receive the antagonism of all patriotic Americans, may be designated as "gold monometallism" or the "British gold standard."

It seeks to make gold the sole and only unit of value, to make gold the only money of final payment, and to give to banking corporations the sole authority to issue nonlegal-tender notes to be used by the people as a circulating medium for the transaction of the business of the country. Under this system, when fully matured, bank notes would occupy the whole field of circulation, except such amounts of nonlegal-tender subsidiary silver coins as may be used for small change.

Then what little gold we have would be held by the banks as a reserve and as a standard of value. This would, as every honest man who is disinterested must confess, place the currency of the country in the hands of corporations and speculators. In other words, it would turn over to these unpatriotic and heartless institutions the power to issue and control the whole volume of the currency, and place our trade and commerce, our people and our Government, in the hands and under the control of these moneyed corporations that have no sympathy with the toiling millions. They are without patriotism, with no God but gold, and no destiny but to enrich themselves without regard for the sufferings of the people.

When fully enthroned in power they would be as exacting and cruel toward the plain masses of our people as the most brutal tyrant that ever bathed his robes in human blood. They love the government best that gives them most. They extol the leader who, under the euphonious names of "Sound Money," "Safe Currency," and "Honest Dollar," point to them as the gods of finance and the saviors of the people, and spurn the patriotic intelligence of the sons of toil as unworthy to be considered or consulted upon these grave governmental and constitutional questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three crowning evils of the British gold standard about which I desire to speak.

I might properly designate them as the three black-winged angels of death, commissioned by the enemies of free government to go into the world and rule kingdoms, destroy republics, and enslave the people.

First. It destroys our foreign commerce and drives gold from us.

Second. It builds up Asiatic competition that will destroy our factories.

Third. It must end in a bonded indebtedness that will place the chains of slavery upon innocent and unborn generations.

These three propositions, Mr. Chairman, I will discuss in their order.

THE GOLD OUTFLOW AND HOW TO PREVENT IT.

Those who are willing to content themselves with the mere superficial view of our financial condition charge our present pitiable and defenseless situation to the greenbacks and Treasury notes.

The retirement of the Government notes will not have the slightest effect in stopping the export of gold. It might, to some extent, relieve the Treasury, but would cripple, rather than relieve, the country. This gold is demanded to settle our balances of trade, and whether supplied from the vaults of the Government or drawn from the channels of trade, it would nevertheless be lost to our Government.

The advocates of the British gold standard will tell you that our silver and silver certificates are kept at par only because they are indirectly redeemable in gold. If that be true these moneys could likewise be made the instruments to raid the Treasury, and the logic of their arguments would therefore also require the destruction and retirement of not only the silver certificates, but also the silver dollar, before the Treasury would receive the desired protection against the necessary consequences of the heresy of redeeming only in gold.

But those of our countrymen who seek a solution of these troubles must look beyond these mere shadows to find the remedy. As long as we pay out to foreign countries more than we receive, so long will our condition grow more agitated and embarrassing.

The foreign debt of our Government and people now exceeds $5,000,000,000. The interest charge we would have to pay upon this, at the low rate of 4 per cent, would be an annual tax upon our gold supply of $200,000,000 annually. Add to this freights paid to foreign shipowners and the expenses of Americans traveling abroad, and the sum total of our annual foreign payments is simply appalling. And this balance is rapidly increasing from year to year.

The following carefully prepared tables and estimates, made from the most authentic sources, will give the account of the United States with foreign countries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895. This startling picture should be carefully studied by every prudent man before he takes his stand along with the gold-standard advocates:

ACCOUNT AGAINST THE UNITED STATES, 1895.

Interest, at 4 per cent, on $5,000,000,000		$200,000,000
Freight paid foreign shipowners for carriage of 84.5 per cent of our imports, or $590,000,000 out of a total of $699,000,000, allowing a charge for transportation equal to 8 per cent of the value of the produce imported	$47,200,000	
Less freights paid American shipowners for carriage of 8.2 per cent of our exports, or $62,000,000 out of $758,000,000, allowing charges for freight equal to 12 per cent of the produce exported	7,440,000	
Balance due foreign shipowners on ocean carriage		39,760,000
Expenditures of Americans traveling or living abroad		75,000,000
Total account against the United States		314,760,000

ACCOUNT IN FAVOR OF THE UNITED STATES.

Domestic exports		$793,392,599
Foreign exports		14,145,566
Total exports		807,538,165
Less total imports		731,969,965
Merchandise balance in favor of the United States		75,568,200
Net gold exports		31,984,449
Net exports of silver coin and bullion	$37,674,797	
Less imports of silver ore not included for 1895 in the general statement of merchandise exports and imports as prior to 1894	10,636,896	
		27,037,901
Total account in favor of the United States		134,590,550
Balance due and unpaid		180,169,450

Thus for the last fiscal year we added $180,000,000 to our debt and on this additional debt interest must be paid in 1896. So next year the interest charge will be something like $207,000,000 instead of $200,000,000. In this way our debt grows and must continue to grow under the policy of gold monometallism that depresses the prices of our exports.

Not until we return to true bimetallism, the unlimited use of gold and silver, and advance the price of our wheat and cotton and other exports, can we hope to escape these humiliating conditions. The gold standard, which depresses our prices, especially of the commodities, wheat and cotton, which constitute the great bulk of our exports, costs us more than $600,000,000 annually, which is plainly shown by a comparison of our prices now, under the gold standard, with the prices we received in 1873, under the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver.

The figures given in the following table for the year ending June 30, 1895, are not mere estimates, but the result of actual calculations of the comparative prices of the 16 commodities representing over two-thirds of our exports and 26 articles representing nearly one-half of our imports.

A comparison of the prices of these commodities in 1873 and in 1895 gives the following disastrous results.

At 1873 prices our trade balance for the year 1895 would have been as follows:

1895.

At prices equivalent to those received in 1873 our exports of domestic produce amounting to $793,392,599 would have been worth		$1,746,788,683
Reexports amounting to $14,145,566 would have been worth		22,272,901
Our gross exports which were valued at $807,538,165 would have brought		1,769,061,584
The same quantity of imports which were imported at a valuation of $731,969,965 would have cost, at prices equivalent to those paid in 1873		1,152,523,308
Leaving a total balance in our favor of		616,538,276
Add net gold exports		31,984,449
Add net silver exports of coin and bullion	$37,674,797	
Less imports of silver ore	10,636,896	
		27,037,901
Making the total balance that the same amount of effort that we expended in our foreign trade in 1895 would have put to our credit in 1873		675,560,626
Balance actually due on foreign trade for 1895		134,590,550
Loss to our foreign trade for 1895 directly due to the fall in prices caused by the demonetization of silver in 1873		540,970,076

Thus if we had received 1873 prices for our exports, and paid 1873 prices for our imports, the amount of effort that we expended in 1895 in our foreign trade would have resulted in a net balance in our favor of $675,560,626.

We could have paid our interest charge of $200,000,000 and had the sum of $475,560,626 due us, which would of necessity have caused this sum of money to be paid to our people, and instead of gold being exported it would be flowing into the vaults of our Government and into the pockets of our people. [Applause.]

But England, the great consumer of our exports, does not want a rise in prices. We owe her. We sell and she buys. And the lower the prices go the more produce it takes to pay our debts.

Mr. Giffen, one of the ablest writers on political economy, says:

A creditor nation is able to draw more from its tributaries who have to pay in the appreciating money than it would otherwise be able to draw. To pay the same debt they must send to their creditors 30, 50, perhaps 100 per cent more of produce than they would otherwise have to send. There is no doubt that in this sense the weight of a gold debt of a debtor country like India or the United States has enormously increased of late years.

Gold monometallists in England want low prices. Bimetallists in the United States want an advance in prices.

As an evidence of what England wants I submit the following paragraph from the London Times:

It seems impossible to have bimetallists understand that there is quite a large number of us for whom a general rise in prices has no charms whatever. We like them low, and the lower the better. If they all went down to half their present figures we should rejoice, because we have nothing to sell and many things to buy. For those who have things to sell we do not feel any great concern.

This explains their position, but why an American gold bug should advocate this British policy, if disinterested, no man can divine.

Gold monometallism has brought us to this humiliating condition, and in order to maintain it the President has been compelled to issue bonds and saddle a burdensome debt upon the people.

Our foreign creditors have become the dictators of our policy. They take our gold and compel us to issue bonds. And the gold monometallist all over the country applaud the President's courage because he so kindly submits to British dictation.

How long shall this continue? Let the unbought millions decide.

If our foreign debts are permitted to go on increasing, as they must and will under the gold standard, prices must continue to fall, and as prices continue to fall we are called upon to export a greater and greater quantity of produce. More bushels of wheat and corn and more bales of cotton must be sold to meet our foreign obligations.

You may retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes, and still the grinding process will go on and continue until it ends in the abject slavery of the producing classes. And this, too, at no distant day, for our property is rapidly passing into foreign hands, and our Government seems submissive to the dictates of foreign creditors.

There is but one way to avert these calamities: Stop the depreciation of things we sell to pay our debts. Abandon the gold standard. Return to the free coinage of gold and silver. Pay in the money of the Constitution and of the contract. We can then preserve our commercial independence and escape dependence upon foreign money lenders, the degradation of our Government, and the slavery of our people. [Applause.]

ASIATIC COMPETITION.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another evil growing out of the gold standard, more destructive to our industries and far more disastrous to the great army of our honest and patient working people than the proposition just presented. There are to-day more than 1,000,000,000 people whose governments are upon the silver basis and who have not felt the shock and paralysis of falling prices which has well-nigh prostrated our single gold standard countries.

I have never seen any fact nor read any statement from any disinterested economist that refutes or denies that prices in all silver-using countries have remained stable and substantially the same since the demonetization of silver in 1873; and all admit that since the fall in the value of silver or the rise in the value of gold, whichever you may choose to call it, every country on earth having the single gold standard has been swept with panics, and universal loss and depreciation in prices have brought want and gloom to the masses all over the land.

That these conditions have existed in this country since the demonetization of silver is within the personal knowledge of every man who has lived during that period. Every piece of property stands sponsor for the declaration and every farm in the great agricultural South and West is a mute but living witness of the truth of this declaration.

The sworn records from all the States of the Union show that in the year 1894 there was a falling off in the valuation of property, as compared with the previous year, in all the States lying between Pennsylvania and the Pacific Ocean on the west, and the Gulf of Mexico on the south, of the astonishing sum of $412,510,985; and every farmer living in this broad and fertile region has felt the crushing grasp of this cruel monster—the British gold standard.

Let Mr. Giffen, the head of gold monometallism in England, answer. In his essay on the changes of prices and incomes in 1888, he says:

The fall in prices in such a general way as to amount to what is known as a rise in the purchasing power of gold is generally—I might say, universally—admitted.

And he further said:

All the evidence points to a continuance of this appreciation.

And in speaking of the effects of the situation he frankly said:

Debtors pay more than they would otherwise pay and creditors receive more, and this appreciation is a serious matter to those who have debts to pay.

Mr. Goshen, for many years Mr. Gladstone's chancellor of the exchequer, and also Professor Jevons declare the same truth, and fully concur with Mr. Giffen.

These three leading gold-standard advocates, not only of England but of the world, frankly admit that gold has largely increased in its purchasing power, and that consequently prices generally have greatly fallen. And yet the new converts to English faith in this country deny it, but whether their denials are unselfish and wholly patriotic I can not say.

But in silver-standard countries the situation is just the reverse. Their standard when measured by their own products has remained stable. There has been no preceptible change in the general level of prices in their country. They have not been subjected to the disastrous effects of constantly falling prices. They have been free from financial panics. Their people have been as

prosperous and happy as at any previous time in their history. The ounce of silver will, in their country, pay for as much labor, buy as much of the necessities of life, and pay as much of debt as it ever would, but when compared with gold, then the appreciation of gold and the disparity between gold and silver appears.

The result of this condition is that if a Japanese manufacturer makes a plow or other articles at a cost to him in Japan of $10 and exports it to the United States and sells it for $10, valued under the gold standard, his plow will have brought him in his home money about $20. So that the premium on gold, amounting to about 50 per cent, operates as a bonus to him of 50 per cent, represented by this premium on gold.

And upon examination we find that this condition has inspired the manufacturing interests of Japan and China to such an extent that it actually threatens our factories, not only with hurtful competition, but with actual destruction. There are to-day, in actual operation in Japan, 57 cotton mills, with 834,000 spindles. And the additional factories that are being rapidly constructed gives promise that in the near future there will be 700,000 more spindles going.

During last year England sold to Japan and China machinery amounting to $50,000,000, which shows the wonderful progress of manufactures in those countries.

The following interview appeared in the Philadelphia Item, December 14, 1895, with the Japanese consul-general at New York, which shows clearly the growing danger:

WHAT NONFREE SILVER IS DOING.

[The Item, Philadelphia, Pa., December 14, 1895.]

The Japanese consul-general of New York says that he thinks Japan is on the eve of building up a large trade of Japanese products in the United States. He says Japan has an ample supply of low-cost coal, and is buying and making the best machinery for a large export trade.

He adds that hemp and cotton carpets, wall paper, copper and bronze ware, crystal ware, silk handkerchiefs, raw silk, pongee, umbrellas, rags, beer, tobacco, coal, and matches are among the leaders.

Besides these, Japanese agents are now offering bicycles at $12.50, sashes, doors, and blinds, and wool carpets at astonishingly low prices; in fact, no line is now drawn limiting what that country proposes to do in selling to the United States as well as to all gold-basis countries so long as silver continues depreciated.

Take the above bicycle as an example for all the other goods. It is claimed equal to the best in this country, and at the price mentioned is delivered duty and freight free in San Francisco.

The $12.50 received for each bicycle is in gold. This is sold for silver, equaling $20 to the Japanese manufacturer. He pays fifteen of his silver dollars for making, freight, duties, etc., and clears a net profit of $5 in silver.

This same method of profit is available to the Japanese for everything they are able to produce, as well as selling coal in the San Francisco market.

The consul-general says that coal would be so sold now if the ships had a return cargo.

The following statement made by William M. Bunker, editor of the Stock Report, a reputable journal of San Francisco, in answer to an inquiry made by the Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART, shows more in detail the character of this competition:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *November 30, 1895.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART, *Washington, D. C.:*

The Daily Report of November 23 gave details of a Japanese invasion of the American markets. Articles of Japanese manufacture since the close of their war are being received of equal quality with American manufactured goods, and at prices so low that our manufactories of these articles must close unless relieved by Congressional action. Report stated that H. E. Reynell, of Kobe, Japan, established an agency in San Francisco, in the Crocker Building, Mr. Edward O. Burns being their agent, for the sale of Japanese manufactured goods for the purpose of underselling American products. Similar agencies are being established East and West now by representatives of Japanese houses. The agency here is now selling the best parlor matches in tin-lined box, in box and case lots of 50 gross in a case, delivered to the merchant freight and duty paid, at 30 cents per gross. He also sells doors, sashes, blinds, and all articles of woodenware, cooperage, stock, etc., of Japanese manufacture at from 30 to 50 per cent less than they can be manufactured for in this country, with all freight and duty paid by the Japanese importers; also clocks, watches, bicycles, boots, shoes, clothing, hats, caps, gloves, fancy goods, and notions on similar terms. Their agents are buying cotton-mill machinery and shipping to Japan and will take our cotton from here to Japan and send it back manufactured for less than it can possibly be manufactured in this country. They also take cargoes of Pacific Coast lumber, manufacture the same in Japan into woodenware, etc., and return same here manufactured at 50 per cent less than our manufacturers' wholesale prices.

A meeting has been called in San Francisco for the Chamber of Commerce, Board of Trade, and Manufacturers' Association to memorialize Congress for relief. The appraiser of the port of San Francisco, in an interview with the editor of the Report, speaks of largely increased importations of Japanese goods of all kinds. He also notes a change in silk goods. They were formerly all white, but are now colored to beat the coloring of France or America.

* * * * * * *

WM. M. BUNKER,
Editor Daily Report.

This difference in the value of gold and silver caused by the exclusion of silver from the mints represents the difference of exchange between gold-standard and and silver-standard countries, which is about 50 per cent.

The producers of wheat and cotton first felt the injurious effects of this Asiatic competition and this divergence in exchange. For a hundred years an ounce of silver in the Asiatic countries has represented the value of a bushel of wheat, with very little fluctuation. Although this may appear phenomenal, the fact stands established beyond any question, and remains true to-day.

The Asiatic exports his wheat to Liverpool, which brings him there an ounce of silver, as it did before the demonetization of silver. He coins this silver at home into from $1.30 to $1.37, according to the ratio established in the particular country.

While our mints were open to the free coinage of silver our people could ship their wheat to Liverpool and receive an ounce of silver for each bushel of wheat and return home and have it coined into $1.29 of silver money; but since the closing of our mints he can not do this.

The Asiatic can have his silver coined into money. The American can not, but must suffer the difference in exchange; and while his competitor realizes $1.30 a bushel for his wheat the American realizes about one-half, or 60 cents, for his wheat when measured by the gold standard.

The same is true of cotton or any other commodity that must meet this competition in the foreign markets.

Before the demonetization of silver our proximity to the markets, our fertile lands, improved means of production, and the activity and skill of our people made us masters of the open markets; but not so now. These conditions, operating as they do to give their competitors a premium or bonus over the fruits of our farms, is building them up and pulling us down. Their countries are a scene of progress and enlarging agriculture. On every hand the cry is to enlarge the farms. Plant more wheat and more cotton. Let the forests give way to our rising civilization, our growing agriculture, and our expanding commerce; but with us it is different, sadly so. Amid the rich harvest fields of the South and West the cry is overproduction. Plant less wheat and less cotton. Reduce your acreage, and let your labor stand idle and beg employment in the face of your wasting fields.

This advice can be heard from farmer, pulpit stand, and press. While our much inferior neighbors are fast taking the markets of the world, while we are fighting at shadows, while our modern patriots are discussing the parity of the metals, the ratio, the 50-cent dollar, etc., the Mongolian races are winning victories over our commerce and over our factories that should alarm every patriot for the safety of our nation.

These appalling conditions, Mr. Speaker, must be met; met promptly, patriotically, and with courage, or the great Anglo-Saxon race must go down in the conflict, and our boasted Republic, the hope of the world, but the victim of British greed and hate, must melt before the rising Oriental sun.

For many years the pauper labor of Europe has alarmed our laboring people, but here are 1,000,000,000 people whose competition, under the gold standard, will close our factories, reduce our laboring people to pauperism and want, and utterly annihilate our agriculture, and drive our commerce from all the seas.

In the presence of these dangers, and surrounded by these conditions we should demand the restoration of silver and reestablish the parity of exchange between the nations of the world; rehabilitate our factories and farms; reestablish the conditions of universal prosperty. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, if I could to-day with mathematical certainty make known to this House and the country what twenty-three years of the gold standard has cost the people of this nation there would not be an advocate of that cruel system in this Capitol or at the other end of the avenue but whose knees would knock together like Belshazzar's when the hand appeared upon that frightful night and wrote upon the wall:

Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin. Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.

Sir, the broken fortunes, the wrecked homes, the crushed hopes, the shrieks of woe, the suicides, the army of tramps thrown upon the world by its cruel decree, make a picture that would appall the stoutest heart and make the vilest miscreant of earth hide his face in shame.

But, Mr. Speaker, we need not dwell in conjecture or mere speculation. We have only to look at the operations of our Treasury under the rules and practices inaugurated by the Republican predecessors of Mr. Carlisle, which he has so blindly followed, in open defiance to the doctrines of the Democratic party.

By the written law of the land the greenbacks and Sherman notes are made redeemable in coin; but our distinguished Secretary prefers to travel the unlawful paths of his Republican predecessors, rather than give the gold gamblers and speculators an honest Democratic rebuke.

This same scheme of raiding the Treasury was attempted in Mr. Cleveland's first Administration, when Daniel Manning was Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Manning went to New York and called the gold raiders together and gave them this plain Democratic talk:

GENTLEMEN: The Treasury is willing to furnish gold for any legitimate demand, but if you attempt to draw upon the Treasury gold after to-day as you are now doing, for hoarding or speculation, I shall adopt an effective remedy for the protection of the Government's reserve. We have a cash balance of over $150,000,000. Not one of you doubts for a moment the ability and purpose of the Government to maintain specie payment. But if you continue to withdraw gold I shall at once order that you be paid 10 per cent in silver coin the

first day, the second day you will be paid 20 per cent in silver, and the third day 30 per cent, and so on until one-half is paid you in silver.

"But," exclaimed the astonished bankers, "this is in violation of the implied obligation that the Government will pay in gold."

"Make no mistake about that, gentlemen," replied Mr. Manning, "the law says 'coin,' and the Treasury will exercise its undoubted prerogative."

That ended the gold raiding. The Government won the victory just as soon as its Secretary showed that he had backbone. And it could win the same victory to-day. Manning's way was Jackson's way. Jackson said: "I take the responsibility," and ordered the removal of the deposits from the United States Bank, telling the banking ring that if they wanted a panic they were at liberty to proceed.

If President Cleveland would only suggest to Mr. Carlisle the propriety of administering to these mercenaries a dose of Manning's medicine, the Government would be saved from the humiliating process of the "endless chain." When statesmen took hold of one end of the chain, the thieves would release the other, and the credit, as well as the dignity of the Goverment, would be maintained.

The Treasury is amply able to take this course. We have to-day more than $50,000,000 in silver bullion in the Treasury which belongs to the Government; and we have, in addition to that, a cash balance of more than $170,000,000.

But rather than take this course, Mr. Carlisle chooses to continue to issue bonds for more gold, and parade the country, making speeches in defense of his Republican practices, trying to convince the commercial world that our money is not good, and that the public credit is in danger. If Mr. Carlisle was a merchant, and should make such speeches about his own business, he would be closed by attachment in ten minutes.

This course is sought to be justified upon the ground that it is necessary to maintain the parity. They seek to maintain silver by refusing to extend to it the same privileges that gold enjoys as redemption money. They hold one up and strike the other down. They claim to be the friend of silver, and with remorseless hand plunge the dagger into its heart; and notwithstanding all this, the irredeemable silver dollar stands to-day at par, not by reason of this treatment, but in spite of it.

Dr. Sagrado said of his patient:

I poured hot water down his throat till he could paddle in it, and I bled him till there was not a drop of blood in his body, and yet he came devilish near dying.

We have many political Sagrados in this country of ours who use the same high degree of scientific learning in the treatment of our finance.

We are a great, recuperative, and strong people, able to regain strength almost as fast as we are bled; but it would make glad every honest heart to see how the very desert places would bloom and blossom beneath the righteous sun of a beneficent Government that would maintain honest bimetallism in the interest of all our people. [Continued applause.]

The defenseless efforts being made to maintain the single gold standard in the very teeth of our statutes and in open violation of the plainest principles of our Government has, during the present Administration, already cost us $262,000,000 in interest-bearing bonds, and the burden has only begun.

In order to perpetuate and maintain the gold standard, the greenbacks, amounting to $346,000,000, and the Sherman certificates or Treasury notes, amounting to $154,000,000, must also be redeemed and canceled, and $500,000,000 more of interest-bearing bonds issued to accomplish that purpose, giving us in bonds $762,000,000. And when these bonds shall have gone into the hands of the national banks the same war will be inaugurated against the silver dollar and silver certificates that is now being waged against the greenbacks and Sherman notes, and they, too, will be retired in order to protect the gold reserve, which will necessitate the issuance of $340,000,000 more bonds. This will give us a bonded indebtedness of $1,102,000,000, which will cost us, interest at 3 per cent, $33,060,000 annually.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the cost the people must pay for the destruction of their own money. The place now occupied by this money will be filled by national-bank notes. The banks will furnish the people their money at 10 per cent interest, if they can put up the collateral.

Let me recapitulate, and show what this change of our fiscal system will cost us in thirty years:

Bonds already issued	$262,000,000
Bonds to retire greenbacks and Sherman notes	500,000,000
Bonds for retirement of silver dollars, etc	340,000,000
	1,102,000,000
Interest for thirty years at 3 per cent	991,800,000
	2,093,800,000
Say the people borrow of banks (low estimate)	500,000,000
Interest for thirty years at, say, 5 per cent	750,000,000
Grand total	3,343,800,000

This is $300,000,000 more than the civil war cost the United States. It is five times as much as all the gold in the United States. It is almost three times as much as all the money of all kinds in the United States. It is nearly as much as all the gold in the inhabited world.

It would be far better for us, Mr. Speaker, if every dollar in gold in the United States were cast into the bottom of the deep rather than place the chains of this bonded slavery upon the necks of our people.

Well may I repeat the words of the once great Carlisle: "The destruction of one-half of the money metal of the world would be more disastrous to the people than all the pestilences, wars, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world."

And yet, Mr. Speaker, honorable gentlemen will stand within these walls and declare that they are the friends of silver, that they are bimetallists, and cast their votes against this bill.

They may deceive themselves, Mr. Speaker, but they can no longer deceive an honest and confiding constituency. It may be the voice of Jacob, but it is the hand of Esau.

Double dealing will no longer be tolerated by the people. The Republican party has pretended in its platforms and before the country that it was in favor of silver as one of the standard moneys of the country, but when by its vote it shall defeat this bill it will give the lie to its pretensions and stand before the country in its true light as the party that demonetized silver, established the gold standard, the mother of national banks, and, with its hands still black with these crimes, is willing, in defiance of the wishes of the people, to defeat this beneficent measure and authorize the issuance of an unlimited amount of bonds.

You are in absolute control of this House, but instead of giving relief you have decided to do nothing this session toward relieving the people. You choose to increase taxation and give an additional power to issue bonds rather than give relief.

Our people, Mr. Speaker, are a patient, patriotic people, but the point of their endurance has been reached, and you can already hear the mutterings of their discontent, and when you defeat this bill an outraged and indignant people will rescue the Government from your hands. The Democratic party, elected in 1892 by an unprecedented majority, was overwhelmed in defeat. Her standard bearer, Mr. Cleveland, turned his back upon the cardinal principles of the party and espoused the Sherman idea of finance, divided his party, disappointed the hopes of our people, and converted triumphant victory into ignominious defeat, and the same ignominious defeat awaits you in 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The majority of the American people are Democrats; and while they are loyal to their party, they are also loyal to its fundamental principles. When their trusted leaders deceive them, it must be expected that they will administer just such a rebuke as the party received in 1894.

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not indicate the putrefaction or decay of the party. It only shows that the party possesses the elements to purify itself. Let the rank and file of the "unwashed" Democracy become aroused, and they will take charge of their party machinery and impress upon its candidates and platforms their patriotic convictions.

The Democratic party will live as long as constitutional government is maintained; and I believe the perpetuity of our institutions, personal liberty, home rule, just taxation, and the hopes of our industrial people depend upon the destiny of that party.

No surer means for the defeat of free coinage can be adopted than to induce a part of its number to draw away from it. Divide its forces upon the advocacy of bimetallism to warring factions under the names of new parties, and you make victory an easy task for the enemies of the money of the Constitution.

The great body of the Democratic party is for free coinage of gold and silver, and her great heart beats in sympathy with the struggling masses of the world. Let her brave and patriotic sons gather hope and courage, and as one man take charge of her conventions, nominate her candidates, write her platforms, and victory is at hand. Rescue her flag, consecrated by a thousand victories and made glorious by seventy years of government administered in the interest of all our people, from the hands of those who have defiled it, and place it in the hands of a man in touch with the cardinal principles of the party, and victory is ours.

I can hear her battle songs of liberty. I can see the long columns of her soldiers, made up from farm and shop, as they charge upon a retreating foe. I can see stock jobbers, gold gamblers, and protected plutocrats flying in utter confusion before the tramp of her invincible hosts.

We can do this; it is our duty to do it. We owe it to ourselves, our children, and our country. I urge this course upon my countrymen, believing that it is the only sure road to victory. [Renewed applause.]

The following is a copy of the bond bill as it passed the Republican House:

An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled

"An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875 he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to issue certificates of indebtedness of the United States to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, payable in three years after their date to the bearer in lawful money of the United States, of the denomination of $20, or multiples thereof, with annual coupons for interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and to sell and dispose of the same for not less than an equal amount of lawful money of the United States at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States and at such post-offices as he may select. And such certificates shall have the like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said resumption act for the bonds therein authorized. And the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purpose prescribed in this section, and for no other.

The following is a copy of the above bill as amended by the Senate:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

I oppose the bill; I support the amendment of the Senate, and upon this issue I appeal to the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything upon this important question at this late hour, but as I have been recognized by the Speaker, I will submit my views upon the substitute that has been brought from the Senate to the House. I much prefer, Mr. Speaker, the substitute to the House bill. I will give my reasons for it. The tendency, in my opinion, of the management of the financial affairs in the United States is to ignore silver altogether. Coinage, according to the best definition that I have seen, is to stamp upon pieces of metal certain characteristics which give it the character of legal tender. To stamp upon metal, Mr. Speaker. That is the definition given by old Noah Webster, who is regarded as a pretty good authority not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Now, sir, according to the present construction placed upon our coinage laws by the powers that be in the United States, this definition of coinage has been, or soon will be, changed so as to make it read: "The stamping upon gold metal such characters as give to it the force and power of a legal tender."

In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, that is a dangerous innovation. It reverses the meaning of language. It reverses the policy of this Republic, and will, in the end, result in still further confusion and disaster to the people of these United States. If I had it in my power I would limit the coinage of silver to the American product. I would do that, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that there does exist in these United States to-day a serious question in the minds of some of the best thinkers of the Republic as to whether the United States Government would be able to maintain at par with gold all the silver in the world—I mean by that the free and unlimited coinage of the silver of the entire world.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I prefer this to the bill that went from the House, and while I shall vote for any amendment, should there be such an amendment presented, which limits the coinage of silver to the American product, I shall vote for this substitute that came from the Senate, preferring it to the House bill. Still, my best judgment is that it is safer to limit the coinage of silver to the American product. All the American product should be coined into legal-tender coins. This is absolutely necessary to provide an adequate redemption fund. The Chief Executive of the United States has informed this Congress in his first message at this session—

That the Treasury notes issued in payment of silver purchased under the law of 1890 were necessarily treated as gold obligations, at the option of the holder. These notes on the 1st day of November, 1893, when the law compelling the monthly purchase of silver was repealed, amounted to more than $155,000,000. The notes of this description now outstanding, added to the United States notes still undiminished by redemption or cancellation, constitute a volume of gold obligations amounting to nearly $500,000,000. These obligations are the instruments which, ever since we have had a gold reserve, have been used to deplete it.

It thus appears, Mr. Speaker, that the basis upon which our financial system now rests is too narrow. Sixty-five million dollars, which is about the amount of the gold reserve, is insufficient to meet the ever-present demand of $500,000,000, which, as fast as they are paid, are at once reissued. Hence the President's remarkable utterance that—

This redemption does not redeem, and this payment is without acquittance.

This condition is like a cone on its apex. The stupendous volume of money necessary to our national prosperity must have a broader basis than $100,000,000 to rest upon. The coinage of the American product of silver into legal-tender coins will supply this great want and render wholly unnecessary any further issue of Government bonds.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the coinage of metals, so far as the United States is concerned, should be confined closely to the two great metals that have heretofore existed and which have heretofore been considered as the best representatives of money—I mean hard money, to wit, gold and silver. In the past ages of the world both gold and silver have been recognized as money. I recollect calling upon one of the ablest divines I ever knew, the Rev. Mr. Tidball, an old blue-stocking Presbyterian, who had given forty years of a noble life to the study of theology, and I asked him to collect for me, if he could, from the Holy Scriptures, and to give me from revealed truth, the various texts touching this question of silver, and that grand old servant of the Almighty presented me, I believe, with sixty-nine references, and gave me this information, that in those sixty-nine references, drawn from revealed truth, from a source that could never err, in every one of them silver was recognized as the current money of the merchants.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I believe if you will examine the books you will find that the gold talent and the silver talent bore about the relation of 16 to 1. I believe, furthermore, that if scholars will examine the question they will find that the old shekel, the silver shekel and the gold shekel, bore about the same relation of 16 to 1, showing that according to the edict and decree of the God of the universe this ratio of 16 to 1 was established long before the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] had being.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to notice one or two of the objections that are made against the coinage of silver. It has been asserted upon this floor, and it will be asserted whenever a speech of any length is made by those who oppose silver coinage, that the friends of silver are actuated by some personal interest. I heard the argument made the other day in the Senate by grave and dignified Senators that the free coinage of silver would only result in benefiting the owners of silver ore, the owners of the lands in which silver is found, and thus inure to the benefit of a class and not of the masses. I deny that. Let us see if it can be proven. Who are the owners of the silver in the United States? You do not know to-night, Mr. Speaker, but what you own the richest mine there is in this country.

No man upon this floor, no man that ever has been upon this floor, can tell but what the very ground on which this Capitol stands is rich with an inexhaustible store of the white metal. No living mortal knows but what the immense blocks of stone out of which this great building is made will be torn down by the hand of the miner in less than fifty years from this time in search of silver. Prior to 1861 it was supposed that we had no silver in the United States. Since that time it has been ascertained that God Almighty has blessed us with more silver than all the other countries in the world possess. Prior to 1861 we had to resort to foreign silver to supply our wants, principally the Spanish milled dollar. But after 1861, and especially after the seventies, when it was ascertained that the greatest natural gift that God had blessed us with was silver, we turned our backs upon it and so, in a business sense, committed business suicide, if such an expression is admissible.

But I take the position, Mr. Speaker, that so far as anyone now can know, so far as it is possible for human intelligence to ascertain, the argument is a sound one that silver and the silver interest are more universally diffused throughout this country than the timber interest, than the water-power interest, than the stone-quarry interest, than the iron interest, than almost any inter-

est you can speak of. Why, sir, a few years ago it was supposed that we had no silver in the Piedmont region of country where I live, but it turned out but a few months ago that an enterprising fellow-citizen from the great State of New York traveled down through that country and while passing over the mountain known as Grandfather Mountain—a great mountain that has been lying there in the shape of a grandfather on his back from the beginning of time down to the present without having been approached by anybody except, perhaps, for the purpose of herding cattle upon it—that old New Yorker, passing through the laurels there, discovered some evidences of silver, and a man went to work upon it, and to-day that is regarded by some of the best business men of our country as the finest property in the district that I have the honor to represent.

In all probability there is within that mountain, deep down, placed there by the hands of Omnipotence, a silver interest greater in value than all the rest of the property in the district. Is it not, then, a suicidal policy for the people of the United States at this time, when they are just beginning to learn that the greatest gift that has been bestowed upon them by God is silver, to turn their backs upon it, especially when, as I remarked a while ago, before the sixties, and back in the Revolutionary time, we had to resort to foreign silver, to the Spanish milled dollar, even, to save this great and glorious country of ours? And it is respectfully submitted that we can only protect this great interest by its coinage; for that was the purpose of its creation.

At this point an idea strikes me, drawn from our country's history. The first bank organized in the United States was in the State of Pennsylvania. It was without a charter. Its stock was all paid in the Spanish milled dollar. How did it happen to be organized? It was without a charter. It was organized upon a report that the Army was about to mutiny and disband because of the impossibility of getting provisions. Those grand old Pennsylvanians made a donation of 3,000,000,000 of rations and 300 hogsheads of rum for the Army. But those supplies could not be transported. So this bank was organized, and every dollar of its subscription was paid in the white metal, the Spanish milled dollar. And by these means those 3,000,000,000 of rations and 300 hogsheads of rum made their way to Washington's army, and thus in all probability that army succeeded by reason of the employment of the Spanish milled dollar in the organization of the first bank that was ever organized in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I deny that the friends of silver or even the owners of the silver mines are reasonably or justly liable to the charge of being actuated by unpatriotic motives. Let me see about that. Suppose it were proved beyond controversy that there was not a single ounce of silver east of the Rocky Mountains, but every particle of it lay west of the Rockies. Even then it is a godsend to this country that it exists there in the abundance that it does. Why do I say that? In the first place, there is territory enough west of the Rocky Mountains for almost every citizen of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Maine, where I believe they hate silver, or rather I will say they oppose it—there is territory enough there for every one yet to become an owner of real estate and thereby obtain an opportunity to become the owner of the white metal. But suppose they did not do that. Still the existence of the metal there as a part of our national wealth, though undeveloped, opens up hundreds of thousands of avenues of hope to the young, to the active, to the poor of this country, who would otherwise find these avenues of hope closed.

Sir, let me give a practical illustration. A few years ago there was a poor fellow in my part of the country, a plowman, working, I am told, for 35 cents a day. The idea struck him that possibly he could better his condition by going out to the "woolly West" and hunt for silver. Seated upon a mule, he passed through a portion of the wilderness country in the State of Montana. By accident he discovered some silver. He went to work and realized from that enterprise a large sum of money, $50,000 I have been informed, at the start. That poor plowman came home after organizing a company; he returned to the very neighborhood where he had worked for 35 cents a day as a plowman; he purchased broad acres in the beautiful valley of the Yadkin, and he now has under his employment a large number of hands. He stimulated several other industrial enterprises in that neighborhood; and thus Montana's silver has blessed the plowmen of North Carolina. Here is an instance where an humble plowman availed himself of those great natural resources away across the Rocky Mountains and is to-day a public benefactor to the section in which he originally resided. So, Mr. Chairman, I take the position that we are all interested in this silver question, and the argument that only the owners of the discovered mines are benefited is without force.

But suppose it should turn out presently that great mines of silver should be found in the State of Maine or New York, how long would it be before those two States would make a complete somersault upon the silver question? They would not be able to change their ground quickly enough.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect reading once in an old book a comment upon logic. One of the old philosophers said, "If you will give me Aristotle's system of logic, I will force my enemy to a conclusion; give me the syllogism and that is all I ask." Another old philosopher replies, "If you will give me the Socratic system of interrogatory, I will run my adversary into a corner." Another old philosopher, standing by, said, "My brethren, if you will give me a little ready cash, I will always gain my point; I will always drive my adversary to a conclusion, because," said he, "a little ready cash is a wonderful clearer of the intellect."

So, I say, if it should turn out that silver should be found in large quantities in the East, in the State of New York, the State of Maine, the State of Massachusetts, the State of North Carolina, or South Carolina, to the same extent that it exists in Nevada, what would be the result? Why, we of the East would be just as anxious to have the white metal recognized in the legislation of the country as the gentlemen who represent the States of the Pacific Coast.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for the plowmen of the Republic. They constitute the great conservative, productive force of this Republic whose interest we can not ignore. Possibly 90 per cent of that class of our people would be benefited by the enlarged use of silver as money. It is recorded in the Wisdom of the Ancients, that in the reign of Henry VIII the question was presented to the minds of the best leaders of thought of the British Empire, "How can civil war be prevented? What remedy can be applied for that greatest national disorder, civil war?" The only remedy that then appeared satisfactory was this: Let the British Empire so govern its subjects that the greatest possible number of plowmen shall be the owners of their own plows. Let all the American products of silver be coined into legal-tender coins, and the plowmen of the land, the toiling masses, will have new lines of hope opened up to them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

And then, on motion of Mr. SIMPKINS (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Attorney-General, with accompanying papers, recommending an increase of the salary of the warden of the United States jail, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter of the Attorney-General submitting for an appropriation the account of C. R. Evans for legal services—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General relating to the reimbursement of Capt. John R. Bullis, Twenty-fourth Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the resolution of the House (No. 40) calling on the Secretary of War for information, cost, and estimate of making surveys of certain outlets on the Great Lakes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 254); which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPERRY, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5473) concerning delivery of letters in towns, villages, and other places where no free delivery exists, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 255); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLYNN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4585) to regulate passenger rates on railroads in the Indian Territory, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 257); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FISCHER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2912) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation, in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 258); which said

bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2921) to repeal section 6 of an act entitled "An act to define the duties of pension agents, to prescribe the manner of paying pensions, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1870, and now being section 4784, Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 259); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LOUD, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4566) to amend the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 260); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 261); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 262); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3216) granting an increase of pension to James Hurley, reported the same without amendment (Report No. 263); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 5550) for torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) to amend sections 4520, 4522, 4526, 4530, 4564, 4566, 4568, 4572, and 4612 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the employment, care, discharge, and payment of seamen employed on merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fishieries.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 5552) to provide for the allotment of lands to Indians without changing their tribal relations and to authorize the leasing of Indian lands in certain cases—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5553) to exempt the wages and property of persons engaged in interstate commerce from execution, attachment, garnishment, distress, or other legal process in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 5554) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon to Ben H. Porter Post, No. 164, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5555) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to organize national naval volunteers in all States bordering upon the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 5556) to amend sections 4582, 4583, and 4600 of the United States Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) to amend sections 4556, 4557, 4558, and 4559 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the inspection, equipment, and repair of merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5558) to amend sections 4590 and 4597 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to offenses committed by seamen employed on merchant vessels, and providing punishments for such offenses—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5559) to permit the location of mining claims in the Cascade Forest Reserve, in Oregon, and to permit roadways over the same—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 5560) to regulate the transmission of certain free matter through the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5561) to extend the civil service to the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5562) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize the organizations of the Sons of Veterans as part of the military reserve of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5563) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States"—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 5564) authorizing the Arkansas Northwestern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOKE of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 5565 to amend sections 713 and 714 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5567) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate 1 condemned cannon and 15 cannon balls to McDowell Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Enid, Okla.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) prescribing the punishment for injuries to property in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 5631) to authorize the construction of a life-saving station at the extreme end of Mononomoy Point (Chatham), Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A resolution (House Res. No. 157) for the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 5419) granting an increase of pension to George Roney—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5226) to give increased pension to Gen. James C. Parrott—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4410) to increase the pension of Elise Blenker from thirty to fifty dollars—Committee on Pensions dicharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Memorial of the city council of Hoquiam, Wash., favoring legislation on the Nicaragua Canal—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolution of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce urging passage of Nicaragua Canal bill—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5570) for the relief of Samuel Cloyd, of Tennessee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) for the relief of Robert Stone, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5572) granting a pension to Susan Fields, widow of Jason Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5573) for the relief of Robert A. Russell—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Hans Castor, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5575) for the relief of Daniel C. Trewhitt, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) for relief of Hugh J. Brady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 5577) granting a pension to Vinson M. Woodrome—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5578) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Stephen Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5579) for the relief of John McCain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) granting a pension to Archibald Hunley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 5581) for the benefit of the administrator of E. B. Treadway, deceased, late of Owsley County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) granting pension to certain battalions of Kentucky State Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) for the relief of Tyni B. Turpin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Sarah E. B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOKE of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 5585) for the relief of William L. Orr—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5586) to place the name of Mary J. Smith on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5587) to grant a pension to Frederick Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5588) to pay Eugene Hagan, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $4,000—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5589) to pay David Overmyer, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $2,733—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 5590) for relief of Mrs. Mary E. V. Jones, widow of Col. James A. Jones, Twenty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5591) for the relief of the trustees of the German Evangelical Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5592) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5593) for the relief of the trustees of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, at Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5594) for the relief of the trustees of Trinity Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 5595) for the relief of Stewart J. Donnelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5596) for the relief of E. F. Korns, late postmaster at Phillipsburg, Kans.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOOTE: A bill (H. R. 5597) for the relief of Charles Deal—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5598) to increase the pension of Frances O. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 5599) for the relief of Alonzo Platt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) to increase the pension of Enoch Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5601) granting a pension of $100 per month to Mary Stuart Lasselle, widow of Brig. Gen. William P. Lasselle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 5602) to pension Flavius J. Williams at $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5603) to correct the military record of John Mullarkey and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5604) to correct the military record of Robert H. Pyke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5605) to correct the military record of Micajah Powell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5606) for the relief of Morton A. Pratt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 5607) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5608) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cousens, late of Company K, Thirty-second Regiment Massachusetts Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5609) granting an honorable discharge to Albert Lockee, alias Shipley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 5610) for the relief of George T. Stevens, assistant surgeon Seventy-seventh New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5611) for the relief of the estate of Phillip W. Engs, deceased, late of New York City, N. Y., and Enoch Marshall, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 5612) granting a pension to Nathan Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 5613) for the relief of E. H. Murrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) for the relief of Arthur Connell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 5615) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel and William Offutt, late of the parish of St. Martin, La., deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5616) granting an increase of pension to James McCue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) granting an increase of pension to Henry Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5618) granting a pension to James Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 5619) granting a pension to Mary Bemus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 5620) to pension George E. Reid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5621) for the relief of Maria S. Poe, and to have her name put on pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5622) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnely and Patrick Egan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 5623) increasing the pension of W. W. Ferguson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Stoner, of Montgomery County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5625) to increase the pension of Lucinda Stamper, of Lee County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5626) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry Maddox and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5627) for the relief of Matilda Tutt—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5628) for the relief of Thomas Fletcher Foley, alias Thomas Fletcher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5629) for the relief of the legal representatives of Needham Bullard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5630) to increase the pension of A. D. Manion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 5632) granting a pension to Mrs. Diana Clark, widow of Capt. Charles Clark, of Company B, Thirtieth Iowa Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Robert J. Linton and 76 other citizens, of Bellevernon, Fayette County, Pa., praying for the free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of Robert A. Russell, to accompany House bill for relief—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York (by request): Petition of Mrs. William Simmonds and others, praying against the sale of beer to immigrants landing at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also (by request), petition of Ellen Kinsey and others, praying against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Memorial disapproving the bridging of the Detroit River, adopted by the directors of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., protesting against bridging the Detroit River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of 153 citizens of Coraopolis, Allegheny County, Pa., praying for a free Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DANFORD: Petition of L. O. Okey and other citizens of Graysville, Ohio, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of Frances E. Willard and others, protesting against Senate bill No. 1035, to establish a bureau of military education, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of George W. Wood, relating to the retirement of greenbacks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDDY: Resolutions passed at a mass meeting of the citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the outrages committed upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of Boyd, Brown & Brunson and other citizens of Florence County, S. C., in favor of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of W. B. Poole and 200 others, of Noble County, Okla., praying for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROW: Petition of Union ex-Prisoners of War Association of Altoona, Blair County, Pa., in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Hezekiah Moore and other ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the rebellion, requesting the passage of a pension bill granting a pension of $8 to each man who served not less than ninety days—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of Emma S. Jones and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Busti, Chautauqua County, N. Y., urging the prohibition of the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, and at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolutions adopted at a meeting of the citizens of Portville, N. Y., relative to atrocities perpetrated upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Forestville, Limestone, Nile, and Dunkirk, N. Y., against the sale of liquors at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth and at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Whitman Agricultural Company and others, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of House bill No. 2779, for the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of F. L. Coats and others, of Richburg, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Two petitions of citizens of Sacramento and Oak Park, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill No. 58, restricting immigration, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIEFER: Petition of George N. Morgan Post, No. 4, Minneapolis Minn., for the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Two petitions of William H. Ryan and 36 others, Josiah Thornton and 18 others, all of the county of Noble, Okla., for free homes in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the New York Mercantile Exchange, praying for the passage of a pending bill regulating the manufacture and sale of an article known as "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Petition of 64 ex-Union soldiers and inmates of Waupaca Soldiers' Home, asking for graded service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of members of Company E, Fourth Regiment Iowa National Guard, in behalf of House bill No. 2294, for the organizing and disciplining of the militia of the several States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. PRICE: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel and William Offutt, deceased, late of the parish of St. Martin, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Binghamton, N. Y., in behalf of the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of Thomas G. Brown Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chaplin, Conn., favoring a service-pension law and a minimum rate for widow's pension of $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to removal of the charge of desertion in the case of George A. Daniels—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petition of George Eldridge, C. A. Freeman, George W. Bloomer, W. L. Nickerson, and others; also of the Boston Towboat Company, Boston and Philadelphia Steamboat Company, shipowners and masters of seagoing tugs and sailing vessels, for the establishment of a life-saving station at the extreme southwestern point of Mononomoy Beach, Chatham, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of a large number of residents of the counties of Passaic and Morris, N. J., for more stringent regulations with reference to immigration, and for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of 100 citizens of Ashland, Wis., asking for legislation to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of George E. Reid, for the passage of a bill granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Henrietta M. Freeman, Sarah E. Tiffany, and others, to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors at certain places—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of V. R. Harris and others, of Erin, Tenn., favoring the passage of the bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Robert M. Woods and others, asking that protection be secured to American citizens on Turkish soil—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 6, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously received the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

SENATOR FROM OHIO.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present the credentials of Joseph Benson Foraker, elected a Senator to represent the State of Ohio for the term commencing the 4th of March, 1897. I ask that the credentials be read, printed in the RECORD, and placed upon the files of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE STATE OF OHIO, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Columbus, Ohio, January 16, 1896.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

I, Asa S. Bushnell, governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that at the time and in the manner designated in the certificate hereto attached, Joseph Benson Foraker was duly elected to the office of Senator to represent the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States for the constitutional term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed at Columbus, the 18th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896, and in the one hundred and twentieth year of the Independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL.] ASA S. BUSHNELL.

By the governor:
SAMUEL M. TAYLOR, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the accompanying paper be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The accompanying paper is as follows:

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OHIO,
Columbus, Ohio, January 15, 1896.

SIR: It is hereby certified that the senate and house of representatives of the general assembly of the State of Ohio did, in each house on the 14th day of January, A. D. 1896, that being the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization thereof, openly, by a viva voce vote of each member present, name a person for Senator to represent the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States for the constitutional term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897; that Joseph Benson Foraker received a majority of the whole number of votes so cast in the senate, and that the same was entered on its journal by the clerk thereof, and that said Joseph Benson Foraker also received a majority of the whole number of votes so cast in the house of representatives, and that the same was so entered on its journal by the clerk thereof; that at 12 o'clock meridian, of the day following, to wit, the 15th day of January, A. D. 1896, the members of the two houses convened in joint assembly in the hall of the house of representatives of said general assembly, whereat was read that portion of the journal of each of said houses, of the preceding day, relating to and showing the result of said vote.

Whereupon, it appearing from the journals of the senate and house of representatives, respectively, that Joseph Benson Foraker had received a majority of the votes in each house, the president of the joint assembly declared that said Joseph Benson Foraker, having received a majority of all the votes cast in said senate and in said house of representatives, was duly elected to the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Ohio for the constitutional term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897.

ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.
DAVID L. SLEEPER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:
A. C. CAINE,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN R. MALLOY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

To his excellency ASA S. BUSHNELL, *Governor of Ohio.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Whatcom Board of Trade, of New Whatcom, Wash., in behalf of the bill introduced by me to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses. In the course of the statements of the petition it is set forth that there are fortifications in British Columbia in the immediate vicinity of the city from which this petition proceeds. It is represented that the city of Vancouver is fortified, also the cities of Victoria and Esquimalt, British Columbia, and that though placed in such a perilous position near the frontier there is not a single fortification on the coast of the State of Washington, nor a gun or man to defend it. The petitioners represent that the interests involved are very great, many populous cities line the shores of Puget Sound, that the interests of 200,000 people and a foreign commerce, excelled only by the ports of New York and San Francisco, are at stake, and that our national interests in that region require fortifications. I shall not comment at length upon it. The petition is a very earnest one, and is well expressed. It is signed by the members of the board of trade, the city council, and numerous other citizens. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition signed by many citizens of the State of Washington, including the governor, judges on the bench, and prominent lawyers of the State, in favor of Senate bill 988, having for its object the removal of contests and litigations in the United States Land Department from that Department to courts of the United States. Among other things, it is stated that the rights of the settlers to their homesteads are often violated, owing to the inefficiency of the Land Department, in that it has no compulsory process for the attendance of witnesses, and that it is compelled under existing laws and circumstances to adjudicate the rights of contestants without the proper facilities and without the process or authority of the courts. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of Senate bills No. 1172 and No. 1242, to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Cosmopolis, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that an appropriation of $10,000 be made for the purpose of flax fiber experiments on Puget Sound; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition from the city of Spokane, Wash., in which it is stated that in consequence of the near relations, commercial and otherwise, of the United States to the people of Cuba the citizens of the United States can not refrain from feeling a deep interest in the restoration of peace in the Island of Cuba. The petition also prays that the President of the United States be requested at as early a date as possible consistent with due regards for the rights of Spain as a friendly nation to recognize the belligerent rights of the revolutionary party now existing in the Island of Cuba. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Benjamin T. Clark and 105 other citizens of Bound Brook, N. J., and the petition of Luther Walling and 60 other citizens of Belford, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ALLEN. I present the petition of J. J. Boyle and 300 other private soldiers of the California Soldiers' Home, located at Los Angeles, upon the subject of discrimination in pensions. The petition is short and important, and I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be read.

The petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

SOLDIERS' HOME, *Los Angeles, Cal., January 30, 1896.*

Having seen with regret, if not alarm, the rapid formation of classes in our once free Republic, and noticed the constant tendency of the legislation to foster and encourage the same, it is with profound satisfaction we view the position taken by United States Senator ALLEN of Nebraska in opposing the granting of special pensions of extravagant and unreasonable sums to the widows of officers, while those ex-soldiers who sacrificed as much, if not more, are put off with a mere pittance, if not rejected altogether on some technicality.

We therefore desire to express our very highest admiration of the Senator in daring to stand up in the present United States Senate and oppose the principle being put in law that makes one citizen better than another in consequence of wealth or position. The following is Senator ALLEN'S own language as delivered before the United States Senate on January 14, 1896:

"I want to go on record as opposed to any distinction between the widow of a private soldier and that of brigadier-generals, major-generals, or any other generals.

"It was the plain private soldier who met the blunt of the war."

Believing, as we do, that all men are born equal and are entitled to equal and exact justice, we desire that the above sentiments be immortalized—the Declaration of Independence must not be crushed.

Signed by J. J. Boyle and 300 other ex-soldiers.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Society for the Prevention of Criminal Malpractice of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 3893 of the United States postal criminal statutes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Commandery of the Naval Order of the United States, favoring the passage of the bill to erect a monument to John Paul Jones; which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the members of the Congregational Church of Hatfield, Mass., praying for the speedy interference of Christian nations to put an end to Turkish atrocities; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of Colonel Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of Ellis Post, No. 6, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Germantown, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Encampment No. 73, Union Veteran Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the bill forbidding the desecration of the American flag; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Catholic Central Organization of Erie, Pa., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Morgan Post, No. 4, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEORGE presented the petition of Eugenia M. Allen, of Nanachehaw, Miss., praying that she be granted compensation for loss of property taken from her plantations in the States of Mississippi and Louisiana by United States naval and military forces during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Congregational Club of Crete, Nebr., praying

for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry soldiers of the late war, residing at the Soldiers' Home, Grand Island, Nebr., praying for the repeal of the arrears of pension act of June 29, 1880; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of 300 citizens of Omaha City, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Vancouver, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Columbia River between the city of Vancouver and the mouth of the Willamette River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the town council of Cosmopolis, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the erection of a bridge with spans across the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHILTON presented petitions of J. S. Garrison and sundry other citizens of Timpson, of George Harris and sundry other citizens of San Saba, of Volney Ellis and sundry other citizens of Hallettsville, and of E. C. Dickinson and sundry other citizens of Rusk, all in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE. I present the memorial of Mr. Austin Corbin, of New York City, in favor of the establishment of a free port at Fort Pond Bay, Long Island, in connection with Senate bill No. 561, introduced by me by request December 5, 1895. I move that the memorial be printed, together with the bill and the annexed papers, as a document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented the petitions of George Fisher and 124 other citizens of Allegheny County, of Edward Weed and 59 other citizens of Allegheny County, of H. A. Carr and 44 other citizens of Flatwood, of George Wallace and 90 other citizens of Crawford County, of W. S. Chapman and 74 other citizens of Allegheny County, and of H. E. Dorwood and 90 other citizens of Carbon County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the repeal of the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma and Arizona Territories, and substituting in its stead the stricter divorce law of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent from 16 to 18 years in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the enforcement of the compulsory-education law in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Encampment No. 73, Union Veteran Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill forbidding the desecration of the American flag; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I desire to have changed the statement of a memorial presented as a remonstrance in my name on Tuesday. It is a memorial of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia and relates to the enactment of legislation granting to the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company the authority to extend their tracks in the city of Washington. The memorial contains suggestions as to the legislation proposed, and is in no sense a remonstrance against the extensions of the road sought for.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 347) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Helmuth F. Soeckel, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment intended to be proposed to the Military Academy appropriation bill, submitted by Mr. VILAS on the 30th ultimo, reported it with an amendment, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 533) for the relief of Sidney W. Moss, of Oregon City, Oreg., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 532) for the relief of H. W. Shipley, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3009), granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," reported it without amendment.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1820) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near Point Arguello, Cal., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 415) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land, of Nathrop, Colo., reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 553) granting to Ira Bacon, of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, an additional bounty of $100, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MCBRIDE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1764) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., reported it without amendment.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1922) creating an art commission of the United States, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 16th ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1973) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick A. Noeller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1974) for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Jones Duncan, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Samuel A. Duncan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1976) granting a pension to Catherine E. O'Brien; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1977) granting an increase of pension to John C. Knapp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1978) to provide pensions for freedmen, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1979) to improve the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1980) for a relief light vessel on the Pacific Coast; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1981) for the relief of Herman C. Funk, late general-service clerk, class 1, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1982) for the relief of Anna V. Ingerton, widow of William H. Ingerton, late lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1983) removing the charge of desertion from the name of James Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1984) to authorize the Indian and Oklahoma Union Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 1985) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, in Montana, under the homestead and mining laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1986) for the relief of Enoch Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1987) to provide street entrances for alleys in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph G. Marsh, of U. S. S. *Galena;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1989) to authorize the payment to Rear-Admiral John H. Russell of the highest pay of his grade; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1990) authorizing the purchase of that portion of the unpublished correspondence and manuscripts of President James Monroe known as the "Gouverneur collection;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1991) granting a pension to Mary Abercrombie Shufeldt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 71) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States Army, upon all occasions of ceremony; which was read twice by its title, and referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

CAPE LOOKOUT HARBOR OF REFUGE.

Mr. PRITCHARD submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the United States as to the probable cost of providing a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, on the coast of North Carolina, said harbor of refuge to be capable of sheltering the largest vessels.

BIDS FOR BONDS.

Mr. HILL. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed at his earliest convenience to transmit to the Senate a statement of the bids for the bonds recently advertised for sale by him and opened yesterday, giving the names and residences of the bidders, the amounts bid, and any other detailed information which may be desirable for a proper understanding of said bids.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from New York that instead of saying "opened yesterday" he say "opened on the 5th."

Mr. HILL. Very well; let it read "opened on the 5th."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

CENSUS OF EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution which I desire to have read, printed, and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a proviso contained in section 17 of an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Eleventh and subsequent censuses," approved March 1, 1889, reads as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That said Superintendent shall, under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, cause to be taken on a special schedule of inquiry, according to such form as he may prescribe, the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion, and who are survivors at the time of said inquiry, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, or marines"; and

Whereas the said section further provides that "the only volumes that shall be prepared and published in connection with said census shall relate to population and social statistics relating thereto, the products of manufactories, mining, and agriculture, mortality and vital statistics, valuation and public indebtedness, recorded indebtedness, and to statistics relating to railroad corporations, incorporated express, telegraph, and insurance companies, a list of the names, organizations, and length of service of surviving soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines": Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the schedule relating to the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion was prepared and the information required taken; and if so, whether the said information was published as required by said section 17 of the act named, and if not so published, the reasons for withholding said publication.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN PRODUCTS.

Mr. THURSTON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate of the United States, at his earliest convenience, copies of all such laws, decrees, and regulations promulgated by the Governments of Germany, France, Belgium, and Denmark as in their present operation discriminate against the admission into the said countries of American cattle, meats, and other agricultural products.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. QUAY that House bill 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions.

Mr. TURPIE. I gave notice last Tuesday that at the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour to-day I should call up the joint resolution (S. R. No. 66) introduced by me and move its reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that on the motion to refer I would submit some remarks upon the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Indiana that we are still under the head of morning business. The resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania is a part of the morning business.

Mr. QUAY. Before the resolution is taken up for consideration I desire to modify it by striking out all after the word "committee," in the third line, and inserting in lieu thereof "for further consideration." I understand that it is the desire of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] to proceed with the consideration of his joint resolution to-day.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out of the printed resolution all after the word "committee," in line 3, in the following words: "with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions," and insert in lieu thereof "for further consideration"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

Mr. QUAY. I believe that under the rule I have a right to make the modification I have suggested.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be modified as indicated.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will not be kind enough to permit the resolution to lie over without prejudice, that the Senator from Indiana may address the Senate, after which I shall ask the Senate to take up Senate joint resolution No. 48.

Mr. QUAY. I have no desire to press the resolution immedi-

ately, and if the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber will agree to the arrangement, I will agree that it shall go over until Monday, at the conclusion of the morning hour, in order that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] may proceed with his remarks this morning, and that the joint resolution which the Senator from North Dakota has in charge may be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator proposes to modify his resolution. I suggest to him that he present his modification now, so that it may be printed with the resolution.

Mr. QUAY. The modification has already been made.

Mr. HARRIS. I was not aware of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. It seems to me there can be no objection at all to recommitting the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL. There is objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not see any necessity for delay. I imagine, as a matter of course, that this is a formal proceeding. I hope the resolution will be disposed of in that manner, so as not to stand in the way of other business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit to the Senate the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. The request is, I presume, distinctly understood. It is that the resolution shall go over until the conclusion of the morning business on Monday, and shall then be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will again submit it to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. I may not object, but I want to know a little more about it. I do not see any necessity to put it off. There is certainly no necessity to recommit the bill in order to accomplish all the Senator from Pennsylvania desires, because if he wishes to have a vote on the silver amendment as a separate proposition, it can be offered as an amendment to the original bill as it now stands, and that amendment will take precedence of a motion to strike out and insert. The sense of the Senate can be taken on it just as well; there is no complication whatever about it. If you want a vote on the two propositions separately it can be offered as an amendment to the original bill, to perfect the original bill. You can then move to strike out. All the votes can be taken in the Senate the way the bill now stands that could be taken after recommitting it. I see no possible object in referring the bill back to have the propositions separated, when it is entirely within the power of the Senate in the ordinary way to reach a separate vote upon the questions.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to know what the request is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state the request. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the pending resolution shall go over until the close of the morning business on Monday.

Mr. QUAY. That request, I will state, is made of the Senator from Pennsylvania by other Senators on this floor, and he acquiesces in it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORGAN subsequently said: I submit an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I ask that it be read and printed and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution the following:

And with the further instruction, that the committee report the following as an amendment to the House bill No. 2749:

"That there shall be deducted from the customs duties that are or may be imposed by law upon articles imported from other countries into the United States for consumption, 10 per cent of such duties when such imports are made in vessels of the United States or in vessels of the country in which such imported articles were produced: *Provided*, That the country in which such articles are produced shall by law provide so that silver bullion the product of mines in the United States shall be admitted to coinage in the mints thereof on equal terms with gold bullion, and shall be received, without discount or discrimination, in payment for all customs dues on articles imported into such country, as full legal-tender money."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. If I remember correctly, there is a resolution on the table, offered by me on the 4th instant, which I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. TURPIE. I wish to make this point of order: I gave notice on last Tuesday that to-day, at the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour, I desired to be heard on the joint resolution regarding the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and the resolution referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire is not a part of the routine business of the morning hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator that the resolution is part of the morning business.

Mr. TURPIE. But the point I make is that it is not part of the routine business of the morning hour, which is the presentation of petitions, reports of committees, and whatever is in regular order as a part of the routine business of the morning hour. But the consideration of a resolution on the table going over from day to day is not a part of the routine business, although it is part of the business of the morning hour. I want especially, because I had asked it many days ago, the courtesy of the Senate to be heard at this hour.

Mr. GALLINGER. While I do not agree with the contention of the Senator from Indiana that a resolution which comes over under the rules does not become a part of the morning business of the next day, I have no disposition to press the matter, and will simply ask that the resolution in relation to pension statistics heretofore offered by me may go over until the next legislative day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. STEWART. The resolution of inquiry submitted by me ought to be passed at once or it will be of no avail.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART February 4, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the Senate an estimate of the probable increase of the revenue if bill H. R. 2749, entitled "A bill to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency," should become a law; and what would be the duty per pound in United States money on the different grades of imported wool according to the present market price; and is the proposed duty on wool provided for in said bill sufficient to compensate for or correspond with the increased duties proposed on woolen goods.

Mr. TURPIE. I now ask to have taken from the table the joint resolution introduced by me on Tuesday last and that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator in a moment. The pending question is on agreeing to the resolution which the Chair has laid before the Senate and which has been read.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator from Nevada will allow the resolution to go over. I desire to offer an amendment to it, and I have had no opportunity to prepare it.

Mr. STEWART. I have no objection to that, but I want to obtain the information which the resolution calls for.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over without prejudice.

Mr. STEWART. Very well; I have no objection if it goes over without prejudice, so that it may come up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the resolution will go over without losing its place.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Indiana, which will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 66) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of the United States, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc. (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely:

That section 3 of Article I be so amended that the same shall read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be chosen by a plurality vote of the people of the several States, for six years, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, and each Senator shall have one vote.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State may fill the same by appointment until the time of the next general election, at which a Senator may be chosen by the people to fill such vacancy."

This amendment may not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator who may be chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution.

Mr. TURPIE. I move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion submitted by the Senator from Indiana, on which he is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, it is said that the present mode of electing United States Senators was provided by the counsels and was approved by the wisdom of our ancestors. In one point of view their wisdom excelled that of this generation. They adopted policies and made laws for their own day and age. They looked at the United States as it then existed, both as to the people and the Government. They made no provision touching the right of suf-

frage, except that the members of the House of Representatives should be chosen by the people of the several States having the qualifications requisite in each State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That portion of the people who voted for such members of the legislature in each State were thus treated as representatives of the whole body politic.

The portion of the people thus entitled to vote was comparatively small—not numerous. Universal manhood suffrage, now grown so familiar to us, did not exist in any of the colonies at the time of the Revolution, nor in any of the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Other qualifications besides those of age and residence continued for many years to limit the number and to restrict the power of the electors.

It was doubtless the general extension of the right of suffrage in the several States which led to the gradual decline of the functions of their legislatures.

When the mass of citizens in a State first became voters voting only for members of the legislature and for Representatives in Congress, it was not long before they extended the use and application of the ballot to the choice of other officers. Governors, judges, the whole corps of administrative officers in the several States and in the counties and townships composing the same are now directly chosen by the people. In the older States one after another were made elective and the legislatures have been deprived of their former power of choosing these officers; in the new they have never been invested with that power. It might be said in a certain sense, even under these ancient forms of government now abolished, that the people chose the governor because they elected the members of the legislature who elected him, or that the people in effect elected the chief justice because he was appointed by the governor so chosen. But the history of political reform for more than a century makes answer that this condition of things did not satisfy the wishes of the people—did not satisfy the just demands of a free ballot or of civil liberty.

The system of election by proxy has been wholly abandoned and overthrown in the several States. The policy long and well established is that each citizen shall personally and immediately have his voice in the election of every public agent concerned in the administration of the Government. And if any man should in any State now propose that the governor, or the judges, or the auditor of public accounts should be chosen by proxy—that is, by the legislature—and should cite the practice of our forefathers as a model or example, he would be reminded that the wisdom of our forefathers was shown in adapting ways and means most suitable to their time and condition, that the wisdom of their descendants is to be shown in the same manner, and that the progress and growth of free institutions preferred and required the new and direct methods of election rather than the old. It is now time for us to pay a rational deference and respect to the memory of our ancestors, not by adhering to what they under different and other circumstances did, but by doing what they would have done under our present conditions.

Unfortunately, while the natural growth of the franchise has gone on—until it comprises in each of the States the whole number of male adults—the artificial polity, in respect to the composition of this body, continues unchanged. The ancient form of choice remains, but this form lacks now the substance. As compared with political conditions in 1779, we have in a very real sense a new people living and acting under an old system. A portion of the community, which had been formerly of small account in its direct influence upon the Government, has expanded and become strong, and it demands a place suited not to its former weakness but to its present power. We have already very perceptibly felt the pressure of the new wine in the old bottles in that continuous assault upon the constituent membership of this body, in the harsh denunciation of the action of legislatures in choosing the same, in that impatience and vehement expression of indignation at any action at all in conflict with that of the House of Representatives, and this doubtless not because the action of the two Houses may have been diverse but because the House is recognized as being of and from the people and the Senate is not of or from the same source. It may be said that these things are and always will be incident to our position in the public service, but this incessant disparagement of the conduct and action of the Senate increases daily in volume and severity and can not be disregarded. It is greatly enhanced by our refusal to submit the question of a change in the mode of our election, as it would be much diminished and allayed by the submission of this amendment, whether it were adopted or rejected. In some parts of the country it has already been mooted—publicly discussed—whether our present system of government would not be improved by an entire abolishment of the Senate.

I do not say that this overture has received the sanction of any considerable number of our people, but the fact of its agitation is not to be overlooked in determining our action herein. This suggestion is much aided by our attitude of hesitation and delay. Every reform necessarily implies a change in some existing method. All change is not reform. But the question of submitting a proposed change in our policy to the arbitrament of decision by the sovereign people may become almost as material and necessary to public order and to the general welfare as its adoption.

THE INVISIBLE EXECUTIVE.

It may be said without disparagement of our numerous fellow-citizens of other races that the prevalent and dominant type of our governmental institutions is in its origin Anglo-Saxon. The political history of that race for seven hundred years in England, the old home of our ancestors, may be summarized as a prolonged contest, sometimes with arms on the tented field, sometimes in the high debate of Parliamentary councils, between the prerogatives of the Crown and the franchises of the people. Very slowly but surely the people have overcome the Crown, until in these latter days the House of Commons, at first an unimportant and quite insignificant factor, has become the ruling power in the nation.

Many of the best men among our Revolutionary founders, having an intense sympathy with the people in this great historic conflict, entertained misgivings as to the effect of our own Constitution at the time of its adoption. They were jealous of the powers conferred on the Chief Executive. They said plainly the President may become, if not in name, in fact, a king. The power of the Executive, exerted through official patronage, always increasing with the growth of the country, might in the end result in serious menace to the liberties of the citizen. These grave apprehensions of the encroachment of the Executive authority have thus far not been realized. The intense devotion of our people to the autonomous freedom of the several States and the extreme detestation of the use of Presidential patronage to control opinion have checked this power, and we have been comparatively safe from its operation.

The danger to our institutions, and especially to the free exercise of our legislative functions, comes from another quarter. That levity of assent which we have used in the creation of corporations both in the State and in the nation has reared from small beginnings a power unnamed, unknown, not mentioned in the Constitution, which, like the famous genii of the Arabian tales, at first confined in a small space, but unwittingly released and let loose, overshadows the whole country with its gigantic form. This power is much greater than that of the constitutional executive—with infinitely larger patronage, with a proletariat composed of thousands of dependents; aiming at a dominion unrestricted by law, and despising liberty. Neither the dogma nor the practice of the division of powers is known to or recognized by this autocracy.

These numerous creatures of our own too facile legislation are wholly artificial, gifted, as is said by Blackstone, with a sort of legal immortality by reason of their prerogative of perpetual succession.

These organizations are decided by the courts to be persons, residents, citizens. These residents never remove, these citizens never disappear, these persons never die. I have heretofore alluded to the enormous growth and number of our bodies corporate in my remarks of December 6, 1894, in the Senate upon this subject.

"Many appellations or epithets have been given to this time of ours. Perhaps one, as appropriate as any other, at least in our own country, would be the Age of Incorporations.

"The jurisdiction and province of these institutions is no longer confined to great enterprises, the construction of public works, the distant transportation of freight and passengers, the opening of mines or quarries. Gainful pursuits of any kind are seldom now undertaken by persons as such. We have companies duly chartered and organized for the manufacture of almost every article, utensil, implement, or commodity sold in the market.

"Not only the carrier, the wagoner, the brazier, the shoemaker, and the smith have disappeared—the workmen in every art and mystery have vanished. The company has taken their room and place; they are forgotten or wholly merged in the corporate life and service.

"Nor is this strange transformation limited to matters of gain or profit. This universal hunger for incorporation, this world-wide riddance of personality, this negation of private action, finds numerous objects for its exercise elsewhere. For the redress of every wrong that is done under the sun there is some society formed and duly chartered. For the cure of every ill to which our race is subject, for the diffusion of every benefit whereof it may partake, there is a body corporate, with its president, vice-president, and board of directors, duly appointed according to the statute in such case made and provided.

"Is a pervading sense of separate weakness the secret of this rushing movement toward collective effort? If so, the men of our generation must have been deeply touched by a sense of their own infirmity.

"Whatever may be the motive or the reason for this tendency or condition, it obtains.

"This deluge of incorporations has not only reached but covered every field, valley, and height of human enterprise."

Had these incorporated societies confined themselves to their legitimate business, the profits to be made by skill, diligence, and ingenuity in their several crafts and vocations, and had been therewith content, they would still have been accounted as among the most remarkable phenomena of the present century. But they are not thus content or satisfied. They aspire to control the political functions of the Government and to enlarge their gains by direct legislation having for its object the increase of the value of their shares and dividends.

To this end certain of these associations have formed an organism, representing the aggregate mass of incorporations having the same or like interests—which is called the trust—alias the pool—otherwise the combine or combination. The life and force of this organism is concentrated in what is known as the executive committee. This new executive assumes strange powers, uses strange methods, methods unknown before.

It resembles very much the Grand Council of Ten, so famous in the history of Venice. The members of that celebrated council were unknown, except to each other. The time and place of their meeting were unknown. No written record was kept of their orders or proceedings. Its power was supreme. Whomsoever they bound in Venice was imprisoned. Whomsoever they condemned died by the hands of the executioner. Whatsoever law of the Republic or decree of the senate stood in the way of their administration was suspended, annulled, or repealed.

The organic law of this country provides very carefully for a distribution of powers. This new executive of the trust will brook no such distribution. Its avowed purpose is to control the executive, to control the judicial, and wholly to supplant the legislative department of the Government in all matters appertaining to the province of the pool.

The Constitution of the United States declares that the Congress shall have power to levy taxes, duties, excises, and imposts, but the invisible executive of the trust dictates absolutely what merchandise shall be free, what articles shall be exempt from taxation, what things shall be subject thereto, and the rate and per cent of the levy. In this mysterious syndicate which decides upon the act and fact of taxation, the people are without any kind of representation.

Herein taxation without representation is now as real a grievance as in the days of the colonial era before the Revolution.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. This invisible executive declares with imperious and imperial fiat, "All regulations are mine."

The old Executive (I speak of the office, not of the person) has the power to veto a bill after its passage; the new executive claims and exercises the power to veto a bill or any part thereof before its passage. The old Executive holds a term of office lasting four years. The new executive holds a term in perpetuity, unlimited. This is a terrible power, an absolutism beyond that of the Czar or the Sultan, omnipotent, irresponsible, and irremovable.

Yet it is the offspring of a free Republic, born of those franchises granted so lavishly, a progeny deformed and monstrous which turns to rend the people who gave it life and being.

Herein lies our danger most manifest. Liberty is of little moment when it is thus dominated by a despotism unseen, impalpable—amenable to no authority.

It may indeed be asked how is all this related to the subject in argument? Most closely, very directly. For it is alleged, and has been now for many years bruited with every circumstance of notoriety and publicity, that the central bureau, the chief powerhouse of this malevolent and intriguing usurper, is located at the capitols of the several States wherever and whenever a member of this body is to be chosen. Destroy the scene of its operations, this arena of its exploits, and it at once disappears. Dissolve this incorporeal aggregate of the trust, with all its dependents, retainers, and procurers into the original units which compose it, and we shall restore the ballot of opinion unawed, unbought. An act of faith such as the choice of a United States Senator by the people at a general election would render this evil genius of the Republic powerless for harm.

There is a virtue in the movement of popular opinion induced by a general election akin to that found in the tidal movement of the waters of the ocean—it dissolves and destroys all impurities; the whole mass is cleansed in every part. Everywhere is felt the touch of the invigorating savor. There is that integrity, that fearlessness, in the greater not found in the lesser number, especially when the smaller number acts in a representative character. The mass of men do not share the bribes of the tempter, and they treat his menace with disdain.

INHERENT EVILS OF THE PRESENT MANNER OF CHOOSING.

As has been formerly stated in the discussion of this proposed amendment, one of the greatest evils of the present manner of choosing United States Senators is the inability of the State legislatures to perform this duty. The failure of the legislatures to elect is becoming more and more frequent. When, during the last session, the instance was cited of some of the new States in the far West whose legislatures had adjourned after holding a session and balloting unsuccessfully for the full constitutional term of their existence, it was answered that these States were new, that their legislatures were without experience in the function of Senatorial elections, and that these conditions had made their action unavailing. But what will be said in relation to the condition now existing in the States of Delaware and Kentucky, two of the oldest States in the Union, in which the legislatures have had a prolonged experience in the election of United States Senators, where there was every motive and reason for a choice, yet the difficulties found in the representative elements of the legislative bodies have proved almost insuperable?

In the State of Delaware the general assembly balloted every day of the session from the first Tuesday in January, 1895, until Thursday, the 9th day of May following, without an election, and on the last day and in the last hour of the last day left us only a contest instead of a Senator chosen. The present status in the State of Kentucky, where the legislature is so evenly divided as necessarily to impose upon a very small minority the power to determine the pending Senatorial election, is an instance of like difficulty. This equilibrium of parties in the State legislatures and consequent domination of minor sections of opinion therein is an increasing mischief, due to the present mode of choice, not inherent in our general polity. No one has any right to disparage either the existence or action of a third party, or to deny its legitimate proportional voice in the conduct of public affairs, but when, as in some cases it has already occurred and is likely to occur in many more, the third party has set aside on either hand the voice of existing majorities, has impeded or wholly defeated the action of the greater number, such a defect in our system must give us pause, room, and opportunity for grave deliberation.

An examination of our internal political history will show that ever since the organization of parties, at the close of the second Administration of Washington, there has always been a third party. Extremely variant in name, policies, and purposes, yet there has constantly been a mass of voters who entered a sort of interlocutory dissent to the ideas and principles, whatever they may have been, of what were known as the two dominant parties of the country. This element of dissent has sometimes attained a representation in the House of Representatives; sometimes in the Senate; occasionally, though more rarely, it has reached the electoral college; but it has been much more frequently known and recognized in the legislatures of the States than elsewhere. There, if it have made any progress at all in public estimation, it is sure to be found. It has a right to be there, but it is owing to our present imperfect mode of choosing Senators that its presence becomes so potential, and that its power becomes vital, crucial, out of all proportion to the small number of voters who at the polls are known as its adherents.

A third party at the present time has somewhat of political representation in both branches of Congress, and in several States has a large number of followers. Sometimes it is said to be numerically larger than ever before, but this may be doubted. A third party from natural causes will increase as our population grows larger. Certain men will always prefer the byways to the beaten paths of political action, and the greater the number of men the more frequent will be the instances of departure. Judging the future by the past, it is quite certain that, although the third party now in vogue may disappear as others have done, a third party of some kind is to be accounted as a constant quantity in American politics, and, in defiance of all arithmetic and all rules of number and order, the third party becomes and has become in the history of this country the first or the second; and yet there is always a number sufficient to form another third party. Whether the state of political equilibrium in our legislatures, now so frequent, arises from the presence and action of a third party or from the personal divisions and private dissensions in one or the other of the principal parties there represented, the result is the same—the failure to choose, or the compulsory choice of some one not preferred by and not representative of the wishes and opinions of the greater number. The election of United States Senators by a plurality vote of the people would instantly remove this growing evil, and would immediately restore and perpetuate the legitimate rule of the majority voting.

To these evils more particularly noted must be added the complications which are liable to occur at any time from the death of one or more members of the general assembly, a mortality which would not disturb in any way an election by the popular suffrage; and also the perplexing and perpetual conundrum of legislative apportionment, becoming more and more intractable—both these causes of mischief constantly growing, not only in the frequency of their occurrence, but in the intensity of their operation, as the number of States and legislatures is multiplied. It is not, however, from the consideration alone of the grievous ills which beset the

present system that a change is argued and demanded. Had these manifold and pernicious ills of the old method no existence, we should yet insist, upon the grounds of the political sovereignty and moral supremacy of the people, that those for whom all laws are made should directly choose the lawmakers.

I wage no Parthian warfare upon the past. We turn to the past, not to traduce or to denounce it, but with the most loyal sentiments of reverence and admiration, yet gathering therefrom both the law and the lesson of real political development.

Forty-five senates in the several States are to-day elected by the popular vote. Every State in the Union has placed its legislative department directly under the control of the people. Why should not the Senate of the States united be chosen in like manner?

A free representative democracy, with a constituency of 70,000,000 of inhabitants, must of necessity be a government of legislative proxies, but these proxies ought to be chosen by their principals, the people.

There is no room, no reason for the functions of middlemen in a transaction of such momentous character.

Such a change would be in full harmony with the spirit of the Federal compact, would marvelously improve its symmetry, would establish that more perfect union which our fathers designed, not as finished, like some sculptured work of art in still life, but as capable of amendment, as susceptible of living growth, actual advancement, and continual progression.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

ARKANSAS AND CHOCTAW RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent to take from the table for present consideration the bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes. It will take but a moment to pass the bill. It is a very important bill, I will state, and a similar measure has been reported from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. I desire that the Senate shall act upon the House bill instead of the Senate bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object, but I shall be glad if the Senator from Missouri will state briefly the substance of the bill and from what committee it comes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill merely authorizes this corporation to complete its railroad from Arkansas into the Indian Territory. It has now completed 10 miles of that part located in Arkansas, and the balance is under rapid construction—all of the ties, timbers, and steel rails purchased, and most of the rails have been delivered. It is believed that all of the line in Arkansas would have been completed, but it was deemed advisable by the promoters to await the survey of the whole line, as the survey in the Indian Territory might show that it would be better from an economical standpoint and in other respects advisable to change the location of the line in Arkansas from its present terminus to the Choctaw line.

A bill for this purpose was introduced in the other House and another in the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] reported the Senate bill, and the other House passed its bill. There are very few changes in the House bill from the bill as reported by the Senator from Arkansas. I have conferred with the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs and they agree to the passage of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill (S. 1579) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

INCLINE RAILWAY ON HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation. It is a little bill which will take but a moment, being practically in one section.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. If it is the intention of the Senate to act upon the joint resolution relating to the distribution of seeds, I hope we will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. BERRY. I appeal to the Senator from North Dakota. Senator after Senator on the other side has had permission for the passage of bills, and I have not asked for the consideration of any other bill during the entire session. It will not take five minutes, and I ask him to allow the bill to be passed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have given repeated notice that I would call up the joint resolution. I have just yielded for a bill which it took almost a half hour to read, and I do not see that I can afford to yield further if I have any rights here in the premises.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from North Dakota can yield for five minutes.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator will lose more than five minutes before he gets the joint resolution through.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then I shall have but twenty minutes left before the unfinished business is laid before the Senate.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. What is the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The bill was read, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRAINERD AND NORTHERN MINNESOTA RAILWAY.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Having yielded to one or two Senators, I accord the same courtesy to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota. It is a bill which has been passed by the other House and has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill was read.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if the usual clause is contained in the bill, that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act?

Mr. NELSON. I think it is in the bill. The bill has been before the Interior Department and has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CALL. I suggest to the Senator that it has been the custom of Congress, as in the bill just passed a few minutes ago, to insert a clause to the effect that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act.

Mr. NELSON. An amendment will simply delay the final passage of the bill. They are required to build the road within three years, and as a matter of fact almost all of the road is really built.

Mr. CALL. I think the Senator ought to add that clause, as it has been the custom.

Mr. NELSON. I hope the Senator will let the bill stand as it was passed by the other House.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CALL. I move as an amendment, in accordance with the uniform custom of the Senate for many years, to add at the end of the bill as an additional section:

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

Mr. NELSON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF PRIZE FIGHTING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals and to provide penalties therefor in the Territories and the District of Columbia was read twice by its title.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senate to pass that bill at once. I have examined it. As the members of the Senate are aware, the prize fighters after going from Texas to Louisiana and then into Mexico have been driven out of Mexico, and they are now proposing to have their prize fight in New Mexico. This is a proposed United States law to prohibit it there. It ought to be passed now, so as to become a law within a few days.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the morning hour to the Calendar.

SIOUX INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act

entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889. The bill was reported by me a few days ago from the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in line 28, after the word "shall", to insert "be for a longer period than ten years, and shall"; so as to read:

Provided, That such leases shall be for a longer period than ten years, and shall not in the aggregate embrace or cover more than one-third the area of said land.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The amendment as stated is not what was intended. It should read that no lease shall be for a longer period than ten years. I wish to correct the amendment so as to make it read "that no lease shall be for a longer period than ten years."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified as indicated by the Senator from South Dakota. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893. The title of the bill does not disclose its real purpose. Its real purpose is to extend the time within which a bridge over the St. Lawrence River can be built.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 4 of the act approved February 9, 1893, authorizing the St. Lawrence Railway Company, of the State of New York, to build and maintain a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at some point in St. Lawrence County, State of New York, by extending the time for the completion of the bridge to February 9, 1898.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMISSION OF FINES AND FORFEITURES.

Mr. WHITE. I ask leave to call up the bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved December 15, 1894, so as to read:

SEC. 5294. The Secretary of the Treasury may, upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any fine, penalty, or forfeiture provided for in laws relating to vessels or discontinue any prosecution to recover penalties or relating to forfeitures denounced in such laws, excepting the penalty of imprisonment or of removal from office, upon such terms as he, in his discretion, shall think proper; and all rights granted to informers by such laws shall be held subject to the Secretary's powers of remission, except in cases where the claims of any informer to the share of any penalty shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to the application for the remission of the penalty or forfeiture; and the Secretary shall have authority to ascertain the facts upon all such applications in such manner and under such regulations as he may deem proper.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from California to state the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. The bill simply adds the word "forfeitures" to the power already possessed by the Secretary of the Treasury to remit the penalties in certain cases, so as to obviate a technical difficulty experienced by the Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. G. M. BROWN.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1477) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. G. M. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Naval Affairs and is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move to strike out the preamble of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. DUBOIS proposing an amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution:

All appropriations relating to the construction, purchase, or maintenance of public buildings and grounds shall be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Rule XXV shall be amended as follows:

"The Committee on Finance shall consist of 15 members."

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. QUAY. As the Senator from Idaho declines to accept the amendment, I will not press it.

Mr. DUBOIS. I could not hear the remark made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. When I offered the amendment yesterday I requested the Senator from Idaho to accept the amendment, as I thought it was in the line of the general idea of the resolution. He declined to do so, and I will not press it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withdraw the amendment?

Mr. QUAY. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. FRYE. There was an amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], I remember.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice has been given of that amendment. It may now be offered, but it has not yet been in order to offer it.

Mr. CALL. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the resolution:

After the appropriation bills shall be reported to the Senate by the several committees they shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and report to the Senate of the total amount of the appropriations and such recommendations in relation to the amount of such appropriations and the changes in such bills as may be necessary to keep them within the revenues of the Government and adequate for its requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], upon which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to make some observations, not upon the amendment, but upon the resolution, at this time. Of course, I will yield to the Senator from Florida if he so desires.

Mr. CALL. I do not desire to take the floor from the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. With pleasure.

Mr. DUBOIS. On December 11, soon after the meeting of this Congress, I made a speech on the pending resolution. I was arguing as to the extraordinary powers of the conferees, and from what has occurred in the Senate since I am satisfied I used an illustration which would properly be considered as a reflection upon the conferees and upon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I did not intend that at all, but I used the following language:

A provision was slipped into that bill—

Referring to the sundry civil appropriation bill—

by the conferees withdrawing all the public lands which were embraced within the arid region of the country from settlement until certain impossible conditions are complied with.

The facts were that that amendment was added in the other House to the bill; that the conferees on the part of the Senate endeavored to get it out; and that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] added another provision which modified the House amendment. I think this explanation is due, because I have no disposition whatever to reflect upon the Committee on Appropriations, much less its distinguished chairman.

Mr. ALLISON. I am much obliged to the Senator from Idaho for himself making this explanation, as it certainly was due to the conferees that it should be made.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject that we have in the Senate at this time. It has frequently appeared here before; but it appears now in rather an unusual way. The established custom and rule of the Senate has been and is that all questions of public importance or that relate to the organization of this body shall have, in the first instance, the consideration of a committee of this body. During a somewhat prolonged period in this Chamber I have never known a case where it was suggested by a Senator that a proposition should be referred to the appropriate committee for its consideration and report in the first instance that that has not been done. We have in this Chamber and have had

almost from the foundation of the body a Committee on Rules, whose duty it is to prepare or modify or change the rules of the Senate and bring into the body the reasons for such proposed change.

The Senator from Idaho, on the 5th day of December, the third day after the convening of the present session, offered this proposition and asked, not that it be referred to a committee, but that it lie on the table in order that he might make some observations respecting it. On the 11th day of December the Senator from Idaho expressed his views upon this subject, and then the resolution again went to the table. Day before yesterday the Senator from Idaho called up the resolution, displacing an appropriation bill of an urgent character, and asked the Senate to consider it. A large majority of this body, I agree, voted to consider the resolution, and I find no fault with that vote or with the consideration that is now going on, except that before it is disposed of and before we take a final vote upon it it is our duty, it seems to me, that it shall have the considerate care of one of the standing committees of this body. That will be necessary for the reason that the proposed amendment of the rules as it now stands is impossible of execution consistent with the other rules of the Senate which are to be left unchanged, as I shall presently show. If we adopt the resolution now it will be necessary for the Committee on Rules of itself to take up this question anew and deal with other rules that are inconsistent with the provision proposed by the Senator from Idaho. I think this is a question of importance to the orderly and necessary procedure of the Senate. But laying aside that question, believing as I do that this is an unwise provision, I shall endeavor to give some reasons, in my mind at least, why the proposed change should not be made.

I have before me Rule XVI, quoted yesterday by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], but which I desire to quote again for the reason that it shows how careful this body has been in the past to surround the question of the consideration of appropriations of public money from the Treasury of the United States. Rule XVI is a modification, it is true, but not a serious one, of the rule of this body from time immemorial which has thrown around the appropriation of public money such safeguards and restrictions as will guard the public Treasury.

RULE XVI.

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session—

The last clause was a modification of the rule; it was an innovation—

or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

"Or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments," which, you see, gives a marked significance and distinction to the estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury, as the estimates are bound to be so made now by law. There must be the report of either a standing or a select committee, an estimate from the head of a Department, or the passage of a bill by the Senate at the session when the amendment is proposed which authorizes the expenditure.

In addition to that there is a second clause, which provides for amendments, as follows:

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce; also amendments to bills establishing post-roads, proposing new post-roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

We shall be in the anomalous position, I will say as I go along, if this resolution shall pass, of having all the other committees of this body reporting bills and amendments here, having had them considered in their committees, whereas all amendments to these bills coming from any other committee or any other source must, under this rule, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has had no part in the consideration of the bills themselves. This illustration alone shows how important it is that amendments proposed to the rules of the Senate shall, before we are called upon here to finally vote upon them, have the judgment of the appropriate committee as to all the changes which are necessary in order to harmonize the present rules with those proposed.

But I read this rule for a wholly different purpose than to call attention to this situation; and I shall not stick in the bark as to the rule. The intent and purpose of this rule was to limit and restrict appropriations of public money in such a way that there could not be forced upon appropriation bills legislation which might not be convenient or agreeable to either House of Congress, or especially to that House which refused to consider such proposed amendments. In other words, it was to throw around appropriations such safeguards and conditions that they would not be left, if I may use the word, to the caprice or the sudden consideration of a majority of any legislative body.

Why was this done as to appropriation bills? I have given the reason. It was that legislation should be considered with deliberation in both Houses, and that it should not be within the power of either House to say the Government will only be carried on on condition that you will accept the legislation we want. It was in effect saying to the Senate of the United States, "You can not put legislation upon an appropriation bill and coerce the coordinate body by saying to them 'you must take this legislation as a condition of the appropriation of public money to carry on the Government.'" It was to throw around the House of Representatives the same restriction, because their rules are of the same character as ours, and they are more rigidly enforced than are the rules of this body.

Mr. President, what is the process under the law and under the rules of the two Houses whereby money is appropriated which has been gathered into the Treasury either by taxation or by selling bonds which are to run thirty years or any other length of time, taxing the present generation for the interest and the next generation for the principal? Early in the history of this Government one of the first laws which was passed by Congress, dating on the 2d day of September, 1789, soon after the Department of the Treasury was established by law, provided in the second section of an act to establish the Treasury Department, found on page 65, volume 1, of the Statutes at Large—

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue, and for the support of public credit; to prepare and report estimates of the public revenue and the public expenditures; to superintend the collection of the revenue; to decide on the forms of stating and keeping accounts; * * * to make report—

I do not quote the whole section—

and give information to either branch of the Legislature, in person or in writing, as he may be required, respecting all matters referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives, or which shall appertain to his office.

So that in the first statute establishing the Treasury Department these estimates which come into our rules had a status and standing, giving the Secretary of the Treasury power to make estimates to both Houses of Congress. Under our rules, when so made, these estimates are given the sanction and power of a bill which may have passed this body. This was modified by the statute of May 10,1800, found in volume 2 of the Statutes at Large, page 79, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to digest, prepare, and lay before Congress at the commencement of every session a report on the subject of finance, containing estimates of the public revenue and public expenditures, and plans for improving or increasing the revenues, from time to time, for the purpose of giving information to Congress in adopting modes of raising the money requisite to meet the public expenditures.

It is under that ancient statute that the Secretary of the Treasury now makes his report direct to Congress rather than to the President of the United States, as other departmental officers do.

There are some intervening statutes, but I shall not trouble the Senate with them. In the act passed August 26, 1842, it is provided in section 14, volume 5, of the Statutes—

That it shall be the duty of the several heads of Departments, in communicating estimates of expenditures and appropriations to Congress and to any of the committees thereof, to specify, as nearly as may be convenient, the sources from which such estimates are derived and the calculations upon which they are founded, and in so doing to discriminate between such estimates as are conjectural in their character and such as are framed upon actual information and application from disbursing officers; and in communicating the several estimates reference shall be given to the laws and treaties by which they are authorized, the dates thereof, and the volume, page, and section in which the necessary provisions are contained.

So the Book of Estimates since 1842 has been required to show not only that the estimates are authorized by law, but also the date of that authorization, the amount, and the volume in which it is to be found.

These provisions were changed by section 3 of an act approved March 3, 1875, page 370, volume 18 of the Statutes, as follows:

That it shall be the duty of the heads of the several Executive Departments and of other officers authorized or required to make estimates, to furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury, on or before the 1st day of October of each year, their annual estimates for the public service, to be included in the Book of Estimates prepared by law under his direction; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit, as a part of the appendix to the Book of Estimates, such extracts from the annual reports of the several heads of Departments and bureaus as relate to estimates for appropriation and the necessities therefor.

I have one other statute which I wish to read. All these statutes relate to the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury and heads of Departments respecting expenditures authorized by law. This is found on page 254, volume 23 of the Statutes at Large:

Hereafter all estimates of appropriations and estimates of deficiencies in appropriations intended for the consideration and seeking the action of any

of the committees of Congress shall be transmitted to Congress through the Secretary the of Treasury, and in no other manner; and the said Secretary shall first cause the same to be properly classified, compiled, indexed, and printed, under the supervision of the chief of the division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations of his Department.

Thus curtailing the power of the head of any Department to make an estimate for any appropriation until it has been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, approved by him, and transmitted to the two Houses of Congress. Such estimates are transmitted, so far as the Senate is concerned, to the Senate from that desk, being addressed to the presiding officer of the Senate.

It may be asked why it is that I have quoted these statutes. I have quoted them for the purpose of showing that from the foundation of the Government it has been recognized that it was necessary that the greatest care should be exercised in order that the appropriation bills should be divested, so far as possible, of legislation, unless the legislation should appear to be necessary in making the appropriation.

Our fathers, the men who framed the Constitution of the United States, supposed that they had guarded carefully and well the provisions relating to the revenues and to the expenditure of public money. They deemed it wise, at least, to insert in the Constitution a provision restricting the power of Congress respecting the great questions of taxation and expenditure, drawing that provision from the custom of centuries in the English Parliament. They provided, it is true, only that—

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In other words, that the taxing power of the people should not, in the first instance, be a part of the power of the Senate of the United States, though, of course, we have the power of amendment in this body, for the constitutional provision further says:

But the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Then, although the language of the Constitution covers only "bills for raising revenue," it has been held from the organization of the Government that the constitutional power carried with it also the power of appropriating money. We have in this Chamber on three different occasions contested that power with the House of Representatives, one of them a most memorable occasion, wherein the Senate actually prepared appropriation bills and sent them to the House of Representatives; but that House laid them upon the table and paid no attention to them. Again, it was contended that we had power in this Chamber to originate appropriation bills, and a committee was appointed by the two Houses, called a committee of high privilege, wherein that question was debated for months, a report made in the House of Representatives denying that right, and a report made in the Senate asserting the right. But so well grounded now is the situation regarding appropriation bills that the Senate never undertakes to originate such bills.

So the appropriation bills which are dealt with in the pending resolution and in the present rule are not bills which originate here at all, but are bills which come to us from the other body, and come to us under their rules. Therefore it is necessary for us to adapt our rules to the House rules respecting the number of bills and what they shall embrace. So it has been that my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] and my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] have, temporarily at least, withdrawn the logical consequence of every argument that has been made in this Chamber for a change in the distribution of appropriation bills.

It is argued here that the appropriation bills ought to be distributed because the several committees have necessarily more knowledge of the subject matter of appropriations than can a separate and distinct committee have upon the same subject. If that be true, there is not a single topic of legislation that should not be divided and distributed among the several committees of this body.

It is true that my friend from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], in his kindliness and generosity to the Committee on Appropriations, leaves to it a skeleton of three bills, one being called the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, another the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the other the deficiency appropriation bill, for all deficiencies. If the logic of those who argue for this change be correct, then these bills of all others should be divided and distributed among the committees of this body. If the argument be that the Committee on Appropriations can have no knowledge of Army affairs, or of the affairs of the Navy, or of the affairs of the Interior Department, why should they appropriate money for the War Department, or the Navy Department, or the Interior Department? It naturally follows, or would seem to follow, that if this bill should be sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee necessarily has more and better knowledge regarding the distribution of money appropriated for the Army, they will also have a better knowledge respecting the personnel of those who are in the War Department and the compensation that ought to be given to those who are there employed; and this applies to every other Department of the Government. If you strip the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of the provisions relating to salaries and compensation there would be practically nothing left of it.

I wish to ask some Senator who favors the pending resolution, if it be necessary that the expenditures which are made by the judicial department of this Government, including the expenditures in the Department of Justice, be made by the Committee on the Judiciary, why should not those made for all the courts of the United States also be considered by the Judiciary Committee, now so ably presided over by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and recently so ably presided over by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] who sits near me? The members of that committee are dealing with judicial subjects all the time; they are considering legislation in relation to the courts of justice, regarding the marshals and the district attorneys, and keep, as it were, an eye, and a keen one, upon all the subjects relating to the powers of the United States courts and their jurisdiction. That necessarily gives that committee a knowledge of these subjects. So I might illustrate by other heads of Departments and by other committees.

The argument made is an argument for the absolute dismemberment of the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, the Senators who have argued have, in my judgment, argued from wrong premises. Take the sundry civil bill, which is proposed to be left in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations. Let me analyze that for a moment, and see if the arguments which have been made here would not necessarily take the sundry civil bill practically from the Committee on Appropriations and distribute it among the various committees which have been named. They, it is said, are especially and distinctively qualified for the performance of the service required in making appropriations.

Take public buildings. I hold in my hand the appropriations for the current year. If there is nothing in this question of appropriations except simply how much the committees can have, or how much they think ought to be appropriated, surely the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which makes a special examination of all these topics, ought to have control of this subject. Last year we appropriated nearly $4,000,000 for public buildings in the United States. Is there any reason why the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should not have charge of that subject? If there is a reason, it is to be found in the logic of this whole situation, and that is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds might be willing to appropriate ten or twelve million dollars, or $20,000,000, if you please, and still appropriate it wisely and judiciously for the Government itself. In a country like ours, extended as it is in its area, with populations growing with immense rapidity, with cities springing up in a week or in a year, where the Government carries its power and its influence through its courts, through its postal service, and through all the ramifications of a great country such as ours, is the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to appropriate, and, I have no doubt, properly to appropriate, ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars for public buildings?

Why do not those who favor this scheme treat these committees alike? It has been said on this floor over and over again that Senators are equal and States are equal. So they are; and so they ought to be; and so they will be in this Chamber; but the question of the division of labor among the committees is a question as to the wisest and best method of reaching true results; and therefore it is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, although they might report in favor of the appropriation of ten or twenty million dollars a year, must be, in a sense, limited in their appropriations and in their power by the revenues of the Government in the first place, and, in the second place, by the necessary distribution of these revenues among all the departments of our Government, and the necessary expenditures to be made therein in order that our progress may be continuous.

Now, take the Committee on Commerce, so long and so ably presided over by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] who sits in front of me. For a good many years the Committee on Commerce has had charge of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. The Committee on Commerce has always had charge of that bill, has it not?

Mr. ALLISON. No, sir; not always.

Mr. HILL. When did it not have it?

Mr. ALLISON. I think it has had that bill since 1846. I may be mistaken as to the date, as I speak from memory.

Mr. HILL. It has always had.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Commerce has not always had it. That is my recollection. If the Senator from New York knows differently I will be corrected now.

Mr. HILL. I am advised that the Committee on Commerce has always had charge of that bill, if not directly, then indirectly, it having been customary for the Finance Committee, which always had charge both of appropriations and finances prior to 1867, to refer the river and harbor bill to the Committee on Commerce. It was the constant rule to do that.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. That is practically done with respect to every other committee of this body.

Mr. HILL. I will say——

Mr. ALLISON. I will come to that matter, if the Senator from New York will excuse me. Does the Senator wish to interrupt me for anything special? If he does I will yield, but I do not wish to proceed further with this branch of the subject.

Mr. HILL. I simply wish to call the attention of the Senate and the Senator to the fact that prior to 1867 the Committee on Finance had control of appropriations as well as the question of finance.

Mr. ALLISON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. HILL. And the change was made then, in 1867.

Mr. ALLISON. Then since 1867 the Committee on Commerce has had charge of the river and harbor bill. I was mistaken as to the date.

Mr. HILL. I do not state that. I say that prior to 1867 I think it was customary to refer river and harbor matters to the Committee on Commerce. That is my recollection.

Mr. ALLISON. The same custom was in existence then that prevails now; that is, consultation with committees as to appropriations affecting their particular duty.

Mr. HILL. It is not a custom now, but a rule with respect to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. But now let us look into the sundry civil bill a little further.

Light-houses, beacons and fog signals, Life-Saving Service, Revenue-Cutter Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey—those are all attributes, if I may use that word, of the Committee on Commerce. All those subjects are under the jurisdiction and control of that committee, and the appropriation last year for the purposes I have just stated amounted to nearly $5,000,000. If the logic of the Senators who argue for the resolution is correct, then the Committee on Commerce should have those items also.

Take the Fish Commission. Why is it that the Committee on Fisheries is not embraced in the resolution? Why should not it have control of the appropriations for fisheries? It is a separate and distinct committee and one of the most important and ablest in this body. Yet the appropriations for this branch of the Government are to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, who necessarily know but little on the subject, according to the logic of our friends.

I do not wish to go into the details of all the questions in relation to the different appropriations, but here is the Committee on Public Lands, presided over by the mover of the resolution, recently made its chairman, and familiar with the whole topic. We appropriate for public lands $1,200,000 annually. Why should not the Public Lands Committee take control of that appropriation and deal with it rather than that we should have a select committee specially devoted to that and kindred subjects?

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that appropriation were contained in a single bill, by the customs and usages of the Senate would it not be proper to send the bill to the Committee on Public Lands? Why not?

Mr. ALLISON. Under the argument of the Senator and those who are associated with him that is the logic of the situation; and the rules of the Senate are brushed aside, it seems, without reference to a committee. How long will it be before the Senator from New Hampshire himself will be clamoring for such a change of the rules as will authorize the distribution of which we are now speaking?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator does not wish to mislead anyone.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution takes the appropriation bills according to the existing custom and makes a little different distribution of them from the present system. The Senator from Iowa is trying to prove, I understand, that because that is done therefore each appropriation bill should be taken and cut up into twenty or thirty pieces. That does not follow at all from the argument. There may be a little reform in this world without absolute destruction of all human institutions.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, and it was stated two or three times yesterday that we are engaged at this time in a great reform, in a sort of evolution; and I suppose we are. I was only arguing the logic of the gentlemen who insist that this distribution shall be made for the orderly division of the work of the Senate.

Now, take the Military Affairs Committee, with my distinguished friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] sitting near me, as its chairman and managing the affairs of the committee during his chairmanship with great ability, surrounded by other gentlemen of distinction and ability. If it be true that the appropriations should be thus distributed, I will ask my venerable friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]—not so venerable as I am, either—to tell me why we should make two bites at a cherry and leave the appropriations for arsenals, military posts, military parks, national cemeteries, and miscellaneous objects under the War Department, which embraces a variety of small and great things, including National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and State and Territorial Homes, amounting to three or four or five million dollars annually, to be provided for by a special committee designated for that purpose?

Mr. PROCTOR. Does the Senator from Iowa wish me to give a reason now?

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to give the Senator a reason in the line of the logic of those who support the resolution, which is that the other committees are better calculated to deal with those subjects than a committee whose only business it is to deal with appropriations of public money.

Mr. PROCTOR. One very good reason why they should not be changed, I think, is because the appropriation bills originate in the other body. They are sent here all framed, and it is not for us to tear them to pieces. The pending resolution contemplates nothing of the kind.

Mr. ALLISON. That is an answer, but it is not the answer that meets the logic of those who are arguing for the resolution, because the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] day before yesterday introduced an amendment providing that those appropriations should also go to the Committee on Military Affairs, a logical movement.

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes; and he withdrew it on consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. He withdrew it on consideration, and I suppose after consultation, giving notice that a joint resolution was required for that purpose; and how long does it take my ingenious friend from Vermont to prepare a joint resolution to reach any purpose he has in hand?

So I could go on with the appropriations. Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee on Commerce has the question of rivers and harbors before it under the rules, the Committee on Appropriations is now bound to consider and does consider all appropriations for rivers and harbors where specific contracts have been made or where the appropriations run for a limited and specific period. Last year there were appropriations amounting to $9,000,000 for river and harbor improvements in the sundry civil bill. I think by the resolution those matters are taken away from the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be necessary under the resolution now proposed for the Committee on Commerce to take charge of those appropriations. I do not see, of course, how they can be segregated from the sundry civil bill.

So I might go on and speak of these matters, but I mention them merely for the purpose of illustrating the logic of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], who says that the main reason for the resolution is to distribute the power of the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] is a little more discreet and a little more gentle to the Committee on Appropriations. He says he wants to destroy the monopolistic power of the Senate. He has gathered a phrase from my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], on that subject.

What is the power of the Committee on Appropriations? Under the rules it is to report appropriations authorized by law and nothing else. If all the committees which I have named have a better knowledge of what should be the appropriations which are authorized by law, then, of course, all the appropriations which are left to the Committee on Appropriations should be assigned to those several committees. Especially is that true of deficiencies. Here is the Army appropriation bill, and there is a deficiency in the appropriation for the Army or for the Soldiers' Homes or for some other branch coming properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs. Why should such a deficiency be sent to the Committee on Appropriations when the original appropriation, the source and origin of the deficiency, was considered by another committee? That is true of every other deficiency, and yet this skeleton of a committee is left with a view of dealing with and gleaning from those old appropriations the deficiencies which have been created or which are made necessary by reason of expenditures beyond the appropriations.

Mr. President, from the reasoning, then, of those who favor this sweeping change it would seem that it is easy to provide for all the appropriations without the Appropriations Committee. I think the philosophy, if I may use that word, or the reasoning which requires a separate and distinct committee to deal with appropriations is manifestly wise. Until 1867, as the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has already called attention to the fact, the Committee on Finance dealt with these subjects. We went through the period of the war, expending millions upon millions of dollars,

raising armies to the extent of nearly 3,000,000 men, and during all that perilous period we, in this body, assisted in raising revenue and in appropriating money chiefly under the guidance and direction of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who is still familiar with those scenes and times.

In the House of Representatives it was never supposed that the Committee on Ways and Means would be deprived of this power until 1865. I was then a member of the House, and I can speak of what I know. Then under the exigencies of the election of a Speaker of the House it was found necessary to divide up the Committee on Ways and Means in order to form two other committees. And at that time the war was practically ended, because the division did not take place until December, 1865. Up to that time the Committee on Ways and Means of the other House dealt not only with the appropriations, but with the enormous internal and external power of taxation, and, in addition, with the power to raise revenues by the millions upon loans authorized to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that that division would not then have been made except under the exigency of enlarging the number of committees.

Now, the reason why the power of taxation and the power of expenditures were lodged in a single committee from the foundation of the Government for the first seventy-five years of its existence was that taxation and expenditure should go hand in hand, that revenues and expenditures should be within the control and direction of men who knew the aggregate of the revenues and the aggregate of the expenditures, so that a wise Government, which desired to maintain its credit, would not by appropriations expend more money than by taxation it raised for revenue. We had not then reached this modern system whereby a Government in a single year can expend $69,000,000 more than it receives from its revenues and make the expenditure from money borrowed from the people upon the idea and the pretense that it is done to maintain the parity in value of the money circulation of our country.

I maintain, and I say it now as I may not think of it again, that a Government can not long endure if it borrows money in order to pay its current expenditures. In the last two and a half years we have expended $130,000,000 more than we have received into the Treasury by means of our revenue laws. In the last month we ran behind three millions and a half. Is it not worth while, then, for us to take some account of our revenues as compared with our expenses? For one I want them to meet as nearly as we can make them meet, and I hope that before long we shall be able to replenish the revenues which were provided for in the act of two years ago through the income-tax legislation, but which were lost by virtue of a decision of the Supreme Court. Can it be that we will go on, upon this side or upon the other side of the Chamber, and appropriate $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 more than is likely to be received into the Treasury from taxation, and borrow money for the purpose of paying the current expenses of the Government at the rate of $40,000,000 or even $25,000,000 a year at 4 per cent, running for thirty years?

When our expenditures and revenues were supposed to be equal to each other, it was supposed by the men who preceded us that taxation and appropriation should go hand in hand. But in 1865 in the other House they changed that system, so that there were a Committee on Appropriations and a Committee on Ways and Means.

I may be mistaken, I may be wrong, but I think that a matter of this character—taking money out of the Treasury or putting money into it, either by appropriation or by taxation—should be in the hands of a single committee of this body. Now, why do I believe it? I believe it because I think the Committee on Appropriations, as a committee, should have no other charge than that of appropriating moneys provided by law.

I will recur again to the question of other committees, and I will illustrate it. Take, for example, the appropriations for the Army. The Military Committee has been organized and is organized for the purpose of framing laws and supervising regulations for the Army of the United States. If it also has thrown into its hands and under its control the appropriations of money for the Army there is no committee of this body to supervise the expenditure. Without reflecting upon any committee of this body or upon any department of the Government, it is the most natural thing for the committees which have care and control of these great subjects to think that liberal appropriations are wise and advisable respecting them; and probably they are. What is true of the Army is also true of the Navy. How often do we find appropriations far beyond the necessities or the power of the Government under existing conditions to expend the money? When I say that I am not speaking against an enlargement of the Navy or against an increased appropriation for fortifications.

By some division of power in this body we now have a Committee on Coast Defenses, which has taken from the Committee on Military Affairs a part of its duty as to new projectiles and new, important, and extraordinary inventions in guns, gun carriages, powder, etc. The Committee on Coast Defenses has taken charge of many of those subjects. I believe, as I have no doubt we all believe, that we should improve and increase our coast defenses and provide liberally for the enlargement of our Navy; but we can only do it by carrying with it one of two things—either taxation or the power to borrow money.

So it seems to me that as to these two great branches of our Government, it is wise that their supervision should be in the hands of a separate and distinct committee, which can see, as it has hitherto done, how much we can afford to appropriate for these objects, unless we are to carry with the appropriations a provision that money shall be borrowed for that purpose.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question at this point? How would it be possible for the Committee on Military Affairs, for example, at a time when some extraordinary expense is thought desirable (I am not speaking of an emergency, but when the tendency was to increase the expenditure for the military establishment), to cut their coat according to the cloth, to use a homely phrase; in other words, how could they know what the Treasury would bear unless they sent around to all the other committees to whom the different appropriation bills had been distributed, and brought themselves into consultation with each one of them in order to form a rational and sensible view of what would be proper under the circumstances?

Mr. ALLISON. That is absolutely true, unless they were to provide by loan for expenditure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is not that very thing done in the other House where these bills originate? Do not all these appropriations go to the Military Committee?

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that where the bill originates the Military Committee has charge of the appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Where the bill originates that committee has charge of the appropriation. But that is no argument——

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, before he proceeds, if that is not all the more reason for retaining in the Senate the present arrangement, that is, that there shall be a place where all the appropriations shall come under one head?

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for that suggestion. It is a very good one.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Iowa will allow me to suggest whether any committee now has supervisory charge of the appropriations for rivers and harbors in the Senate. We get along very well with that measure, do we not?

Mr. ALLISON. I think so. The Committee on Commerce has supervision.

Mr. HILL. Has any other committee supervision, I ask?

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations have every step in the river and harbor bill as a part of their duty. I mean the information which is given is always found in the room of the Committee on Appropriations as respects river and harbor bills and every other appropriation bill. If the Senator has watched the tables which have been printed from time to time, he will see they always embrace all questions respecting rivers and harbors.

Mr. HILL. It has no committee supervision?

Mr. ALLISON. Of course it has no committee supervision. I did not understand the Senator from Delaware to suggest that it was committee supervision; it is committee information that must be sought.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to argue that there should be one committee having supervisory power over all appropriations, and therefore I suggested that when it comes to a question of logic the existing rule, which the Senator is commending, allows the Committee on Commerce to have power without restriction over the question of rivers and harbors. Therefore one is as illogical as the other.

Mr. GRAY. It is a question of degree. That is the only committee.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not judge of a great question by taking a single instance as an illustration. I am now upon the point, and I want to call the attention of the Senator from New York to it, that it does seem wise in the long years which flow on that the committee which originates legislation, whether it be to expend $50 or $50,000,000, ought to have some committee that is thoroughly independent in this body (I mean independent as respects that particular subject) to give the amount of money that can be appropriated for that expenditure this year and next year and the following years, if there is not money enough to provide for it in a single year.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator that if he entertains those views his duty would be best discharged by moving an amendment to the rules taking away from the Committee on Commerce this very power that it has so wisely exercised.

Mr. ALLISON. I am arguing now at large.

Mr. HILL. Quite at large.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not arguing from the single illustration

of the Committee on Commerce, which is a great committee of this body and which has jurisdiction of rivers and harbors under the rules and the law.

Mr. GRAY. Will my friend allow me to suggest, in reply to the question of the Senator from New York, that the example which he cites of the Committe on Commerce in regard to the appropriations for rivers and harbors is one exception to be taken out of the general jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations? I should like to ask him whether, that one exception having been taken out, it logically follows that it would be wise to take many more out? One being taken out for reasons that may be peculiar to itself, leaves that one committee segregated in its jurisdiction from the mass of appropriations, and with the Appropriations Committee, to whom it can always refer and obtain information as to all other appropriations which are to deplete the Treasury. It is a question of degree.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course; but the Senator from New York will answer that question.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing to answer. I venture the assertion that the Committee on Commerce has never sent a communication to the Committee on Appropriations asking how much the pension expenditures this year are going to be, or any other question pertaining to it. All those things are known to every committee, because they are published, and therefore not only every committee knows them, but every single member of the Senate has equal information in regard to them as the appropriations progress. The only point involved is simply this: The Senator was suggesting, in answer to our proposition to enlarge the jurisdiction of several of the committees, that you might go further; that the logic of the situation required you to go further. Our answer to that is that the logic is just as much at fault on the other side, because the argument in favor of having one committee supervise all the appropriations is not kept in view by the present arrangement, where you have a single great exception. Of course it is quite difficult now to draw the line, as it is sometimes difficult to draw the line at what age a party shall be permitted to vote, but some age has to be fixed. So in making this arrangement by the proposition of the Senator from Idaho some line had to be drawn, and this, in my judgment, is the best that can be made.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to make a single suggestion in regard to the point that more than one committee should have charge of the appropriations? The fact is that the Committee on Commerce every year brings a bill in here that is reduced by many millions of dollars; it brings in a bill in excess of what the majority of the Senate consider to be appropriate and necessary.

Mr. HILL. Allow me to say that shows that possibly the wisdom of the Senate is greater than that of any one committee.

Mr. CALL. It also shows that the Senator from New York is entirely wrong in his proposition.

Mr. HILL. That does not follow.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to say a word to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GEORGE. That proposition shows that it is perfectly safe to leave to the Senate the amount of the appropriations to be made in any one bill.

Mr. CALL. Not to one committee.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, it is curious that I can not make myself understood by the Senator from New York. Of course I know, as he does, that the Committee on Commerce is a single exception; but the logic of his observation is that the Committee on Appropriations should not exist because all the things that can be done by that committee are to be more wisely done by a distribution of power in this Chamber among thirteen committees.

I have heard it said sometimes that we do too much in the Committee on Appropriations and that we are at times overrun and overridden with work. That is true, and I wish it were not true. It has been especially true since the change made in the House of Representatives, because under the rules of the House a single committee that deals with an appropriation bill has no concern as to when it shall come to the Senate. They hold it back sometimes until nearly the last day of a short session and then it comes in here, and these bills are necessarily thrown into our committee, and they are considered, I will not say hastily, but they are considered with considerable inconvenience to those Senators who happen to be members of the Committee on Appropriations.

But suppose the bills are divided up as is proposed. If that is done, I want to make a prediction, that when we reach the end of a short session there will be a struggle here between the twelve committees on the last day of the session as to which of them shall get in its report first. In other words, the orderly procedure in both Houses, it seems to me, has always required that this great subject of appropriation of money should be allotted to a single committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask my friend from Iowa a question. One of the plausible arguments made in favor of dividing up the appropriation bills is that each committee charged with the appropriation might then, without waiting for the action of the other House, prepare its bill, and then the two bills would be prepared as they are presented. The Senate has the same power of appropriation at the beginning of a session, and by its own committees, as the House.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SHERMAN. The provision in the Constitution that revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives does not apply to appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. I touched on that question in the absence of the Senator. I have said that that is a mooted question, but the Senate never has passed an appropriation bill that has been assented to by the other House. So the power is exercised by the other House.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senate has undoubtedly power to pass an appropriation bill to the fullest extent that the other House has, and it does it. We pass every day bills providing for the appropriation of money, sometimes enormous amounts.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly; that is done.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interpose, but will the Senator from Iowa allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I happen to have studied this particular question some time ago, and I think it is still fresh in my memory.

The phrase in the Constitution is that the bills for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives. Of course, the letter of that provision does not include bills for merely appropriating the moneys so raised, but the House of Representatives at a very early day contended, and has ever since adhered to the contention, that the spirit of that constitutional provision included general measures for the expenditure of revenue, the general appropriation bills, because in every appropriation bill, certainly in every general appropriation bill, it must be a germane amendment, but perhaps an amendment forming a new provision for raising the money which would be expended—that is, if you are to expend for a general Government purpose $40,000,000—the Senate or the House might or might not agree to that bill, according as they found a practicable way of raising the money, and therefore the two subjects were inextricably connected.

Now, when that matter came up between the two Houses, Mr. Webster said from his seat in the Senate that, whatever might be his opinion, from the necessity of the case it was a subject which must be determined by the House of Representatives. As will be seen on a moment's reflection, whatever may be the opinion of the Senate, it is impossible that any view as to the right to originate an appropriation bill should prevail which is not the view of the House of Representatives. I think there were committees in both Houses that made written reports. The Senate acquiesced in that view and the House have maintained it ever since. I believe the first term I served in the House, from 1869 to 1871, when the Senator from Iowa was there—at any rate about that time—the question was again raised and the House of Representatives appointed a committee that made a new report; but the Senate again acquiesced in the view. So that practically, whatever may be the letter of the Constitution, it is as well settled as any constitutional rule in the country that the House must originate general appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. That, I think, is well settled. Mr. President, it seems to me, then, without going at large into this question, because I do not wish to consume time, inasmuch as we have separated the raising of revenue and given that to one committee it is wise that we give the final supervision of the expenditure of money to another committee. That looks to me like a safe and conservative method of dealing with the people's money.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] yesterday dealt with some force upon the idea that here is an equality of States, an equality of representation, and to illustrate how badly certain sections of the country were treated as respects the Committee on Appropriations, he stated that not a single cotton State had a member upon that committee. The logic of my friend from Virginia would be that the money gathered in the Treasury is a sort of grab bag for the States, and that in its general distribution the States not represented on the committee were badly treated as distinguished from the States represented on the committee.

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for twenty-two years. The State in which I live has as little interest as any State, and, I might say, perhaps a less interest, in all the appropriations that are considered by that committee than any other State in the Union. We have had a few public buildings, and that is all. But the appropriations treated of in the Committee on Appropriations are not marked by State boundaries. They are appropriations that have no relation to States. Take the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, covering as it does an average of over $22,000,000. What

is it for? It is for the people who are carrying on the varied affairs of this great Government of ours chiefly in the city of Washington. What is the postal appropriation bill? It is a bill which carries the mails from every part of this country to every other part by land carriage and by water carriage. The expenditure of that Department is $90,000,000 annually. The revenues that pay the expenditures are derived from 2-cent postage. If the constituents of my friend from Virginia write more letters than mine, then they pay more than do other sections of the country for this service. Here are two bills that cover $113,000,000 of the $400,000,000 that have been suggested by my friend as not justly and equally distributed among the States.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator suppose that the people who live in that broad stretch of territory between the Potomac and the Rio Grande do not know a little more about what is the necessity for appropriations for their postal facilities than those who live in California or in Iowa? Would he not rather represent his own State in telling its needs as to appropriations than have a Senator from Texas or from New Hampshire do it?

Mr. ALLISON. If there was any discrimination, that is true; but the postal service runs upon every railroad of Virginia, as it does upon the mountains. It runs upon every water craft in Virginia as it does on the Mississippi.

Mr. DANIEL. But the fast through mail, for which a special appropriation is made, does not.

Mr. ALLISON. If my friend will allow me, that is a most unfortunate illustration which he has adduced. The fast mail, called special mail facilities, began in 1879, and it was intended for the Gulf States, and old Virginia as well. It begins in the State of Virginia. That is the only place in that part of the United States where special appropriations have been made for fast mails. If I have been criticised for one thing more than another, it was because I supported and sustained for a long series of years a special appropriation for the benefit of the Senator's constituents against the protest of different Postmasters-General and public officers of our country.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is possible to have every district of country represented on the Post-Office Committee any more than upon the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not see how it is possible. The appropriations that are considered by the Appropriations Committee are not like the rivers and harbors appropriations, where there is a distribution; they are appropriations that depend upon laws to execute the various branches of the Government service. I have given two illustrations, the postal appropriation bill and the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Take the Army and Navy appropriation bills that in the aggregate, exclusive of rivers and harbors, because that is an army expenditure, amount to $50,000,000 annually. Is it of any advantage to a man in a cotton State to have the privilege of voting the fixed salaries and compensation of the army officers and privates and the naval officers and privates? The question of the distribution of appropriations, the grab-bag principle, does not appertain to our committee at all.

It is necessary that the Committee on Appropriations shall be within reasonable limits as to numbers. We are told by gentlemen who are now active in the promotion of this scheme of my friend from Idaho that the difficulty with the Committee on Appropriations is that it is too small, and if we would enlarge it there would be no objection to continuing the plan which has prevailed since the Committee on Appropriations was organized.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to say distinctly that I myself never heard of any such proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not saying the Senator did. I am only saying, if I may be permitted now to speak on these topics, that it is a curious thing that only a month ago we thought it necessary to relieve somewhat the burdens of the Committee on Appropriations by adding four to its membership, and now it is to be relieved still further by distributing its bills practically to all the other committees who can possibly take jurisdiction of the subject.

Now, I want to say a word or two as respects another phase of the question that has been dwelt upon by Senators in this debate. It is that the Committee on Appropriations upon the part of the Senate has been guilty of increasing the appropriations over the bills as passed by the other House. I think my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] especially congratulated himself that the Indian affairs have been transferred from the ordinary committee to the Indian Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, and that there has been a great improvement in the legislation in that regard, except that the Senate had put on doubtful and illegitimate claims and swelled the appropriations. Without speaking invidiously or criticising any committee of this or the other House at any time, I want to say that as respects the Indian appropriation bills they were largely increased under the new régime.

They came to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with treaties and contracts innumerable that were put on in the House. Although they have a rigid rule there as to legislation upon appropriation bills, it was legislation to execute what they called existing treaties, and they were existing treaties. Therefore the Indian appropriation bills were swollen largely in the House of Representatives. They were swollen in this Chamber over the heads of the Committee on Appropriations by the Indian Affairs Committee of this body, in many instances, but I will not stop to name them. Whatever may have been the condition of appropriations as respects Indian affairs, that can not be laid to the door of the Committee on Appropriations, or to the fact that the Indian appropriation bill was not in the custody of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate rather than in the custody of a committee especially provided for that purpose.

Now, one word further on the question of increases of appropriations in bills. These increases of bills are inevitable for two reasons. I am not speaking of the present House because I am not authorized to do so; but the House of Representatives have uniformly made less appropriations than they ought to have made to carry on the ordinary business affairs of our Government. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] said the other day that they had made the appropriations for nine months and confessed that they had made them for nine months, leaving a deficiency for three months in order to show a small sum appropriated.

Mr. GEAR. May I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GEAR. Is it not generally understood that in some of the committees of the House they have recommended the appropriation of less money than was necessary and then they have come over to the Senate and asked for an increase?

Mr. ALLISON. That has often occurred, but I am not speaking of what occurs privately; I am speaking of the public record.

Take the judiciary appropriations, with which every member of the Judiciary Committee is familiar. It has become almost a settled rule in the House to appropriate for only six months. That has been done for two or three years. I hope it will not be done this year. The bill that is now on your tables, known as the urgent deficiency bill, is largely composed of deficiencies in the judicial department of our Government, because when those appropriations were made they were made with a full knowledge that there would be large deficiencies. I know how difficult it is to make accurate estimates for the judicial service, because, in the nature of things, no committee and no Attorney-General can make an accurate estimate of what will be the expenditures of the courts in any given year; but for the purpose of keeping down appropriations and for the purpose of going upon the hustings and dilating upon the extravagance of the Senate and holding us up here on the cross-roads of public opinion as appropriating the people's money beyond the just needs of the Government, they have in past years in the House of Representatives neglected to appropriate the necessary funds to carry on the operations of our Government.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] the other day criticised with severity the Committee on Appropriations because of their extravagance and appropriating money when it ought not to be appropriated. There may be illustrations of that, I know, and doubtless they will occur to Senators on both sides of the Chamber. I recollect very well in the closing hours of the last Congress that the Committee on Appropriations had a whole day of its time occupied in the pressure upon it to consider an amendment, which came to us from the Committee on Claims, appropriating, in round numbers, $7,000,000 for the sugar bounty. We did not take cognizance of that question; we did not undertake to deal with it, but it was forced upon us under the sixteenth rule by a standing committee of this body, which sent it to us, and under the rule the amendment could have been offered on the floor of the Senate, and if it had received a majority could have been voted into the sundry civil bill. It came to us in that way, being in order under the machinery of this Chamber provided by the sixteenth rule, and we were obliged in the closing hours or days of the session to take up and ascertain the very right of the mattter as to a great appropriation involving six or seven million dollars. The committee finally decided, it is true, by a bare majority vote, that that was a just and fair amendment, modified as the committee amended it, and it was proposed here in the Chamber by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] now absent.

So, whatever pressure there is upon the Appropriations Committee in the last days of the session comes from the fact that other committees of the body insist that measures which they have failed to secure and accomplish in their regular bills shall, in the

way of legislation, be put on appropriation bills. Therefore it is, that if these bills are distributed every committee of the Senate will have it within its power to legislate by and large upon all the great public topics which appertain to subjects within its jurisdiction and offer them as amendments to appropriation bills, and if they can get a majority of the Senate to agree that they are proper to be put on, it can be done.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will it not, then, be just as much out of order to legislate on appropriation bills as it is now?

Mr. ALLISON. It will. The point I make is that the Committee on Appropriations is obliged to deal with these questions, whether willing or unwilling, whether they ought to go on an appropriation bill or be kept off, the object being to secure these legislative provisions upon appropriation bills so that they may pass the other body without being publicly debated there.

It has been said and it has been believed that legislation and the appropriation of money should be segregated and kept apart so far as possible. There are instances, it is true, where the Committee on Appropriations, under the estimates of the Departments, provides appropriations which have not been previously authorized by law. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], having been chairmen of the Committee on Foreign Relations, know that as to our foreign service it is largely fixed on appropriation bills, so far as the salaries of our consuls and our ministers are concerned. The law upon the subject was passed in 1878. So, where it is necessary to enlarge our commercial or our diplomatic influence or power, these increases have generally been made upon appropriation bills.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] yesterday put in the RECORD a table showing increases and diminutions of salaries and the expenses of officers as found in appropriation bills. I do not know why he went so far back as the Fifty-first Congress to find a table, when a similar table is annually prepared by the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. I have the last table which was prepared, and I call the attention of the Senator to it. It shows a large number of increases of officers. This was under the beneficent influence of a Democratic House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. An increase of officers?

Mr. ALLISON. Both an increase of officers and an increase of salaries.

Mr. HILL. On appropriation bills?

Mr. ALLISON. On appropriation bills; some of them coming from the other House; none of them, I believe, put on in the Senate. I think my venerable and kindly predecessor will bear me out when I say that very rarely indeed have salaries been increased upon appropriation bills.

Mr. HILL. Where did the increase of the salary of the minister to Mexico come from? It crept in through the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. It was done through the Committee on Appropriations, after having been recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it was a wise and just thing, so far as I know.

Mr. HILL. The point was, that it was said that the Appropriations Committee could not change existing law, and one of the arguments made was that they could not change salaries. My point was that while that was technically true, yet they were constantly doing it, and I cited numerous instances where they had. This gives them additional power, and virtually they have the control of the increase of salaries. Now it appears that the increase of the salary of the minister to Mexico was through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALLISON. But the Senator does not draw the distinction between increasing and the increase going through the committee. This was a proposition made by another committee.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. ALLISON. Excuse me. I wish to make my own point and then I will listen to the Senator. The proposition is that the Committee on Appropriations, under the rules, can either sanction such an appropriation or can allow it to be presented in the Senate and agreed to. I do not know which was done in this instance, but I am not here to say to the Senator from New York that salaries are not increased and that salaries are not diminished on appropriation bills. There are certain salaries which have no other designation than on appropriation bills—that is to say, there is no statute, for instance, which says that a certain clerk in a Department shall have this or that salary. The clerks in the Departments are classified 1, 2, 3, 4, and now classified, I believe, downward to $720.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hold in my hand the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the Fifty-third Congress, second session, and I find under the office of Sergeant-at-Arms an amendment inserted by the Senate:

And $500 additional while the office of assistant doorkeeper is held by Isaac Bassett.

I find in the third session, on the same bill, this provision inserted by the Senate:

For clerk to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage and clerk to the Committee on Mines and Mining, at $2,100 each, for the fiscal year 1896 only, $4,200.

Those must have been increases made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire undoubtedly was inattentive, or at least my observation escaped him, when I said there were certain salaries which were only fixed in appropriation bills. Notably so with the salaries of the officers and employees of the Senate. There is no law outside of the current appropriations from year to year which says what the salary of this, that, or the other officer here shall be. Those salaries are all found in appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; I agree to that.

Mr. ALLISON. I admit there are instances where persons well known to us here receiving inadequate compensation have received higher compensation in that way; but the great bulk of these increases—I am now trying to analyze the table inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from New York—do not come from either the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HILL. How have they got in, I should like to know?

Mr. ALLISON. Through the statutes, through the laws.

Mr. HILL. Do the increases get in through the laws?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not speaking of increases just now. Take a new law—and there were numbers of new laws passed last year—the one in relation to the Steamboat-Inspection Service, for instance, which passed this body and the other House. We had to provide for that. Therefore the appropriations to carry out that law go into this table as increases of public officers and increases of appropriations. So as to the mineral lands in Montana, Idaho, and other States. We were last year confronted with such laws, and were obliged to provide for their enforcement in the appropriation bills. There was passed here, as Senators will remember, a statute as to the lands in those States. It was passed at the very last moment, and we put a provision in one of the appropriation bills for the compensation of those people aggregating $30,000. I might give other illustrations.

Mr. COCKRELL. How about the light-houses? A great many of them were established by special act and had to be appropriated for.

Mr. ALLISON. Appropriations had also to be made for the Light-House Establishment. We never insert an appropriation for a light-house unless we have one of two things. One is that it has been established by law through the Committee on Commerce of this body and through the like committee in the other body, or else the Secretary of the Treasury says to us that by some accident of flood or fire the light-house in existence has been swept away, and therefore he asks for an appropriation to rebuild it. I do not see the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] here now, but not long ago a flood raged upon the Atlantic coast and around the Chesapeake Bay, which swept down nearly $400,000 worth of public property. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] will remember it well; and, among other things, there were nine light-houses, if I remember correctly, which were swept from their moorings and carried out into the ocean. We were called upon in this Chamber, by an urgent letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in the interest of the seamen and navigators of the ocean, that we should straightway appropriate a large sum of money for that purpose; and I think we appropriated $200,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in the Fifty-second Congress, second session, a statement of the appropriations, etc., develops the remarkable fact that 2,480 instances of increases are to be found, and 166 decreases. I think the Senator will not find that those relate to the Light-House Establishment or to any department of the Government such as that.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator calls my attention to page 314, and gives the grand total. Of course I have not the time to examine this in detail, but my eye has just turned upon it, and I will give him some information as to it. First sergeants, by the Army appropriation act, were increased from $22 to $25 a month, making $430; and sergeants from $17 to $18 a month, making $2,027. In other words, of those increases of 2,480 officers, 2,450 were sergeants in the Army, one portion of them having their pay increased $1 and another $3 a month. This amendment must come clearly to the memory of two Senators who sit near me, who were interested in the subject, one of whom, I think, offered the amendments whereby these appropriations were made, and said they were just to this meritorious class of soldiers.

Mr. GORMAN. They were reported from the Military Committee.

Mr. ALLISON. They were reported from the Military Committee, I have no doubt, and presented here.

So you may take these bills from year to year, and you will find the appropriations have had reasonable care, and that the committee has given reasonable attention to these great subjects.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. Is it not a fact that nine-tenths of the increase of appropriations and of officers and their compensation come of necessity from the passage of laws passed during a session before action on the appropriation bills, for which we are compelled to appropriate?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly it is so in a very large number of cases.

Mr. FRYE. That was true especially in the case of the steamboat inspectors. That bill was reported by the Committee on Commerce, passed both branches of Congress, and while it increased a large number of salaries, it decreased others. It literally destroyed about a dozen or twenty offices of inspectors, and, taking the law altogether, it reduced the expenditure $12,000 a year.

Mr. ALLISON. My eye falls upon another item in the table presented by the Senator from New York, of the salaries of light-house inspectors, Life-Saving Service, superintendents of the Gulf coast, whereby they have been increased from $1,200 to $1,500. I do not remember whether that was put on by the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE. The Committee on Commerce reported it, and it became a law.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, I believe.

I only mention these things for the purpose of showing to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] that under the rules and under the practice of the Senate the committees of this body have unlimited power to deal with appropriations at their sweet will by complying with the provision which gives them a committee indorsement and referring their amendments to the Committee on Appropriations.

How can the Committee on Appropriations monopolize the power of the Senate? It is within the power of every other committee to put gyves upon our wrists in this Chamber if we refuse to appropriate as they wish us to appropriate, by securing the adoption of appropriations if they are such as to meet the judgment of Senators upon this floor and can be met by the revenues of the Government.

When you come to analyze the system as to these appropriations, you find that there is no wrong; and yet it is proposed now, without reference to a committee, without giving a standing committee of the body the power to give us their judgment upon the question, to put the Senate to a yea-and-nay vote upon a single proposition which takes away from the Committee on Appropriations the jurisdiction which it has over these bills, and thus practically declare that the committee itself shall be disbanded.

It may be a wise thing in these modern days; it may be a wise thing in a Senate of 90 members to thus, without the examination of any one of its committees, upon the motion of a single member of this body, brought in here without much debate up to this time, to take a vote upon a proposition to divide among the committees of the body the great power of appropriating money in accordance with law, if it be a great power, or if it be one of the ordinary powers which appertain to this body, to take from the committee especially designated for that purpose, most of its members having devoted the greater portion of their term of service to membership upon it, the power of supervision and control, and divide that power among the various committees here proposed.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator from Iowa to complain because this resolution has not been referred to the Committee on Rules and reported upon by that committee.

Mr. ALLISON. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. I do not complain.

Mr. HILL. The Senator makes the point and argues that the resolution ought to have been so referred. I simply desire to call his attention to the fact that no one has made any such motion, that no one made such a motion on the day the resolution was presented, and no one made any such motion after the argument of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. I desire further to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are some ten or fifteen, and I do not know but more, amendments to the rules—good, bad, and indifferent—which have been referred to the Committee on Rules, and that committee has not made a report, either adversely or favorably. It has made no report in this Chamber in five years.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, this proposition has been before the Senate a number of times. In the speech which I made here on the 11th day of December I called attention to the fact that the Committee on Rules would not report back these proposed amendments; and I gave the Senate notice in that speech that I wished them to consider the resolution on its merits, so that when they sent it to the Committee on Rules it should go there with the vote of the Senate showing how the Senate stood on the proposition. The distinct proposition was laid down in my remarks that the resolution was not to be referred to the Committee on Rules because we could never get a report from the Committee on Rules in regard to it.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly the Senator, before committing the resolution to the committee, asked the Senate to decide, and then have it referred to a committee. We all understood that. But the Committee on Rules, at the time the resolution was offered, and when the Senator's speech was made, was an imperfect committee, and not organized. That committee now consists of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who is chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. Here are seven of the Senators of this body who are familiar to us. Is it a wise thing for us to deal with a great question like this, imperfectly presented to us, without the report of a committee? Are we to decide and judge first, and hear the evidence afterwards?

I do not complain; it is not a subject of complaint in this body; but we have provided a number of committees selected to deal with particular questions in the division of powers in this body, and here is a great Committee on Rules, familiar with all parliamentary rules of procedure, organized for the consideration of such a subject as this, and yet the Senate is called upon by a yea-and-nay vote to deal with the question, when it has never been examined, so far as we know, except by a single member of this body. Mr. President, this is an exceptional thing. You may ransack your records and you will find that no important question has ever been considered in this Chamber that met with discussion or debate which was not first referred to a standing or select committee of this body. Nothing is passed here without unanimous consent, unless it has been first referred to a committee and had the judgment of the men who are selected to investigate such questions as are submitted to their care.

I have occupied much longer time than I intended; but I repeat here is a great public question going to the very foundation of public expenditures, relating to the credit of this nation, that is sought to be dealt with here by Senators without reference to a committee. I may be wholly mistaken in my views regarding it; I may be wrong; but I believe where proposed legislation is projected into this body and an attempt made to secure its adoption here and in the other House, under which large expenditures of money would be made, it is wise that those expenditures should be supervised by a committee designated by this body for that purpose, and that those expenditures should, from year to year, and from time to time, have some relation to the condition of the Treasury of the United States, and its power to pay the expenditures authorized by the appropriations.

I know perfectly well—and I make no distinction in that respect—that the honorable Senators who preside over these various committees have probably greater ability and more knowledge of the special topics committed to their charge than has the Committee on Appropriations. But what I am undertaking to show is that if the argument upon which these changes are to be made is a sound one, it is an argument for the dismemberment and destruction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. What right has the Senator to assume in his argument, as he does, that any one of the committees named in the resolution is not as competent to deal with appropriation bills as a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, one of the last observations I made was that they are just as capable, and I have no doubt more capable than the Committee on Appropriations. I certainly do not impugn the ability or the capability or the power of any committee of this body. We are all equal here, thank God.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator assume that those committees will be more negligent of the laws than the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not. I have wholly failed in my argument if I have not shown that the wisdom in the consideration of these questions lies in the fact that when the law authorizes the expenditure of money and when that expenditure is authorized to be made there should be some committee having charge of all these appropriations, in order that we may see that the credit of our Government is maintained and continued, and that our appropriations are somewhere within the limits of our revenue. That is my argument, if it is worth anything.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator maintain that the only guardian of this matter is the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the efforts of the Senator and his allies remind me of a pamphlet, a very eloquent and able paper, which had much influence during the war. Its title was "How a free people conduct a long war." I perceive that the Committee on Appropriations is very earnestly opposed to this measure, and that it is prolonging a very able debate, I do not say beyond proper limitations; but in the meantime I hope it is not gaining any recruits from this side of the question.

The only thing about this proposition which gives me any sort of regret or hesitancy is that I am afraid some of the men whom I most love in the world do not like it, but I do no not think that ought to stand in the way of my sincere judgment of what will be better for the Senate and for the legislation of the country.

The very wide field of appropriations still left open to that great committee covers some of the most important bills, carrying a multitude of items in which there is most likely to be extravagance. That is evident.

There are but eleven subjects of expenditure that are to be distributed, and the name is legion of the matters to be attended to outside of those eleven bills. I can not help supposing that it is better to give a great subject to a committee of men who ordinarily have some special reason for being on a committee than to give it to three men, which practically is the rule now. The upshot of it is the consideration of three men in the Committee on Appropriations, with whom I find no fault, with whom my intercourse has been agreeable.

I have been to them many and many a time to get slight changes made in appropriation bills, sometimes to add something to the expenditure; sometimes I was backed by the favorable judgment and report of some select committee. I do not complain of the reception given me there; but I have more than once felt that the two or three gentlemen, able as they were in general and in the general field of appropriations, did not know as much about some things as some other committees did, and I will give you one reason.

To speak of what I know most about, and not because I have any special reason for boasting at all, I sincerely think the Committee on Military Affairs could better consider and dispose of a bill to support the military establishment than any three gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee. One reason is that we are eleven in number, and that we are decently qualified you may perhaps infer from the tabulation which I have just made. There are eleven men on the committee. Eleven of them have been soldiers on one side or the other. Seven of them were bred to the law and have more or less given themselves to the practice of the law. Six of the eleven have been honored by their States with what with us in New England is the high office of governor; and two of them have been Secretaries of War.

I submit that the odds are that we can as speedily and with a better knowledge of the subject pass upon the details of the bill for the maintenance of the Army than can the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee.

I confess that one of my reasons for wishing this thing is that I would rather have the bill for the support of the Army for three or four weeks in the Military Committee room than to have it three days in the hands of three men of the Committee on Appropriations. I think there will be no danger of our being extravagant. I think we may be even a little wiser than the Committee on Appropriations sometimes are in diminishing the sums given some few things and raising the sums given to others.

I am not troubled, Mr. President, with a fear of the extravagance of the United States Senate. I do not apprehend that the eleven committees would rush the Government into a deficit of revenue, for I think we are as anxious to have wise appropriations and appropriations that come within the just needs of the public service as they are.

I am sure, speaking for the Committee on Military Affairs—other committees will speak for themselves—that it would not desire to unduly increase appropriations, and would have some regard for the general condition of the revenue and for the propriety of all subjects referred to them.

I am not prepared to make a long speech, and do not care to. I have practically nothing more to say. I shall vote for this change in the rules.

One thing further, however, occurs to me. The Senator from Iowa complains that this matter has not been referred to and reported upon by the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules, I hope, will forgive me—I do not mean to be discourteous—but if the Senator will read the list of members who constitute that committee I think he will find that every solitary man of them is opposed to the proposed change. If he will consult history he will find that this subject has been before the Committee on Rules more than once, and never has had the honor of being reported adversely or of being reported at all.

I admit that this proceeding is a little bit revolutionary, but I think we can forgive our friend from Idaho for learning something so early.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho if he desires to press the resolution to a vote this evening?

Mr. DUBOIS. I do. I very much desire to have a vote on the resolution this evening.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to make one or two observations about the resolution before the vote is taken. I shall be brief, because the hour is late and I do not think the matter which I have to submit is very weighty anyhow.

This proposed change in the rules is not a new matter to my thoughts. I have long felt that the present arrangement, by which all these important matters were referred to one committee, was wrong in two aspects—wrong as a deprivation of other members of the Senate of their equal participation in the important legislation of the Senate, and wrong in another aspect, that these bills come to us very frequently from the House of Representatives at so late a period in the session that time is not allowed for one committee to give that calm and deliberate consideration which the matters deserve. So I am informed, and it has been so stated in the debate here to-day, that the committee has found it necessary to act by subdivision. Being a large committee, and it being impossible from the lateness of the season and the want of time for the whole committee to act, they proceed at once to divide out the various appropriation bills to subcommittees composed of three Senators.

Mr. COCKRELL. Those subcommittees report back to the full committee and the full committee considers their action.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very glad the Senator told me that. When any of the committees, if the resolution shall pass, shall have acted upon a matter, they will report to a higher body than the Committee on Appropriations for their final action and judgment.

So there seems to have been, so far as I have listened to the debate, a kind of tacit concession made on all sides that the Appropriations Committee possesses almost the power of legislation and of determining what shall be appropriated and what shall not be. I do not understand that to be the office of any committee. The Senate has committees for one purpose and for one purpose only, and that is to inquire into the subject-matter referred to them and then to report to the Senate their best judgment as to that subject-matter. If that is the condition, it seems to me there can be no dispute about the proposition that the various committees named in the amendment to the rules—I will call some of them: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, the Committee on Indian Affairs, etc.—have better opportunities for discharging the duty which the Senate imposes upon them by referring to them a bill than this general committee.

The Committee on Military Affairs, as was stated by the honorable Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], taking it for an example, is composed entirely of men who at some time in their lives have been devoted to the military profession. That committee has charge of the whole military establishment. It is its duty to look into and inquire what laws ought to be passed, what regulations ought to be made, how many soldiers we ought to have, what kind of guns we ought to have, and all that sort of thing. It seems to me that on a bill providing money for the military establishment of the country the powers of that committee ought not to stop at the very point where they are most essential. The committee can inquire, it can decide how many soldiers we ought to have, what sort of guns we ought to have, and all that, but it can not decide how much money shall be appropriated for the purpose.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is not the right thing to do. So with the other committees. Every one of them, if they discharge the duty imposed on them by the rules of the Senate, ought to be familiar, and more familiar than anybody else, with the special subjects to which their duties relate. They have no power, as I remarked, except to recommend, and is not the recommendation of the Naval Committee, for instance, as to how many ships we need, what kind of ships we ought to have, how much money we ought to appropriate for them, better than the recommendation of a committee which is charged in this general way under our rules with a kind of supervision or jurisdiction over the whole affairs of the country? So on that ground, Mr. President, I favor the resolution.

But it is urged that if we divide out the appropriation bills no relation will be preserved between the money we appropriate and the money we have on hand to appropriate. Let us see how that is. In the first place I ought to observe that it is the sworn duty of every Senator here in the discharge of every office given to him by the Senate to perform the duties of that office with reference solely to the public good and not to be influenced by a kind of esprit de corps to favor the Department over which he has supervision in preference to any other Department. I will not assume,

therefore, that the Military Committee, or the Naval Committee, or the Post-Office Committee will be influenced by any other consideration than a desire to appropriate the exact money which is needed for the public service and which the condition of the Treasury will enable them to appropriate.

But it is said that each committee, not knowing what the report of every other committee is, may make extravagant appropriations, may make appropriations beyond the means of the Treasury. But the reply to that is as stated by the Senator from Florida in reference to the river and harbor bill, that the last and final tribunal to decide how much money is to go to this thing and to that thing and to every other thing is the Senate. When it was urged that the Committee on Commerce had appropriately discharged its duties in reference to rivers and harbors, it was suggested that very large appropriations, too large appropriations, had been reported; and the Senator from Florida very properly stated that the Senate cut them down and made them right and proper. The Senate can do that with reference to every other bill.

Now, one other observation, and I believe I shall have said all I desire to say upon the subject. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] seems to complain that the amendment is illogical; that we ought to have gone further; that we ought to have conferred upon the Judiciary Committee power to consider appropriation bills with reference to the judiciary; and other amendments were suggested. I desire to state, in response to that argument, that as the rule now is, as was well suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], we have departed from the rules of logic on the subject. We have already taken away one of the appropriation bills from the general Appropriations Committee and have given it to the Committee on Commerce.

I wish to state further that it is the chief excellence of Anglo-Saxon institutions that they are illogical. Those institutions have grown up according to the needs and according to the experience of the people who live under them, and there is nothing now more illogical than the Constitution of the United States. The very first section of the Constitution says that all legislative power is granted to a Congress composed of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and yet there is another provision which says that a bill can not become a law without the approval of the President. Another provision of the Constitution vests all judicial power in the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other courts inferior to that as may, from time to time, be established. And yet, in the very same Constitution, we have a provision that a very large part of the judicial power of the United States is vested in this body—the trial of impeachments, and a part of it in the House of Representatives—the preferring of articles of impeachment. Then in reference to the executive power vested in the President in another part of the Constitution there is an apparent contradiction. There is not the logical sequence of giving to the President, as the Constitution says in that article, all executive power; but we find this body associated with the President in the making of treaties and the appointment of officers.

Then in another part, when all officers are to be appointed by the President of the United States, it provides that those officers of the United States who happen to be officers of the Senate shall be elected by the Senate, and those officers of the United States who happen to be officers of the House of Representatives shall be elected by the House of Representatives.

So there is nothing in the argument that we are illogical or inconsistent. All Anglo-Saxon people when they have come to arrange institutions of government have not undertaken to pursue the rules of logic to their final conclusion; but they have adopted this thing and that thing or the other thing, sometimes a little contradictory and crossing the lines of each other, because experience and observation have shown that those inconsistent provisions in the Constitution and in our institutions are best for the Anglo-Saxon people. We are bound by the rules of logic only when we undertake to prove the truth of a single proposition, when we have legitimate and honest and true premises; but when we come to framing institutions for a people we are bound to follow the rules of common sense, the rules of experience, the rules of expediency—those things which our common sense, our observation, and our experience have shown to be best.

Now, what has experience shown in reference to a division of the appropriation bills? We are not without experience on that subject. The House of Representatives several years ago adopted about the same thing, I believe, which is proposed to be adopted here. Has any complaint arisen as to the practice in the House under the changed rule? On the contrary, we find every single member of this body who served in the House of Representatives under those rules testifying here to their excellence. It was said on the one hand, that if we divided out the bills it would largely increase the appropriations, and it was answered on the other that that had not been the experience in the other House, and we had the very extraordinary assertion that the House committees on purpose refused to appropriate the necessary amount in order that the Senate should take upon themselves the odium, if it be an odium, and I do not think it is, of adding to the appropriation bills the amount necessary to carry on the Government.

Here let me make one observation in reply to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. He spoke of the large urgent deficiency bills as being made necessary by the parsimony of the other House. Does the Senator forget that there can be no insufficient appropriation by the House alone; that there must be the concurrence of the Senate as well as of the House in order that there can be a deficient appropriation bill? He seems to have forgotten that proposition. So if there be anything in the suggestion which was made, I believe, by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] that the other House did not make the necessary appropriations for some reason or other which was satisfactory to them, I answer by the statement that if they sent such bills to us we have failed to do our duty as to supplying the deficit.

Mr. CALL. We did our duty and the House would not assent to it.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I crave the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes. For the sake of brevity partly, but more for fear that my treacherous voice might give out and I would be compelled, following an illustrious example, to pass the penciling over to the Senator from New Hampshire to read, I have reduced what I wish to say to writing. The notes were made while the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] was speaking, and as he is not in his seat to be embarrassed by the remark I may say that the Senate will understand how very difficult it was while the smooth, mellifluous, and captivating flow of his eloquence was going on to give attention to anything else.

I can not see the danger of increased appropriations from this proposed change. It makes a number of committees who would naturally make common cause against amendments in the Senate increasing appropriations, while it is often the case that they now make common cause, and successfully, to increase them. Now, it is a proposition almost self-evident, and one that I do not think the members of the Committee on Appropriations will seek to controvert, that with a given fixed sum of money the committees on the subject-matter of the general appropriation bills could distribute this money to the best advantage, because they are constantly acquiring, session after session, a personal knowledge of the needs of their branches of the public service.

Take the $5,000,000, for example, which is appropriated by the District of Columbia appropriation bill. That bill provides for the building and repairing of streets, alleys, sewers, aqueducts, support of schools, hospitals, prison, jails, etc. The District of Columbia Committee make many visits in the course of the year to the objects of the appropriation, and become personally acquainted with the situation.

The same is true in a great measure of the other committees. The Committee on Military Affairs is in constant communication with the Department and officers of the Army, who come from all parts of the country, and its members necessarily acquire in the course of their term of service, long or short, a large amount of information.

There is a large element of safety in this change, by reason of this personal knowledge. Personal observation is the best evidence; and parties naturally go to the committee having the subject-matter in charge with their views, pro and con, on any matter under consideration. So they are all the time accumulating information. On the other hand, the Committee on Appropriations can have little knowledge except what they acquire in the very brief and hurried hearing in the committee room. The hearing is so hurried necessarily that there is little opportunity to get adverse evidence. This gives the persistent beggar a great advantage.

Now, it being granted, as it must be, that the committee on the subject can make the best distribution of a given sum, then the only remaining question is, can they not be trusted to fix the sum? I fully believe they can. Every committee will take pride in keeping within proper limits. The several committees will naturally stand by each other in the Senate to resist an increase, while the present system tends to lead applicants for amendments to combine against the Committee on Appropriations. We have all seen this tendency and its resulting evils. If the change should result in increasing expenses, the Senate can be trusted to apply a remedy by limiting the sum of the appropriations and specifying the amount, if necessary, that each should have. That is an improbable event, but it is a remedy that would certainly be applied if the evil should be found to exist.

Mr. COCKRELL. How long would it take the Senate to come to a conclusion as to the amount that the respective committees should allow to each branch of the service?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not think it necessary to cross that river until we come to it. I have no doubt means will be found to cross it if we ever reach such a river. But I do not believe we ever will.

The Senators coming here from the other body bear strong testimony that the distribution works well there. We hear of no

suggestion of its returning to the old system. I do not believe there would ever be any such suggestion here if the change was once made.

The opponents of this measure claim that it is a slight upon the Committee on Appropriations to make this change. Certainly there is no such feeling on my part. I have always been well used by that committee. I have never sought to go on it. The committee is a very able one, and has done its work as well as such a tremendous overburden of work could be done in the short time available for it.

I now come to a point to which I have been asked to refer. I should not have spoken at all except for it. The Committee on Appropriations, if the change is made, will, in my opinion, have more important work and be more desirable as an assignment than any other business committee, if I may use that term. Certainly I should prefer it to any other committee except Finance. I would gladly exchange, if this transfer of bills is made, any two committee assignments I have outside of a chairmanship. Why, Mr. President, a committee having the sundry civil bill in charge would have, I believe, with the 381 items of that bill, more work, if it gave proper time to its consideration, than any other committee of this body. Nearly all of its provisions require separate consideration. They cover the entire country and an infinite variety of subjects. Again, Mr. President, this committee will have, if this change is made, in my opinion, more to do than its entire work when this committee was first constituted. It has grown—especially the sundry civil bill—with great rapidity, and must continue to increase as the country grows and public wants increase. I have looked back to a period of twenty to twenty-five years ago, and I think anyone must be satisfied that more time should now be given to the three bills than was then required for all the bills.

I will refer to some of the appropriations. Take, for example, the appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1871. The sundry civil bill was then thirteen million and odd thousand dollars. It is now, in the last bill, $46,000,000. The legislative bill has increased less, but it has increased from $18,000,000 to about $22,000,000. The entire appropriations for that year were $161,000,000, and this included the deficiency bills, which were more than double what they were the present year. It also included the Army bill at that time, which was also considerably larger, as the military establishment has been reduced since. It was a third larger. The pensions were $30,000,000. So it can be readily seen that, taking those items and considering that many of the appropriations, especially the Post-Office, which was then over $26,000,000, the entire service then was decidedly less than would be required now, I believe, on a single bill; certainly less than would be required on all three, which aggregate $80,000,000.

But, Mr. President, I did not intend to take so much time. I have, as I said, no criticism to make on the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe any can justly be made. But I believe in this change upon principle, that it is the truest system; that it will work well in practice, as it has in the other House, according to the great balance of testimony. I do not attach much weight to the scarecrows and prognostications of disaster with which the Senator from Iowa has favored us. He fights bravely, as he ought, to present his side of the case, to retain all the great powers and duties of his committee. I respect him for it. If any were needed, it furnishes another evidence of his eminent qualifications for the highest position in the gift of the people. I say that in his absence. I almost wonder, in view of the great trouble that he has imagined, that the Senator did not claim that the unprecedented low state of the barometer to-day was a protest from the very heavens against this change. But I have faith to believe that the skies will clear, and that the sun will shine, and that the atmosphere of this Chamber will calm down, whatever way this question is decided. The measure is right in principle, and there is no question in my mind but that the Senate will go on safely, easily, and harmoniously under it when once adopted.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to trespass upon the attention of the Senate, but I have been requested by several Senators, by reason of the fact that I have had the opportunity for many years in the House of Representatives to witness the practical working of a distribution of the appropriation bills, to say just a word in relation to it.

I happened to be a member of the other House when the distribution of the appropriation bills was made. It was resisted there at the time as it has been resisted here, and I believe it is a matter of parliamentary history that from the hour all appropriations were committed to one committee in the House of Representatives every effort to distribute appropriations and divide responsibility had been met with the severest opposition. It is but human. Men love power and will not readily surrender it.

The distribution of these bills in the House of Representatives occurred in the Forty-ninth Congress, at the instance of the Committee on Rules, composed at that time of the Speaker, Mr. Carlisle; the Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. Randall, an ex-Speaker; Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, now on the Interstate Commerce Commission; Mr. REED, and Mr. Hiscock, a committee of five distinguished and experienced legislators and parliamentarians. After thorough consideration of the matter by that committee, they reported unanimously in favor of the distribution of the appropriation bills, with the single exception of Mr. Randall. The report was presented by Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, and I hold that report in my hand, from which I desire to read some brief extracts as showing the considerations which influenced the Committee on Rules of the House in making the proposed distribution, and in this extract we have a brief, but interesting history of the division of appropriations.

For nearly forty years—

This report says—

of our history the appropriations were made in one act, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Government."

One bill, it will be observed, covering the entire service of the Government.

The first separate bill for the expenses of the Post-Office Department was passed in 1844.

In 1847 the appropriations were made in nine separate bills, namely: Army, civil and diplomatic, deficiencies, fortifications, Indians, Military Academy, Navy, pensions, and Post-Office.

In 1856 the consular and diplomatic appropriations were for the first time embodied in a separate bill. In 1857 the legislative, executive, and judicial bill first appeared in its present form.

In 1862 the sundry civil bill was established, containing the various miscellaneous items not embraced in the other bills, and in 1880 the Agricultural and District of Columbia bills were established, the Agricultural bill being transferred to the Committee on Agriculture. With but few exceptions the river and harbor bill was prepared and reported by the Committee on Commerce until the creation of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in 1883, when it was assigned to that committee.

As showing the great increase of appropriations for the support of the Government, it may be stated that each one of our principal general appropriation bills embraces as much money as the whole amount of the net ordinary expenditures of the Government during the first ten years of its existence, and the specific objects to be investigated and provided for in these bills have so greatly increased in number that it has become a very considerable task even to enumerate them. For several years past the various general appropriation bills have been reported at such late periods in the session as to preclude their careful and thorough investigation by members not on the Committee on Appropriations.

The committee is of opinion that the distribution proposed will enable all these bills to be reported at earlier periods in the session, will permit a more careful and thorough consideration of each bill by the committee having jurisdiction of it, and also by the House, resulting in more considerate and economic legislation, and will obviate the necessity for the passage of any of these bills under a suspension of the rules, which has been so frequently done in late years.

This proposition, as I said, coming from the Committee on Rules and reported unanimously, except for the dissenting opinion of Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania, was debated for several days in the House of Representatives and finally, at the close of the debate, with a view of testing the sense of the House on the single question of distributing the appropriation bills, a motion was made to strike out of the report that portion of it which distributed the appropriation bills to the several committees named, and upon a yea-and-nay vote the yeas were 70 and the nays 227—a most decisive vote. So the distribution was consummated, six bills remaining with the Committee on Appropriations and eight distributed to the several committees having jurisdiction of the subject-matter embraced in the several bills.

For ten years this system has been in operation in the House of Representatives, and I never heard during my membership in that body, after this distribution, the faintest suggestion from any source that it would be wise or desirable to return to the old practice; and I have no hesitancy in saying that in my judgment if such a proposition were made to-day in the House it would not command a dozen votes in that body.

There were several reasons which actuated the House in making this distribution. First, it was thought that it was a fitting thing to do. No one was then able to present any sufficient reason why, for instance, the Committee on Agriculture, having that subject particularly in charge, should not make the appropriations for that Department. Their attention is entirely given to that subject, and it was thought not only a fitting, but a wise and appropriate thing to do to allow the Committee on Agriculture to make the appropriations for that Department. So with the Committee on Foreign Affairs and all the other committees.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] the other day suggested that this proposition is more sweeping than the proposition of the House, because it proposes to take from the Committee on Appropriations the bill for fortifications. Let me suggest to the Senator that the reason why that bill was not taken from the Committee on Appropriations at the time the distribution was made was because under the House rules there was no committee on fortifications. Had there been such a committee at that time I have no doubt it would have been given control of the appropriation for coast defenses.

But without going over each of these committees——

Mr. HALE. That is not the only difference between the pending proposition and the practice in the other House.

Mr. BURROWS. No; pensions and the District of Columbia were left with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. There were six bills, were there not?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. And there never has been any proposition since the Committee on Fortifications was provided for for sending the bill to any committee except the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BURROWS. No; there is no committee in the House on fortifications, so that the bill had to go from necessity to the general Committee on Appropriations. But there is a Committee on Fortifications and Coast Defenses of the Senate, and I allude specially to the propriety of a reference of that bill to such committee not because I happen to be a member thereof, but it will serve as an illustration of the propriety of distributing our bills to the several committees clothed with jurisdiction of the subject-matter to be considered. The Committee on Coast Defenses has, from my knowledge, been investigating that great and important question for the last month or six weeks. It had before it a large number of experts from the War and Navy Departments, and has gone into the subject thoroughly. At its head is the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. SQUIRE, with whom is associated the Senator from Connecticut, General HAWLEY, the Senator from Georgia, General GORDON, and the ex-Secretary of War, Senator PROCTOR, and other gentlemen of long and distinguished service, and I submit that the Committee on Coast Defenses thus constituted will be able to make the appropriation for coast defenses and fortifications wisely and with a just appreciation of the needs of this service.

This was one of the reasons which actuated the House in making the distribution of the appropriation bills. There was another reason which, I presume, possibly does not affect the Senate. It had grown to be the practice in the House that the Committee on Appropriations used its power to defeat other legislation. The Committee on Appropriations were in the habit of retaining these bills in committee until toward the close of the session, although prepared and ready to report at any time, and then when any measure came up which in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations ought to be defeated, the Committee on Appropriations would bring forward an appropriation bill, thrust it upon the attention of the House (such bill having the right of way), and insist that they must proceed with the appropriation bills or the wheels of the Government would stop.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether he has ever heard from any source any intimation that ever in any single case in the history of this body an appropriation bill has been held up for that purpose, either for delay or to antagonize other measures, or for any purpose whatever?

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator, if he observed what I stated a moment ago, will recall that I said distinctly that I did not know what the practice was in the Senate; I was stating one of the reasons which actuated the House in making the distribution; but whether that practice has obtained here I am not advised.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator from Michigan ever heard it intimated?

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, I have made no inquiry on that subject. I was confining myself to the reason which actuated the House in making a distribution of the appropriation bills. The Senator knows better than I can possibly know whether the appropriation bills are ever used in the Senate to thwart or impede the consideration of other measures, or to interfere in any way with other and important legislation.

Mr. HALE. I think I may say with entire confidence, appealing to all members, that in all the discussion and urgency with which this proposition has been pushed that has never been claimed.

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator will bear me witness that I have not so stated. On the contrary, I disclaimed any knowledge upon that subject.

Mr. HALE. On the contrary, the Committee on Appropriations has prepared and reported and pressed the bills as fast as it could be done.

Mr. BURROWS. But the evil grew to such magnitude in the House of Representatives that the practice became frequent of holding these bills back to prevent other legislation and then passing great appropriation bills, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, under a suspension of the rules.

There is another reason given for the distribution of these bills in the House of Representatives, and that was that it would create more general interest among the members of the body. I hazard nothing in saying that if we had a rule in the Senate that all proposed legislation of every character should be referred to one committee, it would be impossible to keep a quorum of the Senate present. The more general the distribution, and the more the labors of the body are distributed among its membership, the more general will be the interest, and the greater will be the attendance and attention to public business.

But it is suggested that if we are to make the distribution of these bills among the various committees, why not assign to the Committee on Patents the appropriations for patents and to the Judiciary Committee the appropriations for the judicial service. A sufficient answer to that proposition is that there is no such scheme proposed. These fourteen general appropriation bills cover in fact every conceivable branch of the public service. It is simply porposed to put these bills with committees that have the subject-matter embraced in those bills under special consideration.

These were some of the considerations which influenced the House in distributing the appropriation bills. There were other reasons assigned, which I will not detain the Senate to enumerate.

But it is said, among other things, that it is necessary that these appropriations shall be in charge of one committee, that such committee may confer with the Committee on Finance and ascertain the probabilities as to revenue, so that they may make their appropriations to conform to the receipts of the Government.

I remember the statement of General Garfield in the House that it was important that the distribution should not be made; that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means should stand "back and back," the one facing the resources of the Government and the other its expenditures. One would judge from the argument that it is the habit of the Committee on Appropriations constantly to confer with the Committee on Finance, to ascertain how much money there probably would be in the Treasury, and for the Finance Committee to confer constantly with the Committee on Appropriations with a view of advising that committee how much money could be expended. Judge Kelley said a word in regard to that, to which I beg leave to call attention, which, I think, is quite pertinent. Judge Kelley, in reply to that suggestion, said:

> Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman from Georgia seems to have fallen into an error as to the functions of our Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee report at long intervals, according to the history of our country, bills for raising revenue, and then until the season comes for reporting another bill, changing the scope or system of revenue, the Ways and Means Committee have nothing to do with it. The idea that each year the Ways and Means Committee provides as much money as the Appropriations Committee wants to appropriate or Congress wants to expend is a fanciful theory. It has no foundation, or at least has had none during the sixteen years I have had the honor to be on the Committee on Ways and Means. We have never heard of the Appropriations Committee intimating to the Committee on Ways and Means what amount of money they were likely to appropriate, nor have I heard, on the other hand, of the Committee on Ways and Means saying to the Committee on Appropriations, we will not give you more than so much money. I am quite sure the business men of the country would be frightened from their propriety if they were to hear it was now to be so arranged that the tariff should be changed by each Congress to meet the opinions of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees. The theory is a purely fanciful one.

Judge Kelley said further on, in reply to another suggestion, which I try to quote in this connection:

> Sir, it may be that the wisdom and honesty of the House are concentrated in a single committee thereof, but I do not believe it. I find myself one of 325 chosen Representatives, who, I believe, present a fair average of the prosperous and intelligent men of their respective districts. If it is true that we need but 15 men to determine what appropriations ought to be made, what existing offices ought to be abolished or reduced in consideration under the plea of economy, and what laws ought to be repealed or enacted, why not change our laws and save the pay of the other 310 members? If, sir, you have a better guaranty of integrity and intelligence in the case of a committee of 15, operating, so far as the public is concerned, in the dark, with a guardian at the door of the committee room to prevent intruders from spying into the procedure, than you have with 325 men, each directly responsible to an intelligent constituency, operating in the broadest electric light, with the representatives of the press eyeing them with the microscope and the telescope in order that every constituent may judge of the wisdom and integrity of their acts—if the secret committee offers the better guaranty I have miscalculated probabilities.

Mr. President, the chief objection urged in the House at the time this distribution was made, and the chief objection presented here to the distribution of these bills, that the membership of the Senate may participate in the great work of this body, is that it would increase expenditures, and that it would not be safe to trust to the other committees of this body the appropriation of public funds. That was combated at the time in the House of Representatives, but of course it could be answered only as a matter of speculation. But we have now had the practical working of this distribution in the House of Representatives, and I have taken occasion to have prepared a statement showing the aggregate of appropriations for ten years previous to this distribution and the ten years since, the appropriations carried by the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations made by the committees to whom the bills went after distribution. The bills referred to the other committees in the House of Representatives aggregate in appropriations, ten years previous to the distribution, $955,000,000, and after the distribution, during ten years, the same bills carried $1,470,000,000, in round numbers, or an increase of the appropriations by the committees to whom these bills were distributed of $533,000,000.

The six bills left with the Committee on Appropriations during the ten years preceding the distribution carried $1,256,000,000, and after the distribution the committee retaining these six bills made an increase of $878,000,000. The increase of appropriation in the eight bills not reported by the Committee on Appropriations during the ten years of the distribution was $533,000,000 and the in-

crease in the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations was $878,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator——

Mr. BURROWS. In a moment. Of course it is fair to say that the expenditures of the Government in all branches greatly increased, but it demonstrates the one fact that with the bills the Committee on Appropriations retained the appropriations increased to $878,000,000, while the other bills were increased only $533,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Now, is it not a fact——

Mr. BURROWS. Allow me to conclude the statement.

Mr. HALE. Very well; I will wait.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to say one thing further. The only instance of a decrease in appropriations on any bill is that of the Army bill, which was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The decrease in that committee during the ten years after the distribution was nearly $19,000,000. I cite this simply as tending to show that the claim of Senators that the distribution of these bills will tend to increase expenditures is not borne out by the history of the appropriations.

Mr. HALE. Now will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Is it not the fact that when the Senator adds together the items of appropriations on the bills left in the hands of the Appropriations Committee and compares them with the bills reported by the several committees, the great increase in ten years that is charged to the Committee on Appropriations comes from the consideration that is always occurring to us here, and that is, the overwhemingly large pension appropriations? That bill was retained by the Committee on Appropriations, and they are made subject to the charge that their aggregate appropriations had largely increased when a great portion of the increase was attributable to the immense and constantly growing aggregate of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. From thirty to one hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BURROWS. If the Senator will allow me one word there I will yield the floor and the Senator from New Hampshire can reply, or I will yield to the Senator in just a minute.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the Senator will cover it all.

Mr. BURROWS. Possibly I will not cover it as the Senator from New Hampshire can, who is so familiar with the pension question. What is said by the Senator from Maine is true, that the pension appropriations have largely increased. That bill was left to the Committee on Appropriations; and while I include in this statement the increase of pensions, the Senator will observe that I also include in the other statement the increase in the appropriations for the Post-Office service, amounting to $319,000,000. If you will eliminate $319,000,000 from the Post-Office appropriations on the one hand and strike out the increase by reason of pensions on the other, you still have an increase of $195,000,000 under the bills distributed, and an increase of $137,000,000 by the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I have submitted reluctantly all I care to say on this subject. I rose simply for the purpose of stating that, so far as the House was concerned, this distribution has worked well; it has contributed to the general interest in legislation in that body; it has facilitated the consideration and the report of the appropriation bills; and I believe that the proposed distribution, if made here, would increase the general interest of the individual membership of this body in matters of vital and common concern, facilitate the business of the Senate, and promote the public welfare.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Senator from Michigan takes his seat I would be glad to ask him to state again the aggregate amount of the increase of appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations in those ten years. What was the total?

Mr. BURROWS. The total was $878,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Although these figures are somewhat illusory, if I may add a word, I will state that I have a document before me which shows them in detail, and of this increase $719,648,000 was for pensions alone. So nearly the total increase of the six bills of which the Senator speaks was owing to increases of pensions, certainly to the extent of $719,000,000 in ten years.

Mr. BURROWS. That is true. The increase of pensions was $719,000,000; but, leaving out the increase in pensions, the increase aside from that was $138,000,000, while the increase carried by the bills assigned to the other committees, leaving out the Post-Office appropriations of $319,000,000, which, of course, increased very largely year by year, was $195,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Michigan, who comes to this body as a veteran of the House, is most interesting. In the reasons he gave why the House adopted the system of distribution he struck upon one which was, as I believe and know from long service in the House, the great and prevailing reason that brought about the radical change adopted there. It became a necessity. The conduct and management of appropriation bills, in the manipulation by which they were made to antagonize other measures, the delays to which the body was subjected, with the result that appropriation bills carrying millions of dollars, after having thwarted the purposes of the House and turned aside other legislation, were passed under a suspension of the rules, became intolerable.

I know from my service in the House of Representatives on the Committee on Appropriations that there was a world-wide difference between the condition there and what it is here. There was there constantly occurring what never occurs here, the question whether or not the House would take up appropriation bills. Those bills were antagonized to at one time and destroyed the right of way and turned aside a great revenue bill which was being presented. In my day—and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] will bear me out, and I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], in the statement—there were constantly those conflicts until it became the settled conviction of men in the House that the only remedy was to destroy the evil, and the only way to destroy the evil was in the manner indicated. That never obtains here. No man, however long he may have been in service here, has ever known an appropriation bill to be used for any purpose except to expedite business. The Committee on Appropriations, in dealing with these bills, sits day and night and reports them here at as early a day as possible, and at a very early day after receiving them from the House of Representatives, and by common consent and the rule and practice of the Senate they have the right of way over everything else and are pushed at once to a passage, and thereby got out of the way of other bills.

There is another thing to which the Senator has referred, a belief that appropriation bills would be matured more quickly, sent to this body at earlier dates, and thereby expedite early adjournments. The result is found to be precisely the opposite. I have tables here—I did not have the pleasure, as I was called out, of listening to all the Senator from Iowa said, and it may be that he put them in—showing that since this change, instead of the appropriation bills in the House, which are in the hands of the individual committees, coming to this body earlier than they did when they were prepared and put through by a single Appropriations Committee, they are later now. So that, interesting as the Senator's statement is, and well conceived and presented as it was, attracting the attention of this body, the two great reasons which he has furnished disappear absolutely, one great reason not obtaining here, and never has, and the other, the expedition of the bills, not being borne out by the facts.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not propose at this late hour in the afternoon to undertake to contribute anything of consequence to the discussion. I have listened to it as one of the most interesting and practical discussions which has occurred in the Senate for many years. It has been argued with great earnestness and ability and fullness of information and argument on both sides; but I have listened in vain, having heard nearly every speech which has been made, for any answer to, or any attempt to answer, the one important argument which has been adduced against making this change—if one has been made it has been when I did not happen to hear that part of the debate—and that is, if this change be adopted, there will be no responsible body or organ or authority anywhere to graduate the total expenses of this Government with a consideration of what the Government can afford in each year. Every item of expenditure is to be made, so far as this change goes, by gentlemen interested in a particular subject, for I take it that it is the mark of a good committee, as well as the old maxim of law says it is the mark of a good judge, to expand its jurisdiction. Every committee which proposes one of these great appropriations of public money is to do it without the slightest consideration of what the total expenditure of this year can be or ought to be.

Take the Committee on Commerce, which has the separate jurisdiction of an appropriation bill now, and has had for a good while, and I therefore take that for an illustration. The river and harbor needs of this country, according to the estimates, would require an annual expenditure of seventy or eighty million dollars. It would be money well spent; it would be money which you and I, being business men—if we had the responsibilities and the properties and the duties which this Government has—would rightfully and wisely expend upon rivers and harbors alone, if we had the money and could afford it, in any particular year; and yet Congress never expends more than from 20 to 25 per cent of the amount which the War Department has recommended as required by national and international commerce.

So take the matter of coast defenses. It would be a wise thing, if we had the money, to expend $100,000,000 this year in defending our coasts.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is utterly and absolutely impossible.

Mr. HOAR. I understand it is absolutely impossible. It is impossible considered in relation to the revenues of the Government; but if we had a hundred million dollars in the Treasury which we could apply economically and profitably to that subject and could get a complete system of coast defenses to-morrow in this country, it would be a reasonable and wise expenditure to make. We could not enter into a foreign war, as everybody knows, this year, if the necessity for one came, except at the risk of having our great commercial cities bombarded and laid under contribution.

So in regard to the Navy. Everybody knows that the public desire for a complete and fit navy to patrol the seas and protect our commerce could not be gratified in one year or in ten. So of the matter of public buildings and of a great many other things. There ought to be and should be somewhere a committee or other authority whose duty it is to take every one of these expenditures and see what can be fairly and conveniently afforded in any one year, without bankrupting or discrediting the Government or putting undue burdens upon the people.

What householder, what farmer, what business man makes his annual expenditure for desirable objects without counting the cost, adding up all the expenditures, and considering what that year can spare or can afford?

Now, it is said that the House of Representatives, formerly having a committee whose duty it was to make that estimate and consideration there, has changed that policy. For that reason so much the more the Senate ought to adhere to it. The House could not safely or wisely have made such a change in its policy unless it had known that elsewhere all these expenditures were to be brought under a single eye, compared with each other, and their comparative importance considered in relation to the resources and the capacity of the Government.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. HOAR. For what purpose—to ask a question or to make a speech?

Mr. HILL. To ask a question.

Mr. HOAR. I will hear the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator whether he thinks that the few appropriation bills which have already been reported by the Appropriations Committee have been made with an understanding of what the House committee is going to report hereafter?

Mr. HOAR. I will answer the question. They have been made with an understanding as to what the Senate committee intends to report hereafter, however the House committee may report.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the Senator, further, how can the Senate committee know what they are going to report on bills which have not yet reached them from the House? Have they predetermined the question?

Mr. HOAR. Our Appropriations Committee is made up of men whose minds have been soaked with this knowledge and information, who have been in the habit of doing this thing year after year. They are absolutely cognizant; they know what is coming over from the House of Representatives; they know what is going to pass in that House in all the general items of appropriation just as they know what is likely to happen in the Senate or to happen in their own committee.

Mr. HILL. How could the Senate Committee on Appropriations know that the District of Columbia appropriation bill was going to be defeated yesterday?

Mr. HOAR. There will be a District of Columbia appropriation bill here before this session is over. The Senator need not be frightened about that. The Committee on Appropriations deal with every one of these appropriation bills with a full knowledge that whether it passes before or after a certain time there has got to be $6,500,000 appropriated for the expenditures of the District of Columbia.

That brings me to the only other point which I ought to make, and that is that this is, as it seems to me, a very bad time in the session and in the year to make this proposed change. The Senator from Idaho, it is true, introduced this resolution at the very beginning of the present session, as hundreds, and I do not know but thousands, of resolutions and bills are introduced by Senators to bring the matters to which they refer before the body. He called it up two weeks after, made some remarks upon it, and dismissed it again. It has now got to be within three weeks of the end of winter, within three weeks of the time when, in the short session of Congress, Congress is ready to adjourn. Now the Appropriations Committee consists of men who, by an experience of years, are thoroughly familiar with this subject, and with this subject in the aspect in which I have endeavored to state it, and they are prepared to take up and deal with this years' expenses by the experience they have had and the expectation they have had up to within a day or two, that, of course, they were to discharge this function. On the other hand, the membership of these various committees is made up very largely of new men, of men who have not special experience in the subjects committed to those very committees which men of long service on those committees have.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish this point, and I shall then yield to the Senator from Idaho.

I have looked over these various committees, and the Senate will be surprised to see on each of them how many gentlemen there are who are altogether new to the subjects proposed to be committed to those committees; some of them new to service in the Senate; none of them, even the elders, having had the responsibility of dealing with these subjects with reference to making appropriations.

It seems to me that, if the resolution passes, it ought not to take effect until another session of Congress; that it will be a very bad thing indeed for us to make this sudden change, wrenching the proceedings of the Senate all awry, committing these subjects to men who have not expected to take them up until within the last two or three days of the present session. At this time, when we are so eager to have a short session, and both parties are so eager to have an economical session, I think that it is very unwise indeed to make our appropriations and go before the people with appropriations made without any common oversight of the whole, and made by gentlemen who have not even during the present session of Congress been preparing themselves to deal with the subjects proposed to be committed to them.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire to interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts to make the statement that at the close of the last session of Congress I introduced this resolution. It was not allowed to be considered then. That would seem to have been a very proper time, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, for its consideration. At the very beginning of the present session I reintroduced it, having given notice at the previous session that I should do so. There has been opportunity at all times to consider it, but no time seems to have been a fitting time. I should have been glad to have it considered earlier, but I was put off by one pretext and another until the bond bill came in, and pretty soon the tariff bill will come up. So it does not seem as though there was any fitting time for this resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator understood, and the Senate understood, that I did not make that observation as imputing any laches to the Senator, but only as pointing out, however the fact may have occurred, that the committees of this body, the Appropriations Committee and the others, have not been expecting to have any change of jurisdiction in the middle of the session. I think the matter ought to go to the Committee on Rules. I think so for the reasons stated by the Senator from Iowa, among others, that this resolution cuts into a great many rules that are not named in the resolution. That was one reason for the rule, which was debated when the matter was taken up, which required notice to be given of every rule and part of a rule to be affected by a proposed amendment. Here are a great many rules that will become totally inoperative, or at any rate difficult of construction and application if this amendment shall pass.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Maine yield to a motion to adjourn? It is now twenty minutes to 6 o'clock.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Let us have some understanding about this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DUBOIS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANTLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] on the main question. I do not know whether it is proper for me to vote on this question or not.

Mr. BERRY. If my colleague [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MANTLE. Then I withhold my vote and announce that, if he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PETTIGREW (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], and I vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. QUAY. If my colleague were present, I have no doubt he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL. I vote "yea," then.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with that Senator, but will transfer

my pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], and let my vote stand.

Mr. FAULKNER. I suggest that that Senator would vote the same way as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Wyoming asked me to do this, and said to me a few days ago that he wished me to protect his pair.

Mr. FAULKNER. The Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] asked me to protect his pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. CLARK. On the main question I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on this vote and I should vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER. I think there is some mistake by the Senator from Idaho in reference to the pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. He is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and I so stated to the Senator from Wyoming some time to-day. I understand that there is a letter here from the Senator from New York making that statement.

Mr. NELSON. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DUBOIS. I became a little confused. There is no question about how the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote. His pair and mine have been transferred and the senior Senator from New Jersey stands paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I think they would both vote "nay." I am quite certain the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER. I question that very seriously. From information I have, I think the Senator from Idaho is mistaken.

Mr. LINDSAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. Not supposing the pair extended to a motion to adjourn, I voted. I transfer my pair to my colleague [Mr. BLACKBURN], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I rise to assist in this matter if possible. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] is absent and not paired on this question. He would vote "yea," if present, and so the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], who has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania, was at liberty to vote on this question, and voted "yea," as both Senators would vote the same way.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I could be permitted to make the statement, I am quite sure I should get it right.

Mr. GEORGE (after having voted in the negative). I desire to know if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LINDSAY. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] and will let my vote in the affirmative stand.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I am somewhat responsible for the pairs on the Republican side, and as I am frequently called to account the next day by Senators saying that their pair had not been protected, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], who, I think, has voted.

Mr. FAULKNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], but I am thoroughly aware of the obligations of a pair and my duties under it, and I am voting in accordance with what I regard as my understanding with him.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Hampshire has charge of party pairs, but this is in no degree a party question. The pairs which are arranged on political questions are not applicable in the least to this question. I am paired generally with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], yet he and I agree on this question. So the arrangement does not apply here in the least.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the two Senators from West Virginia would vote differently on this proposition. However, I accept the little lecture from the Senator from Maine with all due humility.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ought to have objected to debate on the part of the Senator from Maine, and I do object to debate on the part of my colleague. [Laughter.]

I voted "nay." I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] on all political questions and on any other question where he sends me notice. He sent me notice by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who did not give it to me. Am I right, I ask?

Mr. GORMAN. I received notice from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] requesting me to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to his pair, and asking him to observe it on all votes on this question. In the press of matters I failed to give the notice to the Senator from New Hampshire until after he had voted.

Mr. CHANDLER. Therefore, I now withdraw my vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] would vote "nay" if he were present. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] that the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY], if he is not paired, be paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE].

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Idaho be responsible for that statement?

Mr. DUBOIS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] had recorded his vote before I could obtain the floor. I was about to say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], my colleague, is also absent. He would vote "yea," if present, and it would seem to me that it would be proper to pair him with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] instead of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], who is present.

Mr. ALDRICH. Two pairs have been announced with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. VILAS (after having voted in the affirmative). I was about to correct that, if the Senator from Rhode Island will allow me for a moment. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and he desired me to protect him upon this vote. I transferred my pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], but inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] says that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] has a special pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who is absent, it is unnecessary that the transfer should be made, and my vote can stand because I am at liberty to vote irrespective of the pair.

Mr. HILL. The difficulty with that arrangement is that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] and he has transferred his pair and voted.

Mr. PASCO. That is the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. I transferred my pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. If that stands I have a right to vote. Otherwise I shall withdraw my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. Let it stand.

Mr. VILAS. I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] transfer his pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES].

Mr. LINDSAY. Then I will transfer my pair so that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] and let my vote stand.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the result be announced.

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the affirmative). There has been a good deal of controversy about pairs, which induces me to announce the fact that I have a standing pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. But as he and I always agree upon questions of adjournment and absolutely agree upon the question lying behind this adjournment, I voted "yea," and I elect to let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I desire simply to say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] has a perfect right to vote, because the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] is paired on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] by an arrangement made to-day.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the result be announced. I insist upon proceeding in order.

Mr. VEST. I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. He and I agree on this question, but at the personal request of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] I announce a special pair upon this particular vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. HILL. A pair has already been announced for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. VEST. I understand; but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] agrees on this question with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from New York is right as to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], of course I do not wish to be——

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to state how it is. He has charge of the pairs on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] being ill——

Mr. PETTIGREW. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to state how it is.

Mr. ALLISON. At the personal and special request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who asked me this morning to secure a pair for him on every phase of this question, I asked the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to pair with him, and I hope that pair will stand unless some other Senator is paired with him.

Mr. PASCO. I will state, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], that the arrangement was made as he states, but the proposed change is entirely fair, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] is left paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. HILL. I made the arrangement at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO]. I did not suppose any other arrangement would be made without his consent. The only way to keep the pairs straight is to have one man look after them.

Mr. VEST (after having voted in the negative). I withdraw my vote under my special pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hoar,	Quay,
Allison,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Sewell,
Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan.	Thurston,
Bate,	Gear,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Berry,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Walthall,
Brice,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Wetmore,
Caffery,	Gray,	Perkins,	Wolcott.
Call,	Hale,	Platt,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Pugh,	

NAYS—29.

Baker,	Davis,	Martin,	Squire,
Blanchard,	Dubois,	Mills,	Tillman,
Brown,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Burrows,	George,	Palmer,	White,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	Wilson.
Carter,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	
Chilton,	Hill,	Proctor,	
Daniel,	Lodge,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—26.

Allen,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Blackburn,	Irby,	Morrill,	Teller,
Cameron,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Vest,
Cannon,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Kyle,	Sherman,	Warren.
Clark,	McBride,	Shoup,	
Elkins,	Mantle,	Smith,	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 7, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 6, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the regular order.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will withhold that for a moment, I have a matter of some importance which will take but a few moments——

Mr. DINGLEY. I regret very much that I can not withhold the demand; but more than 50 gentlemen have just such matters, and I have been compelled to refuse all such requests.

Mr. BAILEY. This will take but two or three minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I regret very much to be compelled to decline; but if I grant this request, I would have no ground on which I could refuse it to others. I think under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must demand the regular order.

I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2904.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893;

A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation;

A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

BOND REDEMPTION FUND.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I was recognized last night just before the termination of the session, but the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN] desires to occupy ten minutes this morning, and with the permission of the Chair I will not take the floor until after he concludes.

Mr. MCLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take any part in this debate. When the bond bill was before the House a few days ago I fully expressed my views thereon.

The silver question has been so thoroughly discussed that it is not now a question of argument. It is a question of brute force and money on the one side, and of manhood and votes on the other side. A reference, however, to the State which I have the honor to represent, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON], renders it necessary for me to say something in addition to what my friend and colleague, Mr. TALBERT, said last evening on the spur of the moment.

In the first place, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] speaks of South Carolina "carrying us into a new secession movement."

Mr. Chairman, it is a useless task to discuss the motives which led to that terrible war. Neither the right nor wrong belongs to one side alone. But I want to say here, that our people acquiesce in the result of the war; and that to-day there is not a State in this Union whose people are more loyal, more devoted to our common country, than the people of South Carolina. I venture the assertion that should foreign aggression threaten us no more loyal sons would be found in any section of this Union.

Our people fought not for slavery, but because they believed that the principles of local self-government, equality in taxation, and all those fundamental questions which have lain beneath every contest for freedom were at stake; and, Mr. Chairman, to-day we are just as devoted to the principles of liberty and of justice as any people. It is time, Mr. Chairman, when the last vestige of bitterness should be wiped out, when the only memories left, is pride and glory for those of both sides who fought, bled, and died for principles which they believed were sacred. Our people are glad, sir, that the Union was preserved. The time has come when the people of South Carolina, are prouder of these United States, more loyal to a nation's flag, than they are to any State, whose star is but one of those constituting the bright galaxy, which makes America the grandest and greatest among the nations of this earth.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when Representatives on the floor of this House, who for cheap applause would revive the bitter recollections of thirty years ago, should be frowned down by the great, the generous, and the forgiving American public. God speed the day!

It comes, sir, with poor grace for a Southern man to refer to his own section, his own people, a sister's children, as the gentleman from North Carolina did last evening. I yield to none in love for this great country, and my patriotism is not bounded by State lines, not cramped by partisan bigotry, nor yet paralyzed by race prejudices. But, Mr. Chairman, I love my native home, the soil which gave me birth. I love my people, hot-headed, impulsive, but loyal and true. Their faults I would condone, their virtues I would extol. And, Mr. Chairman, I shrink in horror from the "bird which would befoul its own nest."

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] refers in bitter terms to a speech made by Senator TILLMAN in the Senate as "hoisting the red flag of anarchy or the black flag of dynamiters in this country," and as trying "to carry us over into a new secession movement." I am not here to answer for Senator TILLMAN; he is fully capable of taking care of himself; but, sir, it would have been better had some Senator possessed the nerve and courage to reply in an arena where he could be fitly answered, not behind these walls and through the eloquent mouth of the gentleman from North Carolina. In my State, when I thought Senator TILLMAN wrong I have said so, and opposed him; where

I thought him right, I defended him. Let me tell the gentleman from North Carolina that the manner in which this speech is received is an omen of trouble. Those awful words were but the echo of unexpressed thought in the bosoms of millions of American citizens. Instead of referring to Senator TILLMAN as an anarchist, let my friend turn his abuse upon those who rendered it possible for such utterances, to go unchallenged in the United States Senate. I was present, sir, and witnessed the shock to "Senatorial dignity," and when all eyes turned toward the "David" from New York he failed to produce his "sling" and smooth rocks which have slain so many Goliaths. There are all sorts of anarchists in this country; the poor devil, shivering with cold at a switch crossing, the maniac in the legislative gallery, and the fat, round anarchist, robed in power, who, by changing the unit of value, has robbed the toiler of his just reward, and the producer of the fruits of his labor.

Oppression and extortion in high places, breed the most disastrous forms of anarchism. Rid us of this class, and the former will disappear and the upper House recover its normal "Senatorial dignity," which of late has been so rudely disturbed. [Laughter and applause.]

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE was recognized.

Mr. BRUMM. I would like to have the gentleman from North Dakota resume the floor for the purpose of answering a question for information. I am sure that the House will extend his time, because this is a matter of a great deal of importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had yielded the floor and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRUMM. I hope the gentleman will take the floor——

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. May I resume the floor for the remaining eight minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been recognized.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I have on former occasions so fully discussed the general propositions involved in the free coinage of silver by this country alone that I had proposed at this time to largely confine myself to some observations on the subject of prices of certain commodities, but on that topic the very able argument and demonstration of the gentleman from North Dakota, just concluded, seems to have produced so much feeling and excitement that, as a matter of prudence, to allow the blood to cool, which now seems somewhat heated, I propose first to present briefly an answer which seems conclusive to the question which has been repeatedly asked in this House and elsewhere as to the reasons for the passage of the act of 1873, if confessedly by friend and foe the silver dollar was then worth 103 cents. It would seem that if such were the fact that it was a vain and useless thing, and in the interest of accurate history upon a subject about which there have been so many loose statements and so much reckless misstatement I ask the attention of the House for a few moments. We were in 1873 on a paper basis, there being no gold in circulation, nor silver, and our currency consisting at that time only of irredeemable paper.

Why, then, was it necessary to legislate upon the subject of coinage? It was because the friends of honest money looked forward to the time as not far distant when we should resume specie payments, and the legislation in relation to the mints was in such a discordant condition that it seemed necessary to codify and systematize it. In doing that it seemed desirable to put it upon a basis which should be permanent, which should be adapted not simply to the conditions of 1873, but to the conditions of 1879, of 1880 and succeeding years.

The recommendation for the passage of the mint act was made to Congress by a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury early in 1870. Accompanying it were communications alluding to the fact that the dollar of silver was then worth 103 cents, but that bill was pending in this House and in the other House for nearly three years. It was under consideration while times and circumstances and conditions were changing, and when the Forty-second Congress met, in December, 1872, it was confronted with a different condition of affairs than existed when the bill was first presented in April, 1870, and the Secretary of the Treasury, in communicating to Congress under date of the 2d of December, 1872, called attention to the changed condition of affairs. I read from the report of Secretary Boutwell, and from that part wherein he speaks of this very act, the passage of which he recommended.

In the last ten years the commercial value of silver has depreciated about 3 per cent as compared with gold, and its use as currency has been discontinued in Germany and some other countries. The financial condition of the United States has prevented the use of silver currency for more than ten years, and I am of opinion that upon grounds of public policy no attempt should be made to introduce it, but that coinage should be limited to commercial purposes and designed exclusively for commercial uses with other nations.

The intrinsic value of a metallic currency should correspond to its commercial value, or metal should be used only for the coinage of tokens redeemable by the Government at their nominal value. As the depreciation of silver is likely to continue, it is impossible to issue coin redeemable in gold without ultimate loss to the Government, for when the difference becomes considerable holders will present the silver for redemption and leave it in the hands of the Government, to be disposed of subsequently at a loss.

If the policy should be adopted of issuing silver coin irredeemable, but whose intrinsic and nominal value should correspond to gold, the time must come when the country would suffer from the presence of a depreciated silver currency, not redeemable by the Government nor current in the channels of trade.

These were words of almost prophetic wisdom.

At the head of the Treasury Department then was one of the ablest and most accomplished financiers that ever occupied that position in the history of this nation, a straight-forward, hard-headed, broad-minded Yankee, trained in the school of practical business affairs, who looked, not simply at the conditions that were present, but at the causes which produced those conditions.

Now, let us see what they were? On December 2, 1872, he made that communication to Congress, written presumably in November. I have before me a statement of the Director of the Mint of the price of silver, month by month, during the year 1872. Commencing in January, it was $1.33 an ounce, and the silver dollar was worth $1.03. In November, when this report was written, and the attention of Congress was called to the fact, the price of silver was $1.30 an ounce, and the silver dollar was worth less than $1.01.

During those few months it had depreciated 2 cents on a dollar, and everything indicated that the depreciation would continue as it did. Why? The Secretary of the Treasury looked undoubtedly at the production of silver. When his recommendation was first made in 1870, the production of silver in the United States was $16,000,000, coinage value. In the next year it had increased nearly 50 per cent, and was $23,000,000. The following year it was $28,000,000, and the next year it was $35,000,000, a constant and progressive increase in the production. The production of the world showed a practically similar increase, rising from $51,000,000 in 1870 to $65,000,000 in 1873 and to nearly $82,000,000 in 1874. So that when this act was last presented and the attention of Congress was asked to it by the careful financiers who were watching history and watching the economic forces that were at work they presumed that these causes would continue, and they desired to place this Government upon a basis, when it resumed specie payments, where it would not be confronted with the necessity of using but one metal and having no gold. That that was understood by Congress I desire to demonstrate by quoting from the speech of the chairman of the Coinage Committee, Hon. William D. Kelley, of my own State. I quote from the Congressional Globe of 1872. He says:

Hence all experience has shown you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage which shall circulate in all parts of your country as legal tender to a limited amount and be redeemable at its face by your Government. The values of gold and silver—

This is what I wish to call attention to—

The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You can not determine this year what will be the relative values of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago. They are 16 now.

So I say that the careful student of history will see that that act was passed for a proper and wise purpose, based upon the conditions existing at that time and future conditions that must inevitably result from forces then in full play.

When the new Congress assembled, in December, 1873, the Secretary of the Treasury made reference incidentally to the fact that this country had "adopted the gold standard and demonetized silver," and spoke of "the depreciation in the market value of silver as compared with gold, which has been going on for some time," and of the purchase by the Government of "as much silver bullion as could be conveniently used in giving employment to the mints," thus clearly indicating the conditions existing and the governmental policy being pursued. The Director of the Mint, in his report under date of November 1, 1873, discusses the effect and operation of the act of 1873 at great length, under the heading, printed in capital letters, "Gold the standard or measure of value—silver subsidiary."

I hold here in my hand that report. With that official statement and explanation before them, with the fact that at that time, when the new Congress assembled, in December, 1873, the price of silver was only $1.27 an ounce and the value of the silver dollar only 98 cents, was any movement made to repeal that act? In this House were such eminent bimetallists as Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, who has only just closed his long and distinguished service in this House. At the head of the Democratic membership of the Coinage Committee was the present eminent Senator from Texas, ROGER Q. MILLS. In this House were the now venerable William S. Holman, of Indiana, and Senator Beck, of Kentucky, all ardent bimetallists.

With the facts stated in that report before them, with the value of silver less than the value of gold in the dollar, was any move-

ment made to repeal that act? In former history, in 1864, when Congress made a mistake and undertook to regulate the value of gold, and the mistake was discovered, in less than fifteen days the same Congress which passed the bill had blotted from the statute books their own work. Did they do it in 1873 or 1874? No. On the contrary, the eminent Senator from Nevada—and Nevada was represented then by those two distinguished and able champions of silver, JOHN P. JONES and WILLIAM M. STEWART—the eminent Senator STEWART from Nevada said, on the 11th day of February, 1874, in the Senate of the United States:

I want the standard gold, and no paper money not redeemable in gold.

And less than ten days later he said:

Gold is the universal standard of the world. Everybody knows what a dollar of gold is worth.

Will gentlemen undertake to say that the act of 1873 was clandestinely passed without purpose? If it was, let me submit to you a practical question. In 1876, when the Democratic national convention assembled and sought with a fine-tooth comb to find all the sins of transgression and omission committed by the Republican party, did it make the least mention of this terrible crime against silver? In that convention were such eminent silver champions as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], who was on the committee on resolutions, and who had been a member of this House in 1873, when this bill passed. The subject of finance was so thoroughly considered in that committee and convention that there were two reports and a heated discussion on it.

In that convention sat my genial friend whose seat I now occupy, Mr. LESTER of Georgia, one of the vice-presidents of the convention; his colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TURNER; the aggressive champion of free silver from Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, and that eminent Democrat, prominent then, prominent often in this House and elsewhere, the Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. Yet in that memorable arraignment of all the sins of the Republican party, real and fancied, no man undertook to charge to it the "enormous, monstrous crime of 1873." Why not? No man who reads the arraignment of the Republican party embraced in that platform of 1876 will believe that this charge would have been omitted had there been any basis on which to plausibly rest it.

But now what has been the effect of that act? If it has reduced prices, as alleged—if the demonetization of silver has sent down the prices of the products of this country, of the wheat, of the cotton, and the other products—if that is true, it is worthy of serious attention and ought to be carefully considered. Gentlemen said last night, and gentlemen frequently say, "Here is a list of 26 articles, and the depreciation has been so much." Do they name the articles? Certainly, they name two articles. We have been deluged with charts, not as illustrative and not as accurate as the charts that have been exhibited in your sight to-day by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]; but in former years we have been deluged with charts showing the prices of what? Silver, wheat, and cotton. Nothing else.

Now, then, is there any connection between them? If the reduction in the price of wheat and the price of cotton was due to the appreciation of the money metal or the medium of exchange, the same law and the same force would apply to all the other products, unless there are exceptional forces which make a difference in particular cases. If the appreciation of the money standard has caused a depreciation in the price of wheat, it would cause a depreciation in the price of corn, oats, potatoes, and tobacco. Certainly it would. But it did not. No, sir; the reason why wheat depreciated in price was because the cost of production had been lessened; the productive power of a day's work had been marvelously increased, as demonstrated to you by my friend from North Dakota, and because the cost of transportation had been wonderfully reduced. I read briefly from Schoenhof's "History of Money and Prices," just published, and you will find in the Statistical Abstract for 1894 the tables showing that in the single element of the cost of transportation there had been a reduction of 20 cents per bushel in the rates between Chicago and New York between 1873 and 1894.

Schoenhoff says:

The through freight charges on grain by the leading roads from Chicago to New York averaged about $1.20 per 100 pounds from November, 1865. They had fallen in 1870, for the same month, to 60 cents, and averaged at that rate till about 1873. Thence, in 1874 to 1880, the rates fell to 40 and 35 cents, and from thence came down to rates varying between 20 and 25 cents in 1890.

What is worthy of note is that rates of freight, when once lowered, have never come back to old positions. * * *

But taking the six months from July to January, when the bulk of the harvest is being shipped, we average for 1870, per bushel, 15¼ cents; for 1873 even, 25¼ cents; for 1876, 16 cents; for 1880 we have 14 cents; for 1884 we have 10 cents; for 1888 we have 8 cents; for 1890 we have about 4 to 5 cents, which is the average for 1892 and may be considered as the general average rate now. * * *

If we go back no further than 1873 we can state that a difference in freight charges from Chicago to New York of 20 cents per bushel over the present rates has accrued to the Eastern consumer and to the Western farmer alike. A further benefit to the Western farmer and the European consumer is in the fall of ocean freight of fully 10 cents in this period of about twenty years.

We in America certainly have to take this margin into consideration (about 30 cents per bushel, the saving of freight to the consumer of the farmer's surplus) when we speak of the fall in the price of his wheat.

Subtract 20 cents from the price of 1873 and you will see how it affects the average price of wheat in these years.

But let me call your attention to the contrasts in the matter of culture and prices between wheat and corn. Both are food products. Wheat is mostly produced on large farms, by the employment of great amounts of capital, by the application of improved machinery and power; produced in exceptional localities. Corn is produced in every State in this great Union. It is consumed generally where it is produced. The element of the reduction in the cost of transportation does not enter into its value. The employment of power increasing the productiveness of individual labor does not materially enter into its value. The small farmer grows corn just as he always did and pursues practically the same methods in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in Oregon, and all over the country. He follows his own plow, behind his own team, cuts his own corn, husks his own corn, and disposes of and frequently eats his own corn. There has been no material change in the methods of production. There has been no material change in the element of transportation, for corn is an article of home consumption; and there has been no material change in price. I have before me tables of prices furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, which I will insert in the RECORD. The price brought by a bushel of corn in 1872, immediately prior to the demonetization of silver, was 39.8 cents a bushel—the average price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not desire to interrupt the gentleman, but I desire to ask him for information—at what place?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. That is the average price throughout the country, given by the statistician of the Agricultural Department. In 1872 it was 39.8; in 1892 it was 39.3 cents per bushel. The average for the decade of 1870 to 1880 was 44.17 cents per bushel; for the decade between 1880 and 1890, 40.75 cents per bushel; for the first four years of the present decade, 41.25 cents per bushel. Allowing for the fact that there was some appreciation, some inflation of paper prices in the first decade, and you will find a wonderful stability in average price, because there were no exceptional influences affecting the price.

Take oats, produced largely in the same way. I am not going into details, but the prices in 1872 were 33.6; in 1892, 31.7, and the average for the first decade was 36, for the second 32, and for the third 33. Take potatoes, in which there is no special improvement in the methods of cultivation. You plant them as you always did and you dig them as you always did. They were worth 59 cents in 1872, 67 in 1892, with the average price corresponding from year to year.

Referring briefly to the other commodity so frequently mentioned, the price of cotton, which has depreciated during these years; and why? There have been improved methods of cultivation and handling. I remember something of the rather primitive methods that were in vogue thirty years ago, when I was trying to raise cotton, and pretty unsuccessfully. With respect to that commodity, also, you will find that the cost of transportation has diminished just as the cost of transportation of wheat has diminished, the conditions being the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I understand him to say that there have been some improvements in the methods of production of cotton. I wish he would state to the House just one.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. In the application of power to ginning, and the application of power in baling and compressing. When I was raising cotton we ginned by hand and pressed by turning the long lever with a mule, and you do not do it so now. Then enormous fields of extra production have been opened.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the gentleman if he is not aware of the fact that the great mass of the cotton crop is ginned and pressed in that way to-day?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am not aware that the vast majority of the crop is produced in that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And does not the gentleman know that the ginning has nothing to do with the production?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am aware that the application of steam power has made a good deal of a revolution in many localities, though possibly not in the gentleman's section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. If it had made a revolution anywhere it would have made it in my section, because that is a great cotton region.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. It is possible, Mr. Chairman, that there is some section in this great country where the possibilities of modern improvement and progress have not reached, and if so I make the necessary exception.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but——

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. And I do not want the gentleman to interrupt me, because my time is limited. Now, Mr. Chairman, the element of transportation in determining price is a very

important one, and has changed materially since 1872. I read further from Schoenhof on Money and Prices:

In cotton the rates by steamer from New Orleans to New York, in 1873, averaged 60 cents per 100 pounds; in 1880, 45 cents; in 1892, 32 cents. The all-rail rates from Atlanta, Ga., in 1886 were 85 cents; in 1893 they were 67 cents. Ocean rates have followed a similar course as in wheat.

Then, sir, another element in the question is that cotton seed is now worth about half as much as the staple, and was practically valueless in 1872. So that for the cotton crop, seed and staple, about as much is received now as in earlier years.

Again, take tobacco. What is the reason why the same forces which apply to the price of cotton should not apply to that of tobacco? The methods of the production of tobacco have not been materially changed, and the element of transportation is not involved to the same extent as in the case of cotton. Now, what has been the price? I have here the average price of tobacco for the decades I have been considering. For the first the average price has been 8.87, for the next 8.41, and for the third 8.01, showing a remarkable stability of price.

The fact is that exceptional influences, cheapening the cost of production and lessening the cost of transportation, have materially affected the prices of wheat and cotton, and have not operated to nearly the same extent on other agricultural products. They have, however, operated even more strongly on silver. The field of production has been vastly increased and the methods of mining, concentration, and reduction have been wonderfully cheapened and increased in effectiveness. This was fully explained by William H. Beck, a practical miner, in his testimony before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the Fifty-first Congress, in part as follows:

In my observation in the far West I see causes there that I think are tending very much to depreciate the value of silver. When I went to Montana in 1886 it cost us to transport our ores from Dillon to Omaha $24 per ton. That transportation now costs $10 per ton. It cost us then to treat the ores $17 a ton. Now it costs $8 and $10. Mining powder cost us 50 and 60 cents a pound. We can buy it now for 20 and 22 cents a pound. It cost us then to board a man $1 a day and more. We can do it now for a less sum. Machinery is better, and improvements in mining machinery are being continually made. Concentration of ores is extending very largely. Many of our ores that were considered of no value a few years ago are now quite profitable.

When I first went to Colorado in 1878 the superintendent of a silver mill at Georgetown told me that he could not afford to treat ores that assayed less than $20 to the ton. By concentration ores can now be profitably handled that yield as low as $5 a ton. By using scientific processes of treatment low-grade ores, running 2 or 3 ounces of silver and 3 or 4 or 5 per cent in lead, will yield a good profit.

So you have similar causes operating on wheat, cotton, and silver, and necessarily producing similar results. The price of each has fallen, but in different and varying degrees. Neither has any relation to the other nor influence on the other in matter of price, but each yields to the influences operating on itself, which, as I have shown, are effective to produce the result found, and a result not found in other commodities not subjected to these influences. Prices of many have remained stable, some have fallen, some have increased. No one disputes the marked increase in the rate of wages of labor, which enters as the most important element into the value of all commodities.

But, gentlemen say give us an increase in the amount of the circulating medium, give us, in other words, an inflation of the currency, and it will raise prices. Now, is that necessarily a fact? If it is a fact, why have not prices increased while we were increasing the amount of our currency by injecting into it over four hundred millions of silver dollars, as we have done since 1878?

But it is said, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has eloquently dilated upon that point, that in 1873 we took the burden of sustaining the circulating medium of this country, which had previously rested upon two metals, and imposed it on one alone, and that the consequence was the appreciation of the metal that was retained and the depreciation of the one that was rejected. Was the gentleman candid in that statement? Did he mean to say that in 1873 the circulating medium of this country rested on gold or silver or on both? He knows, and every man knows, that at that time the currency of this country was an irredeemable paper currency, and that it so continued for six years thereafter. He knows, and every man ought to know, that when we did come again to a specie circulation we came to it with silver as an important element, and that our currency system then rested more heavily upon silver than ever before in the history of this nation.

He knows, and every man ought to know, that when we returned to a specie basis in 1879 we coined more legal-tender silver dollars in that one year than we had coined in the whole eighty-six years of the previous history of the Government—aye, sir, double the amount. What was the proportion of gold and silver in our currency in 1873 and prior to that time? I have before me a statement of the Director of the Mint showing the figures. From the foundation of the Government until 1873 we had coined $795,091,690 of gold currency, and we had coined $143,813,598.70 of silver currency, of which $8,031,238 was in standard silver dollars.

Up to that time, then, the burden of sustaining the circulating medium of this nation had rested upon gold and silver in the proportion of 8 to 1¼. How has it rested since? Why, you have got practically in circulation to-day approximately equal amounts of silver and gold. You have got in this country to-day more nearly a typical bimetallic currency—not a bimetallic standard, but a bimetallic currency—than can be found in any other great nation of the world. And where is the complaint? With four hundred millions and over of standard silver dollars, with a subsidiary silver currency approximating half that amount, where and how is silver unjustly or unfairly treated? What more can you do unless with the cooperation of other nations?

But the gentleman from Colorado says—and it is the old hackneyed illustration which we have heard for years and years—if you should take two kinds of grain—corn and wheat—both used for food, and the Government should stop the grinding of the one and confine the people to the use of the other, would not that inevitably tend to appreciate the price of the one that was kept in use and to depreciate the price of the one that was rejected? I answer that question put to us so often by saying that if the gentleman will make his illustration conform to the facts, if he will assume that the Government had been receiving wheat and corn, storing the wheat and issuing obligations for it, issuing storage certificates, if you please, for it, until the accumulation had reached 400,000,000 bushels, while there could not, by any possibility, be forced out among the people 60,000,000 bushels of it for actual use, while all the corn was freely used, if the proposition were then made to the Government, not simply to resume grinding wheat for use, but to accept every bushel of wheat grown in the United States, or in the world, and guarantee for it to the owner $1, when it was really worth only 50 cents anywhere else, and force every man in this nation to take it for $1 when he could buy it for 50 cents elsewhere, I would say that the Government ought not to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, silver is a national product, relatively unimportant when compared with our great agricultural staples or the production of our manufacturing industries, but still a national product, and the men who mine it should be fairly treated; but I can not aid in the effort to double the value of their product at the risk of cutting in half the wages of the laborer, the pension of the soldier and his widow, and the accumulated savings of our people. The credit and power of this nation are great. It can sustain at par its present stock of silver coin, greater relatively to that of gold than that of France, of Germany, of Great Britain, of Russia, the other great commercial nations; but it has reached the limit of safety. Further advance in that direction, solitary and alone among the enlightened nations of the world, it can not take without inevitable disaster.

Now, sir, I have just one word more to say and then I shall be through. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ALLEN] asked the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] during his very able speech—and asked the question as if it were one that was difficult to answer: "What is the condition of the Mexican people to-day?" That question I shall answer, in connection with the statement that by Mexican law there is in that country a complete system of unlimited coinage of both gold and silver upon practically equal conditions, the charge for the coinage of silver being a trifle less than the charge for the coinage of gold, but the mints being open to both metals without limit or restriction; and the result has been that Mexico is under a flood of silver and has coined practically no gold.

The question is asked, "What is the condition of the people under that system of coinage?" In answer I will ask the Clerk to read from the Bulletin of the American Republics, entitled "Mexico," pages 105 and 106—a publication issued by our State Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Labor is abundant in Mexico; in some places the supply is greater than the demand, and as the laboring classes can live on such frugal diet and need so little clothing, wages, except for imported skilled labor, are small.

Speaking of these classes a Mexican newspaper says:

"One of their greatest evils at the present time is the existence of a scale of wages which defies all power of reduction; which robs the laborers of all sense of dignity or of feeling of association with the rest of their fellow-citizens, and having reduced them to a condition of abject debasement, deteriorates to a like extent their productive power and the measure of their utility. Instead of claiming and occupying the position of an important and essential element in the process of the development of the country's resources, they, the laboring classes, are content to regard themselves as a plant, or machinery, which moves by extraneous aids only, and has no power of volition, and no desire to exercise it if it had."

Mr. John Bigelow, late minister to France, once said that the laborers of Mexico lived at a less expense than a farm horse in a New England State.

The hacendados, as the large landowners are called, own immense tracts of land, and the hacienda, or manor, is a congregation of buildings forming at times quite a settlement, and is generally fortified.

* * * * * * *

The hacendado usually works his possessions in accordance with the traditions handed down from the time of the Spanish conquest—a veritable feudal system. He is not only a landowner, but he is a dealer in provisions, clothing, etc. His peons, as the laborers and tillers of his soil are called, are descended from those his father had before him, and they are paid, live, and work as their progenitors were and did. The peon is born under the shadow

of his master's house, grows up, and remains under him, following his father's steps in everything; using his same implements and receiving the same pay, generally from 27 to 37½ cents a day.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that if the condition of affairs there shown is prosperity I trust the day is far distant when such "prosperity" shall come to the United States. We want no such cheap wages; such cheap civilization; such cheap methods of living; nor such cheap money. [Applause.]

ADDENDA.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
DIVISION OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1895.

SIR: In compliance with your request of recent date, I send you herewith a table giving the annual average farm price for the United States of corn, wheat, oats, potatoes, and tobacco, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, for the years 1870 to 1893, inclusive.

Respectfully,

HENRY A. ROBINSON, *Statistician.*

Hon. CHARLES W. STONE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Annual average farm price for the United States of corn, wheat, oats, and potatoes per bushel and of tobacco per pound, from 1870 to 1893, inclusive.

December 1—	Corn.	Wheat.	Oats.	Potatoes.	Tobacco.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1870	54.9	104.2	43.3	72	10.6
1871	48.2	125.8	40.1	59.6	9.8
1872	39.8	124	33.6	59.9	10.4
1873	48	115	37.4	70.5	8.3
1874	64.7	94.1	52	67.7	13.1
1875	42	100	36.5	38.9	8
1876	37	103.7	35.1	65.5	7.4
1877	35.8	108.2	29.2	44.8	----
1878	31.8	77.7	24.6	58.9	5.6
1879	37.5	110.8	33.1	43.6	5.8
1880	39.6	95.1	36	48.3	8.2
1881	63.6	119.3	46.4	90.9	9.6
1882	48.4	88.2	37.5	55.7	8.4
1883	42	91	33	42	9
1884	35.7	64.5	28	39.6	8.2
1885	32.8	77.1	28.5	44.7	7.7
1886	36.6	68.7	29.8	46.7	7.4
1887	44.4	68.1	30.4	68.2	10.6
1888	34.1	92.6	27.8	40.2	7.7
1889	28.3	69.8	22.9	40.3	7.1
1890	50.6	83.8	42.4	77.7	7.7
1891	40.6	83.9	31.5	37.1	8.4
1892	39.3	62.4	31.7	67.3	----
1893	36.5	53.8	29.4	59	8.1

From this table the following averages for the several decades are compiled:

	Corn.	Wheat.	Oats.	Potatoes.	Tobacco.
Average:	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1870-1880	44.17	106.35	36.49	58.14	8.87
1880-1890	40.75	83.44	32.03	51.66	8.41
1890-1894	41.25	60.18	33.75	60.18	8.01

Average London price of bar silver 925 fine during the year 1872, by months, and the equivalent value of an ounce 1,000 fine in United States money.

Months.	Pence.	United States money.
January	60.875	$1.3345
February	60.9375	1.3358
March	60.8125	1.3331
April	60.5625	1.3290
May	60.28125	1.3214
June	60.0625	1.3166
July	60.125	1.3181
August	60.125	1.3181
September	60.375	1.3235
October	60.125	1.3181
November	59.50	1.3043
December	59.6875	1.3082
Yearly average	60.2891	1.3218

BUREAU OF THE MINT, *January 27, 1896.*

R. E. PRESTON, *Director.*

Average price of silver, by months, during the calendar year 1873.

January	$1.3118
February	1.3118
March	1.3111
April	1.3097
May	1.3070
June	1.30022
July	1.3088
August	1.29334
September	1.28581
October	1.28786
November	1.27143
December	1.27221
Average	1.298

[From Statistical Abstract of 1894.]

Freight rates on wheat, by lake, canal, and rail, from Chicago to New York, 1857 to 1894.

[Prepared by Mr. J. C. Brown, statistician New York Produce Exchange.]

Calendar year.	Average rates per bushel. By lake and canal.*	By lake and rail.	By all rail.	Calendar year.	Average rates per bushel. By lake and canal.*	By lake and rail.	By all rail.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1857	25.29	----	----	1876	9.58	11.8	16.5
1858	16.28	----	----	1877	11.24	15.8	20.3
1859	17.59	----	----	1878	9.15	11.4	17.7
1860	24.83	----	----	1879	11.6	13.3	17.3
1861	26.55	----	----	1880	12.27	15.7	19.9
1862	26.33	----	----	1881	8.19	10.4	14.4
1863	22.91	----	----	1882	7.89	10.9	14.6
1864	28.36	----	----	1883	8.37	11.5	16.5
1865	26.62	----	----	1884	6.31	9.55	13.125
1866	29.61	----	----	1885	5.87	9.02	14
1867	22.36	----	----	1886	8.71	12	16.5
1868	22.79	29	42.6	1887	8.51	12	†15.74
1869	25.12	25	35.1	1888	5.93	11	†14.5
1870	17.1	22	33.3	1889	6.89	†8.7	15
1871	20.24	25	31	1890	5.85	8.5	14.31
1872	24.47	28	33.5	1891	5.96	8.53	15
1873	19.19	26.9	33.2	1892	5.61	7.55	14.23
1874	14.1	16.9	28.7	1893	6.33	8.44	14.7
1875	11.43	14.6	24.1	1894	4.44	7	12.88

*Including canal tolls until 1882, but not Buffalo transfer charges.
†Averages of officially published tariffs.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1896.

Statement of the coinage of gold and silver from 1793 to 1873.

Description.	Value.
Gold coinage	$795,091,690.00
Silver dollar coinage	8,031,238.00
Fractional silver coinage	76,734,964.50
Subsidiary silver coinage	59,047,396.20
Total silver coinage	143,813,598.70

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] is recognized for forty minutes.

[Mr. MCRAE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I favor the provisions of this Senate bill. I shall vote for it. In giving the reasons why I propose to vote for that bill I shall not attempt to fill you with statistics or to please you with a map. I shall attempt to give you some reasons which seem to me strong enough to induce every Republican on this floor to vote in favor of concurring in the Senate bill.

It is related in the chronicles of old that at one time a cunning artificer in metals hung over the road a most beautiful shield, one side of it embossed in gold and the other side embossed in silver, and both elaborately carved.

Two knights coming in opposite directions, one from the east and one from the west, stopped at a short distance to admire the shield. He of the east said, "What a glorious golden shield I see before me." The knight of the west responded, "Sir Knight, it is a beautiful shield; but it is silver." He of the east responded, "Do you mean to say that I lie in reference to it? Sure it is golden." The knight from the west replied, "I know it to be silver." From words they came to blows; and they killed each other in defense of the opinions that they had. While lying weltering in their blood and breathing their last, an honest peasant came along and, looking on both sides of the shield, said, "What a beautiful shield it is, with gold on one side and silver on the other." And the knights said, "God forgive us for killing ourselves; that we did not look on both sides of the shield before we fought, and thus save our valor and our blood for our common enemies."

And so to-day the American people are fighting among themselves because they do not look on both sides of this question of the money of the country. The men from the East are for gold and the men from the West, like knights in legend, are for silver. The Republican party and the Democratic party alike are divided among themselves upon this question. I have no right to speak for the Democratic party. They enjoy internecine strife, they thrive on factional quarrels, and they are most dangerous at election times after they have broken each other's heads at primaries and conventions beforehand. [Laughter.] But I do claim some right to speak to the Republicans of this House and these United States.

I deprecate the manner in which this discussion has been carried on in the newspapers, and to some extent upon the floor of this House and in the other House, with reference to the epithets that have been bandied between one side and the other. On one side you will hear expressions of "gold bugs," "emmisaries of the Rothschilds," and on the other side we hear the expression "silver lunatics," and "silver cranks." To call names is no argument. It amounts to nothing. I am willing to admit that the gold men commenced calling names, and I am of the opinion that they followed the example set them by a young lady who heard her mother having a row with a neighboring woman. She thrust her head out of the window and shouted, "Hurry up, mother, and call her a thief before she calls you one!" [Great laughter.]

These gold gentlemen commenced calling names for fear the silver men would commence that game first. I will admit that if they did commence to call names, the silver men made a very good second in the race. [Laughter.] Now. all such bandying of epithets, and such talk as that, to my mind, is worse than time wasted. Particularly is it unnecessary and unsuitable for us Republicans. We can not afford it—and I am speaking to Republicans now as a Republican—we can not afford to have dissensions in our ranks. Titus would never have planted the Roman eagle over the streets and temple of Jerusalem but for the dissensions and factional fights that kept the Jews cutting each others' throats and expending more power in that than in fighting the common enemy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And so to-day, when I meet Republicans on the outside, I say what is the good of fighting in the party; we must not fight ourselves. The Democratic party is like Joe Bagstock, "tough, very tough, and hard to kill." [Great laughter.] I attended the funeral of the Democratic party in 1872. I saw its estate administered upon. I saw the auction of the effects of the decedent, with Belmont of New York as auctioneer, to a syndicate composed of so-called liberal Republicans. Horace Greeley, Charles Francis Adams, and Carl Schurz conducted the negotiations and made the purchase, and the result of the election of 1872 was disastrous alike to buyer and to seller.

The Democracy was worse beaten that year than ever before, and the fumes of the bargain killed poor old Greeley, made Charles Francis Adams an imbecile, and reduced Carl Schurz to the faded condition of a civil-service reformer. [Great laughter.]

And yet in 1874 the Democratic party, for the first time in the history of probate courts, came fresh and undiminished in estate out of the probate court and, through some strange transmigration of souls that would puzzle Buddha himself to explain, aroused the American people and elected a majority of the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And they have made a Democratic desert of this House ever since, except for two Republican oases, the Forty-seventh and the Fifty-first Congresses. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, it is wise to look at these things. It is wise to remember also that in 1876 this same party, that is now supposed to be dead and buried, scared us almost to death when it came to the election of a President, and since that time every good Democrat has said, and no doubt if you will strip the clothing from our Democratic friends here you will find inscribed on their bosom the legend, "Tilden was de jure President and Hayes was only the de facto President of the United States." [Laughter.] We can not afford, then, to underrate their strength. We can not afford, then, to omit or refuse to do anything that is necessary for the purpose of bringing our ranks together in order to win the election, for in the campaign of 1896 we shall find the Democratic party, in the language of the prize fighters, "slightly disfigured, but still in the ring," and an antagonist worthy of our best endeavors. This House is very strongly Republican, but is our majority permanent? We can not tell until after the election of November, 1896. Therefore we must not be unduly enthused over our 130 majority in the Fifty-fourth Congress.

We can not win this year by a do-nothing policy. A do-nothing policy is unworthy of our party, unworthy of its history, unworthy of its membership, unworthy of its aims, and will as surely result in defeat as the election in November, 1896, comes around. Censuring Ambassador Bayard is not enough [laughter]; seconding Cleveland in Monroe doctrine ecstacies is not enough [renewed laughter]; cheeseparing on appropriations is not enough [applause]; denouncing the Democratic party and the President of the United States and drawing parallels between what they did in reference to the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill and our own action on that subject is not enough. [Applause.]

If we wish to win we must give the people something besides a do-nothing policy. Our self-appointed and our duly elected leaders of the party say to us, "Oh, do nothing, gentlemen; just pass the appropriation bills and go home. Wait until we elect a Senate and a President that are in accord with our party, and then just see what we will do for the people." But, Mr. Chairman, that policy will not win this year in my opinion. We must give the people some substantial fruit from the tree of Republicanism, now so strong in this House. Mere words, mere promises, for next time will not do. We must act for ourselves and for this body. For four years we have belabored the Democracy because they did nothing, although in power, and we at the same time promised to act, to do something, if the voters of the country would turn the Democrats out and put us in. Hence a do-nothing policy is worse for us than usual, and will not satisfy the hunger of the masses of our constituents, who are clamoring for remedial legislation.

What have we to do with the Senate or with the President? Let us do our duty as we find it before us, and leave the Senate and the President to work out their own salvation. [Applause.] I am reminded of a story of an old colored preacher who, speaking of the Bible, said that he believed in it. "Whatever is commanded in this book," he said, "I will do. If I should read in this Bible that it was my duty to jump through a stone wall, I would try. Jumping at the stone wall belongs to me; going through it belongs to the Lord." [Laughter.]

So I say let us do our duty as the House of Representatives and leave it to the people to teach the Senate and the President to do their duty and to pass the wise bills that we send them. [Laughter and applause.] I am a Republican. I want to see a Republican President elected. I believe we shall elect him. But I wish to avoid all question; I wish to make assurance doubly sure. I believe this is one of the turning points in the campaign. I may be mistaken. You may say that I am throwing cold water on the party that I love. You may say that I am wrong. If so, my only excuse is that I am uttering in public the sentiments I utter in private; that I am appealing to my fellow-Republicans in the only manner that I can to get their ear and attention to do something for the people, to act in such a way as to hold the party together in every State, and to recognize the appeal of hundreds of thousands of Republican voters.

I have no fear of the consequences to the Republican party if it does its duty and if its representatives fully understand all the questions before it. [Applause.] But I say to my Republican friends, looking at this political campaign as I do—and I have gone through many a campaign, sometimes successful, sometimes beaten, but always ready to fight [laughter]—I say to you that if the Democratic party of this nation has the courage of its convictions and, when it meets in Chicago in July, adopts a free-silver plank in its platform, if it does not beat us next November we shall at least be worse scared during the fight than we were in 1876. [Laughter and applause.]

I make no prophecies. I indulge in no threats, but I wish in time of fair weather to prepare for storm; I wish to keep peace in our own ranks. I wish to do right by our voters. I wish to do right by the people, and I wish that we would do something in regard to this question. The silver question will not be suppressed. It raises its head in every State, yea, in every county of our nation. It is the most discussed by the plain people of the land of any question before them. It must be met. The cries of its friends must be answered. It is the part of good generalship to increase our army and to cement our forces.

I do not believe in the policy of certain United States Senators who have made the cause of silver a stink even in the nostrils of its friends. I do not believe in the motto of the old Roman who ended every speech by saying, "Carthage must be destroyed." I do not believe it is right or proper to stick a silver amendment upon every bill. No man who is a real friend of silver will act as some men have acted in the Senate. As a friend of silver I repudiate such conduct. I am in favor of free silver. I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. I am ready to work for it, to speak for it, to vote for it, but I do not want it thrust upon me in the morning and at noon and at night. I do not want to be waked up in the dead hour of the night and called to a caucus, in order to put a free-silver amendment upon every bill that is brought before the House of Representatives, and no true friend of silver does. [Applause.] But I do believe in my party doing something for the cause of silver.

I feel that it is absolutely necessary. I feel that we need the votes of the silver men. To gain those votes honorably should be our aim. We should not make improper bargains or enact any measure not in full accord with Republican principles. But in the strict line of our duty to our party, in direct accord with Republicanism as enunciated from every Republican platform save one in the United States, we should recognize silver as entitled to aid at our hands and should do something to cause its rehabilitation as money of the nation. This is all I ask. This is what I am pleading for in my feeble way without going into the history of metals or furnishing you with tables of weights and measures and values and prices.

Have you gentlemen who so glibly talk about your majority on this floor and the certainty of electing a Republican President this fall—have you gentlemen who so glibly talk about the strength of gold monometallism—have you gentlemen who talk and feel so strongly in reference to sound money, as you call it, ever thought

that there are 9 States of this Union, polling 37 electoral votes, that are solid for free silver—Republicans, Democrats, and Populists alike? Are those men not entitled to some recognition? Is not such a large portion of the United States to be considered in legislation? Are its interests to be ignored, its wishes disregarded, its appeals to be ignored, and its people told that they are like children, knowing not their own wants?

One other State ought to be solid for free silver. Its conventions are solid, but its Representative votes against the platform on which he was elected. But there are 9 States, with 37 electoral votes, solid for silver. Are the people in those States all crazy? Are they all "cranks"? We people in California consider ourselves reasonably well informed. Speaking for the other six Congressmen in California, I will say we are reasonably nice men. Of course I am willing to be counted anything; but I am speaking of others. [Laughter.]

But our people are united as never before on this question. Every State convention in California—Republican, Democratic, Prohibition, and Populist—passed resolutions in favor of free coinage of silver. Hence all the voters of California—proud, golden State of the Union—are together on this question, and I speak for them all here to-day.

Are they all crazy? Are they all lunatics? Are they all mistaken? Perhaps they are. If they are cranks, if the people of these nine States are lunatics, remember that Oliver Cromwell's Ironsides that won every battle, that gave freedom to England, that made the commonwealth of England respected all over the world, that carried the British flag in triumph wherever they went—remember that Cromwell's Ironsides were three-fourths crazy on religion; and they were irresistible in battle. So if we are "cranks," we are rather more dangerous than sensible people, and should be cultivated as friends, not ignored. [Laughter and applause.]

The Republican national platform of 1892 was for silver; there is no question about that. Why, sir, we could no more have carried a single State in 1892 upon a gold platform than we could carry this Congress in opposition to the will of a certain four or five men here. [Laughter.] Thirty States of this Union in their Republican State conventions passed resolutions in favor of silver. I have not time to read the platforms, but with the permission of the committee I will print them in my speech with the names of the States. I simply call attention to a few of those States; and the reason I do so is because I want to understand how any human being from North Dakota, or Indiana, or Illinois can vote against silver on this floor; and I want to hear some explanation when we come to a vote.

I want to understand how anybody from Delaware, or from Iowa, or from Kansas, or from Michigan, or Minnesota, or Missouri, or Nebraska, or North Carolina, or West Virginia can vote against silver on this floor. There is not anybody here from South Carolina or Alabama who represents the Republicans of those States [laughter]; but I should like to know how any man from those States is going to vote against silver when all the parties that speak therein have announced themselves in favor of free silver. [Laughter.]

How is it in the State of Mississippi, where you recently had a Senatorial election? Every candidate for the United States Senate was for free silver except one, and he was so badly beaten he did not know he was in the race. How, then, is any man from that State going to vote against free silver? How are any of these Republicans from Tennessee, from Texas, or from good old Vermont, and how, I would like to know, is even a man from the State of Maine going to vote in favor of gold monometallism, when the Republican platform of the State of Maine in 1894, the platform upon which all four of these men were elected, declared openly and squarely that the Republican party was opposed to monometallism, either gold or silver. Yet I presume that some of them, perhaps all of them, will vote against silver.

Only one State, and that the State of New York, has apparently declared against silver. That is not to be wondered at. "Ephraim is joined to his idols." [Laughter.] The State of New York believes in Wall street; and so far as New York is concerned, if the Democrats want the State of New York to lead them to defeat again, I am perfectly willing that they should have the State of New York. [Laughter.] I say that that is the only State that is apparently against silver. Every other Republican State in this Union has either passed resolutions in favor of silver (and the States that have done so number 30) or has passed resolutions in favor of bimetallism, which was intended to make the voters believe they were in favor of free silver, and hence I have a right to claim from the record that the Republican party of the United States, barring New York, was in 1894, when we were elected, practically unanimous in favor of silver and its remonetization.

I might remark right here that there are 25 Democratic States—solidly Democratic—that have pronounced for free silver. I am sorry to be compelled to say right here—and I say it to answer a possible claim that may be made that we do not need to carry the West to elect our President because we can get electoral votes in the South—that I take no stock in the hope of carrying a single Southern State at the Presidential election except West Virginia. Particularly is our case worse than hopeless if we refuse to recognize silver and stand upon a gold monometallic standard. Do you suppose that those gentlemen who control elections down South propose to allow anybody to carry those States for the Presidency except the Democratic candidate? If you do you are very badly fooled. The State of West Virginia perhaps may be carried by us, but that is the only one.

Twenty-five Democratic States, I repeat, have pronounced solidly for free silver. The Populistic party is also for free silver. There is a large number of them, although they do not make so much show here. Are these people, thus numbering millions of voters, located in every State of the Union, representing all shades of business and thought—all parties and creeds—all crazy, as I asked before? Why not, then, do something for silver, when its friends are so numerous, its demands so slight, and our Republican party platforms have so uniformly recognized it and pledged relief? It is in the mouth of every orator; it is inscribed upon the platform of every political party in this nation; it is recognized as a money metal by all these States; and even the States that have pronounced against silver have pronounced in favor of a bimetallic convention with foreign countries, thus squarely proclaiming in favor of silver as a money metal of the country, but seeking merely to postpone its rehabilitation, not because it is not right, but for fear we could not do it alone and must ask help of foreign countries to manage our own financial affairs and settle upon our own money.

For one I do not believe in foreign influences in this country either in a matter of money or anything else. I am in favor of the Monroe doctrine, not merely when it comes to the onslaught made on the little Central and South American Republics, but I am in favor of that doctrine when it comes to defending the United States against the onslaught of that mightier power, stronger than any army even that marched under Napoleon, the men that control the money markets of the world. [Applause.]

Why not support the Senate bill, Mr. Chairman? Why do you not support it? Why will you not give us something for silver? I would for one, answering my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], not care one brass farthing whether the bill is an answer to the House bill or not. I do not care whether it is polite to us or not. It is for silver; it is a legal bill, and I favor it because it does something for one of our great interests, because it answers the appeal made by Republican voters through conventions and elections. I do not want the House to be so very polite, as was a young lady of whom I once heard, who, when the house was on fire, when she was cut off by the flames and stood at a window, the only mode of escape being by means of a ladder, when a brawny, grimy fireman came up through the smoke and the flames, with the ladder crumbling under his feet, and offered to save her, said: "No, sir; you can not take me down that ladder. I have never been introduced to you, and I can not get into your arms; I prefer to burn." [Laughter.]

I am not so awfully polite that I can not accept the bill simply because it is not an answer to ours. This is a bill for silver, and I accept it on that ground. If you think it too much for silver, then do not throw it aside, but amend it; modify it, change it. Show us some middle ground, some bill on which we can all agree. Give us some measure of relief. This on the face of it appears to be a relief for silver, and we are for it on that ground. If it is too strong a bill, then dilute it; give us something, though, that will help the silver cause. It is needed by the country. It will aid our party and the people alike.

Mr. Chairman, I do not regard this Senate bill as a bed of Procrustes, upon which every man must lie, and if he is too short he shall be pulled out by machinery until he fits the bed, and if he is too long that he shall be sawed off until he is of the required length. [Laughter and applause.] I do not regard it as the sine qua non of legislation, but it is for silver, it is in the right direction. You may amend it, but give us, oh, give us something, and make the bill, if it is not satisfactory to you, better by your own amendments, and we will accept it. [Laughter and applause.] But give us something which will legislate in favor of silver.

Some of us think this bill is a good one. Some of us are going to vote for it. Some of you think it a bad one and are going to vote against it in its present shape. If so, and perhaps you have a majority, then your majority will enable you to change it and make it better, but gives us some remedy, some relief under the circumstances. Do not wrap the mantle of criticism around your shoulders and say about this bill, "It is all wrong," and then fade away into the heavenly realms of your own greatness and refuse us any relief. [Laughter.]

Something should be done for silver. We are like the three little boys who hid under a tree during a thunderstorm. Said one, "Bill, can you pray?" "No." "Tom, can you?" "No." "Neither can I," then said the boy, "but, by George, something has got to be done!" [Laughter.] So, if you think this is not

a good prayer, and if you are not satisfied with it, give us something for silver that will bring relief; something that will legislate for silver, for something should be done. [Applause.] Do not turn your back and say that "it is not good"; it is not the "original Jacobs"; it is not the "original Pond's Extract"; that it is diluted and needs modification, and then content yourselves with such condemnation and refuse to do anything except find fault with this bill. Do as you please with it—modify it, amend it, reform it, but give it to us in some shape or other. If it is not right, give us something that is right, in your estimation, and we will accept it. Every man here says he wishes to do something for silver. Now is your accepted time. Arrange some bill if not pleased with this one, and show your faith by your deeds. "Actions speak louder than words"; hence I beg you to act for the interest of silver, and not merely talk sweetly, promise much, and do nothing.

Mr. DINGLEY—no; I beg pardon; I believe that it is proper to say the gentleman from Maine. My friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] says the proper way is to keep still and do nothing; that time will work out its own solution; that relief will come by waiting, as I understand it. Perhaps it will; but you all remember, and permit me to call attention to the fact, that when the Dutchman undertook to teach his horse to live on nothing he said that no sooner had he succeeded in getting the animal down to one straw a day than the fool up and died. [Laughter.] So it is with this country. You cut us down to a straw a day, and that straw a mere promise to do something for silver; and the first thing you know we will be in very great trouble, almost financial death, and you will then have to supply some sort of a remedy, that can be much easier and safer administered to-day.

You say that this bill is not right. You listened for two hours yesterday to the remarks of the eloquent and distinguished gentleman from Maine, which I suppose from your standpoint were convincing. Did you tender us, I ask the gentleman, anything at all as a remedy? You said the medicine was bad that we wanted when you took the chalice from our lips, but you tendered us nothing in its stead. This is not right. We silver people are entitled to something; we silver Republicans are entitled to something. Give it to us. No, you reserved simply the right to object, as I have heard gentlemen say frequently upon this floor. That is all you did. Is that the way to treat this question? You said it was our duty to convince you, or rather the people who sympathize with you, in reference to this silver question, that something was needed to be done for silver, and that the demonetization of silver was wrong.

We say no. We say that the gold men began this war; that they caused all the trouble; they disarranged matters, and must explain why satisfactorily or be forever estopped from denying our position. We say that they began it in 1873. In that year times and people were reasonably prosperous. Silver was at a premium, as you yourself have stated, in 1873. The records of United States history may be searched in vain for the utterance of any man or any set of men, for a single word in any paper or pamphlet or magazine; may be searched in vain for any meeting or assemblage or convention, for any resolution or any platform, for any public speech or private utterance, in favor of the demonetization of silver in 1873. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask unanimous consent to continue my remarks.

Mr. BOWERS. I ask that the gentleman have fifteen minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will consent to an extension of the gentleman's time if I can have the floor when we commence the session to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not make that promise, as the time is already parceled out.

Mr. MCLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I am entitled, as a member of the committee——

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I believe I have been recognized as entitled to the floor, to speak immediately. If I can have my time I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the time of the gentleman from California be extended fifteen minutes?

Mr. SETTLE. If this arrangement is to deprive me of the very limited time which has been allotted to me, I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. It certainly will.

Mr. SETTLE. Then I object.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I am entitled to fifty minutes as a member of the committee, and I yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be done under objection.

Mr. MCLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am entitled to that time, as I understand it, as a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MCLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I should like to know if the objection of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE] extended to my granting a portion of my time to the gentleman from California?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN] that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE] had been promised recognition at the end of the half hour accorded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. If the time of the gentleman from California is now extended, of course that will take away the time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why, no; it will not. We have got all day to-morrow and all day Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this question is out of order. Objection has been made. [Cries of "Regular order."]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman rather than have this discussion go on all night.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] yields to me, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is not in order. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] desire to be recognized?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I desire to have thirty minutes to discuss this question. If I can not have it at any other time, I want it now.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I will yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] myself.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield all my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], with the understanding that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN] is to give me his time. [Applause.]

Mr. MCLAURIN. Yes; I will give the gentleman my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. What portion of his time does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] yield?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. All of it—thirty minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCLAURIN. And I will return the same amount to the gentleman from Massachusetts out of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for thirty minutes longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, during this debate the silver Republicans, as they are called, have unanimously been willing to extend the time for debate asked for by any member upon this floor. When the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asked for further time he was given an hour; and yet these men who call themselves Republicans and who want to disrupt the party upon this question, refused one of their own members an opportunity to close his remarks. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his courtesy in giving me his time, and I will assure him that is something that neither my friends nor myself will forget; and I want to say to the other gentleman that I never forget a favor and never forget an injury. [Applause.] And if it means war, and they want war, I want to say, for one, that the silver Republicans of this House are willing to take up the gauntlet at any time and set the lance in rest with any of them upon this question. [Loud applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying at this time, in 1873, when silver was demonetized, no human being asked for it. You can search the records of the United States in vain to find one solitary utterance in favor of the demonetization of silver. The pages of history are absolutely barren in that regard. No mortal man at that time had the hardihood to advocate the demonitization of silver. But it was accomplished. It is a fixed fact; and we have had to meet it and face it ever since. Now, all that the silver men want, speaking so far as I understand the voice of the silver Republicans, and speaking so far as I understand the voice of the silver Democrats, all that we silver men want is to put the United States back in the same position it occupied in 1873, when silver was coined in the mints of the United States without let or hindrance. [Applause.]

This is all that this bill proposes to do. If you think that is too much, change it, amend it, and we will accept it for the time. Ever since 1873 times have been hard; labor has been unemployed; strikes have been frequent in the United States. Wheat—notwithstanding the claim of my friend and namesake from North Dakota—wheat has sunk so low that it needs the sound of the trumpet of some financial archangel Gabriel or the statistics of MARTIN N. JOHNSON to bring it up to a fair price. [Laughter and applause.] The United States has been a constant borrower of

money since 1873. The United States borrowed $162,000,000 last year, in time of profound peace. The United States has just recently offered a loan of $100,000,000 more; and right here, Mr. Chairman, let me interject a remark: If ever I was proud of the United States of America; if I ever felt proud to be an American; if ever I felt proud that the Stars and Stripes float over a reunited country, a common American country, it was when I read in the papers this morning of the offering from the people of the United States, North and South, East and West, of $500,000,000 to take a loan of $100,000,000. [Loud applause.] It spoke volumes in favor of our nation and its wealth and stability, and it made me proud to be an American. [Applause.]

Now, this money has been borrowed by the United States since 1873, for what? To keep up a gold reserve, not to keep up any silver reserve. No such borrowing of money was needed prior to the demonetization of silver. No such bond issue was then needed. They have continued to borrow money ever since to keep up this gold reserve. We are borrowing it every day, but nobody is happy. The country is not doing well, and we say that the principal cause of it is silver demonetization. Perhaps silver demonetization is not entirely the cause, but silver demonetization is admitted by all to be one of the causes, and I believe all will also admit it is the main cause of the trouble now upon the country. Now we ask you to put this country back to where it was in 1873, nothing more. It is not an unreasonable request. It is made by many millions of voters. It should be heeded. We need those votes next November.

We ask you to quit trying the Keeley cure upon the United States. [Laughter.] We ask you to go back to silver. We ask you to put the nation back to where it was before you got to doctoring the United States with a single gold standard. Why, in 1873 Uncle Sam was healthy and was doing well in all particulars. The country was prosperous. We did not need to borrow money in time of peace. You commenced doctoring him in that year with your vaunted gold standard, and I am afraid if you keep up with your gold cure and your gold bonds you will find that the epitaph that was placed upon the tombstone of the man who died in Maine many years ago, and which reads—

I was well; I wanted to be better; I took physic and died—

will apply to the people of the United States under your financial management. [Great laughter and applause.]

So we say now that we want you to quit doctoring in that way; we want you to adopt the same rule for the nation that you would adopt for your own family. If your family physician failed to effect a cure or to benefit the patient, you would discharge him and try another doctor. You have tried Dr. Gold for this nation for twenty-three years, and the result has been trouble. Try Dr. Silver now. Give him a chance and see if the condition of the patient does not improve; at least take him into consultation with the other physician; let him assist. Every man understands the condition which existed in our nation in 1873, and we simply ask you to go back to that condition.

Gentlemen say they are in favor of bimetallism, but that they are opposed to free silver; that they are in favor of bimetallism, but they are opposed to the coining of silver. They remind me of a man who was a candidate for the legislature in the State of New York at a time when the question of the adoption of the Maine liquor law was before the people. He said:

Fellow-citizens, I am in favor of the Maine liquor law; I believe it is a good law; I believe it would promote temperance; but, fellow-citizens, I am opposed to the enforcement of the Maine liquor law because it interferes with personal liberty.

[Laughter.]

You gentlemen who say that you are in favor of bimetallism and yet refuse to vote any relief to silver are like that man. You are in favor of the law but opposed to its execution. You are in favor of silver but opposed to doing anything for it. [Laughter and applause.] If you think that the free and unlimited coinage of silver is too much, give us less. Amend the bill. Provide that the silver of the United States alone shall be coined in the mints of the United States and put a prohibitory tariff upon foreign silver and I will gladly accept that and thank you in behalf of the people for it. It will not be enough, but it will be something, and will do good and keep our promises to the people.

Give us some relief in this matter and we shall be content. But do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the wishes of the majority of the people of the United States. Do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the opinions of nine-tenths of the farmers of the United States. Do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the opinions of three-fourths of the people of this country, as exemplified in party platforms. Do not turn a deaf ear to the opinion of three-fourths of the Republican party of the United States, as exemplified in the Republican party platform. Do not refuse to do something for silver. Silver and gold are the money metals recognized by the Constitution. Silver was once the unit of money in the United States. Silver was once coined in the mints of the United States. Silver and gold both were, prior to 1873, the money metals of the United States, and we ask you to restore that condition of things.

In the history of Rome, one of the legends of that old empire and republic was that at the battle of Lake Regillis, when the Romans were nearly driven to defeat and when it seemed as though the republic must go down before the power of their invaders, the spirits of Castor and Pollux, the deities that ruled over the fate of Rome, came down from heaven, drew swords in behalf of the Roman army, and led it to victory. So to-day we can say to you, If you give relief to silver, on the one hand the spirit of the gold mines of the United States will come forward, bearing the rich and yellow metal that enables the world to move, and on the other hand will come the spirit of the silver mines, bearing the white metal so necessary to the world, and, like the shades of Castor and Pollux, that carried the Romans to victory, these two spirits, these two metals, working hand in hand, will make this nation strong, prosperous, and forever happy, united, homogeneous, and free. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. SETTLE. Mr. Chairman, I listened throughout the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and was highly entertained from the beginning until the end. I understood him to say at the start that he proposed to give the House some information on the subject of the coinage of silver and to deprecate the fact that too many of the discussions upon this floor did not deal with the true inwardness of the question. I expected him, therefore, to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] who, in his remarks yesterday, asked those gentlemen who think as does the gentleman from California—

Can we, by the action of the United States Government alone, independent of all foreign countries, put the world's product of silver in the attitude of a yokefellow with gold?

I expected, I say, that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would have answered that question, and his great ability warranted me in entertaining the expectation that he would keep his promise and would offer some argument showing how that could be done. But the gentleman's answer has been mere rhetoric, mere assertion, filled with a great deal of denunciation of those who differ from him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the gold standard. I am in favor of just as much use of silver in the money of this country as it is possible to maintain under existing conditions, holding the silver coin upon a parity, equal in purchasing and in debt-paying power with gold, but I do not believe that this country, by its individual, independent action, can assimilate into the currency that we have the world's product of silver, either at the ratio of 16 to 1 or at a larger ratio. I favor the use of silver in our system, but I agree with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that under existing conditions it is not possible for the United States to adopt a policy other than that of the limited coinage of silver until we can reach an international agreement among the commercial nations of the earth.

What limit would I favor placing upon the coinage of silver? I would like to see a measure offered which would assimilate the entire product of the American mines. I do not believe that that can be done without auxiliary legislation. I do not believe it can be done and silver maintained upon a parity with gold unless means are adopted which will give this Government a regular gold revenue, and on that line I should like to have an opportunity to vote for a proposition requiring the payment of not less than 50 per cent of the customs dues in gold.

Representing in part the State of North Carolina, let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], in response to his remark that he does not pin any faith upon the idea that one single Southern State will give its vote to the Republican candidate for President at the next election—let me say to him that if he represents a constituency and a people who think and talk as he does, North Carolina and other States of the South will be found more loyal to the cause of the Republican party than he or his people. [Applause.] Professing to be a Republican, professing love for the organization of the party, the utterances we have heard from his lips, if carried to their legitimate conclusions, mean nothing more nor less than that while professing loyalty, love, and affection he is strangling the very life out of the organization for whose success he declares himself so anxious.

I recognize the fact that in North Carolina, and in every other State of this Union, perhaps, there are wide differences of opinion among citizens with regard to this question of the coinage of silver. As to this substitute from the Senate, I agree with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that the Senate should have made some specific response to the proposition which was offered by the House. There are some things in this substitute with which I am in full sympathy. I should like to see the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury restricted and limited. I voted in the last Congress for the coinage of the seigniorage; and I should like to see such a measure as that passed. I would like, under the other proposition, to see an amendment offered which would limit

the coinage of silver to the production of mines located within the borders of the United States; and I should like to see an additional amendment which would provide this Government with a gold revenue, so as to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain these coins upon a parity with our other coins. Every child in this country knows that the commercial value of gold and silver is wide apart from their coinage value.

We hear much said about the union in political battles between the West and the South. It is urged that they have a joint interest in these questions. I know of no silver mine operated within the borders of any Southern State that is producing a sufficient amount of silver to make it an item worthy of consideration by the Southern people or the nation. When we say that the Southern people want free coinage of silver, I understand that they are not actuated by any sentimental attachment to silver as a metal. The breadth, the length, and the scope of our demand is that we want the volume of money increased; but, for one, I do not want to see the volume of money increased by the substitution of a fluctuating and depreciating currency; for I concur with those eminent statesmen who have declared the idea that of all curses that ever befell the laboring class of our people none is greater than that of an unstable and fluctuating currency. Always the cheaper money finds a resting place in the pockets of the laboring and agricultural classes of our people.

The South, therefore, having no silver mines, is not interested in the cause of silver personally or directly as are the gentleman from California and his constituency. He has mines in his State. There are mines of silver in the West; and I can well understand how it is to his benefit and to the benefit of his people that the Government of the United States should by law be compelled to accept every ounce of silver which is mined in his State or other Western States at double its value, receive 50 cents of bullion and stamp it as $1, and allow him and them to make their purchases with it as such.

The Southern people have no such direct interest as have the Western people in this coinage question. Therefore I say the South in this controversy is not an ally of the West. Hence all this talk of a union between the South and the West in political battles is farfetched and has nothing in it. So far from being allied, the South and the West stand to-day in the attitude of rivals. The West is a largely agricultural country; the South is an agricultural country. The West therefore is, in the markets of our own country, not our ally but our rival. We of these two sections have no union in point of interest by virtue of being agricultural countries and communities. I believe that the future prosperity of the South lies not in the direction of the future prosperity of the West, in agriculture and in mining, except so far as iron ore and coal are mined in the South. Our future lies in the direction of stimulating and encouraging the growth of manufacturing establishments.

Thus much in reference to the talk of a union between the South and the West in behalf of labor. I prophesy that so far as my own immediate country is concerned never will such a union be brought about. In North Carolina and other Southern States there are thousands and thousands of intelligent and patriotic people who believe that the Republican party is broad enough and able enough to solve this question, not on sectional lines, but with a patriotic intelligence that has regard for the welfare and the prosperity of every section, North, South, East, or West. The Republican party, which was originated in a spirit friendly to the laboring classes, stands to-day unwilling to commit itself to a financial scheme or theory which would inflate the currency by the substitution of depreciated money, which would be the greatest curse to the American laborers and farmers that ever befell them, not even excepting Democratic rule.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the cause of our depression is not the refusal to open the mints of the United States to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Some Democrats say that it is; some Republicans say so, and almost all the Populists make that claim. The President of the United States sends a message to Congress in which he says that the condition of our country is due to the existence of the greenbacks in our circulation, and advises their retirement. If the President is right, if the greenbacks are a threatening menace to our country's prosperity, pray tell me why it is that that evil which exists and which you say is inherent in the greenback lay dormant until the Democratic party came into power in this country? [Applause.]

If there is an evil which is inherent in the greenback, and which lay dormant throughout all the Republican Administrations, never did you discover it until the Democratic party came into control in the Government. Under Republican rule, when our revenues were equal to our expenditures, when the credit of the Government was unassailed and unassailable, the greenbacks performed an important function in the finances of the country. They passed at par, and we never heard a word against them. But when the Democratic party came into power disaster followed, and they hunted around for some excuse to account for it. The Administration says that the greenback is the cause of it. I believe with the Republicans, who say that the cause of our trouble is that our revenues are insufficient to meet the expenditures of the Government. [Applause.]

I am, Mr. Chairman, therefore opposed to the retirement of the greenbacks according to the suggestion of the President of the United States. I am in full sympathy with the measure which passed the House, and is now pending in the Senate, for the increase of the revenues of the Government by raising the tariff duties; and I believe that should the Senate prove patriotic enough to pass that bill, and the President of the United States himself give an exhibition of that patriotism to which he has invited the House so frequently, and rise above party and approve the bill, or allow it to become a law, that the atmosphere will be so cleared that prosperity will return immediately to our country. [Applause.]

One other word I desire to submit in this connection. Since this Administration came into power we have sold $162,000,000 of United States interest-bearing bonds running for thirty years. We closed out the first deal with a syndicate, and but for the agitation in this House I believe, but for the provision in the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and promptly passed here, which directed the President when he issued bonds to offer them first as a popular loan, the subscription to the second lot would have been closed out, as was the first, at a rate of about 104. Reluctantly, after much discussion and dissatisfaction, and against his will, finally the President offered the bonds as a popular subscription.

The Administration papers, from one end of the country to the other, and Democratic officials began to prophesy that the loan asked for would be a failure; and yet we are informed in the papers that the bids for these bonds aggregate $558,000,000 and over, and that the bids for them are not at 104, but that they range from 110 to 120, the average saving to the Government by this popular loan being estimated on this issue of bonds of $100,000,000 at between seven and ten millions of dollars. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the bidding upon these bonds is a confirmation of the wisdom of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. I repeat it is a confirmation of the wisdom of the Ways and Means Committee as well as of the House in requiring the Secretary of the Treasury not to be allowed to close out the bids or deal with a syndicate, but that he should be compelled to offer the bonds to the people as a popular subscription.

Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself only, I propose to vote against the Senate substitute unless it can be amended in conformity with the suggestions that I have thrown out in my remarks. Unless we can restrict the coinage under this bill to the American product, unless we can at the same time provide the Government with a revenue enabling it to maintain a parity between these coins, it is my purpose to vote against the substitute. I am not an enemy of silver. I am a friend to the metal, and I want to see it coined to the very fullest extent consistent with safety. But never will I consent to or vote for the free coinage of silver except under an international agreement or unless we can have limited coinage of the American product alone. [Applause.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to very briefly call the attention of this House to one feature of this bill that in my opinion is not receiving sufficient attention, and that is that by its provisions there does not appear to be any intention of using these silver dollars when coined. They are to go into the Treasury along with all the other silver dollars, and certificates are to be issued.

Why buy all this silver that no one wants? Why not print fiat money and have done with it? It is pure inflation anyway, and the more there is of it the less is its purchasing value. I believe to-day the worst feature of our monetary system or lack of system is these certificates.

If silver is desirable to be coined into money, by all means let us use it to the fullest extent that it can be absorbed in the channels of trade. But do not let us deceive ourselves into thinking that we are assisting the silver industry or promoting the use of that metal or increasing its value by purchasing it to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars and storing it up in the United States Treasury.

These certificates which we issue against this silver pass as money by virtue of an act of Congress. They would just as readily pass if there was not a dollar of silver in the Treasury. In their present use they take the place which should be filled by our legal-tender notes. They thus drive these notes out of use and place them in a position where they are the more readily available to draw gold from the Treasury.

If there was not a superabundance of paper notes in circulation greenbacks would be in constant use and could not be spared from daily use for a run on the Treasury.

These so-called certificates, actually warehouse receipts, whether issued for gold, silver, or currency, should be called in and canceled, and that for which they were issued paid out.

If silver is such a good thing, there can not be the least objection to its use in daily transactions, and I am satisfied that its use in this way would very soon convince the most enthusiastic silver advocate that quite enough of it had been coined. [Applause.]

Under the consent given, Mr. LONG submitted the following as an amendment to be proposed to the bill:

At the end of section 1 of the Senate substitute add the following:
"*Provided*, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only."

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee submitted the following amendment:

At the end of section 1 add the following:
"*Provided, however*, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only."

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, unless some gentleman desires to be recognized, I will move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman desires to be recognized for five minutes, the Chair will recognize him. [After a pause.] The gentleman from Maine moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker accordingly resumed the chair; and Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration House bill No. 2904, had come to no resolution thereon.

GAINESVILLE, M'ALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk (S. 879), to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," approved March 1, 1893, be, and the same hereby are, extended for a further period of three years.

SEC. 2. That section 1 of said act be so amended as to make the city of Fort Smith the terminus of said road on the western border of the State of Arkansas.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommended the following amendments:

SEC. 3. That section 3 of said act be amended to read as follows:
"SEC. 3. That a right of way of 100 feet in width through said Indian Territory is hereby granted to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railway Company, and a strip of land 100 feet in width, with a length of 2,000 feet, in addition to the right of way, is granted for such stations as may be established, but such grant shall be allowed but once for every 10 miles of the road, no portion of which shall be sold or leased by the company, with the right to use such additional grounds where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 50 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*, That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein granted shall be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone line, and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used, such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall have been taken."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of said act be amended by striking out all after the word "*Provided*" and inserting the following: "That a map of definite location showing the entire route of said road through the Indian Territory shall be filed and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any part of the said road shall be constructed."

Mr. FISCHER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether this bill has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. BAILEY. It has, and it has been favorably reported.

Mr. FISCHER. Certain amendments have been suggested. Have they all been adopted?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; the amendments are indicated in the bill and in the report.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This is not a bill for a new railroad through the Indian Territory, as I understand it, but it is simply to grant an extension of time to a company already possessing a right of way through the Indian Territory.

Mr. BAILEY. Simply to extend the time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I doubt whether there is room in the Indian Territory for any more new railroad rights of way.

Mr. BAILEY. There might be some question about that. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the amendments proposed are House amendments to a Senate bill?

Mr. BAILEY. This is a Senate bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. The committee have reported it back with a favorable recommendation, and with the amendments which are printed in italics in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BAILEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Accounts to present a privileged resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed to visit Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, for the purpose of inspecting the immigration service and of ascertaining in what respect any existing laws or methods may be so amended as to fairly carry out the objects and purposes of such laws; and that the sum of $560, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this resolution, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated from the contingent fund of the House to defray the expense of this inspection and investigation, and the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to advance said sum to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire in this connection, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, to obtain leave to print in the RECORD a statement of the relative force of the last House and of the present House, inasmuch as there was some confusion in the minds of several gentlemen the other day, perhaps, in respect to the matter. This statement is prepared by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not know that I shall object, but I think we ought to see the paper.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well; let it go over.

The resolution reported by Mr. LONG was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LONG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;* and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HULING, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TYLER, for three days, on account of sickness in his family.

ORDER OF MEETING.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House may now take a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening, the House to continue in session until 10.30 o'clock; that at 10.30 o'clock this evening another recess be taken until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, the time to be occupied exclusively in debate upon the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until half past 7, the evening session to continue until half past 10; that then a recess be taken until half past 10 to-morrow morning, for debate only upon the bill now before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DINGLEY. And in connection with that I ask that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman further asks that during that time the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to act as Speaker pro tempore this evening.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WANGER. I ask unanimous consent that committees having meetings to-morrow at half past 10 may sit from that hour until 12.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] that committees may be allowed to sit during the session of the House to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

And then, in accordance with the order adopted by unanimous consent (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House took a recess until 7.30 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by Mr. HEPBURN as Speaker pro tempore at 7.30 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate is in order upon House bill 2904, to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, gain by any individual or any nation at the expense of honor is irretrievable loss. It is well, I believe, to keep this in mind as we consider the proposition of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. To such a proposition I am unalterably opposed for many reasons. I am opposed to it because I have the honor to represent a district in which reside many thousands of laboring men, and I demand that when any one of them earns a dollar he shall not be paid with 50 cents; we must remember that the drops of sweat which gather on the honest brow of toil are of much greater value than the very best dollars that we can make.

I am opposed to it because it would very soon bring financial disaster to the large commercial interests of my district and the country at large. It can well be stated, in the light of experience, that fiat money is certain to be followed quickly by the fieri facias of the sheriff. As domestic money the free coinage of silver means not only a change, but an abandonment of the standard recognized by this country and all the great commercial nations of the world. And it means more; it means the adoption of a fluctuating base by which all home commerce will be measured, and with it would follow such an unending train of financial disaster and ruin as we have never witnessed. Were the American Congress to accede to such a proposition and embody such doctrince in a statute, every creditor would at once demand payment of all debts due him.

The depositors in all our banks would quickly withdraw their balances, and the banks would be compelled to collect their loans rapidly to meet such demands. In turn, the great active business class of men, the intermediate class between the capitalist and laborer, a class of men who are often borrowers, and who are, in fact, the live, active, really valuable business men of this country, the merchant, the manufacturer, the coal operator, and such others, could not meet the immediate demands of the banks and would go down to financial ruin, thus throwing out of employment hundreds of thousands of laboring men. Who can measure the ruin, distress, and suffering that would be entailed? I feel sure that this House of Representatives, which has become and certainly is to-day the thoughtful and conservative body of the American Congress, will not follow the wild and visionary views of the United States Senate.

The great business interests of this country to-day have seen and learned that they must look to the House and not to the Senate for protection and for honest money, and they are to-day watching us with intense anxiety. Do any of us fear the disapproval of some of our constituents, and, thus fearing, will we adopt the tactics of the timeserver and demagogue by evading or remaining silent on the issue confronting us? I well know tha there are in my district some so-called free-silver men. By my remarks I can not expect their favor, but they shall know that upon this important question I have the courage of my convictions. Like all of you, I care for my political future, but I care very much more that this nation be honest; honest with itself and honest with all its people of every class; that this country, the heritage of a mighty people, shall be prosperous; that my people and your people and all the people shall be contented and happy; that soon again we shall emerge from out the cold shadow of adversity into the warm sunlight of prosperity. [Applause.]

Let us address ourselves now and here to the great task before us, and demonstrate to our own people and to the world at large that by our act we will not agree with that radical body known as the United States Senate, and that by this House no financial dishonor shall blacken the pages of our glorious history.

That there is great business depression, that there are many who are unemployed, and that wages are too low will be readily admitted. High wages is always proof of general prosperity. If we were enjoying the prosperous condition of a few years ago, we would hear much less of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Adversity is the fertile parent of wild theories, and with every period of business depression the speculative or incompetent or indolent citizen who fails is prompt to attack the financial system of the Government as the cause of his misfortune. Congress is powerful, but it has not the power to make 50 cents worth a dollar or legislate money into the people's pockets directly; neither can we produce crops and control markets by statute. There are business principles, practices, and laws higher than any statute we can enact; and you may pass laws enough to fill the Congressional Library, but no amount of talk, theory, or legislation can change the conditions of human life.

But, Mr. Speaker, the currency question, as I view it, is in no sense the cause of our financial troubles. A few years ago, when we were enjoying great prosperity, we had about the same quantity and just the same kind and quality of currency that we have to-day. We must look deeper for the cause; and in doing so let us keep in mind this truism—that any individual or any nation whose expenditures exceed the income will, sooner or later, meet with financial disaster. Is not this true as proven by all business experience; and will we not apply the same business principles to our Governmental affairs as we do to the general business of everyday life? If we will, then will we be able to discover the cause of our financial troubles, and having discovered the cause we can remove it.

Let me give you a few statistics:

IMPORTS FROM EUROPE.

During year 1895	$383,686,842
During year 1894	295,077,865
Increase, 1895	88,608,977

Thus it appears that during the year 1895, since the Gorman-Wilson tariff went into effect, we bought from European countries foreign goods worth $88,608,977 more than we bought in 1894. Now, having seen how we increased our purchases by this large sum in a single year, let us look at our exports or sales and learn what kind and manner of business we have been doing. Here are the figures.

EXPORTS TO EUROPE.

During the year 1894	$700,870,822
During the year 1895	627,975,133
Decrease, 1895	72,895,689

Thus it is clear that during the year 1895 we sold to European countries $72,895,689 worth less of our American products and manufactures than we did during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894. And in the year 1895 we spent $88,608,977 more money in European countries, and they spent $72,895,689 less money in this country. So our loss for the year's deal, under the Gorman-Wilson bill, exceeded $160,000,000. Is it not, then, apparent to the most casual observer that the cause of our trouble is the so-called tariff measure passed by the Democracy in the Fifty-third Congress? That measure largely increased our purchases or imports and decreased our sales or exports, thus spending more than our income, which, as we have seen, always brings disaster. Not only this, but it has destroyed our industries, almost ruined the farmer, caused the loss of over $100,000,000 in wool growing alone, and, worse than all else, it has turned out upon the highways hundreds of thousands of honest laborers who are begging for bread because the opportunity to earn it has been denied them.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this is not a party question, it is a business question, and one of common humanity. The laboring men of this land care not for your fine-spun theories of finance, or your treatise on political economy by college professors, but they do care for the opportunity to earn fair wages by honest labor; and they not only care for it, but demand it, as citizens of this great Republic.

Are we, indeed, so blind to our interests that we can not "see ourselves as others see us"? Let me read you an article taken from the London Financial News, of October 8, 1895:

Once more the board of trade returns are of a gratifying character, and the improvement has, fortunately, occurred all around. The imports of the month were worth £30,618,854, an increase of £378,393, or one twenty-fifth of 1 per cent. There still remains a deficiency on the nine months, but the figure has been reduced to £662,301. Had it not been for the lower prices ruling for wheat and cotton throughout the greater portion of the year this decrease would not have to be recorded, for in bulk the import trade of the nine months has exceeded that of 1894. Luckily, our exports have been advancing by such leaps and bounds that the lower range of prices has not affected their monetary value to the same extent as it has the imports. For the month the gain is £1,862,620, or ten fifty-eighths of 1 per cent, and for the nine months the augmentation reaches £5,157,866, or three-nineteenths of 1 per cent.

One rather odd feature about these figures is the fact that one-half of the increase comes under the head of yarns and textile fabrics, although one department of our textile industries has been very hardly hit. The great prosperity of the wool trades has, fortunately, more than offset the retrogression in cotton, though that reflection brings small consolation to Lancashire. The total gain for the nine months under yarn and textiles is £3,297,675, and as the value of woolen tissues taken by the United States has been about £950,000 and of worsted tissues nearly £3,000,000 greater than in 1894, no further search for the origin of the improvement in the trade returns need be made. The lowering of the American tariff has been our salvation and it can not be said that we have shown much reciprocity, for, instead of taking the increased value of our shipments across the Atlantic in kind, we seem to have bought less American produce. It is needless to go beyond our own board of trade returns to find an explanation of a good deal of the monetary trouble in the United States.

Practically every penny that was subscribed here toward the recent American loan has been got back through the expansion in the exports of woolens and worsteds, but the United States has not confined her increased purchases to those articles. Last month she bought less raw wool than in September, 1894, but had to pay more for it. She took more cotton pieces, more iron, more alkali, and more of sundry articles which need not be specified. In some instances the rapid growth of the preceding months resulted in a slight check in September, but in all these cases the figures of the nine months show a big advance on 1894. On the other hand, we have paid a good deal less for American wheat, flour, bacon, hams, cheese, tallow, and cotton, to mention only those articles in which the contraction is almost apparent. The fact that the Argentine Republic heads the United States in respect of maize is not without significance.

Thus the trade balance between the States and this country is moving rap

idly against the former, and it would require a large and regular transference of securities from New York to London to redress this tendency and restore the former position. And with India, Argentina, and Australia keeping up and even improving their positions as purveyors of wheat to this country, with Argentina sending more as the United States sends less tallow, it will not be easy for the Americans to regain their old footing in our market. Last month India and Argentina sent us more wheat than the United States, and Russia and Roumania together also topped the American figures. These are all factors that must be borne in mind in judging the outlook in the United States, and it is unfortunate that they are so consistently overlooked in that country itself. The increase in the purchase of British manufactures may not be maintained; but, on the other hand, the United States must count on the competition in wheat and maize becoming more and more intense as time goes on.

The movements in the imports last month were not of a nature to call for much comment, but we must note with interest the substantial increase in the arrivals of sugar and guano from Peru, the larger purchases of goats' wool, due to the briskness of business in mohair goods, and the fact that South Africa has sent us more, while Australia has sent less, sheep's wool. In the exports spirits have gone up considerably, and mining would seem to be thirsty work, for nearly all the increase has gone to South Africa and Australia. We have already referred briefly to cotton piece goods, which continue to decline both in quantity and in value. Central and South America, with the sole exception of Brazil, are buying more freely, and so is Japan, to which country we are sending more yarn, also, thanks, no doubt, to the disorganization of native industry by the recent war. India is, of course, reducing her purchases, though Bengal and Burmah constitute exceptions in the case of yarn. To Brazil we owe a satisfactory increase in jute, yarn and pieces, while Germany joins with the United States in absorbing more woolen and worsted yarn. It is rather odd to find that iron is going to America in larger quantities.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, notice how, in another direction, our financial affairs have been managed by the present Democratic Administration, and also make some comparisons:

Between August 31, 1865, the date upon which the national debt reached its highest point, and March 1, 1893, the amount of the Government's outstanding obligations was reduced by $1,881,367,873. To accomplish this remarkable feat of debt paying, bonds were purchased before their maturity and canceled to the amount of $770,809,750. The reduction of the national debt by four-year periods, is given on March 1 of each fourth year, as follows, cents omitted:

March 1, 1869	$280,430,492
March 1, 1873	403,948,484
March 1, 1877	65,204,017
March 1, 1881	73,646,781
March 1, 1885	480,161,982
March 1, 1889	341,448,449
March 1, 1893	236,527,666
Total reduction	1,881,367,873

On March 1, 1895, the national debt had been increased by $105,323,774, and on December 1, 1895, by $57,273,470, making the total increase under the present (Democratic) Administration $162,602,245.—*New York World.*

To this frank avowal of Democratic deficiency and imcompetency, we must now add another $100,000,000 of debt, authorized by the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury on January 6, 1896, making the total Democratic debt $262,602,245 within thirty-five months, as compared with the Republican decrease of debt of $1,881,367,873 within three hundred and thirty months, the monthly averages being:

Republican monthly decrease of debt 1865–1893	$5,701,114.77
Democratic monthly increase of debt, 1893–1896	7,502,921.28

Mr. Speaker, I confidently believe that the great masses of the American people at this time fully realize that because of the incompetency of the present Administration there must be a change, so that full power in all the departments of the Government may be given to the Republican party to enact such legislation, as they surely will, as will again give us prosperity in our business, comfort in all our homes, and contentment at every fireside. God speed the day when again the honest laborer shall have full employment at honest wages paid in honest money. [Loud applause.]

I do not abuse, and will not attack, the present Administration, The facts and figures which I have given speak in louder and more emphatic tones than I can utter. If it were cruel to sneer at its impotence, then the feeble must be pitied. As to the Republican party, its financial views and specific financial doctrine, I am not authorized to speak, but as a Republican I have my own opinion, and I believe I am in accord with very many Republicans.

I favor as money gold, silver, and paper, interchangeable on equality, each dollar as good as every other dollar. I favor bimetallism and free coinage based on international agreement. If this can not be had, then I favor the coinage of silver limited only by the ability of our Government to make and keep each silver dollar as good as every and any other dollar and maintain the honor and integrity of the nation. [Applause.]

Let us not be deceived by the cry of our free-silver friends, that the great debtor class has interests which free silver will protect. We must not forget that for every dollar owing by any debtor there is a dollar due to a creditor. Simple justice demands that the creditor should receive from the debtor the same kind of money in value which he advanced, and common honesty demands that the debtor should return to the creditor just as good money as he received from him.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that, in my judgment, the financial question will speedily settle itself, when by a wise system of protective tariff we shall have sufficient revenues to pay our expenses; when by such system our great business and manufacturing interests are protected and thus employ our laborers and protect them against the low wages of foreign labor. Let us again see the smoke continually ascend from the iron furnace, the coke oven, the tannery; let us again hear the happy melody of the loom and the factory, again listen to the clicking of the reaper in the fields of grain which will yield the farmer profit and not loss, and then we shall not need to issue more bonds and shall hear no more of deficits and depleted Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration by the House is a bill "to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet a temporary deficiency of revenue."

As it originally passed this House the bill in effect provided that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized from time to time, at his own discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to bear not to exceed 3 per cent per annum interest, payable semiannually, and redeemable by the United States in coin after five years, and payable in fifteen years from their date.

For the purposes of this discussion I do not care to enter into a consideration of section 2 of said House bill, inasmuch as the objections to the first section are conclusive.

The bill as passed by the House went to the Senate and was there considered by its Finance Committee, which reported back a substitute, the main point of which is that it provides for the coinage of silver by the United States as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, or, in other words, opens the mints of the United States to the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

I did not have the honor, sir, of holding a seat in this House as a Representative of the State of Utah when the original House bill was here considered and passed. Therefore I think it fit that I should not only give my reasons in support of the passage of the Senate amendment, but should also give my reasons why we should accept it in preference to the bill which originally passed this House.

The people of the United States are opposed, and opposed on safe economic grounds, to the creation of bonded debt in time of peace. It has been said by those who own money and seek investment for it in such ways that it will be absolutely safe and beyond the reach of the tax collector, that great public debts are a source of safety, stability, and strength to the nation. The statement has no foundation in fact, and when the theory is carried into the practice of government it is fraught with direful consequences to the people who adopt it. Anything which adds to the burdens of the producing classes of a nation can be nothing but hindrance to them in the race of life. They are those who in the final analysis carry all the burdens of taxation and of private and public debt. How, then, can a nation be strengthened by increasing the burdens of those who create wealth? Useless debt incurred in times of peace is an economic crime, a crime for which not only that generation which incurs it must be punished, but a crime which affects even the children of the third and fourth generations.

And yet to one who studies the financial history of this nation there can be no escape from the conclusion that the men who own and practically control the money of this nation have been laboring for the past twenty-five years steadily, persistently, and cruelly to increase the indebtedness of the nation, that they might find a source from which they could draw additional revenues and additional gains.

The first attempt was to retire the greenback absolutely and completely from circulation. Under the distress which was thus caused came such an upheaval of public sentiment that those who had initiated this movement were forced to give way and a law was passed that the greenback, whenever taken into the Treasury of the United States, should be canceled and reissued.

By the demonetization of silver in 1873, done, as I believe, in the dark by stealth, without the desire of the people and against their present welfare and their future prosperity, a blow was struck at the integrity of the United States, under which it has reeled and staggered for the last twenty-three years. In spite of continued discussion in the Congress of the United States, in spite of Congresses elected pledged to the restoration of the white metal to its use as money, in spite of the growing distress of the agriculturists of the nation and the narrowing profit in all business, in spite of all true principles of monetary science this economic evil has been persisted in, and now, more than twenty years after the great wrong against the people of the United States was wrought, it is sought to take another step which inevitably must stifle industry and overwhelm our people with greater indebtedness.

Though the first attempt to retire the greenbacks had failed, those who had sought to compel their retirement had not yielded their point. The advocates of the coinage of silver have heretofore asserted that the next step in this conspiracy of the money owners against the producers of the United States and the world would be to force the destruction of the national paper currency. Citizens of the Republic have not realized this until within the last few months, but now the purpose is boldly declared and we are

confronted with the proposition that the greenback and silver certificate must be retired from our circulation. And when this shall be done there will be left to us nothing but our gold, our token silver, and such national-bank currency as the owners of bonds and money in their self-interest may allow to be issued to the people of the United States. Then it will be discovered that silver, the silver that we have coined or have held as bullion within our Treasury, is a further menace to the gold standard, and the third and last step in this series of contractions will be taken, and silver, if the scheme can be carried to its ultimate end, will be retired from use, except in so far as it may be utilized as small change by the people. It is well that this purpose of the gold monometallists at last stands revealed, since men more and more will realize the cost to the nation of this futile and foolish attempt to do its business on a money basis which is constantly decreasing as compared with the increase of population and the opportunities which will arise thereunder for the use of money.

If the House stand by the proposition which it made to the Senate and refuse to concur in the amendment made by that body, and the Senate should recede from its position as declared in the amendment presented to us, there would be given to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury the right to issue bonds in times of peace; and for what? To maintain a gold reserve. It is thereby confessed that gold monometallism is a failure; it is thereby confessed that we can not maintain it under the practice of the executive department, unless from time to time we increase our national indebtedness, put greater burdens of interest upon our people and the far greater and farther-reaching burden of a continued fall in prices, and the consequent diminution of the ability of the people to pay the burdens which are thus heaped upon them. When is this purchase of gold to cease?

No one will dispute that there is distress abroad in the land; no man in this House has the temerity, sir, to arise here and claim that the United States are prosperous. In 1893, sitting in the galleries of this Chamber and those of the Senate, I heard men declaim on the great prosperity that would come to America if the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman Act were repealed. The President of the United States said, in effect, that the purchase of silver by the Government had produced the financial distress which was prevailing in our land, and he called upon the Congress of the United States to pass in a day a bill which would relieve the Government from the necessity of purchasing 4,500,000 ounces, or any amount at all, of the white metal. The bill was passed, the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was repealed, and no relief came. Instead of that which had been fondly pictured, came the necessity of supplying from time to time gold to maintain the so-called reserve—gold purchased with bonds of the people, purchased sometimes under the terms of a secret contract for less than their market value.

The President and his Secretary of the Treasury have had at all times their means of relief at hand. If they thought it necessary to maintain in the Treasury a given amount of gold, it was at their option at any time to pay out silver upon the obligation of the Government. The people would have been benefited, the bondholders and the gold speculators would have been stopped in their raid upon the Government Treasury. But these high officials refused to exercise this option, and under a law which conveys no authority to them for this purpose purchased gold and used it to pay the running expenses of this Government.

Now, sir, it is proposed to give to these officials, and to those who may succeed them, the right, under cover of law, to issue bonds at any time with which to buy gold in order to maintain the gold reserve. Why does gold leave the Treasury? Simply because it is more valuable for export than it is for use within the United States, and because under the low prices which exist we are unable to export of all of our other products sufficient to pay the demand against us of foreign countries. This would be equally and increasingly true had we no greenbacks, no Treasury notes, no silver dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there is a sound economic reason why bonds should not be issued at such a time as this—a reason which lies at the foundation of monetary science. The people of the United States are suffering from a contraction of their real-money volume. They now have as their real money, money of ultimate redemption, according to the estimates of the Treasury Department, about $550,000,000 of gold. No doubt this estimate is far beyond what the facts will warrant. In order to account for this sum of gold within the United States it is necessary to assume that outside of the $175,000,000 which are in the vaults of the banks, and the $50,000,000 which it is estimated are in daily circulation among the people of the mountain and Pacific Coast States, there are $310,000,000 in circulation among the people of the East, or hidden away by them. What man of intelligence believes that the people of the East have hoarded any such sum of gold as this? It is not in active circulation. Gold, as we all well know, is not in daily circulation among the people of the North, South, and old West. If they have this enormous sum it must be hoarded by them, withdrawn from active use as money by the people themselves. And every time that the Government steps into the market and buys $100,000,000 of gold it contracts the money market in so far and produces an evil effect upon business and production. All men acknowledge that the effect of contraction is to depreciate the price of products; that the expansion of the money volume increases the price of products. By contraction business is hampered, credit must be withdrawn, and failures may ensue. Therefore, instead of easing monetary conditions, the sale of bonds and the purchase of gold with the proceeds must inevitably have the effect of contracting the volume of money in circulation and of forcing down the price of all the products which we produce and offer for sale.

[NOTE.—Since the above speech was made I have received a circular from Dimock & Co., of New York, bankers and brokers, which, in commenting upon the bond issue, confirms my statement above. Extracts from the circular are as follows:

The work necessary to the preservation of a gold standard, so auspiciously begun, is far from complete. During the last five years the Government banks of Europe have added nearly six hundred millions of gold to their reserves. In the same period the New York banks and the United States Treasury have together reduced their gold reserves nearly one hundred millions. Yet all natural conditions were incomparably favorable to the United States. The trouble is unpalatably stated in a recent issue of a well-known politico-economic publication: "The history of our national economic and financial policy since the civil war is an almost unbroken record of fatuous ignorance and empirical experimentation, and insolent disregard of the best established inductions of science." It is of small use to take up one form of Government note, if another ultimately redeemable by the Government is to be issued in its place. The original issue of national-bank notes was monumental folly, and without support from any sound principle of economic or financial science. Gold can only be drawn to this country and kept here by sufficient contraction of the circulation to create the vacuum necessary.

The sentimental advance in stocks which followed the favorable developments of the bond call was even more than we anticipated, but the reaction must soon set in. The pyrotechnics are over and we have now to face for months the most serious contraction of recent times.]

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed upon one side that the source of this difficulty is the lack of revenue, and upon the other side of the Chamber that there is no lack of revenue. The question of revenue does not enter into the consideration of the question before us. In my opinion, at no time and under no conditions should the executive department of our Government have the right to issue and sell the bonds of its people in time of peace. To give the right to the Executive is to grant a power which will be used for the benefit of the few and add burdens to the many. No power except the Representatives of the people sitting in Congress should be granted the opportunity of creating or increasing such indebtedness. Therefore I shall vote to concur in the Senate amendment, because it does not confer upon the Executive the right to sell the bonds of the people in time of peace, while the original bill does grant this power.

It is not my purpose, in what I shall say upon this occasion, to go into any extended discussion of the question presented to us by the Senate amendment. The reasons for and against the free and unlimited coinage of silver, irrespective of the action of other nations, and at the ratio which existed under the law of 1837, have, for the most part, been presented again and again. But the rapid march of events has brought more distinctly into view within the past two years the extent of the evil which is being brought upon the United States by its adherence to the views of the gold monometallists. As briefly as may be, I shall view the question from the standpoint alone of our debtor relations to the nations of Europe and the new trade relations which must inevitably spring up and have arisen between ourselves and the silver-using nations of the world if our present financial policy be maintained.

The United States can not protect her citizens against low prices and maintain a monometallic gold standard so long as she is a debtor to the nations of the world. The people of the United States must pay abroad annually upon the interest of their debts, public and private, in the expenses of their traveling citizens, and to the nations which carry their commerce upon the seas about $250,000,000 over and above the excess of their exports over imports. This amount, which by some is made even greater, must be paid year by year, or else our foreign indebtedness must increase and must be paid either with the other products of toil or with our gold. We have not produced, and will not produce in the future, gold sufficient to pay this demand upon our resources. During the last year we produced about one-fifth of this sum. Therefore we must pay the balance either with the gold which has accumulated in the United States during the period when silver was continuously coined, or we must pay it with our products, or increase our foreign debts as we have done continuously since 1862.

We can not say to the nations of the world that we demand such or such a price for those products which we send abroad to pay this balance, but we must go into their markets and offer them for such a price that foreign nations will purchase, or we must pay the annual demand upon us by means of the gold which we produce or have accumulated. Therefore, to meet this drain which never ceases, if we would maintain the supply of gold which

we have we must force the price of the product which we export down to a point where we shall be able to meet or undersell the products of other nations.

Since the first blow was aimed at silver, year by year, almost month by month, there has been a steady and persistent decline in the price of our great products which enter into competition in the world's markets with those of other nations, and the effect has been to not only reduce the price of that which we sell abroad, but also to reduce the price of that which we sell at home. The decline in the price of our chief exports has not yet ceased and is shown for 1895 as follows:

About three-fourths of our exports in value consist of the following-named items: Cotton, wheat, wheat flour, bacon and hams, lard, corn, pork, beef, tobacco, and cheese. The value of our exports of the above-named articles in 1894 was $510,012,686. In 1895 the value of our exports of the same product was only $452,719,941, a decrease of $57,292,745, a decrease amounting to 11⅛ per cent. As compared with the prices of these exports in 1894 there was so great an average fall in their value that had we obtained the prices for these exports which we received in 1894 there would have been placed to our credit by their sale $552,486,345 instead of the $452,719,941 which we actually received; so that in 1895, as compared with 1894, upon these ten articles our total loss was $99,766,404.

Therefore the statement which the Secretary of the Treasury makes wherein, to account for the decrease in the value of our exports, he says that this decrease is due to "the improved crop conditions in other countries" which, he writes, "account largely for the diminished exports of domestic produce in 1895," is without foundation and utterly misleading. The inference to be drawn from the language of the Secretary is that we shipped less of these products abroad in 1895 than we did in 1894, and therefore received less money for them, while the statistics prepared in his own Department and under his own direction show that there was an increase in the amount of the above-named products exported to foreign countries from the United States in 1895 as compared with the year 1894, amounting to 8⅛ per cent.

Nor will this fall in the price of our chief exports cease with the year 1895. Prices must go lower and lower until the level made necessary by the single gold standard is reached, and when that shall have been done we will be upon the level, not of Mexico, but of China.

The gentleman from Maine in opening this debate with dramatic fervor asked if we wished to Mexicanize the United States. This gentleman, with the adroitness for which he is distinguished, did not pursue the subject further. Other gentlemen upon this floor have undertaken to show that the people of Mexico are indolent, uneducated, oftentimes slaves to their masters, and, generally speaking, utterly unfit to be compared with the citizens of this great Republic. For the sake of argument I will admit that what has been said by the adherents of gold monometallism upon this floor during this debate is true. What follows? If such a people at a time when every gold-using nation in the world, nations which boast themselves as being superior in intelligence and business ability, finds itself upon the verge of bankruptcy and looks with dismay into the future—I say if such a people at such a time are found prosperous and business of all kinds within the limits and under the laws of that people is flourishing, failures are rare, and dividends are large, surely they must have some great advantage which enables them to thrive and prosper when other nations are increasing their debts and the burdens of taxation. It can not be found, according to these gentlemen, in their blood, because they are Mexicans; it can not be found in their customs, because they are antiquated; it can not be found in their energy, because the people are lazy; it can not be their soil, since it is no more fertile than that of gold-using nations; it can not be their sunshine, because it contains no more life-giving power than the rays which fall upon our own people. There can be but one explanation of the continued and increasing prosperity of Mexico, and that is found in the fact that she uses silver as money and has the advantage of the difference in exchange over gold-using nations.

The following extract from the Mexican Herald will show the exact condition of affairs with relation to matters therein spoken of:

Mexico is now in position to invade the markets of the west coast of South America in competition with Germany, England, and all other countries on a gold basis. It is very significant that Mexican print works are now selling goods direct to ports on the Pacific coast of Mexico, and taking the market away from the gold-standard countries, which can only be done now because the west coast is quickly accessible.

One of the greatest merchants, forty years in business and a large importer from Europe, says it is no longer possible for the United States or Europe to compete with Mexican mills, which can turn out excellent cottons at $1.25 less per piece. Mexico is growing more cotton yearly, and will soon be able to supply itself without bringing in American cotton; and as the growing and manufacturing are done on the basis of cheap labor and silver money, Mexico should aspire to enter the lists as an exporter of cotton goods.

There is an ample field here for the investment of capital in cotton mills, also in paper and other products. Mexican woolens are now being turned out of superior quality, and thousands of people are refusing to buy expensive English goods. Tailors are supplying their growing demands at prices less than one-half those charged for European goods. For example, trousers are being sold at $5 per pair which if made of English goods would cost $14. Mexican manufacturers are very prosperous, and there is undoubtedly a chance for a modern shoe factory. The policy of the Government is to render Mexico independent as far as possible of the foreign gold-standard countries. This tends to give employment to railways, and the policy of the Mexican Central Railway in favoring every Mexican industry on its various lines is cordially commended in Government circles. The road has become thoroughly Mexican in policy, with resultant higher earnings.

Hundreds of Americans are here, among them many capitalists, and there is a great interest shown in coffee lands and lands for general agricultural purposes. Sugar planters were never more prosperous than now, and this industry can not easily be overdone, as the domestic demand is not filled, and the profits will be large for many years. The National Bank of Mexico will in May declare a dividend of 17 per cent and add heavily to its reserve. The active capital of the bank is $8,000,000, and the reserve $5,000,000.

I will also submit the following letter, written me by a gentleman of standing in the City of Mexico, and which bears out the statements made by the silver men upon this floor and elsewhere that under the vivifying effect of silver coinage Mexico has entered upon an era of prosperity like unto that which we enjoyed from 1850 to 1873 under the impulse given our nation by the increasing flow of gold from California and Australia:

CITY OF MEXICO, *January 18, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: Answering your favor of the 12th instant, I send you under separate cover some printed matter and data referring to Mexico, prepared by this office. In this country the silver question is not discussed, as it is a question which interests us very little, being already on a silver basis. The prosperity of this country has undoubtedly been greatly aided by our silver coinage, as we have been entirely exempt from panics and financial crises of all and every nature. And although within the last five years there have been two droughts, which have resulted in partial losses of the corn crop—the most important crop of this country—still the receipts of the Government from taxes have gone steadily on increasing, and this in spite of the fact that there has been no increase in taxation. In fact, taxes have been reduced during this period.

The effect of the silver basis on this country appears to be about as follows: Native capital now remains in the country and is invested in home industries and enterprises, instead of being sent to Europe for investment as formerly. Also, as the income of our more important or wealthy families is entirely in silver, the premium on gold has resulted in keeping their money in this country and now a larger proportion of them remain at home and spend their money here instead of throwing it away in Europe.

Another thing: The premium on gold has increased in a most wonderful manner the exports of Mexico. We now export and make large profits on various articles which in former years it was not profitable to export. At the same time prices in this country have been but little affected by the premium on gold. I have been a resident of this Republic twenty-six years, and during that time intimately connected with financial and mercantile houses. I would say that a Mexican dollar buys to-day as much in this city as it did when I came here, and at that time a Mexican dollar was worth $1.10 in gold in San Francisco. The price of corn, beans, flour, wearing apparel, etc., is almost exactly the same as in former years. Of course there are fluctuations due to good or bad crops, but the average cost of all the various articles which go to make up the expenses of a family are almost exactly the same as when gold was at par.

You will note by the printed matter sent you the wonderful increase in the income of the Government, and also of the Mexican Central Railway, which I think will compare favorably with that of governments or railroads on a gold basis. Also, the price of Mexican securities has steadily been advancing in spite of the increased premium on gold. The fact is that an abundant supply of good silver dollars, which everybody can get and everybody can spend, seems to make people more cheerful, harder workers, and induces the capitalist to go into new enterprises. Although there are bank notes in circulation in this country, they are represented by an actual store of silver dollars, so that at a moment's notice the same can be converted into coin. They are, in fact, like the gold certificates of the United States, except that ours are issued by incorporated banks. Mercantile failures are rare, and manufacturing establishments, especially those engaged in the manufacture of wool and cotton, are paying large dividends. Banks are also paying from 10 to 16 per cent a year on their capital stock. While the perfect peace and order which Mexico has enjoyed for the last twenty years has had a great effect on the development and prosperity of this country, I also believe that our silver basis has helped us prosper as much as any other cause. Also, another element which has helped this country greatly in all mercantile transactions is the stability of our currency. It obviates the necessity of an inverted pyramid of paper supported on a small gold basis, and there are none of those sudden fluctuations and variations in prices which result from a less sound financial system. The capitalist or the merchant knows that coin can always be procured, and that its value for purchasing purposes in this Republic has had but little, if any, change within the last century. The income of this company, which increased $1,070,000 in 1895 over its income in 1894, shows in a striking degree the constant development of the country. In other words, a sound currency and fixed value has stimulated in the past, and is stimulating to-day, all mercantile enterprises, and the results can be seen in the dividends paid by the banks and mercantile enterprises of the country.

The premium on gold also tends to bring it to this country. European investors, taking advantage of the premium on gold, are more willing to come here and make investments in mining, manufacturing, etc., than if this disparity between gold and silver did not exist. While doubling their capital on bringing it into Mexico they can go into production of articles for export which are sold for gold, as, for instance, coffee, rubber, hides, vanilla, and kindred products, so that practically they double their capital and yet receive a gold interest on their investment.

A silver basis seems to tend to the increase of a larger number of small incomes rather than a small number of larger ones.

Any further information or statistics you would like I will take pleasure in forwarding if you will indicate to me what you desire.

Yours, truly,

A. V. TEMPLE,
Manager Bureau of Information.

MR. CLARENCE E. ALLEN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In Consular Reports No. 182, for November, 1895, the consul-general as Shanghai makes a statement which supports the position which I have here taken—that the effect of the demonetization of silver by European nations and by ourselves has been to force

down the price of those products which we export. The statement is as follows:

Stability in the value of silver is the one desideratum of the foreign merchant in the far East; and it is pointed out that fluctuations in it must really affect the well-being of the entire population of the United Kingdom. * * * Under the influence of cheap silver the volume of exports continues to expand, and the European consumer reaps the benefit of their cheapness in gold prices. The fall in silver and low freights have combined to enable the majority of the stable exports of China to be laid down in Europe at about one-half the cost at which they could be sold twenty years ago.

At the time when the United States entered upon the suicidal policy of destroying one-half of our money of ultimate redemption she found a remunerative market for her products in the marts of Europe.

In spite of the efforts which had been made by England in years past to establish the cotton industry in and the export of wheat from India, the United States had been able to demand and command a fair price for her wheat and cotton. Since that period not only India but Russia and the Argentine Republic and all the States upon a silver or paper basis have been enabled, through the difference in exchange between gold and silver, to enter the markets of the world and to force down the price of the great products which we export, and must export to pay our foreign debt and the interest thereon, to such prices that to-day there is no adequate recompense in any part of the United States for the planter, the farmer, or the ranchman. This could result because in the countries which have continued to use silver silver has the same purchasing power that it had before we recklessly, improvidently, and criminally demonetized silver.

A silver dollar in these countries buys the same amount of labor, pays debts, and purchases equally the products of the country even as it did before the gold-using nations finally effected the demonetization of silver within their limits. Thereby silver-using nations have erected a barrier against imports from gold-using nations which amounts to an ad valorem protective tariff of 100 per cent upon all goods imported, or, to state it another way, they have given their own people an export duty. Every bushel of wheat, pound of cotton, or peck of corn which they send abroad, since their governments retain the full use of silver, can be sold for one-half the former price thereof as measured in gold, because that gold price of such exports will purchase in silver as much labor or as much of the products of such silver-using nations as it would before we placed our financial affairs and the welfare of our people in the hands of the British. And if we would sell in the nations of the world, we must meet this advantage which silver-using nations enjoy by lowering the price of our products until we can command, or at least share, in this foreign trade.

This burden hitherto has been borne by the farmers and planters of this nation because their products have been those which for the most part have been sent abroad to pay the demands against us, but not only has the difference in exchange value between gold and silver reduced to extremity our farmers and planters, by reducing the price of their products below that which would allow a reasonable recompense, but it has compelled the silver-using nations to begin to manufacture for themselves. Under these laws which have been passed by the gold-using nations, where once it took a dollar in silver to buy a certain product from them, it now takes two silver dollars to buy the same product at the same price. Hence the silver-producing nations were compelled or induced by the very force of circumstances to establish within their own borders factories and plants which would produce for themselves that which they had theretofore been accustomed to buy abroad. Thus has the yarn trade of England in the Orient been destroyed; thus year by year are the East Indians finding themselves driven to the wall by the competition which Chinese and Japanese manufacturers are forcing upon them. And now the people of China and Japan stand ready to contend with us, not only for the market of the world, but for our own better and greater market.

The Republican party is the party of protection. Since the foundation of the Republic it and its predecessors in governmental policy have steadily held that the toiler in America must be protected against the cheap labor of foreign countries. To that doctrine Republicans heartily subscribe who believe that the true policy of our nation is to produce and coin all the gold and silver possible to be obtained. They yield to no one in their allegiance to the fundamental principle of the Republican party. By their votes for the last twenty years the great Republican West has made it possible for their party to maintain control of the United States Senate. By their votes they have sustained the fundamental principles of the Republican party. By their votes year by year the Republican party has been assisted to victory, and because we now and at all times announce ourselves to be unreservedly in favor of the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, with or without the consent of any nation, we do not give the right to any man to deny our Republicanism. And we of the West, who were called silver barons until it was suddenly discovered that we could produce gold cheaper than we could produce silver, say and believe that there can be no adequate protection to American industry until silver is restored to its rightful place as a money metal, with coinage privileges equal with those of gold.

Already, by madly holding to gold monometallism, the manufacturers of the East, whom many of you represent, have so reduced the purchasing power of the agriculturists of the nation that their best market, the only great market of the world, has been circumscribed and constricted instead of growing and expanding as it might have grown and expanded had silver retained its constitutional prerogative.

But now another danger confronts these manufacturers, who have put their trust in the golden calf and blindly followed the behest of the English owners of money. Not only is the home market weakened and depressed by the contraction in the world's supply of metallic money, but no longer are Americans to control that market, let alone to extend the sale of their wares to sister nations which use the white metal, as our Constitution declares we shall do.

In support of the position which I have here taken, and which rests upon the eternal principles of monetary science, I wish to submit the following observations of one of the keenest and brightest newspaper men of the United States, Mr. J. P. Young, and some of the quotations from leading newspapers which he published in the San Francisco Chronicle December 13, 1895:

On the 15th of June last the Japan Weekly Gazette published a memorial drawn up by the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, in which the fact was pointed out "that Japan is becoming a great manufacturing country and rapidly advancing to a position of marked prominence in many branches of the Eastern trade." Figures furnished by the agricultural department show that the first cotton-spinning mill was erected in Japan in 1863, but twenty years later there were only 16 mills in operation, with 43,704 spindles. Since then the industry has advanced very rapidly. At the end of 1888 the number of spindles had increased to 88,140, and five years later there were 46 mills, running 600,000 spindles. The memorial above alluded to commenting on the department report, says that "there is a prospect of even more rapid development," and adds, "We think it unnecessary to refer in detail to the many other manufactures in which Japan is not only supplying home wants but is successfully competing with Europe in the markets of China, the Straits Settlements, and India."

Regarding Japanese trade with the United States and India, the memorial says:

We anticipate that if exchange with America remains at a very low level and the rupee continues to be held above its bullion value in India, China will eventually furnish to Japan all the cotton she needs, except such staples as can not be grown on Chinese soil. In evidence of this possibility the import of raw cotton from China into Japan increased from 61,328,021 pounds in 1891 to 95,115,180 pounds in 1893.

So, if the conclusion of these Eastern observers is correct, the fatuous monetary policy of Great Britain and the United States will make it impossible for either India or the United States to compete with China in the matter of supplying raw cotton to Japan. Thus we shall soon be deprived of the sorry satisfaction of furnishing the progressive inland Empire with the raw material for manufacturing the goods she promises to ultimately deluge us with.

The British Trade Journal of a recent date says:

Among the trades more recently introduced in Japan is the manufacture of watches. In 1893 Japan imported more than 103,000 watches from Switzerland, France, Germany, and the United States. The object of the new Japanese factory is to produce a watch of the cheaper kind. * * * But it seems not unlikely that the new concern will manufacture a better class of timekeeper if the demands should necessitate such a step.

There is no doubt about this latter point. Information from another source than that above quoted makes it clear that the American who is at the back of this new Japan enterprise is merely paving the way to the creation of a great industry in which he proposed to take advantage of the undoubted skill of the oriental workingmen, in order to turn out both high and low grade watches which will successfully compete with the best watches made in the Western World.

An English journal early in the present year remarked:

Japan has certainly prospered on cheap silver. Through the instrumentality of the white metal she has made large strides toward industrial independence, and has begun to be recognized by the older manufacturing nations as a formidable competitor. Japanese cotton and linen goods and other manufactured products are invading markets where a few years ago they were unknown, and it is interesting to note that the increased importation of such articles into the United States is beginning to cause uneasiness to American manufacturers.

If the latter statement is true, the American manufacturers have effectually succeeded in concealing their uneasiness. The manufacturing industry in the United States is a powerful one, and if those concerned in it once awaken to the disadvantages under which they are laboring in their competition with the East, they will speedily make their influence felt. But it is reasonable to assume that the American manufacturers are still in the dark, and agree with the Boston Herald that the people of silver-using countries are on a lower plane of civilization, and their efforts to develop manufacturing industries are therefore to be despised. Meanwhile Japan, one of the silver countries on a lower plane of civilization, is increasing her productions at a rate which seems rapid when compared with our own advantages. We have made some progress in the production of pottery, but we venture to say that the Japanese, who in 1884 employed 19,000 in turning out

73,500,000 pieces, and four years later employed 27,000 men, who produced 126,000,000 pieces, a rate of increase that has been well maintained since, have no reason to shrink from a comparison. The extension of their cotton and silk industry has already been noted as being on a threatening scale, menacing a competition which Western people will not be able to stand up against.

The Textile Mercury, an English trade publication, expressed the belief a few days ago that the mischief had already been accomplished, and remarked:

It is high time for the English cotton spinner and manufacturer to look out for suitable fields to which he may emigrate.

The writer added:

It really looks as if the growth of England's cotton industry at home had reached its limit, and that English capital engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods would hereafter be forced to seek locations in India and China in order to find profitable employment. * * * English manufacturers can only hope to maintain their supremacy in Eastern markets by producing the goods on the spot.

The question for American manufacturers to consider is whether they could maintain themselves against a competition which has nearly proved fatal to Lancashire. Should there be an exodus of English capital to the Orient for the purpose of establishing manufacturing industries in China and Japan, how could we in this country hope to successfully exclude the flood of cheap goods that would be poured into the United States? The present tariff scarcely offers any obstacle to the European manufacturer operating under all the disadvantages of the gold standard. How, then, could we hope to successfully compete with the same manufacturer after he has transferred his machinery to a country where labor is phenomenally cheap and is compensated in a metal which, when measured in terms of gold, is likewise cheap? The manufacturer, under such circumstances, would ask in vain for an increase of the protective tariff, for the enlightened opinion of the agriculturist would be against the granting of such a request while the producer is subjected to the destructive influence of a constantly decreasing measurer of values. When the money of the world was composed of gold and silver the farmer could afford to stand shoulder to shoulder with the manufacturer in the United States and assist in building up a great manufacturing industry. The achievement of such a result meant for him increasing markets near his own door, and that, translated into plain English, meant increased profits through the diminution of cost of transportation and the elimination of the middleman. But the changed conditions preclude the idea of agriculture making common cause with manufactures. The farmers are now perfectly aware that the tremendous fall in the price of their products is due to the appreciation of the value of gold, and they will not be so foolish as to consent to rivet their shackles more firmly by assisting in artificially raising the prices of manufactured products while no steps are taken to prevent the depreciation of the prices of the products of the soil.

If this view is correct, unless something is done to restore silver and thus put all nations on a plane of equality the gold-using countries must prepare to have their markets invaded by the manufacturer of the silver-using countries, not only by those of the Orient, but those of Russia as well. The Textile Mercury, in the same article in which it bewails the decadence of the English cotton industry, also describes the prosperity of the Russian cotton manufacturer. It says:

While the English cotton manufacturer is in dire distress, in Russia the trade is in a highly prosperous condition. The mills of Moscow and other cotton spinning and weaving districts are paying dividends of from 25 to 33 per cent. Spinners have all their productions bought up into the middle of next year. A manufacturer who wants yarn now can only purchase it at enhanced values from the middleman or speculator; it is not to be had from any other source.

Russia, according to the theories of the Boston Herald, should be on a still lower plane of civilization than the silver-using countries of the Orient and of Central and South America, for its chief currency is an inconvertible credit note, although the legal unit of money is the silver ruble of 100 kopecks. But instead of Russia being in a condition to excite the commiseration of philanthropists in gold-using countries she actually is enjoying a degree of manufacturing prosperity which fills with envy the ruined cotton manufacturers of England and the United States.

This advantage has also operated to deprive English shipbuilders of a share of trade. At a meeting of the China Mutual Steamship Company, Mr. Maitland, the president, remarked that—

The working expenses had been considerably reduced, almost entirely by the great fall of the gold price of silver. * * * For the repairs of their steamers very large amounts of money were annually needed, and they had already commenced to make repairs in Singapore, China, and Japan. With the dollar at 2 shillings the skilled Asiatic will work for a month for less than a skilled British subject will work for a week.

This testimony regarding the danger to the shipbuilding industry is supplemented by that of the chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental, the greatest steamship line plying between the Orient and Europe, who has not hesitated to predict that if the Chinese and Japanese continue to retain the advantage which the excessive appreciation of the value of gold gives them, the new vessels of the company will be built in those countries; and he adds that it is not at all improbable that the Chinese and the Japanese in the near future will build ships to be operated in Western waters.

On the 20th of September, 1894, the Hongkong Press published an article from the pen of H. Kopsch, F. R. G. S., in which he pointed out the reason why the English shipbuilding industry was suffering from the appreciation of gold. He enforced his views by practical illustrations.

Some years ago—

He said—

a mandarin sought to obtain estimates for a steamship launch in anticipation of his being permitted to introduce steam power on one of the lakes of the Empire. The tender submitted for the launch was £1,000, or 5,000 Mexican dollars. Subsequently the same officer renewed his inquiries and was amazed to find that the launch which he could have had built for 5,000 Mexican dollars when he first made his inquiries would cost him 10,000 Mexican dollars under the changed conditions. Permission has since been given to navigate certain inner waters of China, but owing to the high price of gold the Chinese are themselves making the boilers and engines instead of getting them from England.

This same writer also noted the fact that between 1884 and 1893 there were 399 steamers, aggregating 23,094 tons, built and engined in Hongkong, and he adds:

Twenty years ago had anyone prophesied that Chinese would ever compete with British shipwrights and engine makers, he would have been ridiculed; nevertheless the appreciation of gold has so reduced wages as to make it possible for China to compete with the West in the manufacture of articles for which the raw materials have to be imported.

If the Chinese are able to compete successfully, even when compelled to import the raw materials, as in the case of the manufacture of steam launches, what will they not be able to accomplish when, under the impetus which the planting of industries in a country naturally gives to production, they begin to pay attention to the development of their iron and coal mines and to the extension of the cotton-producing industry?

The extent and rapidity of this development should not be underrated or its significance misunderstood, as it seems to have been by some Englishmen and by our consul at Tientsin, who in a recent report to the United States Department of State, said that he had received information from a reliable source that the customs taotai at that port, representing officially and as an individual the big cotton mills then in course of erection at Shanghai and elsewhere in central Asia, had placed orders with a European firm in Tientsin for cotton-mill machinery amounting to nearly a million dollars (Mexican). Consul Reed, who gave this information, desired the attention of American manufacturers of such machinery to be called to the fact that many mills were springing up in various parts of China. This information was duly published in the consular reports issued by our Government and was reprinted in one or two trade journals. It excited no comment, however, and no doubt those under whose observations it came only looked upon the item as something concerning the manufacturing of machinery. They did not perceive its more important bearing and that the temporary advantage which might be derived from the sale of some cotton machinery would be followed by the loss of the American cotton-goods trade with China, which aggregated $2,851,957 in 1894, $2,772,065 of which consisted of uncolored cloths, which may be easily made by beginners enjoying the peculiar advantages which the appreciation of gold and the state of the labor market have given the Chinese.

What these advantages are may be inferred from a report of the board of directors of Boyd & Co., Limited, a ship repairing and machine manufacturing company doing business in Shanghai, made to stockholders on the 30th of April, 1894. The report, after remarking that "the general working for the past year shows a favorable result which has been largely contributed by the local industries which are springing up around us," goes on to predict still greater activity, provided certain restrictions which the Chinese have placed about manufacturers are removed. Discussing this phase of the subject, the North China Daily News says:

If this discouragement were only withdrawn and private capitalists and companies were allowed to undertake the business, Shanghai in two or three years would be a forest of chimney stacks, and the demand for machinery would startle the manufacturers in Lancashire. The cotton is to be had on the spot, labor is inexhaustible and very reliable; coal is cheap. There are no embarrassing factory acts, so that the machinery could be run twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, and there is an unlimited market at a price for all that is produced. Once withdraw the present restrictions and there will be a wonderful outburst here [Shanghai] of industrial activity.

The Item, Philadelphia, Pa., in its issue of December 14, 1895, says:

The Japanese consul-general at New York says that he thinks Japan is on the eve of building up a large trade of Japanese products in the United States. He says Japan has an ample supply of low-cost coal and is buying and making the best machinery for a large export trade.

He adds that hemp and cotton carpets, wall paper, copper and bronze ware, crystal ware, silk handkerchiefs, raw silk, pongee, umbrellas, rags, beer, tobacco, coal, and matches are among the leaders.

Besides these, Japanese agents are now offering bicycles at $12.50; sashes, doors, and blinds, and wool carpets at astonishingly low prices; in fact, no line is now drawn limiting what that country proposes to do in selling to the United States, as well as to all gold-basis countries, so long as silver continues depreciated.

Take the above bicycle for an example of all the other goods. It is claimed equal to the best in this country, and at the price mentioned is delivered duty and freight free in San Francisco.

The $12.50 received for each bicycle is in gold. This is sold for silver, equaling $20 to the Japanese manufacturer. He pays $15 of his silver dollars for making, freight, duties, etc., and clears a net profit of $5 in silver.

This same method of profit is available to the Japanese for everything they are able to produce, as well as selling coal in the San Francisco market.

The consul-general says that coal would be so sold now if the ships had a return cargo.

The following is from the Chicago Evening Post:

When Japan entered the sisterhood of civilized nations no power gave her a warmer welcome than the American Republic. We extolled her energy, her ingenuity, and her enterprise, and hailed her as the "United States of the East."

To-day we are face to face with the fact that this young-old Empire—old in years and young with the vigor of a new civilization—is already proving a formidable rival to us in the market of the world and at our own doors. The conditions of Japanese labor are a standing menace to American labor and trade. The gravity of this danger was illustrated yesterday in a report presented to the National Association of Manufacturers at Central Music Hall. It was pointed out by the chairman of the committee on Oriental industries that articles of Japanese manufacture now appear in our Eastern cities rivaling and underselling American articles suitable for similar purposes. Japanese matting is now crowding out cheaper kinds of Philadelphia carpets. Japanese rugs, made in imitation of American patterns, are sold in large quantities in preference to American rugs of a higher value. Brushes are sold at retail in Eastern cities for about the American value of the unmanufactured bristles. American watch-case makers are selling to Japan cases for excellent movements, made there for this market. There are 46 cotton mills in Japan, with about 600,000 spindles. New mills are being erected, and Japan threatens to become a bold and large competitor for the trade of the world in cotton fabrics. The Japanese use the latest improved American and European machinery in this and other industries established by them. They begin with mechanical appliances that are superior to those found in some American mills.

There is no use blinking at the facts. Some of our manufacturing industries are gravely menaced by this rivalry of a country where skilled labor may be had at the cost of 10 cents or 15 cents a day, or less than one-tenth of the cost of such labor in our own country. To-day tens of thousands of our laborers are idle. Our markets are invaded and the American workman, like the American manufacturer, is the victim of an Oriental competitor, in whom rare skill and fine taste are joined with a simplicity of domestic habits which enables them to support life in comfort upon a tenth of what it costs to do this in the United States. This competition will grow keener and keener. Japan will not confine herself to her present efforts. Her people are introducing a great variety of manufacturing industries, all using improved machinery, and they are imitating the patterns and inventions of the Western nations with impunity, because there is no protection for either the patents or trade-marks of foreigners in Japan. The importance of this condition of things can not be overestimated.

Already the manufacturers of this country begin to appreciate this fact; already they see that while they have been sitting in fancied security, calmly viewing the distress of the farmer, a distress brought about simply and alone by the demonetization of silver, they have been preparing themselves for the same disaster through which their fellows were passing. The manufacturers of the United States can not compete with a silver-using nation, even when the conditions of labor are the same, because by the use of silver such a nation has a protective tariff against imports from the United States and has an export duty upon her own exports. To-day, into the port of San Francisco are coming goods manufactured in silver-using nations, with which our own people can not compete. Doors, sashes, all kinds of wood products, watches, bicycles, silks, and the finest quality of cotton goods in increasing quantities are being imported from China and Japan and sold at rates which make it impossible for American manufacturers to compete therewith.

We of the West feel the swell of the incoming tide. Soon with majestic sweep it will roll in with ever-increasing power and might, and wherever in its steady, onward, and growing volume it shall force its way American industry, based upon the quicksand of gold monometallism, will forever sink beneath its flood.

Onward through the grand canyons of our incomparable West; over the great highways of commerce designed and constructed by men who put not their trust in English greed nor in English finance for the American nation; across the plains which nurtured, educated, and made great a Grant and a Lincoln, that mighty tide of foreign industry, fostered, upheld, and become great by adherence to sound monetary laws, will force its way until the nation shall arouse itself and, employing every defense given it, stay and turn back the swelling wave of Asiatic industrial invasion by the coinage and use of silver money. [Applause.]

Mr. DANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy but a very brief portion of time this evening. We sent over to the Senate from this House in the early part of the session a bill entitled "An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue." As a matter personal to myself, I will state that I voted against that bill. I did not believe that it was in keeping with the doctrines of the Republican party. I believed that it was the business of the Republican party to raise revenue and not borrow money.

I am gratified, Mr. Speaker, that that bill has had the lines of the Senate drawn through every word of it. But they have sent back to us, in place and in lieu of the bill I just referred to, one entitled "An act to restore the coinage of silver, and for other purposes," and to that measure I am more opposed than to the bill that went from the House to the Senate. I take notice, Mr. Speaker, that the free-silver party, as they are termed in the country, demand nothing less than the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. In the convention that assembled in this city a few weeks ago to forward the silver interest, that was the one solitary feature of their party action—free and unlimited coinage of silver, 16 to 1. Nothing less than that will answer the purposes of those who are pressing this measure upon the country.

No proposition here to coin the American product; no proposition here to limit in any degree the free coinage of all the silver of the world. Mexico, Peru, wherever there may be an accumulation of 50, 60, or 70 cent silver—the attempt in this bill is to provide that it shall be coined by the Government of the United States, coined in our mints, and that we shall issue to the owner of the bullion a silver dollar, "In God we trust," backed by the credit of the American Government. Nothing short of that will answer the purpose of those who demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country.

There is a section of this bill which demands the immediate coinage of what is known as the seigniorage. What that may be or what it is I am unable myself to tell. It is some supposed interest that the United States has in the silver bullion purchased under what is known as the Sherman purchasing act.

This seigniorage is said to amount to some sixty or sixty-five million dollars if coined. And that, Mr. Speaker, would represent the actual profit of those who sold this silver bullion to the Government, would be their gain, their clear profit over and above the value of their commodity in the market. The Government bought from them, during the life of that act, silver bullion at the market value. And it is said that there is in the free and unlimited coinage of silver a profit of sixty or sixty-five million dollars over and above the actual value of the bullion.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is something behind this free and unlimited coinage of silver that looks to the very great enhancement of the value of the silver mines. The owners of silver bullion, by having the Government put its stamp upon their commodity and turn it over to them with the guarantee of the Government stamp upon it, would of course realize a great advantage. It strikes me that the American people are not ready to say that the owners of silver bullion, which brings to-day in the market not more than 53 cents, shall have it coined and get the benefit of the credit of the Government for the other 47 cents. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is any well-informed advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country who believes that at the present time we can maintain what is termed the parity between gold and silver with free and unlimited coinage of the silver metal.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while men talk about bimetallism, and about the use of both gold and silver as money metals, if we should pass this bill it would be practically silver monometallism, and it would be but a very short time before gold would disappear entirely from this country. There is gold in the country now. When the Treasury asks for the bids of the American people for the bonds of the Government, there proves to be more than five hundred millions of free gold that is offered for the bonds of the United States. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we should adopt this measure we should loose all this volume of gold, and we would at once take our place among the silver countries of the world.

There is nothing more sensitive than the money of ultimate redemption. I can remember very well that in the early fifties, after the discovery of gold in California, the bullion value of the silver in the "dollar of the fathers" became greater than its coin value. There was only a slight shade of difference—perhaps 2½ cents to the dollar; yet every dollar of six or seven millions that had been coined up to that time was bought up as a commodity and taken out of the country; and to take the place of the silver dollars thus taken out of the country we coined a little gold dollar about as big as your finger nail, which was to take the place of the silver dollar that, by reason of the 2½ cents excess in its bullion value as compared with its coin value, had passed out of the country, and passed out, let me say, forever.

I remember very well that when the resumption act was passed the subsidiary coin began to come out from its hiding places as early as 1878, and by the time the act took effect in 1879 the subsidiary silver coin was out in the pockets of the people, but never one of the standard dollars. Eight million of them, perhaps, had been coined up in 1873. They passed entirely away from the country and out of circulation. Somebody may have one as a keepsake or a pocket piece. I speak of this only to show that where the value of the metal is not maintained at a parity you can not maintain the coinage at parity.

Mr. Speaker, I voted in the Forty-fifth Congress for a bill similar to this. At that time we had no coin in circulation in the country. Gold and silver had been out of sight since 1862; and for fifteen years we had no coin in circulation. I believed at that

time that the country could stand the free coinage of silver, and I voted for that measure. I believed that it would be a great aid to resumption; and we were aiming at resumption then, straining every nerve to reach a point where we should see again the money of ultimate redemption on the counters and in the hands of the people.

Mr. Speaker, that measure was passed by both the House and the Senate and was vetoed by President Hayes. Afterwards there was a compromise upon what is known as the Bland-Allison Act. I am free to say I think that vote of mine for free coinage of silver in 1877 was a mistake. I do not believe we could have maintained the parity between these metals even for a few years if the coinage had been free and unlimited.

Mr. Speaker, it is said in this House and in the country, and we hear it wherever there is an argument made by an advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, that values have been shrinking ever since 1873; that farm lands have been going down; that the farmer is getting poor pay for his commodities. And all this is charged to the demonetization of silver in 1873. I shall not thrash over a bit of that old straw about the demonetization of silver in 1873. I only know that from 1873 down to 1892 this country enjoyed a season of great prosperity. I know that of the national debt of $2,160,000,000 in 1873 there remained at the close of the Administration of President Harrison less than $600,000,000. I know that during that period from 1873 down to 1892 we built a hundred thousand miles of railroad in this country. I know that we had prosperity almost unrivaled during all those years. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must look in other directions to account for the shrinkage of values of farm lands and farm commodities.

If you will stop a moment and look around the world it strikes me that you can see some reason why the value of farm lands in this country should decrease—why the products of the farm should shrink in value. A good deal has been said here to-day about wheat. Why, sir, the time was, a third of a century ago, when the United States commanded the markets of the world, so far as that commodity was concerned.

We supplied the deficiency of western Europe. How is it to-day? Cheap labor is producing cheap wheat in India; cheap labor is producing cheap wheat in Russia, and the same is the case in South America. And the cheap production of that commodity around the world that we must compete with whenever we leave our own market here and go into the markets of western Europe is no doubt one of the causes that has had the effect of reducing largely the price of wheat in the last two years. We must remember that England, France, and Germany are looking around the world for cheap bread, England especially. She has been engaged for the last third of a century in hunting for cheap bread for her people wherever she can find it.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. DANFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The gentleman was speaking of the cheap wheat of India. Is it not bought with the silver bullion that they buy here so cheaply? If silver bullion here, in other words, had free mintage, would they not have to pay more for it, and does not that cheap bullion which they purchase from us come in competition with the cheap wheat of America through this medium of purchase in India?

Mr. DANFORD. I care nothing for the price of wheat in India. I am speaking of it when it comes to western Europe.

It was said here to-day that the value of wheat in India, or rather the average price last year, was, I believe, 68 cents a bushel. I think that was very greatly overestimated. My recollection is that the wheat of India when it comes into the market of western Europe is sold for about 48 to 50 cents a bushel, and one-half of that goes to the British ship that carries it from India to Liverpool. Not only the cheap wheat of India, but Russia, as I said a short time ago, is engaged in raising wheat, and so also is South America, and this cheap production comes in competition with American produce, and that has tended to bring down the price in the markets of the world. So also with wool, another commodity in which we in the West are very greatly interested. The price of wool has been going down gradually for years, not altogether since the repeal of the McKinley law, but even before the repeal of the McKinley law wool had been declining in price, and why? Because wool was being produced in Australia, in South America, and in South Africa—wool produced by cheap labor; and the competition of the American woolgrowers in the markets of the world from these cheap countries brought about this condition largely before the passage of the present tariff act putting wool on the free list. But that gave it a blow which was fatal to the interest.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are to look to the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country to restore the value of farm lands or the value of farm products among our people. I do not believe that the free and unlimited coinage of silver will reach the trouble that the country is in. But we must prepare in some way, sir, to meet these conditions in the world, in Australia and in South America, as to cheap production of wool.

Now, if I believed that free and unlimited coinage of silver would benefit those who have been most affected in the last quarter of a century by the cheapening of farm lands and of farm products, I would vote cheerfully for the Senate measure. But I do not believe that there is any relief in that direction; I do not believe that there is any relief in debauching our currency. It has been my observation through life that men who deal in stocks, who deal in money, and men who control great enterprises, are men who, as a rule, are able in the main to take care of themselves. It is the plain man in this country who needs an honest Government more than any other, and it is the plain man before others that needs honest money. The men who manipulate stocks, who manipulate great moneyed transactions, can and will always take care of themselves in the great struggle of life; but, as was remarked a few moments ago, the man who has but a single dollar needs a good round dollar, not a 10-cent short dollar, but a full honest dollar.

Now, as to the quantity of money. It would seem from the second section of this bill, the one providing for the immediate coinage of the seigniorage, that those who advocate this bill advocate it from the belief that there is not a sufficient quantity of money in the country to-day to transact the business of the country with. Now, if you will look back to the condition of things as to money at the close of the civil war, you will find that we had in 1865 a little over $700,000,000 of money in circulation, a per capita of about $20.50 for each man, woman, and child in the land. With that volume of money we had paid off the soldiers; we paid them in the field; we had raised great armies; we had built railroads, built cities; we had progressed at the North here in the way of building up the country as we never had at any other period of our existence as a nation and a people. We have at this time, in the year 1896—we have near $23 per capita of actual money, near $800,000,000 being in the Treasury and something like $1,600,000,000 in circulation among the people. That sixteen hundred million dollars makes a per capita of nearly $23.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DANFORD. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not wish to take the gentleman's time, but has not the gentleman made a mistake in his calculation of the per capita by not remembering that practically one-third of the population of the United States from 1861 to 1865 were in rebellion and did not use any part, practically speaking, of the money which we had?

Mr. DANFORD. I am giving the per capita of 1865, and I will publish a table prepared by the Comptroller of the Currency upon this point. It is as follows.

Specie and bank-note circulation of the United States in the years specified from 1800 to 1859.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Number of banks and branches.	Estimated bank notes outstanding.	Estimated specie in United States.	Total money in United States.	Specie in Treasury.	Money in circulation.	Population.	Per capita.
1800	----------	$10,500,000	$17,500,000	$28,000,000	*$1,500,000	$26,500,000	5,308,483	$4.99
1810	----------	28,000,000	30,000,000	58,000,000	*3,000,000	55,000,000	7,239,881	7.60
1820	----------	44,800,000	24,300,000	69,100,000	*2,000,000	67,100,000	9,653,822	6.96
1830	----------	61,000,000	33,100,000	93,100,000	5,755,705	87,344,295	12,866,020	6.69
1831	----------	87,000,000	32,100,000	109,100,000	6,014,540	93,085,460	13,221,000	7.04
1832	----------	91,500,000	30,400,000	121,900,000	4,502,914	117,397,086	13,590,000	8.64
1833	----------	91,500,000	30,650,000	122,150,000	2,011,778	120,138,222	13,974,000	8.60
1834	506	94,839,570	41,000,000	135,839,570	11,702,905	124,136,665	14,373,000	8.64
1835	704	103,692,495	51,000,000	154,692,495	8,892,858	145,799,637	14,786,000	9.86
1836	713	140,301,038	65,000,000	205,301,038	*5,000,000	200,301,038	15,213,000	13.17
1837	788	149,185,890	73,000,000	222,185,890	*5,000,000	217,185,890	15,655,000	13.87
1838	829	116,138,910	87,500,000	203,638,910	5,000,000	198,638,910	16,112,000	12.33
1839	840	135,170,995	87,000,000	222,170,995	2,466,962	219,704,033	16,584,000	13.26

*Specie in Treasury estimated.

Specie and bank-note circulation of the United States in the years specified from 1800 to 1859—Continued.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Number of banks and branches.	Estimated bank notes outstanding.	Estimated specie in United States.	Total money in United States.	Specie in Treasury.	Money in circulation.	Population.	Per capita.
1840	901	$106,968.572	$83,000,000	$189,968,572	$3,663,084	$186,305,488	17,069,453	$10.91
1841	784	107,290,214	80,000,000	187,290,214	987,345	186,302,869	17,591.000	10.59
1842	692	83,734,011	80,000,000	163,734,011	230,484	163,503,527	18,132,000	9.02
1843	691	58,563,608	90,000,000	148,563,608	1,449,472	147,114,136	18,694.000	7.87
1844	696	75,167,646	100,000,000	175,167,646	7,857,380	167,310,266	19,276,000	8.68
1845	707	89,608,711	96,000,000	185,608,711	7,658,306	177,950,405	19,878,000	8,95
1816	707	105,552,427	97,060,000	202,552,427	9,126,439	193,425,988	20,500,000	9.43
1847	715	105,519,766	120,000,000	225,519,766	1,701,251	223,818,515	21,143,000	10,59
1848	751	128,506,091	112,000,000	240,506,091	8,101,353	232,404,738	21,805,000	10.66
1849	782	114,743,415	120,000,000	234,743,415	2,184,964	232,558,451	22,489,000	10.34
1850	824	131,366,526	154,000,000	285,366,520	6,604,544	278,761,982	23,191,876	12.02
1851	879	155,165,251	186,000,000	341,165,251	10,911,646	330,253,605	23,995,000	13.76
1852	----------	171,673,000	204,000,000	375,673,000	14,632,136	361,040,864	24,802,000	14.63
1853	----------	188,181,000	236,000,000	424,181,000	21,942,893	402,238,107	25,615,000	15.80
1854	1,208	204,689,207	241,000,000	445,689,207	20,137,967	425,551,240	26,433,000	16.10
1855	1,307	186,952,223	250,000,000	436,952,223	18,931,976	418,020,247	27,256,000	15.34
1856	1,398	195,747,950	250,000,000	445,747,950	19,901,325	425,846,625	28,083,000	15.16
1857	1,416	214,778,822	260,000,000	474,778,822	17,710,114	457,068,708	28,916,000	15.81
1858	1,422	155,208,344	260,000,000	415,208,344	6,398,316	408,810,028	29,753,000	13.78
1859	1,476	193,306,818	250,000,000	443,306,818	4,339,276	438,967,542	30,596,000	14.35

Coin and paper circulation of the United States on June 30, from 1860 to 1895, inclusive.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Coin in United States, including bullion in Treasury.	Paper money in United States.	Total money.	Coin, bullion, and paper money in Treasury.	Circulation.	Population.	Money in United States per capita.	Circulation per capita.
1860	$235,000,000	$207,102,477	$442,102.477	$6,695,225	$435,407,252	31,443,321	$14.06	$13.85
1861	250,000,000	202,005,767	452,005,767	3,600,000	448,405,767	32,064,000	14.09	13.98
1862	25,000,000	333,452,079	358,452,079	23,754,335	334,697,744	32,704,000	10.96	10.23
1863	25,000,000	649,867,283	674,867,283	79,473,245	595,394,038	33,365,000	20.23	17.84
1864	25,000,000	680,588,067	705,588,067	35,946,589	669,641,478	34,046,000	20.72	19.67
1865	25,000,000	745,129,755	770,129,755	55,426,760	714,702,995	34,748,000	22.16	20.57
1866	25,000,000	729,327,254	754,327,254	80,839,010	673,488,244	35,469,000	21.27	18.99
1867	25,000,000	703,200,612	728,200,612	66,208,543	661,992,069	36,211,000	20.11	18.28
1868	25,000,000	691,553,578	716,553,578	36,449,917	680,103,661	36,973,000	19.38	18.39
1869	25,000,000	690,351,180	715,351,180	50,898,289	664,452,891	37,756,000	18.95	17.60
1870	25,000,000	697,868,461	722,868,461	47,655,667	675,212,794	38,558,371	18.73	17.50
1871	25,000,000	716,812,174	741,812,174	25,923,169	715,889,005	39,555,000	18.75	18.10
1872	25,000,000	737,721,565	762,721,565	24,412,016	738,309,540	40,596,000	18.70	18.19
1873	25,000,000	749,445,610	774,445,610	22,563,801	751,881,809	41,677,000	18.58	18.04
1874	25,000,000	781,024,781	806,024,781	29,941,750	776,083,031	42,796,000	18.83	18.13
1875	25,000,000	773,273,509	798,273,509	44,171,562	754,101,947	43,951,000	18.16	17.16
1876	52,418,734	738,264,550	790,683,284	63,073,896	727,609,388	45,137,000	17.52	16.12
1877	65,837,506	697,216,341	763,053,847	40,738,964	722,314,883	46,353,000	16.46	15.58
1878	102,047,907	689,205,669	791,253,576	62,120,942	729,152,634	47,598,000	16.62	15.32
1879	357,268,178	694,253,363	1,051,521,541	232,889,748	818,631,793	48,866,000	21.52	16.75
1880	494,363,884	711,565,313	1,205,929,197	232,546,969	973,382,228	50,155,783	24.04	19.41
1881	647,868,682	758,673,141	1,406,541,823	292,303,704	1,114,238,119	51,316,000	27.41	21.71
1882	703,974,859	776,556,880	1,480,531,719	306,241,300	1,174,290,419	52,495,000	28.20	22.37
1883	769,740,048	873,749,768	1,643,489,816	413,184,120	1,230,305,696	53,693,000	30.60	22.91
1884	801,068,939	904,385,250	1,705,454,198	461,528,220	1,243,925,969	54,911,000	31.06	22.65
1885	872,175,823	945,482,513	1,817,658,336	525,089,721	1,292,568,615	56,148,000	32.37	23.02
1886	903,027,364	905,532,390	1,808,559,694	555,859,169	1,252,700,525	57,404,000	31.50	21.82
1887	1,007,513,901	892,928,771	1,900,442,672	582,903,529	1,317,539,143	58,680,000	32.39	22.45
1888	1,092,391,690	970,564,259	2,062,955,949	690,785,079	1,372,170,870	59,974,000	34.39	22.88
1889	1,100,612,434	947,738,277	2,075,350,711	694,989,062	1,380,361,649	61,289,000	33.86	22.52
1890	1,152,471,638	991,754,521	2,144,226,159	714,974,889	1,429,251,270	62,622,250	34.24	22.82
1891	1,163,185,054	1,032,039,021	2,195,224,075	697,783,368	1,497,440,707	63,975,000	34.31	23.41
1892	1,232,854,331	1,139,745,170	2,372,599,501	771,252,314	1,601,347,187	65,520,000	36.21	24.54
1893	1,213,413,584	1,109,988,808	2,323,402,392	726,701,147	1,596,701,245	66,946,000	34.70	23.85
1894	1,251,543,158	1,168,891,623	2,420,434,781	759,626,073	1,660,808,708	68,397,000	35.39	24.28
1895	1,260,987,506	1,137,619,914	2,398,607,420	796,638,947	1,601,968,473	69,878,000	34.33	22.93

NOTE 1.—Specie payments were suspended from January 1, 1862, to January 1, 1879. During the greater part of that period gold and silver coins were not in circulation except on the Pacific Coast, where, it is estimated, the specie circulation was generally about $25,000,000. This estimated amount is the only coin included in the above statement from 1862 to 1875, inclusive.

NOTE 2.—In 1876 subsidiary silver again came into use, and is included in this statement, beginning with that year.

NOTE 3.—The coinage of standard silver dollars began in 1878 under the act of February 28, 1878.

NOTE 4.—Specie payments were resumed January 1, 1879, and all gold and silver coins, as well as gold and silver bullion in the Treasury, are included in this statement from and after that date.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. The question I asked was, were not two-thirds of our thirty millions of people using that $700,000,000, which would bring up the per capita to over $30?

Mr. DANFORD. The war closed in 1865, and there never was greater prosperity in this land than during the next few years. The whole people of the country were using the money that we then had, which amounted to a per capita of about $20 or $21.

I speak of this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of showing that it is not more money that we want, but more business. In those days a ten-dollar bill was busy from early morning until late at night. It did a great many errands in the course of a day. Now, in these last two years the money that we have, amounting to a per capita of nearly $23, has been idle a great portion of the time. We have not been doing business. The remedy which I propose is that we should return to the policy of the Republican party as expressed in the McKinley schedules of the tariff bill, that we should return to the policy of protection, which built up this country from 1862 to 1892. The great progress that we made in those years I attribute to the fact that we were taking care of the American markets for the American people.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are times in the life of every individual when he is perplexed by the necessity of accepting or rejecting a policy because the good which it contains is blended in varying proportions with evil.

There are other times in the life of each individual and of each nation when the choice is between absolute good and unmixed evil—when all the convictions of reason, all the teachings of history, all the suggestions of experience, unite with all the generous impulses of man's highest and best nature to influence and lead his action in one particular direction. In such cases duty is plain and choice is easy. And this, Mr. Speaker, is my attitude to-day in reference to this bill.

We are called upon, as the people's representatives, to decide whether we shall, by insisting on House bill 2904—the bond bill—authorize the executive branch of this Government to burden the people of this country with a debt which the present Admin-

istration admits to be unnecessary except for the purpose of retiring and eliminating from our circulation the "greenbacks" and Treasury notes issued under the law of 1890; or whether we shall, by returning to bimetallism, adopt a course which will remove the causes whose existence has been pointed to as an argument for the authorization by this Congress of the issue of bonds. In order intelligently to apply a remedy in any particular case it is always of the highest importance to clearly understand the exact nature of the ailment for which it is necessary to prescribe. In this case we have three distinct and different diagnoses and, naturally, three distinct and different prescriptions.

THE PRESIDETN'S DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDY.

1. The President and those who agree with him on financial questions claim that the true cause of all our woes is the circulation of greenbacks and United States Treasury notes in the channels of business and the danger to our gold reserve arising from the possibility of their being used to draw gold from the Treasury. To remedy this state of affairs (in which they conceive the whole danger to lie) we are asked to authorize the final retirement and cancellation of these noninterest-bearing obligations of the Government payable by law in coin and the substitution in lieu thereof of an equivalent amount of interest-bearing bonded indebtedness payable in gold.

However much I may differ with the President in my financial views, I heartily accord to him that same sincerity, honesty, and purity of purpose (no less and no more), that I claim for myself. Now, if we accept the President's view of our financial troubles, it is our manifest duty, in all sincerity, to lend to his financial policy all the legislative aid that he asks at our hands.

THE REPUBLICAN DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDY.

2. In the second place, our Republican friends claim that the greenbacks are not the cause of the trouble; and in support of their position they can point to the fact that during the fourteen years between the resumption of specie payments in 1879 and the retirement of the Republican party from power in 1893 no such trouble arose through the existence and circulation of the greenbacks as that which the President is now trying to lay at their door.

They claim that the true cause of the derangement of our financial system consists in an inadequacy of revenue to meet the necessities of the Government. In support of this contention they point out that if the Administration had not issued and sold $162,500,000 of bonds, and put the proceeds thereof into the Treasury, there would not be a dollar in that Treasury to day had the same payments been made that have been made.

In pursuance of and in harmony with this claim that the real trouble arises from an insufficient revenue the Republican majority on this floor has, by the passage of House bill No. 2904, provided for the issue and sale, by the Secretary of the Treasury, of bonds to meet any temporary deficiency that now exists, or that may hereafter arise, in the Government's revenues.

It is necessary to a just statement of their position to add that they do not look to this as the normal method—the permanent method—of meeting such deficiencies. They offer this as a temporary or emergency scheme, which will be found necessary only until the amendments which they have proposed to the present tariff law shall have become operative, when, they assert, the tariff itself will produce a sufficient revenue to render a further resort to this bond law unnecessary. This assertion I deny, and in this denial I am supported by the history of this country; but such is the Republican view of the situation. If this view be the correct one, then it only remains for us to consider the wisdom of the remedy proposed by our Republican friends.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CONSIDERED.

Before I proceed to a statement of the third view of the situation, and the remedy offered by those who take that view, I wish to say a word as to the President's plan of relief. As I can not accept his view of the causes of our present unfortunate situation, I can not, of course, assent to his mode of relief. I do not believe that there is too much money in the country to-day; I do not believe that the evils with which the country is afflicted are properly chargeable to an "inflation of the currency"—either at present or at any time hitherto. I do not believe that our troubles are caused by the presence in our circulation of our greenbacks and Treasury notes. I do believe, however, that our greenbacks are a redeemable currency which, sooner or later, it is our solemn duty to redeem and retire; but this should not be done until we return to a bimetallic basis. I believe that the system which prevailed in this country from 1792 to 1873—a system of gold and silver coin, standing upon an exactly equal legal footing, and the coexistence of a paper currency issued by the Government, redeemable in coin, and a full legal tender for all public and private demands—was and is the best system of finance that could be devised for this country; and could I be assured that that system could be restored, I would readily consent to the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes. But in the absence of any such assurance I am opposed to the plan of retiring all United States (greenback) notes and the Treasury notes of 1890, and allowing the national banks, if they will, to issue nonlegal-tender bank notes in lieu of as many or as few of said retired notes as they wish. My objections are as follows:

OBJECTIONS TO THIS PLAN.

Its first sure effect would be a ruinous contraction of the currency of the country, for the bankers have made no secret of their claim that there is too much money in the country. Their orators, their newspaper organs, their apologists and defenders in both Houses of Congress, and all the literature they have so industriously disseminated throughout the country in their campaign of "education," have all preached the evils of an "excessive currency," an "inflated currency," and elaborated upon the glowing beauties of an "elastic" currency, a currency which can "come forth when needed, and when not needed in the course of business can withdraw itself from circulation." By this they evidently mean a currency that can be completely controlled by themselves, a currency which they can let out or take in as they may deem prices too high or too low.

2. In the second place, I oppose the President's plan because it would take from the Government (the people, for the people are and ought to be the Government) the power of regulating the currency, and it would place that imperial power, that highest and most distinctive mark of sovereignty, in the hands of a syndicate of national banks, responsible neither to God nor to man for the abuse of that power.

The friends of the Administration policy seem afraid to trust the American people, through their Government, to exercise this sovereign power, but prefer to take it from the people, in whose collective wisdom democracy is founded, and to centralize it in the hands of a few who appear to favor the subjection of this great country to the sway of European ideas of finance.

3. I object to the President's plan, in the third place, because, as a natural result of the policy of contraction, the burden of every debt, every mortgage, every fixed charge of every kind whatever would be still more increased and made still more difficult to be borne.

4. I am opposed to it, in the fourth place, because it would be an extension of the power, and consequently a further legislative recognition of national banks. If democracy means anything at all, it means the most uncompromising hostility to national banks in any form whatever. Whenever the question has been at issue before the American people, the Democratic party has declared its position on this question in no uncertain tones.

In January, 1836, the New York State Democracy gave the first platform utterance on this subject that was ever heard in American politics. That utterance was: "We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium (notice why), because gold and silver is the only safe and constitutional currency." Notice that the language is "gold and silver is (not are) the only money" (not moneys). In the eyes of these early Democrats the two metals were indissolubly married—were treated as one—were spoken of as one. For the purposes of the Government, gold was silver and silver was gold. The Administrations of those days just went right ahead receiving both and paying out which ever they had on hand, without branding either of them as "dishonest" money, "unsound" money, "depreciated" money, etc., and, naturally, under this parity of opportunity, this parity of treatment, the two metals maintained a parity of value in commerce.

Again, the national Democratic platform of 1840, the first national platform that contained an utterance on the subject, delivered itself in clear and ringing terms: "Congress has no power to charter a United States bank." I wonder what the Democrats of those days would think if they could rise again long enough to learn that the Democratic (?) party was silently acquiescing in the existence of 3,715 of these institutions; that high alleged Democrats were denouncing as "wild-eyed fanatics" and "hare-brained enthusiasts" and silver "lunatics" the men who declare their loyalty to the doctrines of the fathers of Democracy, and to learn that Democrats were asking Congress to turn over the whole business of issuing paper money and regulating the volume (and consequently the value thereof) to these same national banks.

But let us read the remainder of the declaration of the national Democracy in 1840 on this subject:

> We believe such an institution (a national bank) one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and the will of the people.

This resolution or plank was expressly readopted by the national Democratic party in its platform of 1844.

In the year 1848 new and overshadowing issues had arisen, national banks were not an issue, as they had been exterminated by the veto of a Democratic President, and so the party platform of that year said nothing on the subject.

In 1852 the question had again come to the front, and the party again declared its position in its national platform, as follows:

Congress has no power to charter a national bank; we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and that above the laws and will of the people.

In 1856 this identical language was readopted.

In 1860 the platform of 1856 was expressly readopted, and Democratic opposition to national banks was thus again officially placed on record.

In 1864 other issues crowded all reference to money out of all the national platforms.

In 1868 the platform declared that—

Where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide, that they shall be paid in coin, they ought, in right and justice, to be paid in the lawful money of the United States.

It makes a further declaration that now sounds strange, in view of the position now taken by Democrats and Republicans high in authority, that while silver and paper may be good enough for the uses of the ordinary American citizen, the bonds which we sell to bankers and speculators, foreign and domestic, ought to be made payable in gold only. It is this:

One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the office-holder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

In 1872 the Democratic party abandoned all its principles temporarily by accepting the Liberal Republican platform of that year.

In 1876 it declared for a system—

well devised, and, above all, intrusted to competent hands for execution, creating at no time an artificial scarcity of currency, at no time alarming the public mind into the withdrawal of that vaster machinery of credit by which 95 per cent of all business transactions are performed—a system open, public, and inspiring general confidence.

Could this have referred to our present system, controlled and operated by men who make a specialty of producing panics to order for the purpose of furnishing "object lessons" to influence legislation?

In 1880 the party declared for "honest money—consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand." Thus we see that the Democratic idea of "honest money" was "gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin"—into either.

In 1884, the year when the Democratic party first nominated Mr. Cleveland, and when it first elected its candidate for President since the war, it declared—

We believe in honest money—

And then it proceeds to tell what the Democratic idea of "honest money" is—

The gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulation convertible into such coin—

Not into gold only.

In 1888 this very platform was expressly adopted as Democratic faith.

What it declared in 1892, its last authoritative utterance on this subject, is still fresh in the minds of all:

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage.

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the record of Democratic faith on this question. The score stands:

For national banks, 0.

Against national banks, 5 express declarations.

For gold and silver and coin paper, 4 plain declarations.

For gold only, 0.

Thus, standing in the light of the decalogue of Democracy, imbibing my faith from the aggregated wisdom of the fathers and forefathers of the school of political doctrine to which I belong, I oppose the President's plan because it gives additional power and opportunity to a set of institutions which my party has declared and their own history has proved to be—

Deadly hostile to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our Republican institutions, dangerous to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and the will of the people.

THE REPUBLICAN VIEW.

Let us now turn to the remedy proposed by our Republican friends. They propose to issue $50,000,000 of certificates of indebtedness to help the Government out when it has no money and to authorize the Government to issue and sell an indefinite amount of 3 per cent coin bonds to enable it to raise any amount of gold that may be needed to protect the gold reserve. This, with a permanent increase of revenue from an amended tariff—a high protective tariff—they propose as a solution of all our financial difficulties.

Within certain limits it can not be denied that there has been and is now an insufficiency of revenue to meet the expenditures of the Government. This deficiency, however, is not properly chargeable to Democratic administration or to Democratic legislation. Four months before Mr. Cleveland's inauguration and nine months before the Democratic Fifty-third Congress met, the disastrous effects of the improvident and reckless legislation of the Republican Fifty-first Congress had begun to manifest themselves in a Treasury deficit. At the end of Mr. Cleveland's first term he turned over to his Republican successor, in addition to the one-hundred-million-dollar gold reserve, the sum of $83,827,190 available cash assets, together with a fund of $54,207,975, which up to that time had been held sacredly in trust for the security of the holders of national-bank notes.

This fund of more than $137,000,000 for a time served as a breakwater to withstand the reckless onslaughts upon it, but it had to yield at last, and when the Republican party retired from power on March 4, 1893, the gold reserve had dwindled down to a point nearer the danger line than it had ever reached before. Preparations had been made, in part, to issue bonds, the $137,000,000 of cash assets had all disappeared except about $24,000,000 of subsidiary coin and fractional currency, and for the last four months of that régime the receipts had fallen more than $4,000,000 below the expenditures. Not even an absolute control of every branch of the Government had enabled the Republican party to stay the tide of national bankruptcy and panic which had set in through and because of improvident Republican policies, and which, gathering force from its onward movement like an avalanche descending the Alpine slopes, has continued its dire and disastrous course to this day, unchecked by the most strenuous exercise of economy by this Democratic Administration that was possible in view of the legacy of growing indebtedness, maturing obligations, and improvident appropriations inherited from the preceding Republican Administration.

It is true that there is now, and has been ever since the last days of the last Republican Administration, an inadequacy of receipts to meet the expenditures of the Government. This deficiency, however, has been largely caused by the decision of the United States Supreme Court that the income-tax feature of the present tariff law was unconstitutional, for this decision reduced the receipts of the Government more than $30,000,000 a year.

But, however caused, the deficit is with us, and, under present conditions, it bids fair to become a permanent feature of our financial system, and the question now is how to dispose of it. Our Republican friends say that it must be met by selling "coin" bonds. Were this the only way, or the best way, to meet the evil, no consideration of the political origin of this bill would have the slightest influence in preventing me from accepting it and giving it my most cordial support. But, even in that case, I should wish to see these bonds issued as a popular loan in the true sense of that word.

Let it be a people's loan; let it be in the form of United States Treasury notes, like the seven-thirties issued during the civil war; let it be in denominations of $5 and multiples of $5; let these Treasury notes bear a low rate of interest (say 2 or 3 per cent;) let them be redeemable in lawful money of the United States, in the order of their issue, at the pleasure of the Government, at any time after the end of one year and before the end of thirty years; and above all, let them be a legal tender for all public and private debts and demands. With a loan of this character authorized I would be willing to retire all the greenbacks and Treasury notes of 1890 (provided, as I said above, that some form of loan was an absolute necessity, which I do not believe at all), for then the "endless chain," which has entangled our President and Secretary of the Treasury in its inexorable folds, like Laocoon of old, would be broken beyond the power to harm. Not only this, but we would have a legal-tender currency equal in amount to the United States Treasury notes and greenbacks displaced, and these securities would be held by the American people, and would not from time to time be thrown upon the London market to create a panic and influence financial legislation by Congress and to shape and control the financial policies of our Administrations. The "object lesson" thus taught would not be a great and disastrous panic, but would be the happy spectacle of a busy people, blessed with sufficient currency, supporting their Government in its financial straits, never "apprehensive," but always strong in their confidence in its ultimate financial solvency and triumph.

But while this is one way in which the present financial difficulties of the Government can be met, and while I regard it as having many advantages over the coin bonds provided for in the House bill 2904, yet it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is

A FAR BETTER WAY.

Before entering into the consideration of that "better way," let us be sure that we have a thorough and comprehensive idea of the situation that confronts us as the representatives of the American people, charged with the high responsibility of securing for them the freest and the widest opportunity for successful effort in whatever sphere of activity they may severally be engaged. Mr. Speaker, this is no ordinary occasion. A proper consideration of the whole subject-matter fairly involved in the scope of this bill and the Sen-

ate amendments thereto will bring into review our whole financial system, with all its patchwork of incongruities, its temporary makeshifts, its time-serving expedients, and the disgraceful marks of its manipulation by the most selfish, the most unscrupulous, the most conscienceless, and the most audacious body of shylocks that ever insisted on the pound of flesh that lay nearest the nation's heart and life. It is not my purpose, however, Mr. Speaker, to attempt such a review. It would proceed more properly from those of deeper knowledge, wider experience, and a greater degree of familiarity with the sinuous processes of this unseen hand which for thirty years has, by hook and crook, imposed upon this nation as law its own code of gain and greed.

I do propose, however, to state with the utmost frankness and with a bluntness which I feel is demanded by a sense of fidelity to my constituents and to the whole people of the country what I honestly conceive to be the exact trouble with the Treasury today, and what remedy is demanded.

The trouble with the views of the present situation which have been expressed both by the President and by the Republican leaders on this floor is that they are too narrow—that they look at only a part of the case. Both are intently watching the outbreak of a poisonous blood disease and regarding the pimple on the surface as the sole and entire extent of the malady, while the deadly virus is eating its way through the vitals and sapping the very foundations of the patient's life. The Republican party, with its eyes focused on the bare bottom of the Treasury vaults and it hand on the pulse of the avaricious manufacturer, reads in that aching void the conclusion that the Treasury does not take in enough money and feels their "sinews of war" demanding more protection, more favoritism, and larger bank accounts. The President, with his eyes focused on the far East, sees that the great bankers and speculators are "apprehensive"—that they are "solicitous about our future fiscal policy," that they have a feeling of "distrust," etc. But, Mr. Speaker, the eye of true statesmanship looks beyond the empty Treasury vaults, and beyond the "distrustful" speculators of Wall street. To the eye of the honest student of present conditions there is a wider and more suggestive field.

THE TRUE SITUATION.

He sees that times are hard. Money is scarce and difficult to obtain. Business is depressed. Bankruptcy stalks abroad in the land. Prices are constantly falling, and those who buy stocks today must sell them for less to-morrow. Enterprises are languishing. The laborer, already inadequately paid, finds his wages reduced with a periodical and painful regularity. Coal miners in the East hungering for bread which they can not find money to buy, and shivering farmers in the West burning precious corn because they can not find money to buy coal; Eastern mill operatives unable to obtain money to buy Western food products, and Western people unable to obtain money to buy Eastern mill goods—and yet we hear preached the gospel of currency contraction and all our woes attributed to an excess of money.

These money contractionists and gold redemptionists ignore these features of the situation, but evince deep concern for the speculators who have "lost confidence" in the gullibility of the American people and their willingness to be fleeced. They seem deeply moved because of "those who are apprehensive" that the American people can not and will not pay coin obligations in gold.

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned for this class. It is the cor ner stone of their gospel that "business knows no sentiment," and hence their "apprehensions" can arouse no sympathy in my bosom. They bought our securities as a speculation and for profit. Whether they gain or lose is no concern of the American people. If this Government pays its own governmental obligations in "coin"—in the money of the contract—the American people are not "apprehensive" whether European bankers and their unnaturalized American representatives make more or less than they had figured out as a desirable profit.

There is not a man within the sound of my voice who will deny the proposition that every dollar of the bonded indebtedness of this Government is payable, not in gold, not in silver, but in coin, which means either gold or silver, as the Government prefers. In fact, the American Congress, only last year, when asked by the President to authorize the issue of bonds payable in gold only, flatly but wisely, I think, refused to do so, although they knew that by doing so the burden of interest on the bond issue then contemplated, and which was made soon after, would thereby have been reduced $16,000,000. A Democratic Congress very sensibly refused to slap silver in the face and discredit it in the eyes of the financial world in full view of the fact that bimetallism has ever been one of the foundation pillars of the structure of Democratic faith in this country. An American Congress refused to spit upon silver while there remained on the statute books of the country (the act of 1879) a declaration that gold and silver must be maintained at a parity. The Fifty-third Congress sensibly concluded that that was not just exactly the way to maintain the parity of the two metals. So they disregarded the importunities of bond syndicates; they turned a deaf ear to a gold-standard Administration's appeal in behalf of gold bonds; they ignored those who were "apprehensive" that we would not pay coin obligations in gold, and said by their votes, "No; we may pay these bonds in gold if it should be convenient, but not for $16,000,000 will we sell the American people's right to pay its lawful debts in the lawful coin of the realm."

I am solicitous, Mr. Speaker, for those American citizens who are suffering and struggling. My heart goes out not to Wall street, but to the great West and to the great South and to the great East and to the great North—to every part of this great country where men toil and trouble and where women and children work and want. And it is our duty to consider not what will refill the empty Treasury, not what will quiet the "apprehensions" of the immeasurably wealthy syndicates that want to become more wealthy at the expense of the toilers of this country, but what will unclog the wheels of trade and commerce, pour the rich lifeblood of a safe, sound, and abundant currency into the veins and arteries of business, and usher in an era of commercial and industrial peace. What will do this? Will increased taxation do it? Will issuing more bonds for the people to pay do it? Will retiring half the active money of the country do it? Will increasing the value of all money by increasing the difficulty of getting it—will this send a ray of sunlight into the homes of the suffering toilers and those who want to be but can not get the opportunity to be toilers in this land? By that test should we weigh and measure the fitness of every measure that comes before us.

THE TRUE DIAGNOSIS.

My view of the situation, then, is, Mr. Speaker, that the country in all its industries and in every class of its population is suffering from an insufficiency of primary or redemption money.

The constant fall of prices ever since the campaign against silver was begun in 1873 has greatly reduced, where it has not completely destroyed, the ability of our people to consume manufactured products. This has led to depression in manufacturing industries, to reductions of wages, to the shutting down of factories, to strikes, lockouts, etc.

This is the situation in all its breadth and length and depth. This is the state of affairs we should consider. True statesmanship will look over the shoulders of the "apprehensive" gold syndicates and the demands of the selfish manufacturers to the fears and tears, the wants and woes, of the great masses of willing but worn, weary, and disheartened workers who look piteously here for relief.

THE TRUE REMEDY.

This, then, being the situation, what is the remedy?

I conceive the proper remedy is set forth in the provisions of the substitute offered by the Senate for the House coin bond bill. The Senate proposes:

1. To reestablish the free and unlimited coinage of silver as it existed in this country prior to 1873.
2. To coin the seigniorage and use it in payment of current expenses.
3. To retire national-bank notes of less than $10 in favor of the wider use of silver and its certificates.
4. To have the Government resume its option to redeem greenbacks and Treasury notes of 1890 in either gold or silver, according to the condition or convenience of the Treasury.

Such is the Senate's plan of remodeling our financial system, and to each and every one of the foregoing propositions I give my unhesitating and unqualified assent, believing that nothing short of this will give that general and permanent relief which the condition of the country demands, and which it is our duty to extend.

It might seem presumption in me to undertake to make any arguments in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, since they have been presented by the friends of bimetallism on this floor and elsewhere in such great profusion and variety and have been supported by so many known facts and by such plain and convincing logic that it would be impossible, save by some new mode of arrangement or statement, to increase the strength of the contention in favor of equal and indiscriminating bimetallism. Nevertheless, I shall vote to accept the Senate amendments; and my action in the matter will be the result of a deep-seated conviction that not until these amendments, or some other propositions embodying the same principles, are enacted into law and honestly enforced by an administration in full sympathy with them can we hope for any permanent return of prosperity to this country or of sound financial health to our Treasury. I believe in free silver coinage on terms of exact legal equality with gold, because—

FREE COINAGE WOULD PREVENT PANICS.

1. Free coinage of silver will increase the volume of primary money in the country, and thus prevent the panics we have so often experienced under the gold standard by reason of the "apprehensions" of speculators that, on account of the limited supply of gold in the country, we could not, or would not, redeem our securities in gold. The restoration of free coinage will be an unmistakable notice to those shylocks and to all the world that all coin obligations of this Government will be redeemed in "coin," as provided in the contract, and not in gold alone. This announcement may produce a temporary panic among the few hundred English and

semi-American speculators, in fact they may produce an artificial panic themselves as an "object lesson" to this Congress in order to influence it to repeal the law authorizing free coinage of silver. But the law will cause no apprehension on the part of the great masses of our people; but, on the contrary, it will be welcomed by them as a means of escape from the disastrous evils of the panics which are naturally expected and regularly experienced under any financial system where the stock of money of ultimate redemption is insufficient to perform the work of redemption. Should there be, under the restored system of bimetallism, a scarcity of one metal, there will at once be an increased demand for the other, for their money functions being identical, the more abundant or more easily obtainable metal, or its paper representatives, will answer any purpose or demand as well as the other. And this shifting of the demand from the one to the other, according to the relative supply of the two, will remove all incentive to hoard either; and it will obviate the possibility of either going to a premium, and will thus insure absolute commercial parity at the mint ratio.

WOULD INSURE SUFFICIENT CIRCULATION.

2. Free and unlimited coinage of silver will, by increasing the stock of primary money or redemption money, increase in the same proportion the stock of credit money based upon the primary money, and will thus insure at all times a sufficient circulation to transact the business of the country.

GOLD SUPPLY DECREASING.

The annual production of gold in this country is slowly but surely decreasing, and, sooner or later, it will become impossible for the Government or the people to find the gold to redeem outstanding obligations if payment in gold only be insisted upon. In 1853 the gold production of this country, with all the crudity and inefficiency of the apparatus and methods then employed, was $65,000,000. In 1893, forty years later, with the full benefit of all the wonderful discoveries and inventions of nearly half a century of the most rapid progress the world has ever made, with a wider experience in mining, with a more abundant capital, with an infinitely extended and improved transportation service, with better and cheaper machinery and supplies, and, above all, with a demand for gold greater than had ever been known in all the centuries before by reason of the demonetization of silver and the increased need of gold thereby created—with all these causes working together to increase the output, the production of gold in this country had dropped from $65,000,000 to less than $36,000,000, a decline of 45 per cent. And when we take into consideration the increased population of the country, the decline in production becomes still more marked.

In the ten years between 1850 and 1860 the production was $1.29 per head of population. In the ten years between 1884 and 1893 the production was $0.53 per head. Our population has increased from 25,000,000 to 70,000,000—a growth of 180 per cent. Our home and foreign commerce has increased twentyfold; new enterprises have been inaugurated; new lines of business have been opened; new inventions have appeared; new discoveries have been made; the new force of electricity, with its countless applications, has revolutionized the industrial world; new forces and new substances and materials have been brought to light, with new uses and applications for old substances and materials, all calling for a vast increase in the volume of money; and yet our gold production has fallen off nearly one-half. And still we are told by the apostle of the gold standard that it is the most perfect standard; that it is absolutely without variableness or shadow of turning.

The merest exercise of common sense and common honesty in discussion is sufficient to show that the charge of "an inflated currency," and "a currency far beyond the needs of commerce," so often advanced to explain our present troubles, is false. It requires some honesty toward oneself, but no astuteness whatever, to understand that the use of silver as primary money having been discontinued, by the interpretation put on a statute of Congress, silver dollars at once passed from the domain of primary or redemption money. This very fact, this very saddling upon gold all the redemption functions formerly exercised by both metals, naturally led to "apprehensions" that there was an insufficient supply of gold in the country to do this work, and, as silver is not allowed free coinage in Europe, holders of our securities naturally feared they would be paid in that metal which, even in this country, under present administrative policies, is regarded as a mere commodity.

In this way we can see that the partial demonetization of silver has been the cause of that want of confidence which is now pointed to as a convincing argument in favor of the completion of the demonetization of silver. But restore the free and unlimited coinage of silver and the result they fear will be quite different. They may be paid in silver, but it will not be silver the commodity, outlawed as a money metal, and therefore worth but 50 cents on the dollar, but they will be paid in a metal which throughout all the length and breadth of this vast country and among all its busy and increasing millions, will answer every monetary purpose that gold will answer. Then the commodity silver can be converted into current money, coequal in all its functions with gold, and therefore of equal value. The "50-cent dollar" of the gold-bug orators will have disappeared forever. Then, silver and gold both being primary money, or money of ultimate redemption. the ability of the nation to redeem its coin obligations will have been doubled, the medium of redemption will either be gold or the monetary equal of gold, confidence will return, apprehension will cease from troubling, and even the distrustful speculator will be at rest.

WOULD PREVENT APPRECIATION IN VALUE OF GOLD.

3. Free coinage of silver would prevent the injustice of requiring the debtor to pay his debts in a constantly appreciating currency. Prices have been falling with remarkable uniformity since 1873 in most of the products of labor. But debts, interest, taxes, and many other things calling for the laborer's money have either remained stationary or, as in the case of interest, have actually advanced. In this way the burdens of the debtor, instead of becoming lighter with each succeeding year of toil and self-denial and gradual payment, have been actually increased.

I submit here a table, taken from the Bimetallist, a British publication, showing the great appreciation in the value of gold in Great Britain since the demonetization of silver in this country in 1873. Any given amount of gold will purchase more than it would in 1873 by the following amounts:

More wheat by 108 per cent.
More flour by 76 per cent.
More sugar by 60 per cent.
More iron by 64 per cent.
More cotton by 95 per cent.
More lead by 110 per cent.
More wool by 93 per cent.
More leather by 24 per cent.
Average increase on these articles, 78¼ per cent.

A still more startling statement of this great appreciation of the value of gold is made by President Andrews, of Brown University, in a recent article on this subject, "An honest dollar." He says that on September 1, 1865, our public debt, then amounting to $2,750,000,000, could have been paid by 18,000,000 bales of cotton, but that now, after that debt had been reduced 55 per cent by the payment of $1,500,000,000, it will take 30,000,000 bales of cotton. In other words, it will take 12,000,000 more bales of cotton to pay the debt after it has been reduced $1,500,000,000 than it would have required at first—66⅔ per cent more cotton to pay 45 per cent of the debt now, under the gold standard, than it would have required to pay the whole debt under bimetallism. And yet, when the producer of cotton, or corn, or wheat, or wool, or leather, or iron, or sugar complains that by this appreciation the meaning of the word "dollar" (and consequently the meaning of the contract itself) has been changed to his prejudice in all his notes and mortgages, and asks that the original meaning of the word "dollar," and the meaning of the contract, be retained, and that no new meaning shall be added to the word which will double the burden of his obligation, he is denounced as a repudiationist, a wild-eyed socialist, a silver lunatic. He is told that he wants something for nothing; that the dollar which would mean the same now that it would have meant and did mean a few years ago when the contract was written would be a "dishonest" dollar, an "unsound" dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I resent the imputation or insinuation, from those high in authority or any other misguided idolaters of the gold standard, that my people are dishonest or want anything that is not rightfully their own. To them a dollar means something. To them it means much long, hard toil in the blazing heat of a southern sun. To them it means many of the comforts of life that are indispensable necessities to us, but which are unattainable luxuries to them.

The restoration of silver to its former legal status of perfect legal equality with gold would at once prevent any further appreciation in the value of gold, for the demand for gold would be at once transferred to silver, and the pressure on gold thus removed. The gold corner would be broken, the combine would be "busted," and the great masses of the common people throughout America and all the world would breathe easier.

WOULD STIMULATE BUSINESS.

4. In the fourth place, free coinage will give us a more abundant supply of money, and thus give a much-needed stimulus to every branch of business that makes use of money, excepting, perhaps, that of the pawnbroker and other usurers. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is an inadequate supply of money in this country to properly serve the demands of its great and growing trade and commerce. The fact that the country's business is transacted with the limited supply of money at its command is no argument whatever that the supply is sufficient. A large family can get along somehow by eating off one plate by taking turns; but from that fact no one would infer that one plate constitutes an abundant supply of tableware for a family. So the fact that, in some sort of way, amid suffering, depression, and bankruptcy, we are getting along with our present supply of primary money does not prove that that supply is adequate for

the demands of the country. With a sufficient money stock there would be no appreciation in the value of any part of our currency; the money of payment would be, as it ought to be, the money of the contract—that is, money of the same exchangeable value as that in circulation at the time of the making of the contract. This sufficient supply of money can never come through gold. It can not and ought not to come through fiatism. It should come, as it did for the first eighty years of our national life, through and from the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold.

But the restoration of bimetallism will immediately and permanently stimulate all the industries of this country, except those of the shylock and the sheriff. It will lead to the inauguration of many new enterprises. It will fill the mountains of the West with a busy and joyous host of miners, now wholly or partially idle, but then provided with steady and remunerative employment, digging the gold, silver, and lead from those venerable mountains, and furnishing a new and profitable market for the agricultural and horticultural products of the great West, and for the machinery, tools, and other mining appliances manufactured in the East and the North.

The great West would again spring to its feet full of financial and industrial strength. Towns and cities would spring up among its valleys. New railroads would thread its canyons and surmount its lofty passes; a silver and gold stream would trickle down those lofty mountain sides and find its welcome way into the financial circulation and the business and industrial life of the nation; and a great people would arise from the hideous nightmare of gold monometallism and, with their faces turned to the dawn of a newer and brighter day, address themselves to the great task of restoring that prosperity to which this country has so long been a stranger. Here and there—yes, in too many cases, as experience has shown—the development of mines would prove unprofitable, and the investor would lose vast sums, for silver is not to be had without money and without price or toil or effort, as the gold bug claims to believe; but the investor's loss would be the people's gain, for it would involve the distribution among the armies of labor of vast sums of money that had hitherto been hoarded.

But in other cases a fair profit would reward the progressive capitalist and the net profits of his enterprise would be added to the active capital of the country. New fields would be sought for investment. New enterprises North and South and East and West would be the natural sequence of profitable mining ventures, and those enterprises would each and all call for more men, more material, and more supplies and would thus give employment to the idle, business to the manufacturer, profitable custom to all that purvey to the toiler, and by increasing the number of profitably employed laboring men and by increasing the laborer's capacity to purchase the manufactured products of other labor it would stimulate every line of manufacturing and revivify every department of production and distribution.

Gradually the demand for labor would furnish opportunities for employment to all that would work. The armies of the unemployed could then be mustered out of service, for the war of the Government and its syndicate allies against the business and the industries and trade and commerce of the country—against the comfort and prosperity of the American people—would be over, and peace and plenty would again prevail in the homes of the poor toilers throughout the land. Thus, and thus only, can we fully meet and adequately provide for the situation that confronts us to-day.

WOULD HELP INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM.

5. But the beneficial effects of free coinage would not be confined to this country. The example of the greatest nation on earth deserting gold monometallism, on mature deliberation, and taking a bold stand for absolute bimetallism—the immediate transfer of one-fourth of the enlightened people of the world, and that the most progressive and enterprising part, from the single gold standard to the double standard—would wonderfully encourage the advocates and friends of bimetallism throughout the world, and would go far toward inducing France and Germany, and ultimately all Europe except England, to return to bimetallism. Nearly all the single gold standard men in this country, except a few new converts (always the most zealous champions of any cause), claim to favor the free and unlimited coinage of silver provided it be done by international agreement; that means that they admit that bimetallism would be beneficial if we could have it, but they say we can not bring it about ourselves. If they are sincere in this profession I know of no better way to secure an international agreement than for this imperial nation—the strongest, the most enterprising, the most influential, and the most populous of all the enlightened nations of the earth—to take the lead and invite the others to follow. But her influence would do more than to invite, it would compel the adoption of free coinage by all other nations except England herself, and possibly by England too, after she had once fairly experienced the disadvantages and the losses imposed by her financial isolation.

WOULD GIVE US THE TRADE OF SILVER NATIONS.

6. Evidently the effect of this country's putting itself on a bimetallic basis would be the establishment, to England's prejudice, of closer commercial relations between the United States and the 900,000,000 of people composing the silver nations of the world. The needs of trade would ultimately lead, no doubt, to the establishment of a common or international unit of value, for the purposes of international commerce between these silver countries; and this commercial bond, in connection with the fact that we stood ready to receive their silver currency, as we did prior to 1857, in payment of trade balances due us, would give us a decided advantage over gold-standard nations in dealing with nations that recognize silver as money.

WOULD RAISE THE PRICE OF FARM PRODUCTS.

7. Again, the opening of our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver would at once advance its price all over the world to the price in this country, less the cost of transportation to this country. One beneficent effect of this result would be an immediate advance in the price of wheat and cotton and all other American products that now come into competition at Liverpool with the products of cooly labor in India. Under present conditions England buys our discredited silver at 63 or 64 cents per ounce, takes it to India, and with it there buys cotton and wheat and other Indian products at about the same price she has paid for them heretofore, for the demonetization of silver in this country did not affect prices in silver countries. The silver price paid for those articles in India, plus the cost of transportation thence to Liverpool, becomes the silver price of the same articles in Liverpool, and as silver in Liverpool is worth only about 50 cents on the dollar in gold, the gold price of these products in Liverpool is thus fixed at about one-half their silver price in India.

As Liverpool fixes the price for our surplus of agricultural products, and thus indirectly fixes or determines the price in America of our home-sold products, it becomes apparent that the present depreciated price of silver is the chief cause of the ruinously low prices our wheat, cotton, and such of our other products as come into competition with Indian products command. Let free coinage be adopted by this country, and England, no longer able to buy silver for her India trade at 48 cents on the dollar, but being required to pay its full mint value, will no longer be able to dictate a price to our farmers which they can not afford to accept, but which they are nevertheless helpless to reject. The benefits accruing to our farmers each year under such a system would amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

During the year 1894 we exported the following farm products, worth in Liverpool the following sums:

Product.	Amount exported.	Price.	Value.
		Cents.	
Corn.....bushels..	66,489,529	45.7	$30,385,714
Wheat.....do.....	164,283,129	49.1	80,663,016
Cotton.....pounds..	3,769,391,478	6.94	261,595,074
Total value of these three exports ..			372,643,804

Since the production for 1894 may fairly be taken as an averge, it will be seen that the advance in the value of silver caused by the demand free coinage would create would cause our exports of those three farm products alone to advance in value in the Liverpool market not less than $372,000,000, to say nothing of the vast increase in the value of those portions of the same products which would be sold for consumption in this country. If we consider the home-sold products as equal to the part sold abroad, the benefits accruing to the producers from free coinage would amount to nearly or quite $700,000,000 per year on those three products alone.

And when we add to these three crops the general advance in the value of all other farm products, we can begin to have some conception of the benefits of free coinage.

It is true the price of farmers' supplies and all other articles bought by the farmer will be increased; but the farmer will then be in a condition to pay higher prices, and these higher prices that he pays will redound to the benefit of the operatives and manufacturers engaged in producing these articles. But the debts, interest, and other fixed charges which our people must meet will not be increased, and can thus be more easily met.

WOULD ENABLE US TO MEET JAPANESE COMPETITION.

8. One other great advantage will result to the people (more particularly to the manufacturers and operatives) of this country from the adoption of free coinage. The cheapness of silver in its present demonetized condition not only enables the Indian agriculturist, without loss to himself, to force down our competing farm products to almost half the price they would command under free coinage, but it also enables the Japanese manufacturer to sell his products in this country at such prices as absolutely defy American competition.

The Japanese laborer, by inherited aptitude, by an inexorable life-long apprenticeship to one calling, and that the calling of his fathers for centuries before him, and by the possession of an instinct trained and developed through a thousand years of unrelenting battle for existence, has solved the problem of finding the minimum of human necessity. He has been inured to self-denial till he has deadened natural human desires; he has, by immemorial abstinence and self-abnegation, thrown himself outside the pale of temptation; he has familiarized himself with the contented use of those means of existence which would mean starvation to other men; and he has thus developed himself into the cheapest, the most ingenious, the most patient, the most willing, and the most profitable laborer in all the industrial world. To him a thin cotton garment is rainent, a few morsels of rice are food, and a shed, an awning, or a goods box is shelter. To him strikes and boycotts are unknown. His manufacturing employer can command such labor in unlimited supply for a few cents a day, and pay those few cents in silver depreciated one-half by our demonetization of it in this country. The products of such labor can be and are to-day sold in our markets for less money than they can be actually produced for in this country.

They have already entered the field of competition in many lines of industry, and, exulting in their easily obtained success in those fields, they will undoubtedly enter others. What is to be the outcome of this new invasion of the western world—an invasion which, if unchecked, threatens to result in a greater measure of human suffering and calamity than was ever produced by any invasion of Europe by Goth or Hun or Vandal or Turk? When, as soon will be the case, all the heretofore pent-up energies of that wonderful nation are directed to our industrial overthrow, we shall be compelled to abdicate our proud position of the world's purveyor and descend to the level of a civilization in which the conditions of life are so hard that to the vast majority of our people bare existence will be the summation of all human hope—the ne plus ultra of human aspiration.

And let us not flatter ourselves that the Japanese will be without allies in this momentous struggle. Almost in sight of the shores of Japan lies a sleeping giant with dormant powers whose magnitude has never been tested, but who holds in his hands the key to the future progress and happiness of the human race on this globe. The Chinese Empire has just been waked by its war with Japan to a consciousness that its methods belong to the past, and that it must align itself with the progress of the present if it would rise to the true level of its opportunity. It is now rapidly shaking off the sleep of centuries, opening its eyes to the grand opportunities of the present, and girding on its armor to meet us in the industrial wars of the future.

With a population equal to that of the United States and all Europe combined—a population whose faculties have been sharpened into inherited instincts by forty centuries of untiring exercise under the relentless laws of necessity—a population with which toil is the normal condition of existence, unrestricted by legal limitations and unrelieved by the restful oasis of the Christian Sabbath—with such a population thrown into the scale against us, paid in the silver our own greed and folly have depreciated, our industrial fate is inexorably fixed unless we resort to the only avenue of escape left us. Either we must give up to them the markets of this great country (the most remunerative markets in the world) and all our markets for manufactured products in other countries or we must struggle to retain them. The "most favored nation" clause in our treaties with those countries would prevent our discriminating against them in our tariff schedules, and thus protecting our manufacturers and operatives. But even if we resort to the exclusion policy of a high tariff, it would not only impose unjust burdens on our own people in the effort to protect our own people, but it would be powerless to save for us our foreign markets.

There remains, then, the one hope—restore the free coinage of silver in this country. Raise thereby the price of silver throughout the world at one stroke, as such a step would do, to commercial parity in this country and in every country where American commerce finds its way, and by that same act you double the value of the silver constituting the wages paid to the Hindoo farmer and to the Chinese and the Japanese operative, and thus practically place a protective duty of 100 per cent on their products. This would not only protect the American operative and the American manufacturer, but it would also increase the lowest possible price of Chinese and Japanese products in all the markets of the world, and would thus be the wisest step this country could take toward retaining the share we now have of foreign trade in articles of American manufacture, and in saving our people from being degraded from the highest to the lowest civilization in the world of to-day.

In conclusion, then, it is clear that, as the theory of the Republican party is wrong as to the malady that afflicts our people to-day, it must be wrong as to the remedy—higher duties and more bonds. It is clear that, as the President's theory of the disease is at fault, we can not accept his suggested remedy of retiring the greenbacks and abdicating to the national banks the high function of regulating the volume and the value of our entire circulation of paper money. It is as clear to my mind as any proposition involving the exercise of human reason can be made to appear that our financial troubles and the present deplorable condition of the masses of our people have their origin in the lack of sufficient primary money properly to discharge the business of the country and in the low price of silver throughout the world.

Reasoning from this undoubted premise, I can not resist the conclusion that the sure remedy for our financial and economic troubles lies in such legislation as will give us a larger volume of money and raise the price of silver throughout the world by creating an unlimited demand for its limited supply, and that these twin results can be accomplished by the incorporation into our national statutes of the principles embodied in the Senate amendments to this bill. Believing thus, I shall gladly cast my vote in favor of the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee, which recommends concurrence in the Senate amendments.

Believing that the free and unlimited coinage of silver as provided in the Senate amendments will prevent the panics which we have so regularly experienced under the single gold standard, believing that free coinage will furnish sufficient circulation to prevent the evils which an inadequate money supply has imposed upon us, believing it would prevent appreciation in the valne or purchasing power of gold, that it would secure greater stability of prices, stimulate business, promote the cause of international bimetallism, improve our trade with silver nations, raise the price of farm products, ease the burden of every debt in the land, enable us to meet Asiatic competition, and assure to our people prosperity at home and a more commanding financial and commercial position among the nations of the earth, I should be untrue to the interests of the people and to my convictions of duty were I not to cast my vote in favor of the cause of free-silver coinage.

Mr. TURNER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention, of course, of undertaking to discuss in detail the Senate substitute now under consideration by this committee in the brief limit of the five minutes which have been allowed me; but not knowing whether I shall have an opportunity to vote upon the sections of this substitute separately, or whether I shall have to vote to concur or to nonconcur in the substitute as a whole, I desire to say that this substitute has four sections, which are wholly distinct and independent. Neither of them depends upon the other. Each contains an independent proposition so distinct that members of this committee may very well be in favor of some and opposed to others. I find myself in just that predicament. I think the sections ought to be voted on separately. Being thus situated, I desire to express my position upon the substitute, as my vote would not express it if I should be compelled to vote upon the substitute as a whole.

I am in favor of the second section of this substitute, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

I voted for this same proposition in the last Congress, and I see no reason why these millions lying idle in the Treasury, bought and paid for by the Government, now its property, but as worthless as bricks in its present position, should continue to lie there idle, when so much needed for the uses of the Government.

In the next place, I am in favor of the third section of this substitute, which reads:

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

I should prefer to substitute five dollars for the ten mentioned in that section, simply for the reason that I am afraid that if the entire circulating medium of the country below ten dollars in denomination is changed into silver it will be cumbrous and not easily handled; but as I shall not have the opportunity of voting for that modification, I am prepared, if given the opportunity, to vote for this section as a whole.

I am in favor of that part of the fourth section which provides as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department.

The time of Mr. TURNER of Virginia having expired, by unani-

mous consent, on motion of Mr. COOPER of Texas, it was extended five minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Virginia. I am in favor of this provision which I have just read, sir, because I believe the language of this section was the purpose and intent of the original act, and I see no possible wrong in paying in silver notes that were given for silver.

Now, sir, I will say as to the balance of this section, I will be in favor of the same provision with reference to the greenbacks provided that I can satisfy myself that it can be done without any bad faith on the part of the Government, as to which I am not entirely satisfied. I think it ought to be done, if it can be done with honor.

I can not support the first section of the substitute, which provides that all the silver bullion of the world, wherever and by whoever owned, when presented at the mints of the United States, shall be coined for the owner free of cost to him, the owner to receive a standard silver dollar for every 412½ grains of standard silver bullion nine-tenths fine so presented at the mint, and when these coins are received in the Treasury silver certificates to be issued therefor. Thus in effect a silver-dollar certificate going into circulation and becoming an obligation of the Government for an amount of silver which, without the passage of this section, the Government can buy in open market for a sum about one-half that which the owner will get for it from the Government under the operation of this section if enacted into law.

There are other grave reasons, but this is sufficient and controlling to me, so much so that if I am not permitted to vote upon these distinct and independent sections separately, and am compelled to vote upon them as a whole, my understanding of my duty will compel me to vote to nonconcur in the substitute, though I sincerely hope we may be given the opportunity to vote separately on these distinct sections, standing independent of and having no connection with each other—each upon its own merits.

And it does seem to me that if the extreme advocates for free coinage persist in holding they will have all or none, and refuse an opportunity to pass that which I believe we may get, viz, the great benefits and immensely enlarged circulation of silver to result from the second, third, and fourth sections with the first left out, with the incident relief to the gold reserve, the loss to the people will be owing to them, and they will have "lost the substance by grabbing at the shadow."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the only excuse I have for burdening the House with any remarks upon this question is that I expect to be called away and shall not have an opportunity to vote upon the several propositions under discussion, and for that reason it is but just to myself as well as to my constituents that I should define my position upon these various questions. Now, as I understand it, when the discussion ceases a motion will be made to concur in the Senate substitute. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on that proposition, that if present I shall not vote to concur. I am not in favor of the unlimited coinage of silver in this country; I am not in favor of throwing our ports open to the commerce of the world without any restrictions; nor am I in favor of throwing our mints open to the free coinage of silver of the world without restriction. Therefore if present I shall cast my vote, as I have suggested, against concurring in the Senate substitute.

I am further informed that the next question that will be submitted to the House will be on a motion to nonconcur in the Senate substitute, and insist upon the House bill. If present I will cast my vote against this proposition also, for I did not believe, and do not now believe, that the bill passed by the House should become a law. I can not see the necessity of enacting that law at this time. While perhaps some amendment of the law of 1875 should be made, I can not see the necessity for the House bond bill leaving the law of 1875 upon the statute books. I believe the power of the Secretary of the Treasury should be restricted with reference to the issuance of bonds. So, upon that proposition I would also vote no.

There is another proposition or two, separate and independent, that will doubtless come before this House in the way of an amendment to the Senate substitute, and that is with reference to retiring notes of less denominations than $10. Now, I believe in bimetallism, and I believe that we should do just as much as we can, with safety, toward bringing the two metals together. In other words, if we continue to discriminate against silver always we may never hope to see the two metals come nearer together, and the breach will continually widen from day to day and from month to month. It seems to me we have an excellent opportunity of placing in circulation all the silver that is produced by our own mines by adopting this method of retiring all the notes less than $10 in denomination and substituting therefor silver dollars or silver certificates. Now, I am not advised as to the number of these notes, but they must run into the millions, and if we retire these notes and substitute silver therefor we thereby then find an opportunity of placing in circulation a large amount of silver money, equal, in my judgment, to the output of our American mines, and by doing this we will show a disposition to aid silver and prove to the country that we are in fact friends of silver; therefore I should favor that proposition, if I were permitted to vote upon it alone.

I am also inclined to believe that we could safely coin the seigniorage in the Treasury and put that in circulation, and I should vote for that proposition.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we continue to discriminate against silver always, if we fail to put in circulation that part of our silver product which we can safely put in circulation, we need never hope to see the commercial price of silver advance. Therefore I believe it is the duty of the American people with reference to the product of their silver mines to take the same care that they take of our other commodities. In other words, I am a protectionist. I believe in protecting our own industries; I believe in discriminating in our own favor and against the outside world, and I believe in applying that doctrine to silver. We can take care of our own product and let the rest of the world take care of its own. By so doing we succeed in finding an opportunity to circulate every silver dollar coming from our own mines, and certainly we are under no obligation to Mexico or to any other country on the face of the earth to take care of its product. [Applause.]

Mr. DE WITT Mr. Speaker, it has been asserted on the floor of this House that to remonetize silver would at once restore the commercial parity of 1 to 16. This proposition, in the light of such information as I have upon the monetary question, I can not accept as being correct. The commercial ratio existing to-day between silver and gold stands 1 to 32, so that bringing it to 1 to 16 would double the price of silver bullion or cut in two the price of gold bullion. There is nothing in the history of the two metals to warrant this assertion of the advocates of the free coinage of silver. Silver when compared with gold has always fluctuated in value. Julius Cæsar on one occasion exchanged gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 9. Livy mentions that in the year 189 before the Christian era the two metals were exchanged at the ratio of 1 to 10. Under the early Roman Emperors the ratio was 1 to 12. From Constantine, A. D. 306, to Justinian, A. D. 565, the ratio was 1 to 14 and 1 to 15. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that such mints as they had in the Roman Empire were open during this long period to the free coinage of the two metals, yet notwithstanding that fact the metals drifted apart in relative values and no ratio was steadily maintained. The history of our own country shows very conclusively that these two metals vary in value, each to the other, when cast upon the bosom of commerce.

The laws of commerce are far more powerful in regulating the value of bullions than the acts of Parliament or the acts of the American Congress. In 1717 Great Britain called upon the keeper of the mints for a statement as to the commercial ratio existing between silver and gold. Newton, the master of the mint, made a report to Parliament of 1 to 15½. Parliament desired that more silver should be coined, establishing a legal ratio of 1 to 15⅛, thus discriminating by law as against commerce in favor of silver three-tenths of 1 per cent. What was the result? A ratio was established in Holland and in France of 1 to 14, and the silver went from England into the commercial exchanges of France and Holland, where it found a better market than the mint market of England. The ratio which was established by the British Parliament in 1717 of 1 to 15½ was never changed, but remained upon the statutes for ninety-nine years. It remained statutory until 1816, when Parliament abandoned the idea of establishing any legal ratio of the two metals which would be supported by a commercial parity, repealed the act of 1717, and thereby demonetized silver forever in Great Britain. What is true of England and Italy in the variation of values of these metals comes with equal force from the history of Greece; exchanges were noted as early as Herodotus in the fifth century before Christ.

The Senate substitute under consideration, Mr. Speaker, which provides for the free coinage of silver on a ratio with gold of 16 to 1, contains no provision which in any way attempts to maintain a commercial parity of these two metallic moneys so that gold would not be driven out of circulation and out of the country. I am opposed to the substitute.

Silver fluctuates in value in the markets of the world from day to day and year to year. How to maintain the commercial parity of these two metals on a given ratio when both are coined and used as money is a question which has puzzled many ages. It can be done in one way. A gentleman asserted on this floor yesterday that it could be done by an international agreement. Such an international agreement can never be had. Why? From the simple fact that in order to make it effective Great Britain would have to become a party to it, and she never will become a party to any such international agreement. Great Britain, according to a statement current in the public newspapers a few months ago, had at that time within her dominions $1,300,000,000 of gold coin and gold bullion, and according to the statement of Gladstone the people of Great Britain hold in credits, which are payable, principal and interest, in gold, upon people of foreign countries and foreign na-

tions, $10,000,000,000. Under these circumstances, Great Britain, being a gold country, will never unite with the other nations of the earth in an agreement to coin and use silver in any given ratio. No, never; it is an utter impossibility. She is caring for Great Britain, and appears to be doing quite well on a gold monometallic basis.

The people of America who desire the further coinage of silver must abandon the idea of an international agreement; such an agreement can never be had. The European nations—France, Greece, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland—which formed what was known as the Latin Union, agreed to coin and use silver upon the ratio of 15½ to 1. Great Britain did not join with those nations in that agreement, and she broke down the Latin Union; so that each of those nations was compelled in turn to recede from the agreements made in that combination. I ask how, then, can we coin more silver and maintain the parity of silver and gold on any established ratio? I will tell you, first reading a passage from Professor Perry's work on the Elements of Political Economy, published in 1866, when money was discussed for the benefit of the American students in American colleges upon sound principles. This book was written prior to this great flood of silver bullion upon the American market. What does this author say upon this question of a double metallic currency?

When, however, it is designed that both metals shall circulate in the same currency, then it becomes necessary that government shall determine, as well as it can, not the absolute value of either, but the relative value of each in each; and the value of each, estimated in the other, regulates itself independently of edicts or enactments. If the legislators can ascertain in what proportions they are exchanging for each other in a free market, they may mark that as the legal relative value of the two, but they must not suppose that their work will not require revision from time to time.

Taking the old established principles laid down by this eminent author, which permeate the pages of all authors upon the science of money, but which have never been formulated into an enactment to perpetually maintain the parity of silver and gold where both are coined, I here submit a formulation in accordance with those indisputable principles of a frequent revision by which, if enacted into law, stating an unchangeable ratio, the revision being not in the coins, but in the reserves at the foundation of and back of the coins, to correspond with the ever-shifting commercial value of silver bullion, the commercial parity of the two metals can be perpetually maintained at the legal ratio. It is as follows:

First. That the United States of America shall admit silver bullion to coinage in its mints upon the surrender by the owners to the Government of the difference between the market price of the bullion and its face value when coined.

Second. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall set apart, to be governed by the provisions of this act, any silver bullion the property of the Government of 2,000,000 ounces, which fund shall be replenished from said sources so that the same shall not fall below 2,000,000 ounces of silver bullion, and shall be known and designated as the secondary silver reserve fund.

Third. That the aforesaid difference in bullion surrendered to the Government under section 1 of this act shall be held by the Government in trust, subject to the provisions of this act, and known and designated as the primary silver reserve fund.

Fourth. That on the first Monday in each calendar month the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the primary to the secondary silver reserve fund, or from the secondary silver reserve fund to the primary silver reserve fund, as the case may require, silver bullion in such amount as shall be necessary to make the primary silver reserve fund, and all of the coins under this act, equal in bullion value to the face value of all of the coins under this act.

Fifth. That 371¼ grains fineness of pure silver shall constitute $1 face value under this act.

Sixth. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required, when demanded by the holder of any coins under this act, to receive and retain said coins and issue to the holder in return thereof the silver certificates of the Government in denominations of $1, $2, $5, $10, $20, $50, and $100.

Seventh. That the coins and certificates under this act shall be legal tender (unless otherwise provided by contract) in any sum for any debt or obligation, both private and public.

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required when demanded by the holder of any coins under this act who desires to have the same redeemed to receive said coins when presented in the sum of $100 or any multiple thereof, and place the same in the primary silver reserve fund as bullion, and surrender as pay therefor, and in lieu thereof, to such holder from the primary silver reserve fund silver bullion of the bullion value of that day in the face sum of said coins so surrendered and redeemed.

It will readily be seen that under this proposition silver would be remonetized. The party, for illustration, who should present $1,000 worth of silver bullion at the mint would receive 1,000 legal-tender silver dollars. The balance of the bullion, commonly called seigniorage, would pass to the primary silver reserve fund.

That which fails to be in the silver dollar to make it intrinsically worth $1 in gold is in the primary reserve fund held in trust for that dollar. This primary reserve fund is increased or diminished, as the case may require, every thirty days, so that there shall be just that amount, no more, no less.

I submit this proposition for consideration to go in the RECORD because the gentleman from Maine discussed the international agreement plan, which is impracticable and has been exploded, as the remedy for the silver question and the proper method for the further coinage of silver. Should silver be remonetized under this plan, it would not disturb gold, but would aid in taking the strain from gold and would furnish a mint market for silver bullion. This would give it two competitive markets, the mint market and art market, which would, at least to some extent, enhance the bullion value of silver. Should silver bullion advance under this proposition, the Government would gain through the reserve; should it decline, the Government would loose. It is fair to make this deduction in political economy. A metal used as money and demonetized depreciates in its bullion value; remonetized it appreciates in value.

The Republican national platform of 1892 favors the coinage of silver "under such restrictions and such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal." The Democratic national platform of 1892 is exactly the same, only differing in the phraseology of the sentence in the resolution. I believe in the further coinage of silver on a safe, conservative, and enduring plan. The two great parties are together by their last national declarations.

Why not this Congress devise the way to coin silver under safeguards and redeem our pledges to the people of the whole country? Silver is an American product. It is a source of great national wealth. Why not utilize it and let the mines yield their wealth to the American people? [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that nothing that can be said upon this floor can affect the result of the vote which will be taken upon the report of the committee, and that no amount of discussion will change the settled purpose of the large majority of gold monometallists or Pickwickian bimetallists to prevent the enactment of any legislation looking to the recognition of silver. But this discussion extends beyond these walls and reaches the great body of the people of this country who are vitally interested in the results and critically weighing the sentiments that control this body.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON TRIAL.

The last campaign was a remarkable one in the political history of the Union. It was an off year. No Presidential election was pending. Nevertheless, the Democratic party was arraigned throughout the length and breadth of this land as hopelessly incompetent to manage the finances of the country; that although in full control of the executive and legislative departments, it had entirely failed to give any relief to the suffering millions of our citizens and our languishing industries. And the people believed the charge. The party in power was held responsible for the unfortunate and distressed condition of the nation; how unjustly, it is now beginning to realize. History declares the indisputable fact, of which this side of the House is justly proud, that during all the half century of the government of this country by the Democratic party there was never an act passed contracting the currency of the people or imposing upon them laws calculated or designed to enrich the few at the expense of the masses, making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

It has the enviable distinction of having been always true to the Constitution and its bed-rock principles; that the only justification for taxation is the necessity of it, and that its only virtue is in the equality of its burden upon all classes of citizens and all kinds of property. It has ever opposed robbery in all of its forms, whether directly by extravagant expenditures, or indirectly by tariff assessments upon the consumer for the benefit of the manufacturer, or insidiously by the contraction of the currency, and thereby depriving them of the opportunity to work, the means to pay their debts, and of fair values for their products. That is still the position of our party, judged, as it should be, by its platform and the votes of its representatives in Congress. It is essentially and by inheritance the party of the people. Its past record bespeaks its future, and it will yet, and at no distant day, resume business at the old stand as young and lusty as when ten years ago it emerged from its eclipse of a quarter of a century.

As I was stating, in the campaign of 1894 the Republican party proclaimed that it alone was capable of conducting the finances of the Government and of infusing life into the arteries of commerce, giving employment to labor, and restoring a general era of prosperity. The people took them at their word. That party is now in full possession of the Senate and House. Congress has been in session two months. The eyes of the people have already begun to open to the true situation. The recollection is now dawning upon them that this very party is the cause of all the financial ailments of the Government and of the ills of the country. That party has erected monuments to itself which will be as enduring as history. It has enacted every tariff law that has been passed for the benefit of the manufacturers rather than for revenue for the Government.

The act which destroyed silver as a mint money was enacted by you in 1873. From that date to this we have been trying to rehabilitate it, to restore it to the house of its fathers, while you have with equal persistency striven to prevent a resurrection. In November, 1877, Mr. Bland (Democrat) carried through the House a bill for the free and unlimited coinage of silver which should be legal tender at face value. In January, 1878, the Senate amended

it by limiting the coinage to a minimum of $2,000,000 per month on Government account and providing for the exchange of silver coins for certificates of not less than $10 each. The bill passed as amended. President Hayes vetoed it "as an act of bad faith" to bondholders. It was passed over the veto. It was repealed July 14, 1890. In June, 1890, a bill authorizing the issue of Treasury notes upon deposit of silver bullion passed the House. The Senate substituted for it a bill for the free coinage of silver. The House rejected the substitute. The committee of conference agreed to what is known as the Sherman law. It became an act July 14, 1890. It provided for the monthly purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, at not more than $1 for 371¼ grains of pure silver, and for the issuance of Treasury notes in payment, redeemable on demand in gold or silver, at the discretion of the Secretary. It made them legal tender except when otherwise stipulated in the contract, required the monthly coinage of the bulllon into standard silver dollars till the following July, after which he could coin only so much as should be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes.

It may be well to state also in passing that it also declared it to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio as may be provided by law." Now the mask can only be taken from this miserable appearance of silver recognition when it is compared with the essentials or qualities constituting the stability as money of a metal. Those essentials are that the owner of it shall have free access to the mints for coinage and in unlimited quantity; that there shall be no charge for mintage beyond the actual cost to the Government; that the amount, by weight, of pure metal in the coin shall be exchangeable for its weight in the bullion, and that the coin shall at all times be a full legal tender. The hollowness of the pretense appears at once. It was indeed a "miserable makeshift." Its author has since justified, or rather excused it, by claiming that that was the only way to defeat the free coinage of silver. And, at last, the coup de grâce was given to aspiring silver by the act of November, 1893, which repealed that portion of the Sherman Act which allowed the purchase of silver. That is the story. All the glory for the demonetization of silver—whatever that glory may be—is yours. All of the wrongs done your countrymen by that act rest upon your head.

THE RESULT OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION.

With Sir Christopher Wren you may point to your own work as your monument. You may claim as your own particular production the long and continually lengthening list of tariff barons, manufacturing princes, trust-monopoly magnates. All the rivulets of a nation's toil and all the streams of her industry have, under the system of protection, paternalism, extravagance, and class favoritism, inaugurated and maintained by the Republican party during the past thirty-five years, been poured into the cavernous vaults of the favored few of her citizens and of the alien. That party has been the means of concentrating wealth to an extent never before known to any nation or people. Europe with her centuries of feudal despotism, class distinctions, and hereditary accumulations stands awestricken in the presence of the colossal fortunes which have risen in this Republic of freedom and equality within the past quarter of a century.

I need not dwell upon details. They are known of all men. Extreme wealth and extreme poverty have become the features of our civilization. One-half of 1 per cent of our population owns one-half of the total wealth of the country. The remaining 99½ per cent of the people must divide among them in all manner of proportions this unappropriated other half of the wealth of the nation. It is they who are vitally interested in this measure and who are keenly alive to the disposition to be made of it. They realize that within the past thirty-three years twenty thousand millions of wealth of this country, created and produced by its honest toilers, have passed into the hands and under the control of capital, and that that process is continuing at the rate of about one billion each year. The census of 1890 tells them further that from 1861 to 1890 the people of these United States were compelled to run into debt, public and private, twenty-eight thousand million dollars. Labor has been most vigorous and faithful, the soil has been most generous, the spirit of enterprise has been active, energy and boldness have characterized these closing years of this marvelous century in all departments of commerce, manufacturing, and development of all our resources. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the great mass of the people have steadily been growing poorer and poorer, and the wealth created by them has flowed into coffers already filled to overflowing.

The last census demonstrates the fearfully blighting effect of our financial system upon our agricultural and producing States and the corresponding benefits to the States where organized capital has taken its abode. One illustration will be sufficient. The 16 agricultural States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have a combined area of about 800,000 square miles. The State of New York has about 50,000 square miles. The population of the 16 States was about 21,000,000 in 1880, and that of New York about 5,000,000. The assessed valuation of the property of the 16 States was a little over $4,000,000,000 in 1880, while that of New York was $2,650,000,000. Now, in the ten years the 16 producing States, with an area sixteen times as great as that of New York, increased in wealth eleven hundred and fifty millions, while that State alone gained eleven hundred and twenty-three millions. These silent figures tell more eloquently than I can the story of the great body of the people being made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the favored few. If any further evidence is desired, it can easily be found in the comparison of the values of our two great export crops, cotton and wheat, in the years 1881 and 1893, which has been compiled as follows:

In 1881 the wheat crop of the United States was 383,000,000 bushels. It realized $456,000,000.

The cotton crop of the United States for the same period, estimated at 6,000,000 bales, at 470 pounds per bale, at 10 cents per pound, would amount to $282,000,000; the same weight of cotton in 1893, at the selling price of 6 cents per pound, realized only $169,200,000, or a difference in the price of the crop, estimating the quantity the same, of $112,800,000.

The difference in the price of wheat for the same period, 1881 and 1893, was $243,000,000 less than 1881, so that we have a shrinkage of values in the two staple crops of the country of $355,800,000, which, together with the other staple crops, will make at least a shrinkage in farm products alone of more than $1,000,000,000 per year.

We have for the past twelve years lost in the material wealth, the product of the soil from which the wealth of the country is derived, $12,000,000,000. With this vast sum of money in the country we should never have been in the pitiable condition we are to-day—a sum so large that it would purchase all the railroad stocks and bonds, watered or unwatered, besides leaving a surplus.

THE ACT OF 1873 CHIEFLY RESPONSIBLE.

That this robbery of the producing and laboring classes has been chiefly accomplished through the instrumentality of the demonetizing act of 1873 has never been successfully denied and has been conceded by the greatest of Republican statesmen and politicians. It would indeed be a bootless task to enter upon the discussion of that subject at this late date. Those that are not now convinced of the fact would scarce believe though one came from the dead.

In 1880 Secretary of State James G. Blaine said:

On the much-vexed and long-mooted question as to bimetallic or monometallic standard my own views are sufficiently indicated in the remarks I have made. I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in and throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly $7,000,000,000 of coin or bullion in the world, very equally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands.

I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution; indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which the great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize either. If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it. If its coinage has been prohibited, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed; I am in favor of having it enlarged.

Prof. Francis A. Walker said in an article in the North American Review:

The abandonment of silver will result in the enhancement of the burden of all debts and fixed charges, acting as a drag upon production; and suffocation, strangulation, are words hardly too strong to express the agony of the industrial body when embraced in the fatal coils of a contracting money.

Dr. Giffen, of England, chief of the statistical department of trade and an authority with monometallists, has admitted:

If the test of prophecy be the event, there was never surely a better forecast. The fall of prices in such a general way as to amount to what is known as a rise in the purchasing power of gold is generally, I might almost say universally, admitted. Measured by any commodity or group of commodities usually taken as the measure for such a purpose, gold is undoubtedly possessed of more purchasing power than was the case fifteen or twenty years ago, and this high purchasing power has been continued over a long enough period to allow for all minor oscillations.

President Andrews, of Brown University, a member of the International Monetary Commission, concedes all that I have asserted: That the underlying cause for the financial and industrial depression is the fact of ever-falling values produced by the contraction of the currency and the displacement of silver from its position in the world's money circulation; that it was "the hardest, sadest blow to human welfare ever delivered by the action of the States; that so long as gold is the sole standard of money these wrongs and sufferings must continue—to abate them, silver must be monetized."

Hear what Senator JOHN SHERMAN, at present the high priest of gold monometallism, says in a letter written by him in 1878:

During the monetary conference in Paris, when silver in our country was excluded from circulation by being undervalued, I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter, which you will find in the proceedings of that conference, stating briefly my view. At that time the wisest of us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver or the rise of gold that has occurred. The uncertainty of the relation between the two metals is one of the chief arguments in favor of a monometallic system, but other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh in my mind all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system.

There should be yoked to this opinion of one so high in Republican councils and of such undoubted authority in finance the maiden and unbiased judgment of his twin brother in economics, the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, who a few months previously sounded this clarion note to his countrymen, who even that early appreciated his remarkable abilities:

I shall not enter into an examination of the causes which have combined to depreciate the relative value of silver and to appreciate the value of gold since 1873, but I am one of those who believe that they are transient and temporary in their nature, and that when they have passed away or have been removed by the separate or united actions of the nations most deeply interested in the subject, the old ratio of actual and relative value will be reestablished on a firmer foundation than ever. I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever become so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry. According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age.

The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence, and famine that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the movable property of the world, including horses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money of the world.

One more object lesson from statistics, and I shall leave this subject In 1873 wheat was $1.30 per bushel, cotton 19 cents a pound, and silver $1.30 an ounce. The farmer could then pay a debt of $100 with 77 bushels of wheat or with a bale of cotton weighing 526 pounds. To-day, with silver at 57 cents, for him to pay a debt of $100 it would require 220 bushels of wheat, or 3 bales of cotton weighing 450 pounds each. And it is the unavoidable result of the demonetization act of 1873. It can not be explained upon the theory of overproduction. The statistics already produced in this debate demonstrate that there has been no fixed ratio upon the basis of production. The ordinary law of supply and demand has been overridden by the higher law, that an insufficient currency reduces all commodities to beggars upon the market, be the production great or small.

It is equally futile to attempt to ascribe this disastrous condition to improvements in machinery appliances. The tabulated statements appearing in the London Economist show that the decline in values is greatest in the raw materials and in which there is the lowest minimum of the application or employment of such improvements. There is no escape from it. The conclusion is irresistible.

The one great cause of the depression which is resting like a nightmare upon the people of this broad land—the producers, the laborer, the merchant, the manufacturer; upon all save the money lender and the security owner, benumbing their energies and paralyzing their industries, as they measure a future which can only promise further decline in values—is the statute law of this Government, which, with ruthless purpose, has deprived the veins and arteries of the business of the country of the sufficiency of the money which is its lifeblood. Let not gentlemen delude themselves. The issue confronts you. The people are intensely in earnest. The limit of the tether has been reached. You made the law. You must unmake it. The country expects Congress to act. Almost every agricultural journal and every labor organization in the country is demanding the repeal of that iniquitous law. Manufacturing industries, seeing the impending ruinous consequences of an Asiatic competition which it is fostering, are joining in the demand. Commerce has long felt its chilling hand and is eager to rid itself of its grasp. The one cheerful voice, bidding you stay your hand from interference with that lovely act, is that of your old friends, the bondholder and the capitalist. They will never get enough, even though it comes from the hearts of the poor, struggling masses, who have made you and made this country.

BONDS CAN GIVE NO RELIEF.

You have met this demand of the people by introducing and passing through this House a bill which is a masquerading farce, a meaningless nothingness, a vapid, airy, unsubstantial appearance of relief.

It simply proposes these changes in existing laws: It provides for the issue of bonds, the reduction of the interest to 3 per cent and of the length of them to fifteen years, and for the issue of three-year debenture certificates in the sum of $50,000,000, should it become necessary, in order to defray the expenses of the Government. That is all. Should it be passed, no possible relief could proceed from it other than now provided by the existing law authorizing the issue of bonds. A 3 per cent short-term bond will realize less than a 4 per cent long-term bond, and a larger issue would be required to raise the same amount of money. Nothing would be saved to the Government. By this bill not one dollar of gold will be kept in this country, not a dollar would be added to the circulation, not one single enterprise encouraged, not a day's employment given to labor.

The height of its aspiration is to improve upon and render more facile the present indefensible system of issuing bonds—more bonds! It simply echoes the policy of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, adding by way of adornment a bay window and a few turrets. The "grand old party" has pinned itself to the policy of the President, and is content to solve the financial problem by the easy and primitive process of borrowing money. It has committed itself to the system, odious to American sentiment, and injurious to the interests of the people and of generations yet unborn, of levying tribute upon them in time of peace by the issue of bonds with which to borrow money to keep up a gold reserve whose only good purpose is to subserve the interests of bond investors by continually exhausting itself, only to be replenished by the sale of more bonds. Within two years we have issued one hundred and sixty-two millions, and yet the last condition of the Treasury is worse than the first. Another issue of one hundred millions will follow within a few days, and the end is not yet. The policy inaugurated by Secretary Sherman, continued by Secretary Carlisle, and now approved and indorsed by this bill has proved utterly unavailing, a delusion and a snare.

The original act of 1875 may have subserved the purpose of placing the greenback notes upon a par with our metal currency. The effort to maintain the reserve so authorized is productive of evils exceeding in their magnitude all the depreciation that those notes could have suffered had they not received the support afforded by that act. The remedy has proven worse than the disease, under the application of the ruinous construction given to the word "coin" in their redemption. One note redeemed in silver coin would have stopped the drain of gold from the Treasury and the reserve would to-day be intact. But the face of the Administration is set straight toward gold, and there is no hope for an early departure from that policy. It is very seriously questioned whether the reserve is any longer of service in sustaining the par value of the notes. When it has fallen as it is to-day to forty-six millions, there is no accompanying decline in their market value. Had it descended 50 per cent lower, the greenbacks would have scarcely depreciated one cent. The one hundred millions is at best but 10 per cent of the Government's indebtedness. It is asking too much of the public to believe that this small deposit in our national vaults is essential to the maintenance of the three hundred and forty-six millions of our greenbacks at par with our other currency. The majority in this House thinks differently and will commit your party to the position that it has done all that is necessary to relieve the country when it has provided for the issue of more bonds to create or sustain a reserve which at most is not admittedly essential or for the public good.

THE SENATE SUBSTITUTE THE REMEDY.

The Senate in its substitute to this bill proposes relief which is practical, substantial, clear-cut, and certain. It restores the status that existed prior to the demonetization of 1873 by opening the mints to the free coinage of silver at the old ratio of 16 to 1; provides for the coinage of the seigniorage accumulated under the act of 1890; requires bank notes under $10 to be redeemed and larger denominations substituted; and directs that the greenbacks and Treasury notes shall when presented for redemption be paid at the option of the Government and not of the holder in gold or silver, the greenbacks when so redeemed to be reissued as provided by the act of 1878.

That substitute, if adopted, will give relief. It presents squarely the issue that the only source of permanent relief to the country is in the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

WE CAN NOT HOLD GOLD UNDER PRESENT LAWS.

It is useless for the United States to attempt to hold gold. History proves it; the conditions now surrounding us demonstrate it beyond a question. Our mines have furnished about one-half of all the gold of the world. Seventeen hundred millions have passed through our mints. Of that vast sum we have to-day only about six hundred millions. The rest has gone over the waters. Other causes must be found than that the greenbacks and the Treasury notes have drained it from our vaults, for, as an

evidence, from 1849 to 1879 there were no Treasury notes, and no gold was paid for greenbacks. Yet during those thirty years, the era of our great metal production, of the fourteen hundred millions of gold and silver produced, one thousand million were exported. Forced residence of gold in our Treasury can only be temporary and fleeting. The three last purchases of it with our bonds remove the fact from the domain of controversy. So long as we are burdened with our present heavy foreign indebtedness and continue our foreign expenditures, by which the balance of the trade is against us, just so long will it be impossible for us to retain the gold which is necessary or required to liquidate that balance.

Our indebtedness to Europe and foreign holders of our securities is variously estimated at from five to six billion. Upon this we must pay an annual interest of at least $200,000,000. As not over 8 per cent of our exports and imports are carried upon our own ships, we must pay an estimated expense for carriage of $100,000,000. In addition to this, it is estimated that the annual expenditures abroad of our tourists is about $100,000,000. These three items make a total annual outgo from the United States, roundly estimated, of $400,000,000. Against this we have upon our side of the account not more than one hundred and fifty millions, consisting of excess of exports over imports of products, manufactures, gold, and silver, leaving an annual balance against us of about two hundred and fifty millions. Under present conditions there is no reason to expect a reduction of this balance. Our gold must continue to settle, upon demand, these balances against us, so long as they continue to exist. We can not pay them by borrowing money. We can pay them by increasing the value of our products, which can only be done by increasing the value of our currency, and also by increasing the volume of our foreign trade, which can best be done by monetizing silver.

OUR ONLY HOPE IS IN MONETIZING SILVER.

It is a law of economics recognized by all that the prices of commodities rise or fall with the enlargement or the contraction of the currency. It is needless to hope for any appreciable increase in circulation from gold alone. All the gold in the world to-day would not pay one year's interest upon the bonded indebtedness of the world. Dr. Giffen, the monometallist whom I mentioned, gives it as his opinion that practically the whole annual production of gold is consumed in the arts and sciences, none of it adding to the supply of money. Our population is increasing at the rate of 3 per cent a year. The per capita supply of our metal coin must each succeeding year become less and less. Prices must continue to fall and debts become harder to pay. The result is as certain as the laws of Newton and Kepler, as sure and relentless as fate.

The value of all money is dependent upon the elements of value vested in it by the law, which are its legal-tender qualities and its debt-paying power, and the debt-paying power is measured by the quantity of the legal tenders. Under the act of 1873 the quantity of silver dollars was then and there fixed, and under the act of 1893 it is prevented from being further enlarged. Silver has been reduced from a money to a commodity. This country is now upon a single gold basis; as much so as England and Germany.

So, then, the fact confronts us in all of its fearful reality that under the laws upon our statute books the money of the people will year by year become scarcer and scarcer; commodities will grow less and less in value; all industry will be handicapped with the almost certain loss of a falling market. In a word, this fair country, with its boundless possibilities, which should be the home of millions of happy, contented, and prosperous people, will fall a helpless victim to blighting, merciless legislation. Our silver mines are ready and anxious to open their stores of wealth; but no! And why not? Because gold permits no rival, is jealous of its monopoly, and wishes not for its daily growing greatness to be curtailed. The less money there is the better for those who have it is a fact too strong to be resisted by those who are in position to profit by it.

WE CAN VENTURE ALONE UPON FREE COINAGE.

Now the question arises: Can the United States, without the cooperation of Europe, safely venture upon the free coinage of silver—as the Senate substitute proposes?

The great need of this Government is the infusion of some of the Monroe-doctrine courage into its financial policy. We boldly announce our fiat that no foreign hand shall lay hold of American soil or extend dominion already acquired, and we stand prepared to maintain it. The great heart of the nation beats responsive to the declaration. But when the proposition is suggested that we exercise our independence by establishing our own currency, we are seized with timidity and halted with dire forebodings and given visions of all the horrors of a debased and dishonored currency. We are told that we dare not run counter to the financial systems of the great powers of Europe. Prophecy is the last refuge of a defeated cause. The future is invoked, armed with all manner of dangers and calamities, and employed to induce us to take counsel of our fears. It is very effective. It is to-day restraining thousands of our citizens from declaring for the remonetization of silver. Their timidity is not justified by the conditions. If ever a people were in a position to work out their own financial salvation it is this people. We have 70,000,000 population, only a little less than the combined population of Great Britain and France. We have 3,000,000 square miles of territory. Our per capita indebtedness is less than that of any of the great powers, as this table shows:

Country.	Population.	Debt.	Per capita.
Austria-Hungary	41,827,700	$2,866,339,539	$70.84
France	38,218,903	4,446,793,398	116.35
Germany	49,421,064	1,956,217,017	39.58
Great Britain and Ireland	37,880,764	3,350,719,563	87.79
Italy	29,699,785	2,324,826,329	76.06
Russia	113,354,649	3,491,018,074	30.79
Spain	17,550,266	1,251,453,696	73.85
United States	69,000,000	915,962,112	14.63

In each of those countries, its per capita indebtedness largely exceeds its per capita of coin, whereas our per capita of coin exceeds our per capita of indebtedness by nearly $4. We furnish Europe nearly one-half of its breadstuffs and three-fourths of its cotton. Our supply of silver is only one-third of hers. It seems bold indeed to assert that this great country, so marvelously favored, so Titanic in its enterprise, the foremost nation of all the world, should not be able to keep at par its silver metal bearing the stamp of its mint. For more than a century it has done so, and at 16 to 1. The people of the United States are not afraid of it in their domestic affairs. The great bugaboo held up to us is the effect of free coinage upon foreign exchange. At best, foreign exchange amounts to scarcely more than 5 per cent of the business transactions of the world; and almost the only thing that would be accomplished by the impossible ignis fatuus of international bimetallic agreement is international exchange. In all other respects each country is free and independent to act for itself, as the almost infinitely varied coins and currency of Europe, Asia, and Africa to-day attest.

If there is any power on earth that can restore the old ratio between gold and silver as money it is the United States. The conditions to which I have already referred, and the urgent necessity for the relief of our people, certainly justify the effort. So soon as our mints are opened to the free and unlimited coinage of silver the demand for it will necessarily increase. The strength of our Government and national resources would nullify the effort of gold to depreciate the coin and to place itself at a premium. Gold would no longer be the master of the situation, but the Government. The demand for it would decrease as the demand for silver increased, and they would soon move along side by side, in friendly parity, at the old step of 16 to 1, as they should do, for that is the ratio of the stocks of the two metals in the world.

But let us suppose that, as claimed by the opponents of this substitute, gold would go to a premium and remain there. Then the result would simply be the difference in exchange between us and the single gold countries to the extent of the premium. There is nothing in that to frighten us. The ultimate results would be vastly in our favor. That very rate of exchange is to-day a mighty barrier in the way of the trade between Asia and South America on the one hand and Europe and ourselves on the other. The rate is continually changing. The Japanese merchant can only guess at what his goods will be worth in English or American gold at the time of arrival at their destination. The profits of the transactions are largely dependent upon the exchange fluctuations. Our trading relations with them can not prosper when thus hampered. The advantage in the difference in exchange is all with them.

China, Japan, and Mexico have the money they have always known and none other. Silver is to-day what it was. They are satisfied to receive it at its old valuation. If we are to compete with their manufacturers we must be content with silver on the same basis, and not at 100 per cent exchange. At the present bullion value of our silver and its exclusion from the mints it is on a gold basis, worth only one-half of its face value, and the only thing left us is the payment of the difference of that exchange before being placed in equal competition with our new Eastern rivals. Even the most ardent friend of protection can not hope for his old friend to cope with 100 per cent exchange. The extraordinary progress and development now being made in those countries, upon a silver basis, effectively chase away the dogmas, theories, and hobgoblins of the gold monometallists. The consular reports, which have already been so freely quoted in this debate, tell the story of the vast impetus given to the commiserated silver countries by this little matter of exchange. China and Japan's 1,000,000 spindles are alone sufficient to make anyone but a gold zealot stop and think a moment.

If there is no possibility of restoring the two metals to a parity,

if the line now drawn between gold-standard and silver-standard countries is to be permanent, then it is the policy of this country to cast its lot with the silver-using people.

Hear what President Andrews again admits:

Should the United States begin free coinage alone, it would take its place as the one great manufacturing nation of the silver world, and derive from that position the immense gain which England has hitherto reaped, but largely lost, by the demonetization of silver. We should manufacture for Mexico, South America, China, and Japan, and England, owing to the lack of par exchange with them, would lose most or all of her custom. No doubt here is a splendid chance. We may effectually dish England as a manufacturing and commercial nation by the means suggested. I do not wonder that this prospect carries away so many, for it is indeed a glorious one.

The London Financial News, a very high authority in matters of finance, says:

There can be no doubt about it that if the United States were to adopt a silver basis to-morrow British trade would be ruined before the year was out. Every American industry would be protected, not only at home, but in every other market. Of course the States would suffer to a certain extent, through having to pay their obligations abroad in gold, but the loss on exchange under this head would be a mere drop in the bucket compared with the profits to be reaped from the markets of South America and Asia, to say nothing of Europe. The marvel is that the United States has not long ago seized the opportunity, and but for the belief that the way of England is necessarily the way to commercial success and prosperity undoubtedly it would have been done long ago.

The balance of trade in those silver-using countries is now strongly against us, that of China and Japan alone being for the last year $34,000,000 in their favor. It will continue to grow as it is doing to-day, at most rapid rates, to the increasing injury of our products and manufacturing industries and the labor which they employ.

It will be a glad day for the vast majority of the people of this industrious land when the shackles of money contraction are removed from the energies of our people, and they are given the opportunity to carve out the destiny of their Republic and the happiness of its citizens with the money of their constitution, and that day is not far distant. This substitute will be rejected by this House. Nevertheless it voices, as I believe, the sentiments of a large majority of the voters of this nation.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal I shall not attempt to present in detail all the historical and statistical facts bearing upon the free coinage of silver. These phases of the subject have been presented exhaustively, time and again, upon this floor and in the prints of the country. Every nook and corner of history on financial and cognate lines have been closely scanned under the calcium light of the concentrated attention of the monetary world, and the results spread out as a common fund of information.

Hence, for the sake of brevity, I shall assume sufficient familiarity, both on the part of the House and on the part of the country, with the leading facts to warrant me in merely referring to them, though under different conditions I should prefer, for the sake of symmetry and completeness, to quote the authorities in full.

In the endeavor to adjust myself to the limitation of time I shall (1) bestow only a passing notice upon considerations of mere policy—considerations which, to my mind, have been accorded undue attention in the discussions of this subject here and elsewhere. Believing that public questions are never settled until they are settled right, I shall dispose of such considerations as have been accorded most attention, and having disposed of them, will (2) endeavor to present plainly and briefly the questions of principle and right lying beneath this turbulent surface discussion.

AS TO MERE QUESTIONS OF POLICY.

First, then, in discussing the questions of policy, I will follow the order of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], deservedly the leader of the opposition on this floor, in his argument before the House yesterday. I select his order because, as chairman of the leading House committee and leader of the opposition, it is to be presumed that he has presented the subject in the strongest possible aspect from the gold monometallist point of view. What, then, are the considerations of policy urged against the free coinage of silver by the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

1. First and foremost (and this is the stock argument of the other side, urged with more or less of vehemence), that the enactment of this or any bill providing for the free coinage of silver would create widespread alarm in business circles, an all-pervading distrust of the honesty of the Government, a disastrous shrinkage of values, and universal distress. This has been urged time and again in the same connection. It was urged with great vehemence at the other end of the Capitol last week, when this bill was on its passage in the Senate. It was urged then that even the agitation of the bill was a menace to the pending bond sale, and Senators who favored the bill were charged with conspiring to defeat the bond negotiation and destroy the confidence of the financial world in the integrity of our purposes. All this and more was iterated in the press of the country. And yet, Mr. Speaker, even while the distinguished gentleman was on this floor insisting with vehement iteration that such results would follow with the absolute certainty of doom, there was being enacted in the Treasury Department the most crushing, because the most practical, refutation of his argument.

The bids for the one-hundred-million-dollar popular loan then and there being opened demonstrated that 4,600 applications, aggregating $558,269,850, had been filed at prices ranging all the way from par to 119. Not only so, Mr. Speaker, but the big bankers were fairly treading on each other's toes and resorting to the disreputable practices of Wall street in their eagerness to get hold of these coin bonds; and offering to pay for these *coin* bonds in gold. Does this look like lack of confidence? Where was the distrust and alarm about which members and others have so vociferously declaimed? Surely, Mr. Speaker, after this practical object lesson, concurrent and contemporaneous with the passage of this free-coinage measure, I need not consume more time in refutation of this argument of the opposition—their strongest argument, if we are to judge by the frequency of its repetition. It is no answer to this crushing demonstration at the Treasury for the opposition to say that the President, as has been intimated, has given assurances of a veto in case this bill or any other free-coinage bill be passed. Without discussing the propriety of his conduct, or the necessity of some modification of the veto power given him by the Constitution, it is sufficient to say in regard to the case in hand, that Mr. Cleveland's power to interpose a veto upon the will of the people in the matter of silver legislation will expire next year, while these coin bonds run thirty years; and, to borrow a favorite expression of the other side, "you know capital is proverbially timid," even of remote contingencies.

2. The second argument, from the standpoint of pure policy, to which the gentleman from Maine devoted much attention, was in substance this: If this bill should pass, the Treasury notes would immediately become redeemable in silver dollars, while the silver dollars in the Treasury would not be free for the purpose of such redemption, being really the property of holders of silver certificates outstanding. Hence, he argued, no holder of a greenback could get a silver dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar, namely, the dollar of the holder of the corresponding silver certificate outstanding. Admitting the literal accuracy of this statement, in what respect does this condition differ from the existing condition as to the greenback in its relation to the gold redemption fund, which the gentleman seeks so ardently to perpetuate? What are the facts? There are in the neighborhood of $346,000,000 of greenbacks outstanding, which the gentleman, following the unwarranted construction of the Administration, desires to redeem exclusively in gold. There has not been at any time for several years exceeding $100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury for the redemption of these greenbacks. According to the Treasurer's statement for this date, there is only a little over $46,000,000 of such gold on hand. At times it has reached even a lower figure. How can $346,000,000 of greenbacks be redeemed with $46,000,000 or even $100,000,000 of gold? How can any holder of a greenback, under the condition which our opponents seek to perpetuate, get a gold dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar? If there is any force in the point raised against redeeming greenbacks in silver dollars, surely there is threefold more force in the point as applied to redemption of greenbacks in gold exclusively as proposed by our opponents and actually attempted by the Administration without warrant or the color of authority of law. If there be any force in the point that no holder of a greenback can get a silver dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar, then surely no holder of a greenback can get a gold dollar out of the Treasury to-day without getting a dollar to which at least three other people have an equal claim.

The condition so much feared by gentlemen on the other side is already with us, in more aggravated form, under their favorite method of an exclusive gold redemption. The difference between our proposition and theirs is, that theirs involves more bonds, more taxes, more monopoly; our proposition means a strict compliance with the contract, less taxes, no bonds, and death to gold monopoly.

3. The third consideration of policy urged against the free coinage of silver is, that its effect would inevitably be to drive this country to a silver basis, and the stock references to India and Mexico are cited here on this floor in style ranging from tame assertion to incoherent declamation—in no case supported by proofs of any sort, or the semblance of proofs. It might be sufficient to point again to that scene now progressing in the Treasury, and remind our "friends the enemy" that with so swift and palpable a refutation of their assertions on another point, in the shape of a fresh object lesson under our very eyes, we prefer to go a little slow in accepting their assertions on this point at their face value.

The cold facts in point are that the Government has been offered upward of six hundred millions of gold for an issue of one hundred millions of *coin* bonds at a rate of premium that would yield interest at 3½ per cent. Not *gold* bonds, mind you, but *coin* bonds, at a time when a free-silver bill has passed the Senate and

is pending in the House! And there is nothing unusual about this. It is thoroughly in keeping with the financial history of our Government during the entire eighty years that silver coinage prevailed on equal terms with gold.

In other words, at the very storm center of the agitation for free coinage, a call for one hundred millions of gold is met by prompt responses to more than five times the amount called for. There is a scramble for the bonds, and the premium offered voluntarily is such as to yield on the investment only 3¼ per cent. This, too, in spite of the Executive dictum (when the private deal for these same bonds was pending at 104 or thereabouts) that there was doubt about floating a coin bond at all; but that a bond payable exclusively in gold might be floated at 3 per cent interest. There is absolutely no proof that we should go to a silver basis, and our experience so far teaches exactly the contrary.

4. Neither need I occupy the time of the House with the causes for the alleged decline of silver. It might be sufficient to deny any real decline in the value of that metal. The value of silver to-day as compared with the values of all staple commodities and forms of property is practically the same that it has always been, the slight difference being readily accounted for in the improved methods of production and manufacture of those commodities which are cheaper than formerly as compared with silver bullion.

It is only as compared with gold that silver has declined, and in that decline all other commodities have more or less shared. Is it not plain that to say silver and all other commodities have declined as compared with gold, is tantamount to saying that gold has risen in value as compared with all other values? Is it not more rational to say gold has risen in value as compared with everything else, than it is to say everything else has fallen in value as compared with gold? Is not the rise in gold an inevitable and necessary corollary of the fall of everything else?

But granting, for the sake of argument, that silver has fallen in value, is not a sufficient reason to be found for that decline in the legislation against silver? The act of 1873 dropped the silver dollar out as the measure of value, the unit of account, and substituted the gold dollar in its place. If there was no advantage in the position of unit of account, why did the gold combine seek to displace silver? Why did they seek to put gold in its stead? At the time the act was passed the silver in a silver dollar was worth a dollar and three cents in gold. As a result of that change, gold has appreciated until their holdings have doubled in value within twenty-three years, without their turning a spindle or plowing a furrow. They have amassed untold millions by a mere stroke of the Executive pen, unconsciously given, and the masses have been robbed by just so much. That legislation may affect the value of everything no sane man will doubt. If anyone doubts, let him procure the passage of a law against the use of pacing horses, and see where the price of pacing horses will go to.

So much for the considerations of mere policy which are relied upon to sustain the opposition. What are the real issues? What are the principles, upon which the question should be settled rather than upon questions of policy?

THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.

1. The free coinage of silver involves the integrity of all contracts, public and private, entered into for eighty years. For eighty years, from 1792 to 1873, every contract involving the measure of value and the payment of money was predicated upon the silver dollar of 371¼ grains of fine silver. During the period of the civil war alone the public contracts amounted to more than two thousand million dollars. The total, public and private, before and subsequent to that war, up to 1873, would defy conception, not to say computation. By the statute of 1792 every one of these contracts in plain terms provided for liquidation in coin upon the basis of 371¼ grains of fine silver as the measure of value. The act of 1873 changed all this. So long as that measure of value remained the same, every contract could be settled with equity and exact justice to both the creditor and the debtor. Increase that measure of value, and the debtor is robbed by just so much as the increase multiplied by the number of units; decrease the measure of value, and the creditor is robbed in the same ratio. Increase it and not only are the debtors robbed, but every farmer and wage worker and producer is robbed in the markets where he sells his products or his labor.

Nothing can be more elementary or plainer than this. The farmer is robbed just as surely by increasing the value of the dollar as if the half bushel in which his grain is measured at the market had been correspondingly increased in size; he is robbed just as surely as if the scales upon which his cotton or his pork are weighed at the market had been previously loaded or "set back."

The fathers evidently appreciated this fundamental truth, and hence when they in 1834 found the commercial value of silver and gold varying slightly from the coinage ratio, they properly adjusted it by changing the coinage ratio. But how? By changing the unit of account, the silver dollar? Nay, verily. Through all the changes in our coinage laws—in 1834, in 1837, in 1849, in 1853—no change in the amount of pure silver in the silver dollar was ever made. And the reason is plain. It was the measure of value, the standard of value, the unit of account, and the most primitive honesty demanded that it be inviolate. Whatever change was made in adjusting the difference between the silver and the gold dollar was adjusted by reducing the gold in the gold dollar. Only once in all the eighty years from 1792 to 1873, under the operation of open mints to both gold and silver on equal terms, did it become necessary to adjust the commercial difference between the gold and the silver dollar by a change of ratio in the coinage. That was in 1834, when the gold in the gold dollar was reduced from 27 grains to 25.8 grains.

It was left for the gold combine that battened upon the misfortunes of their country during the civil war, while the brave sons of the North and the South were drenching the soil in defense of their convictions—it was left for these sordid sons of greed to shift the measure of value by surreptitious means in the coinage act of 1873, and thus unsettle the equities and destroy the integrity of the contracts of almost a century. By the act of 1873, which passed both Houses without many of the most prominent members knowing what its secret purpose and concealed effect would be, which was signed by the President without any suspicion of its intended effect—so carefully was it framed, so carefully managed to conceal its purpose while assuming the air of utmost frankness—by that act of 1873, procured in this way, the equities of a century were destroyed and the way opened for limitless oppression of the masses of the people, for limitless pillage of the farmer and of all productive industry. In the name of the masses, who have been wronged by the rich for the benefit of the rich, we stand here to-day and demand that the wrong shall be righted; that the debtor, public and private, be allowed to discharge his debt according to the plain terms of the contract—i. e., in the coin of the Constitution (gold and silver), but measured in the silver dollar of 371¼ grains of fine silver.

And we deny that the payment of those debts in silver dollars, according to the terms of the contract, is paying them in dishonest dollars. Our debts are payable in coin, and under the definition in the Constitution coin is both gold and silver; while by the act of 1792 the silver dollar is the sole measure of value. If the term "dishonest" properly attaches anywhere in this connection, it attaches to that dollar which requires double as much of the farmer's cotton and wheat and corn to pay a debt as was required when the debt was made.

Here is a table showing that we have paid the civil-war debt nearly twice over in dollars, and yet it would require nearly twice as much of the products of the farm to liquidate the balance due, $889,313,380, as would have sufficed to pay the whole debt at first:

Year.	Debt, interest-bearing and noninterest-bearing, less cash in Treasury.	Debt could have been paid in bales of cotton of 500 pounds each.	Average price of cotton.	Debt could have been paid in bushels of wheat.	Average price of wheat.
1866	$2,636,026,164	12,940,020	$0.43	1,116,922,103	$2.36
1873	2,105,462,062	22,035,118	.20	1,349,719,338	1.56
1879	1,996,414,905	39,928,298	.10	1,649,929,673	1.21
1894	889,313,380	25,916,812	.0694	1,474,284,229	.61
Paid in principal and interest since 1866	3,914,424,855	65,240,414	.12	3,131,539,884	1.25

Add to this the enormous private debt during the same period and we get some faint idea of the mammoth stake for which the gold combine played during and since the civil-war, and which they are now striving to still further enlarge at the expense of the debtors both public and private.

In the first burst of righteous indignation that swept over the country after the true meaning of the act of 1873 became apparent, men were sent here fresh from the ranks of the people to undo this wrong. Among them was the present Secretary of the Treasury, whose magnificent arraignment of that crime has rarely been matched, never surpassed. Here is what Mr. Carlisle said in 1878:

I shall not now enter into an examination of the causes which have combined to depreciate the relative value of silver and to appreciate the value of gold since 1873, but I am one of those who believe that they are transient and temporary in their nature, and that when they have passed away or been removed by the separate or united action of the nations most deeply interested in the subject the old ratio of actual and relative value will be reestablished on a firmer foundation than ever. I know that the world's stock of the precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever become so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry. According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age.

The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence, and famine that ever oc-

curred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money of the world. With an ample currency, an industrious and frugal people will speedily rebuild their works of internal improvement and repair their losses of property, but no amount of industry or economy on the part of the people can create money. When the Government creates it, or authorizes it, the citizen may acquire it, but he can do nothing more.

I am in favor of every practicable and constitutional measure that will have a tendency to defeat or retard the perpetration of this great crime, and I am also in favor of every practicable and constitutional measure that will aid us in devising a just and permanent ratio of value between the two metals, so that they may circulate side by side and not alternately drive each other into exile from one country to another.—*Congressional Record*, volume 7, part 5, page 41, Appendix.

Closing the same speech, Mr. Carlisle uses the following extraordinary language:

Our power of legislation over this subject will not be exhausted by the passage of this measure, and we ought not to halt for a single moment in our efforts to complete the work of relief inaugurated by it. The struggle now going on can not cease, and ought not to cease, until all industrial interests of the country are fully and finally emancipated from the heartless domination of syndicates, stock exchanges, and other great combinations of money grabbers in this country and in Europe. Let us, if we can do no better, pass bill after bill, embodying in each some one substantial provision for relief, and send them to the Executive for his approval. If he withholds his signature, and we are unable to secure the necessary vote here or elsewhere to enact them into laws, notwithstanding his veto, let us, as a last resort, suspend the rules and put them into the general appropriation bills, with the distinct understanding that if the people can get no relief the Government can get no money.

And here is what Mr. SHERMAN, the arch evangel of gold monometallism to-day, said in 1869, when the proposition was made to go to a specie basis:

It means the payment of $135 where he has agreed to pay $100; or, which is the same thing, the payment of $100 where he has agreed to pay $74. When he has purchased property and paid one-fourth of it, it means the loss of the property. It means the addition of one-fourth to all currency debts in the United States. A measure to require a debtor now to pay his debt in gold, or currency equivalent to gold, requires him to pay 135 bushels of wheat when he agreed to pay 100; and if this appreciation is extended through a period of three years, it requires him to pay an interest of 12 per cent in addition to the rate he has agreed to pay. The appreciation of currency is a far more distressing operation than Senators may suppose. Our own and other nations have gone through this process before, and always with the sorest distress. It means the ruin of all debtors whose debts are twice their capital, though one-third less than all their property. It means the fall of all agricultural productions without any great reduction of taxes. To attempt this task suddenly by a surprise upon our people, by at once paralyzing their industry, by arresting them in the midst of lawful business and applying a new standard of value to their property, without any reduction of their debt or giving them an opportunity to compound with their creditors or distribute their loss, would be an act of folly without example in modern times.

And yet these men have out-Heroded Herod in recent years to bring about precisely the conditions of misery and distress they so vividly portrayed. Shall we trust them again? Shall we follow them further? When they were fresh from the people, they eloquently pleaded for the rights of the people; now they construe every point of law and of contract against the people, and violate law to do it. We who are fresh from the people to-day are standing for precisely what they stood for when they were fresh from the people twenty-five years ago.

2. It is argued that if free coinage of silver under this bill be reestablished a hardship would result in the settlement of contracts entered into since 1873. My reply is that we should not hesitate to right a wrong because, forsooth, some of those instrumental in bringing about that wrong and who, by reason of that wrong, have amassed fabulous fortunes, will be compelled to disgorge some of their ill-gotten gains. Still, there would doubtless be a large number of innocent and honest contractors who do not merit any punishment of this sort, and for their protection I would suggest as an amendment to the bill (which is sent to the desk) that all such contracts be adjusted upon the basis of the purchasing power of the dollar at the time the contract was made, as certified to by the Bureau of Statistics.

I need not pursue the question through its various phases since 1873. The compromises of 1878 and of 1890, and the final crowning infamy of 1893 have been burned into the memory of the masses. How the Executive grasped the reins and dictated legislation is fresh in mind. What was lacking in the act of 1893 to give full swing to the conspirators has been since supplemented by Department-made law to fit the schemes and the desires of the gold combine. Never before, perhaps, in the history of constitutional government, have trusted agents of the people dared go so far in construing contracts to which the people are a party to the manifest disadvantage of the people. Never before have trusted agents dared violate the laws so flagrantly to force the people's representatives along the lines laid out by the conspirators. And when the Congress hesitates to carry out their behests, forsooth, the representatives of the sovereign people are insolently met with the scarcely concealed threat that if we do not go forward and validate by law what the head of a Department has done without the warrant of law, there will be another object lesson of panic and ruin and disaster.

By such efforts at compulsion every energy should be aroused. I say to such, We accept your challenge; we will pass this bill. Do your worst. The contract right of the Government to pay its debts, according to the plain terms of the contract, shall not be tamely surrendered. The rights of the plain people shall not be bartered away. The worst you can do can be no worse than the prolonged and ever-increasing distress of the millions under the existing conditions. Even if your new object lesson result in wreck and ruin equal to the last one, the loss and destruction of value can be no greater than the ultimate aggregate loss and shrinkage from the continued operation of the existing system. But after the paroxysm of this new object lesson is past the toiler in shop and field and factory will be free to pursue the road of prosperity and progress without having his heels forever clogged with an ever-increasing load, without meeting a gold monopoly tollgate at every milestone.

[Mr. HYDE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is scarcely to be expected that anything which might be said at this time in the brief period allowed for debate by the Republican majority on this floor upon this, the mightiest issue which now confronts the American people, can add very largely to the general stock of information on the subject. With a full appreciation of my lack of preparation to discuss the pending Senate bill, and of my inability to do the vast and far-reaching subject justice even under the most favorable conditions, still less at this late hour of night, I have yet deemed it a duty of highest moment to seek opportunity to present my views briefly, even though my method and arrangement be crude.

At the outset I beg to say that I gratefully salute the American Senate and render my meed of praise, feeble though it be, to that body for its prompt and ready recognition and performance of duty to the great body and mass of the citizens of this Republic in the passage of the bill now pending in this House.

That Senate which in the past has often been the subject of ribald diatribes from the penny-a-liners of the metropolitan press of the country and the sometime theme of the cheap-john and pinchbeck criticism of pseudo statesmen infesting this House has once again risen to the heights of a grand statesmanship and taken the initial step toward enacting into law a measure more beneficent, more just, more equitable, more largely enuring to the best interests of the masses of the plain people of these United States—the toiling millions, if the phrase pleases you, or if it displeases you—than any legislation enacted in this Capitol within half a century of the past. Think you the action by so decided a majority of that Senate, composed of Senators representing by entireties the sovereignties of all the States of this Union, is a matter to be lightly considered, pooh-poohed, and laughed out of court by the cry of "thrashing over old straw," "calamity howls of Populists," "wailing of anarchists," and other kindred stentorian utterances of the attorneys and advocates of the single gold standard of money?

To those who entertain such views, let me sound a warning that they are mistaken, and perchance grievously mistaken. It is well that all should know and be advised at the threshold that there are representatives of the people on this floor who, believing that the time has not yet come, and with an abiding faith in the providence of the God of nations that it will never come, for the patriotic and honest masses of the people of this country to be permanently enslaved, in a thraldom thricefold worse than the worst example of African slavery, will stand unflinchingly by the action of the Senate and demand of you, the representatives of an outraged people, to do likewise. Looking to the environments and difficulties and obstructions besetting the pathway of the great mass of producers, toilers, and wage earners of this country, preventing absolutely that degree of material prosperity which it is their God-given right to enjoy, is it not, fellow-Representatives, a time for calm, deliberate, and unprejudiced consideration on our part?

I have during all the period of my manhood life been a partisan. In my early manhood there came a call which sounded and seemed to my ears the call of my country, a call to arms in defense of my native Southland, whose flag I followed through evil as well as through good repute until it went down in a sea of gloom and disaster never more to rise. I was then a partisan. Returning to the paternal rooftree which, more fortunate than many others, had escaped fire and sword, I again, by the tolerance—if it please you—of the conquering section, was permitted to resume the duties and privileges of citizenship in a restored Union. The very logic of events, the instincts of self-preservation and a self-respecting manhood, made me a Democrat. I was a partisan. Later on I read and studied somewhat according to my limited opportunities the history of our Government and of the political economy affecting it, and became convinced that the tenets, theories, and practices of government advocated by the Democratic party were those best adapted to the welfare—material, moral, and mental—of the masses of the people. I was still a partisan, and I am yet a Democrat, rock-ribbed and thoroughly grounded in the faith, if

I know myself, but nevertheless somewhat rattled and shaken up, as it were, in my partisanship. [Applause.]

As a Democrat I would talk to-day, and of the theories and practices of finance as applied to our Constitution and Government, which are Democratic as I read the history and experience of the past, and yet I know full well that all I may say in this behalf will fall unheeded, and even scorned, upon the ears of some gentlemen whose Democracy in the past has been unquestioned and is yet unchallenged by me. This again somewhat impairs my partisanship, in fact, impels me toward discarding narrow partisanship, and to try to make my argument on the broader and higher plane of an appeal in behalf of all of my fellow-citizens of this broad and grand Union of States. In fact, I will take the liberty—I trust it is not an undue or an improper one—to remind my fellow-Representatives upon the other side of the Chamber that there is a duty resting upon them of as high import as that resting upon my humble self; that they should also rise above the low plane of partisanship, eschew all desires and practices looking simply to party advantage, and cooperate with gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber in striving to do our whole duty to the entire people of these United States.

A majority of you gentlemen, acting under the party whip, nominally in response to the sensational message of the President so dramatically sent to the Senate on the evening of December 20, 1895, passed a bill soon afterwards for the issuance of United States bonds, which bill reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to issue certificates of indebtedness of the United States, to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, payable in three years after their date to the bearer in lawful money of the United States, of the denomination of $20, or multiples thereof, with annual coupons for interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and to sell and dispose of the same for not less than an equal amount of lawful money of the United States at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States and at such post-offices as he may select. And such certificates shall have the like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said resumption act for the bonds therein authorized. And the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purpose prescribed in this section and for no other.

The Senate Finance Committee reported this bill with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

In this form the bill passed the Senate a few days ago by a majority of 7, the vote being—yeas 42; nays 35. There was no demand by the country for the bill which you passed and sent to the Senate. That bill is said to be also unsatisfactory to the Executive, in response to whose request you had professed to act. In my humble opinion there is a demand existing to-day by a majority of the people of these United States for the passage of the amended Senate bill, providing for the free coinage of silver, and for the retirement of all national-bank notes of a denomination less than $10.

There can scarcely be a question of more importance to a free people than the question of finance. Upon this subject Senator JONES of Nevada, in his great speech in the Senate in October, 1893, used the following language, which I deem eminently worthy of repetition here:

Upon a proper solution of the problem of money in a country depends the decision of the question whether there shall be in that country more poverty or less, more crime or less, more insanity or less; whether among its people there shall be more employment or idleness, more happiness or more misery—indeed, more liberty or more slavery; for it must be borne in mind that men may be as thoroughly enslaved by unfavorable industrial conditions as by legal enactment.

No matter under what form of government a people may live, whether the irresponsible despotism of a military autocrat or a constitution carefully framed to permit the widest play of political action, the table from which hunger rises unsatisfied will have no seat reserved for freedom.

Surely a subject that affects so vast a range of topics deserves serious consideration at the hands of a self-governing people.

These are the utterances of a man who has given the subject great consideration and study, which his intellect, education, and habits of life preeminently fitted him for.

Gold and silver coins are the money of the Constitution. On this subject Daniel Webster, whose great ability as a statesman was never questioned, whose most enduring fame, perhaps, was won as an expounder of the Constitution, and whose patriotism was never challenged, so far as I know, except in the closing years of his life in his own native New England, said:

Most unquestionably there is no legal tender, and there can be no legal tender, in this country under the authority of this Government, or any other, but gold and silver, either the coinage of our mints or foreign coins at rates regulated by Congress. This is a constitutional policy perfectly plain and of the very highest importance.

The States are prohibited from making anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts, and although no such express prohibition is applied to Congress, yet as the Constitution has no power granted to it in this respect but to coin money and to regulate the value of foreign coin, it clearly has no power to substitute paper or anything else as a tender in payment of debts and in discharge of contracts.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Gwin *vs.* Breedlove, 2 Howard Report, said:

By the Constitution of the United States gold and silver coin, made current by law, can only be tendered in payment of debts.

Similar language was used by Chief Justice Chase and perhaps by some of the other judges of the Supreme Court in the decisions on the legal-tender cases. Of course I do not overlook the fact that this same court, by a bare majority, and by a construction which I think most lawyers consider a forced one, afterwards decided that the Government Treasury notes were a legal tender for the payment of debts.

Silver and gold had circulated side by side at par in the United States from the date of the first coinage act in 1792, until the demonetization act of 1873, with the slight change of ratio from 15 to 1 provided in the act of 1792 to the ratio of 16 to 1 provided in the coinage act of 1834.

During this period there had been coined in the United States mints about $145,000,000 in silver coins, and under the operations of the acts of Congress of February, 1793, April, 1806, April, 1816, and June, 1834, respectively, the silver dollars of Spain, Mexico, Peru, Chile, Central America, and the crowns and 5-franc pieces of France had been made legal-tender money in the United States and were in circulation here to an amount estimated at $100,000,000.

It is the fashion nowadays of the advocates of the single gold standard to speak of the free coinage of silver as a new and strange doctrine, a device of Populists and a scheme of anarchists, in order to debase the people's money, to ruin commerce, unsettle business, and derange prices. [Applause.] And these same flamboyant orators immediately and in the same breath proclaim themselves the friends of the laboring people and manifest an interest in the welfare of the working classes, which might be somewhat touching were it not so manifestly and transparently fraudulent in its purpose and design. In truth, the very first coinage law enacted under the present Constitution provided for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. It did more; it made the silver dollar, or unit of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same was then current, the unit of value.

I refer, of course, to the coinage act of April 2, 1792.

Section 14 of said act provided as follows:

And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for any person or persons to bring to the said mint gold and silver bullion in order to their being coined; and that the bullion so brought shall be there assayed and coined, as speedily as may be after the receipt thereof, and that free of expense to the person or persons by whom the same shall have been brought. And as soon as the said bullion shall have been coined the person or persons by whom the same shall have been delivered shall upon demand receive in lieu thereof coins of the same species of bullion which shall have been so delivered, weight for weight, for the pure gold or pure silver therein contained.

This was free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, and that without any charge for mintage.

And thus the law stood until the act of Febuary 21, 1853, which

provided for the lessening of the weight of half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes, respectively. The sixth section of which act also prescribed a mintage charge of one-half per cent for coining either pure metal or that of standard fineness. So that, as a matter of fact, under the coinage laws of Congress there was free and unlimited coinage, pure and simple, from 1792 till February 12, 1873.

During all this long period from 1792 to 1873, I have never heard that any of this stock of silver money was ever discredited, or failed to fulfill all the functions of good money and sound money, at home or abroad, except at our own National Treasury, where it is refused and dishonored by the gold sharks, Treasury despoilers, and shylocks, who are permitted to demand and receive gold only in redemption of the Government's paper promises to pay, to wit, legal tenders and silver-purchase Treasury notes.

It is true that Secretary Carlisle asserted in his Covington (Ky.) speech that the undervaluation of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, established by the coinage act of 1834, when the ratio existing at the mints of France was 15½ to 1, caused our silver to leave us and be taken abroad and sold as bullion.

The same statement has frequently been made by others, and has perhaps become a stock argument of the gold monometallists.

These men make these statements as evidence to prove their assertions that gold and silver coins will not remain in circulation together when the commercial ratio differs from the legal ratio established by law. That is to say, that when the relative commercial value of the bullion of the two metals varies from the relative value of the same metals after being coined the coins will not both remain in circulation, but that the coins made of the metal having the highest commercial ratio or value will be driven out of circulation and sold for bullion.

The weakness of these statements consists in the fact that they are palpably untrue as applied to the history of some parts of the United States, while they may be true as to the larger portion of the country. I assert it as a fact easily within my recollection, and more fully within the recollection of intelligent gentlemen older than myself with whom I have conversed frequently on the subject in the last year or two, that the standard silver dollars of the United States and the Mexican silver dollars and the 5-franc pieces of France constituted a large part of the money in Arkansas from 1846 to the beginning of the war in 1861. I know from the statements of intelligent gentlemen, some of them older than myself, that the same state of facts existed in the States of Tennessee and of Missouri adjoining my own State.

It is within my knowledge that the receiver of the United States land office which was located at Batesville, Ark., from about 1828 to 1861, received large amounts of the silver coins above mentioned in payment to the Government for its public lands, and was receiving them up to the day the State attempted to secede from the Union in May, 1861.

I know it would be very easy for some fellow in the North or East to say that down in Arkansas and the Southwest we did not have very much money at that time. While it is true we had no great money centers like at present exist, the people there had money, most of it brought in by the immigration coming from the States east of the Mississippi River, and while I do not controvert the proposition that in the more commercial States of the Union, those having most intercourse with the countries of the Old World, it was a fact that between 1834 and 1873, when the legal ratio between gold and silver was in this country 16 to 1, while in France the ratio was 15½ to 1, thereby giving a greater value to silver in France than in this country, there was a tendency in our silver coins of standard value to find their way to France.

But it is not true that this was the case as to all our silver coin, and I have mentioned my own personal knowledge of affairs in some parts of the country to prove that the coins of the two metals did remain in circulation together in some sections, and that those sections of country enjoyed the benefits of bimetallic currency up to the disappearance of both gold and silver coins during the late war.

But the question as to whether the coins of gold and silver will both remain in active and general circulation under any fixed or given ratio is not the great vital and underlying principle in favor of free coinage, which is the right of free access to the mints by both metals without discrimination against either.

Something very like this was embodied in the seventh section of the platform adopted by the Democratic party at Chicago in June, 1892, which reads thus:

> We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver, without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage.

Recurring for a moment to the condition of monetary affairs in this country from 1834 to 1873, during which period, as a matter of fact, silver bullion was undervalued slightly at our mints by the coinage laws, and when we were, according to the dictum of the gold-standard people, on a gold standard, I submit there was no inconvenience or injustice suffered by silver. The industrious miner could dig out of the earth the precious metal, and there was a demand for it, and I may say truthfully an unlimited demand. If he did not choose to take it to the mints of his own country, and there have it coined entirely free of all mintage charge prior to 1853 and with the mintage charge thereafter, there was a good demand for it in France at a rate slightly above its coinage value in the United States.

During the period referred to, that is to say, from 1834 to 1873, when, as our gold-standard friends assert, the United States was practically on a gold standard, and when we know that England was absolutely so, it appears by statistics published by the Treasury Department of the United States that the silver product of the world was year by year increasing. I now quote from the report of the Director of the Mint for 1895, on pages 248 and 249, that the annual product of silver during the period from 1831 to 1840 was $24,793,000 coining value. Annual product from 1841 to 1850, $32,440,000. Annual product from 1851 to 1855, $36,824,000. Annual product from 1856 to 1860, $37,618,000. Annual product from 1861 to 1865, $45,772,000. Annual product from 1866 to 1870, $55,663,000.

The advocates of the single gold standard continually harp upon the fact that prior to the demonetization act of February 12, 1873, there had been only some 8,000,000 of standard silver dollars coined altogether, and that since the reopening of the mint to silver under the Bland-Allison Act of February 28, 1878, there have been some four hundred and twenty-odd million of standard legal-tender silver dollars coined, and that therefore this country is already flooded with silver. The gentlemen who indulge in this sort of statement—I will not call it argument—forget to take notice of the population of this country in 1870 and the vast increase between that date and the present. By the census reports the population of the United States in 1870 was in round numbers 38,000,000, and in 1890 it was 62,000,000.

It seems to me that it would be apparent to any fair-minded man who is really seeking for the truth that the people of this country would be capable of using profitably a good deal larger amount of money in 1890 and up to the present date than was required in 1870 and anterior thereto.

The same gentry also utterly ignore and in my judgment try to conceal the real truth in the case, to wit, that whereas, while prior to 1873 the coinage of silver in the United States had not amounted to an enormous sum, still the metal having free access to the mints, and having abroad a larger value as bullion than it had at home when coined, the people of this country got the benefit of all the silver mined in the United States whether it was coined or not coined. If it was shipped to Europe there was a return in money or some kind of commodity for its value.

Another stock argument of the gold bugs is that the silver we already have will not circulate, as, for instance, that of the 423,000,000 standard silver dollars coined by the United States mints there were on the 1st day of January, 1896, 364,000,000 in the Treasury and only 59,000,000 in circulation. And they raise a great hurrah over this, and say the people do not want silver and will not have it. They neglect to tell the whole truth, which is, that for every silver dollar in the Treasury there is outstanding and in the hands of some person a paper dollar in the form of a silver certificate. They also neglect to state the fact, plain to all men of some experience in the affairs of life, that at this time there is little or no gold in actual circulation. For instance, the statement from the Treasury Department of date February 1, 1896, issued from the division of loans and currency, places the amount of gold coin in the Treasury at $84,000,000, and the amount of gold in circulation at the same date $499,000,000. Now, of this amount stated as being in circulation the Treasury does have means of knowing the amount held by the national banks, which are required to make returns to the Treasury Department.

This is stated in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency made to the Secretary of the Treasury December 22, 1895, on page 15 of said report, as being upon July 11, 1895, $127,621,099.

Where is the remainder of the four hundred and ninety-nine million asserted by the Treasury Department to have been in circulation on the 1st day of this month? I state upon my knowledge and information upon such matters, which is, however, not very extensive, that there are not $150,000,000 of gold coin in the United States in general circulation, and I challenge any gentleman on this floor to show where even that amount is, even by prima facie evidence. I venture to say there is not a gentleman within the sound of my voice, unless he be a bank official or has been about a bank, that has within six months past seen $500 of gold coin of any description whatever. It is an undeniable fact that this coin does not pass from hand to hand. Even the people who have it will not part with it except upon extraordinary occasions. It has been laid away in vaults, and the peope who have it will not allow it to be handled lest it suffer abrasion, thereby lessening its value.

Another stock argument which has been used against any increase in our stock of silver coins is that because of its demonetization by the countries of Europe it has not in any of those countries a value as coin over and above its bullion value. And the Secretary of the Treasury, who in the spring and early summer of

1895 abandoned the duties of his great office and meandered over the country in advocacy of a system of finance which he had in 1878, when a Representative in this House, denounced with a logic and eloquence alike superb, drifted down to Memphis, Tenn.—he was doubtless there by invitation—to instruct the Tennesseeans in the matter of finance.

He is quoted by the St. Louis Republic, a reputable newspaper, which published what purported to be a full report of his speech, as saying, among other things, that—

Up to the present time there is no legal tender in international trade. Whether payments are made in gold and silver coins or in gold and silver bullion, the actual intrinsic value determines the amount or quantity to be delivered, no matter what may be the legal-tender laws of the different countries, and no matter though they may have the same or different ratios of value between the metals within their respective limits. * * * The law of France, for instance, places a higher value upon silver relatively to gold than is placed upon it by the laws of the United States, the French ratio being 15½ to 1 and ours being 16 to 1; but if 16 pounds of our silver, coined or uncoined, were sent to that country to be used in the payment of a debt or in the purchase of commodities, it would not be accepted at the ratio of 15½ to 1 or at the ratio of 16 to 1 as compared to gold, but only at the ratio of about 32 to 1, which shows that neither our ratio nor the French ratio has any effect whatever upon the value or the purchasing power of the metal itself.

I place in contrast to this statement and against it the testimony of Mr. William P. St. John, the president of the Mercantile National Bank of New York City, taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House on the 15th day of December, 1894. Under a rigid cross-examination by Representative SPERRY, Mr. St. John said:

The silver dollar of the United States if it were in London to-day would sell at a discount of about five-eighths of 1 per cent, that is par, less freight, insurance, and interest to New York. It would not sell at the value of the bullion composing it, as you are sometimes told here.

This statement went unchallenged by all the great array of single gold standard advocates and witnesses in attendance at that hearing, and I assume, without fear of successful contradiction, that it was absolutely true.

It would take a volume of vast proportions to contain all the objections which the gold monometallists in this country, not to speak of their allies in Europe, can bring up against the free coinage of silver at any ratio. They utterly ignore the experience of the country under the free-coinage laws obtaining here up to 1873. With them experience is nothing. They have a theory which they intend to stick to; whether logical or illogical they care not. Every mother's son of them is like old Sol Gills was in the estimation of grand old Captain Cuttle, in Dickens's novel of Dombey and Son, "chock full of science."

They tell us that with the restoration of silver coinage, gold would at once go to a premium, that it would leave the country and go to the gold-standard countries of Europe. Then they tell us, which is true, that our largest foreign commerce is with these gold-standard countries.

It occurs to me, as I think it has occurred to all rational men who have considered the subject without prejudice and with a desire to arrive at the truth, that if gold left this conntry and went to the countries of Europe with whom we have the most trade, we would scarcely be injured by that. If we sent over our produce it would be paid for in gold, and the larger the stock of gold there most certainly the higher prices would be. But in truth all this twaddle that gold would go to a premium in the event of the restoration of silver coinage is begging the question. As a matter of fact, gold is at a premium to-day, and has been for months. I hold in my hand the weekly financial review of Henry Clews & Co., of Wall street, New York, who, I believe, are considered an authority in such matters. This circular bears the date of January 25, 1896, and states that the current rate of premium on gold and on legal tenders at that date was three-fourths of 1 per cent. The weekly letter of same date of Dimmock & Co., bankers and brokers, of Broadway, New York, states that there is one premium on gold and another on greenbacks, but without giving the rate.

In the line of my argument some minutes ago that the amount of gold in circulation in the United States is far below the amounts estimated in the Treasury statements, I desire to submit the opinion of Cox, Bixford & Co., bankers and brokers, of 46 Congress street, Boston, set forth in their circular of the 1st instant, who say:

In order to bring up the amount of gold to his estimate the Director of the Mint is obliged to charge to circulation among the public the astounding figures of $367,600,000.

These parties further say:

As this sum does not circulate, that is, pass from hand to hand, it must be either locked up in stockings or strong boxes, and it is a sufficiently ridiculous proposition to anyone knowing our people as to warrant some explanation on his part and an effort to produce some statistics in justification of his claim.

Continuing, they say:

No less an authority than Professor Taussig, of Harvard, challenges this absurd assumption as follows: "This last figure of $367,600,000 I am inclined to question very much. I am inclined to think $150,000,000 is all the gold there is in circulation."

The gold monometallists of the United States assert that the only financial safety for our people is to keep our monetary system in harmony with that of Europe. A few weeks ago there was witnessed on this floor a wonderful ebullition of enthusiasm over the reading of the message of the President of the United States upon the Venezuelan controversy with Great Britain. I can say truthfully that I at the time marveled at the temper of men who manifested such a belligerent disposition toward Great Britain in a matter which, however much it enlists our sympathies, can scarcely be said to strictly, immediately, and vitally concern the people of the United States, and yet the same men are so absolutely cringing and subservient to England's opinion, England's views, and England's methods of finance.

It is a well-authenticated fact, denied by no well-informed person, that at and for some time prior to February 12, 1873, when the further coinage of standard silver dollars was prohibited by law, that the coins were at a premium of about 3 per cent over gold; in truth, this fact is relied upon by gold-standard advocates as an argument against bimetallism. It is also a fact that at the very date of this demonetization act of February 12, 1873, the United States had successfully resumed the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars, which had almost ceased during the war and for some years thereafter.

The report of the Director of the Mint for 1895, on page 273, shows that in 1871 there were coined of standard silver dollars $1,115,700, and in 1872, $1,106,450, and in the month and twelve days of 1873 ending February 12, $293,600. These facts to a plain man of common understanding would seem to be evidence that the free coinage of silver ought not to have been disturbed when it was in successful operation, especially as the law by which it was done is strongly suspected, if not proven, to have been tainted with fraud of the basest character. [Applause.]

It is contended by those who are opposed to the free coinage of silver that the general decline of prices has not been caused by the demonetization of silver and the correlative appreciation of gold.

In the discussion of this identical measure in the Senate this position was taken. A Senator, in his remarks, asked the question:

What evidence has been adduced by a single advocate of the free-coinage measure to show that prices have declined because of the so-called demonetization of silver, and that gold has appreciated, which is the correlative of the decline of prices in gold? None that I have been able to discover, except that the price of silver itself has declined nearly pari passu with that of the staple commodities with which it is compared.

Secretary Carlisle, in his Memphis speech, which I have heretofore alluded to, also assumed this position, although he did not go to the full length of asserting that the discontinuance of the use of silver had caused no appreciation in the price of gold and no effect upon prices.

While there are perhaps few phases of this subject of finance that are capable of clear mathematical demonstration, yet there are some things connected with it about which we may be reasonably certain by means of observation, experience, and the concurring opinions of those in the best position to get at the truth. Now, to my mind, as a plain man and a practical one, and in a small way a man of affairs and business, there is a vast multitude of circumstances tending to prove that the general fall of prices which has occurred since about 1873 has been caused to a great extent by the demonetization of silver in this country and in Germany and the consequent measurement of all values by the amount of gold in existence. I am supported in my view of this by many eminent authorities. Mr. Robert Giffen, the statistician of the London Board of Trade, is perhaps the ablest as he certainly is one of the bitterest enemies of bimetallism. From his book entitled The Case Against Bimetallism, printed in London, 1895, I desire to submit the following extracts:

Holding, myself, the view that there is "a" relation between the quantity of the precious metals and prices, I have been frequently claimed by bimetallists as going a long way with them. I avail myself, therefore, of the present opportunity to give an answer as to how the question of the ratio of exchange between the precious metals and other commodities is fixed. I hold most fully to the view that it is fixed in no other way than is any other ratio, viz, by the supply and demand, and by the cost of production of the last margin of supply necessary to meet the last margin of demand. * * *

The demand for non-monetary purposes on the annual production is also preponderant in the case of gold, and very large in the case of silver. About two-thirds of the gold annually produced is taken for the arts; and if the consumption of India is included, as being either for simple hoarding or for the arts, and in no case for the purpose of circulating money, then the demand for gold for non-monetary purposes appears almost equal to the entire annual production. * * *

Equally with the stock of precious metals for purely non-monetary uses, the stocks of the precious metals hoarded are very large. The military and quasi-military chests of military Governments like France, Germany, and Russia, the accumulations of the precious metals in these countries, far beyond any strict requirement of monetary circulation, are enormous. The United States again has accumulated both gold and silver in its Government vaults far beyond any ordinary monetary necessity. There are large private hoards besides all over the world, but especially in India, where both gold and silver are largely hoarded. Whatever the motives may be which determine these hoards the hoards themselves are not money in circulation in any form, and the supply of these demands is not a supply of "money," which can help to make any such relation between the quantity of money and prices as the quantitative theory of money, and with it the bimetallic theory, assume. (Pages 82, 85, 87, and 88.)

We see, then, how largely mistaken these monometallists have been who, in their dislike of bimetallism, have denied that the recent great demands for gold in proportion to its supply were likely to have caused a rise in its exchange value for other things. Looked at in this way, the fall of prices is in itself a proof that gold, in relation to all demands for it, has been relatively scarcer than it was.

Everybody who has wanted it has had to give more for it. If everybody who wanted coal or pig iron was giving more for it than before, we should not hesitate to say that coal and pig iron were relatively more in demand than they had been; and what we should say of coal and pig iron we must also say of gold or silver in a like case. * * *

Some monometallists, as we have already hinted, have given a great advantage to their opponents by denying altogether the necessary connection between a fall in general prices and a relative scarcity or short supply of gold, which they have foolishly done on the score of gold in the form of currency being abundant enough. (Pages 219 and 221.)

This is one of a multitude of authorities to the same purport which might be produced if time permitted. That we are living in an era of falling prices and general depression of a majority of the interests of the whole people of the United States will, I think, be admitted by every observant and well-informed person who is honest enough to tell the truth. The great producing classes of agricultural products, including the landowners as well as the tenants and laborers who perform the manual labor, are not prosperous. There is no thrift, no enterprise. The people who have considerable sums of money are unwilling to let it out, except upon the most overwhelming and ironclad security. They are afraid to invest it in any kind of property on account of the general continuous shrinkage of values.

The result is stagnation, labor unable to procure employment, landowners unable to make any profit by the most economical and industrious management. This should not be so. The United States has a territory the richest on the earth; a population for industry, enterprise, intellect, courage, and morals unsurpassed by any upon the globe, if indeed it could be equaled by selections from all other nations.

A benign providence has blessed the toil of the husbandman with abundant harvests, and while there is no lack of food and raiment, there are hundreds of thousands of honest people unable to procure the bare necessaries of life in a sufficient amount, and that without any fault of their own. This evidences that there is something wrong in our condition. My belief, and in my opinion the belief of more than half of the people of the United States, is that the present source of our trouble is that we are on the gold standard; one-half of our metallic money, although in use and circulating as token money, is denied at the Treasury of the Government which coined it the full measure of its legal-tender qualities. And I will add that this is done not only without warrant of law, but in absolute defiance of law, under the paltry, miserable pretense of keeping up a parity between gold and silver.

Mr. Speaker, I charge, and I make the charge with all earnestness and with a full sense of my responsibility, that all this cry for sound money and for a single standard and all this opposition to the coinage of silver dollars upon any ratio is directly in the interest of the holders of the $749,000,000 of outstanding United States bonds and of the holders of the hundred million to be now issued immediately under the recent bidding. These bonds, according to law and according to the contract written or printed in the face of each bond, are payable in coin of the United States of the standard value of July, 1870, which included standard silver dollars as fully as gold coins. No man will deny this, because it is a matter of record and a matter of law. Five hundred and fifty-nine millions of the bonds mature in 1907, one hundred millions in 1904, and one hundred and sixty-two millions in 1925.

The holders of these bonds are now getting the interest in gold without any warrant of law. They desire to get this country firmly anchored to a gold standard in order that the principal of all the bonds may be payable in gold. These bonds constitute a mortgage upon the property, the energy, the industry, and the toil of the entire people of this country for the next thirty years, and it will be utterly impossible for us and our posterity to pay them in that time.

As touching upon the subject of these bonds, and as touching the subject of a gold standard and the theory that all the Government obligations must be paid in gold alone, I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk a concurrent resolution introduced in the Senate of the United States by the Hon. Stanley Matthews, a Senator from Ohio, on the 6th day of December, 1877.

This resolution was considered by the Senate, and thereafter, on the 25th day of January, 1878, adopted by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate—42 yeas and 20 nays, not voting 14.

This same concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives January 28, 1878, by a yea-and-nay vote—180 yeas and 79 nays.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MATTHEWS. I submit the concurrent resolution with a view of having it read for the information of the Senate and laid upon the table to be printed.

The resolution was read, as follows:

"Whereas by the act entitled 'An act to strengthen the public credit,' approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold or silver; and

"Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt,' approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

"Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled 'An act to provide for the resumption of specie payment,' approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled 'An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt'; and

"Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, as declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled 'An act supplementary to the act entitled "An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,"' to be a legal tender of payment according to their nominal value for any sums whatever: Therefore

"*Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor."

Mr. NEILL. I ask the Clerk to read the yea-and-nay vote upon the adoption of this concurrent resolution in the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

YEAS—42.

Allison,	Davis, Ill.	Jones, Fla.	Plumb,
Armstrong,	Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Nev.	Ransom,
Bailey,	Dennis,	Kirkwood,	Saulsbury,
Beck,	Dorsey,	McCreery,	Saunders,
Booth,	Eustis,	McDonald,	Spencer,
Bruce,	Ferry,	McMillan,	Teller,
Cameron, Pa.	Gordon,	Matthews,	Thurman,
Cameron, Wis.	Grover,	Maxey,	Voorhees,
Chaffee,	Hereford,	Merrimon,	Wallace.
Coke,	Howe,	Morgan,	
Conover,	Johnston,	Oglesby,	

NAYS—20.

Anthony,	Christiancy,	Hamlin,	Paddock,
Barnum,	Conkling,	Kernan,	Rollins,
Bayard,	Dawes,	Lamar,	Sargent,
Blaine,	Eaton,	Mitchell,	Wadleigh,
Burnside,	Edmunds,	Morrill,	Windom.

ABSENT—14.

Butler,	Hill,	McPherson,	Whyte,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Patterson,	Withers.
Garland,	Ingalls,	Sharon,	
Harris,	Kellogg,	Randolph,	

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I will not ask for the reading of the vote in the House of Representatives upon this concurrent resolution, but will state that on the 28th day of January, 1878, the resolution was agreed to in the House by a vote of 189 yeas to 79 nays; not voting, 24. Among the yeas there is the name of Carlisle, who, I think, is the same distinguished gentleman who now holds the portfolio of the Treasury, and who is so solicitous that the Government of these United States shall not pay any of its obligations in a money which he now considers inferior, to wit, silver. I also observe the name of Herbert, if I mistake not the same Herbert who now holds the portfolio of the Navy, and who has found it convenient during the past twelve months to absent himself from his post of duty and make stump speeches urging upon the people of this country their solemn duty, from his present standpoint, to pay all their governmental obligations in gold. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, as illustrative of the feeling of the people of this country upon the momentous question of the use of silver money in 1878, only eighteen years ago, I desire to read the following from the proceedings of the Senate on the 10th day of December, 1877. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. Mr. Matthews, a Senator from the State of Ohio, said:

Mr. President, the general assembly of the State of Ohio at its session last winter adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio*, That common honesty to the taxpayers, the letter and the spirit of the contract under which the great bodies of its indebtedness was assumed by the United States, and true financial wisdom each and all demand the restoration of the silver dollar to its former rank as lawful money."

Continuing, Senator Matthews said:

This resolution was passed with great unanimity.

There were but three negative votes in the house of representatives and one in the senate, and I have no doubt it expresses the deliberate and considered public opinion of the people of that State with the same proportion among them as to unanimity as was evidenced by the vote of their representatives in the general assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate in the Senate upon this concurrent resolution Senator Matthews further said:

* * * But my statement is, that gold has risen in value with all commodities and therefore with silver, and with silver only because it has risen in value with all commodities.

I have the testimony of my observation; I have the testimony in the list of bankruptcies which I read; I have the testimony in the list of sheriffs' sales I have noticed; I have the testimony of the prices to which real estate has sunk; and I could recount instances in that city which I believe to-day the soundest and most prosperous one on the continent, where business has been transacted the least on credit—I mean the city in which I live (Cincinnati)—where the depreciation in real estate and in every article of property other than gold itself has been actually unexampled. What else means all this cry of discontent? What else means all this half-suppressed murmur of dissatisfaction?

Do gentlemen suppose that people are crying out when they suffer no pain? Do they suppose that the voice of lamentation comes up from the homes and houses of the people merely that they may hear themselves shriek and cry? Or is it the truth and is it the fact that the distress of the country is beyond

all historical comparison in our country and that to-day it will require but a few more turns of the wheel to submerge the majority of the body of the people into hopeless bankruptcy? So then, Mr. President, on any ground and in any view that I am able to take, if we restore the silver dollar to its former and accustomed place in our legislation, in our coinage, and in our currency, we are still paying the public debt and all private debts according to a large and a full and overflowing measure of value.

Mr. Speaker, who was Stanley Matthews? Was he a lunatic, an anarchist? No; he was a Senator from the great State of Ohio and died an honored member of the Supreme bench of the United States. With him, and his great colleague in the Senate at that time, was Allen G. Thurman, who heartily and warmly supported, spoke for, and voted for the resolution which I have had read. I will not take up the time of the House in commenting and calling particular attention to other great names whose support was lent to that resolution, many of them now historic. These men were talking and were acting at a time when the demonetization act of 1873 was fresh in the minds of the people, who were stirred to profoundest depths of indignation.

During that very session of Congress, on the 28th day of February, 1878, there was enacted into law over the veto of a Republican President the act commonly called the Bland-Allison Act, which restored to silver dollars their full legal-tender qualities and provided for a limited coinage of silver, which gave to the country in thirteen years something over $400,000,000 addition to its coinage, and gave very considerable relief to the monetary needs of the people, and in a measure alleviated the distress of which Senator Matthews spoke so graphically. But the Bland-Allison Act never was satisfactory to the gold bugs of the country, and when I use the term "gold bugs" now I mean those people who are directly interested from mercenary motives in the establishment and maintenance of a gold standard, and in 1890, during the life of a Republican Congress, these people were strong enough to secure the repeal of the Bland-Allison Act and the substitution therefor of the so-called Sherman silver-purchase act.

This act has been confessed upon the floor of the Senate to have been intended as a device to prevent the enactment of a law for the free coinage of silver. I refer in this directly to a statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio in the extraordinary session of 1893. There is no sort of doubt but that the Sherman law of 1890 was designed and intended, and that it did prevent the passage of a bill for the free coinage of silver. This view of the case was evidently in the minds of the majority of the national Democratic convention assembled at Chicago in June, 1892, when that convention in section 7 of the platform adopted used this language:

> We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman Act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, and which should make all of its supporters as well as its author anxious for its speedy repeal. We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either or charge for mintage.

Was that declaration, solemnly made, and upon the faith of which the present Administration came into power, and without which it could not, in my opinion, have been elected, a delusion and a snare?

We shall see, and history will record the facts.

It is certain that the majority of Democrats in Arkansas have been terribly disappointed in the nonfulfillment of their understanding of that declaration, dispirited and discouraged. They had followed the flag of their party with a fidelity as unselfish and a devotion as pure as that which inspired the patriot fathers in their struggle for liberation from the British yoke in the war of the Revolution.

Having but few Federal offices located within their territory, their expectations of Federal patronage were necessarily small. They were not contending for pelf and power, but from love of principle and pride of party.

They had been educated by the men in whom they trusted into the belief that the system of coinage authorized by the Constitution and adopted by Hamilton and Jefferson in the days of Washington, and pursued and amplified under the Administration of the immortal Andrew Jackson, was a tenet of Democracy. To have one of their cherished doctrinal beliefs and traditions, inherited from a past century, and endeared by the history of a glorious past, rudely thrust aside, nay, even trampled upon, by an Administration which they had found in obscurity and by their generous suffrages helped to elevate to power, has been to them indeed a draught of the bitter waters of Marah.

In my opinion they will still adhere to principle and to the doctrines and usages of Democracy as taught by the fathers of the party, but it is almost certain that they will not longer consent to be dominated by a faction whose sole aim seems to be to fasten this country to a system of finance imported from monarchical Europe, and which will surely result in the ruin and financial enslavement of the masses and their children and children's children through untold generations.

It is, in my opinion as an humble member of the party in whose ranks I have toiled so long, a time for plain speaking. It may be that my candor will cost me my political life; if so, so be it. I am no better than the rank and file of my party. In the first remarks I ever had the honor of submitting on this floor, in February, 1894, I said to my fellow-Democrats that, in my judgment, our grand old party was perilously near to shoals and breakers. I was not a prophet or the son of a prophet, yet it seemed to me the danger was apparent—the elections in November, 1894, proved it to be so.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to concur in the Senate amendment for two other reasons, namely, if the amended bill is enacted into law it will compel the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem legal tenders and Treasury notes in standard silver dollars without giving any option to the note holder. In the next place it will to some extent, even though slight, curtail the power of the national banks, which I regard as the enemies of the human race. I have not time to amplify upon this part of this subject. Let us, fellow-Representatives, do our duty in the premises without regard to any probable or prospective Executive action. The issue is upon us now; it may be shirked, but it will not down. Seventy millions of people are interested in the result; the right will in the end prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By the order of the House a recess was to be taken at 10.30 p. m. until half past 10 o'clock to-morrow. Unless objection is made, the Chair will assume that consent is given that the recess be taken now.

There was no objection; and the House accordingly (at 10 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until 10.30 a. m. on Friday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examinations and survey for location of dams Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Ohio River series—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Labor, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant, relating to the efficiency of employees in certain Executive Departments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for engraving on copper a map of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant, relating to the efficiency of employees in certain Executive Departments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 264); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULICK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 265); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 266); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PENDLETON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred House bill No. 3342, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5641) to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure depot grounds, accompanied by a report (No. 267); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2662) to provide for the adjudication of the claim of the Fond du Lac band of Chippewa Indians arising upon the failure of certain treaty stipulations, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 268); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4580) to amend

section 3449 of the Revised Statutes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 281); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of Thomas H. Millsaps. (Report No. 269.)

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws. (Report No. 270.)

By Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2605) granting pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war. (Report No. 271.)

By Mr. COFFIN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3749) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades. (Report No. 272.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteers. (Report No. 273).

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of Michael H. J. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry. (Report No. 274.)

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4606) to grant an increase of pension to Mary B. Houk. (Report No. 275).

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson. (Report No. 276).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1181) for the relief of Maria E. Wilson. (Report No. 277.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2621) to increase the pension of Jane Webster, widow of Joel Webster. (Report No. 278.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1634) to grant pension to William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers. (Report No. 279.)

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Joseph A. Cooper. (Report No. 280.)

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall. (Report No. 282.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall. (Report No. 283.)

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1256) for the relief of Henry A. Webb. (Report No. 284.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5633) to incorporate the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5634) providing for the withdrawal of distilled spirits from bonded warehouses by the distiller or owner, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5635) to amend section 1754 of Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to preferences in the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5636) for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5637) for the relief of settlers on certain lands in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 5638) to grant 2 condemned cannon and 50 cannon balls to A. G. Reed Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 5639) to amend section 711 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5640) disposing of 4 condemned cannon and 24 cannon balls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 5641) to provide for the retirement of the Treasury notes issued in payment of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," to provide for the coinage of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 5642) to insure creditors of corporations in the collection of their claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5674) authorizing Rear-Admiral W. A. Kirkland, United States Navy, to accept the gold box presented to him by the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 5675) authorizing the construction of a wagon and motor bridge over the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5676) to extend the provisions of an act to provide for the muster and pay of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 109) to provide for an investigation to determine a location for the Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of William L. Vance, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Miriam Goodloe, widow, and Laura Blinn, Richard V. Goodloe, and Joseph A. Goodloe, children, and James H. Goodloe and Mrs. Fannie Hough, grandchildren of James Goodloe, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5643) granting a pension to Charles A. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5644) granting a pension to Augustus Witte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5645) for the relief of James W. Wilmot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5646) granting a pension to Frances M. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5647) for the relief of Mrs. Magdelena Eitel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5648) granting a pension to John A. Link—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) granting a pension to Henry H. Taylor, of Burlingame, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) for the relief of Solomon F. Brown, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5651) for the relief of James V. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5652) granting relief to the heirs of the late J. M. Doddridge, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5653) for the relief of Mrs. Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 5654) for the relief of Catharine Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 5655) to increase the pension of William H. McClelland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5656) for the relief of Hugh M. Henson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) for the relief of Hugh M. Henson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5658) for relief of Henry Runnebaum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) for relief of John Wade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) for relief of Thomas M. Wadley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5661) to increase the pension of Anna E. Botsford, widow of Eli W. Botsford, late major of Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 5662) for the relief of W. T. Fitzpatrick, Bedford City, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 5663) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe, late sergeant Company A, Seven-

teenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 5665) granting a pension to Henry F. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5666) granting a pension to John A. Hopkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 5667) granting a pension to Mrs. Maria B. Brinton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5668) for the relief of Miss E. A. Lewis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5669) to increase the pension of Salem Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) to increase the pension of Richard S. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) to remove the charge of desertion against Elisha K. White and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 5673) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert H. Hamlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of H. A. Carr and 47 other citizens of Flatwoods, Fayette County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations, especially with Canada, Mexico, and the States of Central and South America—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, urging the passage of the Patterson bill, to prevent unjust discrimination in freight rates, without amendments—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring aid in the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the continuation of the improvement of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers and their navigable tributaries—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petitions of citizens of Delphos, Concordia, and Glasco, Kans., to prohibit the issuance of liquor licenses except to those who hold a permit issued by virtue of the laws of Kansas, so far as that State is concerned—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of the Structural Iron Workers' Protective Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., and the Blacksmith Workers' Union, of McKeesport, Pa., in favor of a bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANFORD: Petition of David Lentz and others, of Antioch, Ohio, and vicinity, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. V. McMaster and others, of Demos, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIS: Memorial of the Commercial Club, of Vancouver, Wash., asking an appropriation for the improvement of the Columbia River between Vancouver and the mouth of the Willamette River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of John Blanchard and 68 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of 5,000 settlers in Oklahoma, praying for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4091—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5596—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Hornellsville, North Hector, Southport, Canisteo, Buena Vista, Havana, Reading Center, Odessa, and Wellsburg, all of the State of New York, in favor of the suppression of the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of T. S. Card and 79 citizens of Corning, N. Y., in favor of a bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of H. P. Burdick and others, of Hornellsville and Hartsville, N. Y., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of George W. Page, A. M. Snyder, P. F. Custer, and 45 others, of Mineral Point and Vinco, Pa., praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Charles J. Kinnie and 51 others, of Rockford, Ill., urging an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting any law, State or national, respecting an establishment of religion or the use of public moneys in support thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allentown, Fredonia, and Frewsburg, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, and at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Blair County Union ex-Prisoners of War Association, of Altoona, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 306, providing pensions for soldiers and sailors who were prisoners during the late rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of David Mering and 14 other ex-soldiers of Springboro, Ohio, and vicinity, for the enactment of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of S. J. Loughran and 76 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking that no money be appropriated for private or sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HURLEY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., to forbid the sale of beer to immigrants at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LACEY: Petitions of F. M. Davis and 28 others, H. Barrett and 24 others, J. C. Mathis and 23 others, all citizens of Oklahoma, for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWSON: Petition of certain colored citizens of Georgia, for aid from the United States to facilitate their emigration to Liberia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAHANY: Memorial of the East Buffalo Live Stock Association, to remove unnecessary restrictions from the foreign live-stock trade—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of J. O. Larson and other voters of Round Lake, Minn., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: Petition of the Los Angeles County Association, Union ex-Prisoners of War, favoring the passage of House bill No. 306, relating to the granting of pensions to soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of American seamen on the Pacific Coast, protesting against the repeal of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1895—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of C. P. Nance & Son, E. F. Rogers, and others, of San Lucas, Cal., for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe, late sergeant, Company A, Seventeenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to grant 2 condemned cannons and 50 cannon balls to H. G. Reed Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAY: Resolution of Watrous Post, No. 30, Grand Army of the Republic, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the independence of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Campville and Tioga County, N. Y., for a measure to prohibit the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petitions from chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Bridgeport, Stamford, and Berlin, Conn., and from citizens of Middletown, Montville, New London, and Groton, Conn., and from the president and officers of Yale University, and the president and officers of Wesleyan University, containing 439 names, all forwarded through Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Groton and Stonington, Conn., in favor of the acquirement of additional plats of ground contiguous to the Fort Griswold property, in order to preserve and protect that Revolutionary site—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Resolutions adopted by the Indianapolis Board of Trade, requesting the passage of House bill No. 3212,

to secure a better foreign market for grain and other agricultural products of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Club of Madison, Ind., asking for an appropriation of $25,000 for dredging and otherwise improving the Ohio River at that point—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Albion, Nunda, Elba, Corfu, and Bergen, N. Y., in the regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, and at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILBER: Petifion of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Schenectady, Richmondville, Rockton, and Amsterdam, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth. and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 7, 1896.*

Prayer by Rev. HUGH JOHNSTON, D. D., of the city of Washington.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

The Secretary (Hon. W. R. Cox) called the Senate to order and read the following communication:

VICE-PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER, *Washington, February 7, 1896.*

SIR: It will be impossible for me to be present at the opening of the Senate this morning. You will, therefore, please call the Senate to order, as required by law.

Very respectfully, A. E. STEVENSON.

Hon. W. R. COX,
Secretary United States Senate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Secretary, I offer the following resolve, upon which I ask immediate action:

Resolved, That the Senate now proceed to elect a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Secretary, I also offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, be, and he hereby is, elected President pro tempore of the Senate, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, and in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March, 1890, on the subject.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Secretary, I have been instructed by the unanimous vote of the Democratic Senators on this side of the Chamber to present the name of the honorable Senator from Tennessee, Hon. ISHAM G. HARRIS, whom the Democrats when they had control of the body honored by electing as President pro tempore of the Senate, and upon whom the Senate further conferred the honor of not permitting any other name to be presented in opposition to him. That was done in accordance with the precedent which has grown up in the last few years, so as to avoid even the appearance of a scramble for that high position, but to accord it to the majority of the body, as was also done in the case of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, and the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Ingalls. The Senator from Tennessee, appreciating as a matter of course the compliment that his colleagues on this side of the Senate had paid him, has requested me, in view of the precedents, not to present his name, and it is only because of his desire and request that I fail to carry out the direction of the Democrats of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Secretary, I avail myself of this occasion to tender my profound thanks to the Democratic Senators for the honor they did me in nominating me for reelection, my term of office as President pro tempore of the Senate having expired with my then Senatorial term on the 4th of March last.

As already stated by my friend from Maryland, in March, 1891, the then senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, was elected President pro tempore of the Senate without division and without a single dissenting vote. In March, 1893, the Senate honored me by electing me in the same manner. It is true, Mr. Secretary, that in 1891 there was a Republican majority in this body. It is equally true that in 1893 there was a Democratic majority here. It is also equally true that the Republicans lack one of having a majority of the whole body as the Senate is now constituted. But notwithstanding that fact, in order that there shall be not even the appearance of friction and in order that those kindly relations which should exist and be maintained between every Senator and the Presiding Officer of the body, my personal wish is that the distinguished Senator from Maine may be elected to that high position in the same manner that Senator Manderson was elected in 1891 and I in 1893.

This much I have deemed it proper to say.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Secretary, the Populist party, numbering six in this Chamber, concluded some time ago to present the name of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] to the Senate for the office of President pro tempore. But in view of the fact that there has been or is to be such a harmonious union between the Democratic and Republican parties in this Chamber, I do not know that it would be worth our while to present his name. We can certainly have no choice between the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. Either, we have confidence, would make a competent presiding officer, fair in his rulings. Therefore the Populist party, while holding to its determination to stand as a distinct party in this Chamber upon all vital matters, will not offer any resistance to the election of the honorable Senator from Maine.

The SECRETARY. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The resolution was agreed to nem. con.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will conduct the President pro tempore-elect to the chair.

Mr. FRYE was escorted to the chair by Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HALE, and, the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Secretary of the Senate, upon taking the chair as President pro tempore, he said:

Senators, I am profoundly grateful for this exceedingly generous expression of your confidence. I can only try to justify it by bringing to the discharge of the duties of the office to which you have elected me fidelity and strict impartiality. The Secretary will read the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

Ordered, That the Secretary wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Senate has elected WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold and exercise the office in the absence of the Vice-President, from time to time, during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the terms of its resolution passed March 12, 1890, and that he make a similar communication to the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 5th instant approved and signed the act (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889.

The message also announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; and

An act (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after the usual morning business on Monday morning I shall desire to address the Senate for a few moments upon the resolution now on the table in regard to the Monroe doctrine.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of George K. Shaw and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Greene, Clark, and Clinton counties, all in the State of Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for an adequate duty on wool; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 120 citizens of Bucyrus, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of sundry lake shippers of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against placing obstructions to navigation in the Detroit River in the nature of bridge piers; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Wooster, Ohio, and a petition of the Ministerial Association of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I present a memorial of the Northeast Citizens' Suburban Association of the District of Columbia, relative to school facilities and the lighting and the grading of streets. I move that the memorial be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of Walter B. Cole and

sundry other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CULLOM. I present two petitions of citizens of Wayne County, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill 3814, or the bill which I had the honor of introducing, in relation to the adjustment of swamp-land grants.

I also present a petition, in the form of resolutions, on the same subject of the board of supervisors of Wayne County, Ill., attested by the clerk. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of Hon. Freeman Knowles and several hundred other citizens of Deadwood, S. Dak., praying that Congress may accord belligerent rights to the Cuban patriots; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DANIEL presented a petition of the American, English and Venezuelan Trading and Commercial Company, of Richmond, Va., praying for recognition by the State Department and for the restoration of their rights of mining, etc., in certain territory of Venezuela by virtue of a grant from the Venezuelan Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fernandina, Fla., praying that the improvement of Cumberland Sound and Fernandina Harbor be placed upon the list of permanent appropriations for rivers and harbors; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Florida Bankers' Association, praying for the establishment of a subtreasury of the United States at Savannah, Ga.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURROWS presented a memorial of 140 citizens of Watrousville, Mich., remonstrating against the appropriation of public moneys for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Big Prairie, Mich., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., and a petition of the board of trustees of South Pasadena, Cal., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Memorial Baptist Church of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the board of supervisors of Sacramento County, of the board of supervisors of Sierra County, of the board of supervisors of Sonoma County, and of the board of supervisors of Amador County, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation developing the mining industries of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRICE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation ceding certain lands to the State of Ohio; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution No. 12. Requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in securing the passage of an act ceding certain lands to the State of Ohio.

Whereas the Ohio canal commission in the prosecution of its work of investigating the titles of State lands finds that section 7, town 6 south, range 4 east, Auglaize County, Ohio, is the property of the United States; and

Whereas said section 7 is wholly within the limits of the Mercer County reservoir, and therefore a part of the public works of Ohio, and any disposition of it to private parties or corporations would work great injustice to the public works of the State; and

Whereas the canal commission having made application to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for a patent to the land in the said section 7 under the swamp-land act of 1850, and said application having been rejected, and the application is now pending on an appeal before the Secretary of the Interior: Therefore

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their good offices in securing the passage of an act ceding the land in question to the State of Ohio, and that the governor be requested to forward to our Senators and Representatives of Ohio a certified copy of this resolution.

CHARLES H. BOSLER,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted January 29, 1896.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 29th day of January, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 29th day of January, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRICE presented a petition of the Piqua Rolling Mill Company, of Piqua, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a bureau of military education and to promote the adoption of a uniform military drill in the public schools of the several States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the Republic Iron Company, of Mitchell & Co., of Palmer & Co., of the Hawgood & Avery Transit Company, and of sundry vessel owners, all of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of bridge piers in the Detroit River; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VILAS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Pewaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COCKRELL. In behalf of the bill (S. 172) for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, I present two petitions, one numerously signed by citizens of Jackson County, Mo., and the other by citizens of Howard County, Mo. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Claims, to accompany that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 789) for the relief of Kate Winter, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1493) granting a pension to Mary Clare Kelly, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 826) granting a pension to Caroline Reed, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to William T. Walker, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to George C. Abbey, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1962) for the erection of a public building at the city of Jamestown, N. Y., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 323) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1904) to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 912) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages; and

A bill (S. 1514) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 474) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment, to report it with amendments, and submit a report thereon. I ask that 1,000 extra copies

of the report, which is very full, be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to state that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], and myself, who are members of the Committee on Public Lands, do not agree to this report, but dissent from the report recommending the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that 1,000 extra copies of the report may be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Lands. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and that order will be made.

Mr. BRICE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 893) for the relief of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 290) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others for supplies furnished the Indian service, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon. I supposed that I had made this report before, but I do not find it upon the Calendar, and therefore I assume that my recollection is at fault.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 990) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1386) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

WHITE LOT AND MONUMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. GEAR. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896," to report it without amendment. I am also instructed by the committee to ask that immediate action be taken on the joint resolution. The title explains the meaning of the measure.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not ask for present consideration. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] has given notice that after the routine business he desires to be heard, and I understand that an early adjournment is to be had to-day.

Mr. GEAR. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that it will only take an instant. The joint resolution has passed the other House. It proposes to grant the Society of Christian Endeavor the use of the White Lot temporarily for their annual convention.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall interpose no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee for a moment to the fact that this measure will at once go through, and I have one other bill that I desire to have put on its passage. Although we want an early adjournment to-day, by reason of the urgency of the case I must ask immediate consideration of that bill after this is disposed of or after the Senator from Nebraska has concluded. I shall be delighted to wait for him, for I am always glad to hear him; but I do hope the Senator will not prevent the unanimous consideration of such measures.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall interpose no objection. I merely wanted to suggest that where a Senator has given notice that at a particular time he desires to address the Senate the privilege is usually accorded to him. Hence I hope these requests will be delayed until after he concludes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Ah, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEAR. I also report back from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the joint resolution (S. R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the White Lot and part of the Monument Grounds. The House joint resolution having been passed, I move that this joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

LOCATION OF MINING CLAIMS IN COLORADO.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. TELLER], who is unfortunately detained from the Chamber to-day by illness, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 4991, a very short bill, under circumstances of some urgency. It is a bill which has already passed the other House and which opens a forest reservation near Cripple Creek to the prospectors for the precious metals. The reservation was created at the request of the people of the county before the discovery of Cripple Creek, since which time there has been much prospecting going on there. The lines are unknown. The Committee on Public Lands of this body unanimously reported the bill favorably. It is desired by everybody and opposed by nobody. I have spoken to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who does not object to my asking the Senate for its immediate consideration at this time.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Is it to facilitate the production of gold?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Very largely, and it will be of great service to the constituents of the Senator from New York and that sort of bimetallists who are under the impression that if we produce gold enough silver has no rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR SENATE AND HOUSE LIBRARIES.

Mr. HALE. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], in relation to furnishing additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Senate library, to report as a substitute for it a joint resolution directing the Public Printer to supply the Senate and House libraries each with 20 additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. R. 72) directing the Public Printer to supply the Senate and House libraries each with 20 additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, etc., That section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and binding, and the distribution of public documents, which reads: "To the Senate and House libraries, 10 copies each," be so amended as to read: "To the Senate and House libraries, 20 copies each."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1992) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia and in the offices of the recorder of deeds and the register of wills for said District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1993) to increase the pension of George E. Tibbetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1994) authorizing the Arkansas Northwestern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1995) granting a pension to Hiram Daman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 1996) amending the act of June 8, 1880, entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint an officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps to perform the duties of solicitor and judge-advocate-general, etc., and to fix the rank and pay of such officer," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1997) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Baker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1998) to extend a patent of Joseph Zihlmann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1999) to provide for the observance of the 12th day of February as a national holiday; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2000) making appropriation for the payment of the French spoliation claims which have been adjudicated by the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2001) authorizing the sale of title of the United States to certain tracts of land in the District of Columbia to Margaret Shugrue, Caroline Lochboehler, and John R. Scott; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2002) for the relief of Arthur Connell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2003) for the relief of James Gilfillan and John A. Rollings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2004) to increase the efficiency of the infantry of the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2005) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, approved July 16, 1894," amending the third proviso thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2006) for the relief of Newell A. Burrows; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 2007) to authorize the United States Court of Private Land Claims to hear, try, and determine the issues as to the extent and boundaries of the Las Animas grant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Fanny Moale Gibbon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2009) to simplify the system of making sales in the Subsistence Department to officers and enlisted men of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 2010) to remove the charge of desertion against Phillip Schaefer, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2011) granting a pension to Nancy Whirley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 2012) authorizing Isaac M. Mason and Webster M. Samuel and their associates to improve the channel of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cairo, Ill., and between Cairo, Ill., and Vicksburg, Miss., upon certain conditions and for certain considerations, to be paid by the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next, immediately after the disposal of the usual routine morning business, I will, by permission of the Senate, submit some remarks upon the resolution lying upon the table relating to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to give notice that at 2 o'clock I shall move an adjournment of the Senate until Monday next. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the deficiency appropriation bill when that bill is likely to be taken up, and whether it will be convenient to fix some time when the consideration of the bill shall be proceeded with?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has that bill in charge. It ought to be taken up on Monday next if we adjourn until Monday. It certainly should be taken up as soon as the matter we have now in hand is disposed of. I think it is not the intention to interfere with the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS].

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, I will move now that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. DUBOIS. I wish the Senator from New Hampshire would allow me to make a statement.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well; I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. DUBOIS. I think an arrangement has been made by which a vote can be had on my resolution at 2 o'clock. It will only take a few moments, and we had better dispose of it without further debate. I think it would be satisfactory to the Senate and better all around if we could dispose of that matter to-day, and it will only take ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it can be agreed that the Senator's resolution shall be voted on at 2 o'clock without debate, of course I shall not move an adjournment until after that vote has been taken.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock, without further debate, we shall proceed to vote on the resolution which has been under discussion.

Mr. ALLISON. Is it proposed that the resolution shall be taken up at this moment?

Mr. DUBOIS. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator from Idaho merely asks unanimous consent to set the time.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask unanimous consent that we shall agree to vote on the resolution at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. Simply upon the resolution?

Mr. DUBOIS. And the amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. Or any motion connected therewith. We do not want any misunderstanding again as to what will be in order at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HALE. I think perhaps that the Senator, instead of asking unanimous consent, may as well leave it to the general understanding there is that at that time there is to be no further debate, and that then we shall proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the resolution or any parliamentary motion connected with it.

Mr. DUBOIS. Very well.

Mr. HALE. And not ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am perfectly content to leave it in that way.

Mr. ALLISON. I rose to ask the Senator from Idaho to allow the matter to go over for the present. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and others interested in the question are not now in the Chamber.

Mr. DUBOIS. It has gone over in that way.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it the request that at 2 o'clock all debate shall close, but that unlimited amendments may be offered?

Mr. FAULKNER. The request has been withdrawn.

Mr. DUBOIS. The request has been withdrawn, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator does not understand that all amendments have been withdrawn?

Mr. DUBOIS. No; the request for unanimous consent has been withdrawn.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire whether it would not be wiser to defer that motion until we see what is going to be done at 2 o'clock. I suggest that we do not now know what disposition will be made of the resolution at that time.

Mr. CHANDLER. On the suggestion of the Senator from New York, I will defer making the motion until after the vote is taken on the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, if a vote be taken at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. CHANDLER. If a vote be taken on the resolution I shall then move to adjourn until Monday next.

Mr. HILL. That is satisfactory.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senate will indulge me, I will again ask the Senator from Maine, who has charge of the deficiency appropriation bill, what his purposes are with reference to that bill? I will say to the Senator that that bill carries a very large deficiency, especially the deficiency with regard to the expenditures for the courts of the United States, and I desire to make some suggestions to the Senate when the bill is taken up in reference to those expenditures. Therefore I should like to know, if the Senator from Maine will oblige me by informing me, when he proposes to press the bill for consideration.

Mr. HALE. As the Senator has appealed to me with reference to the course which I intend to pursue upon the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, I will say that it is my intention, looking at the probabilities between now and that time, to ask the Senate to proceed to its consideration after the routine business on Monday; and I hope that then the Senate will make a speedy disposition of it. It will be followed by three other bills which the Committee on Appropriations have reported to this body.

I am glad to find that the Senator from New Hampshire has been looking into the subject of the large deficiencies in the Department of Justice for the courts, because it is a subject that has exceedingly pestered the Committee on Appropriations. The increasing deficiencies in that Department of the Government, as has been said before, arise largely from an imperfect method which has been followed in the other House of appropriating only a part of the year's appropriation in the regular annual bill, and that necessitates, of course, a deficiency to make up the lack. But aside from that, the deficiencies are increasing, and I hope that the fertile mind of the Senator from New Hampshire will evolve some proposition that will be not only a discussion and criticism of this condition, but a remedy for it. The Committee on Appropriations will welcome, I am sure, any suggestion in that line.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will only add that my remedy is ready, and that is, not to appropriate for the deficiencies.

Mr. HALE. That, of course, we will discuss and decide upon when we reach the bill. I will repeat, as it looks now as though other matters would be out of the way, and I have no doubt the Senate will adjourn over Saturday, that I propose to call up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill on Monday morning.

Mr. CALL. I desire to make a remark to the Senator from Maine who is in charge of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I am in receipt of a telegram from the marshal of the southern district of the State of Florida, stating that the court is in session at Jacksonville, with a large number of witnesses in attendance, with no money available to pay them, and that the immediate passage of the deficiency bill is needed for that purpose.

COLONIAL CHARTERS AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS.

Mr. QUAY. I offer a resolution for reference to the Committee on the Library, which provides, I will say in offering it, for an appropriation from the contingent fund of the Senate, and therefore it must ultimately go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; but I especially desire to have it referred in the first instance to the Library Committee, in order to receive a report from that committee before it is referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on the Library, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library cause to be prepared a compilation of the colonial charters and constitutions of each State of the United States, together with all amendments thereto at any time in force, arranging the same in chronological order for each State, with suitable explanatory matter and indexes, and that the expense of said compilation be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That, when it may be so necessary, the chairman of the Committee on the Construction of the Nicaraguan Canal is authorized to employ a stenographer, whose compensation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PROPOSED TARIFF RATES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], coming over from a previous day, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate an estimate of the probable increase of the revenue if the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue, to meet the expenses of Government, and provide against a deficiency, should become a law.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask if the routine morning business is closed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have two resolutions that have gone over under the rule, and I think must be now laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was just proceeding to lay resolutions before the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. My resolution has not been disposed of, and I am anxious to have it passed, so as to get the information it calls for. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] suggested that he intended to offer an amendment to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of the Senator from Nevada is now before the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. May I interrupt the Senator a moment?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada and also the Senator from New Hampshire to allow their resolutions to pass over temporarily until I make a few remarks, which will not exceed thirty minutes.

Mr. STEWART. I suppose my resolution in regard to the tariff bill can be passed in a minute. It has been waiting for a long time, and we ought to have the information at an early day.

Mr. ALLEN. My remarks will not take thirty minutes.

Mr. STEWART. If my resolution can be postponed by unanimous consent until the Senator concludes his remarks, I shall not object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been very courteous to Senators in regard to my two resolutions. They are simply resolutions of inquiry, which will not provoke any discussion, and the committees are very desirous of getting the information they call for.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] asks unanimous consent that the resolution offered by him shall be laid over without prejudice.

Mr. STEWART. Until after the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, and then to be called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without losing its place. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PENSION STATISTICS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I now ask that my resolutions may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a series of resolutions submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions submitted by Mr. GALLINGER February 4, 1896, as follows:

Whereas there are certain pension measures new pending before the Senate Committee on Pensions upon which such information as can be furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions should be placed at the disposal of Congress, and in order that there may be established from the records of the Pension Office some reliable estimate of the mortality rate of pensioners: Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to furnish the Senate, at the earliest possible moment, the statistics and information which the records of the Pension Office disclose, from the 1st day of July, 1895, to the 1st day of January, 1896, of invalid pensioners pensioned under the general law, showing the total number of names on the roll July 1, 1895, and January 1, 1896, and the number of deaths which have occurred during that period in each classification or grade of such pensions.

Second. The same information relative to pensions granted under the act of June 27, 1890.

Third. The same information relative to widow pensioners under each act, which latter shall include under a separate classification all extinctions of title for pensions from death, remarriage, or abandonment.

Fourth. The same information as regards dependent pensioners under each act except that of June 27, 1890.

Fifth. Statistics with regard to each class of pensioners under acts granting pensions to survivors and their widows under Mexican and Indian wars and the war of 1812.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate, at the earliest possible moment, a statistical statement, showing the number of pension certificates issued during the six months ended January 1, 1896, classifying the same as originals of each class and reissues of each class, showing whether increases or reductions, increased pensions or any other classification usually observed, and also statistics showing the suspension and other stopping of pensions from causes other than deaths or extinction of title by remarriage, covering each class of pensions under each class of acts separately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

CENSUS OF EX-SOLDIERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], coming over from a former day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER February 6, 1896, as follows:

Whereas a proviso contained in section 17 of an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Eleventh and subsequent censuses," approved March 1, 1889, reads as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That said Superintendent shall, under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, cause to be taken on a special schedule of inquiry, according to such form as he may prescribe, the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion, and who are survivors at the time of said inquiry, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, or marines"; and

Whereas the said section further provides that "the only volumes that shall be prepared and published in connection with said census shall relate to population and social statistics relating thereto, the products of manufactories, mining, and agriculture, mortality and vital statistics, valuation and public indebtedness, recorded indebtedness, and to statistics relating to railroad corporations, incorporated express, telegraph, and insurance companies, a list of the names, organizations, and length of service of surviving soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines": Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the schedule relating to the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion was prepared and the information required taken; and, if so, whether the said information was published as required by said section 17 of the act named, and, if not so published, the reasons for withholding said publication.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to ask the consent of the Senate that the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins, be made the unfinished business for Monday next.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from North Dakota will indulge me to make a short speech of about thirty minutes without interruption, I promise him that I shall never get in his road again, if it be possible to keep out of it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I simply want an order of the Senate, and I doubt if it will take more than a minute to decide the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask that the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations with reference to the Monroe doctrine be laid before the Senate and read by title.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Do I understand the Senator from Nebraska declines to yield?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the resolution by title.

The SECRETARY. A concurrent resolution reported by Mr. DAVIS from the Committee on Foreign Relations, January 20, 1896, relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, December 2, 1823, James Monroe, then President of the United States, in a message to Congress, said:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

At the time these words were written the Holy Alliance was in existence. It was formed at Paris from September 14 to 26, 1815, between the Emperor of Russia, Alexander I; the Emperor of Austria, Francis I, and the King of Prussia, Frederick William III. It is said to have been the most remarkable attempt in history to control the policy of other governments. The Holy Alliance furnishes a valuable lesson to the student of political history. It was formed for the ostensible purpose of carrying the cross of Christ into every known European land, and was an alliance between the Greek, Catholic, and Protestant religions, though, strange enough, the Pope, the head of the Catholic Church, was not admitted to it.

Farseeing statesmen of that age knew that it had a deeper significance to Europe and the world than to merely force the gospel on those unwilling to receive it. Its real purpose was to extend the territorial dominion of the signatories and to subject weak and irresolute nations to its control; and it was especially aimed at the downfall of Napoleon Bonaparte, the brilliant son of Corsica, then in the zenith of his military glory and power, whose sun arose and set for the last time on the field of Waterloo in 1815.

Mr. President, it was this real purpose of the Holy Alliance that called forth President Monroe's message and induced him to declare that, while amicable relations existed between the United States and the Allied Powers, we would consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any part of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. President Monroe foresaw with clear vision the great truth, then apparent to the wise men of that age, that if the Holy Alliance should accomplish its purpose it meant eventually the absorption of power in America and the reduction of every State on this continent to vassalage, and by that means it would weaken the power of the United States, if not result in its complete overthrow and final destruction. Nothing can be more truthful than the declaration that the slightest interference with the Goverments of this continent who had secured their independence by treaty or by the valor of their arms would directly interfere with the independence of the United States.

I make reference to the Holy Alliance only for the purpose of leading up to the scientific principles upon which the doctrine of national self-preservation is based.

It is my purpose to consider this doctrine as an original proposition, for I know of no other way in which it can be rightfully and intelligently considered. Senators who have preceded me on this subject have exhausted the written history of the question, some ascribing the doctrine to Washington, some to Jefferson, some to John Quincy Adams, some to James Monroe, and still others to Channing, the great English statesman and diplomatist.

Mr. President, I would not knowingly rob any man of the glory justly due him, much less an illustrious citizen, who, in life, served his country well and who died to the great regret and loss of his countrymen; but a doctrine as plain as that under discussion, and which is as old as government itself, arising out of and based on a prime necessity of all human government, ought not to be ascribed to any man, however exalted or illustrious he may have been, when it is the common property of the human race.

No nation has ever existed, and, indeed, none in the nature of things can exist, without adopting and applying in its foreign relations the doctrine of national self-preservation, generally ascribed to Monroe and known as the "Monroe doctrine." President Monroe is entitled to the credit of having first formulated this doctrine and given it to the world, as a ruler, in a message to his people, but there the credit must end. We observe this law manifest in all creation. The plant, when assailed by violence, even the violence of the wind, shrinks in self-preservation; the bird uses its wings in flight; the fish scurries to some hidden moss or to the fathomless depths of the pool. In the larger animals, where the instinct of self-preservation is frequently overborne by that of ferocity, the chances of battle are taken with doubtful results. Man, however, occupying the noble heights to which God has assigned him, possesses not only the animal instinct of self-preservation, but the intellect which foresees coming events and fortifies against danger.

A nation is an aggregation of human beings occupying a definite portion of the earth's surface, banded together by common interests and the necessity of self-preservation, each lending to all, and all to each, the assistance necessary to that end. From this relation, aided by reason, springs the known necessity of preserving the nation from the aggression of others, and anything which will have a tendency to deprive the nation of its territory, and therefore its independence, or to imperil its autonomy, and therefore its safety, is provided against by the law of national self-preservation, which is the aggregate or intensified form of individual self-preservation. From this source, and from none other, springs the doctrine embodied in President Monroe's message, which has been so frequently referred to in the debates on this floor.

Galileo, the Italian philosopher and mathematician, in the sixteenth century, made known to the world the diurnal motion of the earth, but it is not to be supposed that Senators would claim that the diurnal motion of the earth has not existed from the beginning of time and long before Galileo shed the light of his learning upon the world. It was the great truth, thus observed and classified by him, though it had existed from the beginning of time, that gave to the world day and night in regular order from the dawn of creation. As well might we ascribe the existence of this great truth to Galileo, as to say that President Monroe originated and applied for the first time the doctrine of national self-preservation.

Doctor Harvey, the eminent English anatomist, discovered the circulation of the blood in 1628, but Senators will not deny the fact of the circulation of blood from the time of man; for if it had not existed man could not have lived and performed the prodigies of labor and learning that have been performed by him in all ages.

Sir, at the same time Sir Isaac Newton, the celebrated English philosopher and mathematician, discovered the law of gravitation; but I presume that no one will claim that the law of gravitation has not existed from the foundation of the world and long before Newton opened his eyes to the scenes of this earth.

Mr. President, these great natural laws were in existence before Galileo, Harvey, and Newton classified and applied them. It remained for them to apply laws that are coexistent with creation itself. So we may say of the doctrine of national self-preservation; it has been applied from the foundation of human government to the present moment; it was applied in the struggles of Judea and Israel; it has been applied in every nation, civilized or barbarous, from the foundation of the world. It remained, however. for President Monroe to put this doctrine into tangible form and first apply it to the foreign relations of this country, and to that extent he is entitled to the credit of its application.

I took occasion in some remarks submitted in this Chamber a few days ago to speak of this doctrine as the law of self-defense. Perhaps the expression was not strictly accurate. I should have spoken of it as I speak of it now, as the law of national self-preservation; but, after all, as the law of self-defense is but the outward manifestation or execution of the law of self-preservation the expression was not far from the truth.

Mr. President, having stated my opinion of the principle upon which this law of necessity rests, and that it is indispensable to the maintenance of every form of government among men, the next question to be considered is, How shall it be applied? Is there any necessity for its application in the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela?

Fraud, say the law writers, can not be defined with absolute accuracy. While it consists in the false representation by words or acts of some existing or supposed fact which is calculated to and does mislead to his injury the one upon whom it is practiced, yet just what facts will constitute fraud can not be determined in advance of its application. It is for the courts in the practical

administration of the law to determine whether a given state of facts comes within the definition of fraud or not.

Mr. President, in like manner we are to determine the question of the application of the doctrine of national self-preservation. If the invasion of the South American Republics by Great Britain will endanger the welfare or menace the safety of this Government in any way, we should apply this doctrine and resent her action with all the strength and resources of a mighty nation. We must be the exclusive judges of when the doctrine is to be applied. We can not permit Great Britain, or any other foreign power, to determine when and to what extent the acquisition of territory on the Western Hemisphere will imperil our Government. The President of the United States, under a law passed by this Congress, has appointed a Commission of five eminent citizens who are to listen to the evidence to be submitted to them and make diligent inquiry for all information as respects the true line of demarcation between Venezuela and British Guiana.

When this Commission shall have reported it will be ample time for us to act. If we shall then determine that the action of Great Britain in acquiring terriory in Venezuela will imperil our Government by imperiling the rights of Venezuela, it will become our duty to marshal all the resources of our people to resist the threatened or actual invasion. If, on the other hand, we shall determine, after due investigation and deliberation, that our interests will not be imperiled, it will be our duty to abstain from any interference with the action of Great Britain. I feel confident, however, that the dispute over the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana is not for the primary purpose of obtaining territory, but for the purpose of gaining control of the Orinoco River, which leads into one of the richest portions of South America. Mr. President, if this be true, it will be our duty to repel the aggressive action of that nation.

It has been disputed here that the law of national self-preservation is a law of nations. Sir, it is of necessity the law of every nation, whether expressed in its fundamental law or in works on international law or not. As well might we dispute the law of individual self-preservation as to deny that the law of national self-preservation is a part of the law and being of every Government.

It is to be hoped that the people of Venezuela will not be overelated at the attitude this country has taken; it is to be hoped they will not be deceived by the language used in this Chamber; it is to be hoped that their conduct will be conservative, and that nothing will be said or done by them in consequence of the friendly spirit manifested toward them by this country that will lead to rash or inconsiderate action.

Mr. President, I do not deem it necessary to discuss the principles upon which this doctrine rests to any greater extent. It is not only a legal question, but it is a question of patriotism as well. It is not my purpose to indulge in useless jingoism. Extravagant expressions in times like these count for nothing; threats are useless; but if the time shall ever come when we are called upon to defend this doctrine, it must be done, no matter at what cost or at what sacrifice.

I would not encourage the feeling that England and America, the two greatest English-speaking peoples of earth, are to be needlessly thrown headlong into a mighty conflict for the supremacy of jurisdiction on this continent; but England should be given to understand in a manner that can not be mistaken that the honor and interests of our country will be preserved at all hazards and under all circumstances, even though it may take every man and exhaust all the resources of this nation to defend them.

The threatened demolition of England and the English institutions that we have heard in this Chamber is not real; there is no danger from foes without. We have simply been indulging in the harmless pastime of twisting the caudal appendage of the British lion to arouse a war spirit in the breasts of our people, and thus induce them to forget their grievances and their wrongs.

Mr. President, we mistake the temper of the American people. They know full well that there is no danger of our becoming involved in a war with England, or with any other foreign power. They do not seek war, and I can not condemn in too severe terms the lack of confidence in the sober judgment, the intelligence and patriotism, of the American people that has led at least one Senator in this Chamber to assert that a large portion of them would welcome war and bloodshed as a relief from their present conditions.

Sir, much eloquent denunciation of England and the English system of forcible colonization has been indulged in in this Chamber within the last few weeks, but they are as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals—

> Full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.

Florid language has been used, and a willingness to die for the country has been expressed when there is not the slightest likelihood of being called upon to make the sacrifice, but these will not meet the situation nor solve the problem. We must meet this question in the serene and pure atmosphere of a cold philosophy that rises high above the dust and smoke and clouds of mere contending words. If, after we have tried this, the sky line is not visible; if the clouds of war should still gather and threaten to deluge our beloved country with blood, then let our eloquence speak from a thousand battle ships that skim the seas and ten thousand cannon that will wake the echoes of the world.

Mr. President, back of all this rises the vision of an oppressed, patient, toiling people, asking for relief; and while we have indulged here in empty phrase, their condition has been daily growing worse. Is it not the better part of valor, the higher and better part of statesmanship, to meet the just demands of a God-like humanity by giving our country relief; by giving to our people a greater volume of money; by making their toil more remunerative, their property more valuable? Shall we not awaken in their breasts a new hope, a new life, and a new energy by giving renewed activity to industry, and gladden their hearts by bringing to the wife and children of him who labors a smile of gladness and sunshine where the clouds of poverty and sorrow sit, and by putting into their mouths a new song?

If, unhappily, the time shall come, which God grant it may not, that American valor must again be displayed on the field of battle in defense of American institutions and against foreign greed and aggrandizement, we may confidently expect the sons of America to march under the flag of the free, consecrated by the blood of a hundred years, to permanent and glorious victory. Then for every Grant there will be a Lee; for every Sherman a Johnston; for every Thomas a Jackson; for every Sheridan a Stuart, and Mason and Dixon's line will be blotted from the map of the United States, and true Americans, North and South, welded by the blood of the Revolution, the war of 1812, and the war with Mexico, renewed by the estrangement of 1861, as lovers renew and intensify their affection by estrangement, soothed and sustained by a united and splendid American womanhood, will give to the world a lesson in valor that it has never known before. And when the end comes, as it surely will come, and the storm that has rocked us in a great civil strife for renewed American freedom shall have subsided, and the nation shall arise once more from the ashes of its deadly conflict with the enemies of human liberty, crowned with a new glory and encircled with a new halo, shall we not place the songs of our recent civil strife with the sacred memories of other days, and sing that sweeter, grander, more inspiring and God-like song, dear to all American hearts:

> My country, 'tis of thee,
> Sweet land of liberty,
> Of thee I sing;
> Land where my fathers died,
> Land of the pilgrims' pride,
> From every mountain-side
> Let freedom ring.
>
> My native country, thee—
> Land of the noble free—
> Thy name I love;
> I love thy rocks and rills,
> Thy woods and templed hills;
> My heart with rapture thrills
> Like that above.
>
> Let music swell the breeze,
> And ring from all the trees
> Sweet freedom's song.
> Let mortal tongues awake;
> Let all that breathe partake;
> Let rocks their silence break;
> The sound prolong.
>
> Our father's God, to Thee,
> Author of liberty,
> To Thee we sing;
> Long may our land be bright
> With freedom's holy light;
> Protect us by Thy might,
> Great God, our King!

PROPOSED TARIFF RATES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the Senate an estimate of the probable increase of the revenue if bill H. R. 2749, entitled "A bill to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency," should become a law; and what would be the duty per pound in United States money on the different grades of imported wool according to the present market price; and is the proposed duty on wool provided for in said bill sufficient to compensate for or correspond with the increased duties proposed on woolen goods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution in relation to the distribution of

seed. I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] desires to submit some remarks on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, the purchase and distribution of improved seeds may be, in the opinion of some, a small matter, but the nonexecution of an act of Congress by an executive officer is by no means a small matter. It is a propensity of human nature that when one makes up his mind to do something which does not comport exactly with his ideas of duty, or does not measure up to the test of his own conscience, the first thing he does is to look around for a plausible pretext with which to justify his action.

The Secretary of Agriculture has done this. He made up his mind to refuse to expend the appropriation for the purchase of seeds; he sought and found a pretext for this refusal. The language of the appropriation act directing the purchase and distribution of improved seeds, I understand, is the same language that has been used for years past in making similar appropriations. It is the same language that was used in the three appropriation acts for the three years last passed, during which time the Secretary of Agriculture has occupied his present position. He did not refuse to execute those laws, however much they may have been condemned by his judgment. But he could stand it no longer. Having made up his mind that the purchase and distribution of improved seeds was a wasteful expenditure on the part of the Government, he determined that he would put a stop to it. How? Why, simply by refusing to execute the law; and having resolved to try the experiment, he looked around for a pretext to justify it.

Accordingly, quoting the language of the statute, "for the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings," etc., underscoring and laying stress upon the words "as required by law," he writes a letter to the Attorney-General of the United States and propounds to him the question:

> Can the Secretary of Agriculture legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to wit, seeds "rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent change from one part of our own country to another," under authority of the act of March 2, 1895?

The answer to this question he had doubtless discovered in advance would be favorable to his purpose. The Attorney-General, replying officially, places a convenient construction upon the words emphasized by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that official finds in that construction the pretext for the nonexecution of the law which he was seeking.

Mr. President, the question as to how far executive officers may go in withholding assent to the execution of an act formally enacted into law is one that strikes pretty close to the foundations of our institutions. It involves a consideration of the extent of legislative power, and of the means by which that authority may be enforced. It involves expunging, even, an act of Congress from the statute books. This attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to take a law of Congress by the throat and hold it up, refusing his assent to its execution, is not the first time that such a thing has been attempted under the present Administration.

In the sundry civil act of the last session of the late Congress a provision was inserted directing the payment of $5,238,000 to the sugar producers of the United States in recognition of the equity of their claim for payment of part of the bounty earned upon the sugar crop of the calendar year 1894.

It will be recollected that eight months of the calendar year of 1894 had expired before the provisions of the McKinley bounty law were repealed, and during those eight months the crops of cane and beets from which sugar is made had been cultivated and laid by, and all that was necessary was to await their full maturity before commencing to manufacture the cane in the one instance and the beets in the other into sugar. As the cultivation of the cane and beet crops had more and more progressed, as more and more money had been expended in their cultivation, so had the bounty upon the crop of 1894 been more and more earned. So that when the McKinley bounty provisions were repealed by the Wilson Act, more than half of the bounty upon the sugar crop of that year had been fairly earned, and in recognition of this Congress made the appropriation to which I have referred.

But it seems that Congress may enact but executive officers will avoid. Accordingly when this provision of law reached the Treasury Department and had gone through the preliminary stages of its execution, in its further execution it came before an official known as the Comptroller of the Treasury. He took that law by the throat as a highwayman holds up a traveler and prevented its execution. It made no difference to him that the law-making power of the Federal Government, in unison with the executive authority acting through the President, had concurred in the enactment of the law. It made no difference to him that when the President of the United States had affixed his approval to the act, he acted for the entire executive branch of the Government, and thereby precluded further question of its validity by such branch.

It would seem, Mr. President, that prior to that time the source of veto power under our system had been thought to be lodged solely in the Chief Executive of the Republic, but we learned on that occasion that another and even greater veto power had lain dormant all the years that the Republic had existed, and suddenly rose into life and activity through the official personality of the Comptroller of the Treasury. The President of the United States, under the Constitution, when he vetoes a measure must veto it as a whole or approve it as a whole; but not so with the Comptroller of the Treasury. He is limited by no such narrow confines. No pent-up Utica circumscribes his boundless power. The appropriation bill may pass muster before the President and be approved by him, and yet when it reaches the Treasury Department the Comptroller, exercising a power greater even than that which the President is given by the Constitution, selects out of the act certain items of appropriation which do not measure up to his constitutional test, or his idea of validity, and deliberately runs his pen through the same.

For the first time in the history of the Government the power was distinctly claimed by a subordinate official of the Federal Government, charged with the execution of a law, that he could call into question its constitutionality. The Comptroller of the Treasury, holding that the appropriation for the payment of the bounty upon sugar in the sundry civil appropriation act last passed was unconstitutional, claimed the right to withhold his execution of that law because of unconstitutionality. Prior to that time it had been thought the Constitution vested in the courts alone the authority to pass on the constitutionality of laws.

When the President of the United States, in exercising his prerogative of veto, vetoes a measure because he deems it to be unconstitutional, and the two Houses of Congress, in the exercise of their constitutional prerogative, pass the measure over the Executive veto by the necessary two-thirds majority it is as much a law of the land as though it had been signed instead of vetoed by the President. And after that, notwithstanding the opinions of the President are not changed, still believing, as he may, that there is no warrant in the Constitution for such a measure, he must, under the duties prescribed to him in the Constitution, and under his oath of office, proceed to its execution. But the Comptroller of the Treasury, in the powers claimed by him and for him, went far beyond anything of that kind. Under the view of the authority vested in him, taken by the Comptroller himself, it makes no difference to him whether or not the Executive power of veto of a measure has been exhausted before it reaches him in due process of its execution. Even if the President vetoed a bill and it had been passed over his veto and had gone to the Comptroller for his execution, he could exercise anew the power of veto and strike from it any provision or any appropriation which did not measure up to his idea of a constitutional test. So mighty is the Comptroller of the Treasury!

In the case to which I have referred he exercised that power, though the President had approved the act. Claiming the right to call in question the validity of the appropriation, he announced a suspension of the law, and, further, that on a certain day a hearing would be had before him touching the validity of this particular appropriation. In other words, he arrogated to himself the functions of a court, resolved himself into a branch of the judiciary, and invited the citizens of the United States interested in the appropriation to appear before him in person or by counsel to argue before him, a subordinate executive official, whether or not the law should be executed by him. And the remarkable spectacle was presented of three gentlemen, who, as Senators of the United States, occupying seats upon this floor, had assisted in the passage of the act, and of two gentlemen of the other House, acting in the same capacity in that body, impelled by a sense of duty, appearing before this subordinate executive officer and submitting arguments for the execution of a statute!

It had been thought prior to that time that when gentlemen holding high positions in the legislative branch of the Government had discharged their proper and legitimate functions by taking part in the enactment of a law by the body to which they were accredited, their duties ended, but in these degenerate times it would seem that their duties do not end, and they must follow up into the Executive Department to which the act goes the law which they assisted in enacting and there see to its execution.

Mr. President, under the view taken by the Comptroller of the Treasury, if he could question the validity of the appropriation to which I have alluded, then, sir, no appropriation whatever is safe. If he could hold up, as he did, the disbursement of the money appropriated to pay the sugar producers of the United

States the equitable claim which was theirs and which Congress had recognized, then I submit that he could hold up any other appropriation enacted by Congress. If this extraordinary power is to go unquestioned, the time may come when some future Comptroller of the Treasury, holding office in the time of a great war, in which perhaps the life of the Republic itself is involved, and Congress should appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to put the country in a condition of defense, may sit in judgment upon such appropriation and decree it to be invalid and unconstitutional and refuse his assent to its execution. This may be an extreme case to put, but not an impossible one.

Prior to the extraordinary position assumed by the Comptroller it was thought that all that was necessary to enact a measure into law was for it to pass both Houses of Congress and receive the Executive approval, or else in case of his veto of a measure that it should be passed by the constitutional two-thirds majority over his veto by the two Houses of Congress. But it would seem, under this new order of things, that an act of Congress is not a law, that a measure is not enacted into law until it shall have passed both Houses of Congress, received the Executive approval, and then the roll is called upon it in the Department of Agriculture, in the one instance, and in the Treasury Department in the other, and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Comptroller of the Treasury answer "aye."

Mr. President, pretensions of this kind on the part of any executive officer must be repudiated by all sound opinion. In the case of the sugar bounty appropriation it did not matter with this Treasury official that the bounty law had been executed by him in several preceding years, and that from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000, all told, had been paid out to the sugar producers of the United States by the present Administration on claims approved by the Comptroller of the Treasury. This was done in the calendar years 1891, 1892, and 1893; millions of dollars paid out before he became conscious of the extraordinary veto power lodged in him; twenty-five or thirty million dollars paid out by the Treasury officials on claims approved by this very Comptroller before he conceived the idea that such appropriations were without constitutional warrant, and only when it came to the tail end of the execution of the bounty law, after about $40,000,000 in all (including prior payments) had been paid out to the sugar producers in the time following the enactment of the McKinley Act, when only this $5,238,000 was left to be disbursed, he arrogates to himself the authority of asserting the unconstitutionality of such appropriations, and withholds his assent to the payment of the few millions yet to be disbursed before the bounty policy was to finally terminate.

Mr. President, I deemed this a fitting occasion to call to the attention of the Senate of the United States this usurpation of authority on the part of a subordinate executive officer. While the Senate is considering the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], requiring the execution of a law of Congress by the head of one of the Executive Departments, it is opportune to call the attention of the country to another glaring and flagrant usurpation of power in the Treasury Department growing out of the conduct of the Comptroller of the Treasury alluded to.

I do this, Mr. President, in the hope that the Judiciary Committee of this body, to which this matter of the refusal of the Comptroller to execute the law of Congress has been referred, will find time to investigate the extraordinary conduct of this executive official and take some action to vindicate the law making power of the Government; and I do so in the further hope that the Senate of the United States, if it can find time from its work of attaching silver linings to the legislative clouds that hover in and about this Chamber, will give some attention itself to the way in which one of the laws in which this body participated has been ruthlessly set aside by a subordinate official of the Government.

Mr. President, the action which the Senate is asked to take on the pending resolution has back of it a precedent which occurred in the Thirty-sixth Congress. It would seem, sir, that at that time, in 1860, a Comptroller of that period refused to execute an act of Congress, just as the Secretary of Agriculture is now refusing to execute an act of the late Congress. On one of the appropriation bills of that year was attached the following provision of law:

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That the First Comptroller of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, required to adjust the damages due to Edward H. Carmick and Albert C. Ramsey, on account of the abrogation by the Postmaster-General of their contract to carry the mail on the Vera Cruz, Acapulco, and San Francisco route, dated the 15th of February, 1853, to adjudge and award to them according to the principles of law, equity, and justice the amount so found due. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby required to pay the same to said Carmick & Ramsey out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

When that provision of law reached the Treasury Department the Comptroller refused to execute it. It makes no difference upon what ground he based his refusal. It is not for any executive officer to question the wisdom or propriety of the enactment of a law. His duty is confined to the execution of the law. So, the Comptroller, going out of his way to question the propriety of the enactment of the statute, refused his assent to its execution. When the Senate of the United States met thereafter the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That a select committee of five be appointed to inquire whether the sixth section of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post-Office Department during the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1859," has been executed by the First Comptroller of the Treasury, and whether any further legislation is necessary to carry into effect said act, and report by bill or otherwise.

The select committee of five was appointed and took the matter under consideration. I hold in my hand the elaborate report made by the committee. It is known as Senate report 270, Thirty-sixth Congress, first session.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me to ask him a question? Was the resolution which he has just read introduced in the Senate or in the other House?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It was introduced in the Senate, but the Senator from Delaware is informed that a similar resolution, touching the very case, was also introduced in the other House, only there the duty of examining into the conduct of the Comptroller was imposed upon the Judiciary Committee instead of a select committee.

Mr. GRAY. What was the purport of the report of the committee?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I shall read a part of it. The committee of the Senate took into consideration the right claimed now by the Secretary of Agriculture, and claimed last August by the Comptroller of the Treasury, to withhold execution of a statute. Their report says:

The first duty imposed by the resolution under which your committee is acting, and the first inquiry made by them, was to ascertain whether the sixth section of the said law had been executed, and they found that it had not, because the law can not be executed without an assessment of damages due to the parties, which the present Comptroller has refused to do. The former First Comptroller, Mr. Whittlesey, promptly took the case up and fully examined and considered the subject, decided some important points, and made a most elaborate and conclusive report in favor of it.

The present First Comptroller, however, in resistance to the mandates of law and in violation of its obligations, has interposed every obstacle and impediment which his ingenuity could suggest to prevent and defeat its proper execution. And the committee regret to say that other officers of the Government, having no official connection whatever with the subject, also interposed to prevent the law from being carried into effect according to its purpose and its terms. Their action, however, could have no legal effect, because this is a question over which they had no jurisdiction.

I skip much of the report and come to the following paragraph:

The Comptroller alone was amenable to the President and to Congress for the faithful execution of the law, and to no one else. He could not divide his responsibility; and the opinion of the Attorney-General, or the opinion of any other officer of the Government, even of the President himself, could not absolve the Comptroller or release him from his obligation and duty to execute the will of Congress as expressed by the law.

Mr. President, that has a direct bearing upon the instant case. Here the Secretary of Agriculture seeks refuge in his refusal to execute this law behind the opinion of the Attorney-General, and yet the report of the select committee of the Senate declared that even the opinion of the Attorney-General did not release this executive officer from the duty to execute the will of Congress.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the fact that the opinion of the Attorney-General in the case of the Secretary of Agriculture by no means sustains his position.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I agree with that. Nevertheless the Secretary of Agriculture claims that it does sustain him. But if it does, here is a high authority which decided that an executive officer could not shield himself from liability behind the opinion of the Attorney-General.

Mr. President, I see the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, at which the morning hour, in which I am speaking, ceases. I would like to conclude my remarks, and therefore ask unanimous consent of the Senate to proceed, promising to conclude in a few moments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. DUBOIS, proposing an amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the request of the Senator from Louisiana will be granted.

Mr. DUBOIS. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I do not think I will occupy more than ten minutes.

Mr. DUBOIS. Very well. I ask that the regular order be laid aside temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the regular order may be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senator from Louisiana may conclude his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Louisiana will proceed.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am asked by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to give the name of the Senator who was chairman of the select committee from whose report I have quoted. His name was Green. This report was submitted to the Senate of the United States on the 12th of June, 1860, by Mr. Green of Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. James S. Green.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, following the paragraph in the report I last read appears a further discussion of this matter, which I will omit, and come to the concluding part of the report. It is as follows:

Now, in considering the peculiar circumstances of this case, it becomes a matter of very grave inquiry to know how far any executive, ministerial, or subordinate officer of the Government can be permitted to go behind the law, or question the motives or action of Congress to find excuses or reasons for the nonexecution of the law. If this be permitted without rebuke, it would be subversive of all law; it would, in fact, be an end of all Government; because, if the legal agents of the Government appointed to execute the laws are, in their discretion or caprice, to question their policy or wisdom, and then refuse to execute them, all the functions of lawful government must cease.

The faithful execution of the law is imposed upon all the officers of the Government alike.

This duty is equally imperative upon all. From the President down to the lowest official, all are bound by this obligation. And the Constitution itself, ruling supreme over all, limiting and defining our rights, and prescribing our duties in the Federal Government, makes it the special duty of the President "to see that the laws are faithfully executed."

* * * * * * *

The main object of the committee is to vindicate the lawmaking power. Congress represents the people and the States, and is justly held responsible for its action. A mere deputy to investigate a fact of damages should not be permitted to nullify the act of Congress, whether right or wrong, nor should he be allowed to insult others by impugning their motives.

Mr. President, not willing to trust longer the execution of the law to the Comptroller, despairing of coercion being brought to bear upon him by the then Chief Executive to compel its execution, the select committee saw fit to recommend to the Senate that the power of executing the law be taken out of his hands and vested in other officers of the Government who would have regard to the legislative will. Accordingly they reported this resolution:

Be it resolved, That the power devolved on, and the duty required to be performed by, the First Comptroller of the Treasury, to assess the damages due the parties under the sixth section of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department during the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1857," be, and the same are hereby, transferred to and vested in, and shall hereafter be performed by, the Register of the Treasury and Commissioner of Patents.

In that time the lawmaking power vindicated its authority to have its acts executed, and it is to be hoped, now that this Congress has had called to its attention two glaring instances of the refusal of executive officers to execute the law, and when there appears to be no hope that the Chief Executive of the Republic will require at the hands of these appointees of his its execution, that the legislative branch of the Government will again vindicate its authority by taking some action to compel these officials to the performance of their duties.

I have here also the report made by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to the Thirty-sixth Congress upon the same refusal of the First Comptroller to execute the law at that time. The matter was taken up in the House of Representatives under a resolution adopted instructing the Judiciary Committee to investigate. It did so, and through Mr. Billinghurst submitted a report, which I will not take up the time of the Senate to read in full. One paragraph, concluding the report, I will, however, read. It is as follows:

Congress has taken its share of responsibility in declaring that a contract existed, was abrogated, and that damages are due. Whether it has wisely or unwisely met and discharged that responsibility is not a question that can be reviewed now by the First Comptroller, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster-General, or the President. That is a closed question. The President has approved the law.

In the opinion of your committee, it is the duty of the First Comptroller to execute the existing law.

Mr. President, if precedent were needed in the effort which is now being made in this body to vindicate the lawmaking power of the Government by compelling a stubborn Secretary of Agriculture to execute a law, here is the precedent. But even if a precedent did not exist in a case like this, where there has been a flagrant omission of public duty by a public officer, the Senate of the United States should itself make a precedent.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator yield to me for just one moment?

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, rising to the unfinished business, I wish to express my regret that the Senator from Louisiana has seen fit, in the able and scathing arraignment he has made of the action of the Comptroller of the Treasury in setting at naught a law of Congress, passed with the disapproval of the President, to link with it a denunciation of the Secretary of Agriculture for executing a law of Congress. I agree with him in regard to what he said as to the action of the First Comptroller in seeking to nullify an act of Congress. I believe with him that it was beyond the scope of the duty and the power of that officer to declare a law, passed with all the forms which are prescribed for legislation, to be unconstitutional; but that was a distinct refusal to execute a law, and the Senator links with that a denunciation of the Secretary of Agriculture for deciding that he will execute a law according to its terms and according to the lettering in which it is written upon the statute book. He finds fault with that distinguished and able Cabinet officer for observing the limitations that a law enacted by Congress placed upon his powers; that law in regard to the distribution of seeds, about which so much has been said, being:

That the purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture—

I read from section 527 of the Revised Statutes—

shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country.

Because the Secretary of Agriculture sought to confine himself to that limitation placed upon his power he is joined as an object of denunciation with the Comptroller of the Treasury for refusing to confine his powers and his duties to the strict letter of a Congressional enactment.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the Senator from Delaware will yield to me for a moment, I would say——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Perhaps before the Senator came into the Chamber, in the beginning of my remarks, I took occasion to say that the Secretary of Agriculture had taken refuge behind a pretext for his refusal to execute that law, and that pretext was an opinion of the Attorney-General.

Mr. GRAY. The part of the Senator's speech which it was my good fortune to hear made no discrimination in its denunciation of those two officers. Both were held up as declining to execute a law, when I here point out to the Senator and to the Senate that the law applying to the Secretary of Agriculture was strictly construed by him according to its letter and unmistakable terms. The law says that he shall confine himself to the distribution of "such seeds as are rare and uncommon"; and that he attempted to do.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture did not confine himself to that construction the year previously.

Mr. GRAY. And in that construction the Secretary of Agriculture was supported by the first law officer of the Government, if indeed it was necessary in a case so plain to apply to that officer to make an official construction of the law. I ask the Senator from Louisiana what interpretation he would have given to that law if the Secretary of Agriculture had asked him what it meant when it said he must confine himself to the distribution of the seeds there described?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I am under restraint as to time, there being another matter pressing.

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon, and shall not trespass on his time further.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I beg a moment to answer the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ALLISON. For a moment.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The Senator from Delaware asked me a question, which I desire to answer. He wants to know what construction I would have put upon the law which he read, if my opinion had been asked by the Secretary of Agriculture. Had I been Secretary of Agriculture and had executed that same provision of law for the three preceding years, I should not have stultified myself by refusing to execute it the fourth year. The opinion of the Attorney-General should have been asked earlier in his administration. The Secretary of Agriculture has done something for three years, and then suddenly discovers in the fourth that it can not lawfully be done. The country will adjudge it a mere pretext.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes; agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HULL, Mr. TRACEY, and Mr. MCCLELLAN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;*

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism, and

fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and the District of Columbia; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. DUBOIS proposing an amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I now resume the floor, and move that the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, and all amendments thereto, be referred to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the same to the Senate on the first Monday of December next, with or without amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that resolution is to be disposed of without debate I have no objection. Otherwise, in pursuance of the notice I gave this morning, I propose to move an adjournment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HALE. I wish to ask the Senator a question. It is not intended that this motion shall in any way be an instruction to the Committee on Rules as to what its report shall be, favorable or unfavorable?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. PALMER. I desire to ask whether there is any unanimous-consent agreement that this question shall now be disposed of without debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not informed.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. PALMER. The motion of the Senator from Iowa involves a disposition of the resolution of the Senator from Idaho which I think fairly admits of discussion.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PALMER. I do.

Mr. DUBOIS. I wish to submit a statement. I understand, I think correctly, that there will be some amendment or substitute offered for the resolution.

Mr. HILL. I intend to offer a substitute.

Mr. DUBOIS. And that no debate will be had on it. I think Senators understand the question thoroughly, and the different phases of it will be presented by amendments which Senators can vote upon as they see fit.

Mr. PALMER. The question whether there shall or shall not be debate, of course, is largely under the control of the Senator from Idaho, but at last I suppose it must be referred to the individual judgment of each Senator as to whether he desires to be heard on the question or not.

I desire to state that I very earnestly and cordially support the proposition of the Senator from Idaho, and I should like to see it adopted; but I desire before any other step is taken to express my views on the subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PALMER. I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. Did I understand the Senator to say that he desired to debate the resolution at this time?

Mr. PALMER. I have no objection to the resolution going over until another day if that be the wish of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

Mr. ALLISON. Before that motion is put, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to yield to me until I move, as he moved a while ago, that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield for that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. DUBOIS. I trust if the pending resolution is not disposed of that that motion will be beaten.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will withdraw that for a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I withdraw it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to yield to me until I make a request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to take the sense of the Senate in respect to a proposition that the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins be the unfinished business of the Senate immediately after the matter the Senator from Idaho has in charge is disposed of.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator except appropriation bills?

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. DUBOIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] has the floor.

Mr. PALMER. I thought I had the floor, Mr. President. I yielded to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] for a suggestion, but I supposed I was still on the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois is correct. He is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PALMER. I merely desired that my right should be recognized. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, I wish to appeal to the Senator from Idaho, who has the pending resolution in charge, that he ask unanimous consent to dispose of it now. I think the Senator from Illinois will permit a vote to be taken upon the resolution, as it has been before the Senate for a considerable length of time. If it goes over until Monday it will take one day and perhaps two days more. Everybody is here and willing to vote upon the proposition now, and I ask the Senator from Idaho to request unanimous consent that it may now be disposed of.

Mr. DUBOIS. I stated during the morning hour that if the matter could be disposed of without debate at 2 o'clock I should be very glad to have it come to a termination. I did not ask unanimous consent then, because some objection was raised, but I made the statement that if we could dispose of the resolution without debate at 2 o'clock that would be agreeable to me. I maintain that position now.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Idaho if he objects to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. DUBOIS. I object very much to the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I insist on my motion to adjourn.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Idaho will ask unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has not asked unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. That I object to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York objects.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to determine.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and taken.

Mr. BERRY. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. CALL (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. I do not think he has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has not voted, the Chair is informed.

Mr. CALL. Then I withdraw my vote and announce my pair with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. TELLER] is detained from the Chamber to-day by illness. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], as has been announced.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 52; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Baker,	Hawley,	Palmer,	Vest,
Caffery,	Hill,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Cannon,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	Warren.
Chandler,	McBride,	Sherman,	
Gallinger,	Mills,	Smith,	
Harris,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,	

NAYS—52.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hoar,	Pugh,
Allen,	Daniel,	Kyle,	Quay,
Allison,	Davis,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Bacon,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Mantle,	Squire,
Blanchard,	Frye,	Martin,	Thurston,
Brice,	Gear,	Mitchell, Wis.	Tillman,
Brown,	George,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Butler,	Gibson,	Nelson,	Vilas,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Carter,	Gray,	Peffer,	Wetmore,
Clark,	Hale,	Perkins,	Wilson,
Cockrell,	Hansbrough,	Platt,	Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—16.

Berry,	Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,
Blackburn,	Elkins,	Jones, Nev.	Shoup,
Burrows,	Gordon,	Morrill,	Teller,
Call,	Irby,	Murphy,	White.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. Let the motion be stated.

Mr. HILL. I offer what I send to the desk as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. I understand the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] desires to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the proposed substitute.

The Secretary read as follows:

This amendment shall not take effect, however, until on and after the first Monday of December next.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from New York is not a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Iowa. It is an amendment to the original proposition.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. A motion to refer can not be amended in that way.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am satisfied that under the rules no motion can be made to affect the motion of the Senator from Iowa except a resolution that will modify, change, or amend the instructions to the committee.

Mr. MILLS. That is this amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. A motion which embodies the main feature, which is a reference to the committee with instructions, is the only amendment that can be made. It takes precedence of all other motions.

Mr. HILL. There are no particular instructions as to the matter to be reported. The motion of the Senator from Iowa is to report at a particular time. That is all it is.

This is a proper substitute, because it does away in effect with the effect of the motion. For instance, without intending to reopen the discussion, permit me simply to say that it was suggested here that the resolution originally ought to have been referred to the Committee on Rules, and that the committee should have reported it. Therefore the suggestion is now made by a motion that the resolution shall be referred to the committee with instructions to report at a particular time, not a particular thing, but at a given time. As a substitute for that motion, to meet the objection, it is proposed that the amendment to the rules itself shall not take effect until the very date when it is proposed that the Committee on Rules shall report.

It strikes me that the substitute is germane to the question, because there are presented the two phases of the controversy. One is that the resolution shall be referred to the committee, not simply a general reference—that is not the question—but a reference with instructions to report at a particular time, on a given day. Those who favor that motion recognize the propriety of some postponement of action. I propose by the substitute that the amendment of the rules shall not go into effect until a particular day. We provide by the substitute a counter proposition, not that the resolution shall be referred to a particular committee, not that that committee shall report at a particular time, but that the amendment of the rules which the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] directs shall be reported on the first Monday of December shall itself not go into effect until that time.

There are the two propositions involving the question before us, and to say that one is not a substitute for the other is to violate every principle of parliamentary law.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New York, in seeking to accomplish this purpose, has forgotten the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. He always does.

Mr. HILL. A little louder, please.

Mr. HALE. There is an order in which motions shall be entertained, and one of those orders is a motion to refer or to refer with instructions. When that motion is made it cuts off all amendments to the original proposition, and the motion must be entertained and a vote taken upon the motion to refer with instructions or an amendment to the instructions. There can be no doubt whatever about it. There is no man who has been in the Senate and subject to its rules and is willing to be subject to its rules who does not know it.

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. And having said that, I am willing to leave it to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order that has been made and rules the amendment out of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to submit an amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I ask whether the Chair has ruled the amendment out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has so ruled.

Mr. MILLS. Then I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have submitted an amendment to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. MILLS. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Mr. GALLINGER moves to amend by inserting after the word "back" the word "favorably."

Mr. MILLS. That is just what I was going to do.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] wishes to be heard on this question, and I hope he will not be cut off.

Mr. ALDRICH. He does not wish to speak on this particular amendment.

Mr. PALMER. I have no interest in this particular question, and so long as these questions are depending in the Senate I do not desire to occupy its attention.

I will make another remark at this point. I observe all around the Senate very great anxiety to vote and dispose of this question now. I think I discover that the main question, that in which I am most deeply interested, has already been disposed of. My idea would be to adopt this proposition now and provide for its going into effect from to-morrow, taking all the possible and imaginary consequences that might result from it. If that is not my good fortune, I have no desire to occupy the time of the Senate in submitting remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] moves to lay upon the table the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. FAULKNER. I make that motion because the other one is such a fair proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask that the motion be again read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the motion be read as it will read if amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the motion as it will read if the amendment should be adopted.

The SECRETARY. If amended the motion will read as follows:

To refer the resolution and amendments to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the same back favorably to the Senate on the first Monday of December next, either with or without amendment.

Mr. HALE. It is understood that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] does not make the motion in that form.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will include in my amendment the striking out of the latter part of the motion, "either with or without amendment."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the motion will be modified to that extent.

Mr. GRAY. Let the Secretary state the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. FAULKNER. Let the motion be read, and then let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will first read the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. ALLISON moves to refer the motion and amendments to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on the first Monday of December next, either with or without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will now state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. Mr. GALLINGER moves to insert after the word "back" the word "favorably"——

Mr. GALLINGER. And to strike out.

The SECRETARY. And to strike out the words at the end of the resolution, as follows: "Either with or without amendment."

Mr. MILLS. Let the motion be read as it will read if amended.

The SECRETARY. So that, if amended, the motion will read as follows:

To refer the resolution and amendments to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back favorably to the Senate on the first Monday of December next.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the amendment be divided; that the motion to insert be separated from the motion to strike out. The two propositions in the amendment are not at all inconsistent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. FAULKNER. The motion before the Senate is to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Is the question on the motion to refer or on the motion to lay the amendment on the table?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HALE. To lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. On that the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CANNON (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], but he and I agreeing, as we do, upon all questions in respect to the resolution, and as I understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] stands paired upon this question with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MANTLE (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. VEST (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DANIEL (after having voted in the negative). I desire to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Lindsay,	Sherman,
Allen,	Faulkner,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Allison,	Frye,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Bacon,	Gear,	Pasco,	Vilas,
Bate,	Gibson,	Peffer,	Voorhees,
Berry,	Gorman,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Brice,	Gray,	Platt,	Warren,
Caffery,	Hale,	Pugh,	Wetmore,
Cameron,	Harris,	Quay,	Wolcott.
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Sewell,	

NAYS—29.

Baker,	Dubois,	McBride,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Squire,
Brown,	George,	Mills,	Tillman,
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	White,
Butler,	Hawley,	Nelson,	Wilson.
Carter,	Hill,	Palmer,	
Chilton,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Davis,	Lodge,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—21.

Blackburn,	Elkins,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Call,	Gordon,	Morrill,	Teller,
Cannon,	Irby,	Murphy,	Vest.
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	
Clark,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	
Daniel,	Mantle,	Shoup,	

So Mr. GALLINGER's amendment to the motion was laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DUBOIS. I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Iowa on the table.

Mr. HALE. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH answered to his name.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, the answer to which may save a roll call. If that motion prevails, does it not lay the whole subject on the table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would, undoubtedly.

Mr. HALE. Let the roll call proceed.

Mr. HILL. What was the parliamentary inquiry? I did not hear it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whether, if the motion to lay on the table is agreed to, the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and the amendments pending will be laid on the table

Mr. CULLOM. Would it lay upon the table the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], which is the main question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that it would.

Mr. HILL. Nor any other amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except those pending to the single motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HILL. Certainly all those amendments, but none other is pending.

Mr. GRAY. There is no other amendment pending.

Mr. MILLS. I ask that the amendment may be stated.

Mr. GRAY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I ask the Chair to state what the motion is and what the effect of it will be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is to lay on the table the motion to refer made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. The question was asked whether or not, if that motion prevailed, it would carry with it the amendments pending to it. The Chair ruled that it would.

Mr. HILL. Are any amendments pending?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not know.

Mr. HILL. There is none. So that it carries nothing, but simply lays the motion to refer on the table.

Mr. HOAR. As I understand, a motion to lay on the table the motion to refer carries the whole subject with it. Formerly a motion to lay on the table an amendment, if adopted, carried the whole subject. We were obliged to provide for that by a special rule.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. HOAR. I beg pardon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I answered to my name, and it strikes me that the discussion is out of order.

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my sentence.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the point. It does not carry the main question with it to the table. The rules are explicit on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Rhode Island makes the point that the roll call has commenced and a response has been made, the Chair will sustain it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not make it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island does not make the point of order.

Mr. HOAR. Otherwise the motion would not be in order. There are certain motions in order. One is to report with or without instructions. No one of them can be disposed of by a motion to lay on the table——

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Without carrying the whole subject with it. That is the proposition I make.

Mr. HILL. Then, the other amendment having been laid on the table, if the Senator's argument is correct the whole subject is laid on the table.

Mr. HOAR. We have a special rule in regard to amendments. Any amendment can be laid on the table without carrying anything with it. I myself am the author of that special rule. Until the last three or five years you could not lay an amendment on the table without carrying the whole subject with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. My friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], I think has fallen into an error. The proposition to lay the motion to refer on the table simply denies the motion to refer and the Senate retains before it the subject-matter under discussion. It seems to me that is perfectly clear. While I sympathize with the Senator in the votes he has given, I myself can not sustain that construction of our rules. Such a construction would work great damage at different times.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Ohio will permit me, I will read the rule.

When an amendment proposed to any pending measure—

Any pending measure—

is laid on the table it shall not carry with it or prejudice such measure.

Mr. HOAR. That is the rule.

Mr. CULLOM. That does not touch the main question before the Senate, which is the motion to refer.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes; it does.

Mr. GRAY. The motion to refer is not an amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. As the Senator from Delaware says, the motion to refer is not an amendment. If the motion to refer is laid on the table the next question will be on the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho. Those who want to take up the resolution had better vote to lay the motion to refer on the table. Those who do not had better vote to sustain the motion to refer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us know what the decision is.

Mr. HILL. It does not lay the whole question upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would be very strongly inclined when the point comes up at its proper place to submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is inclined to think the point is well taken, and that it does carry the whole question, but it does not propose so to rule now.

Mr. HARRIS. It seems to me vitally important that every Senator should understand the effect of the vote that he is to give upon this motion. If it is to have one effect I should vote one way. If the motion to lay on the table simply carries to the table the motion to refer made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], I should vote one way, but if the motion to lay on the table carries with it the resolution, disposes of the whole subject, then I should vote another way. I think it vitally important that the Senate and every Senator should understand the effect of the vote that he is to give on this proposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair is compelled to rule he would rule that it carried the whole question.

Mr. HILL. I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has not ruled yet.

Mr. DUBOIS. Of course Senators desire to vote advisedly on this question, and it seems to me we can reach the same conclusion by a simpler method; that is, by my withdrawing the motion to lay on the table, and thus let the vote come directly on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HALE. That is it.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. DUBOIS. Therefore I withdraw my motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the motion is withdrawn. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. ALLEN. Let it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. ALLISON moves to refer the resolution and amendments to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on the first Monday of December, either with or without amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Question!

Mr. CULLOM. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CANNON (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I beg leave to state that I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. MANTLE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. VILAS (when Mr. VEST's name was called). The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who was a short time since called from the Chamber, desired me, in case he was not able to return, to announce that he is paired on this question with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], and that if present he would vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 40, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hoar,	Sewell,
Allison,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Sherman,
Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan,	Smith,
Bate,	Gear,	Mitchell, Wis.	Thurston,
Berry,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Brice,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Burrows,	Gray,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Caffery,	Hale,	Platt,	Warren,
Cameron,	Harris,	Pugh,	Wetmore,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Quay,	Wolcott.

NAYS—28.

Allen,	Davis,	Lodge,	Pritchard,
Baker,	Dubois,	McBride,	Roach,
Blanchard,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Squire,
Brown,	George,	Mills,	Tillman,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Carter,	Hill,	Palmer,	White,
Chilton,	Kyle,	Peffer,	Wilson.

NOT VOTING—21.

Blackburn,	Elkins,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Call,	Gordon,	Morrill,	Teller,
Cannon,	Irby,	Murphy,	Vest.
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	
Clark,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	
Daniel,	Mantle,	Shoup,	

So the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins be made the unfinished business in the Senate, excepting appropriation bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the joint resolution relating to the distribution of seeds shall be made the unfinished business of the Senate as against all other business except appropriation bills. Is there objection?

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will ask the Senate to agree upon a time to vote upon the joint resolution. There are several resolutions, the Cuban resolution particularly, that I desire to have brought up as soon as the appropriation bills will allow. I suggest to the Senator that he ask unanimous consent that we shall vote on the joint resolution at a particular time.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will say to the Senator from Florida that on Monday morning I shall endeavor to reach an agreement of that kind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from North Dakota will remember that I yielded to him upon his joint resolution a day or two ago with the understanding that the resolution offered by me in relation to the bill reported by the Committee on Finance shall be taken up on Monday and shall have precedence of all other business.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania continues as morning business. It went over without prejudice and is a part of the morning business on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

GAINESVILLE, M'ALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, in line 11, after the word "Arkansas," to insert:

SEC. 3. That section 3 of said act be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That a right of way of 100 feet in width through said Indian Territory is hereby granted to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railway Company and a strip of land 100 feet in width, with a length of 2,000 feet in addition to the right of way is granted for such stations as may be established, but such grant shall be allowed but once for every 10 miles of the road, no portion of which shall be sold or leased by the company, with the right to use such additional grounds where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 50 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*, That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein granted shall be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone line, and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall have been taken."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of said act be amended by striking out all after the word "*Provided*" and inserting the following: "That a map of definite location showing the entire route of said road through the Indian Territory shall be filed and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any part of the said road shall be constructed."

Mr. CHILTON. I ask the Senate to concur in the House amendment. It is merely a formal one. The bill has already passed the Senate. It had the approbation of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and passed the Senate. It went to the other House, and they have made an amendment which is acceptable to the parties interested. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PATENTS IN POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. KYLE. I submit a resolution calling for information. I presume there will be no objection to its consideration now. It is very short.

Mr. CHANDLER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire objects.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. KYLE. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will allow this resolution to go through. It merely calls for information.

Mr. CHANDLER. I gave notice that I would move an adjournment at 2 o'clock.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to have my resolution read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

Mr. LODGE. I object to any further business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. KYLE. May I not introduce the resolution and have it read and go over until Monday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to that request? The resolution, without objection, will be received.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inform the Senate whether any person or persons in the employ of the Post-Office Department has applied for or has received any patent for an invention or improvement of existing invention made or received since his entry into the employ of the Post-Office Department touching any article used by such Department; and whether such employee has received any royalty in respect to the same.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the Senate to take up and consider——

Mr. LODGE. I thought a motion to adjourn had been made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I have the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that I have had the floor on a motion to adjourn for a long time. It was understood that Senators upon this side of the Chamber wished an adjournment at 2 o'clock for a particular purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. I have the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a matter never interfered with before that I know of in the history of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is giving me a piece of information I did not possess.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand perfectly. I know the Senator did not mean to insist upon it.

Mr. DANIEL. I always respect a consideration of that sort. I did not understand the situation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Unless in the case of very urgent business, I must insist on my motion.

Mr. DANIEL. I will not make the motion that I intended to make.

Mr. CHANDLER. I would prefer to have the Senator withhold his motion, as I have a motion to adjourn pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 10, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 6, 1896.*

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 10.30 a. m. (Friday, February 7), and was called to order by the Speaker.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, not to retract anything that I have said or to apologize for anything that I have said, but it having been——

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] that as the meeting this morning is for debate only on a particular subject——

Mr. TALBERT. I will state that I would like to be heard now. I have been misrepresented by the press——

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman whether it would not be best for him to wait until the session opens at 12 o'clock, when an opportunity will be afforded——

Mr. TALBERT. I would prefer to go on right now and make my statement. Will you recognize me, Mr. Speaker, at 12 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be obliged to recognize the gentleman on "a question of personal privilege." The Chair thinks it would be better that the gentleman should not proceed now, because these understandings in regard to order of business ought never under any circumstances to be violated.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

The House, according to order, resumed the consideration of the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of the revenue.

[Mr. NEWLANDS addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, the issue presented by this bill is a plain one between the policy of gold monometallism as against bimetallism. No ingenuity of words or plausibility of statement can disguise the plain situation presented at this time. No gentleman here will deny that we are now on a gold monometallic basis. To be relieved of that basis, and of the conditions produced by it, the Senate framed and passed the bill now under consideration. In the able argument of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] against this bill, every argument possible to be presented in the time occupied by him adverse to the bill was placed before the House. The fact that that gentleman devoted his entire time to criticising the remedy proposed in the Senate bill and did not at any time give expression to any view favorable to the maintenance of the gold standard, but, on the contrary, especially avowed his fidelity to bimetallism, without pointing out any practical manner of achieving it, has left the House without the benefit of his valuable opinion upon that question, and has been to that extent a disappointment to many of us.

The gentleman from Maine is probably the best equipped man upon the floor of this House for the performance of his duty as a Representative of the people, and it is with great diffidence that I undertake to make any reply to the masterly presentation of the antifree-coinage argument made by him to the committee in the opening of this debate. That diffidence is not in the least dispelled by the thought that whatever may be said by me must be compressed within the small space allotted to me for the discussion of this great question. In his argument the gentleman from Maine charges that France and the Latin Union having entered into the agreement to maintain a bimetallic standard, were compelled to abandon that standard and were unable to maintain it. Upon what authority was such a statement made? The history of the transactions of those Governments with respect to the maintenance of bimetallic coinage nowhere discloses the inability of those Governments to maintain the coinage of gold and silver.

On the contrary, the reason assigned by France for her course in closing her mints to the coinage of silver was that she did not propose to aid her ancient foe, Germany, by absorbing her silver. I have been unable to find any authority to justify the statement that these nations were compelled, by reason of their inability to maintain the standard, to abandon it. The gentleman says that France and the United States are maintaining, tentatively, precisely the same coinage policy, not gold monometallism, but limited bimetallism. With every respect for that gentleman and for his profound knowledge of public questions, I most respectfully deny the truth of that statement.

The United States and France both have gold and silver money, but in France gold and silver are standard money, while in the United States, under the administration of a law declaratory of a bimetallic standard, gold is standard money and silver is token money. Gentlemen tell us that they are trying to do justice to both metals—to do justice between them. As well might a father undertake "to do justice" between two sons in this way: He might say to William, "I will give you $50,000, and you shall have a store on this side of the street"; and then he might say to John, "I will give you $50,000, and you shall have a store on the other side of the street." So far the action of that father would seem to do equal and exact justice between his sons; but if, after having made this equal division, he should march up and down the street and say to the people who came to buy: "Do not go near John's store; he sells bad goods; he will cheat you; he will not give you your money's worth; if you want to buy anything go to William's store"—if that father, professing to do equal and exact justice between his sons, should act in that manner, he would be acting as the Government of the United States acts with reference to gold and silver as money metals. Professing to treat them with equal justice, it practically says to the people and to the world: "We coin gold and silver as money, but take care to have nothing to do with our silver; it is bad money; it is worthless; it is a fraud."

Let the administration of the law governing our gold and silver currency be carried into effect upon the same lines and upon the same theory which obtains in the French Government, and the statement of the gentleman from Maine and those who act with him will be correct. Let the United States Government, the Government of a nation of 70,000,000 of people and sixty-five billions of wealth, follow the example of the great Bank of France and use the option which it possesses under the law to pay the demands against it in gold or silver, and the United States Government will stand on a par in its credit with the great French Republic.

Who has heard of any assaults upon the credit of France? Who has heard that her ability to pay any portion of her six billions of indebtedness has ever been questioned or doubted for a moment? What Frenchman has ever been compelled to read in the public prints charges that the money of his country, or any of it, was a cheap or worthless money?

France has 38,000,000 people, owes a debt of $6,000,000,000, and maintains $700,000,000 of silver currency at par with her gold. The United States has 70,000,000 people, owes a debt of $847,361,960, and had July 1, 1895, $500,243,653 of silver coin. And yet we are told that with our superiority of resources, with almost double her population, and less than one-seventh of her debt, we can not absorb and maintain at parity the annual product of the silver which would come to our mints. The total product of the world of gold and silver for the year 1894, at its coinage value, was only $216,892,000. Of this amount $113,095,000 was silver at its coinage value. Of this amount the United States produced only $64,000,000—less than $1 for every man, woman, and child within the limits of our country. Does anyone contend that, with the population of the United States increasing regularly at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, the trivial increase to the currency which would be occasioned by adding less than $1 per capita of silver would in any way imperil the parity of the two metals, if the United States would exercise its option and maintain the parity by redeeming its obligations as the law authorizes it to do, in either gold or silver?

Sir, it has always been the contention of the advocates of bimetallism on the part of the United States, independent of any other nation, that the exercise of the option conferred by law on the Government would maintain the parity both between the gold and silver coins, and between the coinage and market value of our silver.

That it would do so is best proved by the experience of France. The United States, under the administration of its laws as they now exist, is purely upon a gold basis. France, in the administration of its laws, is upon a bimetallic basis, not coining gold and silver freely, but using its option to pay either.

Every member of this House is probably familiar with the fact that if a citizen of this country or any other goes to the Bank of France with a draft upon which he desires money, he will be paid that money in either gold or silver at the option of that bank, and by this means, even with the persistent pressure on the part of gold-using countries to depreciate silver in the markets of the world, France has always maintained the integrity of her currency. And she is to-day a prosperous, thriving nation, while we are under the curse of the twin producers of cheapness—the gold standard and the Democratic tariff for revenue only.

The gentleman from Maine inquires for what reason the advocates of independent bimetallism believe that the United States could alone coin silver freely without detriment to the integrity of its currency? The answer to that is, first, that prior to its demonetization it did coin silver freely and without injury; second, Japan, with only 41,000,000 people, less skilled in the sciences and the arts than ours, and with fewer resources, coins silver freely, and presents a picture of prosperity to-day compared with which the depression in all branches of trade in all gold-standard countries is a standing, living rebuke to the assumption of superiority on the part of those nations claiming to have reached the highest civilization. This opinion is not alone entertained by the Senators and Representatives who vote for silver, and are therefore openly charged by the gold-standard press with personal dishonor and with actually misrepresenting their people, but the opinion has been countenanced and expressed by some of the highest authorities in the financial world. Sir Henry Hucks Gibbs, a director in the Bank of England, and a recognized authority in Great Britain upon monetary questions, before the English commission which met in 1888 to investigate the financial question, when asked if Great Britain alone could maintain bimetallism, promptly replied, "Yes, or any other great commercial nation."

The United States is the greatest producing nation on the globe. In its products consists its wealth. From its products its obligations must be paid. Their value measured in gold (and all values in the United States are now measured in gold) must of necessity be great or small according as the supply of the measure of value is limited or extensive.

The year 1895 has added to the world's supply of gold about $200,000,000. Of this amount about 75 per cent has been used in the arts and in supplying the losses from accumulated stocks of gold. Therefore there has actually been added to the gold currency of the world in the year 1895 about $50,000,000. The population of the world is about 1,500,000,000 of people. Therefore there has been added to the world's stock of gold money about 3⅓ cents per capita for every man, woman, and child. The increase in the gold currency, it will be observed, has not and can not possibly keep pace with the growth of population, the growth of industries, and the consequent demand for sufficient currency for the successful transaction of business.

I can understand how a great consuming nation like Great Britain, absorbing the surplus products of the world, should be interested in depreciating the price of those products by maintaining a constantly appreciating standard of money. But it is difficult for me to understand by what process of reasoning gentlemen are able to convince themselves that a producing nation, any more than an individual producer, can possibly be interested in lowering the value of the things which constitute its fund of wealth. It is not the token money which is the measure of value; it is the money of ultimate redemption.

Under our Constitution that money is gold and silver; under the law and its administration gold is the standard and all other money is token money. It is a rule of monetary science which I presume no gentleman will dispute that if you double the supply of money (and when I say "money" I mean standard money) you double the value of the commodities whose value is measured in money.

A statement was made some time ago, about a year ago, in the New York Tribune that the values of railroad stocks had depreciated in the previous two years about $1,000,000,000. It is not wonderful that this is so. What gives to railroad stocks their value? The earning capacity of the road. What gives earning capacity to the road? The producing capacity of the country tributary to it. What stimulus is there to the farmer, the producer of wheat, of corn, of oats, of barley, of cotton, and of stock, to raise and put upon the market the products of his farms when the prices, measured in gold as they are, are in many instances less than the cost of production? And, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the statements and the arguments of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, I want to say that I know that in my own State the farmers have been raising crops of grain without profit, and even at a loss in many instances. These figures which are cited here may show a greater yield per acre, but that may be accounted for by the exceptional yield of the year on which the gentleman from North Dakota bases his argument. As a matter of fact, we all know that many a farmer in our respective States—and it is not confined by any means to the Rocky Mountain States; it applies also to the Mississippi Valley States—we all know that many a farmer has been of late years no more than able to pay the cost of sowing and harvesting and marketing his crop. Give the farmer and stock raiser such a price for what he produces as will enable him to make a fair and reasonable profit and the freight earnings of your great railroads will be swelled to such an extent that an occasional dividend will be in sight, instead of a perpetual deficit and a receiver.

In support of our contention that the free coinage of gold and silver at the existing ratio by the United States would fix and maintain an actual parity between the market and coinage value of silver, I desire to read briefly from the report of the royal commission of 1888 on gold and silver. The report was made in three parts. Part 1 was signed by all of the commissioners, consisting of six gold-standard men and six silver men; one of the gold-standard men, Mr. Courtney, has since renounced his gold-standard views and declared for bimetallism. This is the statement made by that commission:

Nor does it appear to us a priori unreasonable to suppose that the existence in the Latin Union of a bimetallic system with a ratio of 15½ to 1 fixed between the two metals should have been capable of keeping the market price of silver steady at approximately that ratio.

The view that it could only affect the market price to the extent to which there was a demand for it for currency purposes in the Latin Union or to which it was actually taken to the mints of those countries is, we think, fallacious.

The fact that the owner of silver could in the last resort take it to those mints and have it converted into coin which would purchase commodities at the ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold would, in our opinion, be likely to affect the price of silver in the market generally, whoever the purchaser and for whatever country it was destined. It would enable the seller to stand out for a price approximating to the legal ratio, and would tend to keep the market steady at about that point.

It will be observed by inspection of the report of the Director of the Mint for 1895 that the total stock of silver coin in France is only $487,900,000. The report of the Director for 1891 shows that there was $700,000,000 of silver coin in France. It is difficult to understand upon what basis the last estimate of the Director is made, if the estimate of 1891 is correct, unless it be upon the hypothesis that it is a part of the Administration's policy to attempt to show that France is discarding her silver money, for an examination of Mr. J. Barr Robertson's work on Bimetallism, published in 1895, shows that in 1892 the imports of silver into France exceeded the exports $720,000, and in 1893 the imports of silver exceeded the exports $1,320,000, while in 1894 the exports only exceeded the imports $680,000. Therefore if this table be correct, and it is compiled from Dr. Soetbeer's estimates, it would seem that there is no foundation for the charge that France is abandoning her silver money. It may be, as an explanation for the discrepancy, that the Director of our Mint has failed to take into consideration the foreign silver coin amounting to over $120,000,000 in circulation in France.

The gentleman from Maine seems to shrink with horror when

he contemplates the danger of this country being placed on a par with Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, while it has never been the belief of the advocates of bimetallism by the United States that its adoption would lead to silver monometallism, it is but fair to say that the condition of Mexico and Japan, both silver-using countries, is so much better from the standpoint of profitable production than that of the United States under the gold standard that I feel that a dignified silence upon the part of our people when making comparisons between those nations and ours in their present industrial conditions would redound to our benefit.

The following extract from the Boston Herald, under date of February 1, 1896, indicates a condition of affairs in Mexico which I am of the opinion the distinguished gentleman from Maine would be glad to have transplanted to some of the idle factories of the New England States:

The remarkable prosperity of Mexican cotton mills, which are declaring big dividends, in some cases 20 per cent, has attracted the attention of the press.

And I want to ask the gentleman from Maine how many mills in the New England States within the last twelve months have declared a 20 per cent dividend or a 10 per cent dividend?

The Mexican Herald declares that—

"Mexico is now in position to invade the markets of the west coast of South America in competition with Germany, England, and all other countries on a gold basis. It is very significant that Mexican print works are now selling goods direct to ports on the Pacific coast of Mexico and taking the market away from the gold-standard countries, which can only be done now because the west coast is quickly accessible.

"One of the greatest merchants, forty years in business and a large importer from Europe, says that it it no longer possible for the United States or Europe to compete with Mexican mills, which can turn out excellent cottons at $1.25 less per piece. Mexico is growing more cotton yearly, and will soon be able to supply itself without bringing in American cotton; and as the growing and manufacturing are done on the basis of cheap labor and silver money, Mexico should aspire to enter the lists as an exporter of cotton goods.

"There is an ample field here for the investment of capital in cotton mills, also in paper and other products. Mexican woolens are now being turned out of superior quality, and thousands of people are refusing to buy expensive English goods. Tailors are supplying their growing demand at prices less than one-half those charged for European goods. For example, trousers are being sold at $5 per pair which if made of English goods would cost $14. Mexican manufacturers are very prosperous, and there is undoubtedly a chance for a modern shoe factory. The policy of the Government is to render Mexico independent as far as possible of the foreign gold-standard countries. This tends to give employment to railways, and the policy of the Mexican Central Railway in favoring every Mexican industry on its various lines is cordially commended in Government circles. The road has become thoroughly Mexican in policy, with resultant higher earnings.

"Hundreds of Americans are here, among them many capitalists, and there is a great interest shown in coffee lands and lands for general agricultural purposes. Sugar planters were never more prosperous than now, and this industry can not easily be overdone, as the domestic demand is not filled and profits will be large for many years. The National Bank of Mexico will in May declare a dividend of 17 per cent and add heavily to its reserve. The active capital of the bank is $8,000,000 and the reserve $5,000,000."

I join hands with the gentleman from Maine in advocacy of the great Republican principle of protection, but say to him frankly that no protective tariff under a gold monometallic standard will be adequate to foster the industries of this country. No tariff can be made high enough to protect American producers from Asiatic competition.

Gold monometallism and free trade are the twin sisters of cheapness. It is the avowed object of both to cheapen every product to the consumer, and experience has taught us that the objects have been accomplished. Bimetallism—that is, the equal use and recognition of gold and silver as standard money—and protection are both intended to enable the producer to receive a higher price for his product. It is therefore not difficult for me to understand why the President, who is an advocate of the gold standard and free trade, should oppose any policy designed to give added value to any commodity. His entire interest seems to be confined to the holders of gold, and when they are cared for he doubtless feels that his duty is done. But when the gentleman from Maine is found opposing a policy designed to elevate rather than depress the values which go to make up the wealth of this nation by refusing to remove the conditions which depress all values, and at the same time advocates the protective theory, he is certainly open to the charge of driving a team one horse of which is going in one direction and one in the other.

The gentleman no doubt finds now, and will to a much greater extent find in the future, manufactured articles from Japan excluding American manufactured articles in the markets of the world. Anyone who has read carefully the reports of the growth of the manufacturing industries in Japan must be blind indeed who is not apprised of the wonderful strides that nation has made in the establishment and growth of its manufacturing industries.

With the permission of the House, I shall print, as a portion of my remarks, some extracts from newspapers upon this question of the development of manufactures in Japan, for that development is going to do more to open the eyes of the Eastern manufacturers to the iniquity of the single gold standard than all the arguments that can be offered on this floor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose briefly to refer to the position of the Republican party in its declarations in the national platform of 1892 upon the question of bimetallism. The following is the plank:

FREE AND SAFE COINAGE OF GOLD AND SILVER.

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal. The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workingmen, demand that every dollar, paper or coin, issued by the Government shall be as good as any other. We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure a parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

Now, sir, a careful reading of that plank will disclose the fact that the first twenty-four words thereof are declaratory of a principle; they specifically commit the party to bimetallism and the use of both gold and silver as standard money. The remaining portion of that plank is devoted entirely to declarations relative to the achievements of bimetallism and the maintenance of the two metals at a parity.

The method of achieving bimetallism as advocated by the gentleman from Maine and those who agree with him is through an international monetary conference which requires the consent of Great Britain. I presume there is no member of this House who believes for one moment that Great Britain can be induced to abandon the gold standard and adopt bimetallism, for the simple reason that she is the great creditor nation and the great consuming nation of the world. If that be true, then the road to bimetallism marked out in our platform is hopelessly blocked. If that be true, then the declaration is meaningless and bimetallism can not be achieved in that way.

Republican Representatives who agree with the distinguished gentleman from Maine do not think that the United States can go to independent bimetallism, and therefore they will not travel our road. That being the case, firmly adhering to my conviction that the United States is perfectly able to achieve independent bimetallism, but desirous of having our eastern Republican brethren reach that desired goal, I propose for the purpose of this present debate and vote that we blaze a new trail, and I therefore send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the following amendment, which I propose to offer to the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECTION 1. That the President is hereby authorized and directed to call a commercial and tariff conference, to assemble at the city of Washington, not later than June 1, 1896, to be composed of representatives of silver-using countries.

SEC. 2. That at such conference the representatives of the United States Government are directed on the part of this Government to endeavor to secure a compact between the countries there represented for the mutual benefit of the contracting parties, which compact or agreement shall contain, among such other provisos as may be deemed advisable, the following propositions, to wit:

First. The silver-using countries represented at such conference and agreeing to the compact shall open their ports to the free admission of all products of this country, in exchange for which the United States will open its mints to the coinage of silver.

Second. A discriminating duty shall be levied against imports brought into the country from gold-standard countries, and all duties upon goods imported into this country from such gold-using countries shall be paid in gold.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer this amendment only for the purpose of finding out to what extent the Republicans of the East are willing to go in the direction of bimetallism. I do not yield one jot or tittle from my former position, that the Senate bill in itself as it stands is the proper and complete solution of the present difficulty, and I repeat I shall offer this amendment only for the purpose of seeing what support can be obtained for this bimetallic idea from the Republicans of the East.

The opponents of bimetallism insist that the burden of proof in this argument is upon the supporters of bimetallism. The contention of the distinguished gentleman from Maine was that it was incumbent upon us to show that the adoption by the United States of the system of coinage provided for by the Senate bill would redound to the benefit of the country. Nearly all of the opponents of this system insist that the proposal of the Senate is experimental legislation.

Mr. Speaker, such is not the fact. The fact is that for four thousand years the money of the world consisted of gold and silver, and not until 1816 was there any attempt to make a single standard of gold. In all those years abundant opportunity to discover the imperfections of the bimetallic standard and to repudiate it was given, but the wisdom of ages has demonstrated the soundness of the system, and as a result its retention naturally followed. The experiment of a gold standard was tried and has utterly failed. It is unnecessary for me to go into the details surrounding the successive actions of certain Governments looking to the establishment of the gold standard. It is sufficient, however, to say that in Germany and Austria there is a growing sentiment looking to the rejection of the gold standard and reestablishment of bimetallism.

The experience of those countries, like the experience of the

United States, has been that the system has been disastrous to the producing classes. And since production is the source and foundation of all wealth, the evil effects of any system which depreciates the values of products must of necessity sap the foundation of wealth. The United States is experiencing now the beneficial effects of a gold standard. Either it must remain or some other standard be substituted in its stead. What have you of the opposition to propose in lieu of the present system? What have you to propose instead of the Senate bill except a continued and uninterrupted issue of bonds? Your sacred gold reserve has touched the forty-seven-million point to-day. How do you propose to cure the situation? The answer is by the issuance of more bonds. And how long will this practice be kept up? When will the day of reckoning come? These bonds must some time be paid. They will be paid by the people of the United States from their accumulated wealth and their accumulated earnings. Which is better for the people of a producing nation, an appreciating standard, which lowers the prices of all commodities, or a depreciating standard, which raises the price of all the products of human toil? You who vote and who propose to vote to maintain this standard have no remedy to propose. You stand here helpless. We offer you a solution which the experience of forty centuries has approved, and we are told that this is experimental legislation and that the United States can not undertake to restore silver unaided and alone.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the opinion of Sir Henry Hucks Gibbs, referred to in a former part of my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to an item in the London Financial News expressive of the English fear that the United States will adopt the free coinage of silver and its effect upon English trade, as follows:

There is a plain moral in the remark that if the United States would venture to cut herself adrift from Europe and take outright to silver she would have all America and Asia at her back and would command the markets of both continents. The barrier of gold would be more fatal than any barrier of the custom-house. The bond of silver would be stronger than any bond of free trade.

There can be no doubt about it that if the United States were to adopt a silver basis to-morrow British trade would be ruined before the year was out.

Mr. Speaker, the duty and responsibility of solving this great question will, in my judgment, rest upon the Republican party. That party has furnished a solution for every great question presented to it by the American people since its existence. It furnished a stern and final solution of all of the difficulties growing out of the great strife. It gave us our liberal homestead laws, and wrote upon the statute books of this country in various acts the beneficent provisions of protection. It remains to be seen whether or not it will neutralize the splendid achievements of the past by lying supinely down and submitting to the perpetual riveting upon this great producing country a system of finance whose purpose and effect is to depreciate the value of every acre of land, of every bushel of wheat, of every pound of cotton, and of every day's labor owned by the citizens of the Republic. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the time of the gentleman from Montana be extended for three minutes?

Mr. KEM. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, I have no desire to cut off the gentleman in his remarks, and if I can be assured some time in which to be heard upon this subject I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is hardly a time to make bargains. Does the gentleman from Nebraska object?

Mr. KEM. I must object, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances.

Mr. HARTMAN. Under the permission of the House I desire to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from Mr. Wharton Barker's excellent paper, the American, of January 18, 1896, entitled "Protection without bimetallism impossible," and mark it Appendix A:

APPENDIX A.

PROTECTION WITHOUT BIMETALLISM IMPOSSIBLE.

Under gold monometallism a protective tariff is an impossibility, for no tariff can be made high enough to protect our producers from Asiatic competition, fostered by the appreciation of gold. Receiving pay for what they sell to us, or England, or any other gold-using country, in gold that has appreciated as measured in silver, their standard of value, 100 per cent, the silver-using peoples can afford to sell their agricultural products and manufactured goods for just one-half the price in gold of what they would be obliged to charge if the parity between gold and silver had not been destroyed and gold had not appreciated as compared to silver 100 per cent, for 50 cents in gold is now worth as much to them as $1 twenty-five years ago.

The divergence in the value of gold and silver has enabled the silver-using peoples to cut the prices of what they sell to gold-using countries in half, without reducing the silver price which they receive, and, as the purchasing power of silver is as great with them as ever, without curtailing their profits. As the Japanese and Chinese learn to use European and American machinery, and as they learn by experience to economize in production, adopting the improved methods of production, and profiting from the experience of Western civilization, they are naturally enabled to reduce the cost of production, but aside from any cheapening of production, the producer in Japan or China, or other silver-using nation, can sell in America, or England, or Germany, or any gold-using nation, for just one-half the price in gold that he could before the parity between silver and gold was destroyed by demonetizing silver, without reducing his profit one jot.

The Chinese tael, based on silver, and the Japanese silver yen go just as far as ever, will buy as much labor, pay for the production of as much cotton, or yarn, or cotton cloth as ever. With the tael, worth 68 cents in gold, or the yen, worth 50 cents, the Chinese or Japanese manufacturer can produce as much as when the tael was worth $1.36 in gold and the yen $1, and even more, because of the use of improved machinery, but with the gold received in gold-using countries for what he sells to such countries he can buy exchange for twice as many taels or twice as many yens as he could when silver had not commenced to depreciate as measured by gold. Thus he is enabled to sell at half price in gold.

To keep our markets our manufacturers must meet this. But meet it they can not. Try as they will, they can not cheapen production so as to enable them to do so. They may improve machinery and economize in production, but their silver competitors will promptly avail of the same improved machinery and the same economies in production. In this way our manufacturers can gain no advantage over their Asiatic competitors. Just so far as silver has fallen as measured by gold our manufacturers must reduce prices, or the difference will result as a bounty on imports and lead to the import and sale of Chinese and Japanese goods in place of those of home manufacture.

Under gold monometallism the necessity of meeting competition with silver-using peoples, fostered by a bounty of 100 per cent in the shape of a premium on gold can not be avoided, but for our maufacturers to meet this competition successfully is impossible. All manufacturers, whether debtors in their individual capacity or not, have their share of fixed charges, charges calling for a fixed number of dollars to bear. Each must bear a portion of the national and State and municipal indebtedness, that becomes more burdensome as gold appreciates. Taxes to meet interest on this debt, taxes that can not be reduced, he must pay, whether profits are large or none, whether commodities are high or low. If he is indebted individually, as most of them are, he is just that much worse off.

Taxes, and interest, and rents he can not reduce, nor can he reduce his largest item of outlay, wages, in anything like proportion to the depreciation of silver as measured by gold. Attempts to cut wages must lead to strikes and lockouts, for the wage earner can not but resist such reductions. He buys at retail, and the butcher's and baker's and grocer's prices do not fall with wholesale prices, as is only natural, but much later, and then not so far. The result is, cuts in wages mean to the wage earner a lower standard of living such as alone the cravings of hunger for himself and family will force him to accept. And, if driven by hunger and suffering, the laborer loses hope and incentive, and he is no longer capable of the same effort or of performing the same amount of work as when he labors hopefully and ambitiously. For the manufacturer to cut wages in like degree with the fall in prices is impossible, and in attempting to do so he must destroy the superiority of his workmen.

To compete with Asiatic competition, fostered by the premium on gold, a bounty that we ourselves blindly pay to exporters in silver-using countries, is already ruinous. It must soon become impossible.

Gold prices have not fallen so far as the gold price of silver. The difference acts as a bounty on exports from silver-using to gold-using nations.

In this way blind adherence to the gold standard is enabling Japanese and Chinese to undersell us in our own markets. But it is not in this alone that we suffer from the divergence in the value of gold and silver, and it is not the bonus we pay exporters in silver-using countries that is alone undermining and must undermine and counteract any tariff that we vainly try to make protective under gold monometallism.

The same difference between the gold price of silver and the price of commodities in America and England and Germany and other gold-using countries acts as a protective wall around the silver-using world. Manufacturers, here or in England or Germany, sending their goods to silver-using countries ask gold in payment. This gold costs the people in such countries just twice as much to get as before the demonetization of silver, and unless the goods are offered to them at half price, the price asked represents an enhanced value to them. Manufacturers in gold-using countries can not reduce the price of their goods in any such proportion for reasons already given. The result is that the price of European or American goods has been enhanced in China and Japan, although our manufactures sell for much less in gold than formerly. The price to the Chinese and Japanese is not enhanced 100 per cent, which about represents the appreciation of gold in their money, for the gold prices our manufacturers ask are somewhat less than heretofore. But whether the price is enhanced 40 or 50 per cent, it is just so much protection. It drives the Japanese and Chinese to make for themselves what they can not, at the enhanced prices, afford to buy abroad. The result is that European and American goods are being crowded, not alone out of China and Japan, not alone out of India, despite the efforts of England and the closing of the Indian mints, but out of all silver-using nations. The markets of silver-using nations being closed against English and German manufactures, the pressure to sell them in America is much greater than it would otherwise be.

Thus our manufacturers, excluded from the Eastern markets, are forced to meet an unnatural competition, not alone with Chinese and Japanese manufacturers, but with European as well.

But this is not all. Seeking a market for their produce in England and Germany, our farmers are obliged to sell their wheat in competition with Indian and Mexican wheat raised on a silver and of Argentine and Russian wheat raised on a paper basis, while our planters have to compete with Indian cotton. Our competitors for the markets of England have been enabled, because of the appreciation of gold, to cut the price they ask for their wheat and cotton in half without reducing the amount of silver which they receive in payment. To meet this competition, our farmers and planters have been forced to accept lower and lower prices as the gold price of silver has fallen. Unlike their competitors, who are recompensed for the lower prices they receive by the premium in their currency of the gold they receive in payment, our planters and farmers, raising wheat and cotton on a gold basis, paying taxes and interest and other fixed charges in gold, and finding that the much smaller amount in gold which they receive and spend on a gold basis goes but little farther than heretofore in paying the cost of producing cotton and wheat and other produce, have been impoverished and ruined and are absolutely unable to buy manufactured goods liberally as heretofore.

Thus the gold standard destroys the home market for our manufactures. We must make the farmers prosperous before they can buy liberally manufactured goods, and they can not become prosperous while forced to sell their produce in competition with silver-using peoples and handicapped by the appreciating gold standard.

Until bimetallism is restored and the unfair advantage which the appreciation of gold has conferred on the silver-using peoples in competition with the gold-using is destroyed, no tariff can be made protective. The first step toward the reestablishment of a true protective system must be the restoration of bimetallism. Any attempt to restore protection without bimetallism will fail.

Protection must be united with bimetallism. To endeavor to make a tariff protective under gold monometallism is folly.

Also the editorial from the same paper of the same date, entitled "Cheapening of production not accountable for the fall in prices," and mark it Appendix B.

APPENDIX B.

CHEAPENING OF PRODUCTION NOT ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE FALL IN PRICES.

Improved methods of production, the introduction of economies, and the substitution of improved and labor-saving machinery, resulting in a reduction of the labor cost of production, do not of necessity lead to a fall in prices. Prices naturally adjust themselves to the money cost of production, for men will not permanently work at a loss, and if the price that can be obtained for a commodity is not sufficient to recompense those engaged in its production for their outlay of money, time, and energy, production will be curtailed until, as a result of the reduced supply, the price rises to a point that will repay those engaged in it for their expenditure of money and labor in production; and if, on the other hand, the price of any commodity rises much above the cost of reproduction, those engaged in less profitable employments will be tempted to embark in the production of that commodity by the prospects of larger profits, and production will be thereby increased until, as a result of the increased supply, the price falls back to a point that will not tempt further increase of production.

But the money cost of production does not always fall with the introduction of labor-saving machinery, resulting in a cheapening of the labor cost of production, and if the money cost of production does not fall, prices will not fall. Unless there is a change in the value of money, the cheapening in the cost of production of any commodity must lead to a fall in price, and the general introduction of improved methods of production and transportation to a general fall in prices proportionate to the saving of labor, time, and energy in production and distribution. But such a tendency of prices to fall consequent upon a cheapening of the actual cost of production may be entirely offset by an increase of the quantity of money in circulation and a fall in the price of money as measured by commodities.

The value of money is dependent upon supply and demand. When based on gold, as at present, the supply of money is limited to the amount of gold that is coined and available for coinage, for although paper money and bank credits are used extensively in exchanging commodities, such paper and credits are based on gold and redeemable in gold, and if the volume of gold is contracted the paper money and credits resting on gold must likewise be contracted. If the quantity of gold in use as money is increased, the quantity of paper money and bank credits based upon it may be increased; if the quantity of gold is contracted, the money and credits resting on such gold must be likewise contracted, just as a bank is obliged to contract credits when the cash in its vaults is depleted.

Those having money have but one use for it—to exchange it for those commodities they desire, and the greater the quantity of money in circulation the more money there will be to be exchanged, and hence the greater the demand for commodities. And as the quantity of money in circulation makes the demand for commodities, the quantity of goods in the hands of those desirous of selling them—that is, of exchanging them for money—constitutes the demand for money. It follows that the greater the quantity of goods on the market the greater the demand for money, and the greater the quantity of money the greater the demand for commodities. Thus an increase in the quantity of money, unless accompanied by a proportionate increase in the production of commodities, must lead to higher prices, while a decrease in the quantity of money must result in a falling off in the demand for commodities until a lower level of prices is reached.

A cheapening of the cost of production naturally leads to increased production and an increase in the quantity of goods in the hands of those seeking to exchange them for money, with the result that the demand for money is increased, money rises proportionately in value, and prices fall correspondingly. It is thus that improved methods of production tend to cause a fall of prices. But if the quantity of money happens to be increased so as to more than offset the increased demand, prices will rise despite cheapening of the cost of production, while, on the contrary, if the value of money is contracted simultaneously with the introduction of labor-saving machinery, resulting in increased production and increased demand for money, prices will fall much further than they otherwise would.

Thus the period 1849-1872 was one of generally rising prices, although this period was marked by an unexampled rapidity in the perfection of labor-saving machinery, introduction of economies in manufacture, and of great extension of transportation facilities. Production went forward with leaps and bounds. The demand for money was greatly increased; yet money did not rise in value, but fell, and prices did not fall, but rose. And why? Simply because the discovery of gold in California and Australia led to an addition to the quantity of money in circulation, which was more than sufficient to offset the increased demand. As shown by the Senate report on comparative prices, prepared by Prof. R. P. Faulkner, prices were nearly 30 per cent higher in 1872 than in 1849.

This is positive proof that cheapening of the real cost of production does not always lead to lower prices. When prices do not fall as a result of the introduction of labor-saving machinery, the wage earner, whose wages are of necessity dependent upon the price received by the capitalist for the joint product of labor and capital, benefits by receiving higher wages. When prices fall as a result of improved methods of production, the wage earner may be benefited by being able to buy cheaper; but he will not be benefited to the same degree, for he buys at retail and his wages are fixed by wholesale prices, and retail prices do not fall as rapidly as wholesale prices.

Since 1873 prices have fallen, as shown by the Senate report before referred to, down to 1891, and by tables prepared especially for the American since, 35.6 per cent. The question is, what has been the cause of this fall? Gold monometallists have attributed it to the introduction of labor-saving machinery and a general saving of labor and time in production.

Progress has undoubtedly been made in cheapening the actual cost of production since 1873, with a tendency to lower prices, but there can be no doubt that the fall in prices is due primarily and chiefly to the rise in the value of money. The greatest advance in improved methods of production has been made in manufacturing establishments, and if the cause of the fall in prices was the cheapening of production, the products of such factories would naturally show the greatest decline in prices. But such is not the case. On the other hand, it is agricultural products that have fallen furthest. As shown by tables based on 100 staple commodities, which we have prepared, the general level of prices has fallen 14.71 per cent since January 1, 1891. For the same period breadstuffs have fallen 40.41 per cent, while manufactures of iron and steel have fallen but 28.51 per cent, and manufactures of textiles but 9.44 per cent, while raw cotton has fallen 17 per cent and wool over 40 per cent

During these five years there has been little if any cheapening in the cost of production of agricultural staples, yet they have fallen in price much further than manufactured articles in the manufacture of which the greatest advances have been made toward cheapening production by the constant improvement of machinery. This fact disproves the assertion that the fall in prices is due to cheapening of the actual cost of production.

For the fact that agricultural products have fallen much more rapidly than manufactured articles there is only one explanation, and that is that our agricultural products were the first to come into direct competition with the products of silver-using countries. The appreciation of gold, of the money which silver-using peoples receive in payment for what they sell to gold-using peoples, and which they can exchange for double the amount of silver that they could twenty years ago, has greatly encouraged production and stimulated exports from silver to gold using countries. To increase the area devoted to raising wheat and cotton was the work of a season; gathering experience and knowledge and building the factories to make manufactured goods the work of a decade or more. The result is that while our farmers and planters have suffered from the competition of silver-using countries for years, our manufacturers are only now beginning to feel Asiatic competition. This is the explanation of the fall in prices that has been more marked in agricultural than manufactured articles.

Relief can only be found in a return to bimetallism, the restoration of the parity between gold and silver, and the inauguration of a true protective tariff.

Also, as illustrative of the growth of manufacturing industries in Japan, the following argument from the pen of Mr. J. P. Young, quoting from various newspapers, and published in the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1895, and mark it Appendix C:

APPENDIX C.

On the 15th of June last the Japan Weekly Gazette published a memorial, drawn up by the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, in which the fact was pointed out "that Japan is becoming a great manufacturing country and rapidly advancing to a position of marked prominence in many branches of the Eastern trade." Figures furnished by the Agricultural Department show that the first cotton-spinning mill was erected in Japan in 1863, but twenty years later there were only 16 mills in operation, with 43,704 spindles. Since then the industry has advanced very rapidly. At the end of 1888 the number of spindles had increased to 88,140, and five years later there were 46 mills, running 600,000 spindles. The memorial above alluded to, commenting on the department report, says that "there is a prospect of even more rapid development," and adds, "We think it unnecessary to refer in detail to the many other manufactures in which Japan is not only supplying home wants, but is successfully competing with Europe in the markets of China, the Straits Settlements, and India."

Regarding Japanese trade with the United States and India, the memorial says: "We anticipate that if exchange with America remains at a very low level and the rupee continues to be held above its bullion value in India, China will eventually furnish to Japan all the cotton she needs, except such staples as can not be grown on Chinese soil. In evidence of this possibility the import of raw cotton from China into Japan increased from 61,328,021 pounds in 1891 to 95,115,180 pounds in 1893." So, if the conclusion of these Eastern observers is correct, the fatuous monetary policy of Great Britain and the United States will make it impossible for either India or the United States to compete with China in the matter of supplying raw cotton to Japan. Thus we shall soon be deprived of the sorry satisfaction of furnishing the progressive island Empire with the raw material for manufacturing the goods she promises to ultimately deluge us with.

That there is no illusion about this matter will readily be conceded by anyone who has attentively read the letters of Frank G. Carpenter, who has been devoting some time to studying the abilities of the Japanese. It may be remarked here that Mr. Carpenter does not write from the standpoint of a student of money. He is simply a trained newspaper correspondent in a strange land making use of his highly developed faculty of observation. In a letter written toward the close of 1894 Mr. Carpenter remarked: "By the new treaty Americans can go into business anywhere in Japan. They can set up factories and employ Japanese cheap labor to make goods for America. * * * The Japanese have for some time realized that the markets of the world are open to them. They are now studying our (American) tastes and are manufacturing for our markets. They are fast becoming a nation of inventors. * * * There is an American firm in Kobe which is shipping vast quantities of rugs to the United States and which is introducing the manufacture into Japan in a curious way." The writer then goes on to relate that the factory turning out these rugs sent artists to all the great museums in Europe, who devoted themselves to copying the rugs exhibited, which, on their return, were reproduced by Japanese workmen, who skillfully imitated the most difficult designs and colors.

The information furnished by Mr. Carpenter can be supplemented by some obtained in the city. It is a well-known fact that agents of Japanese manufactories frequently pass through San Francisco. Some of these have freely talked about the development of their country, and have not hesitated to make predictions of great things to be achieved in the future. A local merchant relates that about a year or more ago a Japanese made inquiries regarding a certain silk fabric manufactured in New Jersey or Massachusetts factories which, up to that time, had not been produced in Japan. After ascertaining the probable extent of the demand, he inquired whether he could fill an order at a much lower price than the American factories could possibly afford to produce the fabric. Of course he received the order. A few months after a consignment of the Japanese silk, in every respect equal to the American, was received, and the prospects are that in the near future, as its manufacture develops in Japan, this silk will entirely supersede the product of United States or French factories.

It is also a matter of common report that trained Japanese mechanics are studying all of the Western processes of manufacture likely to be easy of adaptation in their country. Mr. Carpenter has spoken of their efforts in the direction of manfacturing a certain class of rugs which are now shipped in large quantities to this country, but he does not appear to have learned the fact that the Japanese are contemplating the manufacture of carpets. They have had expert men copying American and English looms, and they will not hesitate to employ their extraordinary imitative abilities in turning out large quantities of the cheaper grades of tapestry and Brussels carpets as soon as they can get their machinery made. And it may be assumed as certain that the manufacture of cheap goods will be speedily followed by that of higher grade articles in this particular line. Recent achievements of the Japanese indicate unmistakably that, their attention being once turned to a thing, they are likely to investigate it thoroughly and develop it to its fullest extent.

But it is not only Japanese enterprise and ingenuity that we are obliged to consider. The disparity in wages between Eastern and Western countries and the fact that they may be paid in money made of a metal whose value, measured in gold terms, has greatly depreciated, have attracted the attention of shrewd Americans, Englishmen, and other foreigners to Japan, and they are preparing to take advantage of the superior facilities offered by that country for the profitable pursuit of manufacturing industries, having for their object the supply of the Japanese home demand and for export.

The British Trade Journal of a recent date says: "Among the trades more recently introduced in Japan is the manufacture of watches. In 1893 Japan imported more than 103,000 watches from Switzerland, France, Germany, and the United States. The object of the new Japanese factory is to produce a watch of the cheaper kind. * * * But it seems not unlikely that the new concern will manufacture a better class of timekeeper if the demand should

necessitate such a step." There s no doubt about this latter point. Information from another source than that above quoted makes it clear that the American who is at the back of this new Japanese enterprise is merely paving the way to the creation of a great industry in which he proposes to take advantage of the undoubted skill of the Oriental workingmen, in order to turn out both low and high grade watches which will successfully compete with the best watches made in the Western World.

In Great Britain, where this new manufacturing development in the Orient has attracted more attention than in the United States, a peculiar attempt to find consolation is noted. Commenting on a paper read before the Royal Colonial Institute by T. F. Whitehead, a member of the legislative council of Hongkong, in which he pointed out the rapid growth of Oriental manufacturing industries, a London journal said: "Mr. Whitehead's paper, it seems to us, leaves entirely out of calculation many of the advantages which may result to our commerce from the extension of Japanese industries, however much they may interfere with the exports of manufactured goods from Europe to Japan itself. The establishment of manufacturing industries there must necessarily be accompanied by a large demand for machinery, apparatus, tools, chemicals, and other raw materials, and for the higher classes of skilled labor which this country can provide."

That this is a perilously shortsighted view to take of the situation a moment's reflection ought to convince anyone. What grounds for felicitation can Great Britain find in the fact that just at present she is shipping considerable cotton spinning and weaving machinery to Japan and China? It is true the manufacturer of the exported machinery has been benefited, but how about the cotton spinners and weavers of England, whose products are to be displaced by those of Japanese weavers and spinners operating English machinery in their own country?

But even the newly created demand for English machinery can not be depended upon to last long. The imitative faculty of the Japanese is well known, and their disposition to make the best of it is also understood. It may be assumed that a people who speedily learn to reproduce the best class of marine engines, and who have access to cheap coal and iron, will not long neglect the opportunity to save their countrymen the trouble of importing cotton machinery from England or the United States, and thus at an early day even the small comfort of providing English rivals with the means for the undoing of England will vanish.

The condition of affairs existing in Japan is also met with in other parts of the Orient. The transference of the jute industry to India from Scotland is plainly attributable to the fluctuations in exchange since the demonetization of silver. The manufacture of jute was once confined almost wholly to Dundee, but now large quantities of jute are worked up on the Hoogly, near Calcutta, and in the near future the transfer will be complete, for the Scottish manufacturer can not compete with the subtle advantage enjoyed by the manufacturer in silver-using countries.

This advantage has also operated to deprive English shipbuilders of a share of trade. At a meeting of the China Mutual Steamship Company, Mr. Maitland, the president, remarked that "the working expenses had been considerably reduced, almost entirely by the great fall in the gold price of silver. * * * For the repairs of their steamers very large amounts of money were annually needed, and they had already commenced to make repairs in Singapore, China, and Japan. With the dollar at two shillings the skilled Asiatic will work for a month for less than a skilled British subject will work for a week." This testimony regarding the danger to the shipbuilding industry is supplemented by that of the chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental, the greatest steamship line plying between the Orient and Europe, who has not hesitated to predict that if the Chinese and Japanese continue to retain the advantage which the excessive appreciation of the value of gold gives them the new vessels of the company will be built in those countries, and he adds that it is not at all improbable that the Chinese and the Japanese in the near future will build ships to be operated in Western waters.

On the 20th of September, 1894, the Hongkong Press published an article from the pen of H. Kopsch, F. R. G. S., in which he pointed out the reason why the English shipbuilding industry was suffering through the appreciation of gold. He enforced his views by practical illustrations. "Some years ago," he said, "a mandarin sought to obtain estimates for a steam launch, in anticipation of his being permitted to introduce steam power on one of the lakes of the Empire. The tender submitted for the launch was £1,000, or 5,000 Mexican dollars. Subsequently the same officer renewed his inquiries, and was amazed to find that the launch, which he could have had built for 5,000 Mexican dollars when he first made his inquiries, would cost him 10,000 Mexican dollars under the changed conditions. Permission has since been given to navigate certain inner waters of China, but owing to the high price of gold the Chinese are themselves making the boilers and engines instead of getting them from England." This same writer also noted the fact that between 1884 and 1893 there were 399 steamers, aggregating 23,094 tons, built and engined in Hongkong, and he adds: "Twenty years ago had any one prophesied that Chinese would ever compete with British shipwrights and engine makers he would have been ridiculed; nevertheless the appreciation of gold has so reduced wages as to make it possible for China to compete with the West in the manufacture of articles for which the raw materials have to be imported."

If the Chinese are able to compete successfully even when compelled to import the raw materials, as in the case of the manufacture of steam launches, what will they not be able to accomplish when, under the impetus which the planting of industries in a country naturally gives to production, they begin to pay attention to the development of their iron and coal mines and to the expansion of the cotton-producing industry?

The extent and rapidity of this development should not be underrated or its significance misunderstood, as it seems to have been by some Englishmen and by our consul at Tientsin, who in a recent report to the United States Department of State said that he had received information from a reliable source that the customs taotai at that port, representing officially and as an individual the big cotton mills then in course of erection at Shanghai and elsewhere in Central Asia, had placed orders with a European firm in Tientsin for cotton-mill machinery amounting to nearly a million dollars (Mexican). Consul Reed, who gave this information, desired that the attention of American manufacturers of such machinery be called to the fact that many mills were springing up in various parts of China. This information was duly published in the consular reports issued by our Government, and was reprinted in one or two trade journals. It excited no comment, however, and no doubt those under whose observation it came only looked upon the item as something concerning the manufacturing of machinery. They did not perceive its more important bearing and that the temporary advantage which might be derived from the sale of some cotton machinery would be followed by the loss of the American cotton-goods trade with China, which aggregated $2,851,957 in 1894, $2,772,065 of which consisted of uncolored cloths, which may be easily made by beginners enjoying the peculiar advantages which the appreciation of gold and the state of the labor market have given the Chinese.

What these advantages are may be inferred from a report of the board of directors of Boyd & Co. (limited), a ship repairing and machine manufacturing company doing business in Shanghai, made to stockholders on the 30th of April, 1894. The report, after remarking that "the general working for the past year shows a favorable result, which has been largely contributed by the local industries which are springing up around us," goes on to predict still greater activity, provided certain restrictions which the Chinese have placed about manufacturers are removed. Discussing this phase of the subject the North China Daily News says: "If this discouragement were only withdrawn and private capitalists and companies were allowed to undertake the business, Shanghai in two or three years would be a forest of chimney stacks, and the demand for machinery would startle the manufacturers in Lancashire. The cotton is to be had on the spot, labor is inexhaustible and very reliable; coal is cheap. There are no embarrassing factory acts, so that the machinery could be run twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, and there is an unlimited market at a price for all that is produced. Once withdraw the present restrictions and there will be a wonderful outburst here [Shanghai] of industrial activity."

That these restrictions will be removed is now quite certain, for the official class who hoped to enjoy a monopoly of the profits arising from the new dispensation are beginning to realize that the course pursued by Japan is by far the one most calculated to advantage them, and mandarins who have hitherto opposed the creation of joint stock companies are now favoring that sort of enterprise.

These facts have not escaped the observation of workingmen in Great Britain. The labor leaders in that country long since recognized that they were injured by the new competition called into existence by the appreciation of gold, and many of them have become active bimetallists, and are doing much to promote a sentiment in favor of silver in England. These labor leaders have clearly perceived that which presumably acute English statesmen have overlooked, namely, that political supremacy is dependent on commercial activity, and that the power of the British Empire must begin to wane if, owing to a persistent adherence to a suicidal monetary policy, nations that have hitherto been dependent upon the Western World for manufactured products, and which, under normal conditions, would continue to be, are given such advantages that manufacturers operating in countries on a gold basis can not compete with them. To these workingmen the predictions of such men as Sir Thomas Sutherland are full of meaning. When he declared that in the near future the steamers of the Peninsular and Oriental line, instead of being built on the Clyde, would be turned out of the yards on the Yangtze in China, they realized that thousands of their fellow-workingmen are in danger of being thrown out of employment, for they are perfectly convinced, after a study of the question, that the extension of the principles which make possible the fulfillment of Sir Thomas's prediction regarding the transference of the shipbuilding industry to China must result in similarly effecting all industries not exclusively the property of gold-standard nations.

An English journal, early in the present year, remarked: "Japan has certainly prospered on cheap silver. Through the instrumentality of the white metal she has made large strides toward industrial independence and has begun to be recognized by the older manufacturing nations as a formidable competitor. Japanese cotton and linen goods and other manufactured products are invading markets where, a few years ago, they were unknown, and it is interesting to note that the increased importation of such articles into the United States is beginning to cause uneasiness to American manufacturers." If the latter statement is true the American manufacturers have effectually succeeded in concealing their uneasiness. The manufacturing industry in the United States is a powerful one, and if those concerned in it once awaken to the disadvantages under which they are laboring in their competition with the East they will speedily make their influence felt. But it is reasonable to assume that the American manufacturers are still in the dark and agree with the Boston Herald that the people of silver-using countries are on a lower plane of civilization and their efforts to develop manufacturing industries are therefore to be despised. Meanwhile Japan, one of the silver countries on the lower plane of civilization, is increasing her productions at a rate which seems rapid when compared with our own advantages. We have made some progress in the production of pottery, but we venture to say that the Japanese, who in 1884 employed 19,000 workmen in turning out 73,500,000 pieces, and four years later employed 27,000 men, who produced 126,000,000 pieces, a rate of increase that has been well maintained since, have no reason to shrink from a comparison. The extension of their cotton and silk industry has already been noted as being on a threatening scale, menacing a competition which Western people will not be able to stand up against.

The Textile Mercury, an English trade publication, expressed the belief a few days ago that the mischief had already been accomplished, and remarked: "It is high time for the English cotton spinner and manufacturer to look out for suitable fields to which he may emigrate." The writer added: "It really looks as if the growth of England's cotton industry at home had reached its limit, and that English capital engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods would hereafter be forced to seek locations in India and China in order to find profitable employment. * * * English manufacturers can only hope to maintain their supremacy in the Eastern markets by producing the goods on the spot."

The question for American manufacturers to consider is whether they could maintain themselves against a competition which has nearly proved fatal to Lancashire. Should there be an exodus of English capital to the Orient for the purpose of establishing manufacturing industries in China and Japan, how could we in this country hope to successfully exclude the flood of cheap goods that would be poured into the United States? The present tariff scarcely offers any obstacle to the European manufacturer operating under all of the disadvantages incident to the gold standard. How, then, could we expect to successfully compete with the same manufacturer after he has transferred his machinery to a country where labor is phenomenally cheap and is compensated in a metal which, when measured in terms of gold, is likewise cheap? The manufacturer, under such circumstances, would ask in vain for an increase of the protective tariff, for the enlightened opinion of the agriculturist would be against the granting of such a request, while the producer is subjected to the destructive influence of a constantly contracting measurer of values. When the money of the world was composed of gold and silver the farmer could afford to stand shoulder to shoulder with the manufacturer in the United States and assist in building up a great manufacturing industry. The achievement of such a result meant for him increasing markets near his own door, and that, translated into plain English, meant increased profits through the diminution of cost of transportation and the elimination of the middleman. But the changed conditions preclude the idea of agriculture making common cause with manufactures. The farmers are now perfectly aware that the tremendous fall in the price of their products is due to the appreciation of the value of gold, and they will not be so foolish as to consent to rivet their shackles more firmly by assisting in artificially raising the prices of manufactured products while no steps are taken to prevent the depreciation of the prices of the products of the soil.

If this view is correct, unless something is done to restore silver, and thus put all nations on a plane of equality, the gold-using countries must prepare to have their markets invaded by the manufactures of the silver-using countries, not only by those of the Orient but those of Russia as well. The Textile Mercury, in the same article in which it bewails the decadence of the English cotton industry, also describes the prosperity of the Russian cotton manufacturer. It says, while the English cotton manufacturer is in dire distress, "in Russia the trade is in a highly prosperous condition. The mills of

Moscow and other cotton spinning and weaving districts are paying dividends of from 25 to 33 per cent. Spinners have all their production bought up into the middle of next year. A manufacturer who wants yarn now can only purchase it at enhanced values from the middleman or speculator—it is not to be had from any other source." Russia, according to the theories of the Boston Herald, should be on a still lower plane of civilization than the silver-using countries of the Orient and of Central and South America, for its chief currency is an inconvertible credit note, although the legal unit of money is the silver ruble of 100 kopecks. But instead of Russia being in a condition to excite the commiseration of philanthropists in gold-using countries, she actually is enjoying a degree of manufacturing prosperity which fills with envy the ruined cotton manufacturers of England and the United States.

[Mr. TUCKER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. KEM. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose at this time to undertake to discuss the principles involved in this question. In the first place, the time at my command is too limited; and, secondly, I do not believe that anything that may be said on this floor at this time will change a single vote on this proposition. But I do desire, Mr. Speaker, to call attention to one or two statements that have been made on this floor relative to the attitude of the Populist party on this question. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WILSON] the other night made the bold, bare, unsupported statement that the Populist party was not in favor of bimetallism, that the Populist party was not a bimetallist party; and that statement was practically reiterated yesterday by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], upon the Democratic side. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, with all the emphasis I have at my command, that the statement was both uncalled for and unsupported by any fact or evidence in this House, in the Senate, or in the country anywhere. And I am astonished that gentlemen will stand before this assemblage and make such statements as that in the face of the facts contained in the record of the proceedings of this body for the last five years.

Mr. Speaker, when I severed my connection with the Republican party I did so because I believed that party was no longer the friend of the great common people of this country. And after five years' experience in the halls of legislation I now no longer believe, but know, that that party is not the friend of the common people. Let us go back for about thirty years, to the time when Thaddeus Stevens, the great, eloquent old commoner from Pennsylvania, stood on the floor of this House and so valiantly fought the insertion of the exception clause in the greenbacks. Start from that point, and extend your investigations all through the legislation of the Republican party and its attitude on financial questions down to the present moment, and you will find that at every turn and at every opportunity that party, as represented in the halls of legislation, at this and the other end of the Capitol, have stood up wherever and whenever the opportunity offered and struck down the money of the people and step by step have forced us into the terrible conditions financially that the country is in to-day, under their management and control.

I have sat in my place here, Mr. Speaker, and listened to the discussion of these questions on the part of the Republican and Democratic members of this body. I have listened to the talks of both the Republicans and Democrats, each blaming the other for the condition which we are in and under which we are suffering now. Both of them were right and both were wrong. They were both right in that they accuse each other of the responsibility, and they are responsible. The Republican party is responsible for enacting the law which destroyed the money of the people, and the Democratic party is responsible, by its Administration, for carrying out that law to the very letter. Hence they are both wrong and both right, although neither may be responsible wholly for the condition that exists, yet jointly they are both responsible. The Republican is the greater sinner, because all financial law of the last thirty-five years is Republican law.

Mr. Speaker, from the time the exception clause was put upon the greenbacks adverse legislation has grown steadily on and on and all financial legislation has militated against the great mass of the people.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WILSON], regardless of these facts—regardless of the fact that all the laws that have been placed upon the statute books that have destroyed the money of the people, destroyed the prosperity of our country, that have tended to reduce the volume of the currency, that have destroyed silver and wiped it out of existence as money are the results of Republican legislation—stands here and has the hardihood to say to us that, after all, they are the only party in this country that favors bimetallism. I deny this position. I say go to the RECORD and examine the facts; examine the attitude of the Populist party and the attitude of the Republican party and the Democratic party with reference to silver, and it will bear me out in saying that the Populist party is to-day the only party—the only bimetallic political party in existence in the United States of America. It is the only party that has in view and at heart the great interest of the people. Go to the RECORD. You do not need to take my assertion for it, but go to the RECORD and see what it shows on that question. It will show that at every opportunity, upon every question where an opportunity was offered, the Representatives of the Populist party on this floor and upon the floor of the Senate have, to a man, without a solitary exception, voted for bimetallism.

I call attention further to the declarations in the various platforms. My friend from Montana [Mr. HARTMAN] has just read in your hearing the declaration of the Republican party in its platform relative to bimetallism. In the first part of that declaration they declare themselves in favor of bimetallism; but, Mr. Speaker, it is a condition with a string tied to it to pull it back at their own convenience and at their own will, and they did pull it back in the last national campaign. The Democratic platform starts out with practically the same declaration, and they have tied a string to it also in order that they may pull it back at their own convenience. We saw in the last political campaign members of both political parties going over the country proclaiming themselves in one locality as bimetallists, in another in favor of monometallism, a sort of political trickery, a good deal like the old darkey's fish trap, which was arranged in such a manner as to catch them both coming and going. And in view of that fact, every man here upon this floor, whether he be honest enough to own it or not, knows this to be true, that you can not stand here and say honestly that yours is the only party that is true to bimetallism, that your policy is the only one by which you can secure bimetallism, in spite of the fact that after thirty years of these two parties controlling this Government we find to-day the result in the condition of the country and in the fact that silver has been stricken down and destroyed. No member of either party can say of a truth that his party is in any sense a silver party.

I have no objection to the Republican party being in favor of monometallism if it believes it to be the true policy; nor do I object to the Democratic party accepting that theory. But let them be honest about it. If a man believes it he should stand to that declaration. If he believes in monometallism let him so declare. But what I do object to is this method of procedure on the part of the Democrats and Republicans alike seeking to fool and hoodwink and befuddle the people until they do not know the facts on which they are asked to vote. The Republican party will be quite in harmony with its action for thirty years if it will in the coming national convention declare itself in favor of monometallism; if it will do this, then its declarations will be in harmony with its actions, and the people will know where it stands and what the true meaning of its political action on this question is.

I am gratified, Mr. Speaker, to know that at last the great Republican majority of this House is brought face to face with the plain proposition of free coinage. They will have to say by their votes whether the Republican party is in favor of silver money or not. There is no way of dodging the issue, and when the vote is recorded the people can see for themselves just what it is in favor of.

I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I will predict that when the vote is taken it will show a very large majority of the Republicans on this floor recorded against free silver and in favor of gold alone. This would seem to be the only thing necessary to at last convince the people that this party is against silver, and I am pleased that the time is drawing near when this deception must cease and the party stand out uncovered in all of its iniquity, side by side with the Democratic party.

Let us throw this question open, fair and free, aboveboard, to the voters of this country, and let them decide the question. When they do that, gentlemen, I promise you for one that when the decision is rendered by the people in an intelligent manner, under conditions by which they may know what they are voting for and who their friends are, then I say that if they decide that they want a gold basis, gold monometallism, I will acquiesce in that position, and I will cease to agitate the money question in this country. But I say to you here and now that so long as you seek to prevent the people from casting an intelligent ballot along this line, as you have all these years by masquerading behind silver while establishing a gold standard, I will fight you; I will oppose you. I may be whipped, but like my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I will always be ready to fight you until you are driven from under cover and this question is settled under conditions which will place you before the people for just what you are worth. When this can be done you will be relegated to the shades of the past, where you ought to have been years ago.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. KEM. I can not submit to a question, because my time is practically up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the record shows that the Populist party is the only true bimetallic party upon the floor of this House and upon the floor of the Senate; that it is the only true bimetallic party in existence in the United States of America, and it is my firm conviction, sir, that the people of this country will never get bimetallism until a sufficient number of them unite themselves with the Populist party to carry that party into power.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Will you allow a question now?

Mr. KEM. I have not the time.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. You could have answered it while you were pausing.

Mr. KEM. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me. I did not interrupt him the other night. I have stated facts which I said the record will bear out.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Do you believe every dollar of the United States should be redeemable in coin?

Mr. KEM. Mr. Chairman, in spite of my objection the gentleman has injected his question into my speech and I will answer him. The gentleman asks me if I believe every dollar issued by the United States should be redeemable in coin. That has nothing to do with the proposition at all, one way or the other. The question is as to whether the Populist party is in favor of bimetallism, and I say to the gentleman from Idaho that the record shows that the Populist party is in favor of bimetallism; that there has never been a vote cast upon that proposition but what every member of the Populist party voted for it on every occasion and at all times. The platform so declares.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. You have not answered my question.

Mr. KEM. I say, if you turn to the declaration of the Populist platform on that position, you will find that there is no string to that declaration, as there is to the Republican and Democratic declarations.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Answer the question. Do not avoid it.

Mr. KEM. The free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, pure and simple——

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Answer my question. Do not avoid it.

Mr. KEM. I have answered the question. It is not proper for me to go outside the province of this question and answer the gentleman any question he may see fit to ask; the gentleman can not side track me in that manner.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes a. m., Friday, February 7, 1896), the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 7, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bill was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina states that he rises to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. TALBERT. It has been brought to my notice that I have been misrepresented by the press of the country, unintentionally, I have no doubt, for I can not believe that the press of the country desires to misrepresent members upon this floor. And in rising, sir, I do not rise to apologize for or to retract anything that I have said on that occasion, but to reecho and reiterate every word and sentiment that I uttered on that occasion. On last Wednesday evening, when the present bill was under discussion, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] saw proper, while making his speech, to go out of his way to unkindly criticise the State of South Carolina, which I have the honor in part to represent upon this floor, the great and grand and glorious State of which I am proud, and a State that is as true and as loyal to the flag today as any State in the United States.

In his remarks he criticised the prominent part that South Carolina took in the act of secession in 1861. In the course of his remarks, as I understood him, he took occasion to say that North Carolina had followed South Carolina out of the Union in secession, and that North Carolina, and South Carolina, too, had gotten whipped. As to that, I have nothing to say. I only, in a jocular way, remarked to the gentleman that he was mistaken; that South Carolina had never been whipped; that she wore herself out trying to whip the other fellow. But, Mr. Speaker, when he said in substance that he was ashamed of such action on the part of his State, I rose, possibly in an unparliamentary manner, and in the heat of the moment I impulsively said that South Carolina was not ashamed of the part that she took in it; that she was proud of it, and that I for one indorsed secession then. I thought we were right. I think so yet, and that under the same circumstances, surrounded by the same conditions, that I would do the same thing again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat it——

Mr. BARRETT. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARRETT. The point of order is that I ask that the words of the gentleman be taken down and read at the desk.

Mr. TALBERT. I said, Mr. Speaker, that——

The SPEAKER. One moment.

Mr. BARRETT. I desire to have the words taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that the words of the gentleman be taken down.

Mr. TALBERT. I am willing, Mr. Speaker, for my words to be taken down, and I propose to stand by every word that I utter upon this floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to resume his seat. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist that the words shall be taken down?

Mr. BARRETT. I ask that the words be taken down, because, as I understood the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina, his statement was in direct violation of the oath that he took at the bar of this House at the opening of this Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the heat of the moment I impulsively said that South Carolina was not ashamed of the part that she took in it; that she was proud of it, and that I for one indorsed secession then. I thought we were right. I think so yet, and that under the same circumstances, surrounded by the same conditions, that I would do the same thing again.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman was repeating what he said previously for the purpose of making some modification, as the Chair understood.

Mr. BARRETT. I raise the point of order that the rule of the House which provides that when a declaration, made either inside or outside of the House, for which when made a gentleman might properly have been called to order, and the words are repeated here, it is in order for any member of the House to make the point of order——

Mr. CRISP. This is not debatable.

The SPEAKER. One moment. There is one more line to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat it——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution which I am now engaged in preparing.

Mr. TALBERT. I was about to explain my position——

Mr. CRISP. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from South Carolina be permitted to explain.

Mr. BARRETT. I have risen to a point of order, which must be settled by the Chair.

Mr. CRISP. I move, and that is the only motion proper under the rules, that the gentleman from South Carolina be permitted to explain. The Chair will find such motion provided for in clause 4 of Rule XIV.

Mr. BARRETT. I have risen to the point of order, and on that point of order I am entitled to a decision; and if the point of order is sustained by the Chair I will offer a resolution which I am now preparing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read clause 5 of Rule XIV.

The Clerk read as follows:

If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I desire to call the attention of the Speaker to is this——

Mr. CRISP. Clause 4 also bears on the matter.

Mr. BARRETT. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add, is that it has been held in this House that where a member of the House, either in a debate or in a published utterance outside of the Hall of the House of Representatives, has made statements which might have been called in question in the House, and has deliberately reiterated them as his own deliberate judgment, that that reiteration and repetition becomes in the purview of this rule a new statement, upon which any member can raise the point of order when made. The gentleman from South Carolina has deliberately reiterated his statement that under certain circumstances he believes in secession; and I demanded that those words be taken down, as they have been, and upon that statement, when properly called to the attention of the House, I now propose to offer a resolution of censure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. When the Chair called attention to what had

been said, that the gentleman was repeating it, the Chair did not understand the last sentence, which is a repetition of it. The gentleman will send his resolution to the desk.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is leaving wholly out of mind a matter that ought to be taken into consideration in connection with this proposed censure, and that is the declaration the gentleman from South Carolina made in the beginning of his remarks, one I certainly think ought to be taken into consideration in connection with the other, in which he said that he had no such intention as that for which the gentleman proposes to offer a resolution of censure.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I suggest to the Chair that the gentleman very properly made the point of order, and the gentleman from Massachusetts having given notice that he will offer a resolution, I think he should be permitted a reasonable time to put it in writing before further debate takes place on this question.

The SPEAKER. This debate is only by sufferance.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have requested permission of the House to make this statement.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It is not in order.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will make an agreement with the gentleman from Maine that if he will not be in order I will be.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope some other gentleman on that side will come to the same resolution.

Mr. LACEY. The Chair has not ruled whether this is in order or not. Must not a ruling by the Chair necessarily precede any resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order under the fifth paragraph of Rule XIV.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, may I ask why the motion I made is not in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman upon that point.

Mr. CRISP. Rule XIV, paragraph 4, provides that—

If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order; in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate; if the decision is in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and, if the case requires it, he shall be liable to censure, or such punishment as the House may deem proper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never known a case in my experience, and I submit to the Chair whether he has ever known a case since he has been a member of this body, when, a gentleman being called to order for words spoken in debate, and a motion being made by another member that he be allowed to explain, that motion has not been entertained and submitted to the House.

Mr. BARRETT. The Chair will allow me to say that, owing to the noise in the Hall, I have been unable to hear the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia, and am therefore unable to say whether I should agree to his proposition or not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia suggests that under paragraph 4 of Rule XIV he is entitled to make a motion that the gentleman from South Carolina be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. CRISP. My motion was that the gentleman be allowed "to explain." That is the language of the rule, and it certainly never was contemplated in any legislative body that a motion of censure should be submitted before the member had been given an opportunity to explain his words. That is the very purpose of the rule.

Mr. BARRETT. The rule which the gentleman from Georgia has invoked reads as follows:

If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order, in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate.

I do not object to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT], at the proper time, being allowed to explain the statement twice made by him with deliberation, that, under certain circumstances, having taken the oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States, he would attempt to overthrow and humiliate it; but I do claim that the rule does not give any right to postpone the present consideration of the resolution which I propose to submit to the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would any action in the nature of explanation or remarks on the part of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] or of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] be subject to the interpretation that it was "intervening business" which would so operate as to preclude action upon the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, that the matter may be clearly understood—I do not regard it as of any particular importance——

The SPEAKER. It is very desirable that we should proceed in order.

Mr. CRISP. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that I thought it very desirable that the House should proceed in order. Now, that there may be no doubt about the proposition, I will call attention again to the point I have already made, as it appears that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] did not hear me. The gentleman from South Carolina rose in his place this morning to make a personal explanation, or rose to a question of privilege. Pending his remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT], as he had a right to do, called the gentleman from South Carolina to order for words spoken in debate. Now, the question is, what, under the rules, must be done in this condition of affairs? Paragraph 5 of Rule XIV, provides that—

If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

Paragraph 4 of the same rule provides that—

If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order—

That was done in this case by the gentleman from Massachusetts—

in which case he shall immediately sit down—

That is, the member called to order—

unless permitted, on motion of another member, to explain—

Now, he can not make any motion himself, but some other member may move that he be allowed to explain—

and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate.

That is, if appealed to by a motion such as I have made.

If the decision is in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and if the case require it, he shall be liable to censure, or such punishment as the House may deem proper.

Now, in Jefferson's Manual we find stated the rule in the British Parliament:

Disorderly words are not to be noticed till the member has finished his speech—

We have changed that here so far as the time of making objection is concerned—

then the person objecting to them, and desiring them to be taken down by the clerk at the table, must repeat them. The speaker then may direct the clerk to take them down in his minutes; but if he thinks them not disorderly, he delays the direction. If the call becomes pretty general, he orders the clerk to take them down as stated by the objecting member. They are then a part of his minutes, and when read to the offending member he may deny they were his words, and the House must then decide by a question whether they are his words or not. Then the member may justify them or explain the sense in which he used them or apologize. If the House is satisfied, no further proceeding is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, our rule is founded on that. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls to order the gentleman from South Carolina, whereupon the gentleman from South Carolina must immediately take his seat, which he has done, unless he be permitted on motion of some other member—some member other than himself—to explain. I have made the motion that he be permitted to explain.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me a question?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. CANNON. I was not in the Hall when the occurrence referred to took place. I have read the words that were taken down——

Mr. BARRETT. I think I am entitled under the circumstances to be heard in reply to the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The House will be in order; gentlemen will take their seats.

Mr. CANNON. I have heard what the gentleman from Georgia has said since he has been on his feet the last time. I have read the words that were taken down. Now, I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether he understands that the gentleman from South Carolina was in the midst of what he claimed to be an explanation of the words used in debate yesterday or the day before, and that he desires now to make further explanation. I ask that question so that I may know how to vote on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, as to what the gentleman from South Carolina desires I have no means of knowing. As to what that gentleman said I have the same means that every other member who was present has. The gentleman rose in his place and said he desired to make a personal explanation or to present a question of personal privilege, and at the time when he was called to order he was proceeding to make remarks in relation to what took place the other night.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Allow me one question. If I understood the gentleman from South Carolina aright he said, after the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that he was about proceeding to explain what he had said on the previous occasion.

Mr. CRISP. I understood him so to say. But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] does not seem willing that the gentleman from South Carolina should have the opportunity to explain, although the rule says that any member other than the

member called to order may make such a motion as I have made, and that the House may, if it desires to do so, give the member called to order the right to explain.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I beg the gentleman from Georgia to listen to me while I explain the sequence of what has occurred. On Wednesday night I was one of the few members of this House who, braving the action of the elements, were present at the meeting here for the discussion of the bill now, or a few moments ago, under discussion in the House. To my surprise I heard the remarks made by the gentleman from South Carolina at that time, and I supposed that some member older and more experienced than myself would take proper action on the subject. But several moments having elapsed, the point of order became applicable from the fact that the attention of the House was not promptly called to the subject. I allowed it to drop, thinking that perhaps the gentleman from South Carolina had, in a moment of excitement, made a statement of treason to the Constitution of the United States which reflection and time for consideration would prompt him to disavow. This morning, to my still greater surprise, he rises and reiterates that assertion that under certain circumstances—he having within two months taken the oath of office carrying with it the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States—under certain circumstances he would approve and indorse and participate in secession. Immediately upon that statement being made I rose in my place and demanded that the words be taken down, thereby raising a point of order. The gentleman might have been allowed to proceed under the ordinary interpretation of clause 4 of Rule XIV if he had simply violated the rules of this House, under which he might very properly have made immediate explanation, for which the gentleman from Georgia might have asked leave that he be given time.

But upon the words being taken down I offered immediately a resolution and asked the Speaker to give me time to prepare it and put it in proper form. While that offer was pending, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] rose in his place and desired to make a motion, as he claimed, as a matter of right, that the gentleman from South Carolina be permitted to explain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the resolution I offered was a resolution of privilege——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to do so, but I must call the gentleman from Massachusetts to order. The question, and the only question, is whether my motion is in order; and it is not a debatable proposition.

Mr. BARRETT. But the motion I made, the resolution I offered and have sent to the desk, was a resolution of privilege.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman offered no resolution, and can not do so until after the motion I have made, which has priority, is determined.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I insist that the gentleman from Massachusetts be permitted to make his statement.

Mr. CRISP. There is only one thing to be done, and that is to consider the only resolution permissible under the rules, which I have offered.

Mr. BARRETT. I offered a resolution as a matter of privilege to the House——

Mr. CRISP. I call the gentleman to order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to take his seat until the point is decided.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to be heard upon the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, all this is unseemly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] that he understood the gentleman from Georgia to move that the gentleman from South Carolina be permitted to explain; to ask that the motion be submitted to the House. The Chair thinks that has been the usual custom, to submit such a motion to the House for explanation, pending any action on the part of the House, which is taken subsequent to the explanation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if my resolution may be considered as pending I should be very glad, as I said before, to allow the gentleman from South Carolina to explain.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Georgia as made is that the gentleman from South Carolina be permitted to explain.

Mr. BARRETT. What becomes of my resolution?

The SPEAKER. The resolution can be presented, if the explanation is not satisfactory to the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I requested of the Chair and of the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] be given opportunity to obey the rules of the House, which require that his resolution be reduced to writing.

The SPEAKER. Precisely.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And that while he was doing it, after having notified the Speaker of his resolution, while he was using such time as was necessary to the preparation of the resolution, and keeping the floor, he certainly could not lose the privilege of the floor, and the gentleman from Georgia——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks under the rule that the House has a right to say whether it will listen to an explanation from the gentleman of the remarks that he made on the floor of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Undoubtedly, but that is not the point. The point is whether the gentleman from Georgia can rise while the House is awaiting the reduction to writing of a regular resolution and make a motion to take precedence of the resolution itself.

The SPEAKER. The rule of the House and the practice under it seems to give to a member the right to make that motion and the House the right to pass upon it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg the Speaker's pardon for the suggestion that my impression is that the resolution always has preceded the motion, that after the person requiring that the language shall be taken down has offered some resolution calling for the action of the House in a certain direction then, and only then, is the motion in order that the gentleman proceed in order; and if the Speaker please, I think, on reflection, he will see that the motion to be permitted to explain and to proceed in order is an alternative to the proposition for some action in derogation of the language, and therefore that the affirmative proposition of the gentleman, who has asked that the language be taken down, is the pending business.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask just one parliamentary question. Having risen in my place and offered a resolution which is in order under the rules of the House, and not having yielded the floor, is it in order for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to demand as a matter of right to make a motion to allow a certain other gentleman to proceed when I am entitled to the floor under the rules of the House to debate the subject-matter that I have submitted? I had the floor when the gentleman from Georgia rose——

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Georgia to rise when the words were taken down and to make the motion.

Mr. BARRETT. I beg the pardon of the Chair. I offered the resolution and then the gentleman asked that the gentleman from South Carolina be allowed to explain.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine and see from the Clerk what the condition of affairs is.

The Chair is informed by the Clerk that his impression is correct with regard to the time when the gentleman from Georgia rose——

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. We can not even hear the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The question will be taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that whatever may be the technical point in the rule in this matter the House does not propose to act upon a resolution of this importance without giving the gentleman from South Carolina an opportunity at least to explain. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was going on to say that——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The House is in such confusion that we can not hear even the motions which are made. The chronology of these events are plain enough to me, but gentlemen of the House can not understand them because they can not hear what is said. I hope if this matter is going to rise to some importance that we shall have a chance to hear for ourselves the words as they fall from the lips of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has suggested to the House several times the desirability of order. The House has come to order and then immediately lapsed into disorder. If the House will be kind enough to be in order continuously until this matter is finished, there will be less misunderstanding in regard to it.

The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as I was going on to say, I rose to correct the misinterpretation, possibly more than the misrepresentation, that was made by the press of the State. I believe that it was done unintentionally. I have no idea that the press of the State desire to willfully misrepresent any member upon this floor, and the distinction between what I did say and what I meant and what was in the papers is simply and distinctively this:

As I said in the outset, that South Carolina to-day stood as loyal and as true to the flag of the United States as any State in the United States, and that the circumstances and conditions that existed when South Carolina seceded can not and never will exist any more, and I am glad of it. [Applause.] And when I spoke of the question of secession, sir, while South Carolina seceded, as

she thought it to be her duty, with the light before her then, it is quite different to-day; and I did not say that I wished to violate the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution by advocating secession now, because those circumstances and conditions can not and never will exist again.

That great question of secession, Mr. Speaker, has been submitted to the arbitrament of the sword, the only place that it could have been settled, and has been settled and settled forever; and I am glad of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I stand here ready and willing, as I have done on other occasions, to extend the right hand of fellowship to the men who wore the blue, whom I had met under the red blaze of battle, and to tell them now that that war of thirty years ago is over, and let us stop waving the bloody shirt, fill the open chasm, and be once more a united people with one flag, one country, one aspiration, and one motive governing us all. While I believe we were right in 1861 and actuated by patriotic motives, I did not want to be put in the ridiculous attitude thirty years after the war had ended and the question of secession had forever been settled, to be held up as an ignorant fool, advocating secession to-day, and I meant no such thing; and my language has been misinterpreted. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my position; and I am ready to-day—while I look with pride upon my past life as a Confederate soldier, I look down with contempt upon any Southern man who would apologize for his action as a soldier; while as gallant to-day, and while he and I are ready to take up arms in the defense of our common country, the greatest, grandest nation on the face of the earth, it ill becomes a man from the South to bemean the people he represents, and that is the sentiment I wished to reiterate, and not anything that was unfriendly to the Government of the United States. It is not in me. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I am done.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARRETT. Is the resolution now offered by me pending, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is at liberty to offer a resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, That the words of Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina in declaring that "in the heat of the moment I impulsively said that South Carolina was not ashamed of the part that she took in it; that she was proud of it; and that, for one, I indorsed secession then; I thought we were right; I think so yet, and that under the same circumstances, surrounded by the same conditions, that I would do the same thing again. Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat it," are treasonable and seditious, in violation of the oath taken by said gentleman at the opening of this House.

Be it further resolved, That said statement is—

Mr. BARRETT. I ask the Clerk to read it, as I wrote it off hurriedly: That the said words—

are seditious and treasonable, in violation of the oath taken by said gentleman at the opening of the present session of Congress, etc.

The Clerk read as follows:

That said words are seditious and treasonable, in violation of the oath taken by said gentleman at the opening of this session.

Be it further resolved, That said statement is hereby censured by the House, and that it be stricken from the record.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I desire to know if it is in order to make any remarks upon that resolution?

Mr. BARRETT. I think I am entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to disturb the gentleman from Massachusetts, but to make this parliamentary inquiry. Is that resolution subject to any discussion; is it subject to remarks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is, but will hear anybody who has anything to say to the contrary.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move to refer this resolution, together with the gentleman's explanation, to the Committee on the Judiciary?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order.

Mr. DALZELL. I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CANNON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. If I can have order.

The SPEAKER. The House must first be in order. Gentlemen will please take their seats.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to know whether this would be in order as a motion: "I move in view of the explanation of the gentleman"——

Mr. BARRETT. I am entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to submit my parliamentary inquiry. I suppose that is always in order.

Mr. BARRETT. I can not understand the proposition of the gentleman. I am entitled to the floor, and desire to be heard.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Illinois has risen to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARRETT. I had been recognized, and would be only too glad to have an opportunity to proceed.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen can not be interrupted when on the floor with a parliamentary inquiry unless it relates to something a member has said.

Mr. CANNON. It does relate to this controversy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to know whether it would be in order to move as follows:

"I move, in view of the explanation of the gentleman from South Carolina"——

Mr. BARRETT. I do not submit to the gentleman's motion.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). "That the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts do lie upon the table." [Cries of "No!" on the Republican side, and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think the man who makes that motion ought to lie on the table.

Mr. CANNON. I will make it when I get the opportunity.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may get back and the House may get back to the true position in this matter, the Chair and the House having heard from the gentleman from South Carolina his explanation as to whether or not his remarks made on the floor this morning were in order, I desire—— [Great disorder in the Hall.].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend until the House comes to order.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, I desire to make a single suggestion to him as well as to the House. It is this: In view of the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina made an original statement, which has been taken down in writing, and has since made an explanation, and that explanation is not before us so that we can carefully examine it before we have any debate on the subject, I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts whether it would not be well to refer the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary and have it brought back to the House for deliberate consideration. [Cries of "Yes!" "No!"]

Mr. BOUTELLE. We do not want any lawyer's opinion on this question.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances any suggestion made to me by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who is very properly and deservedly the leader of this side of the House, would be promptly acquiesced in by me; but I desire first to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a categorical question, his answer to which may or may not remove this matter entirely from the consideration of the House. I ask the gentleman from South Carolina—and I wish to know whether he is now listening to what I say—— [Cries of "He is not!" "Order!" "Order!"]

I ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] whether he will rise in his place and distinctly, succinctly, and definitely withdraw any remark made by him on this floor which carries with it, directly or indirectly, any implied threat on his part of secession under any circumstances whatever. [Derisive cries on the Democratic side.] Unless the gentleman will withdraw his remark and make this apology to the House, this resolution is going to be voted upon. [Cries of "No!" "Let it be voted on!" "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. Speaker, the great Democratic party on that side of the House by their gentle shouts of "No" advise the gentleman from South Carolina, as their spokesman, not to withdraw his remark, not to say that he disclaims any statement which gives the slightest color or intimation of an intention, under certain circumstances, to lead in a secession movement against the Government of the United States which he has taken an oath to maintain.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts——

Mr. BARRETT. That is not a point of order. Any point of order must be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. The point of order I make, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] has no right to dictate to the gentleman from South Carolina any answer to any question that he propounds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would sustain that point of order, if it was a point of order.

Mr. TALBERT. I have stated my position, and have not another word to say. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman from South Carolina asks me to yield to him in order that he may make such a direct retraction as is due to the House—which I now pause for him to do—I shall move the previous question on this resolution. [Cries of "Move it!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina desires that I shall yield to him that he may make such an apology or retraction? [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARRETT. I do not yield the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I want to make this parliamentary inquiry: If the motion for the previous question is voted down, will it not then be proper to refer this matter to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. BOUTELLE. How does the Speaker know whether it will be "proper" or not?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I again ask, will the gentleman from South Carolina retract the words which he has uttered? [Disorder in the Hall. Derisive cries on the Democratic side.]

Then, Mr. Speaker, upon the pending resolution I move the previous question and demand the yeas and nays. [Cries of "That is right!" on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] demands the previous question upon the resolution which he has offered.

Mr. BARRETT. And I ask that the vote be taken by yeas and nays.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, is it not now in order to make a motion to refer the pending motion for the previous question——

Mr. RICHARDSON (interposing). Mr. Speaker, I must ask for order. We can not hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER (to Mr. DALZELL). The Chair thinks it is in order.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Let the rule be read.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we must ask for order. We can not hear what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is saying.

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order after a while, I have no doubt. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words of the gentleman from South Carolina, taken down at the instance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, together with the explanation made by the gentleman from South Carolina, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order. A motion to refer the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts would be in order under the rules.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion for the previous question the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARRETT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to commit or recommit in order until after the previous question shall have been determined? Is it not in order after the vote on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The language of the rule is: "It shall be in order pending the motion for or after the previous question shall have been ordered," etc.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a point of order. Is this motion debatable?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is it in order to ask for the rereading of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not in order; but that can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE and others objected.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that the motion to refer is not in order pending the demand for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on that point.

Mr. CRISP. I call the Speaker's attention to clause 4 of Rule XVI:

> When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order.

This is a matter "under debate." The gentleman from Massachusetts has demanded the previous question, and a motion to refer is secondary to that. The other rule—the rule as to recommitment—is a different proposition entirely. But here is a proposition not to recommit, but to refer. A proposition to recommit involves the idea that the matter under consideration has once been reported by a committee; and, indeed, the rules of the House contemplate that no measure shall be considered until it has first been reported by a committee. Therefore the proposition to recommit applies to a different state of affairs from that now presented. It applies to the consideration of a matter which has been reported by a committee. It stands on entirely different grounds. The rule which I have just read has always been the rule; it is the rule of general parliamentary law. The other rule is an innovation, an addition to ordinary parliamentary rules.

The rule I have cited is, I repeat, general parliamentary law; the motion to recommit is an additional right granted under our rules, and is intended to apply only to matters that have been reported from committees.

The SPEAKER. The last sentence of clause 1 of Rule XVII reads:

> It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

That seems to be this case.

Mr. CRISP. What does the Speaker do with the other rule which I have just cited?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thinks both rules can be harmonized.

Mr. CRISP. How?

The SPEAKER. By putting the question to the House.

Mr. CRISP. No. We may as well be right about this; and I respectfully suggest that the way to harmonize these two rules is to hold that, the previous question having been demanded, a motion to refer can not be voted upon until the previous question is ordered; but a motion to recommit may be voted upon either before or after the previous question is ordered. That is the way in which to harmonize the two rules.

The SPEAKER. But unfortunately the rule says distinctly that—

> It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit.

Mr. CRISP. Unfortunately for the position of the Speaker, the other rule, reciting the motions "to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question, to postpone to a day certain, to refer or to amend, or to postpone indefinitely," declares that these "several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order."

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is, Shall the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CANNON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether, if the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania prevails, the Committee on the Judiciary will have, with the resolution referred to it, the explanation of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DALZELL. Of course.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. They will have all the information they can get.

Mr. CANNON. If the committee will have, along with the resolution, that explanation, I am for this motion; otherwise I should be glad to move an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can understand for himself what the Judiciary Committee would do if the question were submitted to them.

Mr. CANNON. Then I move an amendment—— [Cries of "No!" "No!"] Yes, yes. I move an amendment adding that the explanation of the words referred to, as made by the gentleman from South Carolina, be referred with the resolution to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DALZELL. That is what I sought by my original motion; but the Speaker ruled that that part of my motion was not in order. If the matter goes to the Judiciary Committee, that committee will, of course, inquire into it fully.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken. Before the announcement of the result,

Mr. BOUTELLE said: Mr. Speaker, I ask, if I may be permitted to do so—and I think I ought to be [cries of "Regular order!" from the Democratic side], notwithstanding the dissenting opinion of the little knot of members on the other side [cries of "Regular order!"]—I ask that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts may be read intelligibly to the House, so that all may know its purport, that it is simply a demand for an expression on the part of the House whether that sort of treasonable language shall be permitted here. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BARRETT. I demand a division on the motion.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 154, noes 41.

Mr. BARRETT. I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask now that the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the resolution be again reported to the House.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I object.

Mr. BARRETT. I ask that the pending question be stated to the House. I demand, as a matter of privilege, the statement of the question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I will withdraw my objection to the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. If there be no further objection, the resolution will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. BARRETT. I now ask the Chair to state the pending question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the resolution just read be committed to the Judiciary Committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 201, nays 71, not voting 84; as follows:

YEAS—201.

Abbott,	De Armond,	Long,	Simpkins,
Acheson,	Denny,	Loud,	Skinner,
Aitken,	Dingley,	Loudenslager,	Smith, Mich.
Allen, Miss.	Dinsmore,	Maddox,	Snover,
Allen, Utah.	Dolliver,	Maguire,	Sorg,
Andrews,	Downing,	Mahon,	Southwick,
Apsley,	Draper,	McCall, Mass.	Spalding,
Arnold, Pa.	Eddy,	McCall, Tenn.	Sparkman,
Arnold, R. I.	Ellis,	McClure,	Spencer,
Avery,	Erdman,	McCreary, Ky.	Sperry,
Baker, Kans.	Evans,	McCulloch,	Stahle,
Bartholdt,	Fischer,	McDearmon,	Steele,
Bartlett, Ga.	Fletcher,	McEwan,	Stephenson,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Fowler,	McLachlan,	Stokes,
Beach,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLaurin,	Stone, C. W.
Bell, Colo.	Gillett, Mass.	McMillin,	Stone, W. A.
Bell, Tex.	Griswold,	McRae,	Strait,
Berry,	Grosvenor,	Mercer,	Strowd, N. C.
Bishop,	Hadley,	Meredith,	Sulzer,
Black, Ga.	Hall,	Meyer,	Swanson,
Boatner,	Harmer,	Miles,	Tarsney,
Bowers,	Harris,	Miller, W. Va.	Tate,
Broderick,	Harrison,	Milnes,	Terry,
Brosius,	Hart,	Mondell,	Towne,
Brown,	Henderson,	Money,	Tracewell,
Brumm,	Hendrick,	Neill,	Tracey,
Buck,	Henry, Conn.	Newlands,	Treloar,
Burrell,	Hermann,	Northway,	Tucker,
Burton, Mo.	Hicks,	Otey,	Turner, Ga.
Cannon,	Hilborn,	Patterson,	Turner, Va.
Catchings,	Hitt,	Payne,	Tyler,
Clardy,	Hooker,	Pearson,	Underwood,
Clark, Iowa	Huff,	Pendleton,	Updegraff,
Cobb, Ala.	Hulick,	Perkins,	Van Voorhis,
Cobb, Mo.	Hull,	Phillips,	Walker, Mass.
Cockrell,	Hutcheson,	Powers,	Walker, Va.
Codding,	Hyde,	Price,	Wanger,
Coffin,	Kem,	Pugh,	Washington,
Cooke, Ill.	Kendall,	Reyburn,	Watson, Ind.
Cooper, Fla.	Kerr,	Richardson,	White,
Cooper, Tex.	Kiefer,	Robbins,	Wilber,
Corliss,	Knox,	Robertson, La.	Williams,
Cox,	Kyle,	Robinson, Pa.	Willis,
Crisp,	Lacey,	Royse,	Wilson, N. Y.
Culberson,	Latimer,	Russell, Ga.	Wilson, Ohio.
Cummings,	Lawson,	Sayers,	Wilson, S. C.
Curtis, Iowa	Layton,	Settle,	Woodman,
Curtis, N. Y.	Lester,	Shafroth,	Wright.
Dalzell,	Lewis,	Shannon,	
Danford,	Linney,	Sherman,	
Daniels,	Little,	Shuford,	

NAYS—71.

Anderson,	Doolittle,	Howe,	Reeves,
Bailey,	Dovener,	Howell,	Sauerhering,
Baker, N. H.	Fairchild,	Huling,	Smith, Ill.
Barney,	Faris,	Hurley,	Southard,
Barrett,	Fenton,	Jenkins,	Stallings,
Boutelle,	Gamble,	Lefever,	Stewart, N. J.
Brewster,	Gibson,	Leighty,	Stewart, Wis.
Burton, Ohio	Graff,	Linton,	Strode, Nebr.
Calderhead,	Griffin,	Mahany,	Sulloway,
Colson,	Hager,	McCormick,	Tawney,
Connolly,	Halterman,	Minor, Wis.	Thomas,
Cook, Wis.	Hardy,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Cooper, Wis.	Hartman,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Cousins,	Hatch,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Crowther,	Heatwole,	Owens,	Wilson, Idaho
Crump,	Hemenway,	Pickler,	Wood,
Curtis, Kans.	Hepburn,	Poole,	Yoakum.
Dayton,	Hill,	Quigg,	

NOT VOTING.—84.

Adams,	Bromwell,	Fitzgerald,	Hubbard,
Aldrich,	Bull,	Foote,	Hunter,
Atwood,	Chickering,	Foss,	Johnson, Cal.
Babcock,	Clark, Mo.	Gardner,	Johnson, Ind.
Baker, Md.	Clarke, Ala.	Grout,	Johnson, N. Dak.
Bankhead,	Cowen,	Grow,	Jones,
Barham,	Crain,	Hainer, Nebr.	Joy,
Belknap,	Crowley,	Hanly,	Kirkpatrick,
Bennett,	De Witt,	Heiner, Pa.	Kulp,
Bingham,	Dockery,	Henry, Ind.	Leisenring,
Black, N. Y.	Ellett, Va.	Hopkins,	Leonard,
Blue,	Elliott, S. C.	Howard,	Livingston,
Lockhart,	Milliken,	Parker,	Strong,
Lorimer,	Miner, N. Y.	Pitney,	Taft,
Low,	Moody,	Prince,	Talbert,
Marsh,	Moses,	Raney,	Tayler,
McCleary, Minn.	Mozley,	Ray,	Watson, Ohio
McClellan,	Noonan,	Rusk,	Wellington,
McKenney,	Odell,	Russell, Conn.	Wheeler,
Meiklejohn,	Ogden,	Scranton,	Woodard,
Miller, Kans.	Otjen,	Shaw,	Woomer.

So the motion of Mr. DALZELL was agreed to.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BUSINESS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to ask unanimous consent that it be permitted to sit during the sessions of this House.

There was no objection.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the House of Representatives:

Pursuant to the request made in a House resolution passed on the 30th day of January, 1896, I herewith transmit the report, with accompanying maps and exhibits, of the board of engineers under the provisions of chapter 189, of laws of 1895, for the purpose of ascertaining the feasibility, permanence, and cost of the construction and completion of the Nicaragua Canal by the route contemplated and provided for by the act which passed the Senate January 28, 1895, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua,' approved February 20, 1889."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota; and

A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled, "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1447) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. G. M. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list; and

A bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Cox, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That the Secretary notify the House of Representatives that the Senate has elected WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold and exercise the office in the absence of the Vice-President from time to time, during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the terms of its resolution passed March 12, 1890.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

CHAPLAIN AT WEST POINT.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill on the Speaker's table (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the chaplaincy at West Point, be taken up, that the Senate amendments be disagreed to, and that the House agree to the committee of conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309 of the Revised Statutes.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HULL. I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I will ask the gentleman to state the nature of the original bill.

Mr. HULL. It is simply to provide for a chaplain at West Point, instead of having him appointed as a professor.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I remember the bill now.

Mr. CANNON. What is the matter at issue?

Mr. HULL. It is simply a question of salary.

Mr. CANNON. Whether he shall have $2,500 or $3,500?

Mr. HULL. Whether he shall be paid as a captain or as a lieutenant-colonel.

The motion of Mr. HULL was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HULL, Mr. TRACEY, and Mr. MCMILLIN.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, after conference with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I ask unanimous consent that the pension session for this evening be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks that the usual pension session this evening be dispensed with, stating that he does so in accordance with an arrangement with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Is there objection?

Mr. PICKLER. I understand that if the Calendar of private pension bills shall become crowded we shall have no difficulty in getting an extra night or some extra time for the consideration of business on that Calendar, and I give way for that reason.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before moving that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole, I desire to see if some arrangement can not be made with reference to debate in Committee of the Whole. I have conferred with gentlemen upon all sides of the House with reference to time, and while I desired very much that the general debate might be closed to-day, yet I have found on inquiry that there was a desire that it should continue through to-morrow. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the general debate in Committee of the Whole on the bill to which I have referred shall terminate at the close of the legislative day of Saturday. I put it in that form with the view of hereafter asking that the House take a recess on Saturday until 10 o'clock on Monday morning, so as to give two hours in that morning for further general debate, and that there be a session this evening also.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the general debate in Committee of the Whole shall close at the close of the legislative day of Saturday. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire what length of time the gentleman from Maine proposes to give for five-minute debate?

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course that is a matter that is entirely in the control of the committee when we shall reach it. That will be entered upon on Monday, and I have no desire at all to restrict that debate beyond what may seem to be reasonable and proper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLSON. I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the objection? Is it to the arrangement as to the time for general debate?

Mr. COLSON. I object to closing general debate at the time stated by the gentleman from Maine, because there are many members here who have had no opportunity to discuss the question before the committee. I think every Representative upon this floor should be accorded the right to be heard upon this important question. Therefore I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 2904; and pending that motion, I move that general debate in Committee of the Whole close at the termination of the legislative day of Saturday. I desire to make a statement in connection with that, by general connsent, that the intention is to have an evening session this evening and to-morrow evening, and also a session from 10 to 12 on Monday, so that gentlemen can see that it gives a very wide range.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to move an amendment. I should like to get the consent of the gentleman from Maine to it. I know, as do all members of the House, that the gentleman always intends to give everybody a chance and to be perfectly fair. I will suggest that it will be much more satisfactory, and I will move, as an amendment, to strike out the words "legislative day of Saturday."

Mr. DINGLEY. The arrangement which I suggested will carry it until 12 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand; but it will not give a Monday night session.

Mr. DINGLEY. That will be given if desired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move to strike out those words "legislative day of Saturday" and substitute "legislative day of Tuesday."

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to call my friend's attention to the fact that on Monday the bill will be open for debate under the five-minute rule, and it seems to me that is the most instructive debate after all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is perhaps the most instructive part of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will the chairman of our committee permit me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I submit that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I do not think there is any disposition to unnecessarily prolong this debate; but I find around me a large number of gentlemen who have not had an opportunity to speak, and who wish to be heard; and it seems to me that instead of closing general debate on Saturday, and having the five-minute debate on Monday, it could be arranged so that general debate shall close with the Monday session, and that will give an opportunity for a number of gentlemen to speak. This is a very important question, whether we consider it from the standpoint of the Senate bill or the House bill; and therefore I hope the gentleman from Maine will consent to fix the closing of general debate for Monday evening instead of Saturday. That will give a number of gentlemen an opportunity to speak who otherwise would not have any chance, and the gentleman will also remember that this question has been of such general importance that quite a number of gentlemen opposing this bill have occupied more than an hour, and thereby cut off a portion of the time which could have been allowed to others.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will withdraw my motion at the suggestion of gentlemen around me, because I wish to be as liberal as possible in the allowance of time, although we have a number of appropriation bills on the Calendar that we desire to have acted upon as early as possible, and will modify my request so that all general debate in the Committee of the Whole shall terminate with the legislative day of Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Maine moves that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering House bill No. 2904.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

BOND REDEMPTION FUND.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. "The gentleman from Massachusetts" declines to be recognized for thirty minutes, but will speak in his own right, and under the rules, for an hour, if he chooses, if he speaks at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts what he already knows—that time for debate is limited. A very large number of gentlemen have come to the Chair and remarked that they desired to speak, and a hundred names, or nearly that number, the Chair has marked upon the list of gentlemen who desire to speak. The Chair has endeavored to arrange with the different gentlemen for the time that they shall occupy, among others with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The Chair has had an arrangement with him from the beginning of the debate until yesterday afternoon that he was to be recognized for thirty minutes, and the Chair tried to recognize him for that time, as the committee well knows, on yesterday afternoon; but because the committee saw fit to extend the time of some gentlemen that arrangement was interfered with. The Chair still desires to carry out the arrangement with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and recognizes him for thirty minutes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will say that the Chair has declined to "carry out that arrangement," as the Chair told me last evening that he did not know when he could recognize me, or whether he would recognize me at all, and he repudiated the arrangement he made with me; and further, he repudiated the arrangement that——

Mr. CANNON. The Chair recognizes you now.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No, sir; not in my own right. [Continuing:] The arrangement that had been made between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN] and myself, that I was to have fifty minutes of his time, the Chair [Mr. PAYNE] repudiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman for thirty minutes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I must be recognized in my own right as a Representative to speak on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that it would be impossible to carry out the arrangements already made if the gentleman is to be recognized in that way. If the gentleman declines to be recognized for thirty minutes, the Chair will be compelled to recognize some other gentleman.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from South

Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] made an arrangement with me on this floor yesterday afternoon that he was to give me fifty minutes. Besides that I was entitled to fifteen minutes that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] did not use, and when I sought to carry out that arrangement and add that to the fifteen minutes, the Chair declined to carry it out and he declined to agree to recognize me at all, saying, "Perhaps he could do so and he would see about it." The Chair has not recognized the agreement that he made between himself and me, and when the presiding officer refuses to do so, I am compelled to ask to be recognized, if at all, in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that he desires to do no injustice. The Chair on yesterday apportioned out the full time until 5 o'clock, and the gentleman from Massachusetts knows it as well as the Chair knows it. After the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] had occupied thirty minutes and the Chair had called the gentleman to order because his time had expired, an effort was made to extend the time of the gentleman from California. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] offered to give him his time. Previous to that the gentleman from South Carolina had taken the floor and occupied it for ten minutes in his own right and had yielded the floor without reserving a moment of his time. After the gentleman from Massachusetts had yielded to the gentleman from California the whole of his time, the Chair was informed by some member that the gentleman from Massachusetts was to have the remaining time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN], and the Chair responded that the gentleman from South Carolina had no time, and in fact the Chair had not understood that any such arrangement had been made. That was all that transpired yesterday on this subject, and after the gentleman from Massachusetts had yielded his time to the gentleman from California the Chair carried out the other arrangement with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE], who occupied the time until nearly 5 o'clock. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not ask to have the ten minutes yesterday afternoon, and of course the Chair could not give it to him if he did not want it. Now the Chair has offered the gentleman from Massachusetts to recognize him as the first speaker this morning for thirty minutes and has done so.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I wish to say that these arrangements for time are not made under the rules of the House, and I have a right, as the Representative of a district in this Congress, to stand upon my right under the rules, and I wish now to be given my full time. The gentleman from South Carolina said on this floor six times yesterday that he yielded me his time. I read from the RECORD:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.
Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask unanimous consent to continue my remarks.
Mr. BOWERS. I ask that the gentleman have fifteen minutes more.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] is entitled to the floor.
Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will consent to an extension of the gentleman's time if I can have the floor when we commence the session to-morrow.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not make that promise, as the time is already parceled out.
Mr. McLAURIN. I am entitled to fifty minutes as a member of the committee, and I yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from California.
The CHAIRMAN. It can not be done under objection.
Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am entitled to that time, as I understand it, as a member of the committee.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman does not recognize the gentleman from South Carolina.
Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. McLAURIN. I should like to know if the objection of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE] extended to my granting a portion of my time to the gentleman from California?
The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this question is out of order. Objection has been made. [Cries of "Regular order."]
Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman rather than have this discussion go on all night.
The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?
Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I desire to have thirty minutes to discuss this question. If I can not have it at any other time, I want it now.
Mr. McLAURIN. I will yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] myself.
Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield all my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], with the understanding that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] is to give me his time. [Applause.]
Mr. McLAURIN. Yes; I will give the gentleman my time. [Applause.]
The CHAIRMAN. What portion of his time does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] yield?
Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. All of it—thirty minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]
Mr. McLAURIN. And I will return the same amount to the gentleman from Massachusetts out of my time. [Applause.]

And he repeated that statement six times in a loud tone of voice in the presence of the presiding officer, and the Chair then thought he thoroughly understood that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] controlled fifty minutes, as is plainly shown by the Chairman [Mr. PAYNE] saying, "It can not be done under objection."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts doubt the word of the Chair when the Chair states that he did not hear that statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I have no parliamentary right to question that, but it is not my fault. This is very extraordinary. The arrangement was made on the floor in the full hearing of all the members, and if the Chair has any defect of hearing, as we all know he has [laughter], and did not hear it, I do not propose to suffer by that. [Laughter.] Now, I am standing on my rights and I want my hour, as the rules give me.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, may I say just a word?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the practice of the House the Chair has recognized the gentleman for a certain length of time, and has made the limitation of time a condition of the recognition. The reason for that is that members who desire to speak, and who are ready to speak, can not be recognized under any other arrangement. Therefore the Chair proposes to recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts now for thirty minutes, and if the committee desire after that to extend his time, that is for the committee to determine and not for the Chair. The Chair is simply trying to carry out the wishes of the committee and the House in limiting this debate.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to say a word? There seems to be a misunderstanding in regard to this matter of time. On yesterday morning I desired a few minutes, and spoke to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], who agreed to allow me ten minutes. I then went and spoke to the presiding officer and that was agreed to, and, having an understanding with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] that the time I occupied then was to be returned out of my time, when I completed my remarks I failed to use the formal words "I reserve the remainder of my time," because I supposed I was speaking in the time of the gentleman from Alabama. On yesterday evening I offered to give the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] as much time out of mine as he had granted to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The gentleman from Massachusetts having yielded his time, relying on that understanding, I think it would be a gross injustice to him to limit him as is proposed, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed to proceed for thirty minutes more.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I decline to speak under an old arrangement repudiated by the Chair. The presiding officer sat in this chair right in front of me here and was just rising from it to go and take the Speaker's chair when I said to him, "I decline to be recognized by you for thirty minutes, and I propose to get the floor for an hour in my own right." Now, the Chair says that it was under an arrangement that I was to speak for thirty minutes. I say deliberately that it was not so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated distinctly that the arrangement all the time down to last evening was that the gentleman from Massachusetts was to be recognized for thirty minutes, and the Chair has not broken that arrangement, but proposes to carry it out.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire thirty minutes more?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. CANNON. Then, Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts have thirty minutes in addition to the time for which he is recognized by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KEM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to whether that will interfere with the rights of any other member who has been promised time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not interfere with the rights of any member upon the other side of the question.

Mr. KEM. But will it interfere with the right of any member?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, in view of the list which he has before him, that some members upon the same side of the question with the gentleman from Massachusetts must have their time cut down. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed to proceed for thirty minutes in addition to the thirty minutes for which the Chair has recognized him?

There was no objection; and Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts was recognized for one hour.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

During the delivery of Mr. WALKER'S remarks the Committee of the Whole rose informally; and Mr. DINGLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, the following business was transacted:

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 153) authorizing the persons therein named to accept certain decorations and testimonial from the late Hawaiian Government, and the same was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and the District of Columbia.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in opening my remarks I wish to say to the House that what I have done with reference to the Chairman has been done under compulsion in protecting my own rights and the rights of all other members of this House. Having been placed by the Speaker of this House in the third most responsible official position in this country on matters now in question, I felt compelled to speak. I did not at first propose to do so, for I thought I had exhausted in previous speeches what I had to say on this subject. It was only because of the gross injustice done me by the present occupant of the Speaker's chair that I took the course I have taken.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, first, that this question is purely an economic question. The fact that silver has been used in any previous time, in any particular manner, is nothing to the point at issue in this discussion. It is as much out of order, in being urged as a reason why we should grant the free coinage of silver, to quote any previous condition of silver as it would be to urge the fact that our forefathers rode in ox carts, subsequently in stagecoaches, to say that therefore we should not ride in steam cars, and to argue that therefore we ought to use ox carts, stagecoaches, and that such vehicles ought to be treated by law and in every other respect as steam cars.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the position of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and of the other gentlemen from the so-called silver States is the

MOST REMARKABLE OF ANY POSITION

taken on this floor by any Representative of any State since 1860. What position do they take on this floor?

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] says:

> The American people are fighting among themselves because they do not look on both sides of the question of the money of the country. The men from the East are for gold; the men from the West, like the knight in the legend, are for silver.

Mr. Chairman, there never was a statement made on this floor in behalf of the silver cause that was more variant from the facts than that statement—never.

The gentleman says again:

> There are 9 States of this Union polling 37 electoral votes that are solid for free silver.

And the gentleman might have added that 7 of those States have 14 Senators and only 7 Representatives. Now, what is the position of those States. They are gold measure of value States, beyond reach of the legislation of these United States. We can no more reach a single obligation payable in those States than we can reach obligations payable in Great Britain. There is not a single one of those States in which every time obligation is not

PRACTICALLY WRITTEN IN GOLD;

principal and interest are made payable in gold. It is so in California. That is the universal rule. I hold in my hand a copy of the ordinary notes used in those States. They are made payable "for value received in United States gold coin."

Mr. HARTMAN. I desire to interrupt the gentleman. I can not speak for California, but I say that the gentleman's statement is absolutely incorrect as to the State from which I hail. Our notes are not made payable in gold; they are payable in lawful money of the United States.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. The gentleman has interjected that into my remarks. I repeat that in all but exceptional cases, a comparatively few cases, where the transactions are not large and where the parties are the common people who are not posted in the

CUSTOMS OF THE COMMERCIAL CLASSES;

with these exceptions their notes are payable in gold. Furthermore——

Mr. HARTMAN again rose.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I decline to yield for any further statements of that kind. The gentleman having interjected that statement into my remarks, I can not give him the opportunity to repeat it fifteen or twenty times. [Laughter.]

Furthermore, what are the facts with regard to those States? The banks of those States are gold banks. They hold seven and a half million dollars in gold. They hold only eight hundred and nineteen thousand dollars in silver—just enough for the purpose of small money under five dollars among their people. They are beyond the reach of legislation. Being safe themselves, they would degrade us. Ah, but says the gentleman from California again—

> I wish to do right by our voters. I wish to do right by the people. I wish that we would do something in regard to this question. I do believe in my party doing something for the cause of silver. Do something to cause its rehabilitation as the money of the nation. That is all I ask.

That is all they ask, is it? But what is this they ask? They ask that all the States this side of the Mississippi River shall be degraded to

A SILVER MEASURE OF VALUE,

to a silver standard with Mexico, China, etc., when, as I said before, no law of Congress, no legislation which by their votes they force on us, can reach those nine States. There may be a few exceptions in one of the States or in certain sections; but where there is one neighborhood in any of those nine States whose obligations are not all written in gold, there are ten times as many sections from Texas and up, west of the Mississippi, and, in fact, all over this country, whose obligations are written in gold. At least one-quarter of the obligations all over this country are now written in gold—I am speaking of the obligations of sharp, shrewd, keen men of affairs. But, while keeping their dollar whole, they would cut our dollars in two that are received by the unthinking, the careless, the wage worker, and all who adhere to old customs throughout the United States in taking and giving notes.

So that these men in coming here and taking the position they do, throwing themselves across the ordinary legislation of the country

TO LEGISLATE BY FORCE,

they demand that no legislation shall be had unless it be first to degrade all the money of the rest of the country to the level of the silver measure-of-value countries, while not a hair of their heads is touched and themselves retain the honest gold measure of value to their people. Those States making this demand have a population, eight of them, of only 1,377,000; they have 16 Senators to enforce their demands, but happily only 10 Representatives.

A gentleman sitting near me states that in South Dakota there is an express statute prohibiting gold contracts.

Mr. GAMBLE. With the permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I desire to state that he is mistaken as far as the legislation of my own State is concerned. If South Dakota is included in the list of States which he has read as adhering to the gold standard, he is in error.

In 1891 the legislature of that State enacted that it should be unlawful for any person in the State, whether it be the mortgagee or the owner of any kind of evidence of indebtedness, or his agent, to require that the interest or principal, or any part, should be paid in any certain kind of lawful money, such as gold, silver, or any specific kind of money, and the debt should be deemed satisfied and fully paid when the specified amount stated in the debt, with legal interest, was tendered in any money that was legal tender for public or private debts.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I am glad one of those States has

REPUDIATED MONETARY SECESSION

and came back into the Union in 1891. I do not wish to do injustice to anyone and am glad to be corrected. This list of States and the facts I have stated were given to me by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and so far as he is concerned his design and purpose, by his own confession, is as I have stated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of coinage at all. Grant free coinage to-day, and instead of having more silver dollars coined you would have none. There would be no object in coining them. Every ounce of silver the world over would be potentially at the doors of the mint, physically not an ounce; because we have now more silver coin than the people can use even with free coinage and there would be no inducement to bring it here. We can only use what coin people will carry. They have free coinage in Mexico, and

THEY COIN IN MEXICO EVERY YEAR

more dollars per capita than the average circulation per capita in that country. Circulation per capita in Mexico is $5, and they coin more than $5 per capita each year and it does not add a fraction of a cent to the volume of silver in circulation. It is all exported. This is purely and solely a question of taking from us the old gold measure of value and giving us in exchange a measure of value strange to us—the silver measure.

I have been asked to state what the effect would be of the free and unlimited coinage of silver by this country alone. I have indicated already part of what I believe would be the effect, but the result of it in this country must inevitably be to put us on a silver measure of value, excepting in the States forcing it upon us, and that immediately. There is not a Government or a merchant or trader in the world that pays the slightest attention to coinage. It has not the slightest significance in values. On the 1st day of every month in this country, and in every other country, there is

A STATEMENT SENT TO ALL THE CUSTOM-HOUSES

giving the value of the moneys of the other countries named in invoices and on which duties are paid on goods imported in exactly the grains of silver or gold of the gold or silver coin that happens to be the measure of value for each particular country.

This simple and incontestable fact disputes every one of your theories about unlimited coinage of silver. Grant free coinage to-day, and it is inconceivable to every man who is a merchant or has had his attention called to the matter, or who has had the slightest thing to do with foreign commerce or largely with domestic commerce, how we could do so and not cut our dollar of account and payment down to one-half its present value. Furthermore, the result would be wrought out in doubling the price to our people of every dollar's worth of merchandise imported from abroad, and at once. And the doubling the price of the merchandise manufactured in this country would soon follow, because there is

A WORLD'S PRICE LEVEL

made by the steamboats and all quick and cheap transportation throughout the world.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I would like, with the gentleman's permission, to ask him a question just there.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I believe the gentleman is a protectionist?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I am.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. And I would be glad to ask the gentleman what would be the effect, if his statement is correct, that if we coin silver it would double the cost of imports from foreign countries into the United States? Would it not give us the very best protective tariff we have ever had in this country? [Applause.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. It certainly would give us the most protective and the worst tariff we have ever had, by absolutely putting a stop to all foreign commerce for awhile. Just as sure as the sun is to rise, and until readjustments were made, it would also

HALVE THE WAGES OF EVERY WORKINGMAN

in the country by doubling to him the cost of everything he consumed; and therefore, as markets are in wages, and wholly in wages, in the long run it would inevitably shut up, and at once, one-half of the factories in the country. Is there a man present who will deny it? Do you not admit it? Must it not inevitably be the effect? Why, there is no more doubt of it, Mr. Chairman, than that we are sitting here on these benches. You double the cost to the consumer of every article he buys, and you at once halve his power to buy, and you halve the market and shut up half the factories and workshops. Do you doubt it? If so, I yield to any man who will express a doubt and tell me why not, who desires to contradict the statement.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I will take advantage of that——

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Well, I will yield for a question. [Mr. ALLEN of Utah advanced from his seat in a further corner toward the area in front of the Speaker's chair.] I decline now to yield longer. I yielded for a question, but I did not yield for floor walking. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, now, again, we have talked much about an international conference; that we would coin silver at 16 to 1 in connection with all the rest of the world. Do you know what that means? Call your conference, and I am in favor of it; make your trial, and I am in favor of it, as a practical demonstration of the impossibility of doing anything

TO INCREASE THE PRICE OF SILVER

by legislation or by diplomacy. Call your conference, I say; make your agreement between all the nations of the world; enter into your binding treaty obligations, and it will not affect the relative price of gold and silver by the smallest fraction of a penny. It can not. It is not possible to do it. It is not a question of coinage even. It is a question of the metal of account, and of values, and of prices, the world over, and if you grant free coinage to-day at 16 to 1 and open all the mints the world over, "chaos would come again," or no effect would follow. The millions, billions, trillions, and so on, to figures past the comprehension of man, involved in the value of the total of all existing things of exchange could by no possibility be readjusted for many generations to the new conditions of value, of account. The stupendous results proposed would stop any trying of the task. The task would be to

DOUBLE THE PRICE IN EVERY SILVER COUNTRY

of every existing thing, immediately double every debt, double every wage paid, or halve prices in every gold-measure country.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question now?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, if you will ask it standing where you are. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Is it not a principle of the Republican party that we ought to have high prices and high wages?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No, sir.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. It is not?

Mr. HARTMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I beg your pardon. I [to Mr. HARTMAN] think I am to answer the question, not the gentleman from Montana. [Laughter.] I have one associate Representative on this floor in the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE], and I do not propose to take on any more. [Laughter.]

The rule of the

REPUBLICAN PARTY MAKES HIGH WAGES

and cheap products. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the effect of Republican legislation.

Mr. STEPHENSON. And sound money?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. And sound money; yes, I accept the amendment inadvertently omitted. I should have put it in a little later. High wages, shorter hours, sound money, and cheap products. [Applause.] Those are the effects the Republican party strives for. No Mexican wages.

Now, again, Mr. Chairman, they say, "If you will grant us free coinage of silver it will go a great way toward meeting the competition we are to have from silver measure-of-value countries, where they are making rapid strides in manufacturing with our machinery." Yea, yea, so it will, by halving the wages of every American workingman. It will have a great effect. I grant it; but at a price in suffering, misery, and starvation that will set the civilization of this country back a century, or rather that will

HINDER THE PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION

more than a century in the next two hundred years.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly; yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Then, on your theory, if products are to be low, the farmer is to work for low wages, and the man who works in a factory in New England is to have high wages. I think the gentleman is driven to that conclusion.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Perhaps; but "the gentleman from Massachusetts" is of a different opinion about the "driving"; that is all. I want to say to the gentleman from Utah that the farmer on the average farm to-day can get twice and a half in gold for a day's work on the farm, in the price of his products—twice and a half what he could before 1855, and I will show you that before I get through, if my time holds out, if the Chairman remains complacent—and the House also. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to repeat here what I have said in every speech that I have made on this subject: that there is an inexorable world's measure of value which no nation and no individual has ever been able to vary by the slightest fraction for eighty years. Is it coinage? Nay, verily, it is

A SIMPLE GRAIN OF UNCOINED GOLD.

It measures the price of every dozen of eggs in the remotest hamlet touched by commerce in any country, as it does the building of the largest steamship that ever floated in any navy. When the price of anything sold (which is a subject of commerce), is given in silver it is the number of grains of silver that will buy a given number of grains of gold that are asked for it. Every price is brought to that test at last, as it was here throughout our war of secession. It can no more be evaded or changed or shirked or got away from than we can get away from breathing air or drinking water. They may do the latter in some States, but not the former. [Laughter.]

There is no evidence now submitted, and there never has been since this discussion began, that prices have been very largely—and I mark my words, as I always do every word I utter in this House, in their limitations—there is no evidence that prices anywhere the world over have been very materially affected by the disparity and the departure of the price of silver from the value of gold. The

FLUCTUATIONS IN THE PRICE OF SILVER

have been a very serious hindrance to trade; not its steady depreciation. There is not only a world measure of value, but there is a world price; and a grain of silver and a grain of gold will buy just as much in any village in China, or India, or Mexico, or the United States, or Great Britain, or France, as in any other country and no more; each precisely the same, lacking commissions and transportation. This is susceptible of proof beyond controversy. Think of the speech on economics that we got from the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. Not a single fact, statement, or inference in it material to the issue. Every existing obligation in this country is honestly payable in gold values. Every existing obligation was made in gold values. We have been on a gold measure of value only since 1834, with the exception of the period of the suspension of specie payments, from 1862 to 1879.

Another thing. They talk about the value of gold. They get up to discuss the question, and state it as a fact that gold does not vary in value, that it does not go up, and that it does not go down in value. Stationary as the heavens. There are a great many speeches made on this floor that are clipped from other

speeches, and when once started they keep going from generation to generation, the same as

M'DUFFIE'S SPEECH ON FREE TRADE.

It has been repeated on this floor ever since 1832. Why, I know when the free traders get up precisely what they are going to say, if they have any wit, for I have read McDuffie's speech; and there never has been a speech made since his day that begins to be as able as McDuffie's in 1832. His logic is irresistible, if you admit his premises, and his ability has not been excelled from his day to the present.

So we are told a good deal about bimetallism. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] told you accurately what bimetallism is. Any device which causes a reasonable quantity of two metals to freely circulate together is bimetallism. It is impossible to have bimetallism upon any other plan but a forced plan, one of treaty or law. It never has existed except on trade lines, on mercantile lines, on laws of commerce, except it has been controlled by law and forced by law, and one metal usually has been a token to the other and commanded the other, one being acknowledged as the real measure of value. It has been so as to gold for centuries.

We have the coinage of gold in every silver measure-of-value country there is in the world, but it is not bimetallism? We had in this country from 1792 to 1834 laws granting legal bimetallism; but we were practically

ON A MONOMETALLIC SILVER MEASURE OF VALUE.

Every candid man admits we have had laws granting bimetallism and providing for it, but we have always been a monometallic nation, on silver, up to 1834, and on gold since until 1878. From 1878 we have been a bimetallic nation upon the only practical ground upon which, under existing circumstances, a nation can by any possibility be bimetallic. This silver discussion in this country, first begun as greenbackism and the heresy as regards legal-tender paper notes in unlimited quantity, and then silver being substituted for greenbackism, has cost this country millions upon millions and billions upon billions; taken out of whom? Every dollar of it out of the wage worker, to go into the pockets of the speculator and the manufacturer and the men who conduct the great enterprises of the country, to again be dissipated in failures and disasters and in various monetary crises that have overtaken the country, all finally at the expense of each.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. In a minute. Let me give you this fact, that $2,000 compounded semiannually at 3 per cent will amount to $4,086.80 in twenty-four years; and only $1,000 at 6 per cent, compounded semiannually, will amount to $4,132; that is to say, you can borrow $2,000 at 3 per cent if sure of payment, as in the case of the Government and others to-day, or you can borrow $1,000 at 6 per cent to be compounded; each amounts to the same sum in twenty-four years; and every business man and every other wise man cares more for good credit and ultimate wealth than he does for immediate profit. Now I will answer the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said that bimetallism implies circulation of both metals?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. TERRY. If that be true, and you have a gold standard, does that imply that you have a gold circulation?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No, sir; not at all. The measure-of-value metal does not even indicate what

THE COMMON MONEY OF THE PEOPLE

really is. The gold coin of this country today only circulates in California and a few Western States as currency. It is held for a measure-of-value metal by institutions where written obligations meet and are settled as scales stand in shops and factories to weigh or a measure to measure.

Mr. TERRY. If a gold standard does not imply a gold circulation, why, then, does the gentleman argue that a bimetallic standard necessarily implies a bimetallic circulation?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. From the fact that while the gold only circulates potentially the cheaper money—the silver—actually circulates, each at parity. It is not practical to circulate gold dollars under $5, and it is practical to circulate ones and twos in silver. In this country the advocates of free silver have taken every action they could take

TO DESTROY THE COMMERCIAL VALUE OF SILVER

by buying it and piling it up before the eyes of the people to frighten the country, thus discrediting it and depreciating its price. There are no two opinions on this point among business men and financiers, that the price of silver would not now be as low by 25 per cent if this country had never cursed it by legislation.

It is the unanimous opinion of financiers; and they know as much about finance as a farmer does about farming, as a doctor does about medicine, or as a shoemaker, as I am, about shoemaking. Why talk this nonsense about silver? It is no better and deserves no more legislation than wheat, gold, cotton, corn, or oats, and coining gold is no more to it than measure or weight is to the others. The measure of all things is human effort. Human effort—price of human effort—makes the price of all articles of commerce. No article has a basic price that exceeds the price of human effort. Now, by human effort gold has depreciated, as measured in wages, 51½ per cent since 1840, and the production has increased one-third. Silver has depreciated 73.9, while its production has increased threefold. Furthermore, the use of metal money of any kind has increased in its efficiency by thousands of folds. Take $1,000 in gold to-day and it will do what it would take $3,000,000 to do by the methods of eighty years ago.

All admit as economists that

INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF ANYTHING

is equivalent to increasing it in quantity. Horses for use, cars for use, wagons for use, plows for use, carriages for use, increasing their efficiency, is equivalent to multiplying them. Here is an object lesson in economics. Since 1840 gold measured in products has depreciated 44.7 per cent. Silver has depreciated 71.2 per cent. Since 1873 gold has depreciated 12.6, and silver 57.6. Overproduction has increased, and cheaper labor cost, and these together account wholly for the depreciation in prices, the cost of labor being less because of greater efficiency, greater skill, and the wonderful machinery used. In 1873 the grains of this country that were produced per capita were 35.6 bushels; in 1892, 51.3, half as much again, and actually a less percentage exported in 1892 than in 1873.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the gold measure-of-value countries produce 80 per cent of all the wheat that is produced in the world, and there is not an economist who has any reputation, or even one with no reputation, for that matter, but believes and thinks he can prove, as I believe he can, that the one-third of any product which averages to costs the most makes the price for the whole body of that product. This can be proved in a dozen ways, and it can be proved in a dozen ways that the

PRICE OF WHEAT NEVER HAS BEEN AFFECTED

even to the smallest iota by the product of wheat in a silver measure-of-value country; and it is impossible that it should be so affected while 80 per cent of the wheat is produced in gold measure-of-value countries.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRUMM. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the cost of human effort makes the price of all things?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, ultimately.

Mr. BRUMM. That is, that the question of supply and demand is not a factor in the price of any commodity?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Supply and demand is not an abiding factor in the price of any commodity. I make the broad statement that supply and demand is never an abiding and controlling element in determining the price. It influences prices; it does not fix them.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman permit me to give an illustration?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes; but be quick about it, and speak so we all can hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMM. I will make it loud enough. [Speaking very loudly.] Suppose that in a winter which is very cold the ice is frozen thickly—I am assuming that this case occurs before the method of manufacturing ice artificially was known—suppose that in a very cold winter the ice is frozen thick and it costs comparatively little to house it; and next, suppose that the succeeding summer is very hot. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts say that the heat of the summer, which is a reason for an increased demand for ice, will have no effect upon the price regardless of what it cost to house that ice? [Applause.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think the House will thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for not asking a personal question and in private in debate, as is the bad custom in this House—a custom, I observe, which is tolerated by the Chair whoever may be the occupant. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, is not that a rich question? I went out once to talk to a polytechnic school in Worcester, and was propounding this same doctrine, and the president of the institution was so surprised that he inadvertently exclaimed, "How about pears? How about the price of pears?" Pears in economics!

ICE IN ECONOMICS! PEARS! ICE!

[Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMM. Ice is a commodity, is it not?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Commodity, yes; and so is dirt a commodity. So is water in a drought.

Mr. BRUMM. Ice used to be a luxury, but it is now an absolute necessity.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. But does any man doubt that the price of ice, in any series of ten years, is fixed by what it costs to produce it, sometimes more and sometimes less—but averages that? Are the profits on the average more to ice dealers than to dealers or producers of shoes, coats, or hats?

Mr. BRUMM. What accounts for it?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Supply and demand.

Mr. BRUMM. Certainly.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Who said that supply and demand did not influence price? Nobody but you. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I understood his answer to be directly this—because I put the question in that way—that the

COST OF HUMAN EFFORT MAKES THE PRICE

of all things, and when I asked the gentleman whether supply and demand was not a factor in making the price, he said "No; practically not at all."

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I say again, practically not at all. Supply and demand influence price. If you have an oversupply of anything the price will go down to cost, or even below it.

Mr. BRUMM. Permit me to say now——

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No; I am not going to let you do all the talking. [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, when you come to supply the vacuum that is made by consumption, I say that not a single shoe, or boot, or yard of cloth, or anything else will be produced that can not be sold at a profit upon the wages that enter into its cost; and the gentleman knows it. Every man knows it.

Mr. BRUMM. One word more. I assert that the cost of an article is no factor at all in the price, except up to the point of competition. That is all I want to say. Now you disprove that.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Who doubts that? That is what I have been trying to say, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said it more emphatically than I have, why the House is under obligations to him. [Laughter.] Of course it is the cost in wages of human effort, when a commodity is produced

IN NORMAL QUANTITY AND IN NORMAL CONDITIONS,

that fixes the price. When the judgment is wrong as to the quantity required, when mistakes are made in producing commodities, or when earthquake or flood intervenes, or excessive heat or cold, then cost may have little or nothing to do with price within a limited area; but, taking the world over, in economics the cost of producing an article makes a basal line below which prices will never go, in normal conditions. Above that line supply and demand affect prices very materially; below the line production stops.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Does not monopoly absolutely control prices in certain cases?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I decline to go into that subject, because it is a subject which would take a whole afternoon to discuss, and my time is limited.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Let me substitute "monopoly" for "ice." [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will, however, say to the gentleman, that monopoly in nine cases out of ten overreaches itself and reduces the price below what it would have been if there were no monopoly.

Mr. MAGUIRE. But not when the monopoly is sustained by law.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further, because I have but little time and I am somewhat

SUSPICIOUS OF THE PROBABLE MERCY

of "surrounding conditions" when my time expires. [Laughter.]

Now, let me give you the prices of products for a series of years, in crucial years: 1857 was a famine year, which those of us who were in business and had our fortunes swept away remember well. Again, nothing can be proven in economics by statistics from 1856 until you come to 1880, when we resumed specie payments. We have to skip that period; 1860 is a dividing line between the present and the past which those of us who study economics understand. I can not stop to explain.

Now, from 1840 to 1855 cotton sold in New York at an average price of 8.7 cents in gold; from 1885 to 1890 the average price was 10.4 cents in gold—one quarter higher. Did the depreciation of silver make its gold price higher? What has free coinage to do with those prices? Yet those are the prices you must take from official sources.

Now, I want gentlemen to listen to this, if they will. From 1840 to 1855 the average price of wheat in Chicago was 65 cents a bushel in gold; from 1885 to 1890 the average price was 85 cents in gold. Enormous overproduction, intermixed with

CONSIDERATIONS OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND,

have since sent it down out of sight at some times. But those are exceptional conditions. The farmers will soon regulate that matter.

From 1840 to 1855 the price of corn in Chicago averaged 33⅓ cents a bushel in gold; from 1885 to 1890 the average price was 40½ cents a bushel in gold, one-quarter higher. From 1840 to 1855 the average price of hogs in Cincinnati was 3⅜ cents per pound, live weight, in gold; from 1885 to 1890 the average price was 4⅞ cents a pound in gold, one-third higher. And, gentlemen, it cost the farmer during the years from 1840 to 1855 one-third of his crop to get it to New York and Chicago and Cincinnati; to-day not over one-twentieth, taking them all together.

Having given you these prices, I say, without fear of contradiction, you may put the question to any 12 men, I care not where you may find them, whether the effort of the farmer to-day will not give him

TWICE OR THREE TIMES AS MUCH INCOME

in gold dollars at the home where he raises his products as it would in times previous to 1860, and the unanimous answer will be yes.

Now, I want to go a little into the business of shipping gold, if you will allow me. The fact of whether the balance of trade is for or against a country or whether the trade is large or small is no indication of the sum of the export or the import of gold into or from the country. That the balance of trade is for or against a country is not the slightest indication even whether gold will be imported or exported. There is no such thing as trade between one country and another. The buying of an article by a citizen of New York from a citizen of London has no more significance, so far as the movement of the measure of value metal is concerned, than the buying of a similar article by a citizen of New York from a citizen of Brooklyn. To maintain otherwise is all nonsense and fustian and contrary to the facts. It betrays a want of investigation that makes a man who will maintain any such position almost unworthy to discuss economic questions.

Now, I have very voluminous tables on this subject, eight of them, which I have had made for me, besides a great many others, in the departments which I have been working on during the last two months. Those tables, bearing on these economic questions, I will present to the House a little later in connection with the banking question. They will open the eyes of gentlemen on this floor to the real financial situation. But to-day let me say only this: Our

EXCESS OF EXPORTS OF MERCHANDISE

over imports was, in 1891, $142,000,000, under normal conditions, before politics had disturbed any of these things. In that same year, when we had a balance of trade in our favor of $142,000,000, the net exports of gold were $34,000,000. What does that prove on the gold question? Absolutely nothing. The United States accumulated, during the suspension of specie payments, $308,000,000 of gold, and India, a silver measure-of-value country, has accumulated that amount of gold in the last few years, as can be proved.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Does not that abnormal condition simply show that we are publicly and privately mortgaged to Europe, and are sending gold there to meet our obligations?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. It shows absolutely nothing.

Now, let me say to my colleague there is no such thing as ever paying a loan that is made in what is called solid securities; it never can be paid in the sense usually understood. It can never be paid by any moving of the thing upon which the security is given. Giving such security is the making of an actual sale with the right of repurchase.

Mr. MAGUIRE. The interest is paid.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No; nor the interest either, excepting out of the products that the man who obtains the loan gets out of that property or some other; or else the man who makes it comes in possession; and he can not move anything that is the basis of solid securities. When

CHICAGO BURNED DOWN

and the capitalists in Eastern cities built it up, Chicago was as rich the day after they did it, so far as solid investment, products, and buildings were concerned—it was Chicago just as much—as it was twenty years afterwards, after the citizens of Chicago, out of the products from this real estate or other products that were handled in Chicago, had paid all those mortgages and owned the city themselves. You can not restore to a lender to take away solid property once created. Can you dig up the railroads and send them to Europe, the bonds of which are owned in Europe? Neither can you restore such a loan by shipping gold. You can only buy back the property you bonded by paying the bonds in products. All trade is product for product; not with gold, but by gold as a measure only, the thing measured and delivered being the ordinary products of commerce or more bonds and stocks.

Gold in shipment stands as the measure, just as the regulator stands on the engine controlling its movements. When there is a demand for gold shipment, it is

POTENTIALLY SHIPPED IN IMMENSE QUANTITIES,

physically never. Stocks and bonds are always sufficiently depreciated in price to be shipped in place of gold.

In Great Britain total imports and exports of gold as compared to total imports and exports of merchandise, are $7 in gold to $100 in merchandise. In the United States $7 in gold to $100 of merchandise. In France and Germany it is somewhat less. In Great Britain the imports and exports for a normal year were $3,600,000,000, or $4 of visible gold to each $100 of commerce, the visible gold being $145,000,000. In the United States the exports and imports amounted to $1,800,000,000 and the visible gold $288,000,000, or $16 to each $100. In France and Germany the ranges are between these figures.

In Great Britain the excess of imports over exports amounted to $614,800,000, or $17 to each $100 excess of imports over exports, being $4⅛ of net gold imported to each $100 excess of imports of merchandise over exports of merchandise. In France and Germany it was somewhat less.

Now, this whole talk about the quantity of gold is also an illusion. If every country should adopt a gold measure of value to-morrow at the commercial ratio of 32 to 1 it would give you

MILLIONS AND BILLIONS OF THE GOLD OF COMMERCE

that is now hoarded. Not a dollar would be sent from one country to the other, or need to be. Silver would be the money of the people of silver-value countries, as it is here, and they would only retain as much gold as was necessary for the foreign-trade demand and no more. The United States is in an abnormal financial condition, such condition as you do not dream of, as I hope to show you a few days later. All we want is to establish our credit. It is something that we should guard with the most jealous care, and no discussion of the silver question should make us lose sight of the importance of it. We must not undermine the credit of the nation to accommodate the silver States or anybody else. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Will the gentleman now permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. If my time has not expired.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. You said you were in favor of bimetallism. I would like to ask what kind?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Such as is in Germany, France, and as we have to-day—the only possible bimetallism.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Have we not trimetallism as much as bimetallism in principle?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes; as a matter of fact we have it quadruple, because

WE HAVE NICKEL, COPPER, SILVER, AND GOLD.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Are they all not redeemable in gold, and is not that the measure by which their value is determined?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly, and just as paper is. They are on the same basis.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Therefore we have more than bimetallism.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes; if I have any time left.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand you to say that the question of the value of wheat was determined solely by the production?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No, sir; I did not. I beg pardon. I said by the labor cost that entered into the raising of wheat, all along the line. Its basial price being the labor cost of the most costly third.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well. And you stated that wheat had been driven down by overproduction?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes; and cotton and nearly every coarse farm product, excepting pork and beef.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hold in my hand a statement which I will read.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Very well. I will not yield to the gentleman to incorporate a statement in my remarks. If he wants to put in a question, I have no objection. I decline to have anything read.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then I will ask, from the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture that the production of wheat from 1885 to 1892 did not vary more than 10 per cent, how can you make out that the price varies more than 10 per cent?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Let me say in answer to the gentleman that

WE HAVE HAD OVERPRODUCTION OF WHEAT

here for many, many years. And let me say again that there is no question whatever but that the statistics which I have given you are reliable, and not a single figure have I given that has not been furnished me by the Departments, and acknowledged to be reliable.

How much time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Now let me say right here something which I forgot in my speech, that there never was an act done by Congress since this Government was formed that was passed with any fuller knowledge or any more deliberation in purpose than the leaving of the coinage of silver out of the codified coinage laws of 1873. Never. There never was an act that was any more fully indorsed by men of all parties and all sections, particularly by the silver States, than that act was. One of the most enthusiastic indorsers of that act was

THE HON. JOHN P. JONES, OF NEVADA,

who, in a speech recorded in the first column, page 178, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 1, part 2, Forty-third Congress, first session—and I want all you silver men to read it—said:

Does this Congress mean now to leave entirely out of view and discard forever a standard of value? Did any country ever accumulate wealth, achieve greatness, or attain a high civilization without such a standard? And what but gold can be that standard? What other thing on earth possesses the requisite qualities? Gold is the articulation of commerce. It is the most potent agent of civilization. It is gold that has lifted the nations from barbarism. So exact a measure is it of human effort that when it is exclusively used as a money it teaches the very habit of honesty. It neither deals in nor tolerates false pretenses. It can not lie. It keeps its promises to rich and poor alike.

And Senator STEWART was equally emphatic in his approval. "It can not lie," says Senator JONES. Ah, I wish gold was

THE STANDARD OF SPEECHES ON THIS FLOOR

as well as of measures of value. [Laughter.] "It keeps its promises to rich and poor alike."

And what does Senator STEWART say in the second column, page 1392, volume 2, part 2, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-third Congress, first session? The following is an extract from a speech of Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART, of Nevada, made in the Senate February 11, 1874. Senator STEWART was then and is now as much interested in silver as any man in this country.

I want the standard gold, and no paper money not redeemable in gold; no paper money the value of which is not ascertained; no paper money that will organize a gold board to speculate in it.

Also, on February 20, 1874, he said:

By this process we shall come to a specie basis, and when the laboring man receives a dollar, it will have the purchasing power of a dollar, and he will not be called upon to do what is impossible for him or the producing classes to do, figure upon the exchanges, figure upon the fluctuations, figure upon the gambling in New York, but he will know what his money is worth. Everybody knows what a dollar in gold is worth.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Was not that speech delivered a year after the demonetization of silver?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Yes, certainly, and in justification of it and commending it, after cool reflection upon it of a year, which makes it a thousand fold more important than if it had been delivered in the debate and pending the legislation which he so heartily and enthusiastically commends.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate for the country that a purely scientific problem directly affecting the public welfare should have become involved in partisan politics. It is unfortunate for any servant of the people in these halls to be made to feel that his political fortunes depended on his action when called upon to decide for his country an issue of such moment. We are all men, and I shall not pause to speculate how far our judgments may be obscured or our actions determined by considerations personal to ourselves. I will say, however, it is our duty to deal frankly with the country and with one another, and as best we can, and as patriotically as we can, to discuss this great problem in the light of reason and common sense.

The issue, Mr. Chairman, is not whether we shall elect to adopt a bimetallic standard of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. If that was the question it would carry in this House by a practically unanimous vote. It is not a question of choice. It is not a question of desire. It is one of power.

The issue is not whether this country will unite with other commercial powers in cooperating to restore the bimetallic standard. The Fifty-third Congress, almost without dissent, passed a law, and it was approved by the President, which authorized the appointment of commissioners to attend an international conference, when it should be called by any of the commercial powers.

The issue is not whether we are to have the gold standard. I was glad to hear the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], one of the ablest champions of the doctrine of free coinage, say in his address this morning that this country was now on the gold standard. We are at the gold standard, and it is not a question of whether or not we shall adopt the single gold standard, because that has already been accomplished.

It is not whether we shall abandon silver as money. I would be very glad to vote for that provision in the Senate substitute which eliminates from circulation bank notes below the denomination of $10. I would be very glad to go further than the substitute, and vote for a law to eliminate all kinds of money below that denomination, except silver and its paper representatives, so as to make a vacuum for silver and to give it the largest possible place in our circulation.

Mr. Chairman, the real question and the only question for discussion is whether this country can, independently of all other countries, establish a bimetallic standard of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and retain silver in concurrent circulation

with gold. I say this is the only issue, because no American statesman, so far as my observation and reading go, has gone so far as to openly declare that he preferred a silver to a gold standard.

In the discussion of this question it is important for us to get at the root of the matter. In my judgment, the main thing is to arrive at a proper comprehension of what is meant by the term standard money. What is standard money, Mr. Chairman? I define it to be money coined out of a substance the commercial value of which is exactly equal to the purchasing power of the money after it is coined. It will be seen that free and unlimited coinage is necessarily the essential feature of standard money. Gold is the standard of this country. By the laws of the United States all the gold in the world, owned by all the people in the world, can be lawfully brought to the mints of the United States and there coined into money, without charge for mintage, at the rate of 23.22 grains of pure gold to the dollar. As all the world has the right to convert its gold into American money at that rate, it follows necessarily that the commercial value of 23.22 grains of gold is exactly equal to the purchasing power of the dollar into which it is coined. Take up the morning paper and you will find that the Mexican dollar is quoted at 53¼ cents. What does that mean? It means, under the laws of Mexico, that 377 grains of pure silver shall constitute a dollar and the mints of Mexico shall be thrown open to the unlimited and free coinage of silver at that rate. It is the standard money of Mexico and the result is that the purchasing power of the Mexican dollar is exactly equal to the commercial value of 377 grains of pure silver.

Gold being our standard of value, it follows that it not only measures the value of all properties, but measures the purchasing power of all other kinds of money. The greenback note tendered at a subtreasury is redeemed in gold, and therefore it is at a parity with gold. The Treasury note when presented is likewise redeemed in gold, and is therefore as good as gold. We have coined a limited number of silver dollars, and the law declares that they shall be full legal-tender money, and shall be received in payment of all public taxes and public dues. As long as the Government receives them in payment of all obligations due it at par with gold, and, on the other hand, pays gold on all its own obligations, they will remain on a parity with that metal. And so the purchasing power of the silver dollar does not depend upon the commercial value of the substance which composes that dollar, but it depends upon the commercial value of the gold which composes the gold dollar; and so the gold dollar not only measures all values, but it measures also the purchasing power of all other kinds of money in our circulation.

I propose to deal very candidly with the advocates of free coinage. The proposition which now comes to us from the Senate is to establish the independence of silver. Our free silver friends have insisted that silver has been discredited; that it has been denied access to the mints; that it is not standard money, and that its dignity as money of ultimate redemption has been destroyed. It is now proposed by legislation to declare that silver shall be standard money; that it shall be independent money; that it shall no longer lean dependent upon gold, but that it shall depend upon its own merits and become, like gold, independent standard money of ultimate redemption.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose is that all the people in the world holding all the silver bullion in the world, or that shall hereafter come into the world, shall have the lawful right to bring it to the mints of the United States and to coin it into American dollars at the rate of 371¼ grains of pure silver to the dollar.

Mr. COLSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. I hope my friend will permit me to proceed with my argument without interference. I think it is better. Now, as 371¼ is 16 times 23.22, it follows that this measure coming from the Senate, if it should be enacted into law, would give us a ratio of 16 to 1. And so the proposition is for this country to establish the free, unlimited, and independent coinage of gold and silver into standard money at that ratio. I admit that if the commercial value of the substanee out of which the gold dollar is coined is equal to the commercial value of the substance out of which the silver dollar is coined the purchasing power of the two dollars will be equal and a bimetallic standard would result. The law which I desire to expound is this: If the commercial value of the substance out of which the silver dollar is coined has a lower commercial value than the substance out of which the gold dollar is coined, both being independent money, the purchasing power of one will be unequal to the purchasing power of the other, and the dollar which is coined out of the substance of the greatest commercial value will be worth more as bullion than as money, and will retire from circulation.

Let us see how the law operates. By to-day's quotation the substance out of which the silver dollar is made is worth 52 cents. The substance out of which a gold dollar is coined is worth, in the market, 100 cents. Therefore, in the open market you can exchange 371¼ grains of pure silver for only 52 cents in gold, whereas in the same market you can exchange 23.22 grains of pure gold for enough pure silver to coin 192 cents at the ratio of 16 to 1. Are we able to maintain a bimetallic standard on such a basis as this? Who would use gold in our circulation when he could take 23.22 grains of that metal and exchange it for sufficient bullion to coin 192 cents of full legal-tender standard money?

Now I have given you the reasons which underlie a law of universal application—a law that is as exact, that is as unvarying in its operations as the law of gravitation.

I have not time to go into the history of other countries, but will briefly refer to the operation of this law in our own financial experience. In 1792, when the ratio of 15 to 1 was established, it was believed by Mr. Hamilton that he had conformed the coinage to the commercial ratio, and all the statesmen of that day recognized the existence of this law and the absolute necessity of conforming legislation to it. But in a very few years the commercial value of silver slightly declined, and the result was that the substance in the gold dollar was worth a little more than the substance in the silver dollar, and immediately, under the operation of the law I have explained, gold retired from circulation and this country was forced to a silver basis. We all know that Thomas H. Benton and other American statesmen testified to the fact on the floor of the Senate in 1834 that gold had been absent from our circulation for a period of more than thirty years.

Why was this act of 1834 passed, changing the ratio from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1? What motive was it that controlled the statesmen in the days of Andrew Jackson in making this change in the coinage ratio?

The object was the restoration of the gold currency. Andrew Jackson, Thomas H. Benton, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, giants in those days, recognized this universal law; and, for the purpose of restoring the gold currency, went to work to conform the legislation of the country to its mandate. They all insisted on the restoration of that currency, and they all insisted that it could only be restored when the coinage ratio was changed so as to make the substance in the gold dollar equal, or less than equal, to the commercial value of the substance in the silver dollar. Nay, more. If gentlemen will take the pains to read the debates which took place at that time, they will find that Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Benton, and other American statesmen, contended that gold was the preferable money metal, and, over the opposition of the friends of the United States Bank, they passed the act of 1834, fixing the ratio at 16 to 1, when the commercial ratio was in point of fact 15.58. So they purposely and intentionally made gold the preferable metal, but they did their work more perfectly than they intended, for ten years had not elapsed until silver was practically retired from the circulation of the United States.

It will be remembered that from about 1845 to 1853 the people used "shinplasters," little slips of paper representing the 5, 10, 25, and 50 cent coins, and they were driven to the use of these shinplasters in their daily transactions because, under the operation of the law of 1834, not only the silver dollar, but the small coins were driven out of circulation, so that the people did not have change for small transactions. So complete was the operation of the law I have invoked in that instance that in 1853 the Congress of the United States passed an act reducing the silver in minor coins and declaring that the half dollar, the quarter dollar, the dime, and half dime should be coined at the rate of 384 grains to the dollar, and should be a legal tender for only $5. I call the attention of the committee to the historical fact that when the Committee on Ways and Means, in a Democratic Congress, reported that bill it was openly declared upon this floor that the country was then upon the gold standard, and it was the purpose and object of the committee that silver should occupy a subordinate relation to gold.

Let us see for a moment what the operation of this law was from that time down to the breaking out of the civil war. From the 1st day of January, 1835, after the passage of the act of 1834, down to the 1st day of January, 1862, when specie payments were suspended during the war, this Government coined $55,000,000 in silver, only $1,700,000 of which were silver dollars, the remainder being subsidiary coins. During that time we coined nearly twice as much in 5-cent pieces as was coined in silver dollars. But we coined during the same time in gold the enormous sum of $353,000,000. Where is the man who can deny the assertion? Where is the man who can refute the proposition that this country in that day and generation was practically, and to all intents and purposes, on a gold standard? When specie payments were suspended both gold and silver disappeared from circulation by the operation of the law which I have explained, and more gold and silver retired from the country during the period of suspension than the sum total of all the greenback and national-bank note currency then in circulation.

During the period of suspension came the act of 1873. I am not going to discuss the righteousness of that legislation. I have always expressed regret that this country had not then united with the Latin Union for the purpose of retaining and maintaining, if possible, the bimetallic standard. But the act was passed;

its work has been accomplished, and we, in common with the other commercial powers of the world, are on a gold basis. The main fact which I wish to impress, in all solemnity, upon the members of this committee is that from the organization of the Republic down to the hour when the free-silver propaganda was inaugurated, in 1876, no American statesman ever disputed the law which I invoke to-day; and I think I can safely challenge every free-silver advocate in this House to point to one American statesman, from the days of Washington down to Samuel J. Tilden, who ever intimated by speech or vote that this country alone could maintain the bimetallic standard at a ratio which differed from the commercial ratio of the two metals. It was in 1876 that the agitation for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was begun. What a spectacle, Mr. Chairman, has this country presented to the enlightened world since that time! I have seen members of Congress, in defiance of the law which I have invoked, deliberately vote for the ratio of 16 to 1, then 17 to 1, then 18 to 1, then 19 to 1, then 20 to 1, all in one day, on a succession of roll calls. Tell me, Mr. Chairman, what would the statesmen of the days of Hamilton and Jefferson have thought of a performance like that? Tell me what the statesmen in the days of Jackson and Benton, of Calhoun, and of Webster would have thought of such reckless defiance of a universal economic law?

When silver and gold are on a parity an ounce of silver is worth about $1.29. Yet in the history of this controversy, from 1876 down to the present hour, the advocates of free coinage have never inquired into the relative commercial value of the two metals. When silver fell to $1.20 an ounce they were in favor of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1. When it fell to $1.10 an ounce they were in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. When it fell to $1 an ounce they were in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. When it fell to 90 cents, then to 85 cents, then to 80 cents, then to 75 cents, then to 70 cents, they were still in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. And to-day, when an ounce of fine silver is worth only 67¼ cents, these same devotees of silver cry out for the free coinage of silver at the same old ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, have I not stated the facts of history truly? I see in his seat my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], who honors me with his attention. I ask him what would Georgia's greatest statesman, Benjamin H. Hill, have thought of a proposition such as the one now proposed? When 371¼ grains of pure silver were worth 87 cents he denounced a measure for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 as a "pickpocket" bill. What would he say if he were here to-day, confronted with a proposition to coin silver into standard money at the same ratio, when 371¼ grains of pure silver are worth only 52 cents?

I am also honored with the attention of a Representative from the State of Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS]. What would L. Q. C. Lamar, the brightest jewel in the crown of that State, say if he were here shedding luster on American legislation, as he did in the days gone by, when brought face to face with such a measure as this? These Halls once reverberated with his matchless eloquence when he exposed, with unanswerable logic, the absurdity of adopting a coinage ratio in defiance of an economic law of universal application throughout the commercial world.

Mr. Chairman, this is a new era in finance! You can not find any statesman outside of America—not even the bimetallists of Europe—who will advocate a doctrine directly opposed to the universal experience of mankind.

The position taken by the sound-money men that the bimetallic standard can only result where the coinage and commercial ratios correspond is so invulnerable to assault, so fortified by reason, and so illustrated and exemplified by all experience that the advocates of free silver can not assail it. They have avoided all reference to it in the discussion of this question when it is possible to do so. Some of them in this debate have been driven to admit that the passage of this act would force gold to a premium, while others attempt to escape the inexorable logic which environs this measure by insisting that while it would not result in retaining gold and silver in concurrent circulation it would secure an alternating standard of the two metals. That is to say, when gold became more valuable commercially than it was as money it would retire, and then when silver became more valuable commercially than as money gold would return and silver retire, and in that way the United States would alternate, first leaning upon one standard and then upon the other, thereby securing an alternating currency of gold and silver.

If all the commercial powers in the world were attempting, as in the past, to maintain the bimetallic standard, and the ratios fixed by them respectively conformed as near as might be to the commercial ratio, then it is altogether possible that the circulation would in some degree alternate; but this, Mr. Chairman, is altogether speculative and the idea advanced by my friends is altogether chimerical. When you take into consideration that all the commercial powers in the world have suspended the free coinage of silver, there is no room for the discredited metal to alternate with that metal which enlightened mankind has adopted as its measure of value. Suppose we had adopted the ratio of 16 to 1 twenty years ago, would it have returned even once during all that period? And now that silver has declined until the bullion in a silver dollar is worth only 52 cents, is it not absolutely certain, in view of all the conditions which environ the commerce of the world, that gold would be driven out of our circulation and would, so far as we can judge of the future, never return?

Sir, the Bland-Allison Act was passed in February, 1878, as a substitute for a free-coinage bill. The silver in a silver dollar was then worth 87 cents. That act was passed in utter disregard of the commercial value of the two metals. Here was the first blunder which led up to the catastrophe of 1893. That law has now been repealed. But I ask you, now that it has passed beyond the heat of partisan discussion, to consider it in the light of reason and common sense. Here was an instance where the most enlightened, the greatest, and most powerful of all the Governments of the earth entered the open market and purchased silver bullion under a law which required it to coin at its mints bullion which cost it 87 cents into a dollar, impressed with all the qualities of full legal-tender money; and to coin such dollars to the extent of at least 24,000,000 annually. The profit made by the transaction was to be covered into the Treasury. Nothing could rescue the Government from the charge of jugglery and dishonesty in a transaction like this except its implied promise to maintain the dollar so coined on a parity with all other forms of currency.

If there is any obligation resting upon the United States more sacred than every other, it is its duty to maintain these dollars on a parity with gold. Otherwise we would have the spectacle of this Government purchasing silver bullion with gold and then coining that silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and sending it out into circulation to be received in payment of its own obligations and the obligations of its citizens. As the coinage of silver under the Bland-Allison Act was in direct violation of an economic law, for the observance of which I am contending, it follows that our silver currency thus coined is, to the extent of the difference between its purchasing power and commercial value, fiat money, and depends on the disposition and ability of the United States to maintain it on a parity with our other currency. Hence these silver dollars remain with us, and will remain with us for all time to come. You can not send out into the arteries of foreign commerce coined money discredited in this manner. It is only secure in its purchasing power within the jurisdiction of the Government creating such a currency. It is a governmental contrivance, and not the money of commerce.

Then came the act of July 14, 1890, by which Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to go into the open market and purchase each month for all time to come 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, and to issue in payment Treasury notes. The act then required that the silver so purchased should be coined at the ratio of 16 to 1 and employed by the Government in the redemption of its notes. I put it to the committee as a question of honorable and fair dealing by a government, Was that act not a financial monstrosity? Was not that kind of jugglery and profit making by a government at variance with every principle of sound finance? There was but one provision of the law which rescued the United States from national dishonor, and that was the provision which required the Government to maintain the parity of all its money. But this injunction was not sufficient to prevent the catastrophe which followed.

The whole commercial world took alarm and the question was naturally asked, How long can a Government, however great and prosperous, issue this paper money in the purchase of silver bullion on the terms required by the act, and indefinitely, without involving its Treasury in such a condition that it could not maintain a parity between its paper currency and gold? An assault was almost at once made upon the Treasury reserve, and for four or five years we have either been drifting into or have been in the midst of a great financial disaster. Can the seigniorage, so called, which the Government has made on this transaction, or the profit which it has made under the Bland-Allison Act, repay the American people for the losses which they have sustained growing out of the instability of our currency incident to such legislation? Was the Treasury of a great Government ever before in times of peace in such a dilemma? With more than 400,000,000 silver dollars in circulation, with $346,000,000 of United States notes payable on demand, constituting a part of its currency, and with $155,000,000 of Treasury notes outstanding, given in the purchase of silver bullion, and these Treasury notes accumulating every month to the value of 4,500,000 ounces of silver, and with the obligation resting upon the Government to maintain a parity between all its dollars, how was it possible to avoid disaster?

With a large proportion of the representatives of the people clamoring for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and demanding that the Secretary of the Treasury should, without regard to law and the just obligations of the Government, pay silver in the redemption of its notes; with shylocks preying

on the Treasury reserve and the marts of trade and commerce everywhere in doubt and confusion as to what the result might be, I submit the spectacle is not one which reflects credit on American legislation. No such flagrant violation of the established and recognized laws of finance has occurred in modern times. Lying at the root of our trouble is the universal knowledge of the operations of the law which prohibits the concurrent circulation of gold and silver coined at a ratio disproportionate to the market ratio without the aid of the Government in maintaining the parity.

The Senate has passed the measure before us. The American people await the action of this House, confident that it will maintain the honor of the Government and the integrity of the currency. But the truth is that the conviction prevails in every commercial community throughout the United States that this Senate substitute would destroy the parity between gold and all other forms of currency and would impair and contract public and private credit to such an extent as to involve the American people in a catastrophe which would destroy all prosperity and entail upon them an era of financial disasters from which this generation could not recover.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Would it disturb the gentleman at this point if I were to make a single suggestion?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have only a few moments, and would prefer to proceed without interruption.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I agree with the gentleman in his views, and I want to hear him on one point which I was about to suggest.

Mr. PATTERSON. Probably I shall touch upon it. This is the condition of affairs to-day. It has been the condition of the country, except when ameliorated by the sale of bonds to replenish the gold reserve, since the panic began in 1893. To-day its solvency and the parity of its money depend absolutely upon the patriotism of its citizens in standing by it in the hour of its need, and their confidence in their immediate Representatives on the floor of this House and in the Executive at the other end of Pennsylvania avenue.

Mr. Chairman, I have now traced the history of our financial legislation in respect to the coinage for more than one hundred years, and I think I have demonstrated the unvarying operation of the law which forces one standard money out of circulation where the substance out of which it is coined is more valuable than the substance out of which is coined some other standard money. Our experience is in accordance with the teachings of science and the practical judgment of the business world. No evasion is possible. The commercial world understands, scientists understand, and the people will understand that the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, when the commercial ratio is 32 to 1, means only one thing, and that is silver monometallism for the United States. I beg the advocates of free coinage to look abroad over the world and challenge them to point to a single country where the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold is authorized by law which is not admittedly on a silver basis. Take this fact in the light of the teachings of science and in the light of our own experience as a nation, and it is impossible for them to escape the imputation that their purpose is not to advance the cause of bimetallism, but to force this country to a silver standard.

Mr. Chairman, the only remaining question for discussion is whether it is advisable for this country to abandon the gold standard, which it now has, and deliberately adopt for itself the single standard of silver. I admit that when I first began to investigate this subject I was fascinated with the idea that the United States might unite all the American Republics upon a silver standard, construct the Nicaragua Canal, open up trade with the East, and compete with England for the trade of the world. But as I proceeded in the investigation I saw this was a delusion and a dream. I hope the committee will bear with me while I give some of the reasons which influenced my judgment. To precipitate the country to the silver basis would produce inextricable confusion in every department of business. Suppose you elected a President and Congress pledged to the passage of such a law.

The President elected would not take his seat until the 4th of the following March, and the Congress elected would not assemble until the first Monday in December following the inauguration of the President, and then it would probably take six months before a law could be passed and put in force. In the meantime the wildest confusion would ensue. Every bank and every holder of gold would hoard it. Creditors everywhere would enter into a fierce struggle to secure the better money in payment of their debts. That debtor who would not renew his debt payable in gold would be driven to the wall. American securities would be forced upon the market. A government which had borrowed gold dollars worth 100 cents for its people, and had then deliberately enacted a law whereby it proposed to discharge its obligations in dollars worth 52 cents, would be discredited throughout the world. Its securities and the securities of its citizens would be everywhere discredited, and the rush that would be made for liquidation would be irresistible.

As we are a government of the people, both people and Government would share the same fate. For years the investors of money in the United States have been taking their securities payable in gold. The banks have to-day the gold very largely in their reserves. The great life insurance companies, which have insurance on the lives of the American people amounting to $7,000,000,000, have been for years collecting their premiums in gold or its equivalent and investing them in gold assets. The election of a President and Congress pledged to the free coinage of silver would at once result in the withdrawal of every dollar of gold from the Treasury, in the payment by banks of silver to their depositors, in the payment of silver by the life insurance companies to their policy holders, and force on the market great quantities of property to be sold for debts payable in gold. In the meantime all kinds of business would be paralyzed, manufactories would be closed, labor would be discharged, and we would have in a most aggravated form all the adverse conditions which existed during the panic of 1893.

Again, the wit of man could not devise a scheme better suited to place the property of the country more absolutely at the mercy of organized and aggressive capital. If it was the purpose of its advocates to create a moneyed aristocracy and a race of peons out of the freemen of America, a more effective plan than this could not be adopted. Be it remembered, Mr. Chairman, that an unstable and fluctuating currency always enriches the few and impoverishes the many. Once disturb and derange the medium of exchange and all will be confusion and disaster.

Again, Mr. Chairman, gold is the money of commerce; and, whether we retain the gold standard or abandon it, we can not conduct our foreign trade on any other standard. It is the money of all the countries to whom we sell our farm products. We neither export cotton, wheat, corn, meat, butter, or other farm products to the silver-standard countries. It is not a matter of choice with us. We are compelled to sell our products to gold-standard countries or go out of business. The prices of our products are all, therefore, measured in gold. As it is now, we measure products in terms of gold, not only in foreign countries, but in our own. Our merchants take into consideration only the rise and fall of the commodities they buy and sell, and they are not afflicted with any doubt in respect to their money. If we were on a silver basis, then our products would be purchased in silver and sold in gold, and as silver rises and falls in terms of gold like other commodities there would arise an additional risk to the merchant; and every additional risk is another burden on the producer. If the purchasing power of a silver dollar compared with gold was 50 cents to-day, and cotton was worth 8 cents per pound in gold, the cotton buyer could not afford to pay 16 cents in silver per pound, because by the time he delivered the cotton the silver might have declined to 49 cents, and the loss would be his.

This explains why manufacturers and merchants in silver-standard countries are at a great disadvantage in conducting their business. It is a double risk; risk in the stability of prices and risk in the stability of their money. They are eaten up by the money changers, and at last the loss falls on their customers.

Again, the matter of interest cuts an important figure in the solution of this problem. Sound money and a low rate of interest are inseparable. After the war, when greenbacks were our only currency and gold was at a high rate of premium, the rate of interest, like the rate of exchange, was very high. One per cent a month was the usual rate of interest, and I remember that in addition to that 2½ per cent was charged the farmers for advances. Frequently more than half the debt of the farmer to his merchant was composed of usury. Now all that is changed and we have a uniformly lower rate of interest. This must also be taken into consideration when we think of going to a silver standard, for the matter of interest, like the matter of exchange, would then enter into the calculation and very seriously embarrass commerce.

But, Mr. Chairman, agriculture, commerce, and manufactures can not prosper in countries which are denied the use of the best money. To show this it is only necessary to call attention to the gold and silver standard countries. Here are the gold-standard countries: The United States, England, France, Germany, Russia, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Austria-Hungary, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Switzerland, Servia, Greece, Bulgaria, Egypt, Turkey, Australia, Canada, Cuba, Brazil, and Chile. Of these, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Brazil, and Chile have recently gone to the gold standard.

Here are the silver-standard countries: China, Japan, India, what are known as "the Straits," the Central American States, the South American Republics, except Brazil and Chile, and the semi-civilized nations of Africa.

You will see from this enumeration that there is not one silver-standard country on the globe which could be classed as a prosperous, enlightened, and progressive nation. All of the enlightened countries have suspended the free coinage of silver and adhere to the gold standard. If we should abandon it we would take a step backward.

The fact can not be disguised that as civilization advances the preference for gold has been everywhere manifested throughout the world. It is an evolution giving expression to the choice of enlightened mankind for the best money attainable.

Again, Mr. Chairman, another consideration which has influenced my judgment is that all gold countries largely use silver as money, whereas silver-standard countries do not use gold at all in their circulation. The truth is, sir, that the gold-standard countries use more silver in their circulation than the silver-standard countries, notwithstanding the latter have more population than the former. I do not mean by this that there is no gold whatever in silver-standard countries, but I do mean that it is not used as a circulating medium. Therefore, if we pass an act for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, it means the establishment of the silver standard and the immediate exclusion of gold from our country. While it may have the effect to give us dollars of less purchasing power, it will give fewer of them. We now have, according to the best estimates, about $600,000,000 of gold in circulation, and free coinage means the loss to the country of all this gold in the form of money. It will be hoarded at once, and either kept as treasure or sold to foreign countries, for no man would use it as money when he could use something only half as valuable.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there is another lesson to be learned. The advocates of free coinage are always insisting on a larger volume of money. It may seem singular, but it is nevertheless true, that invariably the gold-standard countries have the larger circulation. France, the United States, Germany, and England, in the order I have named them, have a larger circulation than the other countries, and they all have the gold standard. I have made a careful investigation of the matter, and I have not been able to find any silver-standard country which has a per capita circulation exceeding $5. The United States and Mexico are adjacent American Republics. I think I am safe in saying that the United States is the most prosperous gold-standard country in the world, and that Mexico is the most prosperous silver-standard country. A recent comparison shows that Mexico has only 43 cents per capita in gold, which does not circulate; 17 cents in paper, and $4.31 in silver, making a total per capita circulation of $4.91; whereas the United States has $9.01 in gold, $9.18 in silver, and $6.15 in paper, making a total per capita circulation of $24.34. How do you account for this significant and important fact? It shows, in my judgment, conclusively that the volume of money follows always a large volume of business.

Sir, the idea that money precedes prosperity is a mistake, but wherever prosperity sets in there money invariably goes. When the conditions are favorable for investments, money will be forthcoming; and when they are unfavorable it will remain away. A good and fruitful soil, tilled by thrifty and industrious farmers, who diversify their crops and make year by year a surplus of products, will present a condition of affairs which will invite investment in that community; money will increase in volume and general prosperity prevail. The same applies with equal force to nations. Those Governments which are not advancing, and in whose confines all opportuity is lost and stagnation prevails, require no great volume of money. The autocratic few live in listless idleness, while the masses are in a state of peonage. But when there is a quickening impulse, demanding money to set in motion the wheels of progress and to send thrift and prosperity through the arteries of commerce, then it will make its appearance and perform its functions. These conditions not only require money, but the best money. And here lies the reason for the phenomenal fact that prosperous and enlightened countries all have a gold standard and a greater volume of money than the silver-standard countries.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is even a greater reason to influence my vote on this measure. The dignity of labor must be preserved if we would preserve our free institutions. The great majority of mankind must labor for their daily bread. I do not say it for political effect, but I utter a great truth which right-thinking men everywhere in the world will approve when I lay down the proposition that it is the chief end of good government to secure for its citizens the right to labor under the most favorable conditions. The men who work are the true soldiers in the army of civilization. I have repeatedly said that a day's work was the true unit of value, and that that community was the most blessed and enjoyed the greatest prosperity where a day's labor brought to the toiler the most comforts of life.

We all know, sir, that in times of distress the masses who labor suffer most. We have had a recent experience. In 1893, when the great panic swept over the country, the rich, notwithstanding their material loss, still lived in comfort; but the poor—the men who worked for their daily bread—were thrown out of employment. When commerce was paralyzed and manufactories were shut down, men with brawny arms were left without work and their children to cry for bread. It is in such times that our free institutions are put to the severest test. They call for the exercise of the best thought and the highest patriotism on the part of those who have been intrusted with the duty of making and administering the laws.

Agriculture, commerce, and manufactories can only prosper in the enlightened, progressive countries which have adopted the gold standard; and I now assert that men who labor are dependent on these conditions for their well being, and that there is not a silver-standard country in the world where they earn wages sufficient to maintain them in comfort and independence.

Before the death of the lamented Judge Gresham I called at the State Department and requested to have tables made up from the consular reports showing the weekly wages paid labor in all the countries of the world, classifying them as gold and silver standard nations; and it is a comparison between the wages paid in the different countries of the world that bears me out fully in the assertion that I have made so often and so emphatically, that laboring men do not earn wages sufficient to maintain them in comfort and independence in any silver-standard country on the globe.

Notwithstanding all we have heard from our free-silver friends to the contrary, silver-standard countries are the abode of petty tyrants and miserable serfs and dependents. As silver declines the prices of the necessaries of life improve, but wages do not advance in proportion, and the misery of the poor keeps pace with the instability and depreciation of the currency.

Sir, gold is sometimes called the money of the rich, and silver the money of the poor, by the people who try to persuade the poor to adopt their financial vagaries. The rich, and especially the rich in money holding, may fatten on a depreciated currency, for it furnishes unending opportunities for speculation. Not so with the man who labors. He has neither the means, the opportunity, nor the information on which to speculate. He only knows that he gets such a wage in money, and if the money is bad he is indeed unfortunate. Of all men he who works for a wage is interested in securing for the price of his toil money which is equal in purchasing power to the best money; and of all men he is most interested in securing for his country conditions of prosperity, because it is on the prosperity around him that he depends for employment.

Sir, we hear a great deal said about the oppression of the debtor class, and it is assumed that the poor are generally debtors and those who conduct the business of the country are the creditors. This is all a mistake. The wage earners of the country are, almost to a man, creditors, whereas the merchants, manufacturers, and traders of the country are generally debtors. The men and women of the country who work for wages and salaries are creditors every week to an enormous amount, whereas the business men are constant borrowers. Both classes are equally interested in the cause of sound money, because business can not be conducted satisfactorily with an unsound and fluctuating currency, and the people who work for wages and salaries can not get employment and neither can they rely for their support on wages which are not paid in money as good as any other. All alike are interested in seeing that every dollar is as good as every other dollar.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I belong to the party of tariff reform. The people, and especially the people of the Southern States, have felt most keenly the unjust, excessive, and oppressive tariff laws. For more than twenty-five years our party has waged a relentless war on the Republican party in an effort to lift the burden of oppressive taxation from the shoulders of the people. Class legislation, by which the substance of one man is taken in order to enrich another, has been the long-continued aversion of the party to which I belong. How often have you heard free-silver Republicans on the floor of the House declare, during the present discussion, that the silver standard would operate as a high protective tariff?

Sir, the liberty of commerce and sound money go hand in hand. If we expect to continue to sell our products in the markets of the world and continue our trade relations with other nations, we must, in order to compete with such countries as England, France, and Germany, maintain for our merchants the standard of commerce.

Sir, it has been stated time and again that we have had a very great appreciation of gold since 1873 and a very great decline in values. It is not my purpose to enter upon a critical discussion of this question. I propose to call the attention of the committee to one great fact in our history, which, in my judgement, refutes the proposition. It is logically and ridiculously absurd to argue that the decline in prices of commodities, brought about by the marvelous inventions and improvements of the age, is the result of the fall in the price of silver. The truth is that silver itself is a commodity, and, like all other commodities under modern conditions, it can be produced at less cost than formerly, and it has declined for the same reason that wheat has declined and manufactured products have declined. But the great fact which stands out in our history is that during the very period referred to we have had a marvelous accumulation of wealth in the United States.

It must be conceded by every thoughtful student of the history of his country that the United States was practically on a gold standard from 1850 to 1860. Leaving out the decade in which the war took place, we had from 1870 to 1880 another period of ten years when the country was on a depreciated paper basis. Then another ten years, from 1880 to 1890, when we were admittedly on a gold standard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the very important fact to which I desire to call the attention of the committee is that in 1850 we had a population of 23,191,876. In 1860 it had increased to 31,443,321. In 1850 the wealth of the United States amounted to $7,135,780,228. In 1860 it had increased to $16,159,616,068. Now, during that period we had 35 per cent increase of population and 126 per cent increase of wealth. This was under the gold standard.

In 1870 the population of the United States amounted to 38,558,371, and in 1880 to 50,155,783, showing 30 per cent increase in population. In 1870 the wealth of the United States amounted to $30,068,518,507, and in 1880 amounted to $43,642,000,000, showing only 45 per cent increase. Now, in 1890 our population amounted to 62,622,250 and our wealth to $65,037,091,197, showing an increase of wealth amounting to 49 per cent. Now, these two decades, from 1850 to 1860 and from 1880 to 1890, being the decades in which we had not only the gold standard but the greatest public confidence in our currency, were the decades in which we have had the largest increase of wealth during our national history.

I do not pretend to say, Mr. Chairman, that this wealth was justly or equally distributed. I contend that under the operation of unjust tariff laws and other legislation it was not distributed as it would be under just and equal laws. But this is not the fault of the currency. The currency affects alike all sections and all classes of our people.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a controlling reason with me is the enormous production of gold in recent years and now going on all over the world. For years back it was predicted that we were on the eve of a gold famine. Our free-silver friends still cling to this gloomy prophecy and never tire in declaiming about the appreciation of gold and its insufficiency to supply the demands of commerce. The truth is that under modern conditions in this age of telegraphy and railroads and steamships money can perform five times the service it could two hundred years ago. Credit and confidence constitute the foundation on which modern commerce rests. It is not the transferring of actual money, but the transfer of credits, redeemable in money, which causes the wheels of commerce to move.

Thomas H. Benton once said on the floor of the American Senate, during the discussion which resulted in the passage of the act of 1834, that all mankind had a predilection for gold. I do not subscribe to the idea that the free coinage of silver has been suspended by the commercial powers on account of the overproduction of that metal, but I insist that this has been brought about by the exercise of this predilection on the part of enlightened mankind for the better money. It has been an evolution growing out of the fact that the increased production of gold has enabled the commercial world to make its selection of the best money.

From the time Columbus discovered America, in 1492, down to and including the year 1895, the world produced $8,780,467,400 in gold. And of this amount it produced $5,830,602,400 within the last fifty years. In other words, the world produced $2,949,865,000 more gold within the last fifty years than it produced in the preceding three hundred and fifty-three years.

Nor is this all. The world produced $787,463,000 in gold during the first fifty years of this century; and in the last five years it produced $815,378,800, or $27,900,000 more within the last five years than it produced in the first fifty years of this century. Owing to modern improvements and new discoveries, low-grade ores are now being treated everywhere profitably, and the production of gold is on the increase in every continent of the world. In 1895 it produced over $200,000,000, and it is now confidently predicted by the best authorities that the world's production will amount to over $300,000,000 in the year 1900.

I say that in view of these incontestable facts it would be, for this reason, the height of folly for this Government to abandon the gold standard; and in view of all the reasons which I have given it would be a crime against civilization for this great country to commit such a folly.

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass further on the time of the committee. This question, so vital to the public welfare, is one of absorbing interest to me. Sir, I hope my patriotism is sufficiently broad to embrace the whole country, but I admit that I am provincial in my sympathies and aspirations. When I look across the Potomac I see a land whose sad memories and glorious history are dear to my heart. How we have struggled to bring the States of the South into the constellation of the Union with undiminished honor and dignity; how we resisted the effort to reverse the order of civilization through the means of universal negro suffrage; how we persisted until the last vestige of Federal interference in our local affairs has been removed; how we have labored to achieve commercial liberty for the whole country; and how, with the cooperation of our friends in the Northern States, we at last built up a great national party, will make one of the brightest pages in American history. I fondly believed the hour had come when no obstacles would stand in the way of unsurpassed prosperity for our people.

It seemed to me that the difficulties in the way of the development of our marvelous resources had all disappeared. It was then, in the zenith of our hope, that this silver question, like a bird of evil omen, came into our horizon to divide our councils, to blight prosperity and engender bad blood, and to entail defeat and disaster on our party. How singular it is! We have coal and iron, and gold and copper, and limestone and marble, and timber, and all the products a fruitful soil can yield—in short, everything but silver—and silver is the cause of our dissensions! I would turn from the spectacle in despair if I did not believe the South would come out of the discussion on the side of good government and sound money. Our people will soon see that this measure which comes to us from the Senate is the work of the silver-mine owners, who represent a very small fraction of the American people. When they take into consideration that there are ten silver-mining States, which have 20 Senators in the other end of the Capitol and only 14 Representatives in this, and that New York has 34 Representatives here and only two Senators there, and when they receive the intelligence of the great majority which this House will record against this measure, they will see that the American people are in no humor to commit this stupendous folly.

Sir, so far as I am concerned, I would, for their good name and their prosperity, rather vote against this measure and trust to the future to vindicate the righteousness of my action and the integrity of my motives than to give it my support and secure thereby a seat on this floor for the remainder of my life. I intend to stand in the breach and warn the constituency I represent against the impending danger to their prosperity, even though I may there find my political grave. [Great applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest, as I always do when that gentleman speaks, to the speech just made by my friend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON]. I have known him for a long time, and have known him to be always able and wise and sincere. He will therefore excuse me, I hope, if I paraphrase a part of his speech. I state to you, Mr. Chairman, solemnly and most boldly, without any fear of successful contradiction, in the words of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] that there exists to-day upon the face of the globe not a single nation of people standing in the forefront of civilization, leading in the march of advancement and of culture, with strong armies and great commerce, or with great literatures, not a Christian or a civilized people who do not wear long-tailed coats. [Laughter.] And there is just as much reason to believe that the fact that all have prospered in enlightenment and Christianity and literature is due to the fact that they do wear long-tail coats as to believe, from anything which he or anybody has ever said, that they have prospered because they happen now to have a gold standard. These same countries, France, England, Germany, and the United States, led all the nations in prosperity prior to 1873, when they did not have a gold standard, with the exception of one of them. And that one, England, saw her most glorious day prior to 1816, when she adopted the gold standard.

They have *always* led, because they have implanted in them by race, instinct, and heredity the qualities which have enabled them to acquire through the ages by conquest of the wilderness, and through conflict with other men, the moral and mental sinews that *make* them the leaders of the world. They are not great because they have money of a certain color; they are not great because they have a tariff of a certain character; they are great because they belong to a race of men who have always been great, whether with silver or gold, with monometallism or bimetallism, whether under kings or Presidents. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Tennessee says, and other gentlemen have said, that there exists not upon the face of the globe a country which he and which other men call a free-silver country that has not silver monometallism. But there did exist such countries at one time; and France, while it was an Empire, and later on, while a Republic, maintained a parity between the two metals, and had not only a bimetallic standard, but a bimetallic circulation for seventy-odd years. And it was not aided, as the gentleman from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, says—and, by the way, whenever I speak of the gentleman from Maine, I speak of him with that feeling almost of affection which all members of this House feel for him—it was not, as he says, because France and later on the Latin

Union were aided by the balance of Europe at that time. As a matter of fact, on one side was gold monometallic England and on the other side were silver monometallic Holland and silver monometallic Germany, and across the water was the United States of America, not aiding to maintain the parity at the ratio of 15½ to 1, but with a conflicting legislative ratio, thereby destroying the perfectness of the parity from time to time.

My friends, it is true there is not a people *to-day* whose mints are open to silver that is not upon a monometallic silver basis. It is also true that there is not to-day a country whose mint is open to the free coinage of silver that stands even in the list of respectables in point of wealth, commerce, and business. It is not the mill that gives value to the flour; it is not the stamp upon the coin that gives value to the coin. It is the use of the wheat after it has been ground, behind the mill, that gives value to the flour. It is the use of the money after it has been stamped, behind the mint, that gives value to the money. If you can grind wheat freely and in unlimited quantities, and if there is somebody somewhere with stomach and appetite back of the mill, furnishing an insatiable demand for the supply of wheat ground, it will sell; and when you coin money and turn it out of the mint, if there is somewhere back of it a force which can utilize it, it will sell; it will exchange for commodities, and it will do everything else that you want done with minted metal or money.

Now, my friends, let us see. The gentleman from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, said if France and the Latin Union could not maintain a parity, why should we, solitary and alone, attempt it. My answer is twofold. First, that France and the Latin Union did maintain a parity. It is true that they did become frightened for fear the day might come when they could not, and they came to the conclusion not to continue it; but so long as they tried it they succeeded. That is the first answer. The second is this, that the commerce of France, Switzerland, Belgium, Italy, and Greece, composing the Latin Union, all put together, foreign and domestic, does not equal the interstate commerce alone of these United States. The statement has been made, and I believe it to be true, that the interstate commerce of the United States alone is equal to the entire commerce of continental Europe. This leaves Great Britain out of account. You will observe Great Britain's cooperation is not needful for bimetallism. This fact was inductively demonstrated from 1816 to 1873.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see. My friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] and others say "you are going to open your mints at a ratio of 16 to 1 and all the silver in the world (and the gentleman said its vast 'stock on hand as well as the annual production") will seek your shores.' Let us see how it could. Now, it is universally admited by the advocates of free coinage and the advocates of the gold standard—it is one of the few things in which they agree—that were free coinage once inaugurated the value of the bullion and the value of the coined silver would be the same, whatever that value might be. They can not differ one iota. Whether silver would be depreciated, as measured in gold, or not, the value or selling price of the silver bullion will be the same as the value or selling price of the silver coin at that time. In every free-coinage country to-day the value of the silver coined is the value of the silver in bullion; but as they do not furnish use sufficient behind the mints to bolster the price of the silver bullion up, the consequence is that the price of silver coin goes down.

Our contention is that the people of the United States, with their enormous uses for money, their unprecedented productive and consuming capacity (according to Mulhall equal to that of England, Germany, and France), their taxes, their public and private debts, their domestic, interstate, and foreign commerce, all on a gigantic scale, would furnish this needed use, this demand; that this increased demand for silver, coupled with the thereby decreased demand for gold, would bring the two bullions, as well as the two coins, together on a plane of intervaluation corresponding with the ratio of 16 to 1 fixed by law.

Now, it being accepted as a truth that under free coinage of silver the bullion and coin value of silver would be the same, how could all of the world's stock on hand of coined silver, or any of it come to the United States? Whether we succeed in maintaining a parity between gold and silver or not, why and how could this silver come to us? What object would there be in sending it to the United States? If its coinage value after it was coined here as money would be no more than its bullion value before it was coined, why send it across the sea and pay freight and insurance to coin it at a rate of 16 to 1, when it is already circulating in Europe on a parity with gold, at a ratio of 15½ to 1 and in India and the East at its bullion value at a ratio of 15 to 1? There would be a loss either of 3 or of 6 cents an ounce besides the freight and the insurance *en route*. So, my friends, one need not take into account the stock of coined silver on hand. Nor even that which is in the form of spoons and other articles of commerce or of vertu. There would be no temptation to mint them, because the price of new silver out of which new spoons, etc., must be made would have gone up proportionately. All you have to provide for, then, is the annual production of the silver mines of the world.

Now, if I stand in my little town of Yazoo City to-day and offer 15 cents a pound for cotton, and it is a fact (and is believed to be a fact) that I have the money to buy all the cotton that can be brought to me and the business in which to use it after it is brought to me, then, for the present crop at any rate, I can fix the price of cotton all over the world at 15 cents a pound in Yazoo City, and for other places at 15 cents per pound less the profit and transportation thither. So it is with money. It is not the number of mints; it is the character and importance of the mints which is to be considered. But just at the point reached by me the analogy between money and cotton ceases. No man could for an indefinite length of time, no matter if he had all the wealth of the world, offer 15 cents a pound for cotton and maintain the price, because cotton is a thing of growth, of expansion, infinite in its possibilities.

Nature and human skill and capital and human enterprise may be brought to bear to raise more and more cotton every year, so that even if one should be able to fix the price of the world's crop this year the cotton raisers would go on and double up the crop upon him year after year, until finally he would find it impossible to meet the supply. But observe that is not the case with silver. You can not make silver to order. You neither sow it nor do you reap it. You must find it and mine it, and so far in history the world has never been struck by any flood of either gold or silver such as some gentlemen here seem to anticipate. Therefore I think it is fair to assume that the average annual product in the past is a fair index of the annual average product in the future. The world's annual product may of course increase absolutely, but it is doubtful whether it will increase in relation to the uses to which it is to be put.

We have a right to judge the future by the present and the past. Even if true, the fact that the production of silver is growing from year to year, so frequently cited as a reason for maintaining its demonetization, is the strongest possible reason why it should be restored as a standard money metal. I had the honor once before on this floor to demonstrate this proposition and also that the production of silver had not increased from year to year proportionately with the increase of population, business, manufacturing, railroading, iron, etc.

I here reproduce some of the figures. They constitute Fact 4 of my speech on this subject delivered on August 22, 1893:

FACT 4.

The annual increase of gold and silver since 1860 has not been as great as the annual increase of population, of commerce, of railroads, of cotton, of grain, and of pig iron in the United States for the same period.

	1840.	1860.	1870.	1889.	1890.	Increase.
						Per cent.
Gold and silver (world's supply)		$167,000,000			$311,000,000	86
Population		31,400,000			62,600,000	100
Railroad mileage		30,626			166,702	444
Leading railroads of the United States:						
Mileage			15,501		63,477	309
Freight movement, tons			396,000,000		4,938,000,000	1,147
Passenger movement			1,732,000,000		6,421,000,000	277
Banking power	$450,000,000		$2,200,000,000		$5,150,000,000	*390 †134
Grain product, bushels		1,240,000,000		3,454,000,000		178
Cotton, pounds		1,836,000,000			3,629,000,000	98
Pig iron, tons		821,000			9,200,000	1,206

* First period. † Second period.

The table published under the head of Fact 4 is especially important, as showing the danger of relying on one metal only when both put together do not keep pace with the world's growth in population, nor transportation, nor banking power, nor grain, nor cotton, nor pig iron.

Assertions that silver fluctuated violently and is depreciating rapidly from natural causes grow out of the fact that the assertors have reference to the price of silver in gold.

But in addition to the fact that necessarily silver does not fluctuate any more in terms of gold than gold does in terms of silver, it is a fact that the price of all commodities, as expressed in the amount of silver bullion for which they would at given times exchange, has varied less than their price, as expressed in the amount of gold bullion for which they would exchange.

Even the production of gold has been growing the last few years pari passu, or almost pari passu, with that of silver. In short, Mr. Chairman, God has managed things more wisely in the storehouses of nature than politicians imagine. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we may consider the annual production as the only thing which we have to take into account. I have already explained that the stock on hand, of coin or ornament, need not be considered in connection with the question of free coinage. Now, what have you got with which to meet this annual production? You have here a Federal Government that collects nearly $500,000,000 annually in taxes. You have here governments that collect for township and municipal and county and State purposes twice as much. You have therefore, say, $1,500,000,000 per annum of taxes alone to be paid, for every dollar of which the legal-tender standard silver money of the United States could answer a purpose. You could coin $1,000,000,000 more silver than you have *before you overtopped the capacity of tax consumption alone.* In addition to that you have a vast amount of private indebtedness and public indebtedness which can be paid in that money. Back of all that; and infinitely exceeding it all, and growing in a geometrical ratio, stands the colossal figure of our commerce, bestriding, like a beneficent, but insatiable giant, a whole continent. There is your demand, and compared with it what signifies the little annual production of a couple of hundred million dollars of silver? All you want is a demand, a use, equaling or overtopping the possible supply. Have you it not?

Mr. HILL. Why not pay it in paper?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will come to that in a moment, though perhaps I may as well touch that question now, if the gentleman will remind me to return later to the point in hand. When you use paper money, or so-called paper "money," there is no use for the paper itself. It is not the commodity of payment. It is simply a promise of or a draft on the agreed commodity of payment. When I pay you this one-dollar bill, you do not accept from me this piece of paper of a certain length and breadth as of itself indemnity for debt or commodity. You accept a promise to pay $1 in coin. It is not the paper itself which is paid or is accepted, or which is of value; it is the thing called for by it whose value is reckoned. Therefore you may increase your paper currency indefinitely and it would not increase the actual money behind it. You might as well talk about increasing the number of bales of cotton in a warehouse by increasing the number of warehouse receipts as to talk about increasing the quantity of money by increasing the number of paper orders or promises to pay money. Solvent paper answers all the purposes of money as *a medium of exchange.* It answers no purpose as a standard or *measurer of values.*

Now, where money has a real value, where it is a real standard money—and standard money was correctly defined by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] awhile ago as being that money which has unlimited access to the mints—a real standard money, then, which has unlimited access to the mints, is always worth as money precisely the value of the material out of which it is made. Any other form of so-called money—currency—has exactly the value of the standard money, if at par with the standard money. An increase of drafts, checks, clearing-house receipts, bills of exchange, paper currency; in short, of credit appliances representing money as a medium of exchange; is very far from being an increase of the supply of the money which measures. Just the contrary, it is an increase of the demand on money, of the strain which it must bear.

If the increase is disproportionate to the increase of the redemption fund (standard money behind it), it is only a question of time when the entire fabric of credits must shrivel to due proportion in the blast of the "panic." If this were not true, $100 in coin would answer the purposes of trade as well as the world's stock of eight billions of coin. Therefore the case of money is not at all analogous to that of paper.

Now, as to this talk about the "Christian and civilized nations" being for gold monometallism; I observed one thing the other day with sorrow. I heard even our friend from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, who is generally so entirely ingenuous and candid in debate, lose himself for one moment and indulge in a little claptrap schoolboy oratory about "Mexicanizing" this American people. Why, my friends I felt sorry when I heard the gentleman from Maine say that and when I saw sensible men applaud it. You can not Mexicanize this American people except in one way. We have prevented that down South, and the people have prevented it on the Pacific Coast, and elsewhere in our country there has never been any danger of it; that way is by hybridizing the race. [Applause.]

Suppose I were to answer the gentleman by saying, "If you want a gold standard in America, you want to reduce the American people to the condition of Haiti (there is a gold standard there), of Cuba (there is a gold standard there), of Turkey (there is a gold standard there), of the most degraded parts of the world—the Portuguese East India possessions, for example, for Portugal has a gold standard." If I should use such an argument—I, a silver crank and a young man—everybody would say, "WILLIAMS, you are making a fool of yourself." But when one of these gentlemen—not a "silver lunatic," but a "gold lunatic"—indulges in that sort of talk, wise men absolutely applaud it on the floor of the American House of Representatives! [Laughter and applause.]

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] says that he believes the fact that all these Christian nations have adopted the gold standard is the result of "evolution." Now, I am a believer in the scientific doctrine of evolution in physical matters, in intellectual matters, and in other things. I think a race of people with heredity back of it—a language with heredity back of it—a business with experience back of it that has been evolved from long ages—is, all other things considered or accounted for, apt to be the best. But I had the honor once before of stating to the House of Representatives the difference between evolution and mayhem. Some people believe that the remote ancestors of our race belonged to the monkey tribe and that by long lack of use for certain parts of their bodies, they lost those parts and by gradual evolution became men. But, as I had the honor of saying before, if you take one of those monkeys and undertake to rid him of his prehensile attachment by chopping it off little by little, you would not call that evolution; you would call it mayhem. Silver is suffering from legislative mayhem. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, it strikes me as a curious thing that gentlemen come here and talk about not "interfering by legislation" with finance, leaving it to "evolution," when the very thing of which we are complaining is that there has been interference by legislation with finance.

I admit—and I have never been an extremist upon any question—that the point made this morning by my friend from Virginia, HARRY TUCKER, a worthy son of a noble sire, was a point well worthy of consideration. It was that no man can "demonstrate" to a mathematical nicety that the result of the United States resuming free coinage would be to establish ultimately and permanently "a parity between the two metals"—to carry up silver to a parity with gold. But my friend from Virginia forgot one thing. The free coinage of silver will not have so great a tendency to carry up the price of silver bullion, great as that will be, as it will to drag down the price of gold bullion, and of gold coin with it, all over the world, because a great part of the present price of gold bullion and of gold coin consists of a speculative element that has been put into it by the knowledge resting in the minds of the commercial world that there was no hope for any help coming from silver to do its work as money.

No, gentlemen, I do not want to thrash out old straw. I do not want to enter again into the diagnosis of the financial disease. You all know what it is. It is the disease of falling prices, not the disease of fallen prices—not the disease of prices which have fallen, which hardly hurts anybody, except for a short time those persons who might happen to be then and there in debt—but the disease which I would define to be the disease of the *process of constantly falling prices,* discouraging investment, sapping enterprise, extinguishing hope of profit. Now, no man of any intelligence and candor denies that there is to-day, and has been for the last twenty, twenty-two, or twenty-three years, a constant tendency to lower and lower prices. In all countries with the gold standard; whether they are in countries with high tariff, or countries with low tariff, or countries with free trade; this has been going on.

This process has not been going on in any countries which have not a gold standard. That is a fact worthy of all remembrance. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] attempted to account for it. He said there have been great improvements in processes of manufacture, great inventions, a cheapening of transportation, a cheapening and extension of banking facilities. My friends, there are two answers to that, which, taken separately or together, are conclusive. In the first place, steamboats, steamships, railroads, and telegraphs were not invented after 1873, but before; yet during the period from 1849 to 1873 prices were always rising. The process of decrease in the expense of handling products, of transportation, did not take its start from 1873; that process had been going on before, yet prices were rising.

These new methods of carrying on the banking business, these new facilities for commerce, these checks and drafts, and all that sort of thing did not take their rise in 1873; they have been vastly improved since that time; but the rate of their improvement was just as great from 1850 down to 1873 as it has ever been since. So that the theory of the gentleman does not meet the facts of the case.

And I was astonished when the gentleman went out of his way to say that in the production of cotton there have been various improvements. Why, my friend, we have always had three implements for working cotton—the plowman, the plow, and the mule; we have them yet. There have been no new processes introduced for producing cotton.

So much for my first answer. My second is to all minds equally satisfactory and to philosophic ones even more a demonstration. It is that when low prices are really brought about by decreased cost of production, improved processes of manufacture, increased facilities, and lower cost of handling, of transportation, and of exchange, two things happen: First, the consumer gets what he buys cheaper, and secondly, and at the same time, the capital invested in production and manufactures gets the same or a higher percentage of reward, while the labor engaged in either receives higher compensation per day or month. A period of low prices from such causes is always and necessarily a period of prosperity and improvement for both consumer and producer. The period from 1873 to 1896 has not answered that description.

Now, I do not say that the undeniable appreciation of gold, both as bullion and coin, is exclusively accountable for the fall of prices which has taken place in all commodities. As the gentleman properly said, if it were the sole factor in all this falling of prices the fall ought to have been uniform with all products.

My friends, when you want to fix the price of anything you have to consider two separate and correlated factors. When you go to fix the price of gold, for example, how do you fix it? First, you consider, or the commercial world considers, on one side the supply of and the demand for gold—or rather the estimated supply and demand, because the problem is a psychological one after all; if there is a mistake in the estimate, the estimate will still control until it is corrected—you consider, I say, on the one side the supply of and the demand for gold, and on the other hand the supply of and demand for the thing for which you wish to sell the gold. Let it be cotton, for example—then you correlate the two answers you get from these two separate inquiries and from that correlation you get the price, which is "the higgling of the market," as Adam Smith calls it, after all.

So, Mr. Chairman, the demand and supply of a particular article and the demand and supply of the money which may be utilized for the purchase of that particular article are together the factors which enter into the calculation. But the demand and supply of money operates uniformly; that is, it uniformly affects the price of all products. Thus, if the product which you buy is one which has fallen in price, then it is true that it would not have fallen quite so much had the supply of real money—not promise to pay money, but real money—been greater. On the other hand, if it be a product which has risen, it would have risen higher but for the other factor, the money-supply factor; just as gravity operates uniformly on all motion, but nowhere without disturbance; so that you can not say of any particular motion that it is solely caused by gravity.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just there for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is one point that I have not heard discussed here during this debate. I have heard it argued, however, by a man who considers himself very learned on the subject, and I would like to have the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi, if it will not interrupt his remarks.

The Constitution of the United States does not discriminate between gold and silver. It prohibits the States from making anything but gold or silver a legal tender in payment of debts. Now, when Congress stopped the coinage of silver as legal tender, can this Congress—has it the power, in the opinion of the gentleman, to, in its discretion under the Constitution, stop the coinage of gold?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, sir, I think if it had the one power it has both. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Let me ask, further, has this Congress, under the Constitution, or has any Congress, as a matter of constitutional law, the right to prohibit absolutely the coinage of either metal as money?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard a good many honest arguments on both sides of that question, and although I am a strict constructionist myself, I am inclined to think that it is within the constitutional power of Congress to state what shall be the money of the United States. There is no express limitation on the power of Congress in that regard. There is, of course, upon the State, which can not make anything but gold and silver a legal tender in payment of debts. But I do not regard that as applying to the power exercised by the Congress of the United States.

Now, I said, Mr. Chairman, that I should not thrash over old straw, and I do not propose to do so, but——

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Did not Mr. Blaine, when he was a Senator of the United States in 1878, say that Congress had no more power to demonetize silver than it had to demonetize gold, and in making that statement did he not quote from that most eminent constitutional lawyer of Massachusetts, Daniel Webster?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say, in that connection, that I do not desire to take up time with the consideration of the views which great lawyers in the United States may have held. They are infinitely better qualified than I am to give an opinion. I do not consider my own views in the premises to be of any very considerable value, nor do I wish to rest my argument on legal grounds. This question is broader than that. It is true that not only Mr. Blaine and Mr. Webster, but very many of the soundest and best lawyers of the United States have held and do hold the opinion suggested.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] says that we have the gold standard in this country, and he is right. We have it. England has it. Continental Europe has it. We not only have it, but we are suffering from it. Does he like it? The mad, foolish experiment has been tried and has failed. Its wreck abides with us. The field of its trial was broad and fair. The pathway of its destructive influence is equally broad. The devastation has been so marked that for the first time in the history of the world the supremacy of the white man in industrial enterprises seems threatened.

For the first time in the history of the world the yellow man, armed with the white metal, menaces the supremacy of the white man, handicapped with the yellow metal.

The gentleman from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, is right when he says that we are even yet in a condition preferable to that of Mexico and Mexicans. But how long will we be able to maintain it? Industrially, I mean.

Mexico is expanding, her prosperity is increasing; she is becoming day by day more and more quickened with the life-giving spirit of enterprise and hope. Our prosperity is waning, our enterprise is deadened, and our people are year by year less hopeful and more and more the prey of despair. What is true of Mexico is true of all countries which are blessed by not being cursed with the gold standard, although they have every disadvantage of condition, race, and aptitude.

What is true of us is true of all gold monometallic countries, although we have the advantages of Christianity, of a growing spirit of democracy, of world-surveying literatures, and of superiority of race and aptitude. Take cotton manufacturing, for example. Both in England and this country the business is in a depressed condition. According to the figures quoted by Sir William Houldsworth in a speech to the Master Cotton Spinners on October 26, 1894:

> While the exports of cotton yarns to China, Hongkong, and Japan in the six years 1876-1881, both inclusive, amounted to 232,000,000 pounds, in the six years 1888-1893, both inclusive, they only amounted to 206,000,000 pounds, and in the intervening six years they had been as low as 202,000,000 pounds.
>
> *Cotton spindles at home and abroad.*—Authoritative figures just published relative to the number of cotton spindles in this country and in continental countries, the United States, and India show how rapidly, says the Pall Mall Gazette, our great rivals in the cotton trade are advancing on us. We are still a long way in front in point of numbers, but this is not an altogether unalloyed satisfaction in face of the fact that spinning is a very unprofitable game here and quite the reverse among our competitors. The spindles in Great Britain to-day are estimated to be 45,270,000, being the same total as on September 30, 1893.
>
> The Continent has seen an increase on the year of 600,000, the total standing at 27,350,000, the United States an increase of 200,000, with a total of 15,841,000, and India an increase of 74,000, with a total of 3,650,000 spindles. If we take the ten years 1885-1894 the relative increase works out at 5.28 per cent for Great Britain, 20.22 per cent for the Continent, 19.55 per cent for the United States, and 70.16 per cent for India. These figures are perhaps the most eloquent commentary we could have on the present condition of our cotton-spinning trade.

From Mexico we hear statistically that 12, 15, 18, 20, even 22, per cent is being reaped from cotton manufacturing; from Japan, that the growth in all forms of manufacturing and commerce is unprecedented.

Let any of my hearers who wish to understand more clearly this matter of the effect of gold monometallism in crippling the industries of gold-standard countries read pages 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 of Archbishop Walsh's inimitable pamphlet, Bimetallism and Monometallism, especially pages 36 and 37, Dublin edition of 1893

I repeat again, in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, yes,

we have gold monometallism. Does he like it? If so, he has a capacity for keeping jolly not equaled by Mark Tapley himself.

The absurd, ridiculous, novel, and uncalled-for experiment has been tried and has failed, failed miserably. Are you going to continue the experiment?

But when we propose a remedy, as is often the case in such discussions, we are met at the forefront with a "bogy man." These gentlemen propose nothing themselves, but they say that under free and unlimited coinage of silver you will have a silver dollar which will be worth something different in purchasing power from what the gold dollar will be worth. They say, further, that that being the effect, all the gold in the country will go into hiding or leave the country altogether. They tell us that we will have "silver monometallism." They never undertake to prove this. It is more convenient to assume it. That is the "bogy man."

Now, Mr. Chairman, when a man threatens you with anything he threatens you with his definition of the thing. He threatens you with what he understands the thing to be, whatever it may be; and when my friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] and the gentleman from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, come to define "silver monometallism" they define it as a condition under which silver would form chiefly or wholly the circulating medium, and they describe bimetallism as a condition under which both metals would circulate side by side. Neither definition is scientifically correct. But I repeat that when a man threatens you with anything he threatens you with his definition of it, whatever that definition may be. If he threatens you with an elephant, and he thinks an elephant is a bear, he is really threatening you with a bear.

Now, let us see where we are. These gentlemen say that from 1792 down to 1834, although we had a bimetallic standard, we did not have bimetallism, that we had a silver circulating medium, and therefore silver monometallism. It has been the chief call, the chief tocsin, the very starting point in the speeches which my friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] has made in the South, and which have been made by other gentlemen there. Suppose it be true. I have two answers to it. First, if this country had silver monometallism from 1792 down to 1834, we are willing to take it over again. No country on the face of the globe was ever more prosperous, no country ever carried on better the work of developing magnificent manhood and womanhood, which is the object of the existence of Government—for Thomas Jefferson was right when he said that "The object of all science and of all Government is the happiness and freedom of mankind"—no people ever grew as rapidly in wealth and culture as when we had this system. They say that the gold will leave us. My friends, what has become of the gold now?

According to these gentlemen we must now have "silver monometallism," and silver monometallism under a false pretense, because they have admitted upon the floor that there is no circulation of gold among the people in this country, that the only metallic circulation is silver. Of course their admission, logically, merely disproves their definition, but they have threatened us with the definition. Now, my friends, I said upon the floor of this House during the extra session of 1893 that the time would come when, under your present system, the coins would part company. It has come. Patrick Henry said in Virginia, "Gentlemen cry, 'Peace, peace!' and there is no peace," and I say to you that you stand here to-day crying, "Parity, parity!" and there is no parity. It does not exist to-day.

The time of Mr. WILLIAMS having expired, by unanimous consent Mr. MCMILLIN was recognized and yielded fifteen minutes to Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. MCMILLIN. In yielding fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I cut out of the papers the other day several interviews with men in the city of New York, in which they were telling what the amount of premium on gold was then and there as a commercial fact. That is not all. Although it has only lately become palpable to the people of this country as an "object lesson," this premium has been existing in concealed form for, lo! these many months. The amount of the interest which the American people have been paying upon the bonds which they have been issuing for the purpose of getting gold in order to maintain the parity is the measure exactly of the premium upon gold at present existing. Now, if there is to be a premium upon gold, I ask you, were it not infinitely better that it should be paid by the gold exporter and gold dealer and importer than by the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question? You say that we now have silver monometallism, according to these gentlemen's definition?

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to their definition.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. Do you like the situation now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not by any means, and I do not want silver monometallism either. I was merely answering their argument.

Now, my friends, I want to go a step further. I want to say that what I meant to show was that the bogy man with which they threatened us was not so much of a bogy man after all, or else is their own bogy man who is partially here now and must come in full under their own system.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. But you do not like him very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not like this. We have now what I call gold monometallism. Now, the truth of the matter is that gold monometallism is a condition of things where the standard or measure of values is gold, and where gold alone has free access to the mints. Silver monometallism is a condition of things where the standard or measure of values is silver, and where silver alone has free access to the mints, and bimetallism is where the standard or measures of value is an alternate, or, as I prefer to say, an alternative, standard of the two, and where both metals have equally, without limit, free access to the mints.

So we have arrived in the history of this mad experiment at this point. There is a premium on gold to-day. But there are gentlemen who will say that is a mere temporary agio, which exists only at the time bonds are to be bought, for the purpose of getting gold to buy the bonds. Admit it for the sake of argument, but, my friends, the time must come necessarily—mathematically—when the agio will be permanent, if your present system is continued, and when the measure of the agio or premium will be the difference between the bullion value of silver demonetized and discredited and the bullion value of gold overmonetized and overcredited. What a difference! Now, how is it, that it must come?

Any child ought to be able to see on general principles that you can not go on forever legislating one bullion up and the other bullion down, lengthening the chain that fitfully binds them together, making the market price of the two bullions further and further apart, without finally reaching the point where the coins made out of them must part company; the point where even the "faith of the Government," or in plain English the credit of the people of the United States, can no longer bind them together. But to enter into details; you have this endless-chain process going on at New York all the time; little buckets dipping down into the golden waters of the Treasury well and bringing them up day by day; exhausting them; and when they get down to a certain point the cry is made by everybody, "Here, we are about to lose our parity, and we had better issue some bonds."

You know the process. Have you any way to stop it? Can it go on indefinitely? You know very well it can not, under a popular form of government. You know it must have an end. Some time it must be stopped; either by the fact that the American people will rise and revolt against the system—and that is the way I think it will end—or if not in that way, then it will end by the exhaustion of the credit of the United States; because even this great Government can not go on borrowing forever.

Are you gentlemen who oppose bimetallism making any sincere effort to stop it? You know you are not. Are you willing to destroy all the greenbacks and Sherman notes, these little buckets which go down into the well? It is true that you would thereby blight and ruin the country; but what difference would that make? You would have your "best money," your dear gold standard! You would have it protected and impregnable. In that way only can you much longer maintain the parity without free coinage.

This is the one way in the world to do it; to be a consistent and logical monometallist like Grover Cleveland; and how many of you are courageous enough to follow him? Are you willing to carry out your system to its logically necessary result, as he does? If you were, somebody else would be found by your constituents to take your places. You can not have gold monometallism along with no circulation of gold. You have got your greenbacks and Sherman notes of 1890 driving out your gold, and you will have to burn them up or cancel them, or in some way get rid of them, if you maintain your system, and yet, even if you were willing, the people of the country would not let you do it.

Now, even if under a certain state of legislation, indicated by me above as Mr. Cleveland's plan, you could possibly maintain the parity, that condition would have to be reached, as I have shown, by legislation which the American people will never under any circumstances consent to. There are not 10 men in this House bold enough to rise upon this floor (and there are some very bold men here when it comes to defying the will of the people) and offer a bill, and stand sponsor for it, for the redemption of greenbacks and Sherman notes without putting in their place some other form of paper money. If you do away with this kind of Government paper you must swap it for some other. You will have to dip some other little bucket down in the Treasury well if you do—some other Government paper redeemable by the Government in gold on demand, if you are going to preserve both the gold standard and the parity.

Will your substitute be bank notes? Then you will have to put upon the banks the business of redeeming the demands for all the gold exporters and gold raiders in the world. My word for it, they are not philanthropic enough to let you do it. They have already told you as much. No! my friends, the fact is this: That fool parity clause in the act of 1890—and I measure my words—stands here to-day obligating the American people to the maintenance of a parity between gold and silver in the United States and for the world with a gold standard; you can't shift nor evade your burden without deserting your system. Will you be brave enough to come with us and desert your poor old stranded wreck? Your experiment has failed; will you let us try? It has put us under the immense burden of maintaining a parity under a gold-standard system, under which a parity is not natural, but is artificial.

We are taxing our people to maintain it not for America alone, but for all Europe. The moment that, without free coinage, without furnishing any demand for silver equal to its supply to be used as money, you fail at the New York subtreasury to redeem in gold you yourselves say that gold will jump to a premium; and if it does it will jump to a premium in London, in Paris, and St. Petersburg. With free coinage you may maintain the parity. I feel certain that, under your present system, you will find it to be a physical impossibility. Gold will jump to a premium, unless some other nation steps in and begins to do what we have been doing, and what no other country has ever thus far done.

The Bank of England does not furnish gold for export free. They have gold monometallism, and the bank raises its discount when the demand for gold is increased. And the amount of the rise of the discount is the measure of the premium paid for export. The Reischbank of Germany does the same thing. The Bank of France refuses to give out the gold at all, except when it chooses. It simply declines to pay gold on demand. So throughout the world to-day there is but one power that is standing here exchanging gold for silver, not directly, but practically; not by law, but by a custom of the Treasury. When that power fails to carry out that custom, you will have then true silver monometallism, as well as gentlemen's definition of it. It will come upon you, as the Germans say, "ueber nacht," in the stillness of the nighttime. It will sweep over the country by telegraph, and not come gradually, as it would, if it came at all, under free coinage.

There is no doubt about that. The fact that we could under free coinage—our plan—carry the value of the silver bullion up to the value of the silver coin for a time, no telling how long, even if we could not maintain it forever (as I and my school think we could), can not be doubted. Our failure, if we failed, would be gradually accomplished, but this thing with which you are threatened would come at once, and disastrously.

Now, there are but two logical standpoints from which to look at it. You have got to be a bimetallist, with gold and silver for standard money—unlimited coinage, with free access to the mints for both metals—or you have got to be gold-standard men, with a gold circulation back of your gold standard to secure it and all demand paper threatening it wiped out of existence. In order to have that you must destroy all of your paper money on hand and put no more in its place. Now, you know you will not and can not do that. The gentleman from Tennessee says, and several gentlemen have said, that you must have concurrent circulation in order to have bimetallism, and they say that we did not have concurrent circulation from 1792 down to 1834, nor yet from 1834 down to 1873, because at one time we differed from the market ratio on one side and at another time on the other side, and we had silver circulation at one period and gold circulation at another, and they say this came about because our ratio differed from the "commercial relation" or "commercial ratio" of the metals.

Now, I want to explode this "bogy man" of the "commercial relation" between gold and silver. There never was any ascertained commercial relation between gold and silver in the sense in which these gentlemen use the term. There never can be any ascertained or ascertainable "commercial relation" between gold and silver, independent of their money uses, in the sense in which these gentlemen use the term, unless one of two things takes place—unless both the metals were at the same time and everywhere demonetized and treated simply as articles of commerce, so that men could take them or not, as they pleased, or unless both metals were everywhere in the world at the same time treated in the same way by giving both free access to the mints. Neither of these conditions of things has ever existed on the face of the globe, and therefore any man knows that when you come to talk of the "commercial ratio" you are talking of a vain thing.

If there is any way of ascertaining what their natural normal ratio or relation of value, independent of all mint laws or legislation, is, it would be by ascertaining what has been their relative production from the storehouses of God—their bulk ratio. This, long lapses of time being taken, or the entire production up to date being taken, has varied remarkably little. It is now precisely 16.3 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. Add on the three-tenths, if you think it worth while. I would not object materially.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] said that our forefathers in 1792 went to work to find the commercial ratio between silver and gold, and fixed it at 15 to 1, and having missed the true "commercial ratio," as a consequence lost their gold; that they went to work again in 1834 and fixed the ratio at 16 to 1, and having again missed the "true commercial ratio," lost their silver; and he said that at both times it was because they had varied from this imaginary vain thing, this imaginary "commercial ratio," this *evanishing tertium quid*. But the gentleman's explanation is not correct. The result which he describes happened both times because our ancestors were wise, like the gentleman from Tennessee—superwise—and went around hunting after a vain thing, a "figment of the brain." If they had gone ahead like practical business men and said: "We will take the French ratio of 15½ to 1—the mint ratio, the legal ratio, the legislative ratio, which we find existing"—if they had done that instead of going to work to build up a conflicting ratio, there never would have been any loss of gold or silver from the United States at either time.

The fact is that France at both these periods had concurrent circulation of the two metals. Why? Because at that period in the history of the world the commerce of France, and later on of France and the Latin Union, so much outweighed ours in the esteem of the commercial world that it absolutely subordinated ours, and their mint ratio controlled ours, and the ratio of France, except for temporary agios which occurred on special occasions, and under any system will occur temporarily or locally—gentlemen will remember that there was one of 3 cents on the silver dollar during the panic in New York in 1893—the ratio of France, I say, except for those temporary or local agios, was maintained, and the metals were kept at perfect parity all that time in the French market, and at a substantial parity in the London market even.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall publish in the RECORD some figures taken from Sir Hucks Gibbs's Colloquies on Currency, and prepared by Mr. E. Barclay, showing in one column the amount of money which the Bank of France coined in gold and in the next column the amount she coined in silver year by year during this entire period, showing how the concurrent circulation of the two metals was going on in France, whereas it will be remembered that in this country we coined but little gold down to 1834, and but little silver from 1834 down to 1873.

TABLE H.—*Showing by their dates the number of gold 20-franc pieces and silver 5-franc pieces coined in France from 1803 to July 31, 1878.*

Date.	Number of pieces coined each year.		Date.	Number of pieces coined each year.	
	20-franc gold pieces.	5-franc silver pieces.		20-franc gold pieces.	5-franc silver pieces.
1803	58,262	4,565,400	1842	92,636	13,175,982
1804	1,416,387	8,460,663	1843	141,330	14,371,790
1805	520,311	7,836,898	1844	137,113	13,395,112
1806	1,151,950	4,485,649	1845	5,957	16,780,658
1807	839,444	804,423	1846	104,321	8,442,203
1808	1,482,975	9,382,286	1847	385,301	14,332,206
1809	720,110	7,985,445	1848	1,984,887	23,810,589
1810	2,186,802	10,344,480	1849	1,355,478	40,766,309
1811	4,070,593	48,947,496	1850	3,963,594	16,120,678
1812	3,471,798	31,045,613	1851	12,585,214	11,499,290
1813	3,037,054	26,002,853	1852	694,065	13,990,200
1814	3,227,236	12,157,707	1853	15,648,201	3,891,632
1815	2,763,992	7,532,048	1854	23,485,957	10,615
1816	640,106	6,836,669	1855	18,399,783	4,861,173
1817	2,428,882	7,008,958	1856	18,745,899	9,155,481
1818	4,042,851	2,419,939	1857	19,193,214	93,406
1819	2,611,313	4,188,801	1858	18,877,635	26,790
1820	1,428,094	3,612,292	1859	26,166,075	3,365
1821	20,207	13,355,182	1860	15,946,635	----------
1822	233,937	19,688,279	1861	4,030,253	22,098
1823	20,087	16,068,150	1862	7,732,433	21,129
1824	324,477	22,314,567	1863	7,672,793	21,087
1825	2,179,346	14,573,894	1864	10,382,097	32,168
1826	46,153	17,746,462	1865	6,039,958	97,134
1827	157,835	29,916,081	1866	13,970,178	37,898
1828	297,259	31,426,133	1867	7,439,514	10,810,313
1829	13,729	19,929,090	1868	14,110,127	18,724,110
1830	464,908	23,739,223	1869	11,362,847	11,652,857
1831	2,356,943	40,658,479	1870	2,717,440	10,729,670
1832	49,433	26,861,063	1871	2,508,494	942,181
1833	394,307	30,885,119	1872	----------	77,833
1834	883,344	42,306,804	1873	----------	30,929,809
1835	152,927	19,162,221	1874	1,215,985	11,909,202
1836	149,376	8,303,765	1875	11,745,600	15,000,000
1837	44,889	21,840,508	1876	8,824,658	10,532,263
1838	184,953	17,248,016	1877 *	12,759,057	3,292,857
1839	1,033,454	14,307,757	1878	7,090,088	363,130
1840	2,049,912	12,261,177			
1841	618,753	14,659,936	Total	355,294,106	990,973,143

* The coinage of 5-franc pieces in 1877 and 1878 belongs to engagements entered into prior to the law of August 5, 1876. They are a part of the quota allowed by the supplementary treaties of the Union.

TABLE I.—*Showing by their dates the number of French gold 10-franc pieces coined in France 1850 to 1869.*

Date.	Number of pieces coined each year.	Date.	Number of pieces coined each year.
1850	592,051	1861	1,029,214
1851	1,800,524	1862	4,712,118
1852	1,314,697	1863	4,251,637
1853		1864	4,788,520
1854	3,899,802	1865	3,249,295
1855	6,149,585	1866	6,495,917
1856	10,777,734	1867	3,550,274
1857	14,498,136	1868	4,532,811
1858	8,211,046	1869	109,351
1859	13,325,889		
1860	8,075,555	Total	101,364,156

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Frankly and honestly, is there any relation between the amount of gold or silver coined at the mints and the amount in use as money?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Then how do you account for the fact that we coined millions upon millions from 1861 to 1879 but did not see a dollar of that coinage in circulation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a country in its normal condition and on a normal monetary basis, not about one with a depreciated paper currency.

We were not on a specie basis at the time the gentleman refers to. When either metal was brought to the mint to be coined at all, it was for use of the owner in foreign commerce. Depreciated paper was driving out of domestic circulation all metallic money.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Then, you are trying to establish the fact that there was concurrent circulation in France by the fact that there was concurrent mintage, and I repeat my question: Is there any relation between the amounts of gold or silver coined at the mints and the amount that is in use as money?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. In a country upon a specie basis, where both metals are demanded and admitted freely to the mint, nobody will carry his bullion to the mints unless he wants to use it as coin, and its chief use as coins will be for domestic circulation or domestic reserves.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. And does the gentleman say that people did not do that in this country from 1861 to 1879?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They did not carry their gold to the mints unless they wanted to use it; but in our case they wished to use it for a different purpose. We had a depreciated paper currency in this country, and they used their gold as coin to buy commodities that were purchased abroad, or else for speculative purposes on the gold-exchange boards.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Even if under free coinage we failed to close up the gap now existing between the bullion value of the two metals, which my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER], fears might be the case, the effect would still be to appreciate the value of silver bullion very considerably and thereby lessen the strain of Oriental competition with our producers, and to depreciate somewhat the price of gold bullion and, as a consequence, of gold money all over the world, thereby reducing the pressure of fixed charges and debts, public and private, weighing so heavily, under an appreciating standard, on the producing classes.

But I am not alarmed about gold leaving the United States under free coinage. I do not believe it would leave us, because I do not believe there would be a premium on gold under free coinage for the reasons which I have stated. In fact, I believe free coinage of both metals with the alternative use and demand for both to be the only practicable way of maintaining the parity permanently. But I would rather lose the parity and the gold, too, than to continue to pay the price we are now paying to maintain them under this ruinous system of "endless chain and bond issue"—ruinous to the people in their private affairs, ruinous to the Government as a fiscal agent; grinding down hope and opportunity for betterment; sowing the seeds of despair and anarchy; threatening national insolvency.

I would rather have a premium upon gold paid by the gold dealer and the gold exporter than to have, as we now have, a premium upon gold in the shape of interest-bearing bonds, paid by taxing the energies, enterprise, property, sweat, aye, the very hope of my fellow-citizens. If it stopped there it would be bad enough, too bad, but you are laying this burden on their children and grandchildren. Ah, gentlemen, you are making us pay too much for our gold, especially when we remember that, with it all and after it all, we have no gold, and day by day have lessening opportunities to earn any if there were any to earn.

Gentlemen no longer deny that gold is virtually out of circulation in the United States. How would a premium on gold hurt the plain producers of the country? It is an evil, but *not an untried evil.* We had it down to 1878 or 1879. Was manufacturing, was commerce, was farming less prosperous than now?

I am a cotton planter. You will excuse me, therefore, for saying that I have heard the gentleman from Tennessee and others say that a premium on gold would specially injure my class. How? They say because we sell our cotton in Liverpool at the gold price. But they say at the same time that all our gold would leave us and go to England. If so, all the economists, who without exception have taught the truth of the quantitative theory of real money (and not one disputes it), are and have been fools, or else this great influx of gold into Great Britain would lower the price of gold there and thereby raise the price of commodities measured in gold and give me a higher price for my cotton. I would still sell my cotton at "Liverpool gold prices," less transportation and profit to the middle man, those prices being translated at Yazoo City, Memphis, or New Orleans into American silver and paper on a parity with silver, plus the premium.

I remember when we used to sell our cotton for "Liverpool gold prices" translated into American greenbacks at Memphis and New Orleans. It was an evil, but by no means comparable to the evils we now suffer from. There has been much unscientific thought and loose expression on this subject of "gold leaving the country." Some have said there would be a "contraction of the currency" as a consequence.

Mr. Chairman, change of locality is not annihilation. Prices are fixed, other things being equal, by the *world's volume* of money—real money. Prices, like waters, never attain an exact level, but are always seeking it, the world over. As all the waters run down to the sea, so all commodities run down to the markets where high prices prevail; or, to express the same idea in converse, where the price of money is lowest. They continue to seek it until the approximate equilibrium is restored; until a quantity of commodities has come in sufficient to take away a certain quantity of money, whose subtraction from the local volume shall raise the price of money, and thus lower the price of commodities to the normal and natural sea level of prices.

Why does gold leave a country? People speak of it as if it were a sentient entity—"if you make it mad, it will desert." It has no wings—it can not fly. It has no legs—it can not run. It has no volition—it can not make up its mind to go, and, *ergo*, go. It has a master, its owner; it is his automatic and faithful servant. It goes whithersoever it can do him the most service; wheresoever it can buy most for its master, there you find it. Hence, I lay it down as an axiomatic truth that whenever gold, or money of any sort, with the permission of its owners leaves a country, it is under conditions such that it is to the interest of the country that it should leave. The only exceptions to the rule, nationally, are when war and tumult cause the movements. The only exception, individually, is when the owner is a fool, i. e., a miser. Gold, like generous wine, is a good servant, but a cruelly bad master. It is never a master except when its owner voluntarily enslaves himself to it.

Certainly no great nation should voluntarily go into servitude to its "gold supply"—mortgage itself to it! But is not that what you are doing now?

From the above it will be seen that there would have to be an "expansion of the currency" and a general rise of prices before gold could begin to leave us—in other words, the accompaniment would be precisely the opposite of contraction. But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] said that most of the debts now existing are payable in gold, and if we fail to maintain the parity these poor debtors would be ground down. Of course, I believe, and think I know, that we could and would maintain the parity, and I do not agree that most debts are now payable in gold. But, for the sake of argument, grant both propositions. Let us suppose a premium upon gold of 10 per cent. A man owes $5,000 in gold. Say that he has raised 200 bales of cotton, which would yield him in gold the amount of the debt he owes—$5,000. But he sells for silver, with gold at $1.10. He receives in silver, then, $5,500. His creditor would accept the $5,500 in silver in full of the $5,000 debt payable in gold. If he were schoolboyish enough to refuse, the debtor could go to the bank, buy $5,000 in gold with his $5,500 in silver, and pay.

Thus those who have been so unfortunate or so foolish as to obligate themselves to pay gold could not be hurt, although up to the amount of indebtedness they would not be helped in ea re.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up any more of the time of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], and I am admonished that the time granted me by him is exhausted. I am so much obliged to him that I can not express it, and I am also greatly obliged to the House for the kind attention with which it has listened to my remarks. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to make a brief statement of interest to members of the Committee of the Whole. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole informs me that only two members have entered their names to speak this evening, and that unless more gentlemen consent to occupy time at this evening's session it will be impossible for all those who have entered their names to speak on this subject to be heard in the general debate. He therefore requests that gentlemen who possibly can will enter for the debate this evening, because unless that time is filled up the probability is that some gentlemen must lose their opportunity to be heard, in view of the limitation that has been put upon the debate.

Mr. BRUMM. What limitation has been made?

Mr. DINGLEY. We are to close the debate on Monday.

Mr. BRUMM. By what authority?

Mr. DINGLEY. By authority of the House.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago we were told that the high protective tariff was the one great menace to prosperity and that it must be combated and put down. In 1890 the campaign of education was waged for tariff reform. No one knew just what this meant, but it was talked of and written of until everyone was perfectly familiar with the declaration. It became a household expression and every man was expected to inform himself on this question. From early in 1890 until after the election in 1892 the daily mails were burdened with tariff-reform literature inculcating the doctrine that the tariff was a tax and that taxation was an evil. This declaration had the semblance of philosophy, but was in fact misleading. Taxation is burdensome, but it is a public necessity, and when properly adjusted and applied to public objects and uses it is in no sense an evil. But in 1892 the people decided in favor of reforming the tariff, and for nearly two years business was threatened and prostrated while the alleged reformation was being accomplished. Up to the time of the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill we had theory and prophecy to guide us, but since that time we have had the practical results of a low tariff. The great body of the people has not prospered. Business, except in a few lines, has been and is everywhere stagnant. Laborers have not remunerative employment. Capital has avoided enterprise of every kind and has gravitated to the commercial centers. The prices of products of the soil do not now exceed the cost of production. Money seeks investment only in stocks and bonds.

While the new tariff law is responsible for many of these misfortunes, I can not believe it is the cause of all our trouble. From the time of the enactment of the silver legislation of 1878 we were gradually increasing the currency by the purchase and coinage of silver bullion and the issuing of Treasury notes. But in 1893 the Eastern banking associations and some of the commercial bodies organized for the purpose of overthrowing that policy and placing the country on a gold standard. The special session of Congress called for the purpose of repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and which effected this result, provided no way for increasing the currency to meet the demands of an increased business. This may have been on the theory that business would not increase during the time of the present Administration and that no increase of circulation would be required. The repeal of the silver legislation was urged on the ground of public necessity, but it has proved barren of the results claimed for it. It did not stay the outflow of gold, though we have issued bonds to purchase more than a quarter of billion of "sound money" in order to support the Administration policy. This has been an expensive experiment. More expensive than war. We can approximate the direct cost, but we can not estimate the cost resulting from shrinkage of values and loss to labor.

I believe the American people want the money function restored to the silver dollar, that it may be again useful as money of final payment. The one contention made by the gold-standard advocates against giving the silver the place in our currency it formerly occupied, and the one argument urged and emphasized, is that the restoration of the silver dollar would drive the gold out, and yet it is true that since Congress repealed the law directing the purchase of silver bullion, and by that act announced to the world that the United States had joined the gold-standard countries, more gold has departed from this country than ever before in the same period of time. The loss has been more than two hundred millions. From this it would seem clear that it is not silver that is driving out the gold, but that it has been going out owing to other causes.

Metallic money at times and under certain conditions will be sought for exportation or will flow out because of the foreign demand. When this happens it always takes the coin for which there is the greater demand and that which is most convenient for exportation. At this time the coin wanted is gold. The great advantage in having both gold and silver as money is that when, for any reason, one coin goes out the other remains to do business. History shows that it rarely happens that both coins go out of the country at the same time. The one most demanded is usually the scarcer and less bulky. If there is a difference in parity it is true that the cheaper money will usually remain, but these conditions seldom continue for any considerable length of time. When there is a condition in the United States which takes our gold to Europe, it goes whether we have silver or not, and when conditions change in our favor it will return whether we have a single or double standard. We are told in all these discussions that the restoration of silver in the United States without the concurrence of other nations would be a mistake. I believe we could restore it, but I would commence with the American product and supplement it by such legislation as would protect the gold reserve and would so legislate as to put more silver in circulation. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea that we should demand and receive a portion of our duties which come through the custom-houses in gold. If we require this and increase the tariff we will hear no more about the danger to the gold reserve.

It was said in substance by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that whatever increase of silver we have should be gradual. The more conservative bimetallists might agree to this if some provision could be enacted for commencing this gradual increase. I for one would be satisfied in case something substantial can be done; that is, something which will relieve the situation. At some time talk will have to cease and Congress will legislate upon this question, and when it does so, with the experience of the past, it will doubtless legislate intelligently. Everyone understands that there can be no legislation at this time.

But I take it that the real question over which we are now contending is not whether we shall have unlimited coinage, but it is whether we shall use the silver dollar to any extent as money of final redemption. It may seem otherwise, but disguise it as we may, this is the question on trial. It is whether we shall use the two metals as standard money, as we Republicans declared in our platform in 1892, or whether we shall maintain the single gold standard.

It has been contended here that the people will not care to use much more silver than we now have. In my judgment they could and would take care of much more of this coin and keep it in actual circulation were it not for the effort that is being made in certain sections to depreciate and degrade it. By retiring the bank currency of small denominations much more silver would be required, and still more could be used by the banks if they would hold silver as a part of their coin reserves.

It is believed by the friends of silver that the Treasury Department has done much to discredit this metal, but I think under ordinary circumstances the Treasurer should meet the obligations of the Government by paying out whichever metal is desired. But when there is evidence that the gold is being demanded for export or that a run is being made on the Treasury for the purpose of precipitating a panic, as was done in 1893, then the Treasurer should protect the gold reserve by handing out silver. An honest dollar is the dollar of the contract. The obligations of the Government are payable in coin, not gold. The holders might object to receiving silver, but its payment under such circumstances would stop a run in a few hours and would be sustained by the great body of the American people. The people want fair dealing and without discriminations.

If the money function of the silver dollar is gone and it can be used hereafter only as a subsidiary coin, then we might as well suspend its coinage and use altogether, but I am unwilling to concede that this is to be so. There are many bimetallists in the country, and this international struggle for the gold is a great educator.

The restoration of silver is necessary for another reason, and that is in order to prevent the money syndicates from controlling the world's coin and to protect the Government as well as the people against the growing and dangerous power of these great combinations. For the last two years every citizen of the United States has been humiliated beyond expression because of the confessed inability of the Government to manage its own finances in its own way without paying enormously for the support of these banking institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas be allowed time to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRODERICK. I only desire to say a few more words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not joining the clamor against banks. They are public necessities, but they derive their powers from the Government and should be subject to its control. For several years we have been legislating against trusts, but this gold trust is the greatest menace of them all and it seems to be beyond the reach of legislation.

The struggle now going on for the stock of gold is the best evi-

dence of the inadequacy of the supply. There is but little over half a billion in this country, and we keep selling bonds to save this from departing. Let the American Congress provide additional revenue by increasing the duty on such imported articles as interfere with our productions, require a portion of our duties to be paid in gold, and provide for the coinage and use of American silver, and in my judgment we will once more have a restoration of confidence and prosperity. I shall vote for the amendment submitted by my colleague [Mr. LONG], providing for the coinage of American silver, and if this fails I shall then vote for the Senate substitute, believing, as I do, that it is a question of bimetallism or gold monometallism, and that bimetallism is the better policy for the whole people. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, during the brief time allowed me it is not necessary for me to make any explanation of how I am going to vote on the bill. Certainly none of the old members here can entertain any doubt on that point. I rise at this time, Mr. Chairman, simply to congratulate the Democratic Administration—no, I perhaps ought not to say "Democratic;" I do not think it is really entitled to be termed a Democratic Administration; I will merely say "the Administration"—upon the glorious vindication it has received of its financial theories. After having borrowed about $170,000,000 to pay the running expenses of this Government, it has now demonstrated that it has the ability to borrow another hundred million dollars for the same purpose! This amount, it is estimated, will run the machine during the time that this Administration will live. It will pass away in the ides of March, 1897, unlamented except by a small lot of speculators—a syndicate of speculators—who, alone of all living things on the top of this earth, have profited by its existence. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I read with various emotions the exuberant description given in the Post of yesterday morning of the scene in the Treasury Department when the bids for bonds were opened. I will read a few lines from it.

Said Mr. Eckles:

"I have to announce that bids for bonds of the new issue have been received by the Secretary of the Treasury amounting in an estimated aggregate to more than $500,000,000 in offered gold."

* * * * * * *

Those who heard him lost breath for a moment. Then there was applause and cheers, which, for several minutes, echoed around the long Treasury corridors.

This enthusiasm, which was not the enthusiasm of youth or ignorance, seemed for a time as unbounded as the popular responsive voice which provoked it. The cheers came from gray-haired men of finance, and the applause came from many others prominent in the management of public affairs. And it did not take long for reports to come back over the wire from the big financial center in New York, which told also of reechoing cheers there.

At the end of the room which looks out over the broad meadow lands to the river sat the serious-faced Secretary of the Treasury himself, who could not suppress a smile over the welcome news. On either side of him were money magnates whose very names mean wealth and financial power.

Mr. Chairman, I can imagine the magnificence and impressiveness of that scene, when the great financiers of this nation fell upon each other's necks and hugged each other as the dudes do at a game of football, when in their exuberance of joy at their great success they patted each other on the back over the discovery that they could borrow some more money! And I can imagine that at the same time, while their great heads swam in an intoxicating sea of bliss, their thoughts went back to these poor "crazy silver cranks" who do not know anything about finance or how to run a government. I tell you crazy silver cranks you should hang your heads in view of such wisdom as has been exhibited by these "sound-money" financiers.

Contrast the condition of this country to-day under the "sound-money" Administration with its condition five years ago, ten years ago, fifteen years ago. Why, sir, at that time the motto was, "Pay as you go;" but under the administration of "sound-money" financiers the motto is, "Borrow as you go." [Laughter.] Why, sir, the way to run a government is to borrow money to do it on, and then legislate for posterity; legislate so as to leave them an immense legacy of debt. That is financiering; that is the true idea of statesmanship according to this Administration!

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago some of our good Republicans, desiring to share, in some small degree at least, the rich honors that seemed to be clustering around the Administration's throne, introduced a bill authorizing the President to issue some more bonds. He had already the authority to issue bonds in unlimited quantities; but that seemed to be the only way that they could get in on the ground floor and share a part of the honors. The bill passed; it went to the other House; it came back here, Mr. Chairman, amended with a provision to coin honest dollars—dollars like this silver dollar which I hold in my hand. That always was an honest dollar—is an honest dollar to-day.

My friend from Maine referred to this dollar as a "50-cent dollar." I want to say to him that if it is worth but 50 cents to-day it is because this brazen thief here [holding up a gold piece] has stolen the other 50 cents. This is the yellow thief which under the direction of the Wall street syndicate has stolen half the crop of the farmer. Stolen the shoes off the feet of children, stolen half the opportunities of every American workman. This once honest gold dollar now through its evil associations in the slums of a great city has become a thief. Sir, this silver dollar is yet honest. This gold piece has by its thievery swelled its purchasing power. It is now valuable like any other commodity because of the small supply, and it is no longer a money. It has become a commodity in every sense of the term, sold just the same in the markets as corn, wheat, or potatoes, shipped to any market where it will bring the highest price.

Mr. Chairman, what a mess these "sound-money" men have made! What a condition their theories have brought the country into! I have within a few days received a letter from a friend who was engaged in business in southern California, but soon after this Government passed under the control of these sound-money financiers and the business of the country went to the devil in consequence, he moved to Mexico, which country is said to be on a silver basis. He writes me that he is doing well, making money; that the country is prosperous, and he will soon have enough to come back to California, where he would be among his friends and relatives, but where he can not do as well in a business way as in Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a country on the face of the footstool that is on the so-called silver basis that has not prospered every day, while this country has been going to the dogs under the direction of these sound-money pirates; and yet we are taunted with trying to bring the country to a silver basis. Well, sir, it had better get on an honest silver basis than to be on the dishonest gold basis that it now occupies.

Mr. Chairman, I have never in my life witnessed such exhibitions of petrified cheek as have been shown us day after day in this Chamber by these sound-money people chattering about an honest currency—twitting people with being crazy cranks who believe in the money of the Constitution, who prefer honest American money to a modern pirate's gold.

What unparalleled gall it is on the part of presidents, cashiers, and directors of banks, coming here as Congressmen for the sole purpose of legislating for the interests of their banks, for their own pockets, who care for nothing else here, take no part in general legislation, who are only here when they are notified that some of their schemes may be endangered. I say, what unparalleled gall it is in these persons to call men who believe in honest silver coinage names; albeit, calling them names is the best argument, and about the only one, they have to offer.

The other day a majority of the members of what has always been held the greatest and ablest legislative body in the world, and is is held to-day, pronounced in favor of honest American dollars, and has officially notified this House of the fact. Sir, does it lie in the mouths of these advocates of this yellow thief to call the men comprising that majority cranks? Do not the men who comprise that majority compare favorably in respect to intelligence, ability, honesty, and unselfish patriotism with the minority of that body? Do they dare intimate that any one of that majority wears any other collar than his own? Is a comparison in this respect invited by the minority? Do they invite a comparison of the motives that governed each?

Mr. Chairman, one thing is demonstrated, which is that to-day the Senate of the United States, which has been looked upon as the exclusive, aristocratic branch of the Government, is at last in touch with the mass of the people, while this House appears to have cut loose from the people and got into close touch with the money changers only.

Mr. Chairman, I hope some of these sound-money schemers will tell us how it is that they hold it to be honorable and commendable in a banker to come here as a Congressman and boldly advocate and vote for the interests of his bank, while, at the same time, should a silver-mine owner come here and advocate the interests of his mine they hold it to be next to treason.

I do not know that there is a silver-mine owner in the House. We do know there are many directors of banks, who do not hesitate to advocate and at all times protect their business.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I shall not detain the House more than a couple of minutes.

I was not in the House this morning, Mr. Speaker, when the incident occurred in which my name was used. I did not hear

what the gentleman from South Carolina stated in his own behalf. I reached here barely in time to vote for the reference of the resolution which was offered, without having an opportunity even to hear it read.

The remark that I made on Wednesday night, Mr. Speaker, is variously quoted by several stenographers. These reports do not agree with each other, and the official stenographer's notes do not agree, as he tells me this afternoon, with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which my precise language is supposed to have been printed. I spoke rapidly and entirely extempore and in the exciting and unexpected colloquy I can not undertake to reproduce my exact words.

I am quoted in the New York Tribune of February 6 as using this language:

I am ashamed of any man who indorses secession or the motives which lay behind it.

In the Washington Post of the same date I am quoted as saying:

I am sorry for anyone who still believes in secession.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in these words:

I am ashamed of the fact—

That is, of such a statement as that of the gentleman from South Carolina—

and ashamed of any man who would indorse secession or the motives which lead to it.

I did not hear the gentleman from South Carolina this morning when he made his statement, but find that he used these words:

But, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from North Carolina—

Said he, referring to myself—

said in substance that he was ashamed of such action on the part of his State, I rose, possibly in an unparliamentary manner, and in the heat of the moment impulsively said that South Carolina was not ashamed of the part she took in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not use, even in substance, such words as are imputed to me by the gentleman from South Carolina. My tongue, if I had tried to utter such language, would not have performed its office, because that would mean treason to my State and to my own blood. I did say and I say now, in all kindness, that I was opposed to secession. My people were opposed to it, and I am indeed sorry for any man who still believes in it or in the institution which it was designed to perpetuate.

That much is true; but to be quoted as saying that I was ashamed of the conduct of North Carolina in the war, why, I could not utter such a thought, because the truth of history is that she refused three several times to vote for secession, and finally, after there was a vast sea of secession all about her, and she was like an island, surrounded by the angry flood, and her sons had to go in and fight, she entered into the conflict; and I desire to say that my own kinsmen, on both sides of my family, went in and fought for the Confederacy, as they could not possibly have done otherwise under the circumstances. My own and my only brother was shot at Spottsylvania; my brother-in-law had his right arm torn from its socket in the battles around Richmond; my own blood cousin had his head severed from his shoulders by a cannon ball at Malvern Hill; and still another blood cousin of mine in that awful charge at Gettysburg carried his regiment nearer to the mouths of the Union rifles than any other soldiers reached on that dreadful field of carnage, and that spot is marked by an imperishable monument of granite, the farthest advance and last hope of the Confederacy.

I state with pride here in the presence of you old veteran soldiers that while my State was the last to secede she was the last to surrender, and that she left more dead soldiers on the field of battle than any other State on either side of that awful conflict.

And in justice to myself, and in justice to the memory of these heroic men, I must disclaim—I do repudiate, without meaning offense—I must deny and disavow any such sentiment as the gentleman from South Carolina has attributed to me, and I want to say now and in conclusion, thanking the House for this attention, that if the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] will only leave us Union-loving Republicans in North Carolina to attend to our sister State, we promise and guarantee that if South Carolina tries to start another secession, then before the gentleman from Maine can reach the scene of action with his gunboats or the gentleman from Massachusetts can arrive with his rough and ready riflemen, we North Carolina Union-loving Republicans and lovers of the flag—and I will be one of them—will rush down into the State of South Carolina and whip her back into the Union and into her senses or into the sea before these valiant and loyal gentlemen can reach the spot. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Speaker, in the kindest spirit, and as an evidence that there is no ill feeling, I propose that celebrated and hospitable remark of the governor of North Carolina to the governor of South Carolina as a fitting closing scene to this extraordinary incident. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman has disclaimed the remarks that have been attributed to him. I searched the RECORD, and understood him as I have stated. I am sure I do not wish to do the gentleman any injustice, and have had no desire to do so. Possibly if I had better understood the gentleman, I might not have made the remarks that I have; and I now state to the gentleman that I should be glad to accept his invitation on behalf of the governor of South Carolina, except for the fact that I never indulge, and I hope some gentleman will go and drink the liquor for me, and we will go on our way rejoicing. [Laughter.]

Under consent given, Mr. WALKER of Virginia submitted the following amendment:

Insert in line 4, page 3, after the word "silver," the following words: "Bullion which has heretofore been or may hereafter be produced from mines in the United States, and after the passage of this act there shall be imposed an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent on all foreign silver coins, silver bullion, and on all other forms of silver not dutiable under present laws."

RECESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and that at 10.30 o'clock it take another recess until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, these sessions to be exclusively for debate on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent of the House that a recess be taken until 8 o'clock this evening, and a further recess at 10.30 until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, these sessions to be for debate only.

Mr. DINGLEY. And further, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole during those two sessions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as Speaker pro tempore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of Kansas, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. KIRKPATRICK, for ten days.

To Mr. JOY, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

And then, in accordance with the order previously adopted, the House (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, with Mr. PAYNE in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, as preliminary to a discussion of the merits of the pending measure, permit me to briefly and in a condensed form call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to some matters directly appertaining to this bill, as disclosed in the record from its conception on up to its present stage.

On the 3d day of last December, the second day of this session, the President, in his annual message "To the Congress of the United States," after referring at great length to the continual depletion of the gold reserve in the Treasury and the causes therefor, uses this language:

I am convinced the only thorough and practicable remedy for our troubles is found in the retirement and cancellation of our United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and the outstanding Treasury notes issued by the Government in payment of silver purchases under the act of 1890.

I believe this could be quite readily accomplished by the exchange of these notes for United States bonds of small as well as large denominations, bearing a low rate of interest. They should be long-term bonds, thus increasing their desirability as investments, and because their payment could be well postponed to a period far removed from present financial burdens and perplexities, when with increased prosperity and resources they would be more easily met.

To further insure the cancellation of these notes and also provide a way by which gold may be added to our currency in lieu of them, a feature in the plan should be an authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of the bonds abroad for gold, if necessary to complete the contemplated redemption and cancellation, permitting him to use the proceeds of such bonds to take up and cancel any of the notes that may be in the Treasury or that may be received by the Government on any account.

After criticising and condemning, in a dignified manner, however, the free coinage of silver, he closes his message with the following patriotic utterances:

In conclusion, I especially entreat the people's representatives in the Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of inaugurating measures for the safety and prosperity of our common country, to promptly and effectively consider the ills of our critical financial plight. I have suggested a remedy which my judgment approves. I desire, however, to assure the Congress that I am prepared to cooperate with them in perfecting any other

measure promising thorough and practical relief, and that I will gladly labor with them in every patriotic endeavor to further the interests and guard the welfare of our countrymen whom in our respective places of duty we have undertaken to serve.

After this Congress had been in session for eighteen days and no effort having been made, even so far as to appoint any of the standing committees of the House, or otherwise, to carry out the urgent suggestions of the President, referred to in his annual message, he, on the 20th day of the same month, sent a special message to Congress in which he again calls the special attention of Congress to the conditions of the Treasury and the great necessity of prompt legislation to replete and protect the gold reserve. In the concluding portion of this message he says:

The real and sensible cure for our recurring troubles can only be effected by a complete change in our financial scheme. Pending that, the executive branch of the Government will not relax its efforts nor abandon its determination to use every means within its reach to maintain before the world American credit, nor will there be any hesitation in exhibiting its confidence in the resources of our country and the constant patriotism of our people.

In view, however, of the peculiar situation now confronting us, I have ventured to herein express the earnest hope that the Congress, in default of the inauguration of a better system of finance, will not take a recess from its labors before it has, by legislative enactment or declaration, done something not only to remind those apprehensive among our own people that the resources of their Government and a scrupulous regard for honest dealing afford a sure guaranty of unquestioned safety and soundness, but to reassure the world that with these factors, and the patriotism of our citizens, and ability and determination of our nation to meet in any circumstances every obligation it incurs do not admit of question.

I ask at the hands of the Congress such prompt aid as it alone has the power to give to prevent, in a time of fear and apprehension, any sacrifice of the people's interests and the public funds or the impairment of our public credit in an effort by Executive action to relieve the dangers of the present emergency.

On the following day, the last day of the third week of the session, the Speaker of the House, after having wrestled therewith long and patiently, if not painfully, I have no doubt, announced the regular standing committees, by which we learned that the able and distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] became the leader of the majority side, and as such was expected to shape all legislation for the good of the country in general, and of the Republican party in particular, regardless, of course, of the effect it might have on the ambitions of our worthy Speaker.

Cheerfully assuming this leadership and all the accompanying responsibilities, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, on the 27th of the same month, reported the bill (H. R. 2904) now before us for consideration, in words and figures as follows:

An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized, from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same, and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to issue certificates of indebtedness of the United States to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, payable in three years after their date to the bearer in lawful money of the United States of the denomination of $20 or multiples thereof, with annual coupons for interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and to sell and dispose of the same for not less than an equal amount of lawful money of the United States at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States and at such post-offices as he may select. And such certificates shall have the like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said resumption act for the bonds therein authorized. And the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purpose prescribed in this section and for no other.

But two days were allowed, under a special rule, for the consideration and discussion of this most important bill, and on the 28th of the same month, under whip and spur, it was passed by this House by the following vote: Yeas 170, nays 136, not voting 49. Without taking up the time of the committee to give this vote in detail, I desire to add just here, in justice to many of the independent Republicans on the other side, that notwithstanding the whip and spur of the gentleman from Maine, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, about 50 of them refused to bow the head and voted with this side against the bill.

On the 30th of December the bill was referred to the Senate and its concurrence therein requested, and on the same day was by the Senate referred to the Republican Senate Committee on Finance.

On the 7th day of January, 1896, the Senate Committee on Finance reported a bill to the Senate with an amendment as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination of less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

This bill was considered by the Senate from day to day until the 1st day of this month, when a vote was taken on its final passage, resulting as follows—yeas 42, nays 35. Including those paired for and against the bill, the yeas were 48 and the nays 41; total, 89. Showing a clear majority of 7 for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The following is the vote in detail:

Senators for the bill:

Allen,	Chilton,	Kyle,	Squire,
Bacon,	Clark,	Mantle,	Stewart,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller.
Berry,	Daniel,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Blackburn,	Dubois,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Blanchard,	George,	Peffer,	Vest,
Brown,	Gordon,	Perkins,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Call,	Harris,	Pritchard,	Warren,
Cameron,	Irby,	Pugh,	White,
Cannon,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,	Wilson,
Carter,	Jones, Nev.	Shoup,	Wolcott.

Senators against the bill:

Aldrich,	Frye,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Allison,	Gallinger,	McBride,	Quay,
Baker,	Gear,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Brice,	Gibson,	Martin,	Sherman,
Burrows,	Gorman,	Mills,	Smith.
Caffery,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Thurston,
Chandler,	Hale,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Wetmore.
Davis,	Hill,	Nelson,	
Elkins,	Hoar,	Palmer,	
Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Platt,	

Politically they were divided as follows:

For the bill: Populists, 6; Democrats, 24; Republicans, 18; total, 48.

Against the bill: Democrats, 15; Republicans, 26; total, 41.

In this division I have classed Senators JONES and STEWART with the Populists.

The Senate is now composed of 44 Republicans, 39 Democrats, and 6 Populists (including Senators JONES and STEWART).

And here I may stop long enough to call the attention of this committee to the astonishing fact that the Senate of the United States, the representatives of the States as States, the greatest deliberative body on the face of the globe, composed of the ablest citizens of our land, in which the Republican party now have a clear plurality of 5, if not a majority, after due, careful, and able consideration, adopted a free silver coinage measure by a majority of 7.

While referring to this fact, which must not and can not be ignored during this discussion, if I were to attempt to meet sarcasm with sarcasm, or abuse with abuse, I might stop here to inquire if that great body, the United States Senate, is not a strange abiding place for so many cranks and destructionists. I might inquire if it is not a sad commentary on the intelligence and patriotism of our people that a majority of the States would select such men as I have last indicated to represent them in the Upper House of Congress.

Again, the Republican party has always been recognized as the champion of the gold standard, and yet, in this month of February, in the year of our Lord 1896, we see a Republican Senate,

at its first session, almost immediately after a political revolution in favor of its party, passing a free-coinage bill. And yet Republican leaders on this floor, on the stump, and elsewhere will continue to assert that the grand old party is united upon every important question.

But, surprising as was this result in the Senate under the circumstances, it could not well be more surprising and, if I may coin a phrase, "more politically funny," than was the recent action of this House, with its more than 140 Republican plurality, when it passed a Democratic revenue tariff bill, pure and simple, under the guise and pretense of complying with the President's request as set forth in his message. To sum it all up, here we have it: After a continuous session of over two months an overwhelmingly Republican House passes a Democratic tariff bill, and a Republican Senate passes a free-coinage bill. The Senate refuses to concur with the House, and the House now refuses, or, I take it, is about to refuse, to concur with the Senate, and these two bills are the only important measures or general bills yet considered by this Republican businesslike Congress. And yet the Republican leaders will persist in saying that the great Republican party is thoroughly united on every important question and the only party capable of transacting the public business in Congress. Many Republicans, able gentlemen, during this debate have declared on this floor their belief in the efficacy of the free coinage of silver, and some of them have gone so far as to assert that a majority of the masses of their party are in accord with their views. And still the political leaders of that party will doubtless continue to insist that there are no divisions in their ranks on this great question.

On the 3d of this month the pending measure was returned by the Senate to this House and its concurrence therein requested. And on day before yesterday, the 5th instant, the bill was again reported to the House by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, accompanied with a resolution or motion that the House refuse to concur with the Senate amendment and adhere to the original bill. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has given notice that at the proper time he will move to concur in the Senate amendment. And thus is the issue presented. Those of us who favor free coinage of both metals—gold and silver—should vote to concur. Those who are opposed to free coinage of both of the precious metals should vote to nonconcur.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], in his able speech on Wednesday, to which I listened very carefully, says we should vote to nonconcur, for the reason, if for no other, that the Senate has failed and refused to give an answer responsive to the bill which the House sent to it for its consideration. In other words, if I understood him aright, we should rebuke the Senate because it virtually ignored the House bill and in lieu thereof returned to us another and entirely different measure. Upon this proposition I most respectfully, yet humbly, take issue with him. I regard the Senate bill as of the same subject-matter as the House bill, designed and intended to meet and subserve the same common purpose.

In my very limited time I can not undertake to enter into an explanation of these bills in detail. I have had them read and placed in the RECORD where all can see them. They are plain and simple, and all can understand them. The object of the first section of the House bill is to provide for the issuing of bonds—not gold bonds for the preservation of gold for redemption purposes, as requested by President Cleveland in his message, but coin bonds, to be used exclusively for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes. The second section provides for the issuance of time certificates of indebtedness, to be used for the current expenses of the Government in cases of insufficient revenue from other sources.

The first section of the Senate bill provides for the free coinage of silver at the old ratio.

The second section provides that that portion of silver bullion now in the Treasury, known as the seigniorage, shall also be coined into standard silver dollars, to be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government.

Section 3 provides that hereafter no national-bank note shall be issued of a denomination of less than $10, etc.

Section 4 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes commonly called "greenbacks" and those commonly called the "Sherman notes" in silver or gold at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury only, etc.

Now, I repeat, when you come to compare the two more carefully, it must be conceded that they are designed to accomplish the same purpose, but in radically different channels perhaps. Let us see if this is not true. The House bill provides for the issuing of not exceeding $50,000,000—mark you, not exceeding—of certificates of indebtedness to be used for current expenses. The Senate bill provides for the coinage of the seigniorage for the same purpose, which will provide at once for considerably more than $50,000,000.

The House bill provides for bonds for coin for redemption purposes. The Senate bill, taking sections 1 and 4 together, makes provision for the same purpose by providing for the free coinage of silver and its use for redemption purposes as well as gold. Does any member here doubt for a moment that if this policy were adopted we would have plenty of coin—gold and silver—in the Treasury for redemption purposes? If so, where is the necessity for bonds to procure the precious metal?

But of course the gentleman from Maine does not base his opposition to the Senate bill on this one ground alone, but goes on in a very able and learned manner, from his standpoint, to point out the reasons why he believes the bill would be vicious and dangerous to the country, and hence should be rejected.

Even if I could do so, it is not my desire or intention to attempt to answer him in the short time allotted me. I still believe that the weight of the argument is on the side of free silver, just as I have believed ever since I commenced to study the question some ten or twelve years ago. My views and my reasons are well known, to at least very many of the older members of this honorable body, as well as to my constituents, and even if I had the time I would not care to repeat them now, for so thoroughly and frequently has this subject been debated here, pro and con, that I do not flatter myself that I could say anything new or that my humble efforts would result in many conversions, as much as I would desire it. After having given this question all the careful study, research, and consideration that time and capacity would permit, I am a conscientious believer in the true efficacy of the free coinage of silver at the old and time-tried ratio of 16 to 1. I firmly believe it would be better for my country, which I love so well. I most sincerely believe that a great majority of the people of this country want and demand free-coinage legislation at our hands.

I want to be with and for the people. That is my idea of my stewardship here. That is my idea of true Democracy—the party to which I belong. Such, I say, are my own personal convictions, and hence I shall vote to concur in the Senate amendment. And yet, if I were not fully persuaded that such a course was the proper one there is still another and weighty reason that would induce me to vote for free coinage. I believe that it is the duty of a member of Congress to represent on this floor the will of his constituents, as near as may be, whenever that will is clearly and intelligently expressed and made known. I have the honor to represent a district in western Ohio. A people, I dare say, who are as intelligent, on an average, as those of any other district in the Union. A people about equally divided between the country and the town. A people about equally divided in agriculture, manufacturing, and mercantile pursuits. A people who have carefully and intelligently considered and debated for years the identical question now before us for action, the result of which is, I feel safe in saying, that a very large majority of them are as earnestly in favor of the free coinage of silver as is your humble speaker.

At the convention in which I was last honored with a nomination, composed of as bright a lot of men, from all parts of the district, as you will find anywhere, a free-coinage plank was adopted with scarcely a dissenting voice. For this reason, if for no other, I would vote for the Senate bill. But I cheerfully do so anyhow, for, as I said before, I believe the free coinage of silver will be best for our country, will result in better progress and prosperity, and the consequent greater happiness and content of mankind. And I still believe it will be brought about in, by, and through the great Democratic party, which has always shown itself to be the true party of all the people and especially of the common people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress met there were various governmental evils confronting us. Several of these evils related to the Treasury Department.

1. The gold in the Treasury was melting away like ice in summer time.

2. The President was selling 5 per cent bonds running ten years and 4 per cent bonds running thirty years, and had already sold over one hundred and sixty-two millions, increasing our national debt that much, in a time of perfect peace.

3. These sales were being made secretly to syndicates of bankers, some of them foreigners.

4. The proceeds of these sales were being used to pay the current expenses of Government, whereas the sales were professedly to be used exclusively to maintain the gold reserve.

5. There was a growing deficiency in the Treasury, and no method of providing against it except by the sale of long-term bonds.

What was the action of this House in providing remedies for these financial evils?

1. It provided short-term bonds in lieu of long-term bonds.

2. It provided for 3 per cent bonds in lieu of 4 and 5 per cent bonds

3. It prohibited any more secret sales of bonds to syndicates of bankers.

4. It prohibited the proceeds of bonds sold to maintain the gold reserve from being used to pay the expenses of the Government.

5. It provided for any temporary deficiency in the Treasury by authorizing the issuance of 3 per cent certificates not exceeding $50,000,000 in all.

What has been the action of the Senate in reference to these matters?

1. It has sanctioned the action of the President in selling long-term bonds.

2. It has sanctioned the action of the President in selling these bonds secretly.

3. It has sanctioned the action of the President in selling these bonds to syndicates of bankers, some of them foreigners.

4. It has sanctioned the action of the President in using the proceeds of these bond sales in paying the current expenses of the Government.

5. It has refused to authorize the issuance of 3 per cent three-year certificates to provide for any temporary deficiency.

6. It has refused to provide for any temporary deficiency of revenues.

7. It has refused to require that bonds should be sold on public notice.

8. It has refused to reduce the rate of interest on bonds to be sold.

9. In a word, the Senate has indirectly indorsed all that the President has done, indorsed his secret sales of long-term, high-interest bonds, indorsed his dealings with foreign bankers, indorsed his use of the reserve fund to pay current expenses, and, in fact, indorsed, generally, all he has done, and refused in any way to interfere, or change, or forbid. In this state of facts I am called on to make a choice between the action of this House and the action of the Senate, and I have no hesitancy in saying that, in my judgment, this House has met the emergency fairly, squarely, wisely, and patriotically, whereas the Senate refuses to meet the emergency at all, and willfully dodges the issue.

THE SENATE'S ANSWER.

This House, which represents the people in their individual capacity, says to the Senate: "The President is selling long-term bonds, and what are you going to do about it?"

And the Senate rises up solemnly and answers: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver." [Laughter.]

This House says to the Senate: "The President is selling 4 per cent bonds when we can borrow money at 3 per cent; what do you say about that?"

The Senate stands up gravely and says: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver."

This House says to the Senate: "But the President is selling these bonds secretly, and not allowing open competition; are you willing to let that go on?"

Our wise and dignified Senate rises up and answers: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver." [Laughter.]

This House says to the Senate: "The President is selling our bonds to syndicates of bankers, some of them foreigners; what do you think of that?"

Our Senate rises up and deliberately replies: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver."

This House says to the Senate of the United States, at the other end of the Capitol: "The President claims to sell these bonds to maintain the gold reserve, and yet he uses the proceeds to pay the expenses of the Government; what do you think about that?"

And the Senate of the United States rises, and, in measured tones, answers: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver." [Laughter.]

This House, representing the people, says to the Senate, representing the States: "Are you content to let Mr. Cleveland and Secretary Carlisle go on as they have been going, selling high-interest, long-term bonds secretly and to foreigners? Are you content to let the debt of this country be thus permanently increased?"

And the Senators once more reply: "The free and unlimited coinage of silver."

And thus our wise Senate has only one answer to all of our questions. Like Poe's raven, it makes but one response, and that is "more silver"—silver more.

Is there, is there balm in Gilead?
Tell me, tell me, I implore!
Quoth this raven, "Silver more!"

[Laughter.]

"Sixteen to one" seems to be the "lost Lenore" of our Senate; but I am afraid it will have no better fortune than Poe in its longing to—

Clasp that rare and radiant maiden,
Sweet "sixteen to one."

I could well afford to stop here in justification of my vote against the Senate amendment and in favor of the House bill; but as the question of gold and silver has been so generally discussed in this debate, I prefer to submit some thoughts on that issue.

SILVER AND GOLD COMPARED.

In a general way my sympathies are, and have always been, with silver as compared with gold.

Gold is the money of the rich, and silver is the money of the poor. Kings deal in gold, the money lords deal in gold, the millionaires deal in gold; but the farmer deals in silver, the mechanic deals in silver, the day laborer deals in silver, and the poor woman who slaves her life away works for silver.

Gold is the pampered slave that dances attendance upon the wealthy the world over, while silver is the faithful, humble friend that helps the poor man in his hour of need, that buys those items from the merchant that sweeten his life and brighten his home.

Gold is a king, its home is in princely palaces, and it travels none but royal roads. It despises the poor man and scorns to be found in his company. It will not notice the poor farmer's girl, however beautiful and good, but smiles upon the rich daughters of fashion and pride, however ugly and worthless.

The son of the banker, with haughty pride, exhibits his golden eagles upon the street corners where wealth and frivolity most do congregate, while the poor plowboy whistles happily to the tune of a few dimes jingling in his breeches pocket as he does his daily task. [Laughter.]

Gold is a spirit of evil that encourages crime, and sin, and folly; but silver is an angel of mercy that comforts the poor, cheers the hungry, and consoles the needy. Gold, red in color, like the fires of hell, is the metal of avarice and pride; but silver, whose tint is that of the heavens above, is the metal of humble honesty, the minister of mercy, and the currency of charity.

But gold, in spite of the glory of its trappings, in spite of its splendid armorial bearings, in spite of its glittering shield, in spite of its pomp and pageantry—in spite of all these, gold is a coward; and when the stern visage of danger confronts it, it turns tail and runs away and hides out of sight. When War beats his drum, and blows his bugle, and draws his sword, gold trembles like a sheep when a lion roars.

Silver is braver. It makes no great display, it has no lineage depicted on its shield, it is not heralded by the thrilling blast of trumpets or the plaudits of hired retainers. It is not bedizened with spectacular ornamentations, but it draws its sword upon the field of conflict, and fights with valor long after gold has left the field in ignominious flight.

SILVER BECOMING ARROGANT.

But while silver has many graces and virtues which commend it to my sympathy, and to the sympathy of mankind, yet I wish it distinctly understood that when silver throws off its garb of commonalty and assumes the character of a master and a dictator, and arrogates to itself the right of proscription, then my sympathy begins to shrink and a spirit of resistance and resentment swells forth from my heart.

I am willing to give silver the kindest possible consideration. It was the companion of my humble boyhood, and its smile cheered my youthful heart when I had the chance to look upon its face.

But in these latter years it seems to have fed on royal meat, and has grown so great and so imperious that, like Cæsar, it wants to wear a regal crown. It seems unwilling to serve our country any longer, and wants to be our ruler.

A great deal has been said about "the rights" of silver. I deny that silver has any "rights," or that gold has any "rights," or that any other metal has any "rights." All "rights" belong to the people, and the people have the right to use silver as money, and have the right to use gold as money, and have the right to disuse either; and what is more, the right to disuse both. [Applause.]

I spoke a moment ago about gold being a coward, and silver having some courage, yet I can not forget that when, in 1861, the life of my country was in danger, when money was absolutely needed to keep our armies in the field, both silver and gold turned tail and ran away, and seemed not to care whether our country lived or died.

THE MIGHTY GREENBACK.

Neither can I forget another great fact. I can not forget that when both gold and silver had run away and left our armies to starve, and our ships to rot at the wharves, I can not forget that then, in the very crisis of our fate, the mighty greenback leaped from the brain of the Republican party, like Minerva from the brain of Jove, full grown and full armed; then it was that the mighty greenback leaped into the embattled field, and drawing the sword of patriotism won that glorious victory that preserved the life of our country, and entitled itself to the praise and gratitude of patriots while the love of the Union dwells in the hearts of men. [Applause.]

But while the greenback saved our country, and while silver is the money of the poor man, I must not forget that a great nation like ours, with its great cities, its immense manufactures, its endless railroad lines, its enormous wealth, needs gold also in order to conduct its financial operations, both among ourselves and with the other great nations of the earth. Gold is indispensable in our great commercial and financial transactions, and we must retain it as one of our means of national and international exchange.

Hence, I favor all three of our great moneys—gold, silver, and greenback—"these three." We must not become silver-eyed by using silver spectacles, nor must we become gold-eyed by using golden goggles; neither must a green-eyed jealousy of both gold and silver so prejudice us against them as to make us greenbackers and fiat-money men.

We want all three sorts of money, gold, silver, and paper, just as we have had them for so many years, gold and silver representing the substance of things, and the paper representing the spirit of things, the faith of our country; and my chief complaint is that there is not enough of the substance, and an insufficient supply of the faith. [Laughter.]

TRINITY OF MONEY.

There are financial tinkers, just as there are theological tinkers. There are men who are unitarians in money and in religion, who believe in only one Person in the divine world and only one metal in the financial world. But the great mass of Christians are trinitarians in religion and trinitarians in finance; they believe that there are three persons in the Godhead, and that there are three kinds of money—gold, silver, and paper. My people are trinitarians in religion and in finance; they are satisfied both with the Bible of their fathers and the money of their fathers. The Turks, who are unitarians in religion, cry out, "There is no God but God, and Mahomet is His prophet," and the financial unitarians cry out, "There is no money but gold, and Rothschild is its prophet." And as the Turks massacre those who do not agree with them, so some of these financial Turks would destroy those who do not agree with them. And as there are some Christians who are as fanatical as the Turks, so there are silver men who are just as fanatical as the gold men, and who would brand gold as a traitor, and condemn to the political scaffold every public man who is found with a piece of gold upon his person.

And there are also fiat-money men, who regard both gold and silver as relics of barbarism, and who would banish both metals from the domain of money, and make fiat paper the exclusive currency of the nation.

I do not travel with either of these crowds. I prefer the old road. Long ago I discovered that old roads are the safest and best. I am a believer in gold, and I am a believer in silver, and I am a believer in greenbacks, and I am a believer in having a larger volume of each one and a larger amount of money to the man.

But I do not believe the free and unlimited coinage of silver would increase the amount of money, because it would drive out of circulation the six hundred millions of gold now in this country; or, in other words, it would reduce the volume of money in the United States about one-third; and it would take all the mints of the United States fifteen years to make good this loss—and what are we going to do for money these fifteen years?

But it has been said that there is no gold in this country. Ah, that can not be said any more since last Wednesday, when citizens of the United States bid over $558,000,000 in gold for the last issue of bonds.

There are always several hundred millions of dollars hoarded in our country, and the preference is always given to gold. If gold is not hoarded silver will be.

MORE MONEY AND GOOD MONEY.

While I wish a larger volume of money in circulation, I want it all to be good money. I do not want one sort of money to be worth 100 cents to the dollar, another sort to be worth 75 cents, and a third sort to be worth 50 cents; but want every dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, to be worth 100 cents to the dollar. Whatever bears the stamp of my country I want to be as good of its kind as can be found on God's earth. [Applause.] And I do not want one sort of money for the rich, and another sort for the poor, one sort for the banker and another sort for the farmer; but I want the poor man to be paid in as good money as the country has, and I want the farmer's money to be equal to the best; and I want as many silver dollars coined and as many paper dollars printed as can be kept at par with gold.

And this I consider the true Republican doctrine. There are gold Republicans, silver Republicans, and greenback Republicans; but I am not one of any of these Republicans. I am a good-money Republican, and when the money is good I do not care, and nobody else cares, whether it be gold, silver, or paper. All we want is that the money be good and there be plenty of it; plenty of it to float the business of the country, to give fair prices for all products and fair wages for all producers and all workers.

The Republican party does not want gold alone, nor silver alone, nor paper alone; but we want all three, and all three of equal value, and each worth 100 cents to the dollar. [Applause.]

There is this peculiarity about money: good money always leaves the field of business when bad money comes in. The moment a silver dollar becomes of less value than a gold dollar, that moment gold retires and ceases to circulate as money. And the moment paper money becomes of less value than gold and silver, that moment both gold and silver disappear from circulation, and paper becomes the only money in common use among the people.

This rule was illustrated during the war. Both gold and silver disappeared as money as soon as greenbacks became worth less than either, and they never came back into circulation again until a greenback became worth its face in gold and silver.

But it is said that the silver dollar has not been fairly treated. This statement I deny, and I desire to submit some facts in support of my denial. In the first place, I call attention to the great and undisputed fact that before the war a United States silver dollar was a curiosity. I was born in 1837, and have no recollection of having ever seen a United States silver dollar before the war. There were Mexican dollars, French dollars, Peruvian dollars, and some other foreign silver dollars in circulation, but a United States silver dollar before the war was a curiosity, and to-day a United States silver dollar coined before the war is never seen. I doubt whether there is a man in this House who has ever seen a United States silver dollar that was coined before 1861. [Applause.]

ACT OF 1873.

How is it to-day? The land is full of United States silver dollars. There have been coined since the war 423,000,000 silver dollars, while in all the years before the war there were coined only 8,000,000 silver dollars. More than fifty times as many silver dollars coined since 1873 as were coined in all the eighty years before 1873, and yet we are told that silver has been demonetized, has been illtreated, has been degraded. Our ears have been deafened by outcries and denunciations against what is called the "crime of 1873." It is claimed that the bill was passed secretly, and that JOHN SHERMAN is guilty of it, when the facts are the bill was pending in Congress for several years, the debates on it in the Senate cover 78 columns of the Congressional Globe, and the discussions on it in the House fill 66 columns of the same journal, while that "arch conspirator," JOHN SHERMAN, actually voted against it, and that great free-silver champion, Senator STEWART of Nevada, voted for it. [Laughter.] I envy neither the intelligence nor the honesty of the public man who howls himself hoarse in denunciation of the "crime of 1873," when I consider that all the "crime" there is exists in his diseased im gination or in his unfair intention. Neither do I respect the patriotism of that public man who broadly charges that the hundreds of statesmen, Republicans and Democrats, who voted for, or failed to vote against, the bill of 1873 were bribed, or were traitors. [Applause.]

The honest God's truth is that in 1873 there was no silver at all in circulation, and no probability that there would be any in the then near future; and it was not then expected that silver dollars would ever again be in demand as money, except for trade with China; and to suit this trade the trade dollar was authorized. Before the war gold was the main metal money of the country, and we had almost ceased to coin silver dollars, as this table shows:

Silver dollars coined from 1839 to 1862.

Year.	Dollars.	Year.	Dollars.	Year.	Dollars.
1839	300	1847	140,750	1855	26,000
1840	61,005	1848	15,000	1856	63,500
1841	173,000	1849	62,600	1857	94,000
1842	184,618	1850	47,500	1858	None.
1843	165,100	1851	1,300	1859	636,500
1844	20,000	1852	1,100	1860	733,930
1845	24,500	1853	46,110	1861	78,500
1846	169,000	1854	33,140	1862	12,090

From 1806 to 1836, a period of thirty years, not a single silver dollar was coined in the United States. In 1837, 1838, and 1839 not a silver dollar was coined, and in 1836 only 1,000 were coined. And what is more, it is well known that nearly all the silver dollars that were coined between 1793 and 1862 were melted by silversmiths to make silverware and silver merchandise.

There was no "conspiracy" against silver in 1873, and no "crime" against the people. The act of 1873 was fully, honestly, and patriotically considered, and the men who voted for it were not prompted by greed nor bought by gold.

HISTORY OF THE ACT OF 1873.

Here is a true history of the bill of 1873:

The bill was prepared in 1870 by Mr. Boutwell, then Secretary of the Treasury, and his colleagues, and was printed and sent to experts on coinage in all parts of the civilized world. The bill, with Deputy Comptroller Knox's report thereon, was printed in the Bankers' Magazine for July, 1870. The bill was sent to Senator SHERMAN, of the Senate Finance Committee, in April, 1870. It was then printed again and many thousands of copies were sent to bankers, capitalists, and whoever asked for it. In December, 1870, it

was reported unanimously for passage by the Senate Finance Committee. This committee consisted of SHERMAN, Williams of Oregon, Cattell, MORRILL, Warner, Fenton, and Bayard. You will notice this committee had the bill under discussion about eight months. January 10, 1871, the bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 36 for to 14 against.

Among those voting for the bill were the six Senators from the Pacific Coast, and among them was STEWART of Nevada. SHERMAN voted against the bill because it provided for the coinage by the mints of gold without charge or seigniorage. The bill then went to the House, and January 13, 1871, was ordered printed. February 25, 1871, the bill was reported back by the House Committee on Coinage with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, when it was again printed and recommitted to the Committee on Coinage. March 9, 1871, W. D. Kelley reintroduced the bill, when it was again printed and referred to the Committee on Coinage. January 6, 1872, the bill was reported for passage. The bill was read in full and debated at length by Kelley, Potter, Garfield, Maynard, Dawes, Holman, and others. January 10, 1872, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Coinage, and February 9, 1872, was again reported by the committee and was again ordered to be reprinted, and was recommitted to the committee. February 13, 1872, it was again reported for passage, was again printed, and was made a special order for March 12, 1872.

On April 9, 1872, the bill was debated by Hooper and others, and Mr. Hooper's speech alone filled 10 columns of the Congressional Globe. Mr. Stoughton's speech on the bill fills 7 columns of the Globe. On May 27, 1872, the bill was again called up and was amended and passed by a vote of 110 to 13. The bill was then sent to the Senate, was ordered printed, and was referred to the Finance Committee. On December 16, 1872, the bill was again before the Senate, and after debate was again ordered to be printed in full, with all the amendments. On January 7, 1873, the bill was again reported with further amendments, and again was ordered printed. On January 17, 1873, it was passed after a debate which fills 19 columns of the Congressional Globe. The bill then went to the House, was printed on January 21, 1873, and, as is the rule, went to a committee of conference, which consisted of Hooper, Stoughton, and McNeeley, of the House, and SHERMAN, Scott, and Bayard, of the Senate. The report of this conference committee was agreed to by both Houses, and the bill became a law on February 12, 1873. It is thus seen that the bill was debated during five sessions of Congress.

But Congress soon afterwards authorized the coinage of silver dollars, and since 1873 423,000,000 silver dollars have been coined, fifty times more than were coined before 1873.

I have already given a table of the coinage of silver dollars before the war. I have shown that only 8,000,000 silver dollars were coined between 1793 and 1873, a period of eighty years, an average of only $100,000 a year, whereas in the twenty-three years between 1873 and 1895, including both, there were coined 423,000,000 of standard silver dollars, and 36,000,000 of trade silver dollar, in all 459,000,000, or an average of nearly 20,000,000 a year! In other words, since 1873—when they say the silver dollar was demonetized and disgraced—since 1873, a period of twenty-three years, fifty-seven times more silver dollars were coined than were coined in all the eighty years from 1793 to 1873. Indeed, in the one year 1890, we coined over 38,000,000 silver dollars, more than four times as many as were coined in all the eighty years prior to the so-called "crime of 1873." And yet we are told that the silver dollar of our fathers has been "demonetized" and degraded, and most unfairly treated!

Let me give the coinage of silver dollars since 1873, so that it may be compared with the coinage before 1873:

Silver dollars coined from 1873 to 1895.

Year.	Trade dollars.	Standard dollars.
1873	1,222,000	----------
1874	4,910,000	----------
1875	6,279,600	----------
1876	6,192,150	----------
1877	13,092,710	----------
1878	4,259,900	22,495,550
1879	----------	27,580,100
1880	----------	27,397,355
1881	----------	27,927,975
1882	----------	27,574,100
1883	----------	28,470,039
1884	----------	28,136,875
1885	----------	28,697,767
1886	----------	31,423,886
1887	----------	33,611,710
1888	----------	31,990,833
1889	----------	34,651,811
1890	----------	38,043,004
1891	----------	23,562,735
1892	----------	6,323,245
1893	----------	1,455,792
1894	----------	3,093,972
1895	----------	862,470

Now, let any honest man compare this table of silver dollars coined since and during 1873 with the table I have just given of silver dollars coined before 1873 and tell me wherein has the silver dollar been unfairly treated since 1873. Eight millions coined in eighty years before 1873 and 459,000,000 coined in the twenty-three years since 1873—an average of 100,000 silver dollars coined each year before the war, and an average of nearly 20,000,000 a year coined since 1873. And yet there are men who want to make the people believe that there were more silver dollars before the war than there are now!

DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS BROUGHT RUIN.

The great cause of our financial troubles has been loss of confidence in the business capacity of our Government. In 1890 this country was wonderfully prosperous. But prosperity is hard to bear. When men are prosperous they become reckless and are inclined to try experiments.

In 1890 we were prosperous. But we wanted to be more prosperous. Quacks in medicine always guarantee a cure, even when they are sure to kill; and men who have everything to lose and nothing to gain are always prodigal in promises; they are trees that bear a profusion of flowers, but little or no fruit.

The Democratic party was then out of power, and it promised the people that if it was put in power the country would become far more prosperous than it then was. The Democratic politicians told the farmers that if their party was put in power wheat would bring $1 a bushel, and every laboring man would get work at high wages, and all store goods would be so cheap and money so plentiful that everybody would have a sufficiency of all the necessaries and most of the luxuries of human life.

Many a farmer believed this singsong, many a laboring man was beguiled by this sophistry, many a merchant lent a willing ear. And what was the result? The Democratic party elected an overwhelming majority of the members of this House. And what then happened? The business world took a scare. The Democratic party stood for free trade and free silver, and the manufacturing establishments of the United States began to stay their wheels, and the men who had been lending money began to call in their loans, and Europe began to send back to us hundreds of millions of our bonds, and in a short time over 2,000,000 laboring men were out of work, the courts were full of lawsuits, men's estates were sold at a sacrifice, money could not be borrowed, property could not be sold, farms were bought at sheriffs' sales for one-tenth of their value, rich men were made paupers, and no one prospered but lawyers, sheriffs, constables, and court clerks, and a financial panic struck us like a cyclone and in a day broke down a hundred banks, pauperized thousands of men believed to be rich, reduced millions to beggary, and forced tens of thousands to commit crime in order to live.

And, Mr. Speaker, we will not have a full return to prosperity until we get rid of the Democratic party and its twin heresies, free trade and free silver.

DEMAND FOR SILVER EXAGGERATED.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that there is not the demand among the people for silver that a great many of the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver insist there is. In support of my position I call attention to the fact that since 1873 there have been coined 423,000,000 standard silver dollars, and of these 423,000,000 silver dollars 353,000,000 remain to-day in the Treasury of the United States, with only 70,000,000 outstanding. Someone says, "Why does not the Government issue these 353,000,000 silver dollars that are in the Treasury?" That is a question that I want to answer, for I find there is a great deal of misapprehension on this point.

The 353,000,000 silver dollars in the Treasury are represented by silver certificates. I have one in my hand. I am rich enough to own one. How does it read?

This certifies that there has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States 1 silver dollar payable to the bearer on demand.

One silver dollar, deposited in the Treasury of the United States, payable to the bearer on demand! I own that silver dollar on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury would perpetrate a felonious breach of trust if he were to issue that silver dollar to any other person; and so with all of these other 353,000,000 in the Treasury represented by silver certificates. They are held by the people. Look at the money in your pockets and you will find most of it to consist of these very silver certificates. These 353,000,000 of silver dollars belong to the men who hold the $353,000,000 of silver certificates. The Treasurer of the United States just holds them on deposit subject to the order of the people who have the certificates. There is one silver dollar in the United States Treasury that belongs to me by virtue of the certificate I have just read. And yet there are thousands of so-called silver men crying out, "Why does not Mr. Carlisle pay out the silver dollars in the Treasury?" A very large part of this talk about silver is based on ignorance or willful misrepresentation.

SECRET OF THE SILVER AGITATION.

Now, if the people want silver, why are 353,000,000 of these certificates outstanding and only 70,000,000 of silver dollars in circulation? There would be no better method of stopping this outcry in favor of silver dollars than to call in every one of the silver certificates and issue all of these 353,000,000 silver dollars, and make the champions of free silver pack 10, 20, or 50 silver dollars in their pockets day after day and from morning to night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the secret of this silver agitation? The secret of this agitation is that the silver-mine owners of the Rocky Mountains want to get a big price for their silver. If it is not profitable for them to mine silver, why are they mining silver to-day? Why are they taking out millions upon millions of silver, if it is not a profitable business? It is a profitable business. They are becoming millionaires; and yet, not satisfied with getting an

honest payment for their labor, like the farmers, the merchants, and the artisans, they want to be paid two prices for their labor. They want the Government of the United States to pay them 100 cents for every 50 cents' worth of silver they mine.

I will join hands with the silver miners on this subject, and with all the champions of free silver, if the same Government that pays 100 cents for 50 cents' worth of silver will buy 50 cents' worth of wheat and pay 100 cents for it, or buy 50 cents' worth of corn and pay 100 cents for it, or buy 50 cents' worth of coal or 50 cents' worth of iron and pay my constituents 100 cents for it, and 100 cents for every 50 cents' worth of property my people carry to the markets of the country. And I believe it is just as unreasonable for these silver men to expect the Government of the United States to take 50 cents' worth of their silver bullion and coin it into a 100-cent dollar, as it would be to take 50 cents' worth of wheat to a Government mill and insist upon it being ground into 100 cents' worth of flour. What magic is there in silver that it should stand up and say, "I have more rights than any other product of human toil upon the American continent?" I want my people of east Tennessee to have as many rights as the silver miners of Colorado, Nevada, or Idaho, and if these miners are to be paid by the Government a double price for their products, I want the same Government to pay my people a double price for the products of their labor.

THE GENERAL SITUATION.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the general situation? Here are all the great nations of the earth occupying the same position that we do on this silver question. They float just as much silver as they can keep at par with gold, and no more. They are the great civilized countries of the earth. I will enumerate them: England, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Austria, and Holland. They are old nations. Their financiers are the great-grandsons of financial forefathers, who have been in the money business for hundreds of years, whereas we are mere boys in finance, and for our country to set itself up to lead the whole financial world is nothing more nor less than a piece of Yankee impudence, and an exhibition of free-silver assumption and ignorance. That is all it is.

To ignore the example of other great nations is not wise; it is not common sense; it does not meet the exigency of the occasion, and it only tends to make us ridiculous in the eyes of the financial world. The business of a great country must be transacted on the soundest business principles, and can be transacted upon no other. I want to see my country stand in the forefront of the great nations of the earth, holding aloft its glorious banner, bearing no such words as "Gold first and silver afterwards"; but, as Daniel Webster said upon a great occasion, bearing upon all its ample folds as they float over the sea and over the land and in every wind under the whole heavens, these other words dear to every true American heart, "Gold and silver, now and forever, one and inseparable." [Applause.]

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, it is manifest that a crisis in our national financial policy is fast approaching. There have been two startling epochs in recent financial history—1873 and 1893. The former was brought about by legislative stealth, assisted by executive inattention; and the latter was brought about by executive coercion, assisted by legislative subserviency. The legislation that made both of these epochs notorious never received the assent of the American people. The act of 1873 met with sharp repudiation in 1878 by the passage, over the veto of the President, of the Bland bill and the Matthews resolution. Need I comment on the act of 1893? That it was repudiated admits of an ocular demonstration in the political constitution of this Chamber. I forbear comment, out of a spirit of obituary kindness to the illustrious deceased. [Laughter.] I contemplate the exodus that went out of this Chamber on the dissolution of the Fifty-third Congress, not in the spirit of bimetallic revenge, but rather in philosophic sorrow; for hereafter no man will ever attempt to disentomb a "cuckoo." He belongs to the fossiliferous strata of American political geology, and his bones, in the distant future, will excite scientific curiosity as anatomical evidence of an extinct species. [Laughter and applause.]

It is, therefore, historical that the legislation of both periods, 1873 and 1893, have been followed by pronounced signs of the national displeasure. But, Mr. Speaker, it is an old story—old as history and coeval with human cupidity—that the creditor, having won an unfair advantage over the debtor, will not be dislodged without a bitter fight. Hence the battle of the standards has been raging in this country for twenty-five years. At times the people have been victorious. At times they have been betrayed and overreached. They were betrayed in 1873. They were partially victorious in 1878. They fancied they were victorious in 1890, but they were robbed of the fruits of that victory by the artful construction of the act of that year by the fiscal authorities of the nation; and they were disastrously overreached in 1893.

Now, this is true, Mr. Speaker: Either the nation will resort to the pure, unmixed, gold standard, or it will readopt the bimetallic system in force in this country from 1792 to 1873. If the gold standard, as is stoutly maintained by the partisans of gold, will advance not retard the public prosperity, accelerate not clog the wheels of industry, kindle not extinguish the furnace fires, appreciate not depreciate all values, do exact justice to the creditor, not despoil the debtor, overcome deficiencies by providing ample revenues, then the sooner we adopt it the better. It is fatal to misinterpret the situation. The advocates of the gold standard have organized a campaign. They propose to commit the country to the gold dollar as the sole unit of value. They boldly declare their purpose to drive out of public life and to strip of public honors every man who does not subscribe to the gold dollar as the only sound money, who does not wholly adore the gold standard, and who does not detest, or at least profess to detest, silver as a money metal.

Do I overstate their position? Why, Mr. Speaker, there are three successive steps in this projected revolution. First, the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law; second, the retirement and the cancellation of the Sherman notes and the greenbacks, amounting to $500,000,000; third, the withdrawal of the silver certificates and the sale of our standard silver dollars as so much bullion. The first step has been taken. The purchasing clause of the Sherman law was unconditionally repealed by the Fifty-third Congress, and during the progress of the discussion upon that measure its advocates, professing to speak for those in authority, pledged themselves to follow the repeal by legislation friendly to silver. Was that pledge kept? Let the corpse of the seigniorage bill, stricken down by the veto, speak. Why, sir, there are some gentlemen belonging to this House who remember the clamor that was raised against the purchasing clause of the Sherman law in the hot months of 1893. I have been exploring that catacomb of dead eloquence called the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for choice specimens of denunciation. I found them in extinct abundance, if I may so speak.

Why, Mr. Speaker, they made this Chamber resound with their war whoop against the purchasing clause of the Sherman law. They reviled it as the capital vice in our financial system and boldly predicted that if it was torn up by the roots the export of gold would instantly cease, the import of gold would instantly commence, the Treasury would overflow with gold, and the American people would revel in the sunshine of unexampled prosperity. I will not stop to consider whether these golden dreams have been realized. The repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law instead of arresting simply stimulated the exports of gold, for we have purchased $262,000,000 of gold since that time, and we are destined, in my judgment, to purchase hundreds of millions more before the gold standard is finally accepted by the American people. [Applause.]

But, however this may be, it is safe to affirm that the effect of the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law did not answer the sanguine expectations of its authors. If it had been told the Democratic Representatives in 1893, who, yielding to Executive persuasion, violated their pledges to their constituents and voted to strike down silver a second time in our history, that in 1895 President Cleveland would demand the retirement and cancellation of the Sherman notes and the legal tenders and the substitution of bank paper convertible into gold alone, they would have refused credence to the statement. But the question is here, is it not?

Why, sir, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Comptroller of the Currency, with a united voice, demand it. But, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the financial genius of the Administration seems to be concentrated in the Department of Agriculture, and when its great Secretary hurls his pastoral thunderbolts against silver, mighty Jupiter himself is amazed at the exact mimicry. [Laughter.] And when he is reenforced by the Comptroller of the Currency, whose big guns shake the financial hemisphere to its foundation, things look very blue for the poor silver men. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, if it would not be imputed to me as an act of malevolence, I would venture to admonish the Comptroller of a principle in gunnery, namely, that guns of the very largest caliber can be fired only a limited number of times until they become breech burnt, and therefore more dangerous to the artilleryman than to the enemy. [Laughter.] But the greenbacks and the Sherman notes are marked for destruction by the advocates of gold, and the Administration is ready to put the brand of Cain upon them.

Why, sir, we hear constantly from administrative forces about the "endless chain." Well, I do not know who invented this metaphor or simile; but if there is an "endless chain" who forged it? It was forged by a gold-standard blacksmith upon a gold-standard anvil; and the first blow was struck when the Government of the United States surrendered its option to pay its debts in standard gold and silver coin and accepted the intolerable burden of paying them in gold coin alone.

But what is the contention of the gold advocates with respect to

the Sherman notes and the legal tenders? Why, it is that they are a perpetual menace to our financial solvency and that the Government of the United States, backed up by the wealth of the wealthiest people in the world, is incapable of maintaining the convertibility of $500,000,000 of paper money into gold coin if it be obliged to reissue the notes thus converted. I entirely agree with them in this contention. Why? Because the foreign indebtedness of the United States is enormous. It is estimated on good authority that $4,000,000,000 of our railway securities are held abroad. All forms of American securities are afloat across the waters. It is difficult to estimate with accuracy the amount of our foreign indebtedness; but it is safe to affirm that it would take every dollar of gold in the world to pay it. When there is a pinch in European affairs (and pinches are fatally frequent under gold monometallism) these securities are thrown back upon the American market, converted into greenbacks and Sherman notes, and the Treasury reserve is raided.

Why, Mr. Speaker, to maintain gold payments with respect to this foreign indebtedness would bankrupt even the United States of America. And the contention of the gold advocates, that if gold payments are to be maintained the Sherman notes and the legal tenders must go, is entirely tenable. But when they are retired, what kind of a circulating medium is to be supplied to the people in their place? The gold advocate is equal to the emergency. His resources never fall below the danger line; and we are now to be treated to the extraordinary novelty of an impending glut in gold! The production of gold, it is claimed, within the next four or five years is to be prodigious; and the wildest dreams of the followers of Cortez and Pizarro are to be more than realized by the output of gold. We are told that the transsiberian railroad is to open up virgin gold fields that will surpass the fields of Australia and California in the palmy days of 1849. With respect to the Transvaal they condescend to give us exact information. They tell us that those regions will within the next ten or fifteen years enrich the gold stock of the world to the tune of $5,000,000,000. Australia, too, is to overexert herself and possibly require the Cæsarian operation in the delivery of her overgrown gold progeny.

But the freshest novelty I have noticed in the gold-standard literature is the reservoir of gold owned by the King of Ashantee. It seems that this monarch has recently fallen a victim to a fresh outbreak of the colonial appetite of Great Britain. The Incas of Peru in their proudest days were bankrupts by the side of the King of Ashantee. He holds court seated in a solid gold chair worth $160,000. He has inherited from his ancestors and extorted from his subjects gold dust and nuggets to the amount of $500,000,000. Every one of his 3,333 wives adorns her sockless ankles with a solid bracelet of gold; and we free-silver cranks are expected to believe that that barbaric, polygamous gold-bug potentate in the wilds of Africa has actually more gold in his possession and under his control than is held in the Bank of England and the Treasury of the United States combined. Why, sir, the ex-Queen of Hawaii ought to join this African monarch's colony of wives, and thus relieve Mr. Blount of Georgia of "paramount" solicitude for her queenly welfare. [Laughter.] Or the present Administration might organize itself into a matrimonial bureau, and thus extricate its foreign policy from serious embarrassment.

The late flurry upon Wall street caused by the patriotic deliverance of the President upon the Monroe doctrine was mitigated by some very touching information. We were told in reputable newspapers that Russia, out of her recent accumulation of $800,000,000 of gold, had generously tendered the United States the use of $400,000,000, and with that moiety of Russia's hoard our Treasury reserve would be impregnable to assault and a tonic administered to Wall street. Now, the extravagance of that statement will become evident when it is known that Russia's accumulation of gold has been chiefly since 1890, and from that year down to 1895 the excess of her imports over her exports of gold has been less than $150,000,000. No nation in the world, Mr. Speaker, owns $800,000,000 of gold. Great Britain, whose accumulation of gold goes back before the days of Julius Cæsar, can not boast of any sum like it. Besides, the sudden transfer of $400,000,000 of gold from Europe to the United States would cause a financial crash from Moscow to Lisbon. I congratulate the advocates of the gold standard on the opulence of their exaggeration, while I lament their penury of economical facts.

The hard, cold, naked truth is that, notwithstanding the mad search for gold in all parts of the world, less than one hundred millions have been added to the coined gold of the world in 1885. There is only one safe way to solve the financial problem, to abolish the "endless chain," to replenish our Treasury resources in coin beyond the possibility of depletion, to retain the Sherman notes and the greenbacks; and that is to return to and employ the common resources of the precious metals as the basis of our monetary system. Give the country protection upon Republican lines, together with bimetallism, and our former state of prosperity will return. [Applause.]

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, in common with every other member on this floor I feel that this debate is practically, as was said in the Senate, but a dress parade, and that nothing that is said during the discussion of this bill will either change the sentiment or the vote of any member of this House. The extended discussion and consideration which has been given to this question of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, not only here and in the Senate, but upon party platforms, by the press of the country, and between individuals, have crystallized, in the minds of every member of this body, ideas and theories which no statement of facts, no array of figures, no argument, however logical, and no consideration of enlightened public policy can modify at this time. Therefore it is that I, for one, would have been ready and willing to have had the vote of this House taken upon the question of concurring on the Senate substitute immediately upon its presentation and without debate. But recognizing the necessity which some of the gentlemen upon this floor feel that they should record not only their vote but their voices in behalf of or against the measure under consideration, we have agreed to have a grand dress parade and review.

Feeling that the views of my constituents in the district which I have the honor to represent and my own are so entirely in accord upon this question of the free coinage of silver, I have felt loath to avail myself of even the short time allotted to me in this debate for any expression of my personal views, and I would probably have been willing to yield my time to some other member who, more than myself, should feel the need of justifying to his constituents the vote which he shall hereafter cast.

But, sir, as a Representative of a district in the same State as that from which my colleague [Mr. McCLURE] is accredited, I feel it my duty to say to this House and to the country that the words he has just spoken, however interesting and eloquent they may have been, do not represent the sentiment of the great State of Ohio upon this question. He and I had the honor in the last Republican State convention to be members of the committee on resolutions which drafted the platform for the Republican party of that State. Out of 21 representatives of the different Congressional districts upon that committee he stood alone in advocating a declaration in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Had such a proposition been submitted to the convention it would have been voted down by a practically unanimous vote. But, on the contrary, the platform that was adopted was a reaffirmation upon this subject of the doctrine promulgated in the national platform and, if I remember right, in the very language contained in the latter. We placed ourselves squarely on record as favoring the use of both gold and silver as standard money, the parity of the two to be maintained either by international agreement or by such regulations as would make the purchasing power of every dollar of every kind of money issued by the Government equal to that of every other dollar.

On this issue and the great issue of protection we went before the people of our State and rolled up the enormous plurality of 95,000 for the Republican State ticket and elected a legislature overwhelmingly Republican in both its branches. Had the Republican party of Ohio indorsed the free and unlimited coinage of silver we should have gone down in ignominious defeat. We should have returned to the Senate of the United States the Democratic representative who now occupies its seat in that body, instead of that grand Republican, J. B. Foraker, and we should have relegated to political oblivion the great protection leader, William McKinley, whom we hope at no far distant day to place in the chair of the Chief Executive of the nation. The advocate of free silver coinage in the Republican party of Ohio are in numbers so inconsiderable, in influence so insignificant, that if we were to apply to them principles of the infinitesimal calculus they might, as compared with the overwhelming numbers who are opposed to this fallacy, be utterly ignored.

These few remarks upon the position of the great State which I have in part the honor to represent I feel it proper and expedient to make, lest the sentiments of my colleague, who stands alone among the Republican Representatives of Ohio, and in whose views even one of the two Democratic members from that State [Mr. SORG] does not coincide, should by my silence appear to represent, in any degree, the views of the citizens of that State. Thus it is that in this dress parade, when the lines are formed and the roll call of the members of this House and the States which they represent shall be made we of Ohio do not wish to be found among those who were reported as absent and unaccounted for.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be permitted to discuss for a few moments some of the features of the measure upon which, when this debate closes, we shall be called upon to vote. As an individual I am opposed to going in debt. It has been my endeavor throughout life to live within my income, and at the end of each year to feel that I have bettered my financial position and am more fully prepared to meet the disasters and misfortunes which are liable to come to any of us through the unforeseen adversities

of life. Were I a man in mercantile business I should endeavor to carry out this principle, and my bills-payable account would be the smallest of all upon my ledger. The greatest curse which has fallen upon the business interests of our country, and which unfortunately has affected the nation as well as the individual, is that of attempting to transact business upon borrowed capital. There has grown up a wild spirit of speculation, a desire to make immense fortunes in short periods of time, a species of gambling mania which has taken hold of the mercantile community of this country; a desire to do business upon credit instead of cash, which has wrecked thousands of business enterprises, and which will wipe off of the face of the earth thousands more before the universal liquidation, which must come some time, shall have taken place. The individual who lives beyond his salary is ever upon the verge of dishonesty and dishonor. The business concern whose expenses exceed its income, and whose deficits of receipts are made good by the borrowing of money, must ultimately go into the hands of receivers or assignees and close up its doors.

The principles which apply to individuals apply equally to a government. The confidence in the great international standing of the nation, its ability to transact its affairs and to continue in existence, are founded upon the same necessities of economy in the matter of expenses and of certainty and sufficiency in the matter of its income as in the case of the individual. It is true that disasters and great emergencies come to nations as misfortune comes to individuals; sickness and death may cut off the earning capacity of the individual; destruction by fire and flood, and the failure of debtors to pay their just debts may harass and embarrass the business concern, and war and pestilence may devastate and eat up the resources of a nation; but in the absence of these unusual and unforeseen circumstances the principles which lead to success or misfortune apply equally to the individual, the business enterprise, or a nation.

One of these unforeseen calamities came upon this nation in the great civil war, and entailed upon us a loss in men and money stupendous beyond conception. To carry the vast weight of indebtedness which resulted, we went into the money markets of the world, borrowed the money to meet our debts, and gave the promissory notes of the Government in the shape of national bonds for the repayment of these loans. Year by year as these notes came due, this Government, like an honest business man under the same circumstances, has redeemed them, from its surplus revenue, until between the 31st of August, 1865, when the national debt reached its highest point, and the 1st of March, 1893, it had been reduced from $2,381,530,294.96 to $963,281,752.63, or a reduction of $1,881,367,873.93. This enormous amount was paid out of the surplus which had been provided by Republican legislation. But when misfortune came upon us in the shape of Democratic control, and the policy which had provided a revenue sufficient to pay our running expenses and wipe out each year a portion of our bonded debt gave place to the free-trade heresy, which, while it crippled American industries, reduced the production of wealth, threw out of employment American labor, cut down the wages of American workmen, and sent vast sums of money into foreign countries to purchase productions which American enterprise had heretofore furnished to American consumers, at the same time so cut down the income of the Government that it not only ceased to pay its running expenses but has had in time of peace to do that which was only justifiable in time of war—borrow money and issue its notes.

The effect upon the nation's credit, like that upon the credit of the individual, was to impair confidence in its ability to meet its obligations, and just as in the case of a bank whose insolvency is suspected, a run commenced upon the Treasury of the Government; the money which passes current in this country alone was made use of as the instrument to draw from the Treasury that money which has become the standard of value through the world, and the drain began upon the gold reserve, which, from June, 1878, when the resumption act went into effect, until the accession of Mr. Cleveland to the Presidency in March, 1893, had easily been maintained at more than $100,000,000, and during a part of that time had accumulated to more than double that amount.

Had a protective tariff been in force no such run would have probably occurred; but even if it had, a slight modification of the law by which the tariff upon goods imported from gold-standard countries were required to be paid in gold would have kept the reserve intact. With no such revenue, however, there was but one thing for the Government to have recourse to in order to maintain its credit and keep up the gold reserve for the redemption of the Treasury notes. And so it came about that bonds have been sold, including the issue about to be made, of over $262,000,000 within the last two years. An effort was made by the Republicans of the Fifty-third Congress to modify the existing law as to the issue of bonds to replenish the gold reserve, and to provide an emergency revenue similar to the provisions of the act which we have under consideration; but the Democratic House and the Democratic President, blind to the defects of the Wilson bill and determined to place the country in the list of single gold-standard nations by demanding the authority to issue a distinctive gold bond, refused to accept the offer made by the Republican minority.

Relying upon the income tax to furnish $40,000,000, which the Wilson bill otherwise fell short of providing for the necessary expenses of the Government, they stubbornly refused to admit that a deficiency existed, and by distortion of figures attempted to delude and deceive the nation into the belief that the sources of all our troubles were the greenbacks and Treasury notes for which the gold could be withdrawn upon demand, and that the only remedy was their cancellation and retirement, or if not their cancellation, at least their suspension in the Treasury for an unlimited time, until the drain of gold should cease. The fallacy of this position is apparent at once if we stop to consider that it is the theory and avowed policy of the Government in both its executive and legislative branches under existing law to preserve and maintain the parity, not only of the metallic coins which are the standard measure of value, but of the various paper representatives of these coins which have been issued by the Government. Not a dollar of money goes out of the Treasury of the United States except for the payment of an indebtedness due from the Government, directly or indirectly, to the individual who draws the money. It is paid out as salaries or wages or for the purchase of things necessary for the performance of governmental function, and every dollar drawn is the representative of value received by the Government.

If the greenbacks were all retired, yet these expenses of the Government would still have to be paid, either in gold or silver or the representatives of these metals; and upon the theory of the equality and interchangeability of these coins the Government would be bound to exchange one for the other, and refusal to do so would immediately destroy the parity and put a premium upon the one which the Government refused to furnish. When the Government has stamped upon a piece of silver its edict that it shall pass current as one dollar and has stamped upon a piece of gold a similar declaration, it is bound to preserve the interchange of both these metals at their face values, so far as its own dealings are concerned, or else it disparages and depreciates the one to which it refuses to extend equal favors with the other. I can not, therefore, see that the greenback and Treasury note should be held responsible as the cause and means of depleting the gold reserve, except that from their more convenient forms in the larger denominations they can be more quickly handled and more easily transported; at any rate there can be little doubt that the contraction of the currency which would result from their redemption and the substitution of bonds in their place, which could not circulate as money, would be disastrous to the business interests of the country, even if we leave out of account the burden of interest which would be added by the substitution of the bond for the noninterest-bearing greenbacks and Treasury notes.

The bond bill which we sent to the Senate to meet the emergency which confronted us at the opening of this session of a still further depletion of the reserve and the disastrous effects which it was feared would follow the President's message on Venezuela were understood by the Republicans of this House and adopted by them as emergency measures only. They were not intended to represent the policy of that party as to the manner of providing for the payment of current expenses and the reduction of existing indebtedness. They did not yield one jot or tittle of their belief that the income of the Government, earned, not borrowed, should be sufficient to pay its expenses; but by sad experience of the obstinacy of the Executive we were assured that little or no relief could be hoped for at his hands in the way of tariff reform to produce the needed revenue; and, yielding to that feeling of unselfish patriotism for which the Republican party has ever been noted, we attempted to sustain and to lift up the hand of the President in maintaining the credit of the Government by the issue of additional bonds. Feeling, however, that in thus yielding to the demands of the Executive our duty at the same time required that we should, so far as in our power, protect the interests of the people, we insisted that the bonds which should be issued should be redeemable in less time, the interest paid at a lower rate, and the American people be given a chance to purchase the bonds instead of their being placed in the hands of a foreign syndicate. In addition to this arrangement for protecting the gold reserve and to enable the Government to borrow money for the payment of current expenses until the Republican party should again return to full and complete possession of every department of the government, we authorized the issue of short-term, low-rate, emergency bonds to the amount of $50,000,000 to cover the probable deficiency which would exist by the 4th of March, 1897. These provisions we sent to the Senate.

The action of that august body as a coordinate legislative branch of this Government it may not be proper for me to either criticise or condemn. I may be pardoned, however, for saying that it reminds me of the story of the doctor who, whenever a patient was brought to him for treatment, immediately proceeded

to throw him into fits, because, as the doctor said, "he was great on fits." And so it seems the Senate is determined that whatever measure of relief we send to them, whether it be an emergency bond bill for the purpose of stopping the drain of gold or a tariff bill for supplying the deficiency of income, is to be thrown into the free-silver "fits," because a Republican minority, aided by Populists and Democrats, think that if they can afflict the country with that disease they can find a cure for all the other distempers.

It has even been hinted that upon one occasion one of the distinguished advocates of free silver, whose mind was so filled with his pet theory as to exclude any other thought, was called upon to make a few remarks beside the grave of a person with whom he had but a slight acquaintance, and being, like all other free-silver fanatics, ready to talk at all times, he remarked:

With the deceased I had little or no personal acquaintance. I therefore can say little of his life and character; but I shall be glad of this opportunity to address you for a short time upon the subject of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

After a month of debate in the other House it comes back to us with all of our remedial legislation eliminated and the substitution of a provision which the majority of this House can not adopt. It says to the President that he may continue to issue 4 and 5 per cent bonds, and let them run thirty years if necessary, thus bequeathing an additional legacy of debt upon the next generation, and that he need not advertise the sale of bonds unless he chooses, but may deal direct with syndicates of foreign bankers, as he did a year ago. If ever the seal of condemnation was put upon any action of a legislative body by the American people, the result of the recent bond sale condemned this action of the United States Senate. Forced by the public demand that these bonds should be offered first to the American people, and should be sold for their full market value, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury reluctantly consented to advertise for bids.

Misjudging and mistrusting the patriotism and public spirit of the American citizens, they threw cold water upon the project and discouraged its success by the restrictions and limitations which they placed upon the sale of the bonds. But in spite of this want of confidence, in spite of their lack of faith in the support the people of this country have ever been ready and willing to give to its Government in time of need, the sale of these bonds was a magnificent success and even the syndicate headed by Mr. Morgan, to which the Secretary of the Treasury was about to dispose of the entire issue at 104, was compelled to raise its bid nearly 7 per cent in order to compete with the demand which it felt would be made by the masses of investors in this country for this loan. There were two things in connection with the opening of these bids which excited surprise in my mind. One was the elation of the Secretary of the Treasury over its success and the assumption by the President that it was due to his efforts, and the other that the opening of a foreign bid should have been attended with demonstrations of applause. Little credit can be attached to either the President or the Secretary of the Treasury for the success of this sale of bonds unless it be for the fact that they were not so utterly blind to the sentiment of the country as to ignore the demand for competitive bids. In the language of one of our great daily journals:

It is positive that we owe nothing to the Administration for this success. The credit is wholly due to the patriotism of the people, of the press, and of our banking institutions!

I have referred to the demonstrations of applause which were made when a foreign bid was read. If that applause was meant to express only the satisfaction that was felt at this bid as an evidence of the confidence of foreign investors, it may have been pardonable; and yet to my mind it was a far greater source of congratulation that the immense bulk of bids was from home investors.

Mr. Speaker, it marks, to my mind, the beginning of a brighter epoch in American financiering when the American people decide that they will become debtors to themselves instead of to foreign nations and foreign individuals. The secret and source of all the financial distresses under which this country is now laboring is the policy which has been pursued for the last thirty years of looking to foreign capital for financial support in our great private, corporate, and governmental enterprises.

We have become a debtor nation because, not content to await a healthy development of our resources, we have rushed headlong into speculations beyond our means; we have gambled upon the chances of the future; we have borrowed money to carry out our games of chance, and have burdened ourselves with the payment of untold sums of money by way of interest and dividends to foreign creditors. Do we open a mine, it is done by foreign capital; do we attempt to float the bonds of a great railroad, we send them abroad to bring back British gold; do we start a manufacturing enterprise, it is foreign capital invested in its management that carries it into operation. I know that this policy has been pursued and enthusiastically supported for many years, and yet year by year it has drained the country of its resources, and it has placed in the hands of those liable at any moment to become the enemies of this Government the means of creating a panic in its market and disaster and distress in every line of business.

Had we been more conservative in our progress; had we depended upon the present resources instead of borrowing from the future; had we deferred investments in these enterprises until our natural development of wealth and population had made them successful; had we paid cash as we went along instead of giving our notes, whose interest has sapped the very lifeblood of our earnings, we would not now be in the embarrassed financial condition in which we find ourselves. Even our Government securities, which ought, like those of France and Germany and Great Britain, to be held by our own people, are in the hands of foreign investors. So that while we resent the interference of a foreign Government or its agents not only in our own political affairs but in the affairs of our neighbors on this continent, we have tamely submitted to have the yoke of their financial despotism placed upon our necks. The tide of prosperity can only set in when Americans, and by that I mean in this connection the people of the United States, become creditors and debtors to themselves alone.

The apt story related of Mr. Lincoln concerning the home market applies with equal force to the sale of bonds which has just been made, for had they gone to foreign investors they would have had our bonds and we their money; but when sold to our own people, we keep in this country both the bonds and the money, and so long as they stay here, $4,000,000, by way of interest, will be distributed every year by the Government to American citizens, instead of being sent abroad to foreign investors.

But there are other sources of depletion of our wealth little noticed, but in the aggregate amounting annually to a vast amount of money. Thousands of dollars, representing the profits on the natural productions and labor of this country, find their way to Europe for the purchase of luxuries and the expenses of tourists. I know that it is difficult to stop this outflow of wealth by any legislative action, but a sentiment should be stimulated and encouraged to check this evil. I have no sympathy with communistic ideas which would pull down the successful and degrade them to a level with the idle, the improvident, and the thriftless; but I do believe that it is the duty of those who have, by combinations of fortunate circumstances, accumulated vast fortunes under the fostering influences of this great Government, to endeavor to elevate the condition and to mitigate the misfortunes of those who have been less successful. I believe that they should, as a duty of citizenship, contribute to the advancement of great public and private enterprises. I believe that their money should be put in circulation to purchase American products and to go into the hands of American labor. I believe that they could build for themselves more enduring monuments of fame in this way than by forming alliances for their daughters and their sons with the titled paupers of European nobility. I believe that $1,000,000 bestowed in the uplifting and improvement of their fellow-men on this side of the ocean will give them a prouder title of nobility than is held by any prince, duke, or baron who has been bought with a dowry of American gold in exchange for his ancient title and dainty hand.

So, too, the thousands of Americans who year after year cross the ocean to spend their money as tourists in foreign lands, the greater porportion of whom have probably seen little, if anything, of this magnificent domain of ours. It was a maxim of the old philosopher, "Know thyself." I would add to that, "Know thine own country." Nowhere in the world can more magnificent objects of natural scenery be found, and whether gazing upon the thundering cataract of Niagara, the magnificent canyons of the Rocky Mountains, the gigantic forests of the Pacific Coast, the Yellowstone Park, or the wonderful Yosemite; whether standing upon the top of Pike's Peak and looking out over a radius of 60 miles of uninterrupted view, or upon the banks of either ocean, he will see no country upon all the earth of which man should be prouder or which contains more to educate and instruct.

Let him spend his money at home, and, as Lincoln might have said, he will have the pleasure and his money will form a part of the wealth of his country.

These are the things which enable us to account for the fact that while the balance of trade—and by that I mean the difference between the exports and the imports of which we keep an account—may be largely in our favor, yet the continual drain of money taken out of the country by tourists and in payment of interest on securities held abroad may be far in excess of the balance of trade and the difference goes to retard our legitimate development year by year. But the remedy for this, unfortunately, is but little within legislative control and must be left to the public spirit and patriotism of the people themselves. If Boston Harbor a hundeed years ago could be converted into a great teapot as a rebuke to the oppression of foreign imposition, is there not enough of the spirit

of '76 left in this country to commence its redemption from the financial slavery in which it has placed itself to foreign capital by spending American money in America and for America?

Having thus briefly stated some of the causes which have tended to make the financial situation so embarrassing to our people and our Government, let us consider what, if any, remedies can be suggested which are within the control of governmental legislation. From a Republican standpoint, and I think that even the free-silver Republicans will agree with me upon the proposition, the first thing to be done is to put the Government upon a paying basis. This can not be done by the issue of bonds, because some day those bonds must be paid. There is but one way that has ever been found by which the expenses of government can be met, and that is by taxation in one form or another. Direct taxation is limited by our Constitution and is only available in cases of great emergency when the General Government finds itself compelled to apportion out among the several States, according to their population, its share of the assessment levied. The other two great sources of income from taxation are those which are levied by way of internal revenue or excise upon the productions or occupations within the country and a tariff or custom duty upon articles imported into the country from abroad.

Feeling that any additional tax for internal revenue would be unwise and uncalled for in time of peace and a burden upon home manufactures which would put them to great disadvantage in the markets of the world, the policy of the Republican party has been to provide its revenue by tariff duties and at the same time so adjust the scale of these duties as to protect, as far as possible, American industries against foreign competition in the markets of the United States. I shall not go into any lengthy argument to prove the wisdom of this policy. It speaks for itself in the results which it has accomplished, and were I to attempt to put into language a statement of those results it would far transgress the limits assigned to me in this debate. Nor could I hope to add anything to the complete demonstration which has been made upon this subject by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, in his recent speech on this bill in the Senate.

Believing that he has fully and completely proven that the deficiency of revenue is responsible for the trouble which has beset the Treasury, has caused the depletion of the gold reserve, has made necessary the issue of bonds to the extent of $262,000,000, to say nothing of the financial distress which has swept over the country at large for the last three years, the remedy to me seems a plain and simple one: That we should pass a tariff bill such as we sent to the Senate during the holiday week as an emergency bill and for temporary relief, and when the Republican party shall have once more come into full possession of the legislative branches, with a Republican President exercising the legislative power of approval over a protective tariff bill framed and passed by a Republican House and Senate, we shall hear no more of raids on the Treasury and the issue of bonds to keep up the reserve.

But the free-silver men claim that even if protection is restored to American labor, if the wheels of American industry begin to revolve, if the American workmen once more receive full American wages and employment for their full time, if the farmer can sell his crops in the home market at prices to make a reasonable profit, yet the full measure of prosperity can not come until silver is remonetized and the mints of the United States are once more opened to its free and unlimited coinage.

Mr. Speaker, nothing that I can say would probably add an iota to the vast learning which has been displayed upon this subject, and nothing that I could say, I am sure, would cause a free-silver advocate to see the error of his ways and get down to what I call a rational footing. They are wedded to their silver gods and no divorce court, unless it be the great national conventions and the judgment of the American people at the next Presidential election, can restore them to a state of separate existence. I shall therefore not take up the time of the House with statistical tables to controvert their claims that silver is the actual standard, that the great natural products of the country have maintained a parity with it, and that gold has appreciated.

While I am committed, not only by the declaration of my party in its national and State platforms, but by my own careful and deliberate judgment, to the belief that the convenience of mankind requires the use of both the metals as standards of value, and while I believe that the honor and integrity of the American Government demand that the coins which it issues shall be maintained by it at an absolute equality so that a dollar of one kind of metal, or its representative in paper money, shall be equal in purchasing power to every other dollar or its representative, I must freely admit that I believe this to be impossible if the mints of the United States are open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, when its bullion value in the markets of the world is but 32 to 1.

But while committed to the support of two kinds of standard money, I can not indorse the idea of two standards of value, one of which is fixed and recognized throughout all mercantile nations and the other is practically a commodity whose price rises and falls, according to the law of supply and demand, with reference to the fixed standard. Were the United States a walled-in nation, excluding, as China and Japan did for centuries, the intrusion of foreign commerce, I could readily conceive how a legislative act or a fiat of the Government could compel the circulation of any form of money which it might adopt and at any value which it might affix to it. But the exports from this country must be sold in the markets of the world and must be paid for in the coins which constitute the money of the world at their circulating value. So, too, the imports must be settled for in the coin and at the value of that coin in the country from which imported, and while my Government may compel me by its power over legal tender to accept a silver dollar in payment of a dollar of indebtedness, it can not compel a foreign creditor to accept a silver dollar in settlement of my dollar of indebtedness to him if the value of my dollar in his country is only 50 cents.

There can be but one way, in my judgment, in which that can be done, and that is by agreement among the commercial nations of the earth with which we deal, by their powers of sovereignty, to agree upon the ratio of 16 to 1 and make silver and gold legal tenders at that ratio. To the extent that this overvalues silver it becomes fiat money; but fiat money, even paper money, which is its worst form, so far as value is concerned, although its most convenient form for the purposes of business, can only be maintained as such by the strong arm of the law setting aside all questions of intrinsic value and placing wholly or partly a fictitious value upon what would otherwise be a mere commodity.

Do not misunderstand me. I heartily indorse a double standard of money, provided by international agreement these two standards can be kept together throughout the mercantile world. I do not believe it possible to maintain that double standard by the United States alone; and without this concurrence and when the separation comes, as it has already done, there can be, after all, but a single standard, and that the one which the world at large recognizes. I can conceive that, for purposes of internal traffic, a limited amount of silver might be kept in circulation at the ratio of 16 to 1, or, for that matter, at the ratio of 1 to 1, just as greenbacks are kept in circulation on a parity with gold while their intrinsic value is almost nothing. This, it seems to me, is what is meant by the declarations of our party favoring the greatest possible use of silver as standard money provided by legislation it can be maintained at a parity for purposes of trade strictly within our own country. That is the case with our silver certificates, any dollar of which will buy as much in our markets as a dollar in gold. Every dollar of our bank circulation will do the same. But not a dollar of greenbacks nor a dollar of silver certificates nor a dollar in bank notes can be forced upon a foreign creditor in exchange either for a dollar of gold coin or bullion nor in payment of one dollar of indebtedness.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that our first duty as a nation is to leave nothing undone to bring about this international agreement. Let us take the initiative. Since we are debarred from offering in this bill such measures of relief as in our judgment are necessary by the issue of bonds, let us at least show that we are willing to do all that can be rationally done for the rehabilitation of silver as one of the standard moneys of the world. I believe that the nations of Europe, with possibly the exception of Great Britain, are ready to meet with us in this attempt, and should Great Britain refuse to do so, surely the wisdom of American statesmanship, with the concurrence of that of the rest of Europe, can, by discriminations against that power, compel her to adopt the agreement for the protection of her own mercantile interests.

For this nation alone to attempt to restore the free and unlimited coinage of silver even to the product of American mines would, it seems to me, be unjust to every other great interest in the country. I have attempted to look at this question from an unpartisan and unsectional point of view. I have studied it as a question of economics in which the people of our whole country are deeply concerned, whether they reside within the Rocky Mountain region, where nature has stored up these vast deposits of mineral wealth, or in the broad prairies of Iowa, Kansas, and Illinois, with their immense fields of corn and wheat; whether in the great manufacturing States of the East or the cotton belt of the South; and I can not but feel that more injury is being done to the credit and business interests of this country by the agitation of this question than it would cost the Government to purchase every silver mine in the United States.

I speak from no feeling of prejudice when I call attention to the fact that this interest of the silver-mine owners which has raised such a disturbance throughout the land is absolutely insignificant compared with the other great industries of the country. To illustrate: In the Cincinnati district alone the amount collected for internal revenue in 1894 was more than the output of the silver mines in any State in the Union with the exception of five. The value of the manufactured goods in my city in that year was four

times as much as the value of the entire silver output in the country, and if we were to aggregate the value of all the corn produced in the country and compare it with that of the silver in the same year the latter would be dwarfed into absolute insignificance in comparison with it.

Why, then, should these great industries of manufacturing and agricultural production be made subservient to the greed of the owners of silver mines in a few undeveloped States, who wish the United States to buy their product at double its value? Would it not be just as reasonable for the distiller to say that the United States should accept from him the output of his distillery and pay him double the market price for his whisky? Would it not be equally as reasonable for the farmer to demand that the Government should put up its warehouses all over the land and buy and store his grain at $1 a bushel when it would sell in Europe for but 50 cents? If the mining of silver as bullion to be sold in the markets of the world as such can not be profitably carried on at its present market price, then let the silver-mine owner do just as any other manufacturer would have to do under the same circumstances, just as the distillers have had to do throughout the country when they overproduced and could not find a market at profitable prices—let him close his mine until such time as the scarcity of silver and an increase in the demand for it shall have made it profitable for him to resume its working.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this silver-coinage question will, if allowed to rest, in a very short time adjust itself. The demand for gold as the single-standard money in European countries has caused the development of before unheard-of wealth in all parts of the world. It has penetrated Africa and discovered immense deposits in the southern and western parts of that continent; it has sought the frozen shores of Alaska and during the last three years has added $4,000,000 of the precious metal to the stock of the world; it has brought to light the hidden wealth of Venezuela and Guiana; Australia has increased its yield; while in these silver States themselves which are raising such an unjust cry and demand for discrimination in favor of the silver interest the development of gold has far exceeded that of silver; so that while the total production of gold in the United States in 1893 was valued at $40,000,000, in 1895 it had increased over 33⅓ per cent and was estimated to be worth over $53,000,000.

On the other hand, the production of silver, which was 60,000,000 ounces in 1893, ran down in 1895 to 51,000,000. The same is true in regard to the increase in coinage of gold and the decrease in coinage of silver throughout the world. In 1892 the world's coinage of gold was $172,473,124, and that of silver $155,517,347. In 1894 the coinage of gold was $227,921,032, while that of silver was $113,095,788, showing that between 1892 and 1894 silver coinage decreased from 90 per cent of the gold coinage to 50 per cent. The same causes which drove silver to a premium when the mines of Australia and California threw their immense quantities of gold for the first time into the mints of the world will, from the natural cause of supply and demand, work the restoration of silver upward from the ratio of 32 to 1, which it now has partly, if not fully, to its ratio of 16 to 1, as in the past. We can not hurry this by legislation; and even this country, rich as it is in its natural resources and growing wealthier every day, may be made bankrupt before it can realize upon its investment if it undertakes, as the free-silver men demand that it shall, to corner the silver market of the world for the next five, ten, or twenty years.

A great deal has been said in this debate as to the amount of money per capita in the different countries of the world affecting the prosperity and financial stability of the country. I have taken the pains to tabulate, from Preston's last report as Director of the Mint, the amounts per capita of gold, silver, uncovered paper money, and of all kinds of money by the leading nations of the civilized world. I find that as to the per capita of gold the following is shown to be the case:

1. Australia, $24.47.
2. France, $22.19.
3. Egypt, $17.65.
4. Great Britain, $14.91.
5. Germany, $12.21.
6. Cuba, $10.
7. United States, $8.78.

In silver per capita we stand as follows:

1. France, $12.94.
2. The Netherlands, $11.96.
3. Spain, $9.49.
4. United States, $8.89.

And Great Britain stands twelfth, with only $2.96 per capita.

In the list of uncovered paper money per capita the order is as follows:

1. South American States, $15.28.
2. Portugal, $10.80.
3. Belgium, $10.38.
4. Greece, $10.18.
5. Italy, $6.24.
6. The Netherlands, $6.08.
7. Canada, $6.04.
8. United States, $5.92.
9. Spain, $4.78.
10. Austria-Hungary, $4.69.
11. Russia, $4.28.
12. Haiti, $4.20.
13. Great Britain, $2.91.

While France stands very near the bottom of the list, with only 84 cents per capita.

As to the per capita of all kinds of money, the following shows the position of the United States:

1. France, $35.77.
2. Belgium, $27.82.
3. Australia, $25.96.
4. The Netherlands, $24.25.
5. United States, $23.59.
6. Portugal, $23.11.
7. Great Britain, $20.78.
8. Egypt, $19.85.
9. Germany, $17.59.

An examination of the above tables goes to show how fallacious any reasoning as to per capita of money in connection with the prosperity of the country may be, for Egypt has more gold per capita than Great Britain, Cuba more than the United States, and Australia heads the list. In silver per capita Spain and the Netherlands are both ahead of the United States, while Great Britain comes in after Belgium and Switzerland and Portugal and Mexico and India; and in the per capita of all kinds of money the United States leads Great Britain and Germany and follows Belgium, Australia, and the Netherlands.

The talk, therefore, about this country needing more money per capita seems to me to be devoid of any sound and reasonable basis. That country is the most prosperous which is free from debt and is the creditor of other nations, and the amount of money per capita is but a small element in the make up of a nation's financial standing.

Much has been said, too, in regard to this nation being made up of a debtor class whose interests are being jeopardized by the demonetization of silver, and that the creditors are given an undue advantage over them by reason of the fact that they are compelled to pay their debts upon a gold basis while the products of their toil yield them diminished values by reason of the slight put upon silver. While I do not admit and do not believe that the demonetization of silver has had anything to do, except possibly in a very limited way, with the fall in prices of agricultural products and of manufactured goods, I believe that these reductions in value can be rationally accounted for in other ways.

I can not agree with the gentlemen who would make us believe that the great masses of our people are in the debtor category, or that the only creditors of the nation are those who make their money and derive their income from loans. Thousands upon thousands of depositors in building associations and in savings banks, thousands of stockholders in American enterprises, are creditors of these institutions in the aggregate to the amount of millions of dollars. They became creditors at a time when the money which they put into these concerns was worth its face value. Let once the country be driven to a silver basis and gold go to a premium, as will be the inevitable result, and every one of these creditors, while paid in silver at the face value of their credits, would be compelled to accept a silver dollar for every dollar of indebtedness, when the intrinsic value and purchasing power of that dollar would be but 50 cents.

For my part I believe that the Republican party is too honest, nay, I believe that this entire nation, without respect to party, is too honest, to consent that even its foreign creditors, who have loaned it their money in its time of need, shall be paid in anything less than the full sum which was understood and agreed should be paid at the time the bargain was made, and surely no one would be so selfish and so unpatriotic as, for the benefit of a few owners of silver bullion and silver mines, or the interests of a few communities whose population in the aggregate is but little more than one or two of our largest States, to deprive thousands of American citizens of the value of their earnings and savings, representing years of toil, by permitting or requiring that they should be paid in a base and discredited coin.

In conclusion, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that my own judgment dictates, the wishes of my constituents approve, and the interests of the entire country demand that the substitute of the Senate for the House bill shall not be concurred in. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Senate amendment to "A bill to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue," as I opposed the bill itself when before the House, and I defend my position in this matter on the ground that the amendment is in the line of traditional Republican policy, the policy of a bimetallic currency, and because the original bill is not in line with the traditional legislation of the Republican party; and further, I support the one and oppose the other because the original bill is, at best, but a measure for temporary relief, along questionable lines, while the Senate amendment seeks to afford permanent relief along lines well understood and in the direction of a return to a policy which in

the past, at least, has prevented the occurrence of those difficulties which now confront us. The Republican party obtained a firm hold on the affection and confidence of the people of this nation by meeting public issues, whenever they arose for solution, fairly and squarely, and it maintained its high position in the esteem and regard of a majority of our countrymen by avoiding temporary expedients in legislation, by adopting no policy of a makeshift character, but by coming out squarely in the open and legislating fearlessly on the great and burning questions of the hour, whatever they might be.

I insist that House bill No. 2904—

An act to maintain and promote the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies in revenue—

as it passed the House can not bring any relief to a distressed Treasury; provides no alleviation from present unsatisfactory financial conditions; opens no new path out of the wilderness of uncertainty in which we find ourselves, and does nothing to place the country on the firm foundation of a currency system that can not be manipulated and controlled by the action of combinations of capital at home or abroad. What relief could the House bill have afforded? It simply provides a new way in which bonded indebtedness in this country may be increased. It merely changes the formula for increasing the load of debt under which our people are groaning, and nothing more.

Its passage would not have assured us the maintenance of the credit of the nation for thirty days after the President had taken advantage of its provisions had it become a law. This is not in the line of Republican legislation, for Republican legislation, from the time that party first took the reins of government, has been along those lines and in pursuance of those policies which would serve a mighty nation not for a day, a month, or a year, but rather such legislation as would build up and maintain our credit and our industries permanently. I trust I fully appreciate the high and patriotic motives which actuated the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting to the House a measure which, in their opinion, would afford temporary relief to a depleted Treasury and bolster up a national credit weakened by the combined influence of a wickedly mistaken Democratic tariff policy and the ceaseless attacks made upon it by the Administration in its blindly persistent efforts to forever fasten upon us a single gold standard of currency, but I must differ from my fellow-Republicans on that committee as to either the necessity or wisdom of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to call the attention of this House to the fact, so patent to all of us, so unpleasantly brought to our daily notice, that this nation is passing through a most trying and crucial period. For years past there has been a steady decline in the prices of nearly all products. This decline began in the early seventies. For various reasons, among the most potent of which was the rapid development of our magnificent resources, made possible by wise protective legislation, the effect of which was to stimulate the development of our resources (so vast as to be almost incomprehensible) with such rapidity that the chilling and withering blight of falling prices was almost nullified by the vast increase of products and the blessings of constant employment for our people. The dreadful and baneful malaria of falling prices and values was, nevertheless, present, though its blighting and deadly presence was scarcely noted while the body politic remained under the influence of the powerful tonic of rapidly developing resources.

The nation calls loudly for the driving away of the miasmatic vapors of sloth and enforced idleness, of closed mills and starving artisans, by a return to the Republican prescription of adequate protection. But even this, healthful and invigorating though it would be, could not win back to us the countless millions that have been lost, and lost forever, by the deadly downward slide of values, upon which slippery slope, with ever-accelerating speed, the masses of our fellow-countrymen have seen their property values descend. We have all heard of the time-worn and, to my mind, time-dishonored argument, that the fall in general prices and values has been brought about by cheapened methods of production, by cheapened transportation, or by overproduction. With these arguments it is scarcely worth while to take issue.

Wheat is not produced any more cheaply now in the United States than it was ten or fifteen years ago; neither corn nor cotton can be produced more cheaply now, provided the same wages are paid, than they could have been produced fifteen years ago; beef is produced no cheaper on the plains of the great West and fed no cheaper on the farms of the Mississippi Valley to-day than in 1873 if you pay the same value for labor and the grains and produce fed to beef stock that was then paid. In some manufactured lines there has undoubtedly been some reduction of the actual cost of production other than in the reduction in wages, but I am of the opinion that these reductions are not so great as have been imagined, and I venture to say that those reductions will not amount to 50 per cent of the fall in the prices of the goods.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to grasp the enormity in actual value of property loss in the United States in the past few years by the shrinkage in the value of that property. It is as though day by day a tier of brick had been taken from every house in the land and slowly the roof had been lowered, and that this process had been going on until, were the actual loss in values of improvements upon real estate (outside of the large cities of the land) represented in the improvements themselves, they would have lost one-third of their height or one-third of their extent. It is as though year after year the farm and village property of the nation had been shrinking in size until he who was accustomed to look about on broad acres could now, measured by their value, encompass his possessions with about two-thirds the number of chains and links that he would have used formerly. It is as though the live stock of the nation had shrunk in size, measured by their value and purchasing power, to one-half or a little more of their former massive size.

In the face of all these facts there has been one class of property that has maintained its value. That class of property is indebtedness of all kinds, at least this is true using the ordinary forms of speech, the actual fact is that property of all kinds, except in cases affected by special causes, has about maintained the same value all these years, while upward and still higher has climbed the value and importance of debts as measured in those things which must finally be used to liquidate them. It has become the fashion among those who believe that the values of all property can be adequately measured by one metal, and that metal gold, to insist that any legislation that would tend to enhance the value, as compared with gold, of another money metal would be dishonest; that the use of any other metal than gold in the payment of debts would be dishonest. I agree with all those who reason thus in so far that I say that all indebtedness should be paid according to the bond and according to the contract as specifically provided. More than that, it should be paid in actual value, interchangeable with other actual values at the time of payment, as the spirit and bond of the contract intended, but I must differ from them vitally when they say that that product of the mine only is honest money which year by year makes more weighty the yoke about the neck of the debtor and which each year brings an increased reward to its holder in the fruits of the labor of his fellow-men.

For a moment let us admit the argument, fallacious though it is, of those who hold that falling prices are the result of better methods of production, cheaper transportation, or of overproduction. Even if that were the case would it be wise, under such conditions as have existed in this country for some years, to have a basic currency of such a nature, so unyielding, so inelastic, so little in sympathy with human effort and human production that each increasing downward slide in the scale of values of products produced no corresponding expansion in the basic coin which represented all values? This condition of things might not be so serious or alarming were all business transacted on a cash basis and were debts unknown, because then the only advantage accruing to the possession of actual coin would be the slight advance in value of the coin during a temporary hoarding. But when you take into consideration the fact that a great proportion of the wealth of the nation is represented by debts, stocks, bonds, and mortgages, public and private, aggregating in the United States $22,066,793,505.55, and when you appreciate that all of this enormous wealth each day grows more valuable, while the possibility of its payment becomes more remote as the values of those things in which it must be paid decreases compared with the dollar standard, then you can appreciate the enormity of the distress that is overtaking our people, the amount of whose debt is ever rising upward on one arm of the scale, while the ratio of the value of those things in which debts must be ultimately paid is constantly dropping.

Mr. Speaker, no man who will honestly, even casually and superficially, study current prices and post himself on property values can deny or doubt for a moment the tremendous shrinkage in values in this country other than those shrinkages that can be accounted for by the loss of speculative values or the depreciation of values brought about by the inauguration of a suicidal tariff policy. To say, however, that there have been tremendous losses in values is not to state the case fairly. The fact is that there has been a tremendous and far-reaching rise in the measuring capacity of the unit of value. It is not true that general values have fallen, but it is true that the value of one commodity, made valuable by legislation, not by any intrinsic worth of its own, has been tremendously enhanced.

This condition of things has been brought about simply because the civilized world, following the lead of England and our own country, have provided by law and ordinance that all of their mighty values, and all of the enormous debts representing these values, shall be represented by one money metal alone, thereby creating a demand for that metal or its representative, because of which demand, working along the lines of the inevitable law of supply and demand, the value of this metal, compared with everything else upon earth, has risen. This condition of things has

made gold the sole measure of values, a thing to be bandied about, speculated in, an article of commerce, to be shipped hither and thither for the purpose of controlling the finances of nations by controlling a large proportion of the free gold of the world. It is this condition financially, aided and abetted by an Administration which at all times, in season and out of season, has been working in the direction of depressing our financial standing, that has made possible the tremendous raids on the Treasury of the nation, that has furnished the excuse for those transactions by the Administration which have caused the cheek of every true American to tingle with shame, that has sent your Uncle Samuel, valiant, rich, resourceful, up and down the exchanges and bourses of the world like a common mendicant, asking for a paltry sum of yellow metal to maintain the currency of a nation the actual wealth of which and the resources of which exceed the combined resources and wealth of all Europe.

Still, our Republican leaders of the Committee of Ways and Means have now no remedial legislation to offer or suggest for this condition of affairs, except a proposition to increase the national debt by a method the details of which vary a trifle from the details of the methods by which the country has been plunged into needless debt to the extent of $262,000,000. Let no man be deceived by the cry oft raised by the Administration and its supporters, that the cause of withdrawals of gold from the National Treasury is the result of the agitation of those who believe in true bimetallism and advocate the return to the use of both gold and silver as money metals of final redemption and measures of values. As well might the pilot, heedless of the chart that would have carried him safely through, blame the warning beacon light, placed to point the shoals and quicksands, for his wreck as those who believe in our late suicidal financial policy should claim that the warning cries of those who saw the quicksands and shoals of disaster were responsible for the wrecking of the ship of state, steered upon these very quicksands and shoals in spite of the warning given by the bimetallists.

Mr. Speaker, the substitute, which I support, is in the line of permanent legislation, calculated to relieve the distressed condition of our country and to place us upon a firm and broad foundation of prosperity. Those who oppose free coinage of silver are prone to refer to "50-cent dollars" and to "dishonest dollars." May the day never come when this nation, noted throughout the world for the magnificent manner in which its credit has been upheld, do aught but pay its debts in money that is interchangeable with any other money the world over. May the day never come—and I believe it never will—when any individual in this country will have the authority of law to pay his debts in any money that will not be acceptable to the debtor when it is paid. But it does not follow that because, by the reason of the striking down of silver, not only by our own nation, but by continental Europe, largely through our example, its present value, measured by gold, has decreased that, therefore, there is no way in which to restore the broad gap between the relative value of the two metals in the markets of the world now and those which prevailed in 1873. There is absolutely no reason for the present vast gulf between the two metals, except that the demand for one has been increased in having put on it the burden of the measure of values of the entire world, while the other has found its chief occupation gone, the demand for it destroyed by the repeal of legislation, thereby becoming a mere commodity, a thing of value only as it may be used as a money token to represent gold values, or as it may be used in the arts and sciences.

Mr. Speaker, the present condition of affairs in this country can not be mended by the issuance of bonds. There is a fundamental and deep-seated malady in the body politic that is turning the lifeblood of the nation into poison, which, as it goes coursing through the system, burns and consumes. You can not remedy this condition by placing bond blisters and plasters upon the cuticle of the nation. You must purify, enrich, and enliven the blood, the circulating medium which gives life and vigor. This can be done by the passage of the Senate amendment to this act. I know that it will be said by those who oppose the position held by the advocates of this amendment that the effect of the passage of the amendment would be to depreciate our currency and bring us at once to a silver basis or standard.

I will not say that the passage of this amendment would not require some auxiliary legislation to aid in the readjustment of business on the new lines thus presented. It is quite likely that this would be necessary, and it is quite probable that this legislation should be along the lines of a protective tariff, whereby we should raise against those countries that insist on maintaining the single gold standard of values a high protective wall, while compelling them to pay the tariff on their imports in gold coin. On the other hand, we might, and probably would, find it to our advantage to enact such legislation as would give us reciprocal advantages in our trade relations with those nations using and recognizing silver. It is not true that our nation would be flooded with silver in vast amounts from foreign nations if we were to return to the use of this metal as a money of final redemption, for we are the possessors of a considerable portion of the world's silver supply, and the amounts held by the nations of continental Europe at least is in circulation on a parity with gold at a ratio higher than that which we propose, and could not be brought to our shores without considerable loss.

Not until the nation is once more enjoying true bimetallism; not until the constantly increasing wealth of the nation is no longer measured by one metal, which fails utterly to keep pace with that increase and the volume of business; not until the constant and seemingly never-ending slump in prices shall be stayed by increasing the volume of basic money, thereby taking from the few millions of gold the enormous demand upon it occasioned by making it the one medium in which all debtors may be compelled to pay their obligations; not until each recurring sunrise shall find a debt, as measured by the human effort required to pay it, on greater than when the sun last set; not until the investment of capital in legitimate lines of human effort shall pay greater returns than capital locked up in safety vaults; not until the day shall come when the miser hoarding his coin wealth shall no longer profit by its daily, weekly, and monthly enhancement of value; not until money, the servant, the medium of exchange, the measure of value, shall cease to be the master and shall cease to crush beneath its golden heel the values of all other classes of property; not until these conditions shall have been brought about shall this nation return to an era of true prosperity. I honestly believe that a majority of those on this side of the House agree with me on this proposition. I believe to-day that a majority of the Republican party believes that we must return, not to a wider and larger use of silver, as has sometimes been said, but to its restoration as one of the metals which may be drawn upon to ultimately pay debts, and thereby relieve the tremendous strain now placed upon gold as the sole liquidator of debts.

Section 4 of the amendment provides:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department; and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

The effect of the enactment of this clause would be to forever break the connection of that "endless chain" which is now sapping the vitality of the nation and putting to shame the statesmanship of its ablest financiers, by absolutely arresting the speculative raids upon the Treasury gold which have been occurring for the past two years. The steam shovels of this Administration which have been working under an extra head of steam in order to pile out gold as fast as it could be demanded would be given a rest, for under the provisions of this amendment the Secretary would be expected to redeem at least a part of the notes so presented in silver. This need not be done in a way that would interfere with the legitimate business interests of the country.

It has not been the legitimate business interests of the country that have been drawing out gold and making a plaything of the United States Treasury, but combinations of capital, aided and abetted by the officials of the Government and their allies. Those who howl the loudest against this provision which would protect our coin reserve, and who become almost frantic in their denunciation of those who advocate it, seem to forget that our National Treasury is the only place on earth where an unlimited amount of gold can be obtained on demand without any charge for exchange. The Bank of England, which the gold monometallists are prone to point to as the bright and shining example of an institution which maintains gold payments, requires those who make heavy demands for gold to pay a smart amount for exchange, thereby discouraging and rendering unprofitable gold raids; while the Bank of France uses its own option as to paying coin demands in either gold or silver.

You may not favor the passage of this bill now because you believe that the mints of the United States could not be opened to the free and unlimited coinage of silver without precipitating a disarrangement of values that would be disastrous to all interests, but the fact remains that the only way to return to bimetallism is to open the mints of the country to the absolute free coinage of both metals on an equality, as the only way to resume specie payments, when we had a depreciated paper currency, was to resume. The disastrous lessons of the past serve as a warning for the future. If we persist in our advocacy of a single gold standard, the same influences which destroyed bimetallism are still at work to still further enhance the value of bonded debts. The enormous values of the lands inhabited by the Mongolian and Hindoo races and those of South America and Mexico are still measured in the white metal, and as the bonded debts of these nations to the money lenders of Europe daily increase, how long will it be, think you, if we make no effort to counteract the baneful influence on property values of the propaganda of the golden calf, ere by cunning sophistry, by bulldozing threats of ruined credit, aye, by brute power,

they will force these nations on to the gold standard; and, think you, this further extension of the measuring value of gold will not increase the purchasing power of the gold unit, and that to an extent that will still further largely increase the value of all debts?

This is no idle speculation, for England has already partly consummated her plans in this direction in India, and in the guise of advocating a uniform currency in the interest of commerce the moneyed interests are working industriously to this end all over the world. If this measure is not a good one, what has been offered in its stead? Are you willing to vote for a measure providing for free coinage when we can obtain the cooperation of France and Germany? Are you willing to provide by law a future date at which we shall resume the free coinage of both metals? We who believe in bimetallism as the only cure for many ills that now inflict the body politic are anxious to know whether we differ from you only as to the means to be employed or do we differ as to the fundamental proposition?

This bill can not pass this House, so it can not become a law, but I look confidently forward to the day when a Republican Executive at the other end of the Avenue shall be working harmoniously with a Republican Congress for the purpose, not of discrediting the currency of the nation by denouncing all those as fanatics and theorists who do not adhere to the single gold standard of values, but who, conscious of the dangers, appreciating the direful effects, cognizant of the terrible consequences of the depreciation of the value of the world's property, will aid in bringing about such a state of affairs that the two metals shall bear the burden of values as moneys of final redemption at the ratio along which they moved, with slight fluctuations, for centuries.

You are not satisfied with the present condition of things. No one is. No man, no matter what may be his opinion as to the causes, can view with complacency the conditions where debts increase without increasing the obligation; where actual wealth decreases without decreasing the quantity or changing the character of that which represents that wealth. No currency can be a safe, sound, and honest currency which does not, as the years roll by, somewhere nearly measure the property and products of to-day so that they shall approximately represent the same amount in circulating medium that they did yesterday, last week, and last year.

How do you expect to win back the fallen prices? By what means of legislation do you expect to make it possible for the debtors of this country to meet their obligations as easily as they did in years gone by? Have you any legislation in mind that will accomplish this? Must we say that the golden era is past and that never again will the producers be able to meet obligations as they did in years past? You may say that a protective tariff will aid in doing this, and it is true that it will enliven and stimulate and that it will at least furnish employment to our people, and by thus furnishing employment will enable them to use a constantly increasing amount of the products of the farm and factory, of the ranch and mill, but you can not hope even by this class of legislation to restore the equilibrium, to reunite the past, to which the future is mortgaged by bills of indebtedness, with the present, except by such currency legislation as will make the dollar of to-day something like in purchasing power the equivalent of the dollar of the past.

It is true that under the present condition of things he who has obtained the golden guinea would fare better than he who obtained the same amount in years past were it not for the fact that under our system of Government every citizen must directly or indirectly bear his proportion of all the debts of a public character, at least. As far as the millionaire is concerned, the owner of vast quantities of securities, his payment of the difference between the enhanced value of indebtedness and its normal value is comparatively small compared with the benefit he derives.

We are confronted with and can not escape from the question of increased metallic base for our currency with the query of what should be done with the greenback, with the question of how the increase in wealth and population is to be met with a corresponding increase in the measure of values, and whichever way we turn for a solution of these questions we are met with the cold, hard fact that the basic money, the foundation of all currency and the measure of all values, gold is not increasing to any appreciable extent.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of my remarks that I favored this amendment because it is a Republican measure, not that I believe it is a measure, understand, that will be favored by a majority of the Republicans of this Chamber at this time, but I reiterate that it is a Republican measure because it strikes at the root of the difficulty instead of being a patent nostrum, a cheap narcotic, expected to produce temporary lethargy in the body politic. It is a vital restorative, to quicken the pulse, improve the heart action, increase the circulation, and, by sending the silver along with the gold corpuscles through the veins of commerce, trade, and enterprise, revivify, enliven, and restore wonted activity in all channels of enterprise. Adopt it and you raise a nation from the slough of despond, rescue the Treasury from the clutch of spoilers, stop the deadly fall of prices which is impoverishing our people, and start your country once more on the road to wealth and prosperity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, opposed as I am to the original bill as it left this House, and not altogether favoring the amendment, or rather the substitute, adopted by the Senate, I ask the indulgence of the House while I give briefly, as I shall, my views on the great questions involved.

The bill as originally reported and passed by this House was objectionable, in my judgment, for many reasons. But as that measure has practically passed into history and is not now before us, I will not waste any time in a statement of the reasons which would have impelled me, had I been present at the time of its passage, to vote against the bill. But, while the substitute passed by the Senate has merit, while it has features which commend themselves to all Democrats and to those who do not desire the country to drift further toward monometallism, it also possesses features which do not commend themselves to me, nor, I believe, to the people whom I in part represent on this floor.

I believe in bimetallism for the United States at this time. I do not believe that the time has come in our history when a single monetary standard, either of gold or silver, would be best for this country. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our career has been a grand one; that the spirit of progress has hovered over us from the birth of this Republic down to the present moment. I know that the America of to-day is not the America of a century ago; that the civilization of 1792 is not the civilization of the closing years of the nineteenth century. I am aware of the fact that within the past quarter of a century this country has advanced steadily but rapidly along commercial lines; that it has improved in all the departments of industry and of business; in the machinery and appliances which have more than doubled and trebled the products of the fields, the gardens, the mines, and the workshops of the country, down during the past twenty-five years, until to-day ours is the greatest nation on the globe. And I am aware, too, that for many years there has been a steady tendency toward a single gold standard among many countries, particularly among the leading commercial nations in Europe, silver in each case giving way to the more favored metal, gold; but I do not think the time has come in the history of this country when a single gold standard will conserve the best interests of the greatest number of our people.

It might be sufficient for certain classes. It might do for certain sections of this country. But there are sections and classes and peoples whose interests will not, in my judgment, be promoted by the exclusive use of gold as the monetary standard. In the great centers of business and population it might do; for the speculator in stocks and bonds it might possibly be better, although this is problematical; but for the rural districts, for the laboring people remote from these great centers, it seems to me that bimetallism, or the use of both gold and silver as the standard money, under such restrictions as would make them circulate at a parity, would be better. I know it is claimed that as civilization advances less money in proportion to population and the volume of business done is needed in the business transactions of the world; so a dollar, it is claimed, will go further now than fifty or a hundred years ago. It is said, for instance, that nine-tenths of the business of the world is done on paper, not a single dollar of any kind of money being moved from its place of deposit in the transactions covered by this 90 per cent. All this may be true, and yet it would furnish no argument against the demand, nor the reasons therefor, which comes from the South and from the West in favor of a freer use of silver.

I do not care so much for the silver miners in the West or the holders of stocks and gold bonds in the East, although I would in the enactment of laws, as in their enforcement, protect so far as possible the interests of each. These classes can take care of themselves and usually do. But there is a class of people between these two extremes. I mean the laboring classes, those who work in the fields, the mines, the factories, and the workshops of the country, whose interests we are too prone to forget and who should receive equal consideration at the hands of those who would legislate for the entire country. It is these classes that the coinage of silver along with gold, and under the conditions above referred to, might benefit.

For this reason, then, I am in favor of bimetallism, or the coinage and use of both metals, but always, Mr. Speaker, under such circumstances and conditions as would cause them to circulate on an equality, and would make and keep their debt-paying power the same.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of an increased use of silver because of the great demand coming up from different sections of this country in favor of that metal. From the South and the West, the great farming sections of the country, there is a desire for silver that, it seems to me, we should not ignore. It may be and doubtless is true that many of the arguments in favor of the

free coinage of silver are not tenable, but that is true of many meritorious questions. It is thought, for instance, by those most urgent in their demands for free coinage that all the financial ills with which we have been afflicted during the past few years are traceable to the so-called demonetization of silver. This, however, is of course incorrect. It is also claimed by the extreme advocates of that doctrine that the demonetization of that metal by this country and other nations had, by the undue appreciation of gold, reduced the prices of commodities and of the productions of labor. This is probably not true to the extent claimed, as statistics will abundantly show, and if it were true the fact would destroy the argument so far as the producing classes are concerned, for if all articles have fallen alike no one, it seems to me, will be hurt, because with a given amount of labor (and that is the standard of value of the workingman) a person should be able to purchase as much now as ever. But still this demand for the increased use of silver which has sprung up throughout the sections of the country just mentioned has a sufficient foundation for its existence to warrant Congress in endeavoring to enact such laws as will give the people the same use of silver as they have of gold.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this cry for silver comes largely from or is influenced by those directly interested in the appreciation of the price of silver, the owners of silver mines or of stocks or securities based thereon, as the advocacy of the single gold standard comes largely from those who have a like interest in gold. These, Mr. Speaker, are the two extremes. Each, if power were given them, would have but a single standard, either of gold or of silver. The one class would eliminate silver and the other gold. But the laboring people, the producing classes having no such motives, demand no legislation that would drive either metal out of circulation. They would use both as standard money without discrimination against the one or the other.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that a large majority of the people in many of the Southern and Western States are deeply in earnest in their desire and their demand for the restoration of silver to its former place as standard money, and these classes are entitled to the respectful consideration of the law making power.

But there is another reason why I am in favor of bimetallism, and that is that I stand pledged to that policy. The party to which I belong, in its declaration of principles at its national convention in Chicago in 1892, clearly and unequivocally, as I take it, declared in favor of bimetallism; the only restriction being that "the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic, exchangeable value, or be adjusted by international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debt." This was one of the declarations of principles made by the Democratic party in its platform of 1892, and it was on that platform that I was elected to a seat in this body. I therefore consider myself, as also the party, committed to that policy. It was on that plank in the Democratic platform, among others, that we went before the people in that year, and the success of the party, by a majority almost unprecedented in the history of the country, shows that this enunciation of principles as outlined in that platform struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the people throughout the land.

But the question arises, will the passage by Congress of the Senate amendment, and its approval by the President, give the people bimetallism in reality as well as in name? Is the substance of the measure such—are the provisions for free coinage so guarded as that the dollar unit of the two metals will be of equal intrinsic value or of equal purchasing power? The answer to this question, or rather the absence of a satisfactory answer, is what causes my chief difficulty. The bill provides for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, while it is a well-known fact that the intrinsic value of the quantity of silver to be coined into a dollar would be little more than half the value of the bullion in a gold dollar. It is because, Mr. Speaker, I favor bimetallism for the United States at this time that I object to the arbitrary coinage of silver as provided for in this bill. There is, in my judgment, not a single provision in the bill, nor has there been any provision made outside of the bill, nor any proposed, that would insure the circulation of the two metals on an equality. The result, according to all precedent, would be to drive gold out of circulation, so that we would practically have but one standard of money, that of silver.

As to the probable results of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, of declaring a silver dollar with only 50 cents' worth of silver in it equal to a dollar of gold with a coinage and commercial value of 100 cents, we are not left in doubt when we read the history of our own country. When our Government was first formed and it became necessary to establish a monetary system, the statesmen of that day set to work patiently to ascertain the true commercial ratio between the two metals—gold and silver—and thinking they had found it, they fixed the coin ratio at about 15 to 1. This, however, was not the commercial ratio, as gold was a fraction more valuable than the coinage ratio as fixed in the coinage law of April 2, 1792. The result, although not at the time foreseen, was clearly discernible a short time after, when all the gold was driven out of circulation.

To remedy this evil the ratio was changed in 1837 from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1. This was accomplished by making the gold coins lighter than before. But the ratio as thus changed placed too high a value upon silver, and the silver dollar could not then be kept in circulation. They were exported to such an extent that Congress in 1853 changed the weight of the silver coins below one dollar, making them lighter. This was done in order that our subsidiary silver coins might be kept in circulation, and it was well, for from this time to 1862, when both metals were withdrawn from circulation, our metallic currency consisted only of gold and these subsidiary coins and possibly a few foreign silver pieces. The silver dollar was nowhere to be found in circulation. This was all in obedience to a law as old as metallic money and as inexorable as the decrees of fate. It was what might have been expected. But it was thought the difference between the commercial and coinage ratio was so slight that both metals would be retained in circulation; but silver in the one case and gold in the other obeyed the mandate of this law and disappeared from circulation. If these, then, were the results when the differences between the coinage and commercial ratio were so slight, what are we to expect under a law which should fix the coinage ratio at 16 to 1 when the commercial value is 32 to 1?

But, Mr. Speaker, it is said that this would be only the temporary effect, and that the passage of the bill would increase the price of silver, so that sixteen parts of that metal would soon be equal to one of gold. I do not know this to be true, while it is controverted by some of the ablest minds in the country. But even if the free coinage of silver, suddenly forced upon the country, would have this effect in the end, the immediate results to business would likely be disastrous. At least, Mr. Speaker, it is an experiment, and at this time I am opposed to trying experiments. Early in 1893, by reason of laws enacted, not by the Democratic party, and for which they were in no way responsible, the financial affairs of this country were paralyzed to an extent seldom witnessed in any part of the globe, and we are now, three years afterwards, just recovering from the effect of this panic.

I am therefore opposed to the trying of experiments in the face of this returning prosperity. The people have suffered enough for one generation, and unless some method can be adopted that is reasonably certain to produce no such results I would be in favor of waiting until the country has recovered from the effects of the panic of 1893 before making experiments. But it is not necessary to wait so long. A step could be taken even now in that direction. It has been declared by solemn enactment that bimetallism is the policy of this Government. The two great parties of this Government have declared in favor of a double standard. Then, let the Government begin to do something toward carrying out that policy. Not by radical measures, to be sure, which may do a great deal of harm, but by conservative processes, which, without damage to any material interests, will yet accomplish the objects.

Perhaps it was not expected or intended that the substitute should become a law at this time, otherwise the provision in favor of silver would have been guarded by others which would in the end have accomplished the object sought without the bad results which would likely follow the passage of the bill in its present shape.

Mr. Speaker, the people I have the honor in part to represent on this floor are a conservative people, and while many of them would like to see such legislation as would give them a larger use of silver, yet they are not in favor of any radical measures nor the enactment of any laws at this time looking to the free coinage of silver which do not at the same time so guard its coinage as to give them bimetallism in the true sense of the word. I know that something should be done to remedy our present monetary system. Something is radically wrong with this system and has been since 1862, and it behooves the party in power, instead of resorting to temporary makeshifts, to formulate some plan that will give permanent relief to the people.

These being my views, Mr. Speaker, and as the proposition is to concur or not to concur in the Senate substitute as a whole, I shall be compelled to vote against concurrence.

The second and third sections meet my approval, but for reasons already given I do not see my way clear to support the first section.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in some respects the present discussion on the part of those in favor of the free coinage of silver has assumed a sectional and acrimonious character. Those residing in or near silver mines we find almost alone in the maintenance of what we believe to be a heresy. Is it not a sad commentary upon representative government that the views

we give utterance to on this floor are narrowed and prejudiced by the particular locality we hail from? Can we not as Representatives of a great nation be searchers for truth rather than selfish seekers for local aggrandizement?

It is admitted that when silver is said to have been demonetized it had been out of circulation for years; that it was at a premium, and therefore in the market as merchandise and not a part of our operative currency. Is it not a fact that the act of 1873 recognized the inevitable and declared what really was the real standard of recognized values? Is it not a fact that the act demonetized nothing, but accepted the then real condition of things? Is it not admitted that the nations forming the Latin Union were compelled against their will to unyoke silver from their established standards and stop its free coinage?

Is it not admitted that the commercial value of silver as compared to gold is as 32 is to 1? Then, in the name of all that is fair, how can we justify free coinage at a legal or fiat ratio of 16 to 1?

Is it not clear that if this monstrous doctrine is maintained gold must appreciate greatly, leave a circulation we have polluted, and the stream or circulation become entirely a silver one; that gold will be thrown upon the market as is merchandise and lose its entire efficiency as money.

We hear talk upon this floor of the South and West uniting. Uniting for what? In the interest of silver mine owners, to force this Government to degrade its currency, impoverish the land, disseminate distrust and misery broadcast for the selfish aggrandizement of a comparatively few.

Unite, if you will, in friendly trade and commercial emulation and rivalry; but it is treasonable conspiracy for you to unite to poison the life blood of the nation; to degrade and depreciate its currency; to compel the Government to take, and force the people to take, a depreciated metal at a falsely enhanced value.

I appeal to all Republican and Democratic Representatives alike to act patriotically and unselfishly, and not to force this Government into ruinous bargains for any product, and especially for that product which, in one fell stroke, would destroy all established values and standards, confuse and distract the commercial world, paralyze the hand of industry, and scatter alarm and poverty throughout our land.

And I desire to state another fact in conclusion that does not seem to have been noticed. It is said that the difficulty might be removed by international convention or agreement. I deny that either this or any number of nations combined can by mere agreement give value to anything. The concerted assent of all the nations of the world to-day could not make 16 ounces of silver equal 1 ounce of gold. What the fiat of one nation can not do the combined fiat of the nations of the world is powerless to do. [Applause.]

Mr. EDDY. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of the session there came an exceedingly urgent demand from the Executive that we have immediate legislation to relieve the extraordinary financial stress of the nation.

In response to this demand, in a very short space of time two measures were brought in and passed by this House, namely, a measure for increasing the revenue; and secondly, a measure for issuing bonds to provide for the maintenance of the gold reserve; and these were sent to the Senate.

They have returned one measure and will undoubtedly return the other so disguised by amendments that their originators would not recognize them.

They have adopted a "stand and deliver" method of doing business, and have served a defiant notice on the House that no measure increasing the revenue of this nation, no measure for protecting the labor and industries of this nation, no measure for lighting furnace fires, starting factory wheels whirling, or providing remunerative labor for the unemployed shall be passed, until the representatives of the majority of the people conform to the wishes of the representatives of the minority of the people in their views of what financial legislation is necessary for the welfare of the country; and if for no other reason, we in the House could not concur in the amended bill without placing ourselves in an exceedingly humiliating position.

I do not intend to enter into a lengthy discussion of this question. I have neither the time nor the ability so do to, but it does seem to me that there are some primary principles that can be understood and discussed by all.

There can be no question but that all the money we have in circulation use should be so regulated and controlled that it will circulate side by side at a perfect parity; a dollar of one kind should be at all times and under all conditions and circumstances worth as much and be interchangeable for a dollar of any other kind, and whatever we circulate as money should possess all the monetary functions. That is:

First. It should be exchangeable at its par value for labor and commodities, no matter where the commodities are purchased or the labor employed.

Second. It should possess the power of discharging and utterly wiping out of existence all obligations calling for the payment of money, no matter whether such obligations exist in this or any other country under a civilized government.

In other words, whatever kind of money we have, it must be universal money. Therefore the question of paramount importance for us to consider is, What kind of money must we have that will perform all these functions? In my opinion, it can consist of but two kinds:

First. Money composed of some metal or metals that all or at least a majority of the leading commercial nations of the world will receive at their official mints and coin back to the presenter in "lawful-tender" money; or

Second. Token money, composed of some other material, that will be promptly redeemed upon presentation in the money first mentioned by the government issuing the same.

No nation can keep and maintain in circulation a money that can not be exchanged on sight for an equal amount in value (less exchange) of the money of any other country without disastrous results to its business and every commercial interest of its people. In other words, whatever kind of money we have it must be universal money. The currency of a country has been styled "the lifeblood of trade." And we might as well expect a man to be strong, healthy, and vigorous with rich, red blood circulating through his extremities and a thin, watery fluid through the veins and arteries of his trunk as to expect the great business enterprises of this nation to keep in a healthy, thriving condition with two kinds of money in circulation, one worth its par value anywhere on earth and the other that would only circulate at par within the boundaries of the United States. No, our money, which I before stated is the "lifeblood of trade," must circulate evenly, uniformly, not only through the great body of national, but through the greater body of international civilization.

At the present time the only money that does this on its own merits is gold coin, and under the present circumstances and the conditions as they now exist the only true money metal is gold. We may think, and many of us, myself among the number, do think, that such a condition of things ought not to exist, but that it does exist is beyond all question and dispute.

Why is it that a twenty-dollar gold piece is worth the face value anywhere in the world? Is it because the laws of the United States say that it shall pass current for that amount? By no means. No one will argue for a moment that if the United States should pass a law that an equal weight of lead or of iron or of silver should pass current for $20 that it would immediately assume that value in countries that had no such law, or that all the legislation that could be enacted could make it purchase here in this country as many commodities or as much labor as a twenty-dollar gold piece that will pass current for its face value anywhere on earth.

The idea is too preposterous for a moment's consideration by thinking men. Will a twenty-dollar gold piece pass current everywhere because the same is intrinsically worth $20? I do not think so. I understand the intrinsic value of such a gold coin to be just what the bullion composing the same would be worth in the markets of the world for the uses of the arts, sciences, and for ornaments, provided that no nation on the face of the earth would receive it at their mints and coin it into money on any terms whatever. I have never yet encountered an individual that maintains that if all or a greater portion of the nations of the world would refuse to receive gold bullion at their mints and coin the same back to the presenter but that one of the principal elements of its value would be destroyed and that it would immediately slide down the scale of prices.

A twenty-dollar gold piece is worth $20 anywhere in the world, because you can take it, either in the form of the coin or in bullion, to the mint of any nation and they will coin back to you an equal amount of "lawful-tender" money of that nation and containing as many grains of gold as your twenty-dollar gold piece, and, if you desire, you can take the money so coined back to the mints of the United States, and they will recoin for you a twenty-dollar gold piece again. (There may be some slight exchange charge, and in some cases small mintage charges, but the statement is approximately correct.) It is universal money, and the reason that it is such money is because it is universally received at the mints of the world and freely coined, and the coinage so put forth is universally recognized and received as "lawful-tender" money. Money that can be exchanged for its face value anywhere in Christendom for anything you may desire to purchase; money with which you can discharge any obligation calling for the payment of money, no matter where the same may be held and by whom owned. Understand me, I do not mean that gold coin is the only kind of money that will perform these functions at the present time, but it is the only money that will do it on its own merits, and gold is the only substance out of which you or I can get this money coined or created. These conditions make a gold coin universally worth its face value, and not because the bullion composing the same is "intrinsically" worth its face, or because any single individual nation so coins or so receives it.

Now, I think I am warranted in saying that if the advocates of

free coinage can produce proof that if the opening of our mints to the free unlimited coinage of silver at the rates of 16 to 1, independent of the action of any other nation, will confer upon the coinage so put forth this quality of universality, there would not be a dozen members in this House who would vote against this measure.

And I submit that the advocates of such coinage should cease their lectures on ancient history, the alleged crime of 1873, abandon their absurd position of the divinity of the 16 to 1 ratio. Stop talking about the distressed condition of the country, to which I think no one will for a moment question other causes largely contributed, and show by some tangible argument that legislative enactment can inject a value of 50 cents into every 412 grains of silver and change the international ratio of silver from 30 to 1 to 16 to 1.

But in all the arguments advanced by the able advocates of such action I have listened and listened in vain for an argument along this line—they have kept clear of this point.

And in such a course they have manifested good judgment. The facts are: Logic, reason, judgment, and history are against such a proposition.

It is a perfectly logical conclusion that if the United States by independent legislative action can by affixing its official stamp to a given amount of silver increase its value 50 per cent and raise the international ratio from 30 to 1 to 16 to 1, by similar action they could make the ratio 15 to 1, 10 to 1, 5 to 1, and increase the value correspondingly. We could stamp the mystic words "this is a dollar" on 2 cents' worth of alluminium, and it would be a dollar. We could print it on an unlimited number of pieces of paper and it would "go."

Our Republican friends advocating this measure repudiate with scorn the idea of fiat money, but the same principle of fiatism enters into the independent coinage of silver at 16 to 1 as enters into the Populist idea of fiat paper money. It is only a difference of degree. In one case the fiat is 50 cents, in the other it is 100 cents. And the Populist party is the only party that has ever officially declared for fiat money, either in part by declaring for the unlimited, unrestricted free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the United States alone, or by the issue of an unlimited amount of irredeemable paper money, and I will venture the prophecy here and now that it is the only party that will so declare.

From the first organization of our Government down to 1873, silver was admitted to free coinage in our mints and also the different mints of the world, with one notable exception, England, who abandoned bimetallism and came to monometallism in 1816, and from the time of our first mintage act, 1792, down to 1873, the commencement of the period of general demonetization of silver by the commercial nations of the world, the commercial ratio between gold and silver only varied from 15.17 parts of silver to 1 of gold in 1792, to 15.92 parts of silver to 1 of gold in 1873, or only seventy-five one-hundredths of a point, and bear in mind, please, that during the time I have just mentioned the leading commercial and monetary nation of the world abandoned bimetallism and came to monometallism. From 1873 down to the present time, during which period the following nations have abandoned bimetallism and have come to monometallism, or, if you prefer the term, have discontinued the coinage of silver: Belgium, Germany, and the United States in 1873; France, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece in 1874; Holland in 1875, Austro-Hungary in 1879, Roumania in 1892, India in 1893, and Brazil and Chile in 1894, the commercial ratio between silver and gold has changed from 15.92 parts of silver to 1 of gold in 1873 to 32.56 to 1 in 1894.

In 1816 England abandoned bimetallism and came to monometallism, but the other nations of the world having refused at that time to follow her lead such action on her part did not materially affect the ratio between the two metals or tend to lessen the price of silver bullion to any great extent in the markets of the world. But from 1873 down to the present time all the great commercial nations of the world have discontinued the free coinage of silver and the commercial ratio has changed from 15.92 to 1 in 1873 to 32.56 to 1 in 1894.

At the present time Japan, Mexico, the Central American and some of the South American Republics are the only nations that open their mints to the free coinage of silver. In China silver is lawful tender, but it is not generally coined, and a person of ordinary judgment can readily see that if these nations were to abandon its coinage and follow the lead of the rest of the nations of the world and come to monometallism the ratio would become still greater and the price of silver bullion would take another drop.

From the above brief statement I deduce the following propositions:

First. That one of the principal causes of the present low price of silver and the enormous increase in ratio between the two metals has been caused by its general demonetization by the leading nations.

Second. That its demonetization by a single nation, even the most important monetary and commercial one, could not destroy its monetary functions or materially affect the ratio or the price of silver bullion.

Third. Reasoning from the well-known axiom that it takes at least as great a power to restore as it does to destroy, it follows that no single nation can restore such monetary functions, bring back the old ratio, or enhance its price, and it also follows that no single nation can prevent such restoration if a majority of the nations agree thereto.

Fourth. That the only way such monetary function can be restored and the old ratio and price regained is by the conjoint action of at least a majority of the leading nations and a mutual agreement on their part to open their mints to its free coinage at an agreed ratio with gold, and a mutual agreement on their part to receive such coinage as "lawful-tender" money.

The advocates of the free coinage of silver point to the present depressed condition of the country and attribute it to the demonetization of the white metal, but will the facts warrant the statement.

For thirty years the country had been traveling the highroad of prosperity under Republican administration of national affairs, until it reached the flood tide in 1891 and 1892, but after the election of 1892, when it became a certainty that the Government in all its branches was to be turned over to the Democracy, who came into power upon a political pledge to wipe out "the robber Republican protective tariff" from the statute books and to enact in lieu thereof "tariff-for-revenue" legislation looking toward ultimate free trade.

Then trouble commenced good and hard. Importers ceased to import, waiting for the expected reduction.

American manufacturers reduced their output for fear of becoming loaded with goods which, owing to foreign competition, they feared they might be compelled to have put on the market at a losing price.

When it became known to the observant, early in the year of 1892, that Democracy would triumph, the financial atmosphere became chilly. When that triumph became assured by the election of November of that year, a frost fell, and when that triumph culminated in that masterly measure of incompetency known as the Gorman-Wilson tariff law a regular winter blizzard of panic swept over the country, costing this nation untold millions.

I will say nothing of the direful effects of that panic upon the people. It is history. A recital of broken fortunes, blasted prospects, ruined hopes, of want, woe, and suffering written upon the pages of time in the tears of the multitude.

There can be no question but this condition was caused principally by the invasion and still further threatened invasion of our protective tariff system.

And to my mind the only remedy is to return to full power that party under whose policy the nation prospered with a wonderful prosperity. In my opinion, if this question is to be settled at all it must be settled by the Republican party. It is the only party that has settled affirmatively any question during the last thirty years. It settled the question of human slavery, settled it forever, and settled it right. It settled the tariff question in favor of protection to American labor and American industries, and when this Government again passes under its control, as it surely will, I believe it contains statesmanship enough to grasp and solve the much-discussed money question, not in favor of the goldites or silverites, but in favor of the people, and all the people. [Applause.]

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity of making a permanent addition to the literature on the subject of finance. I will ask to be allowed, as I believe I am already under the special rule permitted to do, to have printed in the RECORD, in the ordinary type, the speech of the Hon. J. Z. GEORGE, of Mississippi, delivered at Winona, Miss., on Saturday, July 13, 1895. I do not desire to take up any time, Mr. Speaker, in asking permission to print this speech, but there have been so many men who have come to Congress in recent years, so I have been informed, who talk one way before they come here and another way afterwards—in other words, they are educated after they get to Washington—that I want to put this celebrated and philosophical treatment of the financial question in the RECORD, to try and educate them right after they come here and keep them right after they are properly educated. [Applause.]

[Speech of Hon. J. Z. GEORGE on the financial question, delivered at Winona, Miss., Saturday, July 13, 1895.]

FELLOW-CITIZENS: I thank your committee for the invitation to address you to-day. I might indulge in recalling some pleasing recollections, especially of men and events, connected with this portion of the old county of Carroll, and the temptation is strong to do so. But the momentous questions now presented to you and the people of Mississippi for solution, the eagerness of the people to hear these questions discussed, the assembling of this large audience of anxious and intelligent citizens, admonishes me that I should at once proceed in the discussion which you have assembled to hear.

The real question before us, that which underlies all others, and that on which hinge all others, is this: Have the people of the United States the right to govern themselves, or is this great duty to be usurped by the banks and their allies, the creditor classes of this country and of Europe? Is this a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, or is it a Government of banks, by the banks, and for the banks?

I include in the term banks not only those engaged in a strictly banking business, but a large number of others being holders of and dealers in money and moneyed securities; speculators in bonds and stocks and in contracts for the future delivery of commodities—appropriately called gamblers in agricultural products—and all those who look to the banks for the means of carrying on any speculation.

This contest has assumed at present the aspect of a struggle about the currency; it is in substance but a continuation of the contest waged from the beginning of the Government by special and privileged interests to seize, and then to appropriate to their own use, the powers and functions of the Government, granted for the good of all. Sometimes this contest is mostly marked by efforts to destroy the people's right to free trade—to buy and sell in such markets as are most beneficial to them. Under the operation of laws favored by such men not less than $20,000,000,000 have been transferred from the pockets of producers to Government favorites. Sometimes this contest assumes the aspect of securing large bounties from the people's property—sometimes in money and sometimes in other property. Through it has been secured to the favorites of the Government land grants to the amount of near 200,000,000 acres, making a territory four times as large as the State of Mississippi, besides many millions in money.

It has secured from the highest judicial tribunal a decision on the income tax contrary to the ruilngs of that court for a century, by which these men who had perverted thus the power of the Government for their own enrichment procured for themselves an exemption from a just share of the contributions of the people to the support of the Government. In whatever shape it has appeared, it is in fact but the same old eternal and never-ceasing conflict in which the prize fought for was on the one hand the power and the opportunity to use the Government for private ends and on the other a struggle by the people for a fair, just, and equal Government, upholding, advancing, protecting the interests and rights of all alike, with no special favors to any. In fact, it has been in all its shapes a contest between money and its owners and devotees and the great mass of the people; a contest to determine whether money and its satellites and henchmen should rule this fair land for aggrandizing the few or whether the people should rule with such laws and policies as would best subserve the common good—the general welfare.

ATTEMPT TO CORRUPT THE ELECTIONS.

The value of money consists in its purchasing power. This purchasing power has, as will be seen before I conclude, been greatly enhanced. It is now proposed to enhance it further by applying it to a new object of human desire—at least new in Mississippi. As illustrating the nature of this contest now going on in this State, and showing that I am right in what I have said about it, I will read extracts from a journal of high repute among bankers, the Financial Chronicle, published in New York and dated June 22 of this year. The editorial is headed:

A SURE WAY TO DEFEAT FREE SILVER.

It proceeds:

> The seats of several United States Senators are being contested in the South that might possibly be gained for advocates of a stable currency by a little judicious assistance on the part of the North. We can not vote there, but we can send money, by means of which the work of educating the people could be continued—a work that is most effectively done in that section by public speaking at political meetings. The question we want to ask is, Why should not the sound-money candidate in each State, the one who appears to offer the best promise of success, be furnished with the means of conducting his canvass?
>
> What we advocate is a thoroughly organized movement—not to talk, not to write letters, not to prepare sound-money plans, for every editor's table is groaning under the load it is bearing of that kind of literature—but to induce every man to put his hand in his pocket and give what he is willing to give to defeat these enemies to commercial prosperity.

Then, after dilating upon the very great importance of defeating the silver men, the article suggests the employment of the chamber of commerce as a proper agent to execute the designs of the gold monometallists, and then states:

> All we desire is that the amount of the fund should bear some relationship to the object to be sought and the danger to be averted. Our people have borne this cross by laying down under it and coquetting with it long enough. It is about time now to bestir ourselves and shake it off.

The article of course does not openly advocate bribery—the purchase of men and votes. Its pretense is to raise money only to enable gold-standard candidates for the United States Senate to conduct their canvass. It proposes to select the candidate in each Southern State having the best prospect of success, and give him the funds for making the canvass.

As there are only three Southern States in which there are canvasses for the United States Senate—Mississippi, Maryland, and Kentucky—this paper, for three men, one in each State, proposes to raise money to aid them in making the canvass. If only the natural and ordinary expenses to be incurred in a canvass were intended, then the sum of $1,000 in each State is ample. But if money is to be used for the purpose of debauching voters, hiring itinerant speakers, buying venal newspapers, then there will be needed that large sum of money which the Chronicle article indicates should be raised. It will be noted that there is to be a thoroughly organized movement to induce not one man, but to induce every man "to put his hand in his pocket" to defeat the free-silver movement. Of course this language is never applied in a community of rich men, each being able to contribute the sum of $100,000 or more if he saw proper, to induce men to make efforts to raise the paltry sum necessary to pay the expenses of making a personal canvass of the three men in the respective States.

I have read the extract in order to show you the nature of the contest in which we are now engaged—not only a contest with the money power for the guidance of the destinies of the people, but a contest with that power armed with gold to be freely spent in an effort to gain the mastery over us.

I do not think I miscalculate when I say that the effort on the part of the New York bankers to control our elections by money will have no other effect than to deepen and intensify the opposition of our people to the rule of men who subordinate all other human interests to the aggrandizement of those who are already overrich.

OUR COINAGE LAWS.

Our money, or our materials for money, has been fixed by nature. Gold and silver, from the earliest periods, have been used by mankind for money—primary money—money, as it is called, of final payment. So that when a transaction was concluded and money of gold or silver was paid, it was a finality.

In this situation our fathers found these metals at the adoption of the Constitution which gave to Congress the power to coin them into money and regulate its value. This was the situation when that same Constitution, recognizing them—both of them, not one alone—as full money metals, prohibited the States from making anything else than gold and silver a legal tender for the payment of debts.

So when our fathers, in 1792, came to establish a mint and to inaugurate coinage in the United States, they had all these facts and more before them, and recognizing the advantage of bimetallism they admitted to coinage both gold and silver and fixed a ratio of 15 to 1, being 3 per cent less than the French ratio, which was 15½ to 1. Owing to the fact that our ratio valued silver more highly than it was valued in France, we had mainly a silver currency from 1792 to 1834. The silver dollar itself was made the unit or standard of value. In 1834, in order to favor the gold mines in our own country, the ratio was changed so as to be practically 16 to 1. And in this ratio gold was overvalued and silver went to France and other places where it was valued higher than in our mint regulations.

Thus currency and coinage matters stood till 1873, when silver was demonetized.

ACT OF 1873—DEMONETIZATION.

This action of Congress was furtive. It came from an omission in a law of many sections, codifying the laws in relation to coinage. While other features of this long law underwent discussion, it appears that this peculiar feature, the demonetization of silver, was so managed in debate that its practical effect escaped the attention of such men as Senator Thurman and Mr. W. D. Kelley and many others of equal distinction, and finally the bill was approved by President Grant without knowledge that this provision was in it.

Mr. Groesbeck, one of the American commissioners to the International Monetary Conference of 1878, in addressing that body, aptly and truly described the circumstances attending demonetization in these words:

> From 1792 to this day, when by a sort of inadvertency in 1873 the silver standard was superseded, not a merchant, not a banker, not a manufacturer not an establishment, nor an interest of any kind could be cited as having raised any objection to the simultaneous use of the two metals. Bimetallism is, therefore, in the United States not only a tradition of the law, but has entered deeply into the habits of the people.

It was enacted stealthily through the machinations of men interested in appreciating money, with not only no demand on the part of our people, or of any considerable portion of them, for such action, but in opposition to their wishes and in derogation of their rights.

At the date of the passage of this law the United States were on a paper basis; neither gold nor silver circulated as money. This condition of affairs was very favorable to the success of the conspiracy.

Yet it was some time afterwards discovered that demonetization had taken place, and from that date till now the people, without distinction of party, have clamored for a repeal of the act of 1873. The banks have all along resisted, and up to now with success.

THE CONSPIRACY.

That the act of 1873 was the result of a conspiracy, having its members both here and in Europe, we have the authority of Mr. Carlisle, speaking on the subject in February, 1878, when the events attending that transaction were fresh in the memory of men.

That he was correct in this I have no doubt. The circumstances demonstrate that he was correct.

The banks and money holders in this country have acted exactly as if they were in the conspiracy.

They had also the motive, to wit, self-interest, to conspire.

When the conspiracy succeeded, however secret their machinations may have been before that time, they have been bold and open enough since, not only in defending the act, but in resorting to all manner of measures to prevent undoing the wrong.

They are also in possession of the fruits of the crime, as was demonstrated by Mr. Carlisle in February, 1878.

JACKSON'S STRUGGLE.

It ought to be stated that the very name of national bank, or Bank of the United States, had been made odious to the people of the Union through the misconduct of that institution as it was exposed and denounced by Andrew Jackson. In the great struggle for the government of these States, Jackson had known and felt the great power of the bank. He had seen the baneful effect of the operation of the bank on free government. He determined to save his country by destroying it. At first he was opposed by a great party, but as time passed and men could look with entire composure and fairness upon that momentous struggle, the people of the United States almost with one voice pronounced Jackson right. The bank was generally conceded to be not only dangerous, but unconstitutional.

CHARTER OF BANKS IN 1864.

But in 1864, when war was flagrant between the States, the bonds of the United States issued for war expenses had increased enormously. It was deemed necessary to increase the advantages of those who purchased them. The scheme was to have national banks in fact, yet to conceal the name. So a bill was passed with this significant title: "To provide a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds and to provide for the circulation thereof." It became a law on June 3, 1864. The preceding acts, one in 1791 and the other in 1816, chartering United States banks, each plainly stated in its title that it was a "charter for United States bank." But this act of 1864 concealed its purpose, not only in its title, but all the way through the companies chartered by it being called associations, and in no instance "banks."

This was done to conceal from the people that national banks were created.

At once these banks, called associations, entered with avidity on the object expressed in the act chartering them, to wit: To provide a "national currency." Their interest was to furnish all of it. So they set up an agitation to retire all the greenbacks and many millions were retired.

As the law providing for the organization of national banks was created to increase the value of United States bonds by making them the basis of a national currency, so in the same interest the bondholders and banks persuaded Congress to pass an act on the 18th of March, 1869, declaring that all these bonds, though legally payable in any kind of lawful money, worth on an average, when used in buying these bonds, only 67 cents in coin, should be paid in coin only. By this law the bonds were enhanced in value about 50 per cent, and the burdens of the people correspondingly increased.

Having secured this advantage, the next step was to retire silver from circulation, so that the bonds would be payable only in gold, and so we had the act of 1873, as has been explained.

This act vastly increased the value of the bonds, and also vastly increased the burdens of the people. The banks and bondholders had now accomplished their purpose in securing a situation in which there would be no silver money to pay on the bonds, and therefore they would be paid in gold.

As soon, however, as the crime, as Mr. Carlisle justly calls it, was consummated, in the very next Congress, and in the very next year, to wit, on January 20, 1874, the conspirators threw off all disguise, so far as the national banks were concerned, and they procured a law to be passed enacting that the act of 1864, under which the banks were established as associations merely, and which was entitled "An act to provide a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof," should thereafter not be known by its name, but as "the national-bank act."

They felt very secure after the act of 1873 was passed. They confidently relied on always being able to stop any law for a repeal in one or the other of the two Houses of Congress or in the Executive Office. As it required a concurrence of all these to pass the law, so it required the concurrence of all to repeal it. As one of these could have effectually prevented the law from passing, so, it having passed, any one of them could continue it in force against the opposition of the other two.

This situation vastly strengthened the position of the conspirators in fighting against remonetization. Yet the sentiment throughout the country was strong for repeal, manifesting itself not only in the public expressions of the views of the people but also by votes of their Representatives in Congress.

The banks resisted the repeal of the demonetization act from the beginning. In October, 1877, more than a year before the time fixed by law for the resumption of specie payments by the Treasury, the House of Representatives passed a bill restoring free coinage by a vote of 162 to 34, Mr. Carlisle voting for it. In the Senate the banks succeeded in getting it amended so as to allow coinage to the amount of four millions per month, and to compel it to the amount of two millions. This was vetoed by the President (Hayes), but passed over his veto. It will be noticed, however, that in the year 1877, pending the agitation for the restoration of silver, the banks showed their enmity to it by predicting all sorts of disasters to the people, and especially in asserting that it would destroy confidence in the business situation, and to enforce this view they contracted their circulation by fifteen millions, in addition to the contraction of the year before of twenty-two millions, this last-named contraction being made to control the Congressional election of that year. So in the two years just preceding action on remonetization they contracted in all thirty-seven millions.

This was an enormous contraction and there was no means of remedying it, for greenbacks could not be increased, the limit being fixed in 1868, and neither gold nor silver was used as currency, we being then on a paper basis.

Having accomplished their purpose by defeating the Bland bill and reducing silver coinage to two millions per month—for the minimum under the law they knew would be the maximum coinage in actual practice—they immediately commenced expanding their circulation, adding seven and a half millions in 1878, and in the succeeding years up to and including 1882 still expanding, so that in that year the whole expansion amounted to forty and a half millions, notwithstanding the yearly addition to the currency of twenty-four millions of silver under the Bland-Allison law.

It should be noted here, as of special importance, that in the year 1881, to affect the action of Congress in relation to the finances, in which they were interested, they contracted in one day in New York alone $18,000,000. And so great was their desire to make money by expanding the currency, the banks, as soon as the emergency was over which caused the contraction of eighteen millions in one day, began to expand, so that in that very year this contraction of eighteen millions was made up and eleven millions more added to their circulation.

This brings us to the year 1883, in which was passed a new tariff and internal-revenue law. Under the law as it then stood the banks were taxed 1 per cent on the amount of their deposits and 1 per cent on their circulation, this last tax being imposed to pay to the United States the cost of printing and engraving the national bank notes. The banks wanted to get rid of all taxes. They pretended they could not successfully carry on banking with these taxes imposed, notwithstanding they had semiannually declared dividends larger than the gains of the ordinary business of the country. Having succeeded in demonetizing silver, with only a pitiful addition to the currency of twenty-four millions annually under the Bland-Allison law, and the volume of greenbacks being restricted and fixed by law, as I have shown, and the need for more currency being exigent and imperative, they determined to force Congress to yield to their demands for a repeal of all taxes, and so they contracted the currency nine millions. They succeeded in getting rid of the tax on their deposits, which was their main grievance, the tax on circulation, being a compensation for printing their notes, remaining.

OTHER SCHEMES OF THE CONSPIRATORS.

These were only a part of their schemes to control legislation in their own interest and to secure to themselves a monopoly of furnishing the currency of the country. From the very beginning they warred on silver, though silver coin at the ratio of 16 to 1 was then at a premium of 3 per cent. The charge then made was not as now, that the silver dollar was too cheap. The true animus was to destroy one-half of the money of the country, as Chevalier attempted in France as to gold on the discovery of Californian and Australian gold mines, so that the profits of the banks might be increased, though at the expense of the welfare of the people. They resisted the small coinage compelled by the Bland-Allison law of 1878 of two millions per month. Though every dollar coined was the equal of any other dollar and was needed in the commerce and business of the country, they refused to receive silver and silver certificates on deposit, and refused to allow balances in the clearing house to be paid in silver coin and certificates. Congress was obliged to correct this in 1882.

THE GOVERNMENT AIDED THE BANKS.

In the meantime the Treasury Department from the beginning (Mr. SHERMAN being Secretary at the date of the act authorizing

coinage), took the side of the banks as against the people in discriminating against silver money. Though allowed to coin forty-eight millions annually, the Treasury Department refused to coin more than one-half that sum. The Department regularly acknowledged the justice of the claim of the banks and bondholders to be paid only in gold, though the law was plain that they were equally payable in silver and silver was at par with gold. The Department paid everybody else in silver—paid officials, paid laborers on the public works, paid sailors and soldiers in silver; for the bondholders only silver was not good enough, and they were paid in gold. This discrimination, as will be seen hereafter, tended to create a disparity between gold and silver and to give color to the clamor that silver could not be maintained at a parity with gold.

SHERMAN LAW OF 1890.

Notwithstanding the machinations of the conspirators and the actions of the Treasury Department; notwithstanding the outcries and denunciations of the metropolitan press and the clamor of the banks, the bondholders and their allies, silver, safe and sound money, which had served the people faithfully and well, maintained its place in their confidence. They were quite content to use the money of the Constitution, the money Washington and Jefferson gave them, and the money fostered and trusted by Jackson, Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. The complaint the people made was only that there was not enough of it. The people still demanded a correction of the crime, as Mr. Carlisle called it, of demonetization. So in 1890 the House of Bepresentatives passed another free-coinage measure, restoring to the people the ancient constitutional right to use both gold and silver. Again the banks and bondholders and their allies schemed to defeat the people. They forced a compromise through the action of the Senate, and the Sherman law was the result. It authorized the purchase and coinage of 54,000,000 ounces of silver annually. This was a large increase in the currency and gave great relief. The banks of course disliked it, but it was far better for their purposes than free coinage, for it still kept the ban of demonetization on silver. It still made the uncoined surplus a mere commodity, with its value regulated by the use of silver in the arts only; and thus widened more and more the difference in the market value of silver and of gold.

As every ounce of gold could be carried to the mints and there coined without cost to the owner, of course the bullion value and the coin value was the same; but as only a portion of the silver bullion could be coined, the uncoined and uncoinable surplus fixed the bullion value of the whole. Now note: I said the uncoined and uncoinable surplus of silver fixed the bullion value of the whole; but it fixed the bullion value only; for silver coined, by the mere act of coinage, is endowed with a function denied to the uncoinable surplus, as I shall show hereafter, and this function, the money function, gave it money value.

By this forced compromise the banks and bondholders gained a great victory, for its effects now furnish them with their only plausible argument against free silver.

Having defeated free coinage, and substituted for it that miserable makeshift for free coinage, a purchase of a limited quantity only of silver, leaving a large uncoinable surplus, the bankers and bondholders and their allies were quite content to bide their time for the reenactment of the law of 1873 prohibiting entirely the further coinage of silver. They knew the power they possessed as the owners and dominant controllers of the money and the finances of the world. They were more and more impressed with the necessity for final and conclusive action, putting an end to silver as money. For under the first operation of the Sherman law and the votes of Congress on free coinage, which seemed to presage that we were on the eve of full remonetization by the United States, silver bullion went up to $1.20 per ounce—within a small fraction of full parity with gold, at the ratio of 16 to 1. Within a few months after the enlarged use of silver provided for by the Sherman law the Baring failure occurred, which shook to its center the fabric of British finance, compelling the Bank of England to borrow from the bank of bimetallic France $50,000,000 gold. This enlarged use of silver, thus authorized by our law, saved the United States from any serious disturbance from this panic. This is admitted by even the enemies of silver. This helped the free-coinage sentiment. The conspirators saw the danger, yet they were confident in their power and they waited patiently for the opportunity to strike a successful blow.

THE PREPARATION TO REPEAL SHERMAN LAW.

They intended to make no mistake as to preparation. In 1892 the candidates of the two great parties for President were known to be unfriendly to action by the United States alone. The managers from Wall street succeeded in getting the national convention of each party to make a platform on the silver question which looked like a declaration for free coinage, and yet by artifice and trick was capable of the construction that international agreement was necessary for action. So, after the election, an international conference was held, and though its deliberations and discussions showed fear and trepidation if the war on silver was continued, yet an adjournment was had without final action.

The adjournment was to the 30th of May, 1893, at which time there were both hopes and fears that favorable action would be had. The conspirators knew that the United States held that position which enabled them absolutely to control the situation. The sentiment of the United States as exhibited in the Presidential election of 1892 was as strong, if not stronger, for free coinage than ever. For the first time since 1860 the Democrats held the full power of the Government. The Democrats in the main had all along favored free coinage. The declaration in their platform had denounced the Sherman law as a cowardly makeshift for free coinage and had explicitly declared for silver as well as gold as standard money.

The trouble only was about the parity of the two moneys in the ratio of coinage. They knew if the United States determined on independent action that action would be a success. The power of the United States was so great in this respect, as I shall demonstrate, that they knew that action by them, independent action, would compel other nations to follow or surrender to the United States the scepter of the world's commerce.

THE CONSPIRATORS STRIKE THE BLOW.

So the situation was one of distress and danger to the conspirators. The period was critical. The time seemed to be opportune. An effort to defeat remonetization, if not successful, would only leave them in the situation they then occupied; if successful, it would make them lords of the world. So, about the last day of November, in the fateful year 1892, they determined to strike the blow. Quick "as the lightning from the collied night," as unexpected as the lightning at midday from a cloudless sky, and with the destructive force of a thunderbolt, the blow fell upon the innocent victims, the people of America. They said, "Let there be a panic," and there was a panic.

GOLD EXPORTATIONS.

Recall the situation on the 30th day of November, 1892. On that day ended the two months in which the net imports of gold were over four and a half millions. In December following, the next month, the exports of gold suddenly ran up to $12,899,727. These exports continued to increase monthly till the 30th of May, the date fixed for the reassembling of the International Monetary Conference. The conference failed, and England had determined to stop free coinage in India. Then they suddenly fell to $2,771,226 in June, and from that date the scale was turned—the repeal of the Sherman law was assured. In July and August the net imports of gold amounted to about sixty millions.

THE COUNTRY TERRIFIED.

The clamor raised about the exports of gold in December, 1892, and the months following terrified the country, as it was ascribed to our improper monetary system—the enlarged use of silver under the Sherman law. During this factitious panic the New York banks refused payment of their deposits—refused to send the money they owed to banks in other cities. Business men were refused accommodations; money was hoarded, and harsh and unconscionable bargains forced on those who needed money to sustain their credit, and at the same time a clamor was raised to repeal the Sherman law and to issue United States gold bonds to the amount of hundreds of millions with the pretense of securing a return of the millions which the bankers and bondholders had exported to get up the panic.

FINANCIAL SITUATION NOVEMBER 30, 1892.

Let us turn our attention again to the financial situation in the fall of 1892, when the panic was inaugurated, and to the situation during all the time of the existence of the Sherman law. This situation fortifies the position beyond controversy that there was no occasion for the panic.

If what has already been said is not sufficient proof, consider the following:

On the 30th day of November, 1892, the end of the two months of an excess of gold importations into the United States, and the eve of the period when gold exportations were, by the action of the conspirators, to commence, the situation exhibited no signs of the coming storm. Your situation, your condition as cotton-growers, impaired greatly by the demonetization of silver, was more favorable than it ever has been since. Though not a paradise as compared to the happy time when silver was freely coined, as it was brought to the mint, it was a heaven itself, as compared to the distress and misery into which the conspirators have plunged us. On that day, the 30th of November, 1892, notwithstanding we had raised and marketed the largest amount of cotton ever raised in three successive years, the crop of the first of these being the largest ever grown before, the crop of the second being larger than the first, and the crop of the last being larger than that, being 24,989,000 bales in all three, and being immensely larger than the crop of any preceding successive three years—I say on that day middling upland cotton was worth in New York 9$\frac{1}{16}$ cents per pound—within a small fraction of $50 per bale. Under the in-

fluence of this panic—made to order—it was made to decline continuously, with slight temporary advances and falls, caused by speculation, till it reached $7\frac{1}{16}$, on the 30th of August, 1893, a fall of $2\frac{5}{16}$ per pound on a crop of seven and a half millions, a loss of ninety-seven and a half million dollars on the crop of one year.

OUR FOREIGN COMMERCE AGAINST GOLD EXPORTS.

Turn our attention again to the 30th of November, 1892. We find the situation still more adverse to gold exports and the consequent panic based on them. The returns of the Treasury for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, showed the most favorable condition of our foreign commerce. Our exports for that year amounted to $1,030,278,148, exceeding imports by $202,875,686. Our exports had never reached $900,000,000 but in one year before, viz., in 1881, and had never reached as much as $800,000,000 in more than four other years before, to wit, in 1880, 1883, 1890, and 1891. Our exports of gold over imports in the year ending June 30, 1892, were less than one-half million, the lowest that they had been since the year 1888, when the excess was of imports and in our favor. That there should be some exports of gold was natural, as we were large producers of gold—about thirty-three millions annually. So it is seen that the condition was such as to indicate necessary prosperity and confidence in business and not distrust or a panic.

OUR INTERNAL COMMERCE FAVORABLE.

Turn now to the internal commerce of the country so far as exhibited by the transactions of the banks, and that tells you the same tale of absolute confidence in the currency and of hope in the future.

The clearing houses, which exist only in about sixty cities in the Union, show that commercial paper, bills of exchange, and bank checks to the amount of about $62,000,000,000 were settled in them in the year ending the 30th of September, 1892, as large if not larger than in any one year before. These transactions did not report one-fifth or even one-tenth of the internal business and traffic of the country.

Let us see now how the banks themselves and the business men, as they are called, acted.

BANKS AND BUSINESS MEN SAW NO CAUSE FOR PANIC.

In the year ending October 2, 1892, less than two months before the panic began, the deposits in the banks amounted to $243,800,000, more than in either of the two preceding years. The national banks increased their capital stock by $64,000,000 over the year 1889. They also increased their loans to $2,171,000,000 as compared with $1,805,700,000 for the year 1889, being an increase of $365,300,000.

Business men do not increase their investments if they distrust the condition of the currency and anticipate a panic. They do exactly the reverse. They prepare for the coming storm by reefing sail—contracting their business and their credits. Banks do exactly the same.

I mention now, for fear I may omit it, as a conclusive evidence that the banks originated that panic—made it to order—to gain a control over the finances of the nation by completely demonetizing silver; that they acted all along up to May, 1893, as if they were masters of the situation; that they could still the financial storm which they had raised; that from October 2, 1892, to May 1, 1893, including five months of the panic, they increased their loans so that they were nearly as much in those seven months as they had been in the preceding twelve months, which, as I have stated, was largely in excess of those loans in any preceding year.

I have now shown by proof, strong and conclusive at every step, that the banks and bondholders and their allies, in their efforts to thoroughly destroy silver as a money metal, made war on silver money from the beginning, by entering into the conspiracy to pass the demonetization act of 1873—as charged by Mr. Carlisle—by refusing to recognize silver money for deposits, by contracting or enlarging the currency as best suited their ends to destroy silver, and by creating a factitious panic, commencing in December, 1892. It now remains only to show that they had an interest, and a great interest, separate and apart from and adverse to the people, in destroying silver money, and, if need be, at any cost to the people.

INTERESTS OF THE BANKS IN DESTROYING SILVER.

The banks and bondholders and their allies here held most of the gold in this country and their allies in Europe held it there. The effect of the demonetization was to increase the value of gold, as I shall show, and thus add, as an unearned increment, millions and millions of dollars to their wealth. But they had a further and more direct and palpable interest. By keeping money scarce they made it necessary to use those devices as a substitute for an insufficient currency which practically made them autocrats in the world of finance. The official documents show that there were only about $400,000,000 of gold in 1892 and 1893 in circulation in the United States.

These documents also show that the whole amount of money in the United States, current at that time, was about $1,600,000,000. It is also true, as I have stated, that the trade going through the clearing houses alone in 1892 amounted to over $61,000,000,000. It is also true that the annual trade and traffic and business in the country, the demands to pay taxes, interest on the public debts, national, State, and municipal, corporation debts, and the workings of the railroads and water craft, called for at least five times as much more, possibly ten times as much. How all this business, amounting to at least $300,000,000,000, was to be done on the insignificant sum of $1,600,000,000 without increasing the volume of money was the problem to be solved. The nimble penny theory would not do it. So clearing houses, bills of exchange, and checks were put to an unwonted use.

It is admitted by our gold friends that all the business was transacted on about 5 per cent in money and the balance in credits or confidence. But for even that 5 per cent the money of the country was insufficient. So by the necromancy of banking, or of bookkeeping, or whatever else we may call it, we find that the banks, State and national, so arranged that with only $1,600,000,000 in the whole country, including all that large sum in the hands of persons who do not make deposits in banks, the average deposits in the banks in 1892 amounted to within a small fraction of $5,000,000,000—more than three times the whole amount of all money in the country, including all in the State and municipal and corporation treasuries and kept in the hands of private persons. This device is astounding, and would seem to result from some system of bookkeeping known only to the bankers, if it were not for the fact that they actually loaned and received interest on more than four and a quarter billions. By this device the banks were enabled to draw interest on not only all the money they owned, but on all that everybody else owned; and not only this, but on about three times as much money as all the money in the country, or, to be exact, they draw interest on $2.70 for every dollar in circulation in the United States. They did this on a capital of $900,000,000, being loans to the amount of more than five times their capital, with two-thirds of the capital of the national banks otherwise profitably invested than in loans. And in this way they loan and draw interest on a sum equal to all the gold money in the world. Of course they did not want more real money, more silver money, for an increase of the real money would have diminished the necessity for sham money—for these devices which they substitute for real money.

THE DEVICES DANGEROUS TO THE PEOPLE.

If we stop now and reflect a moment we will find the situation such as to cause the greatest apprehension on the part of patriots, and to demand the most strenuous and unremitting efforts on the part of the banks and their allies to preserve it. We see that in banks alone, independent of their allies, is concentrated the power to furnish or withhold 95 per cent of the financial means by which the trade of the country is carried on. If they contract, commerce withers and dies. If they expand unduly, we have that inflation for a season which creates wild and reckless speculation, leading to inevitable disaster to the country. If they mistake as to their securities, or if any considerable number of their favored customers mistake in the investments they make, there is a loss of confidence, a panic, the disastrous results of which lasts for years, overturning fortunes, throwing labor out of employment, crushing out the prosperity and happiness of the whole people.

These are the causes for opposition on the part of the people. These are also the very causes which commend the system to the favor of the banks. It makes them the absolute masters of the fortunes of the people and enables them to acquire the great wealth by which this mastery is to be perpetuated. The necessity for these devices to supply the wants occasioned by an insufficient money volume makes the people tolerate them. If we had free and unlimited coinage of silver money to supply in part this insufficiency we would have no need for these devices; we would have a broader basis for credit and also less need for the credit itself. Need I tell you that the banks owed in 1892 and 1893, obligations payable on demand, nine times as much as the cash and cash items they had with which to meet them, or six times as much if we exclude the savings banks? The result is that with the least disturbance in financial circles anywhere we are in danger of a panic, and the banks having control of all this curiously devised machinery of credit may bring on a panic whenever it suits their interests to do so.

I conclude this part of the subject by introducing here two other witnesses besides Mr. Carlisle as to the agency of the banks and bondholders in creating this panic.

Senator VOORHEES, the able chairman of the Finance Committee, in a speech in the Senate, said:

> The shipments of gold which took place from this country in the last four or five months must be accounted for, to my mind, in a different way. They were a part of the same plan which attempted to sack the Treasury of its gold-reserve fund, to create distrust, fear, agitation, panic, and a withdrawal, as far as possible, of all money in circulation; and all this to be accomplished by a concerted outcry from terror-stricken business circles, and from the whole national-bank system, that nothing can restore confidence and save the public credit except the issuance of at least $300,000,000 of interest-bearing Government bonds.

Mr. HILL of New York said in a speech in the Senate:

Some portion of the present panic may be traced to a concerted effort on the part of numerous monometallists to produce it in order further to discredit silver as a part of the standard money of the country. That fact is apparent everywhere we turn.

And among their acts which contributed to this result he mentioned:

They encourage the hoarding of money; they inaugurated the policy of refusing loans to the people, even upon the best security; they circulated false petitions, passed absurd and alarming resolutions, predicted the direst disaster, attacked the credit of the Government, sought to exact a premium upon currency, and attempted in every way to spread distrust broadcast throughout the land.

He continues (I quote his language literally):

The best financial system in the world could not stand such an organized and vicious attack upon it. These disturbers, these promoters of the public peril, represent largely the creditor class, the men who desire to appreciate the gold dollar in order to subserve their own selfish interest, men who revel in hard times, men who drive hard bargains with their fellow-men in periods of financial distress, and men wholly unfamiliar with the principles of monetary science. It is not strange that the present monetary panic has been induced, intensified, and protracted by reason of their malign influences.

And the distinguished Senator from New York, immediately following the quotation I have made from his speech, used these words:

Having contributed much to bring about the present exigency, these men—

The monometallists and creditors described in the extract before quoted—

are now unable to control it. They have sown the wind and we are now reaping the whirlwind.

Now, if this result be not correct, what other cause can be assigned for the panic? I have heard but one, and that is a want of confidence in our currency owing to coinage of silver. A sufficient answer to that is found in the fact that this very currency so attempted to be discredited sold in New York at 3 per cent premium during the very panic which is thus charged to have been created by its discredit.

EFFECTS OF REPEAL ON PRICE OF COTTON.

As I have stated, cotton was worth in New York on the 30th of November, 1892, when this made-to-order panic set in, $9\frac{15}{16}$, having risen to that point since September 1, the opening of the season, from $7\frac{3}{16}$. From the 30th of November, 1892, it continued to fall, but, though the panic was going on, did not fall below 9 cents till after the 22d of March, 1893, but continued falling till it reached $7\frac{5}{8}$ on the 30th of August, 1893, the end of the season. In September, 1893, the price in New York ranged from $7\frac{13}{16}$ to $8\frac{3}{8}$, and in October from $8\frac{1}{16}$ to $8\frac{3}{16}$, and stood at $8\frac{5}{16}$ on November 1, 1893, the day the Sherman law was repealed. We were promised an immediate revival of business on the repeal; confidence was to be restored, and the country was again to be happy and prosperous. Yet cotton on the day of the repeal was higher than it has ever been since. It kept falling from the day of the repeal, with only slight and spasmodic and short-lived advances, from $8\frac{5}{16}$ on November 1, 1893, to $6\frac{7}{8}$ on the 30th of August, 1894, the end of the season. These are New York figures, and my statistics for New York end on that day; but comparisons as to rise and fall may be as well and satisfactorily made on one market as on another.

Up to the end of the season in which the crop of 1892, a short crop, was marketed, cotton under the influence of this restored confidence fell $8.75 per bale. There was no confidence in business matters restored to the banks, for they had lost none. The confidence they got from the repeal of the Sherman law (or rather its purchasing clause) was an absolute confidence in their power to control Congress, and through its aid to control and dominate not only the finances, but the whole business interests of the whole country. The price of cotton still kept on falling. The cotton season of 1894 opened with the price on September 1, 1894, of $6\frac{7}{16}$ for middling cotton in New Orleans. It never afterwards got above that, and only reached that figure on six subsequent days; falling below 5 cents on two days in November and keeping a shade above 5 cents—less than a half cent—till March 14, and then it went along under 6 cents till April 11, and then it went to 7 cents on May 30, and so remained till June 7, and then it fell and has remained below 7 cents ever since.

You will take note, however, that of late years one-half of the crop is marketed by the middle of November, and the small rise which came at last came when all the cotton had substantially gone out of the farmers' hands.

The fall as compared with the price the day the Sherman law was repealed was over $10 per bale, and from the day when the banks inaugurated the panic—November 30, 1892—about $19 per bale.

Such, my friends, have been the effects of the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law.

FALL NOT PRODUCED BY LARGE CROP.

But our gold friends are fertile in excuses for the failure of their programme. Having made up their minds that silver coinage is wrong, and a double standard—to use the language of Mr. Carlisle—is mathematically and metaphysically impossible disappointed by the failure of all their predictions, yet unable to acknowledge they were mistaken, they continually look for some balm for their wounded spirits, and in this mood they stumble on the large crop of 1894 as the cause of all our woes. I do not deny that large crops diminish prices and small ones enhance them, or in other words, I acknowledge the potency of the law of supply and demand—I shall later on discuss this bugbear of overproduction; but just here it seems to be appropriate to puncture this idle bubble floating on the sea of mistakes and errors with which the discussion on the part of our gold friends is characterized.

Let us make some comparisons as to the effects of increasing crops on the price of cotton, when these crops on the one hand come under the influence of the addition to our currency made by the Sherman law and the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and on the other under the influence of the repeal of both and a total cessation of the coinage of silver.

Let me preface that while one large crop affects prices it does not destroy them. One swallow does not make a summer. Cotton, unlike most other commodities, keeps without injury for years, and besides it never goes out of fashion. It takes several years together of extra large production to make a destructive fall.

The crop of 1889 (calendar year), marketed during the season ending 31st of August, 1890, was the largest ever grown up to that time, amounting to 7,297,000 bales, and the next crop—of 1890—was larger than that, amounting to 8,670,000 bales, and the next crop—of 1891—amounted to 9,018,000 bales. All these together amounted to 24,989,000, being over 4,000,000 greater than the aggregate crop of the three preceding years of 1886, 1887, and 1888, which last aggregate was larger than any three preceding years.

So that these three large crops of 1889, 1890, and 1891 came on the heels of the largest cotton production ever known; yet prices, though falling, as they must under silver demonetization, maintained themselves admirably during these three years of 1889, 1890, and 1891. The first of these crops ranged from $9\frac{1}{2}$ to $11\frac{7}{8}$ cents in New Orleans.

The crop of 1890 ranged from $11\frac{3}{4}$ to 8 cents, never falling below 8 till the 17th of June, 1891, when nearly all the crops had been marketed. Recollect this was also the largest crop ever raised, succeeding the largest then ever before grown. The crop of 1891 being the third in succession of the largest crops ever grown, and which, with the two preceding crops, produced the large aggregate of within a fraction of 25,000,000 bales, and being more than 4,000,000 larger than the aggregate of any three preceding crops in succession. This crop of 1891 sold for prices ranging from $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 cents, being a very little under 7 cents for less than ninety days in the months of January, February, March, April, and August. The crop of the next year, 1892, was also sold and marketed under the Sherman law, and, being a short crop, the price opened at 7 cents on September 1, and advanced, except four days in September, till it reached $9\frac{15}{16}$ on the 30th of November, when this panic, as we have seen, was inaugurated, and kept steadily above 9 cents, notwithstanding the panic, till February, and never got as low as 7 cents.

Then the Sherman law was repealed, and the next crop was a short one and cotton fell, as we have seen, from the date of the repeal constantly till it reached $6\frac{7}{16}$ at the close of the season.

Then came the crop of 1894, the only large crop of the three, but the largest ever made, being now estimated by the best authority at nine and three-fourths million bales. I need not tell you how low that fell. Now, this crop of 1894, together with the two preceding crops, amounted to only 23,746,000 bales, being in the aggregate 1,143,000 bales less than the three crops which preceded them. Under these conditions cotton ought not to have fallen below the price of the crop of 1891, but being nearly a million and a quarter bales less in the three years than in the three years preceding, it ought to have risen much higher than it was at the end of these three preceding years. It fell from the price at the end of those three years near 2 cents a pound for most of the season. The first three years were all marketed under the Sherman law, and the first of the last three years and a part of the second of the last three were also marketed under it, and up to the time of the repeal—November 1, 1893—prices kept up very well, and it was only after the repeal that the disastrous fall occurred. This is demonstration beyond controversy of the disastrous effects of the repeal.

ACTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION.

Now, it is complained that your two Senators and six out of the seven of your Representatives did wrong in voting against the repeal. Governor Stone especially condemns our action, and this condemnation is a part of the thunder of his campaign. Now, I was always glad to have the approval of so good a man as Governor Stone for my official acts; I always regretted his condemnation; but as much as I do prize the approval of so good a man, I prize more highly the approval of my own conscience; and especially when, acting according to my conscience, I have also acted for the happiness and welfare of the great people whose commission I hold. * * * When I do this, while I may regret the

condemnation of any good man, I am content to abide any fate that may befall me.

FREE COINAGE.

This brings us directly to the great issue, was demonetization in 1873 an injury to the country, and is remonetization proper now?

The first question seems hardly worthy of discussion, at least in Mississippi. Governor Stone, the candidate of the gold men for the Senate, declares it to be both a wrong and a blunder, and hopes to see it corrected by an international monetary conference. Mr. Carlisle declared in 1878 that it was the result of a conspiracy formed here and in Europe, that it was the most gigantic crime of this or any other age, and that it would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world. And Mr. Carlisle was right. But it will help to see this blunder and appreciate this wrong—this crime of all the ages—more clearly if we take a short view of its actual consequences.

In the first place, in the very year of its consummation, in 1873, occurred one of the most disastrous panics that ever afflicted mankind. Cotton fell from the date of its passage in February to the end of the year, though the crop marketed was a short one, from 19¾ cents in New Orleans to 15½, more than 4½ cents per pound, or $22.50 per bale. This was pretty bad for a start, but it kept on falling, with only slight variations, till November 1, 1893, the date of the repeal of the Sherman law, when it reached 7⅞ cents, and then its further fall was accelerated till it reached 4⅞ cents the last season. (These are New Orleans figures.) So the cotton farmer, at all events, can see how he has fared under the operation of the act of 1873. Compare 19¾ to 5¼ cents, a loss of 75 per cent nearly, and you can see the loss the farmer has sustained. He got last season a little over one-fourth the price that he got before this baleful act—this crime of all the ages, as Mr. Carlisle called it.

But it is denied that this fall was produced by demonetization. Let us see. Accurate tables of prices prepared by the best statisticians in the world, and which have been often published and never contradicted, show these convincing and unanswerable facts: That from 1850, when the money of the world was being increased by the large output of gold in California and Australia, general prices were constantly rising, so that in 1873 they were about 30 per cent higher than in 1850; and that from the very year of demonetization, 1873, they continually and persistently fell till they were lower in 1893 by between 35 and 41 per cent than in 1873. How could this happen except by and through the act committed in 1873—the demonetization of silver? Up to 1873 we had rising prices with increasing money supply, gold and silver being both used. From this very date, when money was contracting, one-half the world's money being disabled as a money metal, prices not only began to fall, but they continued to fall until a lower range of prices was reached this year than was ever known in our history.

The report of the gold and silver commission of Great Britain, made in 1888, showed that, while for many years prior to 1873 there had been a constant and continuous progress and advance in the trade of Great Britain, from that year—from that very year when silver was demonetized—a fall began and continued, so that while the total commerce of Great Britain in 1873 being represented by the number 62, that commerce in 1887, fourteen years afterwards, would be represented by the number 58; a fall of nearly 8 per cent in total value. But that does not tell the whole story. The numbers above named report only the proportion of the total value in money of the commerce. While the total value had thus fallen 8 per cent, the bulk of the commerce—the number of gallons, bushels, yards, and pounds—had increased in this proportion: The number representing all these bushels, yards, gallons, and pounds in 1873 was 38, and the number representing the same in 1887 was 56. Now, to make it plain, 38 of these bushels, gallons, yards, and pounds in 1873 sold for $62, and in 1887 56 of them sold for only $58. This same fall is shown in the returns of the years 1891, 1892, 1893, showing a large shrinking in value and a large increase in bulk. This shrinkage still continues. Dun's Trade Review, a first-class authority, shows that prices fell in August, 1894, to the lowest point ever reached prior to that time, and yet prices, as shown by the same journal, were lower in December, 1894, than in August of that year.

Many of the most intelligent gold-standard monometallists admit that this fall is in a great measure attributable to silver demonetization. Governor Stone admits that demonetization was a contributing cause. But some claim that the fall is attributable to improvements in machinery—cheapening production.

Undoubtedly there is some truth in this as to some articles. But as showing the difference between an increasing currency and a diminishing currency, I call attention to the well-known fact that improvements in machinery have all along been made. They were as great and important (and many claimed more so) between 1850 and 1873 as since, and yet we see prices rising all along from 1850 to 1873. I have no doubt that some of the fall in some of the articles manufactured mainly by machinery is due to improved machinery and cheaper methods, and so far as the fall is so attributable it is a benefit to mankind; but the far greater part came from silver demonetization, a scarcity of money, and a consequent inability of the people to buy. To that extent it is an unmitigated curse.

OVERPRODUCTION.

But it is again said that the falling prices are attributable to overproduction. In one sense there is overproduction, and that occurs whenever more commodities are produced than the people are able to buy at fair and remunerative prices, and this kind of overproduction comes whenever there is commercial and financial distress, when business lags and enterprise is hampered and the gains of the people are so diminished that they are unable to make their accustomed purchases. This kind of overproduction now affects us, coming from a contracting currency, as compared with the work money has to do; a scarcity of money; the low prices of labor and of the products of labor. I have before me a table made by one of the most intelligent men I ever knew, a farmer of Kansas, in which he states the average gains per acre of the farmer who raised corn, cotton, oats, and hay, for periods of five years, commencing in 1866 and ending 1893.

These gains or products per acre were in the first five-year period, as an average of the whole, $15.64 per acre, and in 1893 they were $8.15—a reduction of nearly one-half, $8.35 being the value per acre of cotton in 1893. If we bring this down to 1894, we find the average product of the cotton farmer to be not more than $5 or $6 per acre. This writer also adds that it is highly probable that agricultural products since 1885 have not exceeded the cost of production, so that of the 30,000,000 workers on farms those who have worked their own farms have made no more than reasonable wages for agricultural labors, throwing in the use of their land free of rent, and could purchase only the bare necessaries of life.

I wish to ask the farmers now present here if this is a true statement as to them? I wish every farmer here who on the average in the last five years has produced more than a fair return for his work as a laborer, with no charge for rent, to make it known. If there be any who have done better than this, I must ask them to rise, stand, and be counted. I have been looking for such a farmer for years and have not found him. [Not one rises.]

So, you see, my friends, that the purchasing power of the 30,000,000 of farmers in the United States has been so reduced, not being able to buy what they once bought; that there is that kind of overproduction which comes from a destruction of the purchasing power of the people. Increase this purchasing power and there will be no surplus.

That there has been overproduction in the sense that more commodities have been produced than the world needs and will buy under fair financial conditions I deny.

One-half of mankind at least—being a majority of the women, all infants of tender years, the diseased and disabled from any cause—are unable to produce anything, though they are all consumers.

At least a half of this capable one-half—including merchants, bankers, traders, seamen, railroad men and others engaged in land and water transportation, Government officials of all kinds, men and officers in the immense armies and navies in the world, the domestic servants of the rich, produce nothing. Of the remaining fourth, many are idle and will not labor; many from the financial condition of the world are enforced tramps and idlers, unable to procure work; many have either acquired or inherited that independence in estate that labor of any kind is unnecessary.

These and many others not enumerated deducted from the remaining fourth have so reduced the producing classes that with all the machinery possible they are unable to supply the wants of mankind. And yet, according to our gold friends, we have hard times; depression, wherein men are starving because too much food has been grown, and are freezing because too much clothing has been made.

To show clearly that this seeming overproduction is, in fact, but that surplus of commodities which remains unconsumed because the purchasing power of the great mass of the people has almost been wiped out, I will call attention to the fact that we never hear of any overproduction in those articles which are consumed by those whose purchasing power is not affected by the hard times. Did you ever hear of an overproduction of champagne wine, or of that old brandy worth $20 a gallon, or of one-thousand-dollar saddle horses, of diamonds and gems and spices, or of those silks and satin tissues, finer than a spider's web, used to adorn those celestial beauties whom fortune has made the wives and daughters of millionaires and of the great magnates of finance who control the money of the world? Never! Did you ever hear of an overproduction of gold and silver? Alas! I am too fast. We now hear of an overproduction of silver, caused by a denial by law of the right of the producing classes to use it in the only mode in which they can use it—as money.

But I proceed now to consider the alleged overproduction in which you are mostly interested—the alleged overproduction of

cotton. Cotton is the cheapest of all the textiles suitable for clothing. It is for that reason the clothing of the masses throughout the world. So true is this that in some countries where cotton cloth simply is not warm enough for winter clothing, they double the cloth and place inside a padding of raw cotton—like our quilts and comforts—and thus use it for clothing. Dyes have been discovered which give as brilliant and lasting colors to cotton fabrics as are given to wool or silk. Improvements have been made in the staple, so that the finest and most delicate fabrics are produced. Then such improvement in the cheapness of manufacture has been attained in late years that now not one-third part of the cost of cotton yarn consists of the manufacturing of it, more than two-thirds being the cost of the raw material; whereas in 1779 the raw material was only one-eighth and the spinning seven-eighths of the cost. In 1819–1821 one hand in the mills produced 968 pounds of cotton cloth as compared with 5,900 pounds in 1887, and there have been vast improvements since. So that year by year the cost of cotton cloth has been approaching nearer and nearer to the cost of the raw cotton, whereby the demand for cotton cloth has been growing and growing, and production has been increasing and increasing to satisfy an ever augmenting demand for cotton goods.

The insufficiency of the supply of raw cotton for the needs of the world has caused kings, emperors, potentates, and great manufacturers to ransack the world to get more cotton. Millions have been spent in efforts by these men to have more cotton grown. They have spent immense sums in irrigation works to make the parched and thirsty earth yield the cotton fruitage to the plow of the husbandman, and in building railroads and canals to reach old cotton fields, and in bringing into cultivation new ones. And yet the world has never been supplied.

Let us look at some statistics about the matter. In the decade 1851–1860 the cotton crop of the United States was more than doubled, yet the demand was so great that the price in 1860 was as high as it was in 1851. That was before the demonetization of silver. Now, take a ten years under the influence of that baleful act, to wit, 1881–82 to 1891–92. In that decade the American crop increased only 65 per cent, though in it is included the largest crop ever grown up to that time, namely, 9,018,000 bales in 1891–92, and yet the price under the increase of only 65 per cent fell 60 per cent, instead of keeping up even as it did in the first decade named, when production was increased over 100 per cent. Everybody can understand the significance of these figures.

THE LARGE VISIBLE SUPPLY.

But our gold friends are not satisfied with this; they point to the large visible supply at the end of each season—the hundreds of thousands of bales on hand to commence the new season with.

These men forget that in these later years the consumption of cotton and cotton goods has enormously increased, and consequently that the demands of the manufacturers for raw cotton has also enormously increased—the weekly consumption of the mills being now immensely larger than ever—and that the supply in sight at the end of the season, as compared with other seasons, should be counted by the number of weeks—working weeks of the mills for which it is sufficient, rather than the number of bales. Taking this only true test, we find that on the 31st of August, 1861, the supply on hand or in sight was for a less number of weeks than in sight on the 31st of August, 1891, yet the average price for the year ending August 31, 1861, when this larger surplus existed, was 7.63d. as against 5.06d. in year ending August 31, 1891. The surplus in sight August 31, 1892, was also less than on August 31, 1861, and the price had fallen from 7.63d. to 4.18d. The same is true as to the next year, when the price was only 4.75d. as against 7.63 in 1861, and the same is also true the next year—ending August 31, 1894—last year, and you know what the price was then.

The least attention to the ordinary routine duties of family life would have taught our gold friends that as the demand grows large—as the number of consumers increase—the surplus of any kind of supplies at the end of a season is to be estimated and then compared with the supplies of another season when there was a less demand and fewer consumers; not by the actual pounds of supply on hand, but by the number of days or weeks or months for which the supplies would last. A supply for a family consisting of husband and wife for so many weeks or months would be vastly smaller in amount than a supply for the same family for the same period when it had increased to ten or a dozen in number. .

So you see that what emperors, czars, parliaments, and millionaire manufacturers could not do—cause overproduction—has been effected by bankers and bondholders; they have made overproduction by destroying the power of the people to buy what they need.

We have now seen that prices, especially of cotton, have declined regularly since demonetization in 1873, keeping equal pace with the growing scarcity of money as compared with the population and the growing commerce of the world, that the fall is attributable in but a small part, if at all, to improved and cheaper methods of production, and that the clamor of overproduction is a myth; that all these facts, taken in connection with the continually rising prices till the very year of demonetization, make such a conclusive chain of evidence as to establish beyond all doubt that demonetization was the cause.

But our gold friends, driven from every post, have made their next stand on the quicksand that low prices do no harm.

LOW PRICES NO REMEDY.

They say that if we are compelled to sell at low prices we also buy at low prices and in the end there is no difference. But the slightest reflection will teach us that in our present situation, certain to continue many years, low prices in purchases can be no compensation for low prices in sales; besides our condition is that we have had continually falling prices and not stable prices, even when very low. Without going into an extended argument on this point it is sufficient here to note that there are certain fixed charges that have not been reduced. Taxes have not been reduced. Salaries and pensions and railroad freights, on cotton at least, have not been reduced, and there are certain other charges which are fixed by custom, as fees of lawyers and physicians, that have not been reduced. At the present low prices, when all these have been paid out of the small income coming to the farmer from the low prices of cotton, the remainder has a far less purchasing power than the sum remaining after these payments have been made when prices are high.

To illustrate, we will suppose the purchasing power of a farmer who does all his work is five bales of cotton which at 10 cents a pound would bring $250. If these fixed charges, as I have stated, should, on an average, be $50 altogether, that would leave him $200 for the purchase of commodities.

Suppose cotton and all the commodities he purchases should fall one-half, so that the farmer's crop of five bales would bring only $125. In this case $75 would remain to purchase commodities instead of $200 as in the first case. But, as commodities have only fallen one-half, he should have $100 to purchase the same amount as before the fall; but he has only $75, a loss of one-fourth. He must increase his product one-third to make this good.

This means he must, by increased hours of labor, add two days' labor to each week; or if he worked nine hours before, with high prices, he must work twelve hours a day with the low prices to have the same amount of commodities. The difference between nine hours and twelve hours a day is the difference between health and vigor on the one hand and sickness and languor on the other—between cheerfulness and despair, between leisure for social enjoyment and mental improvement and that treadmill, constant, wearying labor, which sends the laborer to his bed for repose as soon as the allotted hours of labor have been completed. But it so happens, my friends, that while the price of all commodities has fallen on the average, as some claim, 33⅓ per cent, which is the exact equivalent to an increase of 50 per cent in the purchasing power of gold, yet agricultural products, especially cotton, have fallen much more. The price of middling cotton in New Orleans in February, 1873, when silver was demonetized, was 19¼ cents; the price in January, 1895, was a shade above 5 cents. Within a small fraction of three-fourths of the price has been lost.

I have not time to explain to you why agricultural prices, when there is a shrinkage in the volume of money, generally fall more proportionately than other prices.

But you see, not so much from what I have said as from your own observation and experience, that the fall in the price of things you buy is no compensation for the fall in the prices of cotton.

DEBTORS ARE RUINED BY LOW PRICES.

The low prices of commodities, however much they may mitigate the sufferings of those who have need for money only to make purchases, are utterly destructive to those who owe debts.

Governor Stone, in his letter announcing his platform for his canvass for the place of United States Senator, states that he recognizes the deplorable condition of debtors and sympathizes with them as deeply as any.

But does he recognize how many debtors there are in the United States and in the world? Does he recognize that under the gold standard, as now operating in the United States and Europe, producing the scarcity of gold which has caused Mr. SHERMAN to say there was a scramble for its possession by every nation now going on, gold has increased about 50 per cent in value?

PUBLIC DEBTS.

No man can escape entirely the burden of the public debt of the world, even of countries in which he pays directly no taxes. Bondholders, holders of the public debts of the nations, since they have increased to their present immense dimensions have a mortgage on the labor and property of every man in civilized states. This public debt of the world amounts to more than $30,000,000,000. The bonds to secure this immense sum are not held locally, but are distributed throughout the world, mainly among that class who have such claims on the industry and production of the world that they absolutely dominate the fortunes of mankind. The annual demands of this class on the production of mankind for interest on public debts alone, estimating the average interest at 3½ per cent, would be over $1,000,000,000.

These men are generally engaged in no business. They neither

plow nor spin nor build railways nor ships nor the great shops in which the manufactures of the world are carried on. They simply draw interest—that never-ceasing growth of capital which augments the wealth of the receiver—every day, every hour, every minute, in sunshine and in storm, in seasons of prosperity and in those sad years when pestilence and famine, like avenging furies, leave death and desolation in their track. These bondholders, idle as to production, yet ever active and vigilant to make more investments of the large surplus of income over their wants, cry for more bonds. And they always get them, and generally at their own prices. They still demand an augmentation of the interest-bearing debt. These bondholders get annually in interest from the nations about one-fourth of all the gold in the world. This must be paid by taxation. Each State bears directly the taxes it has to pay, but all nations, buying from and selling to each other, bear a portion of the taxes of each, for taxes enhance the cost of production, and whoever buys any part of the production must pay a part of this enhanced price. Taxes also decrease the purchasing power of the producer, so whoever sells to a tax-ridden people must either sell less or take less for what he sells.

I would like to pursue this interesting question further, but time will not permit it. Suffice it to say that commerce has so tied together the interests of civilized nations that a calamity to one is a calamity to all; and this calamity of a small money volume, confined to gold alone, controlled through its insufficiency by the money magnates of the world, may be increased and magnified at the will of these magnates.

The debt of the United States, State, Territory, and subdivisions in 1890 was $2,027,170,546. Combined taxes of all these $1,040,433,013, being two-thirds of all the money in the country.

PRIVATE DEBTS.

Let us consider now the condition of private debts, due by private persons. Who are they that owe no debts at all? Very few. I pass over all that large class of debtors who either have no property to mortgage or who are so solvent that mortgages are not demanded of them; I pass also over that large class who have given mortgages on personal property only. Every one of these also has his burden increased by low prices.

We have some statistics as to mortgages of real estate. The census tables of 1890 show that in the ten years, 1880 to 1889, there were over nine and a half millions mortgages made, representing an incurred indebtedness of a fraction over $12,000,000,000, nearly eight times as much money as there was in the United States during that period.

Now notice the next item. As we receded from the year 1873, as prices went on falling, the annual number of mortgages increased, as well as the mortgaged indebtedness. The number created in 1880 was 643,143 and in 1889, the last year of the decade, the number was 1,226,323, the increase being over 90½ per cent, and the yearly incurred indebtedness increased from a small fraction over seven hundred and eleven millions in 1880 to a small fraction over one thousand seven hundred millions, or 146½ per cent, in 1889. Does this tell no story of increasing debt and distress under the operation of demonetization?

In 1880 the number of acres mortgaged, excluding town lots covered by mortgages, was 42,743,000; in 1889 they had increased to 70,678,000, or 65½ per cent.

At the end of the decade January 1, 1890, the amount due and unpaid on real-estate mortgages was $6,019,679,985, secured by 4,777,698 mortgages.

So you see that not only the number of mortgages was increased, but also the amount secured. These show that over four and three-quarter million adults out of our population were under mortgage, and that they owed in January, 1890, over $6,019,000,000, or nearly four times as much money as all the money in the United States, and nearly twice as much as the gold money of the world. If the mortgaged indebtedness on land increased in the same proportion (a very fair supposition) in the half decade, 1890–1894, there would be due on January 1, 1895, over $9,000,000,000 on them and the debtors would be seven and one-half millions. In 1890 there were 12,690,152 families in the United States. Of these more than one-half, or 52 per cent, did not own their homes and farms. Only 48 per cent were owners. Of these owning families 28 per cent owned subject to incumbrance.

The annual interest charged on real-estate mortgages amounted to $397,442,762.

These alone, without considering debtors who gave no mortgages, are enough to make one pause before he would consent to a policy which would increase these burdens. Would any good, kind-hearted man add one feather's weight to the burdens of a man who had his home, his shelter for his wife and children, under mortgage?

RAILROAD DEBTS.

I call attention now to the railroad debts. These are strictly private, not public, obligations. They are, however, of deep moment in considering the money question.

The debts of all the railroads in the United States in 1894 amounted to $5,968,398,155, more than three and one-half times all the money in the country. Their debts and stocks together amounted to $10,796,437,813. They must pay interest on the debt and dividends on the stock. They can only pay them by levying taxes or tolls on the people and ultimately on the producers of the country. So every producer, every cotton raiser, owes a part of this debt and regularly pays it? These liabilities have increased in one year more than two hundred and ninety millions under the repeal of the Sherman law. So you see increasing debt on each one of you and decreasing means of payment from lower and lower prices. This burden is still further increased by a diminution in amount of freight carried. In the year 1893, all but two months of which was under the Sherman law, and all of which was under the operation of a ready-made panic, commencing December 1, 1892, the number of tons carried were 745,119,482. In 1894, under the promised blessings of the repeal of the Sherman law, the number fell to 638,186,553, a loss of 107,932,829 tons, or over 15 per cent. The people have to make this good out of the small earnings coming from low prices. Thus also it is shown that while the people had the benefit of low prices, they were unable to purchase by 15 per cent as much as they purchased under the higher, though very low, prices of 1893.

Do our gold friends think that low prices do no harm, when under their operation the purchasing power of the people is reduced 15 per cent in one year? Now, with these results, lower and lower prices, and the increasing value of gold as shown in its increased purchasing power, all coming from the demonetization of silver, and increased and intensified by the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, it would seem a plain duty to give relief to the suffering people.

GOVERNOR STONE'S VIEWS CONSIDERED—GOLD DEBTORS.

Governor Stone, in his letter before referred to, says that he recognizes the deplorable condition of debtors, and sympathizes as deeply as any, and would spare no effort in their behalf.

I am glad to know that Governor Stone regards this sad condition of debtors as deplorable—that it is a good cause for weeping and mourning—and I am glad to know that these unfortunates, who are being crushed to the earth by the appreciating power of gold, have his sympathies. He pledges his every effort in their behalf. But what does he promise? Nothing that he can perform.

Agreeing, as he says, with us, that the conditions are bad, he holds out no ray of hope except an international agreement for remonetization.

This means that Governor Stone recognizes the necessity for more money to remove this bad condition, and yet is unwilling we should have it unless other nations shall consent to have it also. He admits that the rehabilitation of silver would be a proper remedy, a proper medicine for the sick and dying debtor, for a ruined and distressed people, but he says the debtor, the people, shall not have the medicine unless emperors, kings, and bankers shall consent that their people shall also take it. And then he says at the close of his letter that as he will not, if elected, take his seat until 1899, he may never have an opportunity of participating in legislation on the subject of free coinage of silver, and therefore intimates that the question may be settled before he can have such opportunity.

In this condition he places himself on this most important subject: "I offer myself as a doctor to an afflicted people. I know they are sick—so sick as to furnish good cause for tears. I know that more silver money is a good remedy; but the people must not take this remedy unless Europe will take it also; and besides, the people may not need me for a doctor at all, as they may get well or die before the time comes when I can act under my employment."

The governor, however, is prepared to give a prescription for present use, a soothing plaster or an opiate. He advises the sick and languishing people—so sick as to call forth tears from his eyes and the deepest sympathies of his heart—to keep quiet, not to make any complaint, not to agitate for relief; for if this agitation looks like it would be successful, it would be especially calamitous to the debtors of the country. And how is successful agitation, promising a free coinage of silver at an early day, to injure debtors?

The answer to this as given by Governor Stone is certainly the most remarkable statement ever made in political economy. Governor Stone, it will be noticed, says nothing of gold appreciating or getting higher from the prohibition by law to coin silver in competition with it. I infer from what he says of the relative prices of cotton in 1859 and 1860 and in 1889 and 1890 that he does not believe that gold has appreciated to any noticeable extent, if at all. In other words, that gold has maintained its stable value notwithstanding a destruction among the commercial nations of one-half of the volume of money as primary money, leaving gold alone to perform the duty once imposed on both metals; notwithstanding the continuous fall in prices since 1873 until now, gold still holds the power of perfect stability; yet if the people agitate for the restoration of silver as full money and our agitation goes to a point where it will look like success is certain, the gold will

lose its power of stability—so commended by the gold-standard men—and go to a higher price. That is his idea.

It is utterly fallacious. Let us illustrate. Suppose Congress had the power, and should exercise it, to declare that no cotton with a staple under an inch and a quarter should be made into cloth. Would that not at once raise the price of all cotton of longer staple, and especially if this short staple was of an amount about equal to the longer staple? We all see it would.

Then, again, suppose the people, seeing that the uses for cotton other than for cloth were so limited as to depress its value greatly, and should agitate for a repeal of the law, and agitate to the point suggested by Governor Stone, that success would seem certain, so that in a short time the short staple cotton would be used as it once was for making cloth. Does anyone doubt that the holders of the long staple cotton, seeing this competition to be certain in the near future, would at once begin to sell at lower prices? Would they hold it to the very day when short staple cotton would be made into cloth; and especially would they ask a higher price for it? Everyone knows how this would be. Then can anyone tell why holders of gold, already appreciated from 50 to 75 per cent by the demonetization of silver, would still hold it higher and higher when it became certain that silver would be restored to its old constitutional function of a money metal? Governor Stone has not explained this.

In another part of his letter Governor Stone states that by the free coinage of silver the country would lose its gold and thereby $600,000,000 in gold will be driven out of circulation. Yes, out of circulation; that is the word. I remark in passing, first, that there is no gold in circulation in this country except among the bankers and bondholders in New York and other large money centers; second, that counting the gold held by them as in circulation, Governor Stone has the amount largely too high, the amount being only $480,275,057, as shown by the Treasury statement made July 1, being about $19,000,000 less than in July, 1894. Where would the gold go when driven out? It would go somewhere; it would not go into the clouds and set itself up as twinkling stars to beautify and adorn the heavens. It would go to Europe—to England principally. And this large addition to the money of Europe, by a universally recognized law of money, disputed by no one, not even by Governor Stone—this addition to the money of Europe would raise prices there, including our cotton, which is exactly the same thing as causing a fall in the value of gold. * * *

THE SILVER DEBTOR—GOVERNOR STONE'S VIEWS.

But there is another class of debtors for whom Governor Stone also has the deepest sympathy, and whom he finds it equally impossible to benefit and whom he thinks it will also ruin if more money is to be added to the currency of the country.

These are also to be ruined in advance by the development of enough strength by the free-coinage men to make it probable that they will elect a majority of the next Congress and the next President. This, he thinks, will be to serve notice on creditors not holding gold obligations that within two years they are to be paid in a depreciated currency, and that they will therefore at once commence operations to collect their debts.

Luckily, however, debts are not collectable, even by gold-standard creditors, until they are due, and it is not two years till a free-silver President and Congress will be elected.

If the people in the State who owe debts have been unable to pay them when they matured this inability arises in a great measure from the low price of cotton, the returns being such as to allow little, if anything, with which to pay debts. If cotton is still to continue at the present prices, or near them, if the currency is still to remain contracted, no good can come to insolvent debtors by granting them longer delay in payment. The accumulation of interest, with losses arising from raising cotton at prices below the cost of production, could but add to their distress.

But the governor is equally in error as to the dangers to this class of debtors as he was in relation to the others.

There would be no economic business reasons why creditors having debts payable in lawful money would hasten collections lest they should be paid two years thereafter in the same money exactly. But the Governor thinks that this same lawful money would be depreciated—that is, less valuable—after remonetization than now, and therefore creditors would hasten to get this very same money now and keep it for the two years in order that they may have it on hand when the depreciation takes place. Stop and think and see whether this is not the exact proposition which receives Governor Stone's assent. Nobody proposes to put less silver into the dollar under free coinage than is in it now; so the silver dollar will be the same then as now. No change is proposed in the greenback dollar, or in any other dollar; they will all be exactly the same then as now. The difference, in the Governor's opinion, is that this same money will be depreciated, to what extent he does not inform us. Now the creditor pressing for collection, as predicted by Governor Stone, will press to receive the same money, and the same money will depreciate exactly as much in his hands as it would in the hands of his debtor.

Oh! but it may be said the creditor will seek to collect it now in order to invest it in property. But Governor Stone closes out this avenue by stating that all enterprises into which capital enters would cease, general suspension of business would ensue, and universal bankruptcy prevail. Under these conditions men who hold money never part with it—they hoard it. So then we have this absurd and ridiculous conclusion as the result of the Governor's reasoning on the subject, that creditors will insist on collecting their debts at once, lose all interest on them for two years in order that they may have on hand the very money which is then to be depreciated, according to his views. What have they made by this? Nothing. They have lost the interest.

There is no further exposure of the fallacy of the Governor's views needed.

THE RATIO OF 16 TO 1.

I notice now the last ditch in which the gold-standard men have intrenched themselves. They assert that the market price of silver as a commodity is about 32 to 1, and if we have unrestricted coinage we will have a 50-cent dollar of silver and this will drive out all the gold, and we will have silver monometallism. I admit there is plausibility in this argument, and it needs to be met with candor and fairness. The free-coinage men mean to have bimetallism as we had prior to 1873, and we do not mean by any rash experiment, however much we desire free coinage, to so act as to place our country in a position it did not occupy prior to that date.

I agree that law alone can not fix the value—that is, the exchangeable value—of anything. If Congress should enact that the value of every bushel of wheat shall be $1, and of every bushel of corn 50 cents, and of every pound of cotton 10 cents, I admit that the law would be utterly worthless, and that these articles would sell just as if no such law had been enacted. I also admit that if Congress and all the parliaments in Europe should enact that silver bullion, or that part of it not admitted to coinage, should be worth 100 cents or 129 cents an once—that such a law would not have the slightest effect on the price of silver bullion; and an international agreement between the United States and the principal nations in Europe to the same effect would be utterly valueless. Silver bullion, uncoined and uncoinable, would have the same value as before. Being but a commodity, with no use but a commodity use, its value would be fixed by the market sales, the demand and the supply. Then some one at first blush would say: "Why have free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, or at any other ratio, either by the independent action of the United States or by international agreement?"

A solution, I am sure, will be found in the following considerations. While it is true that law can not, by its mere enactment, give value to anything, law can increase the values of things or diminish them, by providing for their use for purposes, or prohibiting their use for purposes, which are highly esteemed by mankind, or for purposes for which the demand of mankind is great and urgent. An actual example in history of the increase in the value of a commodity by providing for its greater use is in the old laws of England, enacted to raise the price of wool, that no person should be buried except in shrouds or clothing made of wool. Decent burial is a necessity for every human being, at some time, and this exigent demand for wool, in addition to other demands, kept wool at a high price.

So the demonetization of silver in 1873 had both of these effects. It prohibited, in a large measure, the use of silver as money, a use to which it had been put for ages, and for which it is admirably adapted, and of course silver became less valuable in comparison with gold, which, by the same act, was increased in price, by compelling its sole use as primary money. As in case of burial, wool was essential; so in business, everyone must have money, and gold alone remained primary money. A very little reflection and one more illustration need only be made to prove this beyond doubt. Take the illustration I submitted some time back about long and short staple cotton—a law prohibiting short staple from being made into cloth. Short staple has always been used for that purpose.

Cotton cloth is one of the most urgent of human wants. Under such a law, long staple cotton would immediately rise greatly in price, to meet the exigent demands of humanity for clothing and other purposes, and short staple would go down, because one of the most important uses to which it could be applied had been taken from it. Long staple would go up several cents a pound and the other would go down, whereby the ratio of the value of the two would be greatly disturbed. But does anyone doubt that if the law should be repealed and short staple cotton should be admitted freely to the use of the weavers of the world—that then long staple would go down and short staple would go up, so that the old ratio in the value between them would be completely restored?

If this is so with reference to a thing which the world could do without, for, though it would be greatly inconvenient to do so, the world can be clothed and clothed fairly well without cotton by substituting for it wool, silk, flax, hemp, ramie, and many other textiles, why is it not true with reference to that thing without which the world can not live—the most exigent and essential of

all human demands—money, which in itself and of itself supplies every human want? He who has money enough can want for nothing that is for sale in all the world. Money is in fact, as was well said by an eminent political economist, an order drawn by the Government in favor of the owner on all persons who have things for sale. Present the order and it is always and everywhere honored. A man may have a surplus of any commodity, which he may desire to exchange for some other commodity which he needs, but he may spend days in finding a man who wants his particular commodity and at the same time has a surplus of the particular commodity he wishes to procure. But every person wants money—and he wants more and more the more he has; he never has a surplus, and he is always ready and willing to exchange any surplus commodity he has for money. The desire for money is insatiable, and it is never satisfied for the reason that it commands all desirable earthly things. It commands not only that which satisfies our physical wants, but all that ministers to fancy or is craved by ambition or greed. It makes emperors and kings, presidents, senators, and governors. It overthrows empires, sets up new dynasties, makes war, and concludes peace.

The difference between uncoined and uncoinable silver or gold and gold or silver money is the difference between weakness and strength—the difference between what a few want in limited quantities and what all want in unlimited quantities.

I admit, my friends, that what I have thus far said, while it does completely establish that a ratio agreed on by all mankind between gold and silver coin would be stable, or so nearly so that variations in it would be practically harmless, yet it does not establish beyond doubt that in the present order the United States alone can effect this, though it goes a long way to prove it. I admit that you have a right to demand that I go further in my proof before you assent fully to the proposition that the United States, with the other silver peoples, can maintain this parity without the cooperation of some of the most powerful nations in Europe.

While once I believed this could be done only for a limited time, yet, as I stated then, that limited time would extend a long distance into the future. Subsequent reflection and subsequent experience in actual events, and a more thorough knowledge of the present and past monetary systems of mankind, have satisfied me that that long period, in which free coinage by the independent action of the United States without the cooperation of the silver-using nations will keep the metals at a parity, will extend into an indefinite future, as far ahead of us as existing institutions of any kind are likely to remain.

In order to determine what can be done by human action, it is well to consider what has been accomplished by the same agency.

During the present century, up to 1873, the market value of gold and silver varied but little from the French ratio of 15½ to 1—generally a little above it—occasionally a little below. And this stability in the ratio was maintained, notwithstanding that from 1801 to 1871, and even up to the year 1894, there was the greatest variation in the relative production of the two metals, varying from 29 cents' worth of silver to $1 of gold in 1851–60, to $3.22 of silver to $1 of gold in the years 1801–10, and ranging between these two the remainder of the time. Treating these metals as commodities merely, to be sold in the market for non-monetary uses, the stability in this ratio would have been impossible, for we all know that the increase of the supply of any commodity tends to decrease its value, and a decrease in the supply tends to raise its value. So we see that there was some other thing, some other force in operation during that period than the market value of the metals or commodities, which prevented a variation in the relative prices of gold and silver with the enormous variations in their relative supply.

That thing—that force—was the bimetallism of France fixing the ratio of price at 15½ to 1, and this seems now to be agreed upon by all candid gold monometallists.

As showing the potency of the French law by itself, I will notice the other agencies operating during that period to destroy the parity as fixed by the French ratio. Among these are: Demonetization of silver by England, demonetization of gold by Germany (taking place at different times), and, I believe, by the Scandinavian States, and the fact that the United States had a different ratio, namely, 15 to 1, till 1834, and afterwards 16 to 1. France was a first-class nation during this period, but during a large portion of it engaged in most ruinous and destructive wars. But France was not the greatest commercial nation, England being first then as now. Yet with all these variations in the relative production of the two metals, and all these changes in the monetary systems of Europe and the United States, France held the two metals everywhere at about the ratio she had fixed by law. Note, I said, the parity was maintained everywhere.

You have a right to demand of me an explanation of this. The explanation is that France was a great and rich country, having much to sell and buying much; that metallic money, gold and silver, was then and always will be in insufficient supply for the needs of the world—as witness the unsafe and dangerous devices to supply more to which I have alluded—doing 95 per cent of cash transactions on confidence and 5 per cent only with money, the banks lending three times the whole volume of our currency and six times their capital, and owing in demand obligations nine times as much as their cash and cash items. I say the insufficiency of such money was then and is now felt everywhere. So, under these conditions, a dollar. or a franc, good in France, a rich and great country, was equally good everywhere in the civilized world. But you may ask why the silver franc, legal-tender money in France, was equally good in gold monometallic countries (less the cost of transportation to France), when it was not a legal tender in those countries. The answer is, there is such an urgent, such an overmastering demand for money everywhere that money, good and legal tender in one great commercial country, meets this exigent demand everywhere.

Our present 50-cent dollar, as our gold friends call it, is worth 100 cents here, and worth the same all over commercial Europe, less the usual cost of transporting it to New York. Then I might ask our gold friends in return why it is that gold is worth in China the same as in London and in New York, though not recognized as money there? The answer is the same: The need of the world for money is such that either gold or silver, recognized as money, legal-tender money at a certain value in any great commercial country or countries, is of the same value everywhere. Then they may ask why the silver money of China, Japan, and Mexico is not worth as much in other countries as at home. The answer is, that these countries have little foreign commerce, little domestic commerce, and the economic forces behind their money are not therefore sufficient to raise its value in other countries to the home level.

These are plain truths, easily understood and incontrovertible, and they contain the solution of the problem before us.

The United States in territory, leaving out Alaska, is larger than all Europe, leaving out Russia. Their soil and climate are unequaled. The range of their productions covers nearly all that is valuable to man and all that is essential to human happiness. Taking the silver-using countries, there is produced in them and in the United States together every necessity and every comfort of human life. We are 70,000,000 people, and are increasing at the rate of 2 per cent per annum. Our country is comparatively new and undeveloped. More and better houses, roads and bridges, railroads and canals are needed. Money is needed to make them. We ought not to borrow that money from abroad, and would not if we had a sufficiency. Our mines are more cheaply worked and turn out more than those of other countries. The immense and valuable forests which now obstruct the farmer's plow need to be cleared away to make homes for our increasing population, 52 per cent of whom are landless. More and better schoolhouses and church edifices are needed, more museums, more galleries of art, more public libraries,

Our population is the most industrious and the most productive of all peoples and consumes more commodities, and therefore needs more money, than any other.

A great statistician and a gold monometallist, Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts, has stated in a public speech that we consume more than do 200,000,000 of the people of Europe—about three times as much per capita. By the extreme subdivision of labor now existing and still progressing, no man produces one hundredth part of the commodities he needs. He produces to sell for money with which to supply his wants. As production increases so does consumption, and so does the need for more and more money.

Let us compare our country a little further with Europe. I take my figures from an English statistican of world-wide renown, Mr. Mulhall.

The merchandise transported on our railroads is double that carried on all the railways in all the other countries in the world. I add that the merchandise carried on our waterways is one-quarter of that carried on the railways. All this merchandise is bought with money and sold for money on an average at least three times. With twice as much merchandise carried and sold and consumed by our people as in all the world together, does it not look a little as if we needed twice as much money as all the world? Yet we have only about one-sixth as much gold (the only good money, according to our monometallic friends) as is possessed in Europe.

Mr. Mulhall gives us some further figures of immense importance in this connection. By superior energy and skill, by the use of more steam and electricity, greater labor-saving devices, the United States possess more productive power than Great Britain, France, and Germany all combined. When we consider the more than 4,000,000 men in the standing armies of Europe who produce nothing and the 1,000,000 necessary to feed and clothe them, we may safely say that the productive power of the United States is quite as great as that of all Europe. And yet our friends of the gold standard say that we can not do what France alone did for nearly one hundred years—maintain the parity between gold and silver at our old ratio, which was 3 per cent less favorable to silver than the French ratio.

I have dealt in figures only as to our country's power. I have not indulged in Fourth of July glorifications. These cold figures

prove beyond cavil our ability to establish, as England did, and as Germany did, our own monetary system without the consent of other nations. I quote from a distinguished enemy of independent action by the United States. He says:

In fact, at this moment our country is the richest in the world. It has in it every element of prosperity. * * * Nothing has ever been seen like the progress of this nation since the world began.

And now paraphrasing his further language to some extent, I say yet here we are, standing on the shores of the Atlantic, turning our backs on our own country and its greatness, and on the millions of our people suffering from the insufficiency of the volume of money, with our faces to Europe, we are begging, imploring, even on bended knees, monarchs and bankers across the ocean to allow us to use our grand powers and opportunities for still further progress in the advancement of our people.

I concur with Mr. Jefferson, who, in discussing foreign influence on our banks, foreign control of our finances, foreign dictation of the policies of our Government, the foreign possession and control of our newspapers, expressed the hope that we might find—

Some means of shielding ourselves in the future from foreign influence, political, commercial, or in whatever form it may be attempted.

And considering the ruin coming to us from this foreign influence, he used these words:

I can scarcely withhold myself from joining in the wish of Silas Deane, that there were an ocean of fire between us and the Old World.

And I reverently add than I can scarce refrain from joining in the same wish.

I have detained you too long for your comfort. The times seem to demand a compliance with the invitation of your committee to address you to-day. The subject is a great one—full of the deepest interest to you and to our whole country and to the latest posterity. The issues involved are no less than the control of our Government in its financial policy by the bankers of New York and of Europe or its control by the people.

The questions which underlie this issue, though plain to the common understanding, have been so obscured by sophistry and error that I deemed it a duty to discuss them at least as fully as I have done and to discuss them with candor, relying on facts rather than on eloquent declamation.

I thank you, one and all, for your attention under circumstances of discomfort. And in closing, allow me to express the hope, the prayer, that the Father who holds the destinies of men and nations in His hands may so guide and direct our actions and counsels that happiness and prosperity shall once again return and remain the everlasting heritage of the people of Mississippi and of the whole country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize any other gentleman who wishes to occupy the floor at this time.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until half past 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the House will take a recess until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Accordingly the House (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) was declared in recess.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the purchase of reindeer for Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mrs. H. H. Stevens, executrix of Wilkins Stevens, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General of the United States, replying to the House resolution of February 4 in relation to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2652) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 286); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HULICK, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3337) amending the act of June 8, 1880, entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint an officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps to perform the duties of Solicitor and Judge-Advocate-General, etc., and to fix the rank and pay of such officer, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 285); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 71) authorizing the preparation of a subject-catalogue of the books of the law library, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 290); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILBORN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4463) to grant two condemned cannon and cannon balls to the Thirteenth Separate Company, National Guard of the State of New York, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 292); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILBORN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5096) to grant two condemned cannon and two pyramids of cannon balls to the Indiana Soldiers' Home, at La Fayette, Ind., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 293); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5286) providing for disposal of lands lying within the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation, not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 294) thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 80) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass. (Report No. 287.)

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of the legal representatives and devisees of James W. Schaumburg. (Report No. 288.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 486) for the relief of William Henry Johnson. (Report No. 289.)

By Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 4510) for the appointment of Frank M. Marshall, as lieutenant on the retired list of the Army. (Report No. 291.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5677) to provide for the erection of a public building at McKeesport, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5678) authorizing convicts to be paroled—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5679) to repeal sections 4532, 4533, and 4534, and to amend sections 4516 and 4529 of the Revised Statutes, all relating to the employment, treatment, and payment of seamen on merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5680) to provide street entrances to alleys in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5681) to amend section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 6 of an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5682) to prevent the purchasing of or speculating in claims against the Federal Government by United States officers—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 5683) to provide for the compensation and promotion of consular clerks of the United States of America, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 5684) to increase the pension of veterans of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5685) to restore lands to private entry and render the same subject to be sold at private sale—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 5686) to segregate and return to the unreserved public domain certain land on the White Mountain Indian Reservation in Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 5687) to erect a light-house at East Point Shoal, in Raritan Bay, New Jersey—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5729) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 5730) to amend section 24 of an act entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PERKINS: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 18) providing for the distribution and sale of compiled statutes in force in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A resolution (House Res. No. 159) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information relating to the harbor of Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5688) granting a pension to Charles C. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 5689) for the relief of J. W. Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5690) granting an increase of pension to Carrie F. Bissell, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) granting an increase of pension to Sophia W. Buxton, of Durango, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 5692) for the relief of Stephen W. Parker—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5693) for the relief of the city of Racine—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS (by request): A bill (H. R. 5694) for the relief of Leo L. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5695) for the relief Francis Scala—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5696) providing for the hearing, trial, and adjudication by the United States Court of Claims of the claim of Albert Wood, and removing the same from the operations of the United States statute of limitations—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 5697) granting a pension to Surg. B. H. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) granting a pension to Surg. Harvey E. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5699) for the relief of the heirs of Carroll Winters—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5700) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Day, deceased, widow of Daniel Day, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5701) for the relief of Julius Stahel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5702) to pension Susan Woody, widow of James Woody, who served in the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 5703) granting a pension to Mary Macauley, widow of the late Brig. Gen. Daniel Macauley, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5704) to grant an honorable discharge to and remove the charge of desertion against W. T. Vick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 5705) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William Henderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5706) to grant L. O. Gooch an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) for the relief John Aldridge—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5708) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane C. Ducrsan, a daughter of Thomas Norman, a Revolutionary soldier—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5709) to pension John W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 5710) granting a pension to Eleanor L. Curtiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) granting a pension to Richard P. Pilkington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5713) granting a pension to George Gamache—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5714) to pension Carrie V. Millar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 5715) to remove the statutory bar of limitation now standing against the claim of J. Viosca, and conferring full jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to try and adjudicate said claim and render judgment therefor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5716) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alfred Duplantier, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5717) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5718) granting a pension to Malinda Kelly, of Jackson County, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 5719) to extend a patent of Joseph Zihlmann—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5720) for the relief of F. R. Lanson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 5721) to relieve Alice Utz, heir and legatee of Joshua Wiley, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitation—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5722) for relief of Daniel S. Miller, of Jasper County, Miss.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5723) for the relief of Helen M. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 5724) to remove the sentence of court-martial from the military record of John A. Swartzwelder, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5725) granting a pension to Mary H. Lamont—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5726) for the relief of Edward Rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 5727) granting an increase of pension to John Zartman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5728) to recognize Louis Semmler as of United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of J. C. Vansickle and 124 other citizens of Washington, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of the Western Tract Society, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in regard to changes in postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of 165 citizens of Fond du Lac, Montello, Wis., and vicinity, favoring an adequate appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor of Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COX: Petitions of A. G. Ezell and others, of Elkton, Tenn., J. D. Couch, T. R. Simerson, and others, of Williamson County, Tenn.; in regard to the claim of book agents of the Methodist Publishing House at Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York, in favor of a general bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of George W. Kircher and other citizens of Louisville, Ky., asking the adoption of a sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Western Massachusetts Union ex-Prisoners of War Association, in favor of pensioning all surviving veterans who were inmates of Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: Petition of A. G. Crofoot and others, of New Auburn, Minn., in regard to Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolutions passed at a meeting held in Chickering Hall, New York, November 21, 1895, and indorsed by Rev. William Gardner and 63 other citizens of Hanover, Jo Daviess County, Ill., urging the Government of the United States to make every possible effort to induce the Govern-

ments of Christendom to put an end to the intolerable state of affairs in Turkey, which threatens with extermination so many Armenian Christians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of citizens of Houghton, Rushford, Sherman, and Panama, N. Y., against the sale of beer and spirituous liquors to immigrants at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petitions of J. R. Rollinson and 50 other citizens of Rahway, N. J.; Luther Walling and 50 others, of Monmouth County, N. J.; Benjamin F. Clark and 90 others, of Boundbrook, N. J., urging the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petitions of P. O. Burnham, Frank Bohae, and others, of Oklahoma Territory, in favor of free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Memorial of the Odd Fellows' Hall Association of New Orleans, La., urging the passage of a bill for the payment of a judgment recovered in the Court of Claims (Congressional, No. 7226)—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of the executor of Mathew Harper, deceased, late of Floyd County, Ga., praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McEWAN: Petition of members of Jersey City Harbor, No. 6, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4242—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolutions adopted in mass meeting at Ocheydan, Iowa, January 24, 1896, in regard to the recent outrages in Asia Minor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOLE: Petitions of citizens of Syracuse and Canastota, N. Y., in the matter of the sale of beer on Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PUGH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2133, for the relief of Elizabeth Fugitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2452, for the relief of William T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2453, for the relief of George Coburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2454, for the relief of Allen Maze—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3908, for the relief of W. H. Copley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3909, for the relief of James Littleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3910, for the relief of Thomas Dean—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3911, for the relief of William E. Shepperd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3912, for the relief of Francis M. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4299, for the relief of Joseph H. Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3787, for the relief of H. C. Herndon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of Dr. J. H. Forrest and other professional gentlemen of Marion, Ind., stating their objections to Senate bill No. 325 and House bill No. 2652 to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dormansville, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloe's Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STRONG: Resolutions and petition of the Ministerial Association of Delaware, Ohio, in favor of raising the age of consent to 18 years, and for other changes in the laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4199, to correct the record of Edward H. Munson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 713, for the relief of Jacob Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3524, for the relief of James McGowan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Miami, Mo., for the improvement of the Missouri River at Miami—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 3528—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of George H. Smallwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of citizens of Warrens Corners, Niagara County, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 7, 1896.*

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 10.30 a. m., Saturday, February 8, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Speaker, more than five weeks ago we passed through this House in the brief period of two days a bill that, if enacted into law, would have relieved the present and future generations from an excessive interest burden and changed for the better the character of Government obligations. This measure in no way affected our currency system or disturbed the business or financial condition of our country; but it has now been returned to us from the Senate with every word except its number obliterated, and in its place has been substituted a most radical currency measure, which virtually establishes silver monometallism as our national currency.

Concurrently with the passage of the bill we sent to the Senate a measure which would have provided sufficient revenue to maintain the credit, meet the expenses, and pay the obligations of this Government. This measure certainly met the universal approval of all classes of our people, and yet we are informed that the same selfish interests propose also to return that wise measure to this House, obliterated in the same way, with a substitute identical in character with the one before us.

As a novice in the halls of Congress, I feel constrained to ask what character of statesmanship this may be called, and with what motives and with what purpose does the lordly branch of this Congress so act?

Our Chief Executive, in the paroxism of despair in which he found himself and the Treasury after the evil effects of his jingo message on the Venezuelan matter, appealed to Congress for assistance, and members of this House, including myself, were hastily summoned from our Christmas feasts and family circles to perform an important and sacred duty to our country.

We acted as we believed wisely and promptly, and as far as by our action we could gave to the Chief Executive and to our depleted Treasury the twofold relief desired. But what followed? The President ignored the acts of this House by proceeding to issue a hundred millions of bonds, running for a long period, and bearing a high rate of interest, while the Senate of the United States leisurely wets its silvery whistle with these two important measures.

This method of trying to securre legislation by whipping the devil around the stump does not seem becoming to a novice fresh from the country.

It seems to me that we are legislatively standing midway between the devil and the deep sea, and I for one am not willing to unite with his satanic majesty, who is bound to lead us into the clutches of the gold monometallists, and surrender our souls as meat for the shylocks; nor am I willing to be guided by the silver monometallists into the dangerous waters of the deep sea.

I gladly voted for the revenue bill, because it clearly granted needed relief to our Treasury, depleted by the destructive free-trade legislation of the past Congress. I also favored the bond bill, which was necessary in consequence of the same incompetent administration of our financial affairs; but, sir, I can not favor a substitute which is not at all germane to the question and entirely foreign to the original measure.

In view of the President's action in the sale of bonds, there is no immediate necessity for this measure. Therefore let us turn our attention to a subject upon which the American people are demanding the action of this House, and that, sir, should be a bimetallic currency bill providing for the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and a volume of currency that shall be equal to the population and the vast commercial interests of our country.

I am irrevocably opposed to the establishment of a gold monetary basis of currency in this country. My convictions and party principles emphatically pledge me to the restoration of silver to an equal position with gold in the currency of this nation. I am prepared to act upon a bill which shall tend to establish this object without waiting for a conference with any other nation.

Our forefathers were able to maintain our independence as a nation and establish a bimetallic currency without international agreement. We had courage to adopt tariff legislation for the prosperity and happiness of our people without consulting the interests of Europe.

We have, by the sacrifice of our best lifeblood and untold wealth, established liberty, freedom, and perpetual union, even against the hostile interests and unfriendly alliances of other nations, and now, sir, can it be claimed that this, the strongest, ablest, and wisest nation on the face of the globe, has not the courage or ability to establish and maintain a currency for its people without consulting the wishes or bowing to the dictates of the shylocks of Europe?

The people of this country, it seems to me, stand between two great evils, the one seeking to elevate the classes and degrade the masses

by means of an endless chain of glittering gold, having its strong link stapled to the house of Rothschild, and endeavoring to encircle within its glistening tentacles the American people in order to feast upon their lifeblood and wither their substance, and, on the other hand, a band of silver, with its main links well secured in the grasp of the kings of the silver mines of the world, whose bold champions seek to lure us within its circle for their selfish interests and our misfortune.

I believe, sir, in taking the middle of the highway between these two great metals, and through the wisdom of the members of this House guide the financial chariot along the safe and more moderate course that has in the past, and must certainly in the future, lead us into more prosperous times.

I have no sympathy with the statesman who does not possess sufficient conviction to give him courage to act upon the most important public issue of the present day.

Our people are universally demanding action. You ask how we may act so as to maintain a parity of values of the two metals? I would invite an immediate conference of the nations, ignoring Great Britain, and unless they would consent to an international bimetallic currency I would establish such a currency for this nation, limited to the coinage of the American product, and I would exclude the foreign product by a wise and most stringent protective tariff on the importation of bullion.

Mr. Speaker, I have filed a motion to refer this measure to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with instructions to prepare and submit to the House a bill that shall provide a currency for the United States, to be composed of both gold and silver as standard money, without regard to the currency laws of any other nation, and with such restrictions and under such provisions as will secure the maintenance of the parity of value of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal; and I trust it may be favorably considerd.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many disparaging remarks against the silver Senators and Members from the Western States, and I myself think that they are disposed to go to the extreme on the silver question, but the fault is not entirely with them. Their people have been watching with interest and fear the growth of the gold monster in the East and the dexterity with which the shylocks manipulate the present Democratic Administration in their interest, and they naturally demand radical action by their representatives with the hope of stemming the ruinous power of the gold monometallists.

While Eastern Senators and Representatives in their public utterances favor bimetallism, I fear there is a lurking influence and interest which withholds action, and I have no doubt should the Representatives of the great Middle States prepare and submit to this House a bimetallic currency bill, in accordance with the principles and platforms of the Republican party, we should have as much difficulty in securing favorable action thereon by those basking in the sunshine of the golden shylocks of Paradise alley, in New York City, as by the silver radicals of the Pacific Slope, but with a wise measure properly before this House for the establishment of a bimetallic currency I am confident we should command the united support of the Republican members on this floor. [Applause.]

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Speaker, the discussion of the measure now before the House for consideration, and the events which have transpired since the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, have emphasized the necessity which existed at that time for legislation additional to the mere repeal of the purchasing clause of what is commonly known as the Sherman Act. I, in common with a great many other Democrats, gentlemen on this side of the House, earnestly urged at that time that the mere repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act would not rehabilitate the national finances and would not give the country the relief which it was desired to obtain. It was then argued in behalf of those who advocated the unconditional repeal of that measure that the mere restoration of public confidence would restore normal business conditions, and with it the industrial activity and reasonable degree of prosperity which usually accompany those conditions. Subsequent events, Mr. Speaker, have demonstrated that the anticipations of those who took this ground were not well founded—have demonstrated that something more was needed than the mere cessation by the Government of its monthly purchases of silver bullion. I scouted at that time the idea that the derangement of national finances resulted from any want of confidence on the part of the people of this country or of Europe in the stability of American currency; and the fact that no such distrust existed then or has existed since has been proved by the avidity with which the commercial world has seized upon the proposition of the United States to negotiate its bonds whenever they were placed upon the market.

Mr. Speaker, the same cause of trouble exists now which existed then—that is, the existence of the demand notes, floating obligations of the Treasury, which are payable in gold, and which may be presented for redemption at any time that the holders of them see fit to do so. So long, sir, as we have out something like $500,000,000 of demand notes and obligations, so long the maintenance of the gold reserve will be absolutely necessary, and so long as commercial necessities or commercial advantages are provocative of the export of gold, so long will the people who desire to export gold come to the Treasury of the United States to obtain it—that is, so long as our demand obligations are payable in gold and furnish the easy means of obtaining gold from the Treasury of the United States. I can not perceive now, and never have been able to perceive, what advantage or benefit it is to the country that we should maintain this floating indebtedness, a floating indebtedness not called for by the necessities of the country, and one which ought never to have been permitted to exist one day longer than the necessities of the Government required.

Great complaints are made by gentlemen on the other side of the question—the free-silver advocates—of the payment of these obligations in gold coin. Such has been the policy of the Government since the Grant Administration; and this policy has been approved by the American people every time the question has been directly or indirectly submitted to them. I took occasion, in making some remarks upon the bond bill brought into this House in the closing days of the last session, to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that while what is known as the Matthews resolution of 1878, declaring that we could, without violation of national honor, discharge national obligations in gold or silver, passed this House and passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority. Mr. Garfield, who was conspicuous in this House in opposition to it, was immediately thereafter nominated by the Republican party for the Presidency and elected. Mr. Blaine, who was conspicuous in the Senate for his opposition to it, was afterwards nominated by the Republican party for the Presidency, and though he was defeated he was defeated by a candidate who occupied identically the same position on that question that he did.

The example thus set was followed by the Harrison Administration; and when Mr. Harrison was defeated for reelection Mr. Cleveland, still more distinguished for his devotion to what may be called the gold standard and the payment by the Government of its obligations in gold, was elected to succeed him. And now, after an agitation which has lasted from the inception of this Administration—after all the appeals which have been made by gentlemen on this side of the House and on the other side of the House in favor of the policy of paying Government obligations in silver, the American people have sent here a House of Representatives which is overwhelmingly, if I am correctly informed, opposed to the payment of Government obligations in silver. If I be mistaken in this view, Mr. Speaker, the question can easily be tested if any gentleman who favors that policy will offer a resolution declaring it as the sense of the House of Representatives that these obligations should be paid in silver. By such a proceeding the question could be easily tested whether there is a majority of the membership of this House in favor of that proposition.

In looking over the House, Mr. Speaker, I observe that nearly all of those who have been distinguished for their earnest advocacy of this policy on the part of the Government are now conspicuous by their absence. The places which knew them once know them no more—at least the places in the national capital. If they come here they come here as spectators, and the clarion voices which they raised in behalf of what they considered to be the rights of the people are hushed so far as the National Council is concerned, and, I fear, for many, many years. It being, then, a settled fact that this policy will be maintained, what is the necessity or the use of retaining a form of currency which is a constant menace to the Treasury, which requires that in order to make the Government able to keep its promises there shall be maintained a gold reserve, and that that gold reserve shall be continually replenished by the sale of United States bonds, thus increasing the bonded indebtedness of the country? I believe, sir, that no sensible business man would pursue any such policy with respect to his own affairs, and I can see no substantial reason why that policy should be pursued by the United States.

Mr. BRUMM. Will it disconcert my friend if I ask him a question?

Mr. BOATNER. Not a particle.

Mr. BRUMM. The gentleman seems to be in favor of getting rid of what are known as the greenbacks and the Sherman notes. Is he prepared to propose any substitute for them; and if so, will he tell us what kind?

Mr. BOATNER. Certainly. I was coming to that question in a few minutes.

Mr. PICKLER. In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, which he can answer when he answers the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My question is, are you in favor of the coinage of the American product of silver?

Mr. BOATNER. I am in favor of just as large a coinage of silver as can be maintained at a parity with gold.

Mr. PICKLER. That does not mean anything. Those of us who believe in the use of silver as money want something definite.

Mr. BOATNER. It does mean a great deal. If we can coin the entire product of the American mines and maintain it at a parity, I am in favor of that. If we can coin more than the American product and keep it at a parity, I am in favor of coining it. And, Mr. Speaker, right there, I think, is where the fatal mistake was made in the enactment of the Bland-Allison Act. That act—although no one seems to have been aware of it at the time, at least no one seems to have claimed for it the merit that it possesses in this respect—that act, in my judgment, possessed the real merit of inaugurating the only system of bimetallism that is practicable under modern conditions. The only sort of bimetallism which, in my judgment, is practicable at this time is that under which the Government buys the inferior metal and coins it on Government account, limiting the coinage to the amount which can be maintained at a parity.

So, sir, if those who enacted the Bland-Allison measure into law had not pari passu adopted a joint resolution suspending the effect of the resumption act and requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue the greenback circulation—if they had permitted the resumption act, which was then in force, to remain in force, which applied all the surplus revenues to the retirement and extinction of the floating national debt, we would long since have had seven hundred or eight hundred millions of standard silver in circulation, and no greenbacks outstanding to make necessary the maintenance of a reserve fund of one hundred millions or any other sum.

The example of the French nation has been repeatedly cited here as one that we ought to follow. The fact that the Bank of France redeems its notes, at its option, in gold or silver is held as evidence that the United States might do the same. But gentlemen who make this argument fail to take into account the fact that the French Government did in 1874 exactly what we should have done in 1878. It then retired, or it had prior to that time retired, all of its floating obligations, and the Government of France to-day has not in circulation one dollar of demand obligations. The consequence is that the French Government has no reserve fund; the French Government has no parity to maintain. The French Government in one respect did just as we did. It limited the volume of its silver circulation to the amount which could be utilized and which could serve the purposes of gold, thus insuring its maintenance at a parity with gold, and having retired its demand obligations, it permits the Bank of France, which is the only note-issuing power in France, to redeem its notes in gold or silver at its option.

The same result would have been reached in this country if we had not adopted the joint resolution to which I have already referred, which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue greenback circulation as rapidly as it is redeemed. A distinguished Senator, commenting at the other end of the Capitol upon this question, has said that there was no necessity for the reissuing of the greenback circulation, and the Secretary of the Treasury has been reproached for trenching upon the funds realized by the sale of United States bonds for redemption purposes and applying them to the ordinary expenses of the Government. Mr. Chairman, a very casual investigation of the subject will disclose the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury could not have pursued any other course unless by an absolute violation of the statutes.

While it is very true that the bonds issued under the redemption act of 1875 are issued simply for the purpose of replenishing the fund for redemption purposes, it is equally true that when the fund thus raised is used in the redemption of Treasury notes those notes, by force of the statute of 1878, must be covered into the general Treasury and must be reissued in payment of the debts and expenses of the Government. Therefore, sir, if there was not sufficient money in the Treasury, exclusive of the Treasury notes thus redeemed, to pay the necessary expenses of the Government the Secretary could not withhold payment by means of the Treasury notes which had been redeemed without an absolute violation of the statutes of the United States; and while we may condemn the system, while we may say that no such system ought to exist, we can not condemn the executive officers of the Government for obeying the letter and mandate of the law.

Mr. BRUMM. Would not the Executive be very potential in having a resolution of that kind adopted, enabling him to pay out silver and gold in liquidation of the floating debt?

Mr. BOATNER. I do not understand that the present Executive favors any such policy.

Mr. BRUMM. That is the reason I asked the question and wanted to have the gentleman make that point a little more fully.

Mr. BOATNER. I do not understand that any Executive who has ever filled the Presidential office since 1868 has favored such a policy as that.

Mr. BRUMM. I understood you to say, and wish to have the House understand the gentleman's statement, that the Executive would have adopted that course, but that the law would not allow him.

Mr. BOATNER. No; my friend from Pennsylvania misunderstood me. I was referring to the conditions and circumstances as they exist at this time, and to censures cast on the Secretary of the Treasury for using the redemption fund, as it is called, in payment of the ordinary debts and expenditures of the Government, and was explaining that he has not done so. I was explaining that the notes that had been redeemed by the Treasury to a large amount—$78,000,000, I believe, last year—notes which had been presented for redemption at the subtreasuries in the United States and which had been redeemed in gold coin, were by force of law carried into the general Treasury, and that by direction of the specific statutes the Secretary was commanded to reissue the same, and that in the mere execution of that statute he has paid out these notes for the debts and expenses of the Government; that while we may reprobate and condemn that policy of reissuing the floating obligations of the Government after their redemption, yet we can not justly condemn him for executing the law as he finds it upon the statute book. That is the point I was making.

Mr. POWERS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, with his consent. I quite agree in his diagnosis of the situation. I think he has stated it forcibly and exactly. The practical question arising on that statement is this: How shall we proceed to effect the remedy?

Now, I wish to ask the gentleman from Louisiana this question: If the Secretary of the Treasury had lying in his Bureau by the side of the greenback that comes in and which he is to issue to pay other obligations—suppose that he had another bill derived from proper sources of revenue, to wit, duties on customs, ample to meet all the current expenses of the Government week by week and month by month—if, under those circumstances, he would not allow the greenback to remain there, where it belongs, without the necessity of the reissue?

Mr. BOATNER. That is very true. If we had, in the Fifty-third Congress, enacted into law the second section of the House bill, that would have remedied the difficulty to which the gentleman refers, because it would have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have issued short-time certificates for the purpose of raising funds to meet any deficiencies that might arise. But to have done so would have been to violate the act of 1878, which in this bill you were so very careful to preserve. Now, that is a species of demagogy to which the Republican party is addicted.

This bill says:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, and to forbid the further retirement of the United States legal-tender notes.

Now, that act was passed pursuant to a rampant sentiment in favor of the maintenance of the greenback circulation. If you have a redundant revenue you may violate the spirit of the law by hoarding the notes in the Treasury, which is another way of retiring or canceling them. If you hoard them in the Treasury you had just as well cancel them, because you do not comply with the mandate of the law by reissuing them. The law requires their reissue. If, therefore, you could meet a deficiency by an increase of revenue, or the issuance of time certificates of indebtedness, you would violate the spirit of the law, which expressly by this very enactment is to remain in full force and effect; you may accomplish the same purpose by borrowing money to meet the expenses of the Government, but in either case you evade and nullify the law you are so careful to retain in force. In any event, you would be dodging the question. You are afraid to meet the issue. You are hoodwinking the people with the idea that you are maintaining that law, when, as a matter of fact, you want to evade it; you know that the best judgment of the country is that it should be shorn from the statute books.

Mr. POWERS. I quite agree with the gentleman as to his view of the matter when he says that this was passed in obedience to a rampant sentiment——

Mr. BOATNER. It was more than two-thirds of the House.

Mr. POWERS. But now, let me ask, would it not be wise—after having seen the evils of that method of keeping the greenbacks in circulation—would it not be wise to inaugurate a new rampant feeling to relieve that condition somewhat in the way I have suggested?

Mr. BOATNER. I am trying to do that now; and if I can influence my good friend from Vermont I shall be very much obliged for his help.

Mr. POWERS. If that situation could be relieved, would there not be perfect safety to the gold reserve in the Treasury, and would it not be relieved if the revenues were ample to meet the expenditures of the Government under all circumstances—revenues arising from customs duties and internal revenue?

Mr. BOATNER. That would depend, Mr. Speaker, very greatly upon the general financial condition of the world and of the United States. If there was no demand for gold for export, of course it would. If our trade relations with the other side were such that Europe was being compelled to pay us gold in settlement of its balances, why, the result which the gentleman refers to would doubtless follow; but in the condition of doubt and distress which

now prevails, the unsettled condition of business, the hoarding of gold to provide against possible dangers which the world sees ahead of it, and especially the United States sees ahead of it, why, sir, the only way to guard the gold reserve is to pay the United States notes when presented for redemption, cancel them, and when they are paid let them remain paid; and if the Government of the United States needs additional money to conduct the public business, let it be raised by taxation instead of by borrowing.

Mr. BRUMM. How about the medium of circulation, if there should be a scarcity by destroying these notes?

Mr. POWERS. Supply the loss of greenbacks by some other issue.

Mr. BRUMM. That is the point.

Mr. OWENS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Vermont—and I endeavored to get his attention while he was on the floor—I wish to ask him if the purpose of the Republican majority in passing what are known as the bond and revenue bills was to provide a means for retiring the greenbacks from circulation?

Mr. POWERS. The primary purpose, as I understand it, was to provide sufficient revenue for the Government, so that it could meet its daily expenses without trenching upon the gold-reserve fund. That was the primary purpose. The other political purpose of retiring the greenbacks is one that, I am frank to confess, probably does not meet the approval of a majority of the Republican side. I myself am in favor of retiring those greenbacks and substituting in their place some form of national-bank currency or other currency that will supply the deficiency in the circulation brought about by their redemption.

Mr. OWENS. I suspected that that was the gentleman's motive; but as his party disavowed that purpose on the floor of the House when these bills were before the House, I thought I should like to have an avowal from him.

Mr. POWERS. Well, the party does not represent all its members in their action upon the bond bill, no doubt, and in respect to that question.

Mr. BOATNER. I do not desire to be discourteous, but I must object to my friends taking me off the floor with a discussion between themselves.

Mr. POWERS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBBINS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], while he is on that subject, if there is any law that authorizes or directs the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve? If so, where can that law be found?

Mr. BOATNER. There is no specific law directing the maintenance of any special reserve fund, but by the act of 1875 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized—and the authorization amounts to a command—to sell certain specified descriptions of bonds of the United States for the purpose of redeeming the Treasury obligations of the United States. And by the same act all surplus revenues are authorized to be used for the same purpose. A short time after the enactment of that law the Secretary of the Treasury sold bonds of the United States, realizing a fund which approximated $100,000,000, which was known as the redemption fund, and which reserve fund has been known as the reserve fund ever since. And it has been the custom of the Treasury of the United States to maintain since that time a fund of gold of about $100,000,000 expressly for the purpose of meeting any demand which might be made upon it for the redemption of Treasury notes.

But, Mr. Speaker, recurring to the question of my friend from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], who inquired of me just now what, in my judgment, would be the best means of remedying this difficulty, I would state that the first and most efficacious remedy would be a cessation of this free-silver agitation. In my judgment the demand of a large and powerful party in the United States for the unlimited coinage of silver has done more and is doing more to unsettle national finances and to unsettle the business of the country than all other causes combined. There seems to be a determination on both sides of the House, and by factions of both political parties, to press this question to the front.

The result of the last election has shown, in my judgment at least, that a large majority of the sentiment of the people of the United States has condemned this project as vicious and impracticable. When I look around this side of the House and miss the faces of the veterans who have been here for years, and who have made this the leading issue, when I realize that Maryland, West Virginia, and Kentucky, three stalwart Democratic States, have gone Republican; when I see the great State of Indiana here without any representation at all on the Democratic side, and the State of Illinois, I believe, with only one, with only one Democrat from west of the Mississippi River, and the Democratic party shaken in almost every State of the Union, I for one can not see the sense, the wisdom, or the politics in the continuance of an agitation which not only unsettles the business of the country, which must be barren of the result sought to be attained, but seems destined to destroy the Democratic party as a national organization.

Mr. PICKLER. That is the great blessing that is to come out of it.

Mr. BOATNER. No doubt that is the Republican view of it.

Mr. BRUMM. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. What substitute would you have as a medium of exchange after the redemption and destruction of those notes?

Mr. BOATNER. I would increase our silver coinage up to the point of safety. I would increase our coinage at least to the extent of the bullion now in the Treasury. I would then take off the tax on national-bank circulation, except so far as necessary to pay the expense of maintenance. I would permit the national banks to issue circulation up to 100 per cent of the value of the bonds deposited. I would take the United States out of the banking business and confine it to the unlimited coinage of gold and the limited coinage of as much silver as could be maintained at a parity, which might be $750,000,000 or $800,000,000, and, then with a basic circulation of money of final redemption of $1,500,000,000 or probably $2,000,000,000, which it would likely reach, the banks of the country could do the rest.

Mr. BRUMM. The State banks?

Mr. BOATNER. Yes; and national banks.

Mr. BRUMM. Why do you want the 10 per cent tax on State-bank issues taken off?

Mr. BOATNER. Simply because I do not want to see a bank circulation of 10 per cent tied up idly and doing nothing. If a bank invests $120,000 for the purchase of $100,000 in United States bonds, I can see no business reason why it should not be allowed to issue circulation up to the par value. I do not see why they should not be allowed to issue 100 per cent instead of 90.

Mr. BRUMM. I understand the gentleman's remarks have reference to the retention of 10 per cent of the amount of the bonds deposited by the national banks. The matter that I had reference to was the tax on State-bank issues that you said you wanted to repeal, and the question I asked was if your object in having it repealed is to allow the State banks to issue money.

Mr. BOATNER. I do not want to go into that question. I have already made my record on that subject. That is a prohibitive tax on the State banks, but I had reference to the national banks.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. BRUMM. Then the gentleman refuses to answer my question?

Mr. BOATNER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BRUMM. My question was as to whether or not you are in favor of the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on State-bank issues because you favor the issue of State-bank notes?

Mr. BOATNER. Why, I stated to the gentleman most unequivocally that I had spoken and voted for the repeal of that tax. I am opposed to the interference of the United States with incorporated banks of the States. I think that those banks should be allowed to issue such money as may be found necessary. Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will not trespass on the gentleman's time by asking him a question now.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to call the attention of the House to the difference between the financial status of the United States and that of France, it being argued here repeatedly that, as the Bank of France pays its notes alternately in gold and silver, the same might be done by the United States.

I find the per capita circulation of gold in the United States is $8.78; the per capita circulation of gold in France is $22.19. The per capita circulation of silver in France is $8.89; the per capita circulation of silver in the United States is $12.94. The per capita circulation of paper in the United States is $5.92; in France it is 84 cents. The United States possesses a gold stock of $618,000,000; France possesses a gold stock of $850,000,000. The United States possesses a stock of silver of $625,000,000: France possesses a stock of silver of $487,900,000. The United States has in circulation $416,700,000 of uncovered paper—that is, a paper with no specie behind it—nothing behind it but the credit of the United States; France has in circulation only $32,100,000 of such paper. France holds $231,900,000 more gold than we do, $137,100,000 less of silver, and $384,600,000 less of uncovered paper. It is this impregnable strength of financial condition which enables France to pay, or rather to authorize the Bank of France to pay, her notes in gold or silver at her option.

It is contended, Mr. Speaker, that the prices of all farm products are ruinously depressed by reason of the restricted volume of money of final redemption, which they insist is gold alone. This, in my judgment, is utterly unfounded.

The money issued under the Bland-Allison Act—in fact, all the silver money in circulation—is full legal tender for all debts, public and private; payment with it discharges the debt, and the Government is under no obligation to redeem the money.

There is no law authorizing its redemption, and, as a matter of fact, none has ever been redeemed at the Treasury or is likely to be. Hence, sir, the volume of money of final redemption is made up of our total stock of both gold and silver. It may be inquired, if this be true, if the Government is in no wise responsible for our silver circulation, what goes with the argument that silver can

not be maintained at a parity with gold on its own merits, and that cheap money always expels all better or more valuable forms of circulation. In other words, if the credit of the Government is not maintaining our silver circulation at a parity, what is?

The answer, sir, lies upon the surface. Although the United States does not promise to redeem a silver dollar by exchanging gold for it, yet it receives it in payment of taxes, and as the expenses of this Government exceed every year the total amount of silver in circulation, a use is furnished every year by the Government itself for every dollar that is in circulation. In no other way can the fact be accounted for that a piece of metal worth intrinsically only 56 cents passes current at 100 cents, the equivalent of gold.

The French silver is maintained at par by the same means.

Contrast, Mr. Speaker, the silver circulation of the United States with that of all silver-using countries, those which have adhered to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. We find in all of them without exception that their money is worth its bullion value and no more. China, Japan, Mexico, and all the Central and South American countries have free and unlimited coinage, and all of them are on the silver basis.

Their money is not only depreciated, but rises and falls with the silver-bullion market.

How is this to be accounted for? Our friends on the other side say the difference is in our people; that the greatness and the power of the United States is so vast that we are able to overcome the laws of finance which govern the balance of the world, and by an edict to create value where none now exists. This is good rhetoric, but poor logic. Economic laws operate with invariable effect, and like causes produce like effects the world over. The reason that the currency of Mexico is debased is because that nation can give no artificial value to it so long as she admits silver to her mints without limit, and it is worth its bullion value. A dollar of the United States is worth nearly $2 of Mexico, because by reason of a limited coinage it serves the purpose and fills the place of a gold dollar, while the Mexican dollar, though legal tender and full weight, is worth 56 cents only.

But, sir, great as the American people are they can not control these natural laws which assert and enforce themselves without regard to statutory enactments; and we have an illustration staring us in the face to-day. One of these laws is that cheap money will always displace the more valuable. This rule, commonly known as the Gresham law, has been operating in our finances for several years past. While, as I have stated, our silver circulation is as good for all purposes of exchange, equal to gold, while it will buy as much as gold, and therefore passes current at par with it, yet the consciousness in the public mind that it is intrinsically worth only about half of its face value and the agitation in favor of furnishing the country with an unlimited supply of it, has produced the invariable result of giving extraordinary activity to the silver and of hoarding gold and its paper representatives. It is from this cause, sir, that the entire revenues of the Government are now paid in silver and that 65 per cent of all money in active circulation is silver. If this law operates on so small a volume comparatively how can it be expected that it would not drive out all other forms of money if silver should be admitted to the mints free of charge for mintage and in unlimited quantities?

It is not necessary, sir, to pursue the subject further. Enough has been said to give the reasons which compel me to withhold my support from the Senate amendment to the House bill. I have been charged with inconsistency upon this question. I admit that my views have undergone considerable modification since we were called to act upon the question in the repeal of the Sherman Act. While I was not clear at that time that free and unlimited coinage was impracticable if we could preserve the parity of our circulation, I believed then, as I believe now, that the best interests of the country will be subserved by the coinage of as large a volume of silver money as can be sustained at a parity, but that the free and unlimited coinage of that metal would be attended with disastrous results.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I can not be expected nor do I intend, in the short time allotted to me in this debate, to undertake to discuss in detail the merits of this great issue, and to point out fully the reasons why I am not in favor of the bill which was passed by the House, but am in favor and shall vote for the Senate substitute. I desire and will avail myself, however, of the privilege given to members of this House to hereafter extend what I have to say in the RECORD; but now, in the time allotted, I propose, without dealing carefully in statistics or in figures, to give to the House some of the reasons why I shall vote to concur in the substitute offered by the Senate. I shall not, however, undertake to answer the argument made by the gentleman from North Dakota, who regaled the House with an exhibition of maps and statistics and mystifying curved lines and figures.

It occurs to me that an incident which is related as happening upon a farm in the South soon after the war aptly illustrates these arguments, which are based upon maps and statistics and mystifying figures, mystifying to everybody but the expert who made them, and at last deceiving even the expert himself. The incident happened soon after the war and before the South had educated to any degree, as she has now educated to a very great degree, those who were our former slaves. At that time farming operations were carried on largely by the old masters and the ex-slaves in a kind of partnership, and so it was in this case, the crops being divided in a certain proportion between the landlord and the tenant, the landlord furnishing the tenant supplies, to be paid for out of the crop.

In the case in question the old negro had a large family that had to be fed and clothed. The crop was gathered and marketed and at Christmas time a settlement was to be had. The accounts were gone over. Great columns of figures were shown to the old negro, who stood scratching his head wondering what it all meant. Finally, when he had assented to all that the landlord had said, when he had admitted that he had received this amount to buy sugar and coffee, and that amount for shoes and clothing, and an order upon the store at this time, and another at that time, when he was shown that the crop had been sold, had brought so many dollars, and that the old man's part amounted to $250, while his debt to the landlord amounted to $256—when all this had been gone over, the landlord said, "Well, Moses, you understand it, don't you?" "Oh, yes; I understand it." "Well, it's all right, ain't it?" "Yes, it's all right, I reckon; but it strikes me, boss, that when you come to look at this thing, a naught is a naught and a figure is a figure, but it is all for the white man and none for the nigger." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these maps and statistics and figures, while they may mystify and delude, deceive some, finally bring us to the conclusion that they are made all for the money kings and none for the people. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this substitute. I am in favor of it because to enact it is to carry out in practice the doctrines of the great Democratic party to which I belong, and which that party has taught for many years, at least during the years that I have been a voter. I am in favor of it because that great fight which we made in 1892, and which resulted in victory for my party, was based, so far as the section where I live is concerned, upon the argument and upon the assurance that Democratic success meant the remonetization of silver—"the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage."

I do not speak idle words. I do not speak simply the interpretation that I put upon the teachings of my party at that time and that I expressed to the people in my district. I speak the words that were uttered in the platform of that party in 1892, words contained in documents which were sent out from the national headquarters, one of which I hold in my hand, and which taught us to tell the people that the Republican party, by its platform, was a party opposed to silver, while the Democratic party was in favor of it. And I believe, sir, that the good faith which we owe to the people who voted for us on that issue, I believe that the honesty of purpose which we told them we entertained at that time in advocating the Democratic doctrine should dictate to us that whenever an opportunity comes we should at least attempt to carry out our purposes and fulfill our pledges.

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I should be only too glad to answer the gentleman's question if I can.

Mr. BOATNER. Does the gentleman think that the people of the United States in the last election declared for free silver?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think that the Democratic party did; and I know that the Democratic party of the Southern States did.

Mr. BOATNER. Does the gentleman think that Missouri and Kentucky and Indiana and Illinois and other States which have heretofore had large Democratic representation on this floor, and whose Representatives voted for free silver in the last Congress, have indorsed free silver in this Congress?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think the Democratic party in those States were so disgusted with the policy of the Democratic Administration and the failure of the Democratic House to pass a free coinage of silver bill that they stayed at home or voted for the opposition. I have the figures here which tell the tale of the election of 1894, and they show that 967,503 voters who had voted the Democratic ticket in 1892 either stayed away from the polls or voted the Republican or the Populist ticket.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. That is so.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; it is so.

Mr. BOATNER. Does the gentleman think that the constituents of Mr. Bland, Mr. Clark of Missouri, General Hatch, and gentlemen of that class——

A MEMBER. What about General Tracey? [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER (continuing). Does the gentleman think that the constituents of the men I have named sought to punish the Democratic party by defeating those gentlemen?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think that Mr. Bland and Mr. Hatch and those gentlemen who tried to be true to the party and the people were slaughtered because the people wanted to strike at the Democratic Congress and the Administration.

Mr. BOATNER. They struck the wrong men then.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; but they were disgusted. I will answer the gentleman further that those who stayed at home were disgusted, while the pretended Democrats who went to the polls and voted against us did so because they disagreed with the party on some of its leading doctrines. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to be drawn into a discussion of this kind, because it is mere side play. I am sorry that the gentleman from Louisiana has asked the question, but I shall not shrink from answering it. Does the gentleman regard as Democratic the scene that is being enacted in Kentucky to-day? When was it, until of late, until new doctrines and new theories had been introduced into the party, that men who were true Democrats refused to vote for the caucus nominee of their party?

Mr. BOATNER. Does the gentleman desire an answer to that question?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I have no time to spare, but I will hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. BOATNER. If the gentleman does desire an answer, I will state to him that the fact he refers to merely shows the absolute destructiveness of the introduction of any such issues into the party. We are threatened with the loss of a Senator in Kentucky because the free-silver men of that State were not satisfied to stand upon the platform of their party.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the Democracy is threatened with the loss of a Senator in Kentucky and with disintegration because a few men, a small minority, can not control the majority. When you are in the majority you have a right to frame the platform and claim that the minority shall assent to it; but if we succeed in making the platform and naming the candidate, you have no right to "bolt." I do not propose to "bolt." Wherever the Democratic flag floats there shall be my standard and there will I follow. Whomsoever my party may put up as its standard bearer, though I differ with him, I will hold up his hands and undertake to carry the cause of my party to victory, however much I may differ on some questions from other members of my party. [Applause.]

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman allow me just there?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I have very little time.

Mr. SKINNER. I should like to ask my friend from Georgia a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I will yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER].

Mr. SKINNER. If the Democratic party should adopt a gold-standard platform, and nominate a gold-standard candidate for President, will you vote for him?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I will vote for any man whom the majority of the delegates who may be sent by the masses of the Democratic party of this Union to Chicago shall select as our standard bearer, though I may differ with him. [Applause.]

Mr. SKINNER. Then you are willing to sacrifice the interests of your people upon the altar of your party.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I am willing to forego temporarily my views and the consummation so devotedly hoped for, which must eventually come, and can only come through the Democratic party, in order to preserve the organization of that party, which, I believe as firmly as I stand here, is the only hope for the preservation of the liberties of this people. [Applause.]

Mr. BOATNER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. These interruptions consume my time.

Mr. BOATNER. Only a moment.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. My time is almost out——

Mr. BOATNER. I will move that it be extended five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If that can be done——

The SPEAKER. It will be impossible to extend the gentleman's time.

Mr. BOATNER. Allow me just one moment. The gentleman called upon me——

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I have not called upon anybody——

Mr. BOATNER. For my opinion in regard to the course of Democratic representatives in Kentucky who do not abide by the decision of their party, I wish to say that I do not indorse their position any more than he does.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I must go on; the gentleman has had an opportunity to make his speech.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. No, sir; I can not yield longer; I would do so if I could, but my time is nearly all consumed.

Mr. Speaker, I intended to say a great deal more. I am opposed to this gold standard because, in my judgment, both gold and silver are the money of the Constitution, and to demonetize silver is unconstitutional. In exercising the right granted to extend my remarks I shall quote the language of that distinguished lawyer, Daniel Webster, and shall also undertake to show that distinguished and gifted American and Republican, Mr. Blaine, agreed with him; and these two are surely worthy of being followed by me. I agree heartily with the present able Secretary of the Interior, my particular and warm personal friend, for whose views I have always the greatest respect, who said as recently as 1894, in canvassing the State of Georgia during a heated political campaign, that he believed that—

A gold standard is unwise and dangerous. I agree to the proposition that it is calculated to contract the currency; and by contracting the currency check industries, suppress business, and turn honest men out of places.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be allowed two minutes more.

Mr. DINSMORE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I had desired to say something in regard to the Gresham law. I had also intended to say something by way of answer to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DINGLEY], when he spoke of the endeavor of gold to find a suitable "yokefellow," and its inability to find it in silver. I had desired also to say something with reference to that gentleman's assertion that he was in favor of bimetallism but not in favor of "bastard bimetallism."

Sir, like him, I am opposed to bastard bimetallism. I am in favor of that pure, genuine, legitimate bimetallism guaranteed by the Constitution, advocated and promulgated by the fathers and framers of the Constitution, and taught us by great Democratic leaders in their speeches, by their votes, and by the party platforms drawn by them—the coinage of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country. I am, however, opposed to that illegitimate pretense and sham for bimetallism which was "conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity" in 1873, and which went through the American Congress "like the stealthy tread of a cat," unknown to even the Speaker of the House, Mr. James G. Blaine, and to but few of its members, and which escaped even the eye of President Grant when he signed the bill. I am opposed to it because it is the product of an unnatural, illegitimate union between England and Wall street and the Administration in power at that time. I am also opposed to that still more illegitimate product born in 1893 from a coalition between the same forces and the Democratic Administration.

Sir, the lesson taught us by the passing years is that the Democrats of this country are in favor of silver as standard money and money of final payment, and its remonetization as such money. Sir, when the election of 1892 was over, and the Fifty-third Congress was chosen, together with a Democratic President, the hosannas of that great throng of Democrats all over the country, whom I in part represent on this floor, went up with a shout, inspired by the hope that now, at least, the farmers and the middle classes, the laborers, and poor people of this country would have an opportunity to be heard through their Representatives, and that something would be accomplished to relieve them of the distresses that the Republican party had brought upon them when in power. But the men whom they had elected did not carry out, as they understood them, the promises and pledges on which they had been elected, so that when the fatal storm of the 6th of November, 1894, rolled away there was found on the beach of the political ocean the wreck of a grand and glorious party. The small band of Democrats remaining on this side of the House are but the flotsam and jetsam that floated from the wreck to the shores.

I have said that the Democratic party in 1892 favored the remonetization of silver and that the people so understood it. Whatever may have been the mental reservation of those who framed the platform adopted at Chicago on June 21, 1892, the words "that we hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and the coinage of both gold and silver, without discriminating against either metal, or charge for mintage" led all the Democrats who believed in gold and silver as standard money to feel assured that the Democratic party meant that it was in favor of bimetallism; not that now contended for in which gold alone is made the standard, but that which makes both gold and silver the standard money of the country. I hold in my hand a circular sent to me in 1892 by the national Democratic executive committee, numbered 7, headed, "The farmers and the currency question. More money, lower interest, fewer mortgages, more prosperity." That circular begins as follows:

By thousands of American farmers the money question is regarded as the supreme issue in national politics. Irrespective of party affiliation, they unite in demanding such reforms in our system of issuing currency as will result in giving the country a sound circulating medium, whose volume shall be sufficient for its business needs.

Discussing this question further, this circular, under the head of The Republican party's position, says:

Judged either by its past record or present promises it is evident that from the Republican party the debt-burdened farmer, struggling under heavy interest on his mortgages, has nothing to hope for. * * * By adroitly appealing to the patriotism of the people, on the ground that it was the only way in which the sale of bonds could be forced during the war, the Republicans succeeded in fastening the system upon the country and have since been able to defeat all efforts to abolish it. To its maintenance they are still pledged. * * *

The lengths to which the Republican party is willing to go in order to keep its hold upon the currency was well illustrated a few weeks ago by Secretary of the Treasury Foster in a speech delivered at Vermilion, Ohio, in which he said that the Government should extend the $500,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds, maturing in 1907, for fifty years at 2½ per cent, for the purpose of continuing the national-bank system, or, in other words, he wants to borrow money that they did not need and to present the bondholders with $11,000,000 yearly for fifty years; in all, $550,000,000, so that certain banks may have the privilege of issuing notes if they are so inclined. On the question of national banks the Republicans have always ranged themselves on the side of those interested in having money scarce and dear; none the less have they shown in all of their actions their lack of sympathy with the common people in their efforts to escape from the bondage of the money lender. In Congress, on the platform, and in the press they have nothing but ridicule for the earnest and sincere advocates of a more abundant and elastic currency, whom they contemptuously charge with desiring to debase the country's money. All pleas for financial legislation in the interest of the masses have been scornfully rejected. In the Republican national platform there is not a line, not a word, to indicate that the party realizes the importance of the currency question or has any solution to offer. While committed to the present illogical, inadequate, and absurd system, under which the farmers have been oppressed by high rates of interest on the capital they were required to borrow, the Republican party stands condemned by every fair-minded citizen who believed that the national prosperity would be vastly increased by the adoption of better methods for supplying money.

This was the message to the farmers of the country by the national Democratic executive committee in 1892 to secure their votes. This was the charge that they made against the Republican party, then in power—that "they had always ranged themselves on the side of those interested in having money scarce and dear"; that on all occasions the Republican party had shown "their lack of sympathy with the common people in their efforts to escape from the bondage of the money lender." The Republican party and its platform and its conduct in Congress was arraigned before the farmers of the country because of its advocacy of the issuance of bonds and its support of the money lender. It condemned the Republican party because the farmers under the Republican administration had been compelled to borrow at high rates of interest and had been oppressed thereby. And to-day we are confronted with a proposition to still further maintain the Republican doctrine of issuing bonds, of making money scarce and dear, and preventing the common people from escaping from the bondage of the money lender.

It may be said that this was intended only for the farmers; but it can not be safely and correctly contended that the great representative of the Democratic party—its national executive committee—in the conduct of the canvass of 1892 would send to the voters of the country such statements and such declarations unless they felt themselves justified by the history of the Democratic party and its platform. Continuing, this same circular declares:

The history of the Democratic party surely always favored the policy of safe expansion of the currency and has opposed the centralizing tendencies of Federalists and Republicans. They condemn the efforts of the Republicans to continue a banking system founded on the country's debt, and declare their opposition to any scheme to benefit the bondholder at the people's loss. They demand the repeal of the Sherman purchasing act and favor the coining of both gold and silver.

These are the interpretations put upon the platform by this executive committee in its address to the farmers. How truly the farmers believed it is told in the tremendous majorities that the Democratic party received in the great agricultural sections of the land. When they believed they had been misled and deceived, in November, 1894, they rejected the party for its failure to give them the relief it had promised.

We need not fear that the equal coinage of gold and silver as a standard money of the country will drive gold out if we are to be guided by the history of the imports and exports of gold for the past twenty-five years. The year that silver was demonetized—1873—there was exported $35,661,863 in gold from the United States, and this large exportation of gold continued to and including 1877, when it was $21,274,565, during the period the demonetization existed, an average during the five years of over $35,000,000 per year.

Immediately after the passage of the Bland-Allison Act, when silver was partially restored, the exports fell off continually until 1890, when they amounted to but $3,951,736. After the passage of the Sherman law in 1890, which converted silver into a commodity, we find that the exports increased from $3,951,736 in 1890 to $67,704,900 in 1891, in 1892 to $42,841,963, in 1893 to $101,844,087, in 1894 to $64,303,840, and up to November 1 amounted to $55,096,639 for 1895. So that if these figures prove anything (the table can be found on page 29, Report of Director of the Mint for 1895) they establish the proposition that when silver was demonetized the export of gold was large, and when it was partially remonetized in 1878, and until 1891, the export of gold decreased. We have here, therefore, a practical demonstration that when silver was recognized and required to be coined as standard money it did not drive out the gold.

This table demonstrated further that during these periods we had more and larger exports of gold whenever by law silver has been demonetized or its equal coinage of gold prohibited. The history of the two metals in this country from 1871 to 1895 demonstrates conclusively that we have nothing to fear from the Gresham law by remonetizing silver. The total exports of gold from 1871 to October, 1895, was $726,766,800, and during that period we had five years in which silver was demonetized, twelve years in which it was coined to a limited extent, two years under the Sherman law, and two years after the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act had been repealed. During this whole period the imports of gold only amounted to $140,696,468. In spite of the successful war waged upon silver in 1893, which culminated in the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, gold continually "went out," although it was announced and understood that the United States was at last upon a gold basis. This bond bill which this House passed, and which we are asked to uphold by our votes, is but a measure to supply the Treasury with gold, because it has been drained of its gold by export in spite of the fact that there is now no coinage of silver, it having been stopped. If these figures do not demonstrate clearly that we have nothing to fear from the "bugbear" called the Gresham law, then they demonstrate nothing.

The distinguished gentleman from Maine declares that silver at its present intrinsic value can not be a yokefellow with gold, for the reason that it would drive the dearer metal (gold) out and we would come to a silver basis. I respectfully call the attention of the distinguished gentleman and the people to this table, that they may see that whenever the United States had yoked silver with gold the exports of gold have decreased, and whenever we have unyoked the two metals and endeavored to draw the commerce of the country by gold alone, in spite of the Gresham law gold has departed from the United States. I do not think it can be successfully maintained that gold does not vary in value; that as a standard of value it is fixed, immutable. The tables of the prices of gold, as contained in the reports of the Directors of the Mint, show that gold has risen and fluctuated in value continually. We find in the History of the Bank of England, by Francis Homans, page 154, that at one time—

A rise of 10 per cent in the current value of the stamp dollar took place; in the same year, in consequence of a rise in the price of gold, the dollars circulated by the bank were selling for more as bullion than their rate as coin.

The only solution that is offered for the coinage of silver by those who are advocating a single gold standard is that it can only come through an international conference, and that no international conference can be had, or at least nothing can be accomplished at any international conference unless England agrees to join in the conference and to fix the ratio for the coinage of silver and to fix its value as a standard. Let no one be deceived by any such false hope. It is but "keeping the promise" of bimetallism "to the ear and breaking it to the hope."

On May 27, 1895, the following letter from Sir W. V. Harcourt, chancellor of the exchequer of Great Britain, was sent in reply to the leading bankers of London, who had written him in behalf of the Gold Standard Association:

TREASURY CHAMBERS, *Whitehall, S. W.*

MY DEAR BERTRAM CURRIE: I have received with much satisfaction the address you have forwarded to me, which I recognized as bearing names among the most weighty which could be found to represent the judgment of the merchants and bankers of the city of London.

I can have no hesitation in giving to that address on the part of Her Majesty's Government the reply which you have a right to expect.

I concur entirely in the opinion expressed in your address, that the experience of well-nigh a century has proved that our present system of currency is suited to the wants of this great commercial country, and that to depart from it would be disastrous to the trade and credit of the United Kingdom.

Continuity of national policy is more necessary in this than in perhaps any other question. You may rely upon it that Her Majesty's Government will not depart from the course pursued by all the Governments that have preceded them, and will give no countenance to any change in the fundamental principles of our monetary system, or in any discussion in which they may be called upon to take part will they admit any doubt as to their intention firmly to adhere to the gold standard, which you justly regard as essential to our well-being as a commercial nation.

I remain, yours, faithfully, W. V. HARCOURT.

Such will be the answer that England will give to all efforts to establish international bimetallism. In the language of the Hon. John G. Carlisle, in a speech delivered in 1878, to be found on page 44, volume 31, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix—

I do not believe that we should consult England.

In that speech he said:

England, having demonetized silver in 1816, and having steadily adhered to the gold standard ever since, can not possibly have any representation or voice in the proposed conference to consider the propriety of restoring to silver coin its money functions throughout the British Empire.

I believe, therefore, that the restoration of silver to its constitutional place as standard money of the country must come, if it comes at all, to the people of the United States through the efforts and action of the United States alone. We boast of our inde-

pendence of England and insist that she shall regard our policy known as the Monroe doctrine; that she shall not establish or extend by force or other means her power over our sister American republics. We arouse the patriotism of our people by appealing to their love of liberty for our neighbors; but when it comes to the great question of a currency, to the question whether we shall be still further bound in bondage to the financial policy of England, it is said we must timidly submit until it shall suit her good pleasure to relieve us. To such an American policy I enter my firm and earnest protest.

Let us not be deceived that this measure authorizing the issuance of bonds will be indorsed by the people if it shall become a law. It is true enough that the Republican party in 1894 was returned to power in the great majority they hold in this House, and the Democratic party met an overwhelming defeat at the hands of the people; yet the figures of the elections of 1892 and 1894 will demonstrate that while the Democratic vote fell off nearly a million the Republicans only gained 215,000. The Democratic voters who voted in 1892 stayed at home and remained away from the polls in 1894. But they are ready and will vote now against that party and those men who shall endeavor to fasten upon them and their posterity the burden of bonds and the financial policy of England.

Already that policy—the single gold standard—has destroyed vast values in property of the people. In my own State, under the baleful influence of the single gold standard, from 1892 to 1895 property depreciated $15,377,777. In my own county during the same period property depreciated $2,716,696. It cost Georgia and Bibb County for three years these amounts to reach a gold basis. On the Stock Exchange in New York, as shown by the New York Herald of June 12, 1893, $700,000,000 was lost in stock for twelve months prior thereto. Wheat and corn depreciated $250,000,000, although there was a full crop, and cotton over $300,000,000. In the past two years it has required the issuance of $262,000,000 of bonds by the Government to maintain the gold standard, the yearly interest being about $12,000,000.

This loss of property, this shrinkage in value of land, of personal property, of stocks and bonds, these millions that have been added to the public debt, this burden of interest that the people must carry, represent the price that we have paid and are expected to pay to reach and maintain a gold standard. If this is for the interest of the people; if adding to the wealth of the bondholder and the money syndicates and the taking away of the values of the property of the people is the road to prosperity and happiness for our people, then, indeed, will we have to learn a new definition for prosperity and happiness.

I believe that the opening of the mints to silver in the United States and declaring it to be full legal tender for all debts would soon place it in its proper position, so that it would circulate with gold and not create a depreciated currency.

I desire to call attention to a fact which will demonstrate that the coinage of silver will increase its price. It has been stated that the statement made by the honorable ex-Speaker, CHARLES F. CRISP, on November 14, 1895, before the Georgia legislature—

that just five years before that silver bullion was worth 94 cents an ounce. The Senate, mark you, not the House, passed a bill favorable to silver, and the general impression going abroad that Congress was going to legislate for silver raised the price of silver, and in ten days it was worth $1.07 an ounce, merely on the hope of its restoration.

This statement created surprise in some quarters and it was admitted to be a strong argument if it did not lack accuracy. Its accuracy was questioned and the statement made that it was not an accurate historical statement. In the spring and summer of 1890, when legislation was enacted to increase the use of silver, the price of silver rose in anticipation of favorable action. The Senate passed a free-silver bill some time in June. Silver commenced to rise in April. The average London price of silver bullion in London was 96.251 cents per ounce for March, 1890, 96.634 cents per ounce for April, $1.02 for May, $1.04 for June, $1.07 for July, $1.15 for August, and $1.16 for September. So that in London, as a result of expected legislation favorable to silver, silver rose from 43⅞ pence per ounce in the month of April to 51⅛ pence per ounce in September. Although the Sherman law did not pass until July 14, 1890, and purchases did not commence under it until August 13, silver commenced to rise in April and continued to appreciate, and it can not be ascribed to any other cause than to the fact that legislation was pending aiming to increase the use of silver as money and favorable action was expected.

Take the case of the closing of the mints in India in 1893. About the middle of June silver sold in London for 38¼d., which was equal to the highest price of that year. On the 26th of June the order closing the India mints was issued, and on June 30 it sold at 30⅛d. in London. In eleven days after the closing of the mints silver fell 21⅛ per cent. And so I might go on from one example to another to demonstrate the proposition I make that the coinage of silver as money and recognizing it as the standard money always has and always will increase its value.

All of the wealth of this country is so unevenly distributed that the millionaires and rich, while they form but 9 per cent of the population, own 71 per cent of the wealth, and the middle and poorer classes, although they form 91 per cent of the population, yet own but 21 per cent of the wealth. If we take the table of the distribution of wealth as prepared by Mr. Spahr, the rich, while only constituting 1 per cent of the population, own 54⅛ per cent of the wealth, and the term rich includes only 125,000 families; the middle classes, composing 10.9 per cent of the population, own only 32⅞ per cent of the wealth, and the poor, while composing 38.1 per cent of the population, own 13 per cent, and the very poor, who compose 50 per cent, own none of the wealth of the country.

One hundred and twenty-five thousand families of this country own over half of all the property in it. This bill we are urged to support, to authorize the issue of bonds and the continuance of the gold standard, will but diminish the number of families who own wealth and increase the number of the poor. The bond sale which occurred a few days ago has been heralded as a great achievement and as an illustration of the patriotism of the American people, who subscribed five times over the amount of bonds desired; but if we examine these bids and the successful bidders we will find that of the $100,000,000 of bonds the Eastern States get more than 92 per cent of them, and of this sum New York alone gets $78,000,000. The Morgan syndicate, it is true, gets only $33,000,000, whereas it was expected to receive about $65,000,000. It may have been a popular loan, but $92,000,000 of the loan went to the same people and to the same section that have heretofore formed bond syndicates with England to make interest out of the American people. I am opposed to and shall resist by my vote the passage of this bill, because I am not in favor of enriching further at the expense of my constituents the Eastern bankers and bond purchasers.

Let us take warning lest this continued concentration of wealth in the hands of a few shall lead to the ruin of this Republic. The words of President Lincoln come back to us almost as a prophecy when he said:

As the result of war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of high prices will follow. The money power will endeavor to prolong its reign until all the wealth is aggregated in the hands of the few and the Republic destroyed.

Mr. Webster spoke against the "concentration of wealth into the hands of the few as being detrimental to the perpetuation of liberty." History teaches us that at the downfall of Egypt 2 per cent of its people owned 97 per cent of its wealth; of Persia, 1 per cent of its people owned all of the land, and of Babylon, 2 per cent owned all the wealth. When the Roman Empire fell a prey to the invasions of the people of the North, the Goths and the Vandals, 1,800 persons in Greece and Rome owned all the known wealth of the world. As a result of the iniquitous financial policy which we are now taught to believe is a sound-money policy, the wealth of the country is aggregated in the hands of a few, and whether the Republic can live or will be destroyed, a victim to the greed and avarice of the few, is a problem for the most serious consideration.

I am opposed to this measure because I am taught that gold and silver is the money of the Constitution, the standard money of the Constitution, the money of final redemption. In the language of Mr. Blaine, "I believe that no power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress, therefore, in my judgment, has no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either any more than to demonetize both." I believe with that great constitutional lawyer, Daniel Webster, "that gold and silver at a ratio fixed by Congress constitutes the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has the right to establish any other standard or to displace the standard." He said, further, "that Congress has no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either any more than to demonetize both."

I shall cheerfully vote to pass this substitute of the Senate in place of the House bond bill. I think we should do it in order to give the people the relief they so much need, and in doing so, in voting for this substitute, I but follow the illustrious example of the present Secretary of the Treasury, who, when a Representative of the people of Kentucky in 1878, said:

Our power of legislation over this subject will not be exhausted by the passage of this measure, and we ought not to halt for a single moment in our efforts to complete the relief inaugurated by it. The struggle now going on can not cease until all the industrial interests of the country are fully and finally emancipated from the heartless domination of syndicates, stock exchanges, and other great combinations of money grabbers in this country and Europe. Let us, if we can do no better, pass bill after bill, embodying in each some substantial provision for relief, and send them to the Executive for his approval. If he withhold it, and we are unable to secure the necessary vote, let us, as a last resort, suspend the rules and put them in the general appropriation bills, with the distinct understanding that if the people can get no relief the Government can get no money.

Mr. Speaker, for myself, I prefer to follow the advice of the Hon. John G. Carlisle, when a representative of the people of Kentucky, and when the recognized leader of the Democratic party, rather than the recent views promulgated by him as the Secre-

tary of the Treasury. In the language of Hon. James G. Blaine, when a United States Senator:

If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it. If the coinage has been prohibited I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed. If it has been restricted I am in favor of having it enlarged.

Before concluding, I shall quote what was said by that great Georgian, always honored and always loved by his people, who devoted his life, his money, his talents, and his time to the interests of his State, and who died serving her in the gubernatorial chair, and who was known also as "the great tribune of the people"—Hon. Alexander H. Stephens. Upon an occasion, while a member of this House, when a measure was before Congress providing for the coinage of silver into full legal-tender dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1, he said:

The ruinous consequences which attend this bad act of administration—

Referring to the act of 1873—

were seen in the failures of mercantile houses and business men, amounting to more than half of the public debt of the United States within the last nine years.

Now, I am for free coinage of silver bullion just as of gold. Gold and silver should be put upon a perfect equality as of yore in the ratio of 16 to 1. This would not only add to the value of real estate and all sorts of property in the United States, but it would greatly encourage and stimulate the mining of silver in this country.

In my view all the gold and silver that can be produced to our mints should be coined alike. The coin should be kept in the vaults of the Treasury and certificates of it given in all cases where certificates are preferred. These coin certificates should be the currency of the country; it would be the best in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are told in mythology and by the great Greek poet Æschylus that Prometheus was the great benefactor of mankind, because he brought down from heaven, for the service of men, the fire which he kindled in a bundle of reeds at the chariot wheels of the sun. On account of this great blessing rendered to the human race he so offended the great Jove that he caused him to be bound and fastened to a pillar on Mount Caucasus, and there his chains were riveted by Vulcan with such power that he could no way stir. A vulture stood by daily gnawing and consuming his vitals, until Hercules at last rescued him from his chains and imprisonment.

So, Mr. Speaker, the power of money and of corporate wealth, combined in England and in Wall street, have bound the American people, because of their opposition to the will of the financial Joves, upon the Mount Caucasus of their greed and avarice, where the insatiable beak of the vulture gold has daily, for nearly a quarter of a century, been devouring the very life and vitals of the people. Their sufferings and their cries for help have continually rung out over the nation, and it will indeed require the power of a Hercules to free them. The people had fondly hoped that the incoming of a Democratic Congress and Administration would mark the end of their suffering and would be the beginning of their deliverance. In this they were disappointed. But the time will come, and is fast approaching, in my judgment, when there will come to the relief of the people, bound and chained as they are, a Hercules who will destroy this vulture and break their chains. I sincerely believe that it will be the Democratic party which will do this, and that the people will at last claim and acknowledge it as their deliverer. And when it shall be done, then, indeed, and not until then, will prosperity, peace, and happiness smile upon this great nation of ours as it once did. [Applause.]

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Speaker, when the bond bill in its original form was before the House in the early part of the session I voted for it—not because I was in favor of issuing bonds in times of peace, not because it was my idea of the course that ought to be pursued to relieve the financial situation, nor because I thought there was any urgent necessity for issuing more interest-bearing bonds, but because I believed it to be the policy of the present Administration to keep up the policy pursued for the last two years; that is, of issuing long-time 4 and 5 per cent bonds under the pretense of keeping up and replenishing the coin redemption fund. I say under the pretense, because as a matter of fact, as shown by a communication to Congress from the Secretary of the Treasury, there is not now and never has been a coin redemption fund. Every dollar which has been received from the sale of the one hundred and sixty-two millions of bonds has been poured into the common hopper of the Treasury, and from thence paid out for the current expenses of the Government.

Under existing law as construed by the President and Secretary of the Treasury they already have the power to issue an unlimited amount of long-time bonds at a high rate of interest. This being the case, and there being no probability of a repeal of that law, I believed it would be good public policy to authorize the issue of a more popular form of bond bearing a less rate of interest and running for a much shorter time. I am of that opinion still. But the Senate, has not in its superior judgment, seen fit to concur, but has adopted a substitute therefor. That substitute is now before us for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in all of my legislative career, either in the legislature of my own State or my short service in this honorable body, I find myself not in sympathy with a majority of my political associates on this floor.

Yet in duty to my own conscience, and as I believe in deference to the wishes of a large majority of my constituents, I am compelled to vote for the Senate amendment.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that this vote will not meet with the approbation of an aggressive and highly respectable number of my constituents who are honestly and earnestly in favor of the single gold standard and believe that a great calamity will befall the country if our mints are thrown open to the free coinage of silver.

I believe that these fears are entirely groundless, and instead of a great calamity a great era of prosperity would be the result of adding to our primary money the silver which God in His great wisdom has so bountifully placed at our disposal.

The Republican party, of which I am proud to be an humble member, has always declared in favor of bimetallism, and for my part I can not conceive of any true or honest bimetallism that does not give both metals an equal chance by free mintage at a given ratio to be fixed by the Government.

If our mints are to be closed to the coinage of silver, and we are to simply use it in limited amounts as a circulating medium, as token money, to be redeemed in gold, the same as we use and redeem paper money, then I do not think we have any use for silver as a money metal, because paper will answer the same purpose, is much more convenient, and certainly very much cheaper.

What we need is not so much an inflation of our currency, but more primary money—more money of redemption—money that the Government will not be called upon from day to day and month to month to redeem in gold, which it is called upon to furnish at such an enormous cost, which keeps enhancing in value and will continue to enhance, until in the end we shall have to declare our inability to meet all our obligations in gold and thus be in a very much worse condition than we are now, because our interest-bearing bonded indebtedness will be very much greater than it is now.

The cost of gold monometallism is altogether too great, and never has been or ever will be sustained by a popular form of government. In fact, none of the political parties, in either State or national conventions, have dared to go before the people declaring in their platforms in favor of the single gold standard, and yet both parties have adopted that policy in the administration of our financial affairs in direct and open violation, as I believe, of the letter and spirit of the law. The obligations of the United States, with the exception of the gold certificates, does not demand the payment of gold, but of coin, in the money of the Constitution—in gold or silver; and yet, with a large amount of silver in the Treasury, we have gone on issuing interest-bearing bonds to purchase gold.

But we are told that although the Government did not expressly agree to pay its obligations in gold, yet the holders of our bonds and other evidences of indebtedness expect to be paid in that ever-appreciating metal.

By what right or authority do they expect to be paid in gold, and gold only? Certainly not by the terms of the contract. The contract is in writing, borne on the face of the bonds and certificates themselves, which expressly state that they are payable in coin. I believe in living up to that contract to the very letter and spirit of the law.

Is there any member of this House who would give his note in writing, and when that note became due would expect to pay more, or in a different manner, than he agreed to pay? Should not the creditor or holder of such a note be satisfied to receive his pay according to the written contract? In a private transaction a man who should claim anything more or different from this would be considered dishonest, and would be frowned upon by all honest men.

But did the holders of our Government obligations expect to be paid in gold; and if they did, by what reasoning did they arrive at such a conclusion? Congress has time and again, when this question has been up for discussion, refused—absolutely refused—to make its bonds payable in gold, and has always insisted on making them payable in coin.

President Cleveland at the last session of Congress asked Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds payable in gold. But Congress utterly refused to give that permission.

When the last sixty-two millions of bonds were offered for sale the President, in a message to Congress, said that if Congress would only authorize the issue of gold bonds he could save the Government some $16,000,000; but, under this great and tempting offer, Congress could not be induced to give him that authority.

The foreign syndicate that bought these sixty-two millions of bonds, and made, it is said, some $10,000,000 in the transaction, could hardly expect that they would be paid in gold, because Congress, in considering that very transaction, absolutely refused

to be bribed into making them payable in gold. I have said that gold had enhanced in value. Is there anyone here who doubts that proposition? Gold is like any other commodity. It is subject to the same law of supply and demand. It makes no difference whether the demand is made by legislative enactment or some other cause, the result is the same.

When the United States, in 1873, demonetized silver and put the whole burden of redemption on gold, from that moment gold began to go up and silver began to go down. When France, Germany, Italy, and other nations shortly after also closed their mints to the coinage of silver, another blow was given to the white metal. Gold took another upward turn and silver was further debased. When the mints in India were closed, the last fatal blow was given to silver—a blow from which it can never recover until it is again placed in the proud position from which it has been wrongfully driven by legislative enactments by this and other nations.

As the United States was among the first to strike it down, it should be the first to reinstate it. Professing to be friends of silver will not do it. Professing to believe in bimetallism will not do it. Nothing short of its restoration to the proud position it held prior to 1873 will accomplish the desired result. I do not believe that the ratio of 16 to 1 is imperative. For my part, if I could have our mints opened to the free coinage of silver I would be willing to compromise on any reasonable basis if I could gain the main object, namely, free coinage and full restoration as money of redemption.

But we are told we must have honest money, sound money, the best money known to the civilized world. I am in favor of honest money. Every friend of silver is in favor of honest money. What is honest money? Honest money is that which is a full legal tender for all debts, public or private. Honest money is that kind of money which is authorized by law and recognized as full legal tender, and backed and supported by a responsible government. Honest money is that kind of money which has the full purchasing power of any other kind of money.

If our mints are thrown open to the free coinage of silver, and its legal-tender qualities kept intact, it will pay just as much debt and have as great a purchasing power as any other legal-tender money. But we are told, Mr. Speaker, that it will not pay a foreign debt; that gold is the only recognized money of the civilized world. The United States can not legislate for foreign countries. We can not make any money legal tender and oblige foreign countries to accept it, whether it be gold, silver, paper, or any other form of money. We can only do that which seems best for us to do, that which in our judgment will accomplish the greatest good to the greatest number of our own people.

The rulers of the Old World, the kings, emperors, and czars of monarchial Europe, rule over these subjects, or claim to rule over them at least, by divine right, by authority received direct from heaven, and the people of those countries submit.

The United States of America, the 70,000,000 of free and independent citizens of this country, possessing sixty-five billions of accumulated wealth, deny the God-given right of men to rule and oppress their fellow-men, and have declared that all men are born free and equal, with the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

England, the head and front of the single gold-standard nations of the Old World, believes in and practices free trade with the other nations of the world. We have not followed Europe in adopting a monarchial form of government. We have not adopted, and I do not believe we ever will, adopt the English doctrine of free trade. Neither should we imitate them in adopting the single gold standard. I believe that the United States of America is great enough, strong enough, and its people patriotic enough to formulate a financial policy of its own, regardless of what the balance of the world may say or do.

But we are told if we throw our mints open to the coinage of silver that gold will disappear from circulation and that our currency will be contracted to that amount. Yet the very attempt to keep up the single gold standard has driven gold from circulation. It is said that we have in circulation in this country gold to the amount of $600,000,000. I believe that this is a gross exaggeration; but even if it were true, what has become of the vast amount of gold produced by the United States since 1792?

During the last one hundred years we have produced in the United States gold to the amount of nearly $2,000,000,000; deduct from this the $600,000,000 now claimed to be in circulation. The query then arises, What has become of the billion four hundred millions of gold which we produced in the first century of our existence as a nation, but which has gone from us? During this same period, according to the report of the Director of the Mint, $1,233,004,476 in silver has been produced by the United States.

On the 1st day of January, 1895, $625,192,694 of this silver remained in the United States; $607,811,782 had gone from us, gone to fill up the coffers of foreign nations, gone to pay our immense and growing foreign indebtedness, gone into the control of foreign bankers and syndicates to be used by them to force the United States to issue more interest-bearing bonds in order that we might be enabled to keep up the gold standard.

Just so long as we continue to pay our immense foreign indebtedness in gold, just so long will it continue to flow out of the country like a mighty river in an ever-increasing torrent. No one knows, no statistics show the amount of our foreign indebtedness.

Of the vast amount of farm products, machinery, and other exports we send abroad we keep a record. We know just how many bushels of corn and wheat and oats we send to foreign countries. We know the amount and value of our immense exports of beef and pork, cheese, butter, and other products.

Our custom-house officers furnish us with the record of all our imports from other nations and their estimated value.

But no one knows or can approximate with any certainty the amount of our foreign obligations. Not only are our Government, State, and municipal bonds largely owned abroad, but our 180,000 miles of railroads, bonded in many cases to double the amount of their actual cost, have sold abroad their bonds in such vast amounts that the sum total is appalling and beyond human comprehension.

But this is not all. This is an age of trusts and combinations. We have our sugar trust, grown so mighty and powerful that it is openly confessed that it controls legislation and scandalizes public officials. Our match trusts, our cotton-seed oil trust, our standard oil combinations, our brewery combinations, our great mining and manufacturing interests, all of these and many others, representing every form and kind of American enterprise, have sent abroad their bonds, mortgages, and other forms of indebtedness until the sum total pales into insignificance our national and State debts.

Our bonds and other debts owned at home, by our own people, can be paid in any kind of legal-tender money—in greenbacks, in gold certificates, Treasury notes, national-bank notes, and even in despised silver or silver certificates. But when it comes to paying this same class of indebtedness to foreigners who are fortunate enough to own them gold and gold alone is demandep and paid.

As soon as the foreign investor takes our national, State, municipal, commercial, industrial, or other form of American indebtedness abroad, that moment they become payable in gold, and gold alone will be received; so that practically, under our system, the Government of the United States not only undertakes to pay in gold its own bonds, but all the other indebtedness sent abroad by State, municipal, commercial, and industrial corporations; undertake to do that which it is a physical impossibility for it to do, except by continually selling its bonds for gold, and in time there must be an end to this process. When do you propose to stop this debt-increasing system? In my humble judgment it is better to stop now and make use of the vast amount of silver found in greater abundance in our own country than in any other country in the world and thus double the amount of primary money and make it possible not only now but in the future to redeem our obligations in gold or silver, in the money of the Constitution, in the money that was always found good and sufficient until degraded and destroyed by foolish, wicked, and vicious legislation.

What remedy does the present Administration offer for all the ills that it is acknowledged we are suffering under? What remedy do all those who advocate the gold standard propose to cure the sick financial infant?

They tell us to retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes. They tell us to issue five hundred millions more of Government interest-bearing bonds, and thus increase the burdens of an already overburdened and overtaxed people.

But would this solve the problem? Would this do away with the scramble for gold? If it be true that our gold goes abroad to pay our foreign indebtedness and the vast sums expended every year by our men of wealth who go abroad for pleasure—and I firmly believe it is true—then the remedy proposed would not stop the demand for gold.

In my judgment if every greenback and every Treasury note were called in to-morrow and canceled it would not lessen the demand for gold for export, so long as our foreign indebtedness, principal and interest, is payable in gold. It might not be so easy for the banker or the exporter to get his gold as he gets it now. But get it he would, or else default would have to be made in gold pay ments, and the last state of things would be as bad or worse than the first. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the committee, that there is not gold enough to go around, and the sooner we recognize this fact, which is or ought to be patent to every thinking mind, the sooner we shall find the true remedy for our bad financial condition.

Let us, then, as Republicans, who are in so large a majority in this House, not only profess bimetallism but act bimetallism. Let us add to our redemption money the products of our mines, gold and silver, giving them both an equal chance for free coinage and in the redemption of our vast indebtedness.

We are told that gold is the recognized standard throughout the civilized world. This is true so far as monarchical Europe is concerned. Yet I believe it to be true that even in Europe those countries using the greatest amount of silver are the most prosperous. France to-day, according to its population, is using twice the amount of silver we are using without any ill effects, and is recognized as being the most prosperous of all the European powers.

Japan, with her 40,000,000 of people, has made mightier strides in the last twenty years in the great onward march of progress and civilization than any nation on the face of the earth, and uses, I believe, nothing but silver. China, with her hundreds of millions of population, though not so progressive on account of her dense prejudices and her unpopular form of government, uses nothing, I believe, but silver. India, with its teeming millions, which has but recently closed its mints to the coinage of silver, yet uses nothing but the white metal as primary money.

Mexico, which is fast emerging from a half civilized condition to the rank of a first-class nation, keeps her mints open to the coinage of silver, and according to all the evidence and information we are able to gather, is in a more prosperous condition than at any other time during her existence as a nation.

The South American Republics, all great silver using nations, are prosperous and progressing at a rate never dreamed of before.

I cite these nations, not that I believe or am in favor of emulating their example by adopting silver monometallism, but to show that nations can and are prosperous even under that condition, and to call your attention to the fact that if it is the true and only honest policy to adopt the gold standard then it would be the honest and best policy for Japan, China, India, Mexico, and the South American Republics to adopt the same policy. If, according to the theory of the gold-standard advocates, these nations, with their hundreds of millions of population, with their vastly increasing commerce at home and abroad, should conclude to be honest and adopt the single gold standard, where are they going to get the gold to do it with?

They would be forced to do precisely what we are doing now—issue their bonds for the purchase of gold.

And the scramble that is now going on among the different nations of the world would be intensified to such an extent as to become intolerable. It would demonstrate to a still greater degree (that which is already patent) that there is not gold enough to go around, and the consequence would be that gold would go higher and higher. The products of the farm, the factory, and mines would go lower and lower, and it would become more and more of a burden for men to live and pay their honest debts. Let us pause while there is yet time in this mad career—this unholy scramble after gold.

I am a Republican. I cast my first vote for Abraham Lincoln in front of Petersburg, Va., in 1864, and have continued to vote the ticket ever since.

I am a firm believer in the principles of the Republican party, and do not believe that a full measure of prosperity will again be reached until the Republican party is again placed in full control of our national affairs and a protective policy again fully restored.

I do not believe that all the ills we have suffered in the last three years were brought about by the demonetization of silver in 1873, but I do believe that making gold practically the only money of redemption has had much to do with the steady and gradual decline of products, business, and profits that has been going on for the last twenty years.

If the Republican party had not been voted out of power in 1892 and the Democratic free-trade party voted in, times would not have been as bad as they are now. We should have been enjoying a measure of prosperity, at least. But I do not believe that this nation will again reach that measure of prosperity which we are entitled to and should enjoy until both gold and silver are again used as a basis for all of our currency.

The convention in which I was nominated adopted a platform in which appears the following declaration:

Resolved, That we believe in the largest possible use of silver consistent with the maintenance of our national credit, and that we also believe in the use of gold and silver as the money of our nation, and that silver should be restored to its time-honored position in the nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that platforms are made merely for politicians to ride into office on. I believe they are made for honest men to stand upon, and for one I intend to stand upon that platform as I understand it.

I do not apprehend that any patriotic citizen of this great Republic is desirous of destroying the credit of this great nation. For one I desire to build up and strengthen the credit of the nation, and believe that the surest and easiest way to accomplish this result is to provide more standard or basic money, and this can only be done by throwing our mints open to the coinage of silver.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the time-honored position of silver in this nation? For nearly a century from the foundation of the Government up to 1873 our mints were open to its free coinage at a ratio of from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1. I do not pretend to say that we may not at any time change this ratio.

The Constitution of the United States expressly places the power to fix the value in the Congress, and to coin gold and silver—not gold alone, but gold and silver.

The platform of the Republican party adopted by the State convention in the city of Grand Rapids in July, 1894, adopted the following plank in regard to silver:

We believe in the use of gold and silver as money metals, to be maintained in circulation on a perfect equality and inconvertibility.

We recognize the so-called silver question as one of the paramount political issues of the day, and believe that the people of this State and country do look to the Republican party, the party of ability and progress, as the only party that can give a wise and adequate solution of this problem. We therefore pledge the Republican party of Michigan to use every effort in its power to restore silver to its historic position in the United States as a money metal.

We pledge this in the belief that permanent prosperity will not be assured or justice be done until silver takes its time-honored place side by side with gold as one of the two great money metals of the world.

In 1895 the Republican platform again declared its adherence to the platform of the silver plank of 1894.

All these declarations in favor of the restoration of silver to its time-honored position in the nation mean something, or else we are dishonest and are attempting to deceive. I believe they mean just what they say, that silver should again be restored, and shall cast my vote for its restoration. The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], in his intensely interesting and able speech delivered on this floor yesterday, like all men who believe in the single-gold standard, says he believes in bimetallism, but points out no way of reaching that desired haven except through international agreement.

I agree with him that international agreement would be the best possible solution if it could be brought about. But the gentleman from Maine knows, as we all know, that there is no human probability of any such agreement. We must therefore adopt some other means, or else give up the fight for bimetallism and settle down to the single gold standard, with all its blighting consequences. Mr. DINGLEY tells us that there are now in the Treasury 353,000,000 silver dollars, kept there to redeem an equal amount of silver certificates which are now in circulation. This is right and proper as the law now stands upon the statute books, but the law is a bad law. It is a law which discriminates against the circulation of silver.

There never should have been a law making any of our various forms of paper money payable exclusively in gold or silver, but in gold or silver, at the option of the Government.

If every silver certificate is to be backed by a silver dollar deposited in the United States Treasury, then the same policy should be pursued with all other forms of paper money. No discrimination should be made against any form of our currency. The Government should not discredit and throw doubt around its own obligations.

If we, by our actions as the representatives of the people, throw doubt or discredit on our own money, we can not expect the people, and especially those of other nations, to have the most unbounded faith in it.

The trouble is, gentlemen of the committee, our whole financial system is illogical, inconsistent, and dishonest. Professing to make silver legal tender, yet we refuse to pay it out in payment of our obligations; professing to be bimetallists, yet we have adopted the strictest kind of gold monometallism.

Mr. DINGLEY says, "Take a five-dollar gold piece, melt it up, and it is worth just as much as bullion as it was when coined and bearing the Government stamp." This is true, but why is it true? Because you have done for gold precisely what we are now asking you to do for silver, namely, allowing the holder of the gold bullion to take it back to the mint and have it recoined into legal-tender money without cost.

When silver enjoyed this same constitutional privilege for nearly a century of our national existence, a silver dollar could be melted up and be worth just as much as when it was coined and bore the stamp of the Government. The difference is in the treatment of the two metals—treat them both alike, on equal terms, and then it will be fair to make comparisons. It is not fair to debase and cheapen silver by destroying by legislative enactment practically all demand for it and then turn around and say that it is not fit for standard redemption money because it is too cheap.

My distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] says that if we open our mints to the free coinage of silver and expect to keep the two metals at a parity we must believe that free coinage will double the value of silver bullion. The error in this statement is this: He insists on measuring all values in gold, which has been made abnormally high by the extraordinary demand created for that metal by making it the only money of redemption. Take away that demand, or a considerable portion of that demand, and the price of gold will fall. Increase the demand for silver by making it perform part of the work now performed by gold alone and silver will go up and meet on a common level with

what is now called the more precious metal. The production of the two metals on a basis of 16 to 1 have been about equal. There is no overproduction of either metal.

But, Mr. Speaker, my time has expired. Allow me to say, in conclusion, that I have no sympathy with those who believe in the formation of a new party based on a single idea for the solving of this question.

A party formed on a single idea never did succeed and never will succeed.

I am a Republican, and propose to make my fight inside the ranks of the Republican party, a party which has the confidence of the people of this country.

Our Democratic friends can not succeed in restoring silver, because the people of this country have no confidence in them. If they should undertake it they would be sure to make a bungling job of it. just as they did with tariff reform. Our Populist friends can not succeed, because they enjoy to a still less degree, if that were possible, the confidence and respect of the American people. In fact, the Populists are not now, nor never have been, true bimetallists. They are simply inflationists. Their wild and visionary schemes of almost unlimited fiat money will never be indorsed by the people of this country. So, Mr. Speaker, our only hope for true bimetallism is through the Republican party. For one, I cast my first vote for it. I expect to cast my last vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes a. m., Saturday, February 8) the House adjourned until 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 8, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 5474, a committee bill, to provide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul patents upon public lands, and for other purposes, to which the Committee on Public Lands have prepared some amendments, be ordered to be printed with the proposed amendments.

There being no objection, the order was made.

BRAINERD AND NORTHERN MINNESOTA RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. That motion is in order. This bill does not go to the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, at the end of the bill, add section 6:
"That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, and repeal this act or any part thereof."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

On motion of Mr. FLETCHER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

SIOUX RESERVATION, DAKOTA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

The Senate amendment was read, as follows:

On page 2, line 28, after the word "shall" insert "not be for a longer period than ten years and shall"; so that it will read "*Provided*, That such leases shall not be for a longer period than ten years," etc.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to hear some explanation of this bill.

The SPEAKER. This is the House bill with a Senate amendment. The question is on concurrence with the Senate amendment.

Mr. MADDOX. I did not understand it; it is all right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to have this amendment read again, Mr. Speaker. I did not understand the reading of it before.

The Senate amendment was again reported.

The amendment was concurred in.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in behalf of the Committee on Printing with regard to a question touching the RECORD, and to make a parliamentary inquiry.

I find in the RECORD of the 7th a speech printed, I suppose, under the consent of the House, put in by Mr. STALLINGS of Alabama, a reprint of many pages of an address by Senator GEORGE at Winona, Miss., last year. I beg to remind the Speaker of the action taken by the House when consent was granted to members to insert speeches in the RECORD. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], in response to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], said:

I ask unanimous consent also that gentlemen may be permitted to print speeches on this question for the period of ten days, with the understanding that they shall be such speeches as would ordinarily be delivered if an opportunity had offered on the floor of the House, and not to be a compilation of chapters from books and essays from magazines, which shall be excluded under this consent. I make this suggestion because once before, when a similar consent was given, members immediately began to print all the books in the library.

The Speaker, in submitting the question, said:

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

It was submitted on the proposition and under the limitation named by the gentleman from Maine.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the instance here cited is in clear violation of the consent given by the House. I understand that there are other instances, thus early, of this character.

Mr. DALZELL. I should like to ask the gentleman if he is aware that a member of the House from Texas has published the speech of another member of the House from Texas, delivered somewhere in Texas at a political meeting?

Mr. PERKINS. My attention has been called to that, Mr. Speaker, but I have not seen the instance in the RECORD.

Mr. HARTMAN. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. We have none of us any disposition, I assume, to violate any agreement or rule of the House. I want to cite my own case in this regard. On yesterday I had the honor of addressing the House for half an hour on this pending bill, and during that address I said that I would publish certain extracts from newspapers. Now, I want to know whether the rule which the gentleman refers to excludes me from doing that thing?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. PERKINS. No——

Mr. HARTMAN. Because I do not desire to violate a rule of the House.

Mr. PERKINS. No; the statement of the gentleman from Maine included this:

With the understanding, therefore, that it is to be such speeches as might ordinarily be delivered in the House, with such extracts as are usually read and belong to a speech, and not chapters from books, etc.

Mr. HARTMAN. The extracts which I propose to insert are of the usual kind.

Mr. PERKINS. The instance to which I call attention, Mr. Speaker, is one in which the entire address of a Senator is repeated, and certainly it appears to us that the Senators have ample opportunity to make expression of their views without our assistance on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa——

Mr. PERKINS. I have also now called to my attention the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PENDLETON] availed himself of the privilege by reprinting a speech delivered by the Hon. J. W. BAILEY at Sherman, Tex., on the 11th day of last June.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is as to whether this consent of the House is to be violated in this way. It would be better to withdraw that consent than to permit this to continue, and I wish to ask that these violations of that consent be marked and ordered stricken from the permanent RECORD; and I hope that instances of this kind may not be repeated, but that the exercise of the privilege may be confined within the limitation of this generous consent of the House. I think for myself that where speeches are printed in the RECORD by consent of the House they should be marked in the RECORD "Printed by consent of the House of Representatives," so that it might be understood that they were no part of the proceedings upon the floor of the House.

The understanding was distinct and clear, and in my judgment no gentleman has a reasonable excuse for violating that understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether my friend has offered any resolution or not. Of course the House will understand it is very difficult to determine exactly what is or what is not an abuse of the privilege to print. I am very sure the Speaker himself does not propose to decide that question.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. CRISP. I say it is very difficult to determine what is or what is not an abuse of the privilege to print remarks, and I am very sure that the Speaker himself will not decide that question. It has frequently arisen, during my service here, and, as I say, it is

very difficult to determine. Now, I recollect very well the statement of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] at the time this consent was obtained, and I agreed with it. I thought it was right and proper.

But I am not prepared to say that that to which the gentleman calls attention is a violation of the rule. either.

Mr. PERKINS. It is a violation of the consent under the limitation.

Mr. CRISP. Now, why? Suppose that I should rise in my place and be recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to make remarks upon the question now pending, and I should have in my possession an address delivered by some other gentleman on that particular subject at some other place, which I regarded as a full, able argument on the subject, and I should say, "Mr. Chairman, I propose to read in this connection the remarks made by Mr. Jones" at such a place and such a time, and I should read. Now, would you strike it from the RECORD?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir; there could be no objection to that, to anything you might read here in your own time, but this is quite a different case. The House has given consent to any member to print without speaking, without occupying time, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the remarks he would have liked to submit in the open House.

Mr. CRISP. That is it.

Mr. PERKINS (continuing). That consent was limited to such remarks as he would have made, but to print speeches that he might find in the Congressional Library or where not was not included in that consent.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman assumes that. I do not know whether it was or not.

The only rule, Mr. Speaker, that has ever been adopted, or ever can be, on the question of this right to print, where it is given, is this: That the speech shall not be impertinent; that it shall not be foreign to the subject at issue, contain any personal matter, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, it shall not be a cooperation between half a dozen gentlemen to print a book, or anything of that sort; but when you come specifically to define what is a violation of this privilege it is hard to do it. Now, I would have no doubt that what was done a few years ago, when a book was printed, when one gentleman presented one chapter and another another, and another another, that that was a violation of the spirit of the rule; but if I get up in my place and present an address made by a gentleman anywhere in the United States on the pending subject-matter, I am inclined to think it is not a violation of the rule.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will permit me, there is no dispute here as to what the gentleman might do when he gets up in his place——

Mr. CRISP. Can not he read it?

Mr. PERKINS (continuing). And what he might offer.

Mr. CRISP. Can not he read it?

Mr. PERKINS. He could read it.

Mr. CRISP. Could not he read what the gentleman said, if he chose?

Mr. PERKINS. There is no question about that, if he chose.

Mr. CRISP. Now, what is the gentleman's point?

Mr. PERKINS. Now, here is the point. Unanimous consent of the House was asked to print speeches outside of the debate occurring in this House, and such speeches as gentlemen might prepare by the aid of midnight oil and much perspiration, where they could not get time here, that they could for a period of ten days, under this unanimous consent, print those speeches in the RECORD, that they might have the advantage of them in their several districts. But that unanimous consent was limited. It was specifically provided that that consent did not extend beyond the production of the individual member.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, no.

Mr. PERKINS. But that he could use such extracts as he would like to make——

Mr. CRISP. Ah!

Mr. PERKINS. In the ordinary course of his speech; but that he could not transfer bodily a speech, or a magazine article, or a book from the library. That was clearly understood, and as to these two instances that have been referred to, they are in clear violation of the consent of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask permission to say a word upon this question.

Mr. CRISP. One moment. The gentleman has overlooked the statement in the RECORD, and I had myself. I call his attention——

Mr. PERKINS. I read it.

Mr. CRISP. I call the gentleman's attention to it:

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity of making a permanent addition to the literature on the subject of finance. I will ask to be allowed, as I believe I am already under the special rule permitted to do, to have printed in the RECORD, in the ordinary type, the speech of the Hon. J. Z. GEORGE, of Mississippi, delivered at Winona, Miss., on Saturday, July 13, 1895.

I am informed that the gentleman did that in the open House. I was not here myself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is true. I am so informed by the reporters themselves.

Mr. CRISP. He rose in the open House and asked that permission.

Mr. BRUMM. There is no doubt about that; I was here.

Mr. CRISP. Now, that seems to cover the whole case.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, in reference to the other case. The gentleman from Alabama stated that he understood he had already consent.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; but he also asked permission of the House last evening.

Mr. PERKINS. That may be. I can not deny that. Of course any consent that the House may at any time choose to give is not a thing for me to criticise or make contention about.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Georgia the RECORD containing the speech before him?

Mr. CRISP. I have.

The SPEAKER. What was said on that occasion? Was the consent of the House asked by the presiding officer or was it stated that consent had been already given?

Mr. CRISP. It does not appear that there was any response to the statement or suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama. The Chair will see what took place on page 1507 of the RECORD.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Alabama proceeded under the assumption that he already had consent, which consent does not appear to have been granted.

The SPEAKER (examining the RECORD). There does not seem to have been any consent granted in this case.

Mr. CRISP. No further than as I have stated. But, Mr. Speaker, what does appear in the RECORD shows that there was no purpose on the part of the gentleman from Alabama to violate the spirit of the rule, and that he intended to print what he would have been glad to read if he had had an opportunity, and that is what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asked might be accorded to members, the right to print such speeches as they would make if they had the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The last clause of the request made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] reads, "with the understanding, therefore, that it is to be such speeches as may be ordinarily delivered in the House, with such extracts as may be usually read belonging to a speech, and not chapters of books or magazines," and matters of that kind.

Mr. CRISP. But, as the Chair sees from the RECORD, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STALLINGS] notifies the House that he desires and intends to print the speech. It is true he assumed that he had already the right to do it, but he asked additional consent to do it, and no objection was made to that request.

Mr. PERKINS. It does not appear that the question was submitted to the House.

Mr. CRISP. It does not.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Speaker, of course it would not be any part of my duty here to call attention to a case where the House had given its consent; and in what I have said I have been referring only to instances which come under the general consent of the House as limited and defined in the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. CRISP. This is not a speech of unusual length, and no doubt the gentleman from Alabama would have been glad to have read it if he had had an opportunity. However, as the gentleman from Iowa doubtless has a proper purpose in view in calling attention to this matter, I submit that if there is anything to be done about it the gentleman had better adopt the course which has been adopted on previous occasions and have the subject referred to the Committee on Rules or in some way direct the attention of that committee to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia would be a satisfactory one to the House. The Speaker, of course, would not like the task of discriminating in such a case as this. It rests largely upon the good faith of members what shall be printed under a general leave to print, and it is very possible that the particular cases which are made the subject of question on this occasion might readily be disposed of with the consent of the gentlemen who have put the speeches in the RECORD, the presumption being that they did not intend to violate the rule.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly have no purpose in this matter except to protect the RECORD. I have no feeling against any individual member. I think that in time past the leave to print has been abused, and, so far as I am able, I desire to prevent that abuse in this Congress. In these two instances, however, I will ask that unanimous consent be given for the printing of these speeches in the RECORD; but I hope hereafter the conditions of the general consent will not be violated, and that any member who has occasion to print a speech of this character will ask for unanimous consent apart from the general consent which has been granted. Now,

Mr. Speaker, to clear up this matter, I ask unanimous consent that these two speeches be retained in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the continuance in the permanent RECORD of the speeches which have been printed in the daily RECORD by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STALLINGS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PENDLETON], respectively.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893;

A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation; and

A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 1447) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. G. M. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BOND REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of consideration of the pending bill.

[Mr. GROSVENOR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. EVANS] desires to be recognized and to utilize thirty minutes of his time and then yield to his colleague [Mr. MCCREARY].

Mr. EVANS. That is my purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. EVANS] is recognized.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, it is by no means my purpose upon this occasion to discuss the currency generally, because, if for no other reason, the question before us does not call for it.

The only matter to be determined is, Shall the House concur in the Senate's action in substituting for our bill for maintaining and protecting the coin redemption fund a measure having objects which do not even in the remotest degree bear upon it? Analyzing the Senate's substitute, we find that it relates to four distinct subjects, not one of which is germane to the House bill. They are: First, the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; second, the coinage of the silver seigniorage now in the Treasury; third, the calling in of all greenbacks and Treasury notes of denominations of less than $10, and the reissue of the same in bills of that denomination, and fourth, requiring the redemption of our paper currency in gold or silver coin at the exclusive option of the Secretary of the Treasury. This last is doubtless under the hope that we shall at some more or less remote date have a free-silver Secretary.

I shall only discuss the first of the measures proposed by the Senate substitute, and that with brevity. The consideration of the free-silver clause of the proposed substitute does not, as I have indicated, legitimately involve any discussion of the general subject of currency, but only that of the coinage, which, though a wide and most important one, falls far short of the limits of the other. As far back as there was money silver and gold were the metals mainly used to make it, and while other metals, from time to time, were also used, yet in that process of evolution by which the best was found gold and silver alone have survived, and if the process of selection is to be continued on the same lines, the friends of silver may, by their extravagant unwisdom in insisting upon the 16 to 1 ratio, force the survival of gold as the fittest, and by the elimination of the least fit put us on a basis of that gold monometallism they so much dread. Unless this is done, it seems to me, from the standpoint from which I view the question, that both metals may continue to be used if there can be an adjustment of all controversies as to their respective values upon such a basis and in such a way as to secure and maintain, at least approximately, the parity of the intrinsic value of the quantity of metal to be put into a dollar made of each. If this is done the two old and traditional money metals will continue their companionship, but in no other way can this result be reached. It may not be reached even in that way, but it will never be attained by free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of rejecting the substitute and of insisting upon our own bill, for several reasons, which I shall take the liberty of presenting to the consideration of the committee. The chief of these is, that we should resist with all our power the creation of fiat money to any extent whatever. No candid and intelligent man will contend that the two metals have now a relative value of only 16 to 1. Their real relative value is unquestionably nearer to 32 to 1. Now, to put into one coined dollar 100 cents of value in gold and into another coined dollar only 50 cents of value in silver, and call them the same thing, is to create in the latter 50 cents of mere fiat money; that is, money which is such by mere fiat or command of the Government alone, and not money which, to that extent, has any intrinsic value whatever. In my judgment this is utterly irrational and unphilosophic, not to say fantastic and absurd, and will ultimately be so regarded by those not blinded by too direct an interest in silver mines or silver miners.

It will not do to say that greenbacks are fiat money, for as long as they are redeemed and redeemable in gold there is nothing like fiat money about them except their legal-tender quality, which, however, becomes immaterial from that standpoint as soon as they are redeemable on demand in gold. When we speak of money and not of its mere paper symbol or representative we mean a quantity of the precious metals the weight and fineness and consequent intrinsic value of which is ascertained by a mark thereon lawfully made by the almost ineffaceable stamp of the Government mint, and we do not mean that unintelligible and elusive phantom called "primary money" or "money of ultimate redemption" by those who employ terms which, like many of those of the old alchemists, nobody so little understands as those who use them most glibly. Any coin is a fraud to the extent that the Government stamp upon it misrepresents its intrinsic commercial value, and our Government, of all others, with its magnificent financial record, ought not to be guilty of putting such a fraud upon her people. We demand honest dollars, every one of which has an intrinsic value equal with the other; one we can tie to at home and abroad; one that the laboring man can rely upon without fear that its fluctuations in value can cause him a loss before he can hasten a time to spend it in order to prevent that loss, and all equally valuable intrinsically, thus excluding fiat money of every sort. We can not afford to have two coins called a dollar, each a legal-tender in paying debts, while one is worth 50 cents and the other a hundred. Such a folly would amaze the thoughtful man of the present and would most certainly astonish our posterity.

The result of such a state of things would be the exclusion of the more valuable dollar from circulation, because, of course, a sensible man would not use 100 cents of value when 50 cents of value would serve him as well, and we should soon be upon a silver basis, and have in consequence a second-rate commercial standing before the world along with Mexico and other free-silver countries, instead of having the magnificent position we have had and to which we are so fairly entitled. Instead of standing in the front rank and at par with the proudest countries of the world, we should sink to a 50 per cent below par position as soon as we reached the silver basis, and our dollar, inflated at home, would be dishonored abroad.

I do not deny that I have a sympathy with our friends of the silver sections of the country, whose expectations may have been disappointed, and who have thought that we should continue to buy enormous quantities of silver the Government had no use for in order to give their principal industry a market for its product. This was a hope fostered by the act of 1878 and the Sherman Act, but it must be remembered that this alternative was thereby presented, either that the small silver sections must give up this unwisely and injuriously bestowed advantage or else that the vast majority of our people and the great preponderance of other sections of the country must suffer injury the extent of which would be so enormous as to be incalculable.

Before proceeding further I will pause long enough to pay a deserved tribute to the Sherman bill. It demonstrated to the country by its operations that the more favor was shown silver the less valuable that metal became. The longer the act was in force the lower silver descended in price and the more there was of commercial and financial disturbance. This is a lesson that should not be lost nor forgotten by the thoughtful legislator. But it is made matter of observation in this debate that the Government should not only permit the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, but should maintain the parity of the two coins.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States may go to the absurdity of declaring that 50 cents in silver shall be equal to 100 cents in gold, and of announcing that it will maintain that declaration against all comers, and with its immense resources and powers it may for a time make the declaration good by exchanging a gold dollar for a silver one every time it is desired; but even its resources are limited, and if free and unlimited silver coinage should go on for any length of time, or if the Sherman Act, which was far short of free coinage, had continued in operation, even our great Republic would have had to acknowledge that it was unequal to the task of losing 50 per cent of every silver dollar it was called upon to make equal to a gold one. There are some things which are impossible, and this would be one of them.

The people of this country were willing and are willing "to do something for silver," as the phrase is, but they are not willing to do that much, nor to "be done" that much.

We can possibly digest the number of that sort of silver dollars already upon the financial stomach, but that the limit has been reached was demonstrated by the panic of 1893–'94.

It comes at last, Mr. Chairman, to a question of wise expediency. Is it wise or expedient to coin both gold and silver, or only one of them? If we make the dollars equal in intrinsic value, use both metals, but if one is only half as valuable as the other, then to coin both upon equal terms would be an act of immeasurable folly which, while it might enrich a few silver miners or benefit politically or otherwise those who depend upon them, would come as near to ruining the rest of us as any one thing could.

There is nothing sacred and there should be nothing sentimental about it. It is a matter of plain common sense.

If you can put a hundred cents' worth of silver into a dollar, then coin silver; but if that is impractical it is because silver has ceased to be a proper coinage metal, and in that event it would be folly to coin it, because, while it might benefit the few, it would ruin the many.

Mr. Chairman, the second objection I urge to the substitute is that the free and unlimited coinage of silver would, to the extent of the difference in intrinsic value between gold and silver dollars, result in the repudiation of public, and especially of private, obligations. Of course, such a system of coinage would promptly drive all the gold out of circulation. The people would understand that the silver dollar, so called, was really only half a dollar, except for the mere purpose of paying debts that had been contracted on a gold basis, as the present basis certainly is. Prices might be inflated as they were in times of depreciated currency during the war, but debts would be stationary and dischargeable in a currency only half as valuable as that with reference to which they had been created. Though belonging myself to the debtor class of the people, I am utterly opposed to this and to every other form of repudiation, however insidious may be its approaches or however alluring may be its disguise.

I have already alluded to the fact that the inevitable result of the passage of such a law as the Senate proposes in the first section of its substitute would be the driving out of all the gold currency, for it could not be retained when it can at home and abroad be converted into that which can perform double its functions at least in paying debts. It will be seen that with the gold dollar worth intrinsically double as much as a silver one it can be used in that ratio in purchasing anywhere its less valuable substitute. To put it otherwise, the possessor of 100 cents in gold will part with it for another commodity which can so soon be converted into what is equivalent for debt-paying purposes to 200 cents, although that 200 cents represents 100 of mere fiat. All gold currency would, in this manner, soon dissappear in the work of dumping the silver of the world upon us.

Because it seems to me that nothing but evil and confusion could result from the adoption of the substitute I most earnestly oppose it.

Viewing the matter, Mr. Chairman, from another standpoint, I oppose the adoption of the substitute because the House bill is an excellent and proper measure within itself, which has had already the happy fate of exerting a most potent and valuable influence for good upon the Treasury, for even while it had only passed this House, and was being stabbed to death in the other, it has, by the operative force of being discussed and passed here, yielded to the Government a net income of some $7,000,000 in gold coin. While it was being discussed in this House we were threatened with the loss of the amount of the enormous profits that a New York syndicate was to make by another sale of a hundred million dollars of Government bonds at a premium of about 4 or 4½ per cent, but under the pressure of the bill as passed by the House, under pressure of the discussions in this body, in short, under that much stress of sound Republican doctrine and statesmanship the Administration has been forced into changing its programme and into offering that hundred million loan to popular subscription, and in this way has been enabled to sell the whole amount at a premium of about 11 per cent, and with bids made for nearly five hundred million more than were for sale. Yet with the value of the House bill thus demonstrated the Senate of the United States sends back to us this wholly irrelevant substitute, which it seems to me this House should never concur in. It should insist upon its own measure, the wisdom and value of which has been thus so signally demonstrated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. EVANS] to now yield to his colleague [Mr. McCREARY].

Mr. EVANS. I do.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when Congress convened two months ago there was a surplus in the Treasury of $98,000,000, exclusive of the gold reserve. With more money on hand than was necessary to defray the current expenses and meet the obligations of the Government and a financial system that was a perpetual menace to the gold reserve, the President in two messages asked for legislation to relieve the country by a complete change in our financial system. He referred to the United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and Treasury notes, which have been draining the gold out of the Treasury, and showed that they were the great source of embarrassment and danger, and recommended such a revision of our monetary laws as will give us an adequate and elastic but not a contracted currency.

The House of Representatives responded to the President's request with a general tariff bill increasing the burdens of taxation $44,000,000 annually, although the President in his message and the Secretary of the Treasury in his report declared that there was no necessity for increasing the revenue and no necessity for imposing additional burdens in the way of taxation upon the people. The House of Representatives also responded to the President's message by the passage of another bill authorizing the issue of 3 per cent coin bonds, redeemable in five years from date and payable in fifteen years. That relief was not such as the country expected; that was not such relief as the President asked. It was unwise, unnecessary, and inadequate. We already had upon our statute books a law authorizing the issuance of bonds, and the strong proof of it is that within the last few days bonds have been issued under the act of 1875.

While one branch of Congress was passing a free coinage bill and the other branch of Congress was seeking to pass a tariff bill, the gold reserve fell below $50,000,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury was forced to make a sale of bonds in order to keep the gold reserve at $100,000,000. The success of the Government sale of 4 per cent bonds at a high premium, which was equivalent to less than 3¼ per cent bonds, has been hailed throughout the country with gratification. The amount asked for was five times oversubscribed. Four thousand six hundred and forty bids, aggregating $568,000,000, were made when only $100,000,000 were desired. It is clear that the public credit of the United States is not excelled by any other nation of the world. The financial independence of our country has been conspicuously demonstrated, and it is believed that not since the resumption of specie payments has anything happened so encouraging to business interests and so promotive of confidence as the success of that sale.

This vote of confidence in our country, this vindication of the patriotism and resources of our people, proves that the people of the United States have no fears that the bonds will be paid otherwise than they have always been paid—in the best money coined. There is but one unpleasant feeling in connection with this splendid transaction, and that is a feeling of deep regret that a nation with such sound credit, whose obligations command such a high premium, should have such unwise and vicious financial laws as to be forced, though her revenues are large and her Treasury surplus ample, to become a heavy borrower of gold to meet the obligations which proper legislation should have provided long ago.

Mr. COX. One word just in that connection. Have you before you a statement showing who made the subscriptions for the bonds?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have not; but there were 4,640 bids, and I can say to my friend from Tennessee that not only did the bankers make bids, but many bids have come from private individuals all over the country, and thus we have the best evidence we have ever had in our country of the confidence that our people have in our Government.

I desire to say in this connection that the Democratic party is not responsible for the existing financial condition. Republicans in 1873 stopped the coinage of silver dollars. Republicans in 1890 passed the Sherman bill, which made silver a commodity and which required Treasury notes to be issued which were held to be redeemable in gold. Republican legislation put our Government in the banking business. Republican legislation required greenbacks and Treasury notes to be redeemed in gold as desired by the holder, and Republican legislation brought about the conditions which have required bonds to be issued to maintain the gold reserve in the Treasury. My friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] to-day spent nearly half of his hour in glorifying the Republican party—that same party which was in the majority in the Fifty-

first Congress, but went out of power so signally in the Fifty-second Congress; the same party that gave us the McKinley tariff bill, but refused to give that McKinley tariff bill a vote of confidence at this session by restoring it, but went only part of the way in its restoration; that same party that gave us the Sherman law in 1890, but made haste to repeal it in 1893. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] glorifies his party now as he did in the Fifty-first Congress. His eloquent words, his well-rounded sentences, and his prediction that the Republican party would be in the majority at the next election are not new to the older members of this House, for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVEVOR] indulged in these same predictions in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. BOATNER. That is a habit of his, is it not?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I think it is a habit of the gentleman from Ohio. He is an optimist, particularly in politics, and especially when it comes to the election of a Republican President. He spoke in "linked sweetness long drawn out" about the Republican prospects in the Fifty-first Congress, yet when the people spoke at the following November election they crushed his hopes and the hopes of many other Republicans, and elected a House of Representatives with nearly a hundred majority of Democrats. If Republican Representatives will continue to make such a record as they have made in the last two months in this Congress, there is good ground for hope that when the next election occurs there will be a repetition of what happened after the record of the Fifty-first Congress had been considered by the country, and the people will again show their wisdom by sending a majority of Democrats to the next Congress. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have limited time and can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. If Representatives will increase my time I will be glad to answer any question.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to what the House of Representatives did, and now I desire to refer to what the Senate did in response to the message of the President of the United States. The Senate of the United States responded to the message of the President by passing a free-coinage bill as a substitute for the House bond bill, and the Senate substitute is now under consideration. I voted against the House bond bill and I am opposed now to concurring in the Senate substitute. This substitute for the House bill provides for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, that is, 16 ounces of silver equal to 1 ounce of gold, when to-day the commercial or market value is 32 to 1. It means that there shall be a change in the monetary system under which we have been living and transacting business for many years. It means that our mints are to be thrown open to the free and unlimited coinage of the silver bullion of the world, and when coined it is to be delivered to the owners of the bullion, and all the people of the United States, but not of other countries, are to be compelled to receive the silver dollars coined as legal tender in the payment of all debts.

I am in favor of the largest use of silver and the largest coinage of silver consistent with the preservation of the credit of our Government and the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, so that a dollar, whether of gold or silver or paper, will have the same debt-paying power and the same purchasing power; but no more silver should be coined than will float at par with gold.

I am opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver by the United States alone. There is not a country in the world now successfully maintaining alone the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver, and every country which has alone persisted in the effort to maintain the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold has come to a silver basis. Every free and unlimited coinage of silver country is on a silver basis, and there is no free and and unlimited coinage country in the world that uses both gold and silver concurrently and equally as money. There is not a free and unlimited coinage country in the world that has one-fourth as much money in circulation per capita as we have in the United States, and there is no free and unlimited coinage of silver country where the laboring man receives fair pay for his day's work.

I regret that the time allowed me will not permit me to discuss at length the propositions I have just presented. They speak for themselves and will not be denied. I desire now to come nearer home with my argument. Gold and silver in the United States have never circulated concurrently and equally under free-coinage laws, but have only circulated concurrently and equally under acts of Congress preserving the parity of the two metals and providing for their circulation. The first coinage act was passed in 1792. The colonies had but a short time before gained their independence, and our Republic had taken its place among the family of nations; but the President and his Secretary of State (Thomas Jefferson) and his Secretary of the Treasury (Alexander Hamilton) were confronted with serious monetary difficulties which occupied much of their time and required much consideration. After considerable deliberation and examination it was agreed that a bill should be passed fixing the ratio at 15 to 1. The coinage act of 1792 was accordingly passed. The theory now so earnestly proclaimed, that we can by mere fiat of law establish a ratio which will remain regardless of the real value of metals, was not even considered at that time, but it was agreed by Jefferson and Hamilton and their associates that—

If the double standard was to be attempted at all it should be predicated on a ratio to be fixed by the commercial or market value of the two metals.

It was soon discovered that gold was undervalued at the ratio of 15 to 1, and that gold had disappeared from circulation. In 1806 Mr. Jefferson stopped the coinage of silver dollars, and no more silver dollars were coined for twenty-nine years, or until the administration of General Jackson. In 1834 President Jackson, aided by Daniel Webster, Thomas Benton, John C. Calhoun, and others, succeeded in having a bill passed increasing the ratio from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1, thereby making 16 ounces of silver equal to 1 ounce of gold. This was done to bring gold again into circulation, and from that day to this gold has been the standard. It was, however, soon ascertained that under this ratio silver was undervalued, and in a short time there was no silver in circulation. Congress passed the act of 1853 to supply the people with small money. At that time all the half dollars, quarters, and dimes coined under the acts of 1792 and 1834 were of full weight and had a bullion value which exceeded their money value, and this caused them to disappear.

The act of 1853 was passed by a Democratic Congress and it recognized gold as the standard, and it provided for the coinage of small pieces at the rate of 384 standard grains of silver to the dollar instead of 412½, as had been done before. This subsidiary coin was made legal tender only to the amount of $5, and in 1879 it was made legal tender for $10. I pause at this point to ask an important question, which I hope my free-coinage friends will consider carefully: If gold retired from circulation under the act of 1792, which fixed the ratio at 15 to 1, because the bullion in the gold dollar was worth 4 cents more than the bullion in the silver dollar, and if silver retired from circulation under the act of 1834, which changed the ratio to 16 to 1, because the bullion in the silver dollar was worth 3 cents more than the bullion in the gold dollar, how is it possible now to maintain gold and silver in concurrent circulation under a system of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 when the bullion in the gold dollar is worth about 50 cents more than the bullion in the silver dollar?

In 1862, in order to carry on the war, Treasury notes were made a legal tender and paper money was used for many years afterwards, the Congress of the United States having suspended specie payment in 1866, which was not resumed until 1879. It was in 1873 that the act was passed by the Republican Congress which dropped the coinage of the silver dollar. In 1878 the Bland-Allison Act was passed, which made silver dollars a legal tender and providing for the coinage of not less than $2,000,000 worth of silver bullion nor more than $4,000,000 worth per month. Under this act over 400,000,000 of silver dollars were coined. From the passage of the Bland-Allison Act in 1878 gold and silver have been circulating in our country upon an equality, the act of July 14, 1890, also requiring that the two metals shall be maintained on a parity with each other.

I will not dwell longer on this point, for I think it is clear that gold and silver have not in our country circulated together concurrently and equally under free-coinage laws, but have done so under laws enacted by Congress limiting the coinage of silver and requiring the parity of the two metals to be preserved.

The Senate free-coinage substitute seeks to change our monetary system, and the onus is on its supporters to show plainly and conclusively not only that the free, unlimited, and independent coinage of silver would not result in injury, but also that it would be beneficial. The United States under the existing conditions has never alone tried this system which has been disastrous to every other nation that has tried it alone and has brought each of them to silver monometallism. Appeals to passions and prejudices, attempts to array one class of citizens against another, and bold assertions unsupported by facts and reason will not be sufficient in discussing this vital and important question. People want facts; they desire truths, and will not be satisfied with fallacies, assertions, and exaggerated statements. I am neither a gold monometallist nor a silver monometallist. I am in favor of the coinage and use of both gold and silver, but, as I have said before, I wish the parity of the two metals to be maintained all the time, and no more silver should be coined than can be floated at par with gold.

Mr. CLARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. What law now keeps gold and silver at a parity?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The act of 1890, which declares that it is "the established policy of the United States to maintain the metals on a parity with each other upon the present ratio or

such ratio as may be provided by law." I will say further to my friend from Kentucky that the purchasing clause of the act of 1890, commonly known as the Sherman Act, was repealed in 1893, but the clause to which I refer, which is in the second section of the act, was not repealed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will ask the gentleman if he did not vote against the Sherman law?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I voted against the Sherman act in 1890, and I earnestly opposed the purchase of four and a half millions ounces of silver per month as provided in that act to be stored in the Treasury as a commodity, and Treasury notes issued on it which were held to be redeemable in gold. I voted, as did the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law in 1893. The clause of the bill providing for the maintenance of gold and silver on a parity with each other, as the gentleman well knows, was not repealed, and there were other clauses of that bill that were not repealed. That clause, for instance, which provided for the redemption of the Treasury notes which had been issued under the Sherman act was not repealed, because such action would have been repudiation of over $100,000,000 of Treasury notes which were in circulation.

Mr. BOATNER. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I can not yield unless my time is extended.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Kentucky be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Kentucky be extended for ten minutes.

Mr. KEM. Since there are members on this floor who are seeking a little time to speak and can not get it, I must object to any gentleman's time being extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, a part of my time has already been occupied by gentlemen who have interrupted me, and I hope I shall not have that deducted from the time allowed.

I was about to say when interrupted that gentlemen who advocate the free coinage of silver by the United States alone are not bimetallists. Bimetallism means "the concurrent use of gold and silver as a circulating medium of exchange at a fixed relative value." The existing law in our country fixes the ratio at 16 to 1. The commercial ratio to-day is 32 to 1. If we had free coinage of silver, with our mints open to the coinage of the silver bullion of the world, it would probably go to 35 to 1, so that there would be no fixed relative value, and the inevitable effect would be silver monometallism and not bimetallism. We have at present in the United States, in round figures, about sixteen hundred millions of all kinds of money in circulation, about one-third gold, one-third silver, and one-third paper. We therefore have about as many silver dollars in circulation as gold dollars, but each is equal in debt-paying and purchasing power. This never happened until after the coinage laws of 1878 were enacted. Assuming, therefore, that the concurrent circulation of gold and silver on terms of equality and parity is the real object of all good citizens, what more could free-coinage men ask than has already happened? We have coined fifty times as much silver in the last seventeen years as we coined in the previous eighty-one years, and we now have about one-third gold, one-third silver, and one-third paper, all circulating upon a parity. This showing conclusively refutes the charge of the free-coinage-of-silver men that the object of sound-money men is to establish gold monometallism.

In these important times there should be confidence as well as currency. Nothing should be done to disturb values, impair confidence, or injure the business interests of the country. In the last quarter of a century monetary conditions have changed all over the world. In the year 1870 the production of silver in the whole world was $55,000,000. Last year the production of silver in the world was $216,000,000. In 1870 the silver production of the United States was $16,000,000. Last year it was nearly $70,000,000. Thus the annual production of silver has quadrupled since 1870, not only in the United States, but in the world, while the production of gold in the world has not even doubled, the whole gold production of the world being in 1870 $130,000,000 and in 1895 $200,000,000. The monetary situation has been further changed because all the nations of Europe have closed their mints to the coinage of silver. Germany began in 1871, and in 1873 completed the work of closing her mints to the coinage of silver. The other great nations of Europe followed her in rapid succession, India being the last to close her mints to the coinage of silver in 1893.

If we propose to inaugurate great financial reforms in our country we must admit the truth of history, and we must submit to monetary laws that are older than our country. The United States can not alone by the passage of a free and unlimited coinage law jump to the rehabilitation of silver and the reestablishment of the parity of gold and silver. It required fourteen countries, including the United States, to maintain the free coinage of silver prior to 1873. Even the Latin Union countries of France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece were compelled to suspend the coinage of silver in 1876 when no longer supported by the other nations of Europe. It has been repeatedly said that France maintained the double standard from 1816 to 1873, and that we should follow her example. From 1816 to 1873 France, instead of maintaining silver in circulation by giving it a peculiar value, merely coined silver like other nations of Europe and at the same ratio. In 1876 France stopped the free coinage of silver, and has never restored it since that time. She is now using as we do, both gold and silver in about equal quantities, and maintaining gold and silver on a parity upon the old ratio. Legislation can not annul or change the inexorable law that "the relation of supply and demand is the regulator of value." The real cause of the reduction in the price of silver is that it only costs about half as much to produce it now as it did twenty-five years ago. Four times as much silver is being produced now as was produced a quarter of a century ago, and all the nations of the world have closed their mints to the free coinage of silver except Mexico, Bolivia, and Peru, and a few other small nations which coin but little. If we examine the map of the world we will see that the countries which recognize both gold and silver in their monetary systems have the largest volume of money and the largest per capita, andthose which have silver alone as money have the smallest volume of money and the smallest per capita. The United States, France, Spain, and Switzerland lead in the list of nations, and have from $16 per capita to $37 per capita, while Mexico, with its singe silver standard, has but $4 per capita, and Peru less than $3 per capita, and China not as much as $1 per capita.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate advocates of free and unlimited coinage of silver have said that the free and unlimited coinage of silver will put much money in the pockets of the people. I deny that statement. Free and unlimited coinage of silver will not fill the pockets of the people with money. Neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the silver mine owner will give freely to all who will take. Those who will be most benefited by the free coinage of silver are the silver mine owners who reside in the States of Colorado, Montana, Idaho, and Nevada, and in the Territories of Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico, with a population of about one million and a half. Would it be wise or just for 68,000,000 of people to have a changed monetary system which according to the experience of Mexico would give us a 50-cent dollar in order that the silver mine owner may prosper and grow rich at the public expense.

It has also been asserted in this House that the prosperity of a country is regulated by the amount of money in circulation, and if the amount in circulation is doubled it is claimed that prices would be doubled also. I am in favor of plenty of money in our country to meet the demands of business and trade and prosperity, but a superabundance of money does not make prosperity or increase the prices of commodities. In France the per capita circulation is at present $37; in England the circulation is $19 per capita; yet there is no appreciable difference in the prices of commodities in these adjoining countries, and labor commands higher prices in England than in France. In the United States the per capita circulation is $22. In France the per capita circulation is $15 more than in the United States, yet the prices of farm products in France are not as high as they are in our country, and labor does not command such wages. I have here a statement on this subject which I desire to present, because it is so applicable. It was compiled by Hon. K. NELSON from the Annual Statistical Abstract of 1894, and from the October Statistical Abstract of 1895, and shows the total money circulation, the gold circulation, the silver circulation, and the per capita circulation, and the New York export price of wheat and cotton for each year from 1872 to November, 1875. It is as follows:

Year.	Total money.*	Per capita.	Total gold.†	Total silver.‡	Wheat, per bushel.§	Cotton, per pound.
						Cents.
July 1, 1872...	$738,309,549	$18.19	$25,000,000	----------	$1.47	19.3
July 1, 1873...	751,881,809	18.04	25,000,000	----------	1.31	18.8
July 1, 1874...	776,083,031	18.13	25,000,000	----------	1.43	15.4
July 1, 1875...	754,101,947	17.16	25,000,000	----------	1.12	15
July 1, 1876...	727,609,388	16.12	25,000,000	$21,055,128	1.24	12.9
July 1, 1877...	722,314,883	15.58	25,000,000	37,884,853	1.17	11.8
July 1, 1878...	729,132,634	15.32	25,000,000	55,134,653	1.34	11.1
July 1, 1879...	818,631,793	16.75	125,785,182	69,797,503	1.07	9.9
July 1, 1880...	973,382,228	19.41	233,659,679	74,411,914	1.25	11.5
July 1, 1881...	1,114,238,119	21.71	321,072,397	115,292,505	1.11	11.4
July 1, 1882...	1,174,290,419	22.37	363,280,345	133,289,859	1.19	11.4

* Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 30. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

† Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 27. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

‡ Statistical Abstract, 1894, pages 28 and 29. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

§ Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 417. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, pages 481 and 482.

Year.	Total money.*	Per capita.	Total gold.†	Total silver.‡	Wheat, per bushel.§	Cotton, per pound.
						Cents.
July 1, 1883...	$1,230,305,696	$22.91	$404,460,863	$154,746,435	$1.13	10.8
July 1, 1884...	1,243,925,969	22.65	411,770,843	182,778,019	1.07	10.5
July 1, 1885...	1,292,568,615	23.02	468,398,141	184,320,836	.86	10.6
July 1, 1886...	1,252,700,525	21.82	434,263,950	186,958,828	.87	9.9
July 1, 1887...	1,317,539,143	22.45	467,766,118	246,250,603	.89	9.5
July 1, 1888...	1,372,170,870	22.88	512,208,683	306,649,367	.85	9.8
July 1, 1889...	1,380,361,649	22.52	493,611,797	363,090,028	.90	9.9
July 1, 1890...	1,429,251,270	22.82	505,089,782	407,867,574	.83	10.1
July 1, 1891...	1,497,440,707	23.41	527,382,232	474,509,782	.93	10
July 1, 1892...	1,601,347,187	24.44	549,662,443	548,516,702	1.03	8.7
July 1, 1893...	1,596,701,245	23.87	501,177,852	596,413,614	.80	8.5
July 1, 1894...	1,660,808,708	24.33	562,316,579	590,650,772	.67	7.8
July 1, 1895...	1,598,859,316	22.72	525,599,252	570,169,756	.692	8.6

*Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 30. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

†Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 27. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

‡Statistical Abstract, 1894, pages 28 and 29. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

§Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 417. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895. pages 481 and 482.

This table shows that during the period from 1872 to 1878 when silver dollars were not coined, when there was scarcely any gold and silver in circulation, and when the per capita circulation never exceeded $18 and was down as low as $16, the prices of wheat and cotton were higher than they have ever been since. It shows also that as our circulation has increased and as our gold and silver money has increased prices have in the main been gradually dropping lower and lower, and that they were never so low as in the year 1894, when our aggregate gold and silver circulation was the highest and when our per capita circulation was near the greatest amount it has ever attained. The table shows conclusively that prices have not been lowered through a want of currency, or through a want of either gold or silver, and that the prices of wheat and cotton during the five years that silver dollars ceased to be coined, from 1873 to 1878, were higher than during any five years since, and that the prices of cotton and wheat were never so low during any five-year period as during the five years succeeding the silver purchasing law of 1890. Fall of prices is mainly due to hard times, overproduction, inventions, competition, and reduced cost of transportation.

It has also been asserted that money is scarce in the United States. We have a larger volume of money in circulation in our country than any other nation on earth, amounting, according to the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, in round figures to $1,600,000,000. France stands next to the United States, with $1,400,600,000; Germany has $900,000,000, and Great Britain $800,000,000. The Director of the Mint in his last report shows that our per capita is nearly three times as great as the average per capita of civilized nations. Our facilities are also greatly increased by our thousands of banks and a greater mileage of railroads and telegraphs than any other country of the world.

It has been repeatedly asserted during this debate that the passage of the Senate substitute authorizing the free and unlimited coinage of silver would put silver on a parity with gold. The object lesson in Mexico answers this assertion fully. Since the enactment of a law authorizing the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver in Mexico gold has disappeared from that country, and they now have silver monometallism, and the Mexican silver dollar, although it contains 6 grains more of silver than the American dollar, is only worth 53 cents. But, Mr. Chairman, let us see what has happened in the United States. In 1878 a law was passed providing for the coinage of not less than $2,000,000 worth of silver nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver per month, and that law was in force until the Sherman law repealed it in 1890, yet silver declined in value. In 1890 the Sherman silver law was passed, which provided for the purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion monthly, or 54,000,000 ounces of silver bullion per annum, for which Treasury notes were issued, being about the entire product of silver of our country, yet silver continued to go down, and in 1893 the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was repealed, but this did not prevent silver from going to the low price of 50 to 51 cents on the dollar. Legislation has not helped the price of silver. The causes that depreciate it are not subject to legislation. If our mints were thrown open to the free and unlimited coinage of the silver of the world, instead of silver going to a parity with gold, silver dollars would be worth the bullion price of silver, our silver dollars would be worth about 50 or 51 cents to the dollar, and we would soon have in this country, as they have in Mexico, silver monometallism.

The time has come, in my opinion, when there should be no cowardice on the money question. If a man is for sound money, let him stand up for it with courage, advocate it, and vote for it. If he is for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, he should also be candid and courageous. Some of my friends take that position, and I am not here to criticise them; but I believe that the United States alone can not maintain the free coinage of silver, and if it should undertake to do so it would bring disaster, hard times, and such a disturbance of values in this country as has never been known before.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the gentleman from Kentucky think that the nations of the world acting together can maintain the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio here proposed?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I am in favor of an international agreement. At the Brussels Monetary Conference, where I had the honor to serve as a delegate, I advocated an international agreement. Our last national Democratic platform declared in favor of securing the parity of gold and silver through international agreement, and the act of Congress approved November 1, 1893, repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, declared in favor of securing the equality of gold and silver by international agreement or by safeguards of legislation. The German Reichstag and the French Chamber of Deputies have both declared in favor of issuing invitations to a monetary conference looking to an international agreement for the rehabilitation of silver at a common ratio, and in England the House of Commons concurred in the expression of the Governments of France and Germany. Our Congress, at the close of the last session, authorized the appointment of delegates to an international monetary conference, and I am heartily in favor of this movement which looks to action, not by one nation, but by many of the great nations of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I should like to have a little more time.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who has been recognized, yields ten minutes of his time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have not time to present as fully as I desire my objections to the Senate substitute, but I will take time to present some of the effects of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in the United States. Its financial effect would be to drive out of circulation the gold in our country, which now amounts to about $600,000,000. According to the Gresham law and to the experience of all countries in the past, depreciated money always drives good money out of circulation. Free coinage of silver would have the same effect in the United States that it had in Mexico and Peru, where gold ceased to circulate after free coinage was authorized.

The foreign commerce of our country amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars per annum. Last year about $700,000,000 worth of products went from the farms of this country. Our commerce has to be carried on with money that is sound and international and as good as gold, and our whole foreign commerce amounted last year to over $1,400,000,000. The effect of the free and unlimited coinage of silver on our great commercial interests, especially if our gold coin ceased to circulate, would be paralyzing if not ruinous.

There is another view to which I call the earnest attention of the members of this House. On the 23d of January, less than one month ago, 16 United States Senators who are the advocates of the free and unlimited and independent coinage of silver, and who represent silver-producing States, signed a declaration which has been widely published, in which they said:

> We are in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the independent action of the United States, and we are in favor of a tariff which shall be sufficient to equalize the cost of production in the United States and in European and Asiatic countries, and that the protection incident to such tariff shall be equally distributed in every section of the United States, and between the various products and industries of each State.

This shows that free coinage of silver and protection are moving hand in hand. Free silver coinage is an obstruction to international commerce. The tariff is also an obstruction to international commerce. Free coinage of silver means protection to the mine owners of the West, and the tariff means protection to the manufacturers of the East.

It is claimed that the interests of debtors demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Who are the largest debtors in our country? The United States owes a little over $900,000,000; cities, counties, municipalities, owe about $1,100,000,000; building and loan associations, $450,000,000; savings banks owe their depositors over $1,700,000,000, and other banks owe their depositors about $3,000,000,000; and it is asserted that the bonded debt of the railroads of the United States amounts to $6,000,000,000. We thus see who the principal beneficiaries would be if free coinage of silver was authorized. Certainly no just and patriotic man would be willing to allow these debtors to cancel their debts by the payment of one-half of the amount they owe. They originally received sound money worth 100 cents to the dollar. They should not be allowed to pay in depreciated money, but should be compelled to pay as they borrowed—in sound, honest dollars. Those

who have deposited their money in savings banks and building associations, and those who have insured their property or their lives, have been paying good money worth 100 cents to the dollar. I am opposed to any law that will rob these people or deprive them of one-half of the amount honestly due them. The national Democratic platform of 1892 declares—

The farmers and laborers are the first and most defenseless victims of an unstable and fluctuating currency.

The truth of this statement is manifest. No person would be injured more by the free coinage of silver than farmers and laborers.

Free-coinage men are clamoring for a free-coinage President and a free-coinage Congress. The evils and hardships which would follow are difficult to state. As soon as it was known that a free-coinage President and a free-coinage Congress had been elected every holder of a Government bond or security would present it for payment, if due, or, if not due, put it on the market for sale. Every holder of a note or other obligation against a debtor would call on the debtor for immediate payment, and if he failed to pay suit would be instituted, because free coinage of silver would mean that the silver dollar would come to its bullion value in our country, as it has in every other country, and the holders of Government bonds and the holders of individual notes or promises to pay would desire to collect the amount due before the new Congress could pass the free-coinage law. The credit of our Government would be greatly impaired, if not destroyed, and no individual could borrow money or get an extension unless he promised to pay in gold, and thus free coinage would bring gold contracts, values would be so much disturbed, business so interrupted, capital so alarmed, and enterprise so crushed that farmers, wage earners, and business men would be the principal victims, and their injuries can not be estimated.

Mr. Chairman, I am admonished that my time is about exhausted, and I desire to say before I close we have to-day in the United States more money than any other country in the world. We have coined more silver dollars in the last seventeen years than have been coined by all the other nations together. In the last twenty years, as shown by the report of the Superintendent of the Census and the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, the value of the property in the United States has increased from $30,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000, and the wealth of the United States is greater, according to the reports of Mulhall and François, than any country of the world, England standing next and France third. This grand and glorious record should be sufficient, and we should not now attempt a monetary experiment which many of the best financiers and truest patriots think would bring disaster and hard times and great injury to the business interests of our country.

The United States as a gold-standard country stands in agriculture, commerce, manufactures, Christianity, education, art, science, literature, inventions—all that it takes to make a grand and glorious nation—with the great gold-standard countries of France, England, Germany, Russia, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, Italy, Brazil, Chile, and others. Does any patriot and lover of progress, improvement, and advancement desire that our country shall leave the proud position of equal and leader among the greatest nations of the world and go backward and join the nonprogressive silver-standard countries of China, India, Bolivia, Peru, and the semicivilized nations of Africa?

The Senate has passed and sent to us a free coinage of silver substitute, which we are now considering. This should not alarm the country or cause any uneasiness among the advocates of sound money. There are 9 silver States with a population not equal to that of the State of New York, yet they have 18 Senators and only 12 Representatives, while New York has 2 Senators and 34 Representatives. In a few days the vote will be taken in the House, and then the representatives of the people will show by a great majority of more than 2 to 1 that the free coinage of silver by the United States alone has been laid to rest.

The last national Democratic convention held at Chicago voted down an amendment offered by Mr. Patterson, of Colorado, in favor of the free coinage of silver. No Democrat can consistently contend to-day that the convention of 1892 declared for free silver, for so far as that convention made a declaration on that subject it specifically refused to indorse free silver. A careful examination of all the national Democratic platforms adopted since the Democratic party was organized will show that not one of them declared in favor of the free coinage of silver, but that every national Democratic platform adopted since 1868 contains a declaration in favor of sound or honest money. Another national Democratic convention will be held in a few months and the declaration of that great convention will reverberate all over our country in favor of sound money and opposed to the free and unlimited and independent coinage of silver.

I see my time has expired. In conclusion, I quote from Samuel J. Tilden, one of the greatest statesmen our country has ever produced. He said:

Uncertainty is the prolific parent of mischief in all business. There can be no permanent prosperity or financial safety as long as there is serious agitation and uncertainty of money questions.

We have had depression in business, trade, and agriculture, but times are improving, prices are advancing, business is reviving, capital is seeking investments, and laborers' wages are increasing, and there is every reason to hope that our country will soon be blessed with the same industrial and agricultural progress which made it so prosperous a few years ago. Nothing should be done now to retard the onward movement. If we will be satisfied with existing conditions, and not seek to inaugurate great monetary changes, we will have a new era of prosperity and our country will move onward to the accomplishment of its grand and glorious destiny. [Applause.]

[Mr. HEPBURN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. TOWNE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the outcome of this debate and whatever seriousness may be manifested by the advocates and opponents of this measure, all of us are conscious of the fact that one of the great coordinate departments of this Government, the assent of which is necessary to enable this bill to become a law, is unalterably opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Our action, therefore, whatever it may be, being absolutely barren of any possible results, will amount to nothing.

This debate has now been in progress two days, and much earnestness has been manifested by many gentlemen. It is perfectly clear that gentlemen honestly differ as to the good or evil that would attend the enactment of this bill into a law. For my part I believe that the interests of the people of the United States would be better subserved by having both gold and silver as money metals, provided that the chief commercial nations of the earth would unite in adopting both metals as money metals or a sufficient number of the principal commercial nations agree to this, so that the two metals would not separate, and that they would both remain in circulation in common in the chief commercial nations of the earth.

Although my predilections are wholly in favor of silver, yet I am unable to bring myself to a positive, affirmative belief that the United States should attempt to maintain silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 without the concurrence of some of the other chief commercial nations. There is no question in my mind but what gold would disappear. The money of least value will always be used for circulation, and the money of greatest value will always hide itself. In all the chief commercial nations silver is to-day discounted. If we attempt to make it a money metal without limitations, it follows inevitably that in the course of trade we will gather in the silver and lose our gold. This means that we would be placed on a silver basis. Bimetallism would be only a theory with us. We would in fact become monometallists, with silver as our money.

The question for decision is, Would this condition be beneficial to the people of the United States? The first inquiry should be, How would silver monometallism affect the laboring people, the farmers, business and professional men of our country? Would the unlimited coinage of silver start any factory in the United States and thereby give employment to any men that are to-day idle? If I owned a silver mine and the Government of the United States, would assume the expense of coining my silver into money and give it back to me free of all costs, and if, in addition to that, the Government of the United States would enact that this silver should be money with full legal-tender qualities, it certainly would be a boon to me, but I fail to see how it would be of any benefit to my neighbor who has little or no property and who is out of employment. How would this benefit the grocer, the merchant, the tailor, and the doctor?

But we are told that the demonetization of silver destroyed half the redemption money of the country, making the value of all of the property of the country to be measured by one-half the amount of money it had been measured by before, and that the logical result of that contraction is to depreciate the value of all property one-half, unless for some local reason property in some particular place maintains its former value. If this be true, it is of great moment and great importance, and I would regard it as my highest duty to vote to remonetize silver at the earliest possible day. But I am unable to see that this is true. Whatever value has attached to property anywhere in this country, so far as the quantity of money fixes the value, was regulated by the volume of money in the country. This volume of money has not been contracted to any extent whatever by the redemption of silver. Not a single dollar of silver has been demonetized. There has been no reduction in the volume of silver money in this country by the demon-

etization of silver or otherwise. All that was done by demonetizing silver was that the Government refused to make any more silver money. Not that it destroyed what it had, but simply refused to make more silver dollars. There was no contraction in this. Every dollar of silver money of the United States has all the properties and all the values that it ever had. If, therefore, property of the country has depreciated in value, it can not be attributed to the destruction of silver currency of the country, because it has not been destroyed. It can not be attributed to the contraction of the silver currency, for it has not been contracted. It seems to me that the claims of the advocates of unlimited coinage of silver, in this respect, must go down before the facts.

But it must be conceded by the advocates of the gold standard that property has depreciated in value recently all over the country, except it be in some favored place where for local reasons its value has been maintained. The wages of labor have gone down all over our country; worse than this, the factories and workshops of our country have closed their doors, and have either wholly or partially failed to give employment to labor. Poverty and distress have followed among the laboring people in all the laboring centers of our country. Retail merchants in our towns and cities have been unable to sell their goods, and stagnation in business circles and bankruptcies and assignments for the benefit of creditors have followed where but a few years ago prosperity prevailed.

Our duty here is to relieve the country of this condition so far as legislative action will relieve it. The advocates of the unlimited coinage of silver attribute this condition in part to the scarcity of money in the country. On last Tuesday the Secretary of the Treasury opened the bids that he had received in response to his offer to sell $100,000,000 in Government bonds. It was found that nearly $600,000,000 had been bid for this proposed issue of one hundred millions of bonds, and of this large amount perhaps five hundred millions of this money was offered by the people of our own country, and this offer is in gold. This shows conclusively that there is at least $500,000,000 in the United States now seeking investment at a rate of from 3 to 3½ per cent interest. In the face of this fact it can not be truthfully said that the business paralysis of the country is due to the scarcity of money. It means that the holders of this money are afraid to invest it in business enterprises and that other active and keen business men of the country are afraid to take the risk of borrowing this money and investing it in business enterprises. Therefore it is that labor is idle to a great extent, and such portion of it as is employed is employed at reduced wages. The laboring people can not buy and pay for the goods of the merchant, and these bankruptcies and assignments have followed where business is being done on borrowed capital.

What, then, can we do as a Congress that will ameliorate or tend to ameliorate this condition? To answer this question let me take into account some existing facts. The revenues of our country are to-day, in round numbers, $50,000,000 less annually than the current expenses of the country. The total of our exports from this country is less than the total of our imports, so that the balance of trade is against us. We are therefore constantly shipping money out of this country to pay trade balances instead of having it shipped into this country for the same purpose. The bonds of our private corporations, railroads, and other interests, are largely held in Europe. The payment of interest on this indebtedness is a constant drainage from our country. Many millions of dollars are spent annually in Europe by tourists from the United States. United, these different sources make an enormous drainage of money from this country. Congress has no power over the tourists, nor has it power over the individual transactions of our citizens and our private corporations, but it has power to place tariff duties upon products of foreign countries which are sent to our shores. A proper tariff duty levied upon imports can at once reduce the volume of imports and increase the revenues derived therefrom. We can in that way turn the balance of trade in our favor instead of against us, as it is now. But of far greater value to us as a people than the revenues derived by these higher duties is the fact that the people of our own country will thereby be enabled to make and manufacture the things used in our own country, and by so doing furnish labor with employment and capital with investment.

This House of Representatives attempted to reach that end by the passage of the tariff bill in the early days of this session. I believe that every Republican in this House voted for that bill and every Democrat voted against it. The Republican party is not in control of the Senate. It can not force the passage of that bill. The Democrats and Populists of that body have thus far refused to consider the bill, notwithstanding the fact that we are hearing from all over our country of the business stagnation, of the idleness of labor, and of the appeal for relief.

I believe that the only safe way for the remonetization of silver is by international agreement; but some of the silver advocates say that we never can obtain an international agreement. Maybe they are right. It is possible that silver as a money metal, without limitations, is a thing of the past, but I am not inclined to accept that as a fact. I am ready to vote for a discriminating tariff. I am ready to vote for a high protective tariff bill, and at the same time confer upon the President of the United States the power to suspend a portion of the duties upon the imports from any country or countries which will unite with us in the remonetization of silver. It is claimed by some that if we should do this, that other countries would retaliate upon us. I think it quite likely they would, but this country of ours produces the foods for the people and we can make and manufacture for ourselves other things we need. We are better equipped for a war of this kind than any other nation upon the earth. We can not be outdone in a war of this kind. This nation is entitled to a voice and an influence in the affairs of the world. Our views upon what should constitute the money of the world are entitled to the consideration of every commercial state. I would use the markets of this country as a means of enforcing upon the nations of the earth the wishes, wants, and necessities of the people of our country as to what shall constitute the money of the world.

I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that an attempt on the part of the United States to coin silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without limitations, and without concert with any other nation or nations, would result disastrously to our people, and that we would have a depreciated currency. The ones who would first suffer from the depreciated currency are the people who are the least able to bear the burden. It would primarily fall upon the labor of the country, and secondarily upon the business men of the country, and, so believing, I can not support this bill.

Under consent given, Mr. STOKES submitted the following as an amendment to be proposed to the bill:

Add at end of bill the following:

"SEC. 5. *Provided*, Nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the adjustment of contracts made subsequent to 1873 upon the basis of the purchasing power of the dollar at the date of the contract, as such purchasing power shall be certified by the Bureau of Statistics."

Mr. OGDEN submitted the following amendment:

Strike out all after line 7, section 3, and insert:

That a special fund, to consist of not less than $200,000,000 in coin, one-half of which shall be in gold and one-half in silver, to be known as the redemption fund, be, and is hereby, set aside from any gold coin and gold bullion and silver coin and silver bullion now in the Treasury, which special fund and excess thereof shall be used for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and for no other purpose.

SEC. 2. That on the passage of this act all gold coin and gold bullion, less an amount sufficient to pay all outstanding gold certificates, shall be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the redemption fund.

SEC. 3. That on the passage of this act all standard silver dollars of 1890, together with an additional amount of standard silver dollars previously coined, and equal in amount to the estimated coinage value of the uncoined silver bullion now on hand and purchased under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, shall also be transferred to the redemption fund.

SEC. 4. That the United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, when presented for redemption at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States, shall be paid in the following manner and no other, to wit:

When the aggregate amount of gold coin and gold bullion on hand exceeds the sum of $100,000,000, and the amount of standard silver dollars on hand also exceeds $100,000,000, the holder of such United States notes or Treasury notes of 1890 shall, at his option, be paid in gold coin and gold bullion or standard silver dollars; but when the aggregate amount of gold coin and gold bullion is less that $100,000,000 the holders of said notes shall be paid in standard silver dollars, provided there be more than 100,000,000 standard silver dollars on hand.

Whenever the redemption fund shall be reduced below the sum of $200,000,000 payments of above-described notes shall be paid one-half in gold coin and gold bullion and one-half in standard silver dollars.

SEC. 5. That for the purpose of maintaining the redemption fund at a minimum of $200,000,000 in specie, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to exchange the above-described notes which have been redeemed for gold coin and gold bullion and standard silver dollars already on hand in the Treasury, or which may be received into the Treasury hereafter from any source, and said notes, when so exchanged, may be reissued.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable rules and regulations by which any holder of gold coin and gold bullion, or of standard silver dollars, may exchange the same at the Treasury or any subtreasury of the United States, free of cost, for an equal amount of United States notes or Treasury notes of 1890.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to coin the silver bullion of 1890 into standard silver dollars at a rate of not less than $5,000,000 per month, and use the same as fast as coined to replace the standard silver dollars transferred to the redemption fund by the provisions of this act.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2904) and had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN MAPS AND TABLES.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] who addressed the House this afternoon. He has some plates illustrative of charts he spoke from during the evening, and desires me to ask unanimous consent of the House that these plates may be given to the Public Printer for use in publishing his remarks, without any expense to the United States Government at all. They will go into the pages of the RECORD, and being already pre-

pared, will cause no expense to the Government. He furnishes the plates at his own expense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the members present to this fact, at the request of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole: That as yet there are not enough gentlemen who have given notice to him of a desire to speak to-night to occupy half of the time, and that on Monday the applications are so numerous as to far exceed the time that will be available for general debate. Therefore, unless time is occupied by some of these gentlemen this evening they will not be able to secure an opportunity of being heard. I make this statement so that gentlemen may act accordingly.

Mr. OGDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion, in view of his statement?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. OGDEN. In view of the fact that the time of so many gentlemen has been extended for a long time on both sides, would it not be wise to extend the time of the debate one more day?

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, no; I think this thing has dragged long enough.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and at 10.30 o'clock to-night take another recess until 10.30 on Monday morning, exclusively for debate on this bill; the debate to take place in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted indefinitely to Mr. ANDERSON, on account of important business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while in Committee of the Whole to-day I was making an address, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] and some other of my Democratic friends thought when I referred to the lower animals not changing their minds I had a personal reference to some of them. I desire to disclaim any such intention. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. It was not necessary to disclaim it.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with unanimous consent, the House now stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening for debate only on the pending bill.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Clerk, who read the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1896.

Hon. ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, *Clerk:*

I hereby appoint Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota as Speaker pro tempore for the evening session.

T. B. REED, *Speaker.*

Thereupon the House, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, with Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I will read a bill which I propose to offer as a substitute for the measure now pending before the House. It is as follows:

A bill for the coinage of silver dollars, restricted only by the law of supply and demand, and to maintain the parity of gold and silver without loss to the Government.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be lawful for the owner of any silver bullion of standard purity and fineness produced from any mines in the United States to deposit the same at any of the mints of the United States and receive therefor its market value on the day of deposit in standard silver dollars of the United States, and sufficient amount of said bullion shall be coined for this purpose as provided in the act of July 19, 1837. The Secretary of the Treasury shall fix each day the market price of silver bullion, basing it on the market price thereof on the next preceding day in the American market, and he shall not be required to receive or have on hand for coinage, under the provisions of this act, more than 25,000,000 ounces of silver bullion at any one time. The Secretary of the Treasury shall also prescribe and enforce such rules and regulations as shall prevent purchase or coinage of any silver bullion not the product of the mines of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized and required within one year to redeem or replace all the United States notes and Treasury notes of the denomination of $1 and $2 now outstanding with notes of not less denomination than $5, and the one and two dollar notes thus received in the Treasury shall not be reissued, but destroyed.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury, under the same regulation as is prescribed in section 2, is authorized and required within two years from the approval of this act to redeem and replace the one and two dollar silver certificates with silver certificates of not less denomination than $5, and the one and two dollar certificates so replaced shall not be reissued, but shall be destroyed.

SEC. 4. That in case the silver dollar at any time declines below its face value and ceases to circulate at par the Secretary of the Treasury is then authorized and directed to exchange gold for the said silver dollars on presentation until they shall again be current at their face or par value. And to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to do this, he is hereby authorized and directed to sell such portion of the gain or seigniorage arising from coinage under this act as may be required for this purpose.

SEC. 5. That in case said silver dollars at any time fall below par, the purchase and receipt of silver bullion at the mints and the coinage of silver dollars shall cease, but whenever the silver dollars received by the Secretary of the Treasury for gold shall have been by him again paid out and such dollars shall again be freely current at par, the coinage thereof shall be resumed as hereinbefore provided for.

SEC. 6. That no silver dollars coined under the provisions of this act shall be receivable for deposit under the third section of the act of February 28, 1878, and no certificates shall be issued therefor.

SEC. 7. That a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect thirty days from and after its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I did not arise with the design of making a speech upon this subject at the present time, but to offer the bill I have just read as a substitute for the one now pending before the House (the concurrent resolution of the Senate). I will say, however, that there is a general demand all over the country, regardless of party lines, for a wider use of silver, and also for a safe use of the metal.

This bill is framed to meet the law of supply and demand, to give to the people of the United States all the silver that they may be able to use, without putting gold at a premium or permitting silver to fall below par. It is designed to make a much larger use of coin and not to lessen the paper money now in existence. I view it, Mr. Speaker, as perfectly safe along all these lines.

I believe that if the free coinage of silver can be attained and the parity of the two metals maintained, it can be accomplished within the prescribed limits of this bill. It has not yet been shown by anyone that this nation could maintain the free coinage of silver while twelve or thirteen of the principal nations of the world are upon a gold basis or a limited coinage of silver.

It must he remembered if free coinage were adopted by this nation and gold should go to a premium, which it is believed would be the result, that the $500,000,000 of gold in the United States would at once cease to circulate or be used as money; consequently the volume of money would be lessened this amount. This would reduce our coin more than one-half, and it could only be replaced by coining and putting into use the vast sum of $500,000,000 in silver.

I am in favor of international bimetallism. The principal nations can, and the principal nations should, maintain the parity of the two metals; and this nation should not cease to work along this line until this object is attained. It was a most serious movement for the European nations to join in cutting the measure of values in two.

Mr. Speaker, I will state that I consider the demonetizing of silver by England and by European nations a crime. Gold and silver have been considered and used as money from the dawn of history until the present time. We find the impress of each inscribed on rocks and rolls, upon papyrus, parchment, and paper, upon everything that has been used to mark values or to make records. Abraham came up out of Egypt rich in cattle and in gold and silver. The golden sun and the silver moon have been used in all ages as symbols of the two metals. I should like to see gold and silver, like these two great orbs of day and night, go on and on, circling the world, ministering to the woes and wants and happiness of man forever.

Mr. YOAKUM. Mr. Speaker, the Democracy and silver have run together from the foundation of our Government, and there exists no reason for their divorcement, and in 1896 the great battle will be fought for the rehabilitation of this money. The agitation might as well be precipitated, so that the sentiments, hopes, and aspirations of the people may crystallize and be thoroughly reflected in the delegations and conventions that will be assembled this year. The patriotic and intelligent citizen knows that he must take an active part in all measures that affect our material prosperity; and we think that if the European control of our finances secures another lease of power in 1896 their domination will be permanent and silver money as an issue will be dead for at least a century.

At each recurring Presidential contest we are assured that international cooperation will be secured by a conservative declaration on silver by the American Government, and in the interest of the integrity of the Democracy we have been induced to accept a plank in our platform that is of dubious meaning. But we have now reached a juncture in our history when we must establish a financial system that is purely American, that does not require the sympathy, cooperation, or consultation with foreign powers; a system that recognizes gold and silver as the money of ultimate

payment. I have no more confidence in an international arrangement than in an interplanetary arrangement. I would as soon expect the sun and moon to come down and confer with the earth about the quantity of heat the sun should emit in summer season as that the gold-standard countries should agree with the United States as to the relative value of gold and silver, and this in spite of the recent declarations of the German Reichstag and the British Parliament professing friendliness to an international financial conference.

To this end we must all toe the mark and answer roll call. No theory must stand in the way, and when we put it in our platforms, and preach it from the housetops, and place it on our foreheads, and write it on our wristlets, and the Democratic press and Democratic leaders speak but one language, we will form such a concentration of forces that we will strike monometallism with such cyclonic power that we will drive it before us "like leaves before an angry wind." And if the people of this generation are to see silver remonetized it will not be through the efforts of any fiatists, or irredeemable paper money element, or by the advocates of the railroad ownership, or the subtreasury friends, as the good sense of the people revolt against such high-handed and revolutionary measures. The rank and file of the American voters are restless and dissatisfied with the action of the Fifty-third Congress on the monetary issue, and while they are ready and willing to aid and assist any movement inside or outside of party lines that will restore silver, they are not willing to lend countenance to any of the above measures advocated by the Populists that they suspect might subvert any fundamental principle of the American Government or impair its efficiency.

While the masses are restless, they are patriotic; while they want to repair, they will not impair; and I challenge any man's devotion to our great country who advocates anarchy or revolution as a means of adjusting the present troubles that have gathered around us, for no man is entitled to respect who will question the ability of our people to compose our differences on finance through the ordinary instrumentalities of civil government. The incurring of the great bonded indebtedness is unfortunate for us, as a great many people will rush to the conclusion that the Democracy indorsed it; but nothing is so fallacious. The bonds are issued to maintain the gold reserve, a policy which grew up in the Treasury Department during the Administration of the Republican party.

The reserve does not exist by virtue of any statute; if so, we might have repealed it. It is only kept up as an earnest of our good faith toward our creditors who hold our interest and noninterest bearing obligations. The reserve, according to the custom, should be held at $100,000,000; not that it represents our fund to redeem our debts, for it exceeds that amount at $10 to $1. The gold reserve ought never to have been established; but as it is said to represent our debts, we silver men insist that these debts were contracted at a period when silver as well as gold was a standard of value, and hence the outstanding obligations ought to be paid off in gold and silver in proportion to the quantity of the money the Treasurer may have. If such a policy should prevail, one-half of our greenbacks presented for redemption would be redeemed in silver, and the gold reserve would not have to be replenished in a half century, and the good faith and integrity of the Government could not be questioned, because we would be paying our debts in lawful money and hence according to contract.

But we are told that this course would affect our credit abroad. In answer to this we ask, who is it that depletes our Treasury and renders a bond issue necessary? Is it the man abroad? No, sir; it is the speculator in Wall street that carries the greenback and Sherman note to the Treasury and demands the gold for them; and why? Because the paper is not good? No, sir. Is it because the gold is leaving the country and the country is growing panicky? No, sir. Then why? Because, sir, he wants the obligations of our Government to draw interest in bonds; whereas if they were paid in gold and silver he could not force a bond issue, as the quantity of money would be sufficient to pay off these notes and not reduce the reserve to low-water mark. Who is it that can complain of the greenbacks, the favorite money, as Lincoln once said of the "plain people"? As long as this money is used strictly for the purposes of money, that is, merely as a medium of exchange, as it is by the humble artisan, mechanic, and farmer of the South and West, there will be no panicky symptoms and no depletion of the reserve and consequent issue of bonds.

Who is it that conjures us to sustain our nation's credit? Sir, it is the very men who are depleting our Treasury by the presentment of greenbacks for redemption, and a change in our currency system is not as essential to our integrity as a mere change in the Treasury Department. How long shall we be mocked by such a makeshift and such a scheme of robbery? Rothschild, who stood behind Germany and dictated the extortion from France of $1,000,000,000 in gold, who has a mortgage on every European throne, has taken charge of our financial affairs and makes eight millions in the first deal. Out of nine subtreasuries, from the 14th of January to February 1, 1895, inclusive, there was drawn the sum of $37,972,140, and from the New York subtreasury alone $36,591,905, thus substantiating that our Treasury is being depleted and the financial panic precipitated by the money speculators.

Those who live under a mantle of wealth keep us excited by the war cry of "National honor, national credit," etc., which, it is said, can not be maintained except by securing the smiles of the foreign money lenders, who seem to be the guardians of our honor and credit. One thousand persons in Europe to-day hold obligations against our people aggregating $13,000,000,000, and hence hold over 70,000,000 people, with $60,000,000,000 of wealth, in custody. Why, sir, if war should shed its somber shadow over our Union and threaten its dismemberment, would we consult our foreign creditors; would we await the convocation of the chamber of commerce or the meeting of national bankers? No, sir; we would lean upon the true source of political power, the host of plain people, who ought to be heard in peace as well as relied on in war. Their interest is our interest, and we can not afford to disregard them.

The debt of the nation is thirty-nine billions, of which the foreign debt is eleven billions, and at 5 per cent interest exacts from us five hundred millions annually—more than all the gold in the Union. How will we pay it? We propose the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver, which will give us one hundred and thirty-two millions annually, thus stimulating our industries and giving employment to our idle forces and increasing our productions and maybe turn the balance of trade in our favor, enabling our trade to settle off our foreign-held debt, and thus contract our debts instead of our currency, and place wages and products of labor upon equality with securities wherever held.

For thirty years we have legislated in the interest of securities and creditors instead of debtors, and every plan proposed or enacted has sunk our people deeper into the quagmire of discontent, until we have reached the juncture where there must be framed a law for the home builder and wealth producer. This is our duty as the representatives of the people—to secure them comfort and protect them against the exacting demand of the gold speculator. Stop the creation of debt and all the world will say that America is the home of the purest, the truest, and the best people of earth.

If I were managing the Morgan-Belmont syndicate, I would bid for the one hundred million bonds offered for sale by Secretary Carlisle, and I would lay the law down to him, and force him to accept my bid, and I would not offer but one-half as much as the common herd, either. Yes, sir; I would talk very plain to the Secretary of this United States Government, and if he rejected my bids I would go down next day and extract every gold dollar out of the reserve with paper money and force another sale, or drive this helpless Government to a silver basis. This procedure is very simple, but it is feasible, and why Morgan & Co. do not do it is because of the charity and indulgence toward a helpless object, and how long they will continue their kindness is conjectural. The fact is, they intended to clean us up last year, but the President and Secretary Carlisle entered into a contract, by the fifth provision of which the syndicate was to help us hold up our financial system. Let me read it:

> Fifth. In consideration of the purchase of such coin, the parties of the second part, and their associates hereunder, assume and will bear all the expense and inevitable loss of bringing gold from Europe hereunder; and, as far as lies in their power, will exert all financial influence and will make all legitimate efforts to protect the Treasury of the United States against the withdrawals of gold pending the complete performance of this contract.
>
> In witness whereof the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands in five parts this 8th day of February, 1895.
>
> J. G. CARLISLE,
> *Secretary of the Treasury.*
> AUGUST BELMONT & CO.,
> *On behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, London, and themselves.*
> J. P. MORGAN & CO.,
> *On behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co., London, and themselves.*
>
> Attest:
> W. E. CURTIS.
> FRANCIS LYNDE STETSON.

When this contract was complete, November, 1895, the reserve began to sink, until to-day it is only $45,000,000, and this would have been gone had it not been checked by an offer to sell $100,000,000 of bonds, double the amount before.

What a humiliating spectacle to a great and powerful people, to place ourselves in the grasp of a monster that will not spare us, and when we demand the recognition of silver, so as to aid gold in the payment of our obligations, and thus stop the depletion of the reserve and issue of bonds, we are told the honor and credit of our country demand that we shall be impoverished and robbed by the money grabbers and speculators, and that we must not interfere with the pleasure of these cormorants as a matter of honor.

The passage of the Senate substitute will do what? It will recognize silver as money, and thus increase the volume of the money with which to liquidate all our obligations. This itself would forever stop the sale of bonds and break the endless chain that is gradually crushing out the last vestige of love of country we are possessed of. The only hope of giving satisfaction to the people is to increase the volume of money and stop the issuance of bonds.

There is no way to avoid the issuance of bonds as long as we continue the payment of our debts exclusively in gold. The speculator has conceived the plan of forcing bond issues. We need the spirit of Daniel Manning, Secretary of the Treasury in the first Administration of Cleveland. We all remember the effort made by the bankers of New York when they threatened to throw this Government into a panic. He stood in their midst and talked like an inspired man, and he was inspired by a love for his country. He said:

GENTLEMEN: The Treasury is willing to furnish gold for any legitimate demand, but if you attempt to draw upon the Treasury gold after to-day as you are now doing, for hoarding or speculation, I shall adopt an effective remedy for the protection of the Government's reserve. We have a cash balance of over $150,000,000. Not one of you doubts for a moment the ability and purpose of the Government to maintain specie payment. But if you continue to withdraw gold I shall at once order that you be paid 10 per cent in silver coin the first day, the second day you will be paid 20 per cent in silver, and the third day 30 per cent, and so on until one-half is paid you in silver.

"But," exclaimed the astonished bankers, "this is in violation of the implied obligation that the Government will pay in gold."

"Make no mistake about that, gentlemen," replied Mr. Manning, "the law says 'coin,' and the Treasury will exercise its undoubted prerogative."

Since then we have surrendered to these fellows, and when they cry panic the bonds are issued to strengthen the public credit and inspire confidence in the ranks of the conscienceless speculators. A short notice, signed by Mr. Carlisle, that a percentage of the greenbacks would be paid in silver will settle the symptom of panics, and the greenbacks will circulate as money, the banker and speculator will then use them as a means of exchange of property as the humble mechanic and farmer and other classes do, instead of using them as a means of exhausting the Treasury of its gold money.

We have four remedies prescribed for the situation, and all concede the evil of the present system, which has been denominated by President Cleveland the endless chain. The vice of this chain is that every link in it is made of gold, whereas it ought to be alternatively silver. But we say we have four remedies.

First. The President proposes one great issue of bonds to absorb the paper money. He has no following of any moment on that theory.

Second. The Republicans advocate the issue of bonds at a lower rate of interest, and increase of tariff, and a payment of public debts in gold.

Third. The free-silver men concur in this bill passed by the Senate.

Fourth. The Populist element believe we ought to issue an irredeemable paper money and pay off debts in that money.

The Republican theory is that by a high protective tariff the balance of trade will be turned in our favor and thus stop the export of gold. The history on this question militates against their theory. In 1893, when we had three years of McKinley protection, which gave the highest rates in the history of the world, the gold reserve ran lower than at any period in fourteen years, and, in fact, for the first time, in that period it was thought necessary to issue bonds to protect the reserve, and the plates were prepared and the following official order was issued by a Republican Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 8 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are $100 and $1,000 of the coupon bonds and $100, $1,000, and $10,000 of the registered bonds.

This authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner.

I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours, CHARLES FOSTER, *Secretary.*

To the CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

This ought to satisfy any reasonable mind that the high tariff will not protect the gold reserve and prevent the issue of bonds. Just at this time the Democracy came into power and fell heir to the condition that was forcing the Republicans to a bond issue, and as no change in the methods of payment was made, the result was the Democracy had to shoulder the responsibility of the act.

Then we turn to the Populist party and we see they demand a paper money without basis on any coin or thing of value; that is, an irredeemable paper money—an unknown currency to America.

While the people are restless and dissatisfied, and are seeking the reinstatement of a system of pure bimetallism, which is the recognition of the metals at the mints, they are not oblivious to the fact that the Populist party is uncompromisingly in favor of the issue of scientific or inconvertible paper money, which, if a true theory of finance, supersedes the necessity of further coinage of either gold or silver. The truth is, the advocacy of an irredeemable paper issue and a metallic money of either gold or silver is the merest nonsense in the eyes of enlightened people or the veriest tyro in financial learning.

The only reason anyone can give for advocating the coinage of gold and silver is because of the inadequacy in the amount of gold supply to furnish a medium of exchange for the business of the people. If there was a sufficiency of gold I would not favor the further coinage of silver, for it is the volume of money we are working for. If the Populist idea of money is correct, that the paper with the stamp of the Government on it will make it good money, they ought not to urge the further coinage of either metal, because we could under that theory issue as much paper money as the business of the country demands.

Now, if you believe the Populist paper money theory, we would have enough paper money to furnish the business world a medium of exchange, and no reason could be further urged in favor of gold and silver. We might believe in gold and silver and paper based on the two metals, but there would be a glaring inconsistency in one advocating gold and silver and paper money, if the latter is good without redeemability. No man can conscientiously believe in the intrinsic value theory and also in the fiat theory, and the Populist when he becomes thoroughly honest will scout and scorn your gold and silver as money, because they are based on the intrinsic value idea. If the Populist fiat doctrine be good, intrinsic value in money is useless; but if the intrinsic value theory be correct, fiat money is worthless, if not foolish. How a man can advocate either theory is plausible, but how he can advocate both doctrines and be consistent I can not conceive.

Then, again, it is very properly suggested that such a character of money is not authorized by our Constitution. It only authorizes us to coin money and regulate its value. The Populists claim we have the power to make money and create its value. They claim, however, that the Supreme Court has upheld an irredeemable paper money. If the Supreme Court of the United States has ever decided that inconvertible paper is money, and that an act of Congress making it a legal tender is constitutional, then we will admit that the Populist idea is correct, and we stop to assert that such a paper was never issued by an act of Congress and hence was never before the Supreme Court for determination. The only decision ever rendered by them was one in which they sustained the constitutionality of the legal-tender acts, which provided for the issuance of the greenbacks, which were a promise to pay by the Government and which were paid in coin.

Judge Strong, in rendering that decision, in volume 20, page 313, of United States Reports, says:

The legal-tender acts do not attempt to make paper a standard of value. We do not rest their validity upon the assertion that their emission is coinage, or any regulation of the value of money; nor do we assert that Congress may make anything which has no value money. What we do assert is that Congress has power to enact that the Government promises to pay money shall be for the time being equivalent in value to the representative of value, determined by the coinage acts, or to multiples thereof.

This decision, which is very lengthy, was carefully drawn, so that the court would not lead any student into the false conception that Congress could, under any provision of the Constitution, impart value to an otherwise valueless material by simply impressing thereon the stamp of the Government. But for fear that some one should draw improper conclusions from the language used, that Congress could make money out of paper or anything else without regard to its intrinsic value, Justice Strong said:

It is, then, a mistake to regard the legal-tender act as either fixing a standard of value or regulating money values, or making that money which has no intrinsic value.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding my views on this question have several times already been expressed and sent out to the people, I feel constrained on this occasion, in their behalf, to again place myself on record, both by my voice and by my vote in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; therefore I shall heartily support and vote for the substitute for the House bill as sent from the Senate, which means the opening of the mints of the United States to silver and relief to the people; and there has been so much said that my mind, in thinking of this much discussed subject, reverts to the old negro preacher who was addressing his flock with great earnestness on the subject of "Miracles," as follows: "My beloved friends and brethren, de greatest of all miracles was 'bout de loaves and de fishes. Dey was 5,000 loaves and 2,000 fishes, and de twelve 'postles had to eat 'em all. Now de miracle is dat dey didn't bust." [Laughter.] Now the people, Mr. Speaker, have been stuffed on this subject for the last three weeks; or, I might say, for the last few years with silver speeches, and the great wonder is that they haven't "busted." [Laughter.]

The subject under discussion has taken a very wide range in this House, embracing almost every other subject in the catalogue of political economy.

Mr. Speaker, even secession has been lugged into the debate by certain parties on this floor in order to direct attention from the real issue. But however much gentlemen may desire to dodge the issue it can not be done, for at last the whole matter reduces itself to this simple, single question, Will this House rehabilitate silver, the people's money, which was stricken down and demonetized by the dastardly hand of the gold monometallist assassin in 1873, the greatest crime of the nineteenth century against the people, or

will its members shrink back like cowards and fail to do their duty to those whom they claim to represent here?

This, Mr. Speaker, is the only real question now before this House; and while gentlemen have ranged all over the earth for argument against it, they have used mere sophistry and flapdoodle. They have tried to mystify and muddle the real issue, but it is only at last a simple question of common sense, and it is to be seen in the settlement of this question whether or not this House will show itself brave and courageous enough, as they have done at the other end of the Capitol, to give back to the American people the money of the country, which was substantially taken away in 1873. Ye blatant advocates of a single gold standard may look at it as you will and mystify it as you please by your long and labored arguments, but the great question after all is simply one of money. All other issues to-day shrink into utter insignificance when compared to the great overshadowing influence of the financial question of this grand nation of ours. To-day it seems that the great money power, allied to corporate wealth, has a hold on the throats of the people, overruling and overriding their rights, controlling political conventions, manipulating party platforms, dictating State and national legislation, and even invading the courts of the land, corrupting both judge and jury of State and nation.

How plainly must the conviction be riveted upon the minds of all intelligent, thinking people that a despotism of corporate wealth has subverted our free democratic institutions. How plain it must seem to the casual observer that the premonitory symptoms of despotism are upon us and that we are fast hastening to a period when we will have a union of the purse and the sword, a combination more dangerous than that of church and state. Then, to put it even more plainly, the issue is, Shall the citizen or the dollar rule this country? Shall manhood or money make our laws? Shall we have a free Government or shall we be ruled by a moneyed aristocracy? On which side will you align yourselves? There is no middle ground. It is not and should not be made a partisan question, notwithstanding some members have brought into the discussion their partisanship. They should leave out all their bitterness and prejudices, quit calling each other names—for there is no argument in calling names—and look alone as one man to the present distressed condition of the country, with the laudable and patriotic ambition and desire to give relief thereto both in deed and in name. It makes no difference whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, a Populist, or what not; this is your country and its people are your people, and what benefits it and them ought to be your pleasure and desire to do.

Then comes the question more forcibly, Are you willing to do right by the great masses of the people of the United States (the laboring people), for I take it that we are all laborers in one sense or another; are you willing to align yourselves with the corporations, the money power, and the monopolists of the country? I dislike very much indeed to think so. Then come to the relief of those toiling masses who are to-day, while I stand here and plead for them, in their far-off homes looking with anxious hearts to you to come to their rescue and take away from their throats the grasping hand of their destroyer, and let them be able to pay their debts and to place bread on their tables and clothes on their backs. This much, gentlemen, they ask you to do, and this much you can do, at least to a very great extent, by giving them back their money by the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. COLSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. COLSON. I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina, how near, in his opinion, would the remonetization, or rather the adoption of the bill before the House, bring the commercial ratio between gold and silver to the legal ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. TALBERT. Why, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, I will say that if silver were put back to the position it occupied before 1873 the natural law of supply and demand would regulate the ratios, legal and commercial. Only give silver a chance and it will take care of itself as it was done of old.

Mr. COLSON. I ask the gentleman how near the remonetization of silver would bring the legal ratio to the commercial ratio? I ask for information.

Mr. TALBERT. As I have already said, if you give silver the same chance with gold, as it had from the time of Abraham down to 1873, the law of supply and demand would regulate it. The legal ratio and the commercial ratio fluctuated somewhat before the demonetization, but to such a small extent that business was not disturbed. But now, while the legal ratio is 16 to 1, the commercial ratio is 34 to 1. They have gradually grown to their wide difference since 1873 because silver has been denied by law an equal showing with gold, a very natural consequence.

Mr. WANGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say, then, that silver at 16 to 1 of gold will circulate currently?

Mr. TALBERT. I think so, with maybe some slight fluctuations, first in favor of one and then the other; and, Mr. Speaker, why I think so is this: It did it for seventy years, on up to 1873; that is, sometimes one was more plentiful than the other, sometimes one metal being used almost entirely; but the legal and the commercial ratios kept so near together as not to disturb business, and I see no conditions so much changed as to prevent it now in case silver is remonetized, which I hope it will be. The ratios, legal and commercial, will be reestablished proportionably without exact concurrent circulation, judging the future by the past.

Now, I want to say right here and right at this time that all the evils predicted as following the restoration of silver to its original position, as due to the mintage laws, are based simply on prophecy and not upon precedents, for there is not one case going to show any of these evil consequences. We had none of these evils when silver and gold had the same showing. There is no precedent for it.

A MEMBER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TALBERT. I do not wish to be in any manner discourteous, but will say as my time is limited, I would like to proceed without further interruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina declines to yield.

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the advocates of a gold standard are keen and shrewd, and make many ingenious and fine-spun arguments here on this floor to show that the gold standard should be preserved and that silver should be kept down; but, sir, I shall stand first, last, and all the time for the money of the people, the money of "our daddies," and more, the money of the Constitution—silver.

It is truly astonishing to me to hear some of the speeches in this House against silver, coming from the ranks of those claiming to be Democrats. It seems to me to be clearly in violation of their own platform, in violation of the dictates of the Democratic party, and such a course on their part has caused the almost universal overthrow and complete wreck of the organization, and, if persisted in, will inevitably result in its entire disintegration. While this is a serious matter and one not to be made a source of levity, I can not help being amused at the turn the discussion has taken. One member will get up and say with wild gesticulation and great force, "If silver is remonetized the country is ruined"; another will grow eloquent and say, "If silver is not remonetized the country will go to destruction." So here we are "between the devil and the deep sea," and this again brings to mind the old darky preacher of whom I have already spoken, who on another occasion was addressing his flock on the subject of "The broad and the narrow ways," and, warming up to his subject (and making a mistake), said: "My bredren, dere's but two roads for you to trabbel; one leads to eternal damnation, and de udder one to hell and destruction." At this old brother Pompey, who was sitting near a door, made a break, and reaching for his hat exclaimed: "Dat bein' de case, dis darky takes to de bushes," and away he went. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, what shall we do? Let us not take to the bushes. [Laughter.] Let us not dodge the issue, but let us come out like men, and men who are not afraid to back their judgment by action. Let us do that which is just and right to those whom we are sent here to represent. Let us do our duty though the heavens fall. [Applause.]

Men get up here and say that if we open the mints of the United States to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, the silver of the whole world will be dumped in here on us. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, if that be the case, just let them dump. I am one of those who would like always to be at the dumping. [Laughter.] If they send their silver here to be coined, do you not suppose that they will exchange it for our produce—corn, wheat, oats, cotton, and many others? And in that way the prices of our products will be advanced, giving us just returns for what we produce, and putting into circulation that which we so much need, thereby enabling us to remove the iron heel of the monopolist from our necks. [Applause.] But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be the case, for, as the National Bimetallist has well said:

> Silver-standard countries are now taking substantially the whole of it, and the opening of our mints would in no way limit their requirements. For the goods which they sell in Europe and America they must be paid, and paid in silver.
>
> The essence of the American bimetallists' claim is that the people of the United States should have the right to the unrestricted use of both metals as money, and having the right the use will necessarily follow in the best and most advantageous way. If concurrent circulation be maintained and parity preserved, as bimetallists believe will be the case, well and good. Should our gold be exported, it will only be for value received, and the silver which remains will perfectly perform the business of the country, just as it has done in time past and just as it is doing in silver-standard countries to-day.

The House bill as it passed and was sent to the Senate authorized the issuing of bonds and certificates of indebtedness; both of said features are objectionable, and I voted against both, for I am unalterably opposed to issuing any interest-bearing obligations when notes can be issued without a cent of interest to the people. But since that time the bond feature has been eliminated, from the fact that bonds have been issued under the old law to the tune of $100,000,000, thus making the sum of $262,000,000 issued within the last two years by Cleveland, Carlisle, and company, whose only

ambition seems to be to issue bonds, shoot ducks, destroy silver, retire greenbacks and Treasury notes, and, in the end, to make slaves of the American people, in order that they, with a few other money-mongers, may grow fat and be at ease. And all this, too, in direct violation of the very letter of the law. Lamentable and sad state of affairs, yet true. However, some good has been done by the agitation of this bond-issuing business, as "the powers that be" did finally advertise for a popular loan by inviting bids for the last bond issue from all parties and not making a secret deal, as before; thus, at least, shutting out the suspicion of private speculation at the expense of the public. Mr. Cleveland has said that "public office is a public trust," and in view of the fact of his having made use of this expression himself, it might have been well for him to have carried out the Biblical injunction which says "Avoid even the appearance of evil."

The gentleman who is the present Secretary of the Treasury has in the past been one of the most ardent advocates of silver. This is an extract from what he said in 1878 in expressing himself about the demonetization of silver, and I have quoted him before:

> According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half of the movable property of the world, including horses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of half of the metallic money of the world.

These are extreme silver views. The author of them was a free-silver man "with a vengeance"; but, like Saul of old, when he was persecuting Christians wherever he could find them, "Yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples" of gold monometallism, he journeyed, "and as he journeyed he came near" the great city; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from Wall street: And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, John G., John G., why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? and the answer came, I am Grover, King of those "whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." And he says: "What wilt thou have me to do?" And Grover said unto him: "Go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Go ye and get Hoke, Herbert, Morton & Co., and we will make for ourselves a golden calf. And so they have. And now they all worship together at the golden shrine. They were once on the right track, but the devil took them upon the high mount and showed them all his rich golden possessions, and said to them: All this will I give you, if you will fall down and worship me. And so they did. They, as well as many others, have been allured and enticed away from the people and the people's money to gold and those who believe in gold money.

And, Mr. Speaker, what caused this sudden and radical change? I will leave the answer for others to give, for it would be uncharitable to say they get gold for it. Saul was converted from wrong to right, but these people were converted from right to wrong. Oh, the power of gold!

The argument, if such it may be termed, of those who oppose this bill seems to me to be very weak, indeed. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has traveled all over the world in quest of argument against the bill and, really, like the first dove sent out from the ark, he had to come back without finding dry ground on which to plant his foot, and brought a "greenback" notwithstanding the fact that he rehashed all the old stock arguments of the gold bugs. He claims that if the mints are opened in the United States to free coinage of silver that we will be driven to silver monometallism. Now, the gentleman must know that we can never have monometallism of one metal unless the other is first demonetized, and vice versa.

Mr. GROSVENOR of Ohio asks in his speech, "Why do something for silver?" I would ask him, Why do so much for gold? Silver is the poor man's money, and gold is the money of the rich. It does seem to me that this Government is determined to continue to grind down the poor man between the upper and the nether millstone of want and usury until, in self-defense, he will be compelled to resort to some other means than an appeal to his representatives in Congress for relief. I hope, though, it will be given him without that necessity.

I have thought of the position of some of our Democratic friends who, like Carlisle, Cleveland, Smith, Morton, and company, have gone over to the worship of the golden calf, and would like to ask if they do not think they occupy very strange ground before the country? Gentlemen, why this change so suddenly? Those of you who are present now and hear what I have to say would afford me great pleasure, and this House too, no doubt, if you would favor us with some of the reasons for these sudden changes of front. True, you may say that the times and conditions have changed, hence your change; but in the face of conditions as they now exist, would it not be better to increase the means of living to the poor by giving back to them the money of the poor—silver?

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota said in his speech the other day that the farmer had gotten a better price for crops under the single standard than he did before. Now, let us see. In 1873, the year silver was demonetized, cotton was bringing 19¼ and 20 cents; and after that crime was committed in that year it went down to less than 15 cents, and it continued to go down gradually till it went below 5 cents, and it has not been very much higher since, only reaching 8 or 9 cents occasionally. It is a fact that ever since silver was demonetized (1873) the prices of farm products have continued gradually to go down, following silver, which, by its demonetization, was reduced to a commodity, alongside of other commodities, itself gradually getting lower and lower. Now, if the demonetization of silver reduces the products of the farmers as silver goes down, then it is reason that the reverse must be true, that its remonetization will gradually put prices of these products up as silver goes up. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this be true, and we believe it is, then the statement of the gentleman from North Dakota, above referred to, is in error.

Now, the above applies especially to cotton, but not only is it the case with cotton, but with all the products of the farm, thus showing that this "crime," as Carlisle called it, falls most heavily upon the farmers, and yet men, and Democrats at that, will have the effrontery to still advocate the continuation of this "crime."

Mr. COLSON. If the gentleman will permit me, although he has refused to be interrupted, I would like to ask (for information) another question.

Mr. TALBERT. I will yield for only one question.

Mr. COLSON. You speak of the constantly falling prices of cotton and other farm products since 1873. Do you not think that the increased production caused this decrease in prices?

Mr. TALBERT. No, sir. Because with this increase of production came also the increase of population, which naturally caused an increase of business and an increase of the demand for these products. The cry of overproduction, which we hear so much about, is a mere farce. It will not do. As long as there are as many people in the United States as there are who are naked for want of even cotton goods, this overproduction howl is the merest nonsense.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about "an honest dollar" (having reference to the gold dollar) and "the 50-cent dollar" (having reference to the silver dollar, etc.) and many other such fraudulent expressions. I claim that one dollar with the United States Government's stamp on it is just as good as another. For instance, four laboring men, A, B, C, and D, go to the merchant to buy potatoes, which are $2 per bushel; A, B, and C have each $1; A's silver, B's coppers, and C's greenback. But D has a dollar in gold. A, B, and C buy their potatoes, and each get one-half bushel, and up steps D and says: "Mr. Merchant, you must give me a whole bushel for my dollar." "Why?" asks the merchant. "Oh, don't you see, it's a pretty little gold dollar!" "That makes no difference," says the merchant; "it's only a dollar after all." So you see the silver dollar, the dollar of coppers, the greenback and the gold dollar all bought just the same; one was just as good as the other—the so-called 50-cent dollar was just as good as the gold dollar. "But," say the gold bugs, "that will do very well perhaps here at home among ourselves, but how about it when we have commercial and business dealings abroad with other countries? How about 'our credit' abroad?"

Mr. Thomas May Thorpe answers this as follows:

> The pretended anxiety for our credit with a little handful of foreign bondholders is as real as the philanthropy of those good women who let their own children go in rags that they may make red flannel mufflers for the heathen in tropical Congo.
>
> Reestablish our commercial prosperity and we have the best guaranty for one and all of our obligations, public and private, domestic and foreign. If that will not satisfy Europe, then let Europe go unsatisfied. If I treat my guests as well as I treat myself and my family, I do all that courtesy requires.
>
> Let us mind our own financial business and politely request Europe to do the same. Oh, for one hour of American feeling! That is only one of the many precious things that a "gold basis" forces us to throw into the bottomless pit of the forum.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that must be the disposal our present Secretary of the Treasury has made of his American feelings and sentiments, as well as our Chief Magistrate; or else these European gold demands upon our Treasury would cease to be gratified. How long, oh, how long, gentlemen, will the vaults of our Treasury continue to be looted, robbed, and plundered of their gold reserve by the heeded demands of a few bloated bondholders? How long will our Secretary of the Treasury, in coalition with the highest official of the nation, continue to override the will and wishes of our people and openly and boldly violate the law of the land? I would that we had more Andrew Jacksons and Daniel Mannings. As someone has well said:

> If Carlisle would only obey the law as Manning did, and pay out silver at his option, and not the bankers', etc., there would ensue "a great calm" financially, as when the Master spoke the all-sufficient word upon the stormy Sea of Galilee.

While Secretary of the Treasury, during the time of a great

demand on the Treasury for gold coin redemption, Mr. Manning, we are told, went to the city of New York, and calling the gold raiders together, said to them:

Gentlemen, the Treasury is willing to furnish gold for any legitimate demand, but if you attempt to draw upon the Treasury gold after to-day, as you are now doing, for hoarding or speculation, I shall adopt an effective remedy for the protection of the Government's reserve. We have a cash balance of $150,000,000, and not one of you doubts for a moment the purpose and ability of the Government to maintain specie payments. But if you continue to withdraw gold I shall at once order that you be paid 10 per cent in silver coin the first day; the second day you will be paid 20 per cent in silver; the third day, 30 per cent, and so on till one-half will be paid you in silver.

"But," exclaimed the astonished bankers, "this is in violation of the implied obligation that the Government will pay gold."

"Make no mistake about that," replied Mr. Manning. "The law says 'coin,' and the Treasury will exercise its undoubted prerogative."

That ended the gold raiding. The Government won its point just as soon as the Secretary of the Treasury showed that he had a backbone.

And it would win its point in the same way to-day. Manning's way was Jackson's way, when that great Democrat said, "I take the responsibility," and ordered the removal of the deposits from the United States Bank, telling the banking ring that if they wanted a panic they were at liberty to proceed with it.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish that our President and Secretary of the Treasury now had the courage and backbone of old Jackson and Manning, for our people have been robbed and plundered, imposed upon, and ground down by this as well as many other schemes and rascalities of those in power, acting in concert with the gold bugs, etc., till it has gotten to where it hurts. The people feel it, and are crying out for relief and help, but our officials and the money power answer back, "Bear it, it's the best."

It reminds me, gentlemen, of the farmer and his little boy who had a bull pup they were training to catch hogs. The farmer would get down on his all fours and the little boy would set the puppy after him. So one day the old fellow got down and capered around like a pig, and the little boy turned the pup loose and said, "Sic him, sic him, pup"; and the pup ran up to the old man and caught him by the ear, and began to bite the old fellow pretty hard, and it began to hurt, and he commenced to squall, "Take him off! Take him off! It hurts! It hurts! Take him off!" And the little boy, standing a little way off enjoying the fun, ran up, and patting the old man on the back, said, "Stand it, pappy! Stand it, pappy! Bear it if you can. I know it's hell on you, but," says he, "it's the very making of the dog."

So that is the answer that our national officials and the money power give the people when they cry out for relief from the present financial system of the country: "Stand it, stand it; bear it if you can. We know it's hell on you, but it's the very making of us."

But, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, I want to give you warning right here and right now that the people have stood this about as long as they propose to, and you must give them relief or else they will leave you at home and send men here to the next Congress who will do something for them, and in my opinion, under the present circumstances, the best way to start is to vote for the bill now before this House, and give the country back its money—give them free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, and that will at least be one step in the right direction.

As often said by others and by the press of the country, whatever may have been hoped by gold monometallists at the time of the first bond issue two years ago, it is now admitted that nothing of a permanent nature can be gained by the sale of bonds for gold. Borrowing gold can no longer be regarded in any other light than a costly makeshift and at best than a means of temporarily postponing suspension of gold payments. Such a state of affairs is eminently unsatisfactory. The necessity of borrowing gold is as annoying and unsatisfactory to gold theorists as the blind policy pursued by Mr. Cleveland that occasions it, is humiliating to the masses of our people.

Also, for the difficulties that confront the Treasury, gold monometallists have but one panacea, a contraction of the currency. Gold Democrats and gold Republicans alike have but one remedy to suggest. As much as the remedy asked for by Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle and the remedy proposed by Mr. DINGLEY and Mr. SHERMAN and other gold Republicans differ in form, in substance they are the same. The only difference between Messrs. Cleveland, Carlisle, and HILL, as representative of gold Democrats, and Mr. DINGLEY and Mr. REED and Mr. SHERMAN, as representative of gold Republicans, is that the former openly urge the funding of the greenbacks and Treasury notes, the creation of an interest-bearing debt of $500,000,000, and the contraction of the currency to the gold basis, while the latter propose such legislation as will attain the same end, but in a covert way.

Then again, the Dingley bond bill passed by the House and the resolution presented by Mr. SHERMAN to the Senate are not avowedly measures of contraction, though the inevitable effect of enacting into law either the Dingley bond bill or the proposition advocated by Senator SHERMAN would be virtually to contract the currency by hoarding greenbacks and the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman Act in the Treasury, but are so drawn as to hide the effect, if not the purpose, of such legislation from the people, and thus quiet opposition.

Like the recommendation urged by Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Carlisle, and other gold Democrats, the proposal of the gold Republicans, as set forth in the Dingley bond bill, contemplates the issue of bonds. Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle recommend the retirement of the greenbacks and the Treasury notes by directly, so far as possible, exchanging them for interest-bearing bonds. The proposal of the gold Republicans, on the other hand, is to sell bonds for gold, redeem the greenbacks and Treasury notes with this gold, and then virtually retire them by hoarding them in the Treasury.

Of course it is true, as also stated, in the face of an opposition in the party that they dare not ignore Mr. DINGLEY and the gold Republicans modified the bond bill by joining to the bill a declaratory clause to the effect that the greenbacks should not be canceled and retired, but when redeemed should be reissued and kept in circulation. But greenbacks, when so redeemed, can only be put again in circulation by being paid out in the usual course of business to meet the expenses of the Government, and if the revenue is equal to the expenditures of the Government—and on the great importance of raising such revenue Mr. DINGLEY and other gold Republicans laid much stress—there would be no possibility of paying out those notes and keeping them in circulation, but just to the extent they were redeemed with borrowed gold they would of necessity be hoarded in the Treasury. That such was the expectation of Mr. DINGLEY is apparent from the gist of his speech in support of his revenue measure, in which he laid great stress on the fact that if during the past two years and a half the revenue had been equal to the expenditures of the Government—whereas there was a deficit of $130,000,000—the drain on the gold reserve would not have reached such alarming proportions, for, as he said, there would have been greenbacks and Treasury notes in the Treasury to an amount of $130,000,000 which are now in circulation and in the hands of those who may present them for redemption.

Then it follows that the sale of bonds for gold by the Cleveland Administration has contracted the currency as it is. If there had been no deficit in the revenues, the currency would have been contracted to an amount equal to the quantity of gold received for the bonds, for, although the gold so received into the Treasury would no doubt have been paid out in redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes, such notes would have been piled up in the Treasury in its place and thus withdrawn from circulation.

Look at this! And, too, we are asked to surrender the control over the measure of value to the banks, to place the producing classes at the mercy of speculating bank managers, and for what? Simply, if we can trust the assertions of the gold monometallists of a class that urged silver monometallism when they feared a depreciation of gold as the result of the discovery of gold in California and Australia, and now urge gold monometallism, whose first and foremost tenet is that the dearest money is the best money, and who are contractionists on general principles, because the Treasury has no means of protecting its gold reserve. They tell us the Bank of England can control and check any export of gold if need be, and stop at any time a drain on its specie reserve simply by raising the rate of discount. The United States Treasury, on the other hand, they tell us, has no real means of protecting its gold reserve. It does not discount commercial paper, therefore it can not raise the discount rate, and consequently it is powerless to check a drain on the gold reserve.

Thus it seems from these and similar statements that Secretary Carlisle is bent on withdrawing from circulation outstanding Treasury notes and legal tenders. And he is succeeding, too. Last year the currency of the country was contracted almost to the extent of $50,000,000, and the process still continues. But the contraction indicated by the statistics does not represent the whole operation. No gold and no greenbacks (both of them indicated as being in circulation) can be had for business purposes; and meantime the bank loans are being drawn in and diminished. Thus the sorely harassed American people more and more are denied the privilege of using the instruments with which they may conduct the business of making exchanges. Thus, while foolish theorists are insisting that we have too much currency, men who wish to collect debts or to meet their engagements or to carry forward enterprises which they have begun are unable to accomplish their purposes. Thus, while commerce is half paralyzed, workmen are idle, and the prices of the products of labor are 50 per cent below the real value, our rulers are borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars and heaping up a mountain of debt upon a despairing people in a vain effort to maintain the British gold system. Is that system worth all this sacrifice, all this distress and embarrassment? And the end is not yet. We can not go on borrowing forever. We can not keep the gold system permanently by agreeing to pay out more gold than we take

in. One day or another collapse will come, and then the present suffering will appear like happiness in comparison with the misery that the people will then be called upon to endure.

Here is another fact stated and never denied. Last year the bankers who managed Mr. Cleveland's little operation in gold pocketed, it is said, about $10,000,000 in profits. Now other bankers are arranging to perform a similar feat, with a promise of equal or greater advantage to themselves. What persons pay these vast profits and the hundreds of millions of debts which are thus imposed upon the country? The wealth producers of the nation—the farmers, the laborers, the common people. What is the condition they find themselves in at a time when the professional manipulators of money are thus gorging themselves with spoils? Are the wealth producers prosperous? Are they by their industry turning out dollars as merrily and as bountifully as the financiers are turning them in? By no means. The farmers are the worst sufferers. They must now give 2 bushels of wheat or 2 pounds of cotton to pay the debt which, when it was contracted, could have been paid with 1 bushel of wheat or 1 pound of cotton. Everything like profit long ago disappeared; and while profits were vanishing the value of farm property has shrunken anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent. Never during the century were American farmers poorer or more despondent than they are to-day. As for the laborers, multitudes of them find themselves in midwinter without work or wages, while other multitudes are working only one-half the time. All of these men number millions, and all are watching sharply Mr. Cleveland's negotiations with the bankers, whose pockets bulge with the profits of last year. The men who create the wealth see it passing into the possession of the money lenders, while the producers toil practically without recompense.

Now, here is a pertinent question, Is this a condition of things that is likely to produce a feeling of contentment in the minds of the masses? What are socialism and anarchy made of but the jealousy and hatred excited by undue prosperity on the one hand and undue misery and suffering on the other? Is not a strong stimulus supplied to socialism when the men who produce get nothing, while nonproducers scoop in the whole product and grow fat? Are not anger and the impulse to violence even more likely to be excited when the discontented men know that the men who thus enrich themselves are the authors and defenders (directly or indirectly) of the destructive system which has been fastened upon us? While Mr. Cleveland and his followers have almost or quite wrecked the hopes of the masses of our people by their many nefarious schemes, the banking class here and in Europe has brought us into subjection to the British gold system in behalf of which these mountains of new debt are piled up. British gold monometallism has played havoc with the farm and with the public Treasury. With these destructive forces paralyzed, all the land would have blessing, and the financiers would win only fair returns for their services. With these forces in operation, the land has blighting and blasting, but the financiers gather their harvests by wagonloads. The system which permits these things can not endure. They would hardly be tolerated in Russia. If free Americans continue to tolerate them they will demonstrate that liberty has been intrusted to unworthy hands.

Now, as I have already said, the question is one of money, and the whole thing just resolves itself into this question: Shall we have a "gold standard," dictated by creditor England and the creditor classes of America in the interest of the creditor classes of both countries and ruinous to productive industry in both, or shall we have a return to the bimetallic standard guaranteed by the Constitution that was wrongfully changed by the act of 1873?

Then, in the language of the bimetallist, when the issue is thus presented the people will not be long deceived by abusive epithets and meaningless catch-phrases, but will see for themselves the true nature of the issue and that the toiling masses can have no prosperity under a system which is rapidly concentrating the entire wealth of the country into the hands of a pampered few. Nothing but ambiguous phrases and vague declarations have heretofore prevented the restoration of bimetallism in the United States. They have been essentially the weapons of the money power, by which the people have been hoodwinked and induced to put men in office not in sympathy with their desires. Upon such an issue as Mr. Carlisle now presents, namely, between the gold standard and bimetallism, Mr. Cleveland could no more have been elected President of the United States than he could have been made Czar of Russia, which position, however, I think, he would have been very much better suited to fill than the one he now has. We welcome the issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word in conclusion in defense of my State and my people in addition to what I said a few days ago. During this discussion some have seen fit to use the terms "tyrants," "anarchists," "communists," etc., in reference to my State and my people. I want to say that American history is sufficient vindication of South Carolina, which shows that the blood of her sons has moistened the soil of every battlefield for liberty from Lexington and Bunker Hill to Yorktown, and from Chapultepec to the City of Mexico. And it was the hardy sons of North and South Carolina who met and repulsed the bloody Tarleton at Kings Mountain, thus turning the tide in favor of American independence, then fast ebbing. Thus South Carolina has nothing in her past history of which to be ashamed, but much to be proud of, and to-day there is no place upon her soil for the foot of a tyrant, no atmosphere in which the anarchist can live and grow, and no congenial spirit with which the communist can move and associate, and her people stand ready to-day to meet the present issue like men, and there are too many Daniels there to worship idols, and, notwithstanding the decree of kings and princes, they will be found bowing three times a day with faces turned toward the Jerusalem of their old-time Democracy, worshiping the true and living God, the God of the whole people, and not the god of the chosen and select few, the "golden calf." [Applause.]

Mr. COLSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated upon this floor that this discussion is merely a dress parade, that the opinion of no one will be changed by it, and that it serves only to give the members of this House an opportunity to go on record for their constituents.

To this statement in its entirety I can not subscribe. I have been instructed by this debate, and I deprecate any effort made by the leaders on this side of the House to limit debate on so important a question as to preclude any member who desires to participate in the discussion from being heard. For this reason when, on yesterday, the gentleman from Maine moved that the discussion close this evening, I objected to the proposition and insisted that the discussion be further extended. The framers of the Constitution of our country provided, and I think wisely, that the members of this branch of the Congress should be elected every two years by a direct vote of the people. This was to insure closeness of touch between the people and at least one branch of the lawmaking power. This House, as now composed, consists of 357 members, a majority of whom never served in any preceding Congress. Certainly, sir, these new members, of whom I am one, coming as they do fresh from the people, know something at least of the sentiments and conditions prevailing among the people. They have felt the pulsation of the masses, they have heard the heart throbs of the people, and therefore ought to be heard upon this or any measure affecting the public interests.

The full attendance here this evening is evidence that the members of this committee feel an intense interest in the pending question, and if there is any relation between the interest shown and the solution of the question, the question will soon be solved. I am not one of those who are denominated throughout the country "gold bugs," neither am I of that class called "silver lunatics" or "silver cranks." I am not an extremist. I think it is not right for those who differ upon this question to call each other names. Such a course does not hasten the solution of the question or in any way throw light upon it. We, as representatives of the American people, ought to be honest and fair in the discussion of this question. We should be open and frank, and if in the discussion of this question we learn something to modify our views we should acknowledge that fact, and act accordingly. By this rule I, for one, propose to be guided. Whatever will bring the greatest good to the greatest number should be done.

> He's true to God who's true to man; wherever wrong is done,
> To the humblest and the weakest, 'neath the all-beholding sun,
> That wrong is also done to us; and they are slaves most base,
> Whose love of right is for themselves, and not for all their race.
> —*James Russel Lowell.*

Some time ago this House passed a bill and sent it to the Senate, and that body has returned it to us with every line eliminated, and has offered us as a substitute a measure which has no direct relation to it, providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1. I can not support this Senate measure any more than I could support the first section of the bill we sent to the Senate, and for which this is proposed as a substitute. In my remarks in the House when that bill was under consideration I stated my reasons for opposing that section, and by those reasons I continue to stand. Could I believe that if we adopt the measure now under discussion silver and gold at the ratio provided would circulate concurrently in this country, I would not hesitate to give the measure my support.

Mr. TALBERT. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COLSON. Certainly.

Mr. TALBERT. If the two metals did circulate concurrently for seventy years up to 1873, is there any reason why they should not do so again if silver were given the same chance?

Mr. COLSON. If silver were given the same chance under similar conditions, I think it would come as near circulating concurrently with gold as it did in the period between 1792 and 1873, but I will say to the gentleman that between 1792, the date free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 15 to 1 was provided for, and 1873, the time when the gentleman says silver was demonetized, there were periods when only one of the metallic dollars was in actual circulation as money.

Mr. TALBERT. But they were both looked upon as money of

redemption, and if the silver circulated a little more freely at one time, or the gold at another, that did not make any difference.

Mr. COLSON. I am coming to the discussion of that point. I will remark here, however, that from 1792 to 1873 we had legally and nominally a double standard. Sometimes at the ratio of 15 to 1, sometimes at a different ratio, but there were periods when, owing to the increase in the commercial value of the metal in one of the dollars above its face value, it ceased to circulate as money and was sold as a commodity, leaving only the cheaper dollar in circulation.

Mr. TALBERT. That was very natural.

Mr. COLSON. Certainly. Now, if you will eliminate the question of parity, if you will insure maintenance of parity, if you will make it possible for gold and silver to circulate concurrently, then I say to you I am in favor of both metals being used as primary or standard money at 16 to 1, or any reasonable ratio.

Mr. TALBERT. I agree with the gentleman that stability is possibly of more importance than the ratio, which seems to be the point that he is making.

Mr. COLSON. There is only one objection to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and that is the difficulty of maintaining the parity. With that difficulty removed, there is no reason on earth why we should not have free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country. I challenge any man to advance one good and valid argument, except the difficulty of maintaining the parity, against free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, and if you will solve that question—if you will guarantee that the two metals will circulate concurrently—then I am willing and anxious to vote for the free and unlimited coinage of silver; and until that is done I very seriously doubt the wisdom of passing the pending measure. I agree with those who are clamoring for the free and unlimited coinage of silver that there is not enough money in this country. I agree with them that the amount of gold that we have is not sufficient to support the volume of currency that this country needs. I am opposed to monometallism, either gold monometallism or silver monometallism. I am a bimetallist, and I want to see the gold dollar and silver dollar go hand in hand—circulate side by side in this country. They say we are thrashing over old straw in the discussion of this question.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, this question of parity has been a question of public interest for many years. It was a question right at the organization of our mint in 1792; it has continued to have its influence throughout our whole history, and is attracting more attention to-day than ever before. If by rethrashing this straw we can get one golden grain, we ought to rethrash it. I am willing to do it. If by any word I may utter, or anything I may do, I can relieve in the slightest degree the depression prevailing throughout the land, I shall feel repaid for the effort. If we can find the philosopher's stone whose touch will heal the nation, if we can discover the instrument with which to pluck the thorns from the agonizing crown that rests upon the people's brow, the consciousness of having done so will be ample reward.

By the act of April 2, 1792, the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 15 to 1 was provided for, but owing to the fact that the commercial ratio between silver and gold diverged from this legal ratio of 15 to 1, owing to the fact that gold became more valuable as compared to silver than 15 to 1, and therefore disappeared as money, ceasing to circulate as such, which resulted in a severe contraction of the currency, the Government, by the act of June 28, 1834, by reducing the amount of the gold in the gold coins, changed the legal ratio from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1, thereby hoping to keep gold in circulation. But by this act of June 28, 1834, establishing the legal ratio of 16 to 1, silver was undervalued, with the result that it disappeared from circulation as gold reappeared. Then, by the act of February 21, 1853, to prevent the undervalued silver coins from being gathered up and sold as bullion, the amount of silver in the silver half dollar, silver quarter and dime and half dime was reduced, and their legal-tender quality limited to $10.

The silver dollar, which was not changed by this act of February 21, 1853, still undervalued, disappeared almost entirely from circulation, and did not reappear to any extent until five years after the act of February 12, 1873, or until the passage of the act of February 28, 1878, authorizing the purchase and coinage of not less than 2,000,000 nor more than 4,000,000 silver dollars per month. It may be well for me to add in this connection that there were only 8,031,238 silver dollars coined by the Government from April 2, 1792, to February 12, 1873, and that there have been coined 419,332,777 silver dollars since February 12, 1873. It is but fair to state, however, that prior to the act of February 12, 1873, silver coins were regarded as money of ultimate redemption, and that it is not so regarded by the officials of the Government at this time.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the most important question before the House to-day, second in interest to none. There is another question to which it is related that has contributed to the depression prevailing throughout the land, and to which I must refer in the discussion of the causes that have brought about the present depressed condition of affairs. That is the tariff question, the merits of which I will not now undertake to discuss. It has, however, been thrust upon us in all its intensity by the present Democratic Administration. Until the election of Grover Cleveland President of the United States and the election of the Fifty-third Congress in November, 1892, the revenues of the Government were sufficient to meet its expenses, and it was not necessary to issue bonds of the Government, ostensibly in order to maintain the gold reserve in the Treasury, but really to meet a deficiency in the revenue.

Never before in the history of the Government has it been necessary in time of peace to increase the bonded debt of the Government. As soon as it was known that Grover Cleveland was elected President and that there was a Democratic Congress, just as soon as the business interests of the country realized that every branch of the Government would be placed under the control of the Democratic party, a season of distress came upon us, because it was known that the Democratic party would legislate upon the line of tariff reform. What has been the result? The Democratic party, installed into power and intoxicated by its own success, began to legislate, and the first thing it did was to wipe from the statute book the best tariff law we ever had in this country, the McKinley tariff law, which yielded ample revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and a comfortable surplus besides, and it enacted in lieu thereof another tariff measure, framed upon the line of tariff reform in most respects, with the result that the revenues of the Government fell off and were not sufficient by many millions per month to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

In this connection I should like to have the Clerk read the following table, showing the receipts and expenditures of the Government per month from September, 1894, to January, 1896, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

A TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY.

The official record of the entire seventeen months of the Gorman tariff shows a deficiency of $74,164,296. The details are as follows:

Month.	Receipts.	Expenditures.	Deficit.
1894.			
September	$22,621,228	$30,323,018	$7,701,789
October	19,139,240	32,713,039	13,573,800
November	19,411,403	28,477,188	9,065,785
December	21,866,136	27,135,460	5,269,324
1895.			
January	27,804,399	34,523,447	6,719,047
February	22,888,057	25,696,035	2,807,978
March	25,470,575	25,716,957	246,382
April	24,247,836	32,990,676	8,742,839
May	25,272,078	28,558,213	3,286,136
June	25,615,474	21,683,029	3,932,445
July	29,069,697	38,548,063	9,478,366
August	28,952,696	32,588,184	3,635,488
September	27,549,678	24,320,481	3,229,196
October	27,901,748	34,503,425	6,601,677
November	25,986,503	27,199,283	1,212,780
December	26,288,937	25,814,317	474,620
1896.			
January	29,237,670	32,696,830	3,459,159
Total	429,323,353	502,487,650	74,164,296

Mr. COLSON. We have here a deficiency in seventeen months under the Gorman tariff of $74,164,296. As a consequence of the insufficiency of revenue to meet the expenses of the Government a raid was made upon the gold held in the Treasury as a fund to guarantee the redemption of the greenbacks. That gold was taken to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government, which should have been met by revenues derived from customs duties and internal taxes. But for the tariff legislation of the Democratic party we would not have the intensely distressed condition which we have to-day to contend with. But it is here, and we must do the best we can to relieve the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party will settle this question; the Republican party is opposed to gold monometallism; the Republican party is opposed to silver monometallism. It is in favor of bimetallism, and in this connection I should like to have the Clerk read from the platform of the Republican party adopted at Chicago in 1880.

The Clerk read as follows:

It has raised the value of our paper currency from 38 per cent to the par of gold; it has restored, upon a solid basis, payment in coin of all national obligations, and has given us a currency absolutely good and equal in every part

of our extended country; it has lifted the credit of the nation from the point where 6 per cent bonds sold at 86 to that where 4 per cent bonds are eagerly sought at a premium.

Mr. COLSON. That, Mr. Speaker, was the declaration of the Republican party in its platform adopted at Chicago in 1880. It referred to the course of that party upon the financial question in this country from the inauguration of Lincoln to 1880. It had been necessary in time of war for the Government to issue what were called the greenbacks, which were merely its notes. Owing to the fact that the life of the nation hung in the balance, those greenbacks or notes of the Government did not, when issued, circulate at par with gold or silver. But after the war was over, when the life of the nation had been preserved, the confidence of the people in the ability of the Government to redeem its paper in specie began to grow, and as the years rolled on and the wise administration of the Government by the Republican party progressed, these greenbacks or notes of the Government continued to increase in value and to approach in value silver and gold.

In 1875 the Republican party passed the resumption act, providing that upon the 1st of January, 1879, the Government should redeem in specie any of these greenbacks presented at our Treasury. The Democratic party opposed this measure. It said that resumption could not take place; that the Government could not redeem the greenbacks in specie; that it could not resume specie payment. That party here in the Congress of the United States opposed to a man that measure providing for resumption. The 1st day of January, 1879, arrived, and the confidence of the people of this country in the ability of this Government to resume specie payments was so great that there was no rush at the doors of the Treasury of people clamoring for redemption of greenbacks in specie. Nobody wanted greenbacks redeemed in coin, because everyone felt satisfied that the Government could do it, and the greenbacks were preferable because less cumbersome. It was to this course of the Republican party, it was to this management of the Government finances, that the Republican party refers in its platform of 1880. I would like now to have the Clerk read from the Republican party platforms of 1884, 1888, and 1892.

The Clerk read as follows:

We have always recommended the best money known to the civilized world, and we urge that efforts should be made to unite all commercial nations in the establishment of an international standard which shall fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage.

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal. The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workingmen, demand that every dollar, paper or coin, issued by the Government shall be as good as any other. We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure a parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

Mr. COLSON. These, Mr. Speaker, are the declarations of the Republican party in its national conventions on this question, and I stand by them, that the Republican party favors bimetallism, provided always that every dollar of our currency is as good as every other dollar. I recognize the fact, sir, and agree with those who seek the passage of this bill, that gold as measured by agricultural products has appreciated in value. I believe that, and I concede it. I believe that it is more difficult to discharge a dollar of obligation now than it was in the past. I believe, on the other hand, that silver has depreciated, and I believe further that unfavorable legislation has contributed to this result. I believe that the legislation of the Governments of the world has contributed to enhance the value of gold and depreciate the value of silver, but I do not believe that it would be wise for this country alone to attempt to make silver and gold circulate concurrently at the ratio of 16 to 1.

If we can secure the cooperation of some other nations I believe that it can be done. I am therefore opposed to this Government alone attempting to restore silver to its former position. I am in favor of what is termed international bimetallism. I am in favor of seeing silver restored to its rightful position by the nations of the earth acting in conjunction, and, sir, if the other nations of the earth now using the single gold standard can by any form of legislation by this country be forced to cooperate with the Government of the United States in bringing about this desirable result I will favor such legislation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Mr. WANGER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SNOVER. I ask unanimous consent that the recess be now taken.

There was no objection.

The House accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) took a recess, according to previous order, until 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m. Monday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint, relative to the amendment of the act of June 19, 1878, providing for the expenses of parting and refining bullion—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Wolf River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jonathan Buzzard against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, replying to the House resolution of February 4, 1896, in regard to the new post-office building at Wilmington, Del.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the United States assistant treasurer at Boston, asking for additional employees in his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BARTLETT of New York, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 295); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1413) for a relief vessel for the Fourth light-house district, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 296); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1412) for a steam light vessel at Overfalls Shoal, New Jersey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 297); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 836) to establish wind signal display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 298); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2290) to provide for the time and place of holding the terms of the United States circuit and district courts in the State of South Dakota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 299); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 539) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows, late postmaster at Williamsport, Pa. (Report No. 300.)

By Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2984) to place Francis A. Field, late captain, Eleventh United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army. (Report No. 301.)

By Mr. CURTIS of New York, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 3852) to amend the record of William H. De Freest. (Report No. 302.)

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones. (Report No. 303.)

The bill (H. R. 4526) granting a pension to Jonathan Scott. (Report No. 304.)

By Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (H. R. 569) granting a pension to Sophia J. Hamilton, widow of Charles S. Hamilton, major-general of volunteers. (Report No. 305.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5732) to amend section 5459 of the Revised Statutes, prescribing the punishment for mutilating United States coins and for uttering or passing or attempting to utter or pass such mutilated coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5733) for the relief of certain State militia who did service in the Federal Army in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5734) to repeal sections of the act of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 5735) to provide for the holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Welch, in the district of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 5736) to authorize the Light-House Board to proceed with the construction of the light-house and fog signal on North Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 5737) granting to the incorporated town of Onawa, in the State of Iowa, for public uses, a certain lake known as Blue Lake, situated near said town—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 5738) to authorize extension of the lines of the Potomac Light and Power Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5739) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 5790) to permit the Pintsch Compressing Company to lay pipes in certain streets in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A joint resolution (H. Res. 110) for a survey and estimate of the cost of removing Starve Island Reef, in Lake Erie—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A resolution (House Res. No. 160) to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to employ a stenographer and typewriter—to the Committee on Accounts.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 2410) to amend an act increasing the pension of Marcus D. Box—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5326) to grant a pension to Sarah A. Blazer—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Petition and affidavit of Edmund P. Tierney in support of his application for a pension by special act of Congress—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Petition of Meta Coleman and others asking increase of the pension of Mrs. O. J. Clark, of Louisville, Ky.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Petition of Anna V. Ingerton, widow of William H. Ingerton, late lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry, praying for relief—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5740) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a duplicate bond to Benjamin March, guardian of Ruth March—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5742) for the benefit of John W. Kirby, late sheriff of Gallatin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5743) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Tiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) to amend the muster rolls of Company B, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, so as to place thereon the name of William C. Armstrong—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Sarah E. B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of Benjamin F. Fox—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 5747) to pension Norman Statham—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5748) for the relief of Mrs. I. J. Russell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to James C. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) granting a pension to Joseph Crow, of Eldorado, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Perry Cottingham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5752) to increase pension of Harrison Moulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of William M. Bird, James F. Redding, Henry F. Welch, and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 5754) granting a pension to Lavinia H. Gachet, widow of James E. Gachet—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5755) increasing the pension of Charles D. Miller, of Company D, Capt. W. H. Rodgers, Howell's Battalion Missouri Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 5756) to correct the military record of Samuel Steinman, of Scottdale, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5757) to remove the sentence of court-martial from the military record of Thomas J. Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Horace G. Reed—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of Evan Henry, of Clark County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5760) for relief of Andrew Howard, sr., of Magoffin County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) for the relief of Arch Huffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) removing the charge of desertion from the record of James F. Prewitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of John M. Fidler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5764) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Marthon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5765) to muster out of service James Canada—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5766) to remove charge of desertion against W. T. Akridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5767) to remove charge of desertion against James Braden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5768) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin A. Helm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5769) to remove charge of desertion against John A. Bishop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 5770) to amend the record of Frederick Steuart, alias H. H. Sanborn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) to amend the record of William Dumond—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) to grant pay for services, clothing, and commutation to James Pierson, alias James Pollock—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 5773) for the relief of Albert E. Redstone—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) to increase the pension of Emily A. Holder from $17 per month to $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of W. B. Horner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5776) granting a pension to Ezra G. Bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) granting a pension to Mowry A. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 5778) for the relief of Sylvester Haus, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 5779) granting a pension to Eda McLauren—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5780) for the relief of Richard E. Hayden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 5781) to increase the pension of Price Castle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5782) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Anna Wedel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 5783) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Longacre, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 5784) authorizing the placing upon the retired list of the United States Army the name of William J. Lee, late confidential scout and guide to Gen. U. S. Grant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 5785) for the relief of certain officers of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5786) for the relief of Kinney C. Miller, Scottsboro, Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) for the relief Henry A. F. Worth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5788) for the relief of the estate of Augustus B. Pharr, deceased, late of McNairy County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5789) for the relief of Isaac Coppock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the Hackmen and Undertakers' Union, No. 5220, in favor of the bill governing the manning of vessels for the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the National Union of United Brewery Workmen of the United States, in favor of the bill governing the manning of vessels for the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4360, for the relief of Jacob Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Petition of the St. Louis Paint, Oil, and Drug Club, favoring the passage of House bill No. 2779, for the improvement of the channel of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Post No. 2, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of bill to pension soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, protest of the A. D. Porter Company against House bill No. 4566, relating to postage on second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of J. W. Freeman and others, to remove the charge of desertion against Frank Herrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Preamble and resolutions adopted by the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., for the protection of seaboard cities—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions by the citizens of Burlington and Winooski, Vt., for the relief of the suffering Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, testimony in the matter of granting a pension to John Thurston, of Island Pond, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, testimony in the matter of granting a pension to Mary Chamberlin, of Chelsea, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions adopted by the New York Mercantile Exchange, together with the New York Produce Exchange, of New York City, in favor of House bill No. 3010, regulating the manufacture and sale of filled cheese—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5778—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5779—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: Memorials of C. A. Stanley and others, E. F. Geason and others, all of Ashland, Wis., and F. M. Wires and others, of the Tenth Congressional district of Wisconsin, asking for the further improvement of the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of Dr. J. D. Cameron and others, of Holly Springs, Miss., praying payment of claims of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South for property destroyed during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: Memorial of city council of the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, asking payment for street paving in front of the Ottumwa post-office—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Garbriel Decker and 92 others, of Wanague, N. J., and vicinity; Mark Orr and 16 others, of Dividing Creek, N. J.; George A. Githews and 28 others, of Salem, N. J., requesting the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the First Baptist Church of Dorchester, Mass., against the appropriation of public money for the support of sectarian Indian schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: Petition of 126 citizens of Bisbee, Ariz., remonstrating against appropriating money directly or indirectly for sectarian undertakings, and praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11, to amend the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOLE: Resolutions prepared by Right Rev. T. D. Huntington, bishop of the diocese of central New York; Rev. George B. Spalding, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, N. Y., and Rev. Michael Clune, pastor of St. John's Roman Catholic Church of Syracuse, and adopted by the citizens of Syracuse at a mass meeting held February 2, 1896, protesting against the atrocities attending the existing religious persecutions in Armenia, and demanding on the part of Congress and the Executive a prompt and explicit expression to the Turkish Government of indignant remonstrance from the people of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (by request): Petition of Levi L. Bowers, James J. Haynes, and others, of Rutherford County, Tenn., in favor of a service pension to soldiers and sailors of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Memorial and petition of the Daughters of the Revolution and war of 1812, of New Orleans, La., asking for an appropriation for the completion of the monument and beautifying the grounds of the battlefield of Chalmette, New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Catharine Bedell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: Letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, to accompany House bill No. 5267, for the relief of Hattie J. Rogers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 10, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The VICE-PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians, in Dakota, into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893;

A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation; and

A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF REINDEER INTO ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, a report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson, upon the "Introduction of domestic reindeer into the District of Alaska for 1895"; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Germantown, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation preventing further outrages upon the Christians in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New York, remonstrating against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and at Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, New York; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Dartmouth College Association of New York, remonstrating against acts of cruelty in Turkish Armenia, and urging the Government to send transport relief ships to relieve the suffering provinces; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HILL. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of New York, passed May 1, 1895, after Congress had adjourned. I ask that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The joint resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK:

In senate.

ALBANY, *May 1, 1895.*

By Mr. Higgins:

Whereas the canal system of the State of New York is maintained by the taxpayers of the said State at an annual cost of about $1,500,000 as a free waterway for the transportation to tidewater of merchandise and products, a large percentage of which originate in other States; and

Whereas the maintenance of said canal system is also of great benefit to other States in reducing to a minimum the rates charged by trunk lines of railroad for the transportation to the seaboard of freights originating at points without the State of New York; and

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of the United States to maintain and improve such waterways as are useful or necessary for the purposes of interstate commerce; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York, by the provisions of its constitution, have forbidden the sale or abandonment of any portion of the canal system of said State; and

Whereas by reason of the premises it is inequitable that the people of the State of New York should bear the entire burden of maintaining a waterway the principal benefits of which are enjoyed by other States: Now, therefore,

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the representatives of the State of New York in the United States Senate and House of Representatives be, and they hereby are, requested to secure with all convenient speed the passage of an act directing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to the comptroller of the State of New York annually a sum equivalent to three-fourths of all sums expended or incurred by the State of New York in the maintenance of its said canal system during the year last preceding.

By order of the senate.

JOHN S. KENYON, *Clerk.*

In assembly.

MAY 13, 1895.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

A. E. BAXTER, *Clerk.*

Mr. HILL presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, praying that an appropriation be made for the establishment of a light-ship off Fire Island; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL. I present a communication in the nature of a petition addressed to me by the Fort Brook Cooperative Association of Florida for presentation to the Congress. It relates to the title of what is known as the Fort Brook Reservation, in the immediate vicinity of the town of Tampa, which has been the subject of contention and controversy in the Interior Department for years. The petitioners are settlers upon this reservation of public land, and they ask that Congress may authorize a suit to be brought by the United States for the determination of their rights, which they claim have been improperly and unlawfully decided against them in the Interior Department.

I move that the petition be printed as a miscellaneous document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition addressed to Congress, signed by W. J. Borden, Hon. N. L. Clarke, Dr. Simmons, and other citizens of Sumter County, Fla., praying the Congress of the United States to enact some legislation in restraint of the abuse of the judicial power in punishing citizens of the United States for contempt of court.

I desire to state that these are agricultural people, farmers, and it only evidences the interest which the people of the United States take in all matters of public concern. They represent a numerous class of people, and are interested in the subject of obtaining some legislation which will prevent the oppression of American citizens by the abuse of the powers of the courts. They are not railway employees or members of labor societies, but are citizens of the United States, acting alone under patriotic impulses.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a memorial of Shipmasters' Association, No. 6, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the placing of bridge piers in the river at Detroit; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Pewaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LINDSAY presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lexington, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Lake Seaman's Union of Illinois, remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 2670, to prohibit advances and regulate allotments of wages to seamen, and also against the passage of House bill No. 2761, to abolish the imprisonment of seamen in the common jails of the United States for desertion; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ipava, Ill., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry ex-prisoners of war of Pana, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the Vermont Merino Sheep Breeders' Association, praying for the speedy passage of House bill No. 2749, to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and provide against a deficiency; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Hampshire, representing 2,700 members, signed by Miss C. R. Wendell, president, and Miss C. N. Brown, corresponding secretary, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of S. D. Williams and sundry other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, prohibiting the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, praying for the abolishment of the present method of seed distribution, and for the distribution only of valuable seeds and plants for experimental purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Bay State Agricultural Society at its annual meeting held in Boston, Mass., approving the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in abolishing the method of seed distribution; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Dartmouth College Association of New York, remonstrating against acts of cruelty in Turkish Armenia, and urging the Government to send transport relief ships to relieve the suffering provinces; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Western Massachusetts Union ex-Prisoners of War Association, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, N. C., praying that an appropriation of $1,000 be made for an examination and report as to the feasibility of a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, on the Atlantic coast, or at some other point south of or near to Cape Hatteras; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented a memorial of the members of the Congregational Church, parish of Hatfield, Mass., remonstrating against the horrible atrocities committed in Turkey; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Western Massachusetts Union of ex-Prisoners of War, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting a pension to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS presented a memorial of 120 citizens of Adrian, Mich., remonstrating against the appropriation of public moneys for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dorrance, Mich., praying for the enactment of a Sunday rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of R. H. Barnett and 18 other citizens of Lake County, Fla., representing different religious denominations, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South by compensating them for the use of their property by the United States without authority during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a memorial, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Fernandina, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 2673, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the St. Louis (Mo.) Paint, Oil, and Drug Club, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the dredging of the Mississippi River from St. Louis to New Orleans by contract by practical river men; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. HALE presented a report of operations, by Col. John M. Wilson, Corps of Engineers, upon repairs and enlargement of the Government Printing Office and the erection of a fireproof building upon the site of the Government Printing Office stables under the Chief of Engineers during the month of January, 1896; which was ordered to be printed.

PENSION STATISTICS.

Mr. ALLEN. I hold in my hand a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions accompanied by a tabulation of the colonels, brevet brigadier-generals, and brigadier-generals of volunteers in the late war who have been pensioned by special act of Congress. I move that the letter and statement be published as a miscellaneous document for the use of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 738) authorizing the establishment of a pier-head light at or near South Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 996) to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 265) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 792) for the relief of Wells C. McCool, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 2013) for the relief of James W. Snyder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bull; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2015) to amend section 597 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2016) to amend "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," passed March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2017) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon to the Allen M. Harmon Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Northville, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 2018) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of David Unsell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2019) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James Harvey Dennis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2020) to quiet the title of certain lands in the State of Mississippi, and for the relief of Eli Ayres or his legal representatives, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2021) to increase the pensions of veterans of the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2022) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska"; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2023) to amend sections 4590 and 4597 of the Revised Statutes, relating to offenses committed by seamen employed on merchant vessels, and providing punishments for such offenses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2024) to amend sections 4556, 4557, 4558, and 4559 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the inspection, equipment, and repair of merchant vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2025) to amend sections 4582, 4583, and 4600 of the United States Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2026) to amend sections 4520, 4522, 4526, 4530, 4564, 4566, 4568, 4572, and 4612 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the employment, care, discharge, and payment of seamen employed on merchant vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PRITCHARD (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2027) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of railroad employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2028) for the relief of Joel M. Bryan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2029) directing the Quartermaster-General to settle with the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad Company, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 73) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to foreclose the Government lien on the Union Pacific Railroad and the Kansas Pacific Railway; which was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 74) relative to the termination of the war in Cuba; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length and that it lie on the table for the present.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whereas the President of the United States, in his last annual message to this body, says:

"Neither the warmth of our people's sympathy with the Cuban insurgents nor our loss and material damage consequent upon the futile endeavors thus far made to restore peace and order, nor any shock our humane sensibilities may have received from the cruelties which appear to especially characterize this sanguinary and fiercely conducted war, have in the least shaken the determination of the Government to honestly fulfill every international obligation, yet it is to be earnestly hoped, on every ground, that the devastation of armed conflict may speedily be stayed and order and quiet restored to the distracted island, bringing in their train the activity and thrift of peaceful pursuits."

And whereas he also declares that the present revolt is more active than the one which continued from 1868 to 1878; and as it appears there are no means of securing permanent peace to Cuba except by the recognition of its right to self-government, the good offices of the United States are earnestly recommended to the favorable consideration of the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. QUAY. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which I ask be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Pensions and printed.

Mr. QUAY. Let it be referred without printing, as I understand the bill will be called up to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be referred without printing.

BONDS OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BRICE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4052) validating certain bonds of the Territory of New Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

DUTY ON SUGARS.

Mr. LINDSAY. I offer an amendment to House bill 2749, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. VEST. Let it be read.

The amendment was read, and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Amend House bill No. 2749 by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 5. That so much of section 182¼ of Schedule E of the act which became a law August 27, 1894, entitled 'An act to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes,' which provides as follows: 'And upon all sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, and upon all sugars which have been discolored there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the said duty of 40 per cent ad valorem,' be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and the collection of said additional duty, from and after the passage of this act, is hereby discontinued."

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to give notice that on next Monday at the conclusion of the morning business I shall ask the leave of the Senate to submit a few observations respecting concurrent resolution No. 15, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I ask the consent of the Senate to make a brief personal explanation.

On Thursday last I introduced a bill providing for a pension to the freedmen. I stated at the time that I introduced it by request and it was so noted upon the bill, notwithstanding which fact I find myself credited by the press of the country with the authorship and advocacy of the measure. I am entitled to no such distinction.

The bill is a copy of a House bill introduced in the Fifty-first Congress by Hon. W. J. Connell, of the First Nebraska district. It was prepared by Col. W. R. Vaughan, a Virginian by birth, a soldier in the late Confederate army, a Democrat of the ultra Bourbon type, and my personal friend. Colonel Vaughan is a gentleman of education, of wide experience, and broad views. He has given the matter of this bill great consideration, and I introduced it at his personal request, upon the explicit understanding that I was not pledged to the support of the measure.

In justice, however, to myself I desire to state that I believe the bill has been framed with a just recognition of the great moral obligation which this Government assumed when it called a people from bondage, not only to the privileges, but also to the responsibilities and duties of freedom. As a measure based upon this principle it is entitled to careful examination, and I introduced it in order that it might be brought to the attention of Congress for its future consideration, deliberation, and action.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the amount of coin and currency, and all forms of notes and money of the United States in existence on January 1, 1896, and the amount held as reserves by national and State banks, private banks and bankers, loan and trust companies, and other financial institutions and concerns, and the total amount then in the Treasury, and the estimated population of the United States at that time.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 7th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 8th instant approved and signed the act (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory.

BILLS BECOME LAWS.

The message further announced that the following bills, having been presented to the President on the 28th of January, 1896, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which they originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become laws without his approval:

An act (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell;

An act (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; and

An act (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene.

FOREIGN OCCUPATION OF ALASKAN TERRITORY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MORGAN, referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, in answer to the resolution of the Senate of December 18, 1895, a report by the Secretary of State, accompanied by copies of correspondence touching the establishment, or attempted establishment, of post routes by Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada over or upon United States territory in Alaska; also as to the occupation or attempted occupation by any means of any portion of that territory by the military or civil authorities of Great Britain or of Canada.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 10, 1896.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. QUAY on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will not agree to let the resolution go over, remaining on the Calendar, until to-morrow without prejudice.

Mr. QUAY. I understand there are some matters before the Senate that it is important to have disposed of to-day, and I will agree to that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. I desire to call up Calendar resolution No. 32.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

THE WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the pending business, which I understand to be the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the war in Cuba and involving the question of belligerent rights and the recognition of the independence of the Cuban republic may be taken up for consideration and be made the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SMITH. I now call up Calendar resolution No. 32, which is on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SEWELL January 16, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of the Allied Powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere.

2. That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

3. That the true ground upon which the Monroe announcement was based and upon which any similar position has been taken rests for its justification upon what may be our interests, and our interests only; and that neither by the Monroe doctrine nor any other official declaration have we ever come under any pledge to any power or State on this continent that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any other power.

4. That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory by invasion or conquest, it is then for us to determine whether our safety and the integrity of our institutions demand that we shall resist such action by armed force if necessary.

5. That the Executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the positions thus taken seems to be a committal of this Government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States; that this would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they be European or American.

6. That this action was premature, looking to the history of the controversy, and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country.

7. That neither Congress nor the country can be, or has been, committed by the action or position of the executive department, in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy, as to the course to be pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final determination. It will then be our province and our duty to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people, and the integrity of our institutions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it is not my intention at this time, in considering the resolutions introduced by my colleague, to attempt either a definition of what is known as the Monroe doctrine or to analyze the various arguments which have been made upon

the question of national policy raised by the President's message. It seems to me that in the certain interest and the possible excitement attending the reception of that message and the prompt and decisive action thereon by Congress some of us have been drawn away from a true apprehension of the situation.

I may say at the outset that, for one, I am opposed to the adoption of the resolutions introduced by my colleague. I may also add that I am quite as strongly opposed to the adoption of the resolutions introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and reported in an amended form by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I also desire to supplement these two assertions with the remark that I have very little sympathy with the position assumed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

My reasons for assuming this attitude may be summed up in a single sentence. There is no occasion for any action of any kind upon this subject by this body at this time. We have done all that either prudence can justify or patriotism demand. We have met the situation outlined to us by the President in such a manner as to show that there is no division of sentiment in the Government of the United States when any question of national honor is involved. So much we have done unanimously in both Houses, without regard to party lines or personal feelings, because to have faltered or delayed would have been a violation of our plain duty to the American people. By entering upon a discussion of what we have already done, and by reopening the question which we have already answered, we could only succeed in nullifying, or at least qualifying, the action we have already taken. A simple statement of the facts seems to me a sufficient and complete justification of this assertion.

On December 17 Congress received from the President a message outlining the position of this country as it related to the existing controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela. In that message the President pointed out, with his usual clearness of vision and characteristic vigor of expression, the bearing of that difficulty upon the welfare, integrity, and best interests of this nation. He insisted, rightfully, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the United States were concerned in a controversy which might result in the seizure of American territory by a European Government. He proved conclusively from official correspondence the obvious desire of Great Britain to enlarge, so far as may be within its power, the domain of British Guiana. He directed attention to the efforts which had been made to induce Great Britain to submit the question of a boundary line between its possessions and Venezuela to arbitration. He laid particular stress upon the fact that all such efforts had been in vain.

From these facts he deduced the logical and irresistible conclusion that it was the plain duty of the United States, in its own interest and for its own protection, to determine the rightful location of this divisional line. He therefore asked from Congress the right to name a commission which should be charged with the performance of this work. The response was prompt, unanimous, and even enthusiastic. On the very next day the House of Representatives, without a single dissenting vote, adopted a resolution embodying the President's suggestion, and on December 20, only three days after the reception of the message, the Senate unanimously concurred in the action of the House of Representatives. Since that time the Commissioners have been appointed and are now engaged in the performance of their duty. Both Houses have done all that the President and Secretary of State, charged with the responsibility of diplomatic negotiations with other powers, desired, and all that the people expected.

It is not only unnecessary, but unwise, to either qualify or intensify our action thus taken in response to both an executive and a public demand. This is the first and chief reason why I am opposed to the resolutions introduced by my colleague, as well as those recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations. Consequently, as I said at the beginning, I do not consider that this is the time for analysis or discussion of either, although there seems to be ample reason for dissenting from some of the provisions of each. I may go even further and add that, so far as the resolutions submitted by my colleague are concerned, I can see very little justification for any one of the various propositions which he has seen fit to advance as a proper statement of our national policy. I especially dissent from his assertion that the mere determination of this boundary line for our own information "would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they are European or American."

If there be any merit whatsoever in the Monroe doctrine, if there be any sound reason why we, for our protection, should uphold the principle of noninterference by European Governments with American Republics, it is absolutely essential that we should satisfy ourselves of rightful divisional lines, such as should exist between British possessions and the Republic of Venezuela. It is absurd to declare in one breath that a European power should not have the right of conquest by force of arms and concede in the next that it may, by the same brute force, extend its boundary line in such a way and to such extent as may seem to itself either just or desirable.

The Monroe doctrine does apply to the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela quite as truly and quite as justly as if the flying squadron were now in a Venezuelan port demanding the submission of a people who have achieved their independence. To define the methods by which a foreign power may accomplish its purpose by evading technicalities is to nullify absolutely the American principle upon which we have taken our stand.

Nor can I agree with my colleague when he says "that this action was premature and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country." Such a confession is only stultification.

It is not for me to criticise the course of my colleague, but if I had believed that this action was properly subject to these restrictions I certainly should not, as I did and as he did and as we all did, have set my seal of approval upon it. If every act of a President of the United States involving national honor or national disgrace can only be taken with propriety when the business and financial condition of the country is such as to warrant it, then great indeed must be the indignation of my colleague when he contemplates the conduct of George Washington, James Madison, and, above all, the many and most "inopportune" acts of Abraham Lincoln.

Is it not probable, also, that my colleague has overlooked one important fact when he asks this body to adopt a resolution to the effect "that neither Congress nor the country can be or has been committed by the action or position of the executive department in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy?"

Nobody supposes that the Executive alone could commit either Congress or the country, but the appointment of this Commission was not the single act of the President. It was authorized by the unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress, and if my colleague has any doubt of the approval of the country I would suggest to him, in all candor and sincerity, that he sound more deeply and carefully than he seems to have done the sentiment of that portion of the country bounded on the east by New York and on the west by Pennsylvania.

I have spoken this much, Mr. President, only for the purpose of emphasizing the dissent which, I believe in common with a great majority of the people of New Jersey, I feel concerning the attitude assumed by my colleague. I have not attempted analysis of his arguments, because I do not consider refutation necessary at this time; nor shall I make reply in any sense to the remarks submitted by the brilliant Senator from Colorado. I can not, however, refrain from saying that in his admiration of the courage and persistence which have always characterized the English race he may have overlooked or misjudged some of the causes which have in times past induced the exhibition of those admirable qualities.

The Senator pictures in glowing colors the bravery displayed by British soldiers in some of the wars waged by South American people to achieve their independence from Spain. I do not doubt that the picture, glowing as it was, is warranted by the facts, but, Mr. President, I have not yet heard and have never understood that the soldiers of Great Britain performed these feats of valor for the sole purpose of aiding struggling patriots. If there was not at the bottom of the assistance which England rendered a distinct, positive, and overpowering self-interest, then, indeed, her attitude in such affairs has been most generally misunderstood and most grossly misrepresented.

I do not doubt that she ardently desired the success of those men in their effort to wrest their independence from the Spanish monarchy, but if the European power so vitally concerned had been Great Britain instead of Spain, is it not within the range of probability that her soldiers would have fought with no less energy and determination than they did fight when certain American colonies, whose seat of Government to-day is not far from this place, were engaged in a like struggle for the liberty to which they were entitled?

Great Britain, Mr. President, is always willing to aid men who are endeavoring to achieve their independence from any power except herself. To weaken one's antagonist is to strengthen oneself, and no nation has ever more fully appreciated this fact than the one to whose greatness the glowing tribute of the Senator from Colorado was paid. It was to accomplish her own ends and to serve her own purposes that she lent her aid to the patriots of South America, and it was for the same reason precisely that she extended her sympathy to our Southern brethren in their mistaken struggle for what English statesmen designated as their "independence" from the Union. It may be true that "blood is thicker than water," and that people who speak the same tongue and respect the same customs should feel a bond of sympathy one for the other. Nor can any harm result from lauding the deeds of English sailors and English soldiers. But, sir, for one, I prefer to contemplate the achievements of Washington, of Greene, of Put-

nam, of Allen, of Jackson, of Paul Jones, and even of Lafayette, to those of Clive, Wellington, Nelson, and the others whose acts have made so deep an impression upon the mind and heart of the Senator from Colorado.

This country, sir, owes nothing to England. If ties of kindred have been broken, she was the aggressor. From the very beginning of the attempt of the noble men who achieved American independence to the present day the attitude of Great Britain toward this nation has been one first of contempt, then of hostility, then of submission to force of arms, and since that time of ever-increasing jealousy, until it became the part of wisdom and prudence to assume the condescending and patronizing attitude perfectly typified in the language of Lord Salisbury in his letter to our Secretary of State.

To assert, Mr. President, that we owe to such a power a debt of gratitude is to pervert the facts of history for the purposes of eloquence, and I, for one, can not refrain from expressing emphatic dissent from such a position.

I come now, Mr. President, to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Minnesota upon behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I oppose the adoptions of these upon the broad ground that there is no occasion or necessity for such definition of the Monroe doctrine by this body at this time. I do not object to the strong American position outlined by these resolutions, neither do I see much to criticise in their language when applied simply and solely to the Venezuelan controversy. But I do insist that it is the height of folly to attempt to provide in this way for all cases trenching upon the principle represented by the Monroe doctrine which may arise in the future. However applicable and pertinent these resolutions may be to the instance now in our minds, it is by no means certain that they are either sufficiently broad or sufficiently specific to reach aggressions which may be made in the future.

The Monroe doctrine itself is a national principle to the simple effect that we can not and will not as a nation permit any European power to extend its territory or possessions upon this continent. Nothing can be simpler or plainer than this mere statement. Nothing can be more forceful. Nothing can be more practicable in enforcement; but the moment we undertake to say, in so many words, exactly what constitutes an infringement upon this principle we tie our own hands and open the door to an ocean of technicalities. The proper way and the only way to apply effectually the Monroe doctrine in dealing with foreign powers is to apply it to each individual case as that case may arise. One infringement upon the principle may be more harmful or offensive than another, and we should not debar ourselves from the privilege of the Mikado to "let the punishment fit the crime."

The only reason I have yet heard advanced for making a specific and official definition of the doctrine at this time is that foreign powers should not be enabled to say, as the premier of Great Britain did say in his communication to the Secretary of State, that the principle had never been officially promulgated. It is urged that we must serve notice upon the Governments of Europe that such a doctrine is in existence and will be maintained. It is insisted that we must not leave to them the privilege of excuse upon the ground that they had never heard of it. I am not prepared, Mr. President, to admit that this necessity has existed for a moment since President Monroe made his famous declaration, but even granting that this may have been so until very recently, it does seem to me very plain that such necessity does not exist to-day. The ringing message of the President of the United States, promptly supported by the unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress and by the unanimous sentiment of the country, is sufficient notice to every power in the civilized world that the Monroe doctrine is a fixed principle of this Government, to be maintained in all cases and at all hazards. No foreign minister now can plead ignorance. The fact of the existence of this doctrine needs no further demonstration, and any attempt at definition, intensification, or qualification only serves to weaken our position.

So much for the subject as it relates to the Governments of Europe. Now, consider for a moment the attitude of our own people. They upheld the President and Congress in emphasizing and applying this great national principle to the case in hand, but signs multiply that their common sense does not and will not approve of unnecessary and unwarranted action upon our part. We showed by our prompt cooperation our satisfaction with the position assumed by the President. We did all that he asked or desired, and turned the whole subject back, in accordance with his suggestion, into the proper diplomatic channels. The problem is now where it should be, in the hands of the President and Secretary of State. Every one of us knows and the people know that, in the interests of both patriotism and prudence, it could not be in a better place. If further responsibility should devolve upon us we will meet it as we met the situation which the President submitted for our consideration. But for the present the responsibility is not ours. It is his, and we have no right to interfere with his conduct of the affair until we become convinced and the people become convinced that his conduct is wrong.

I know that there exists in this Chamber an impression that the President's message has given rise to a patriotic fervor throughout the country which may be utilized to foster Presidential aspirations, but it has happened often in the past, and might easily happen in this instance, that action upon such a theory would have the effect of a boomerang. The patriotic sentiment of the United States is great and powerful, but it is not greater or more potent than the conservative common sense which characterizes our whole people. For one, I believe that they are satisfied. They have had enough. They want no more jingoism. They are sick and tired of the constant injection of party politics and personal ambition into our dealings with other nations. They are suffering from our inaction upon other matters of the most vital importance. Indeed, it is a fact, and we may as well admit it first as last, that the great majority of the people throughout the country are disgusted with Congress in general, and the Senate in particular. The most popular thing we could do to-day, and probably in the present condition of affairs the most beneficial thing we could do, would be to pass the necessary appropriation bills and go home. The mere fact that we are in session is a menace to the revival of business and the return of prosperity.

As a Democrat I might, for partisan reasons, rejoice in such a condition, while one branch of Congress contains an overwhelming Republican majority and the other is controlled by a combination of Republicans and Populists; but as a citizen, professing to possess some portion of the common sense characteristic of my countrymen, I deplore it.

Others may consider it a patriotic duty to remain here for the sole purpose of emphasizing devotion to the lost cause of silver and of listening to discussions of an unjust and unwise tariff revision, which every Senator knows can not be enacted into a law, but I for one am free to say that I see no necessity for such action and feel no call to such duty. Of all the resolutions that have been introduced, or may be introduced, I can think of but one for which I would cheerfully and gladly give my vote, and that is to adjourn. If circumstances permitted us to take this course I am confident the whole country would rise up and call us blessed; but since they do not, I suppose there is nothing to do but to remain here, subject to the dominion of a Republican-Populistic combination, and bear as best we can the just reprobation sure to be visited upon this body as a whole by the great majority of thinking American people.

PATENTS IN POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. KYLE on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inform the Senate whether any person or persons in the employ of the Post-Office Department has applied for or has received any patent for an invention or improvement of existing invention made or received since his entry into the employ of the Post-Office Department touching any article used by such Department; and whether such employee has received any royalty in respect to the same.

Mr. KYLE. As the resolution merely calls for information from the Department, I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. HALE. Is it simply a resolution asking for information?

Mr. PLATT and Mr. KYLE. That is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. As Senate joint resolution 43, in relation to the distribution of seeds, is the unfinished business at 2 o'clock, I am willing that the Senator in charge of that measure should bring it up now, as I understand the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] desires to go on with some remarks, and then I shall not have to be broken into at 2 o'clock. As soon as that is through, however, I will ask the Senate to resume the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Do we understand that the Senator will not ask the Senate to proceed with the urgent deficiency bill before 2 o'clock?

Mr. HALE. Not before 2 o'clock, and at that time if the measure in charge of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] is nearly out of the way I will yield, that it may be disposed of.

THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to give notice that on Wednesday I shall endeavor to call up the tariff bill.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senate to take up the joint resolution in relation to the distribution of seeds.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a very few moments. I apologize for again addressing it at all upon this subject. Inadvertently I neglected when I addressed the Senate last week upon the pending joint resolution to call attention to a very remarkable table contained in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think, as a matter of justice to the Secretary and to those who criticise his action in the administration of his office, and to the Senators who, I take it, propose to defend his action, that all the facts should be made public and attention called to them.

I do this the more readily because I see in yesterday's Washington paper an interview with the Secretary in which he invites impeachment by Congress, and intimates that if we should pass the joint resolution as amended the Chief Executive will exercise his veto power to destroy it. If that is to be apprehended, then the President should be apprised of all the facts as they can be brought out in debate.

The principal point of attack upon the gratuitous distribution of seed heretofore, and I take it the same charge will be made in the future, has been and will be that members of Congress use this legislation to popularize themselves at home. I might acquit myself of this charge by simply stating that I have never taken a large amount of interest in the gratuitous distribution of seed, but have contented myself with answering the demands made upon me by the people of Missouri in that regard. But, Mr. President, when the Secretary of Agriculture and his friends attack Congress and charge that this distribution is used for personal and selfish purposes, it is but simple retribution that the fact should be made known that the Secretary of Agriculture himself has used this legislation more largely and unhesitatingly than any member of either branch of Congress has ever endeavored to do.

Without further preface, I call the attention of the Senate to a table found in the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture on page 204. This table gives the allotment and distribution of seeds to members of Congress for the year 1894–95. It will be found by reference to the table that the State of Nebraska had allotted to it 131,856 papers of seed, and that there was distributed or given to members of Congress from that State by the Secretary of Agriculture 221,961 papers, being an excess of nearly 100,000 papers for his own State.

To show how unequally and unjustly this distribution was made, I call attention to the allotment to my own State, Missouri, which was 278,794 papers. The members of Congress from that State, it seems, received and distributed only 245,846. The State of Minnesota had allotted to it 148,338 papers, and yet the members of Congress from that State distributed only 133,148. The State of Louisiana had allotted to it 129,456 papers, and yet the members of Congress distributed only 124,111.

The State of Iowa had allotted to it 214,266 papers, but the members distributed only 203,219. In the great State of New York, where 534,052 papers were allotted, the delegation from that State distributed only 474,842. In the great State of Ohio there were allotted 380,586, and the members of Congress distributed 366,723 papers. In Pennsylvania, where there were allotted 528,724 papers, the members distributed only 488,468.

So these greedy politicians, passing a law to popularize themselves at home, have absolutely not availed themselves of the pro rata distribution of seed made to them under law, but have sent away less than the amount to which they were entitled, while the Secretary of Agriculture, using the power vested in him as an executive officer, exceeded the just allotment to his own State by nearly 100,000 papers of seed.

Mr. President, this is enough to make the star-eyed goddess of reform hang her head and blush for shame. But that is not all. Upon page 203 of the report will be found a table giving the allotment of seed actually made by the Secretary of Agriculture from July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895—one year. I call the attention of the Senate to the table, because it shows distinctly and emphatically the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture used this appropriation for his own purposes.

The table shows that the whole number of seeds distributed in that year aggregated 9,528,653 packages. Nebraska received 1,133,754 packages, or nearly one-ninth of the whole amount throughout the United States—1,133,754 packages went to the Secretary's own State. The population of Nebraska by the census of 1890 was 1,058,910. Illinois received during the same time 391,230 packages, with a population of 3,826,351. Iowa received during the same time 221,681 packages, with a population of 1,911,896. Missouri received during the same time 267,042 packages, with a population of 2,679,184. When we come to Nebraska, according to this report, the Secretary allotted to Congressmen for distribution 221,961 packages, an excess of the just allotment to that State, as I have shown, of nearly 100,000.

Under the report as shown there is said to have been allotted to agricultural associations and miscellaneous applicants in Nebraska 895,241 packages. These 895,241 packages were sent to Nebraska by the Secretary of Agriculture himself, outside of the number allotted to the members of Congress from that State. To show that this is absolutely true I call attention to the amount given to agricultural associations and miscellaneous applicants in Illinois, which is 4,420 packages, outside of the number allowed to the delegation. In Iowa there were 3,217 packages only, in addition to the number allowed to the Senators and Members of the other House. In Missouri there were 5,637 packages in addition to the number allowed to the delegation, making for the three great agricultural States of Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri an aggregate of 13,274 packages sent to miscellaneous applicants, as against 895,241 packages sent by the Secretary to miscellaneous applicants in the State of Nebraska.

Nebraska, as I have said, received 1,133,754 packages in that year, with a population of 1,058,910, or one package to every man, woman, and child in the Commonwealth. Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri, with an aggregate population of 8,417,411, received during the same time 879,953 packages, showing that Nebraska received 253,801 packages more than Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri combined.

But, Mr. President, this is not all. The great State of Texas received during the same time 276,098 packages of seed, Mississippi 207,779, Arkansas 152,759, Louisiana 134,307, Alabama 247,236, and Tennessee 318,069, making an aggregate in those six Southern agricultural States of 1,336,248 papers, as against 1,133,754 to the State of Nebraska alone.

The population of Texas in 1890 was 2,235,523, Mississippi 1,289,600, Arkansas 1,128,179, Louisiana 1,118,587, Alabama 1,513,017, Tennessee 1,767,518, making an aggregate population of 9,052,424, as against 1,058,910 in the State of Nebraska.

Now, Mr. President, if this law has been prostituted for personal purposes, who has gone further than the Secretary of Agriculture in that direction? Under what authority did he take 1,133,000 papers of seeds and send them to his State, violating the allotment, violating every principle of justice and right which should govern an officer of this Government in the discharge of his high functions?

Sir, I have denounced that action, and if I had no other reason it would be found in the table which I have read here to-day. If a Cabinet officer of this country in the distribution of seeds can strike down the spirit of equality and justice which is the basis of our republican institutions, then the example set to the people at large must at last result in an utter disregard of all the basic doctrines upon which the Government of the United States has been founded.

Mr. GEORGE. I see that certain amendments to the joint resolution have been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and if they are adopted they will remove in a great measure my objections to the measure. I desire to inquire whether the Senate has ever acted upon those amendments; and if not, I ask the consent of the Senator from North Dakota to have a vote on those amendments now.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has drafted a substitute for the whole measure which he desires to offer, and which will make the adoption of the amendments unnecessary.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have that substitute offered at this time.

Mr. VEST. I submit a substitute for the original joint resolution and the amendments reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The substitute will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years; and as the public exigency requires that the valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, to be purchased, may be ready for distribution at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to procure them by open purchase or contract at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold: *Provided*, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed as a substitute by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. BATE. I desire to be heard for a little while on this measure. I have been out of the Chamber. I did not know that the

joint resolution would come up until 2 o'clock, at which time it is the regular order.

Mr. FAULKNER. It was taken up by unanimous consent in the morning hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, the substitute that is now offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is pretty much of the same character as the joint resolution which was brought in by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] in that they both go to the same extent, and I think it does not materially change the attitude of the question before the Senate.

We have had considerable discussion upon this matter, and although it seems a simple thing and a small amount involved, only $130,000 having been appropriated for the purpose of purchasing seed, yet the law which regulates that is a qualified statute and limits the character and kind of seeds that are to be purchased. Heretofore the same law has been in existence, and it has been carried out, as it is said by those who seem to be prosecuting, if not persecuting, the Secretary of Agriculture for what they seem pleased to say is a dereliction of his duty, and the language of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] was strong in the beginning in accusation of him. He even charged that it was not only premeditated and deliberate, but, I believe, he used the word "malicious"—that he had premeditatedly and maliciously disobeyed the law which appertains to the Department of which he is chief.

Mr. President, however much I may differ with the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to some of his peculiar ideas of a political character, as also in regard to some of his economic ideas touching his Department, yet I do not think it is just and fair that he should be accused here in the manner in which he has without vindication. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of this body, and I heard his testimony before that committee touching this matter, and I have also read the Secretary's report. I have likewise read the statute under which he acts, and I do not hesitate to say that I believe the Secretary of Agriculture has carried out the law as it is written, to the very fullest extent, and that he has not deviated a hair's breadth from the true spirit and intent and letter of the law which he stands here charged with having violated by failing to execute it. I believe that any Senator who will look at it reasonably and dispassionately, and read the language which is used therein, and observe its connection by which it is to be governed, will see under the facts presented that the Secretary of Agriculture has most tenaciously adhered to the very letter of that law. Yet he is to be held up to ridicule and even abused here in the Senate, in speeches that are sarcastic and inflammatory, because he dared in discharge of his official duty to follow the letter of the law.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to a question?

Mr. BATE. I will.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the Senator please tell the Senate why it is that the Secretary of Agriculture did not place the same construction upon this language in the two preceding years, when he did execute the law, that he places upon it now, when he does not execute the law?

Mr. BATE. I think I can give a very satisfactory reason why he has not done so. When he came to look at the position in which he was placed when first appointed chief of that Department he found a certain condition of things, and most naturally he purposed following the precedents, as any other reasonable and practical man would. He found the precedents as to the purchase and distribution of seeds all one way. You must remember that this Department is quite a new institution and has been in existence for only a few years. He had but two predecessors as Secretaries of Agriculture, one for only a few months and the other for four years immediately preceding his term, which commenced three years ago. It had not been in existence long enough for the practice in the distribution of seed to have grown into a kind of common law, and therefore the Department must be governed strictly by statutory provision.

Finding in the Department such precedents, he followed, of course, as any newly appointed Secretary would, right along in the wake of those who had preceded him. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that he desired to make a fair test of it. He did so the first year, and pursued the same course the second year. At the end of the first year, however, as you will see by the report, there was a better showing from the seeds and plants that had come from abroad, and better specimens to change from one place to another in our own country, than were presented in the second year. In the second year he began to see that there were frauds practiced upon the Government; that the seeds that were brought there were those of former years; and old seeds were sought to be dumped upon the Government at such prices as those who had them to sell saw fit to ask. That opened his eyes in this regard, and he began to look into it, and believed a change necessary. He did it with extreme caution and in a manner in which no one here who wants to do what is right would disapprove.

Senators may object to him and not like him personally or indorse his political views. I do not agree with him myself, for that matter. I differ with him in some of his views as much as any other Senator here, the Senator from Missouri not excepted. Yet, Mr. President, I propose to do him justice. He is entitled to that, not only because he is the head of a Department, but because he is a man of high intelligence, of virtue, of integrity, and honesty, for no one has dared to call in question his honesty or integrity notwithstanding the onslaught that has been made upon him. We may dislike him for certain sentiments, and he may have gone outside and have published things perhaps that he ought not to have published; he may have pursued that line of policy, objectionable to some, which seems to be a part of the present Administration as well as of former Administrations, that their Cabinet officers shall go forth in the country and enlighten the people on the policy of the Administration. This Cabinet officer does not stand alone as to that, although he has been made a subject of severe and sarcastic criticism for it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. BATE. Certainly.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I understand the Senator, then, to answer the question which I have propounded to him by stating that because the Secretary of Agriculture had found that there had been some abuses growing out of the distribution of seeds in the last two years, therefore the present year he refuses to execute the law because of those abuses. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Secretary of Agriculture himself has in a recent interview given a different reason. I saw an interview a day or two ago with that gentleman in which it is stated that he said it took him two years to find out that that section of the Revised Statutes existed.

Mr. BATE. I did not see that, and there must be a mistake about it, for the reason that he discusses in his report the Revised Statutes very fully and claims to understand them. Very naturally, when he had to take hold of the question and act upon it, his attention was called to it; it was his duty then to examine it thoroughly, and he did so. Not only that, but, in further reply to the question which was put to me by the Senator from Louisiana, I say that when imposition was practiced upon the Department in this way he saw at once that it was running riot and going far beyond the intention and spirit of the law, and being satisfied of that, it was his duty to draw these sellers of seed back to the legal line, and that he sought to do.

Did he go at it in a proper manner, Mr. President? What was the first thing he did when he came to examine this statute in the face of these impositions and extravagances that were being practiced upon the Government? He went to the proper officer, the Attorney-General, whose duty it is to give him information and to construe a statute that he has to execute. That duty of the Attorney-General applies to this Secretary as it does to the Secretary of the Treasury and all other officers of the Government. Indeed, that is what the Attorney-General is for. He is the legal adviser of those who belong to the Administration with him. But does the Secretary go at it hastily? Does he show any ill temper in regard to it? Does he show that he has a prejudice against the distribution of seeds? No, sir; but he very properly puts his application to him in writing. It is here, and has been read heretofore by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE]. I say he puts it in writing, not frivolously nor peevishly, but deliberately and sensibly, and has it sent to the Attorney-General, asking for his construction of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which, in conjunction with section 3709, is the basis of the law under which he then and now operates in the purchase of seeds, etc.

Section 527 has to be construed, and what is the construction that is given to it by the Attorney-General? Let us see if this Secretary ought to be "hung and quartered," abused, and denounced because he has seen fit, as it has been charged, to violate this statute while holding his high and responsible place. It has been said by grave Senators that he ought to be constrained to carry out this Congressional act as heretofore, and that he "deliberately, premeditatedly, and maliciously" violated the law. Now, let us see what this man has done in regard to that matter. This section 527 will show what the law is that guides him. And as it is the initial point of this question, so far as his action is concerned, I will read it:

> The purchase and distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another, and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interest of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

In connection with this I will say that every annual appropriation for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seed since the said section 527 was in force contains the words "as required by law," showing that every purchase must conform

to the terms used in it, and it requires that the seed so purchased shall be "rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another."

The Attorney-General, as I said, was appealed to, and what was his reply to the question as to the construction of this statute? I will read his reply:

The reply of the Attorney-General informed the Secretary of Agriculture that (1) "the seeds purchasable under the act of March 2, 1895, are limited to those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, there being no reasonable ground for claiming that the act of March 2, 1895, operates, or was intended to operate, as a repeal of the earlier statute"; (2) that "if not obligatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, trees, etc., conformably to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, it is certainly competent for him to make the purchases conformably to said statute, the right to reject any and all bids being reserved," etc.

The question that presents itself to the Senate is, has he done that? He has exercised the right, it is true, but has he conformed to section 527 of the Revised Statutes? I think there can be nothing clearer. He went to the Attorney-General for advice and he got that which I have read. He then advertises, under section 3709, and so particular was he in his advertisement that he followed the very language of the law, and does not give his construction nor that of anyone, but leaves it to the seed men themselves to act upon the language of the law in furnishing the kind and quality of seed required.

Does he send forth the advertisement in time? Look to the testimony that we had before the Agricultural Committee and it will be seen that he advertised in the month of April and it ran until the 1st of July. Did he make a limited advertisement? No, sir; it was a most extended one, and in those papers that were usual for such advertisements, and it appeared all over the country. Not only that, but he issued a prospectus and sent it to every man of note engaged in the seed business in the United States, and there are 152 of them who make a specialty of it, and the proof shows that he sent one to each of those and that he advertised in all proper places.

Is there any fault to be found with him in his proceeding under this section of the law? I can see none yet. Then, what was the next step he took? There were some responses made to the advertisement. They came to him as the chief officer at the head of that Department. What did he do next? He appointed a board of investigation to examine the quality, kind, and character of these seeds, to see if they came up to the statute requirement. This board examined the seeds thoroughly, and strange to say, notwithstanding all the advertisements, there were only about $1,485 worth of seeds presented, and why? It shows, to my mind, and to that of any other unprejudiced man who will look at it fairly, that heretofore they had been just dumping their old seeds of every character and kind, old and new, good and bad, upon this Department in the absence of rigid investigation of them.

The Secretary of Agriculture had found this out, and he had put forth in the advertisement that they must present their seeds in accordance with the statute, and he quoted the statute, and when they came to giving a specific description, as required, and putting on record the character and kind of seeds as rare and uncommon, or seeds which it would be better to exchange from one locality of the country to another, these seed men did not care to do it. Therefore, you see, their game was blocked. I say to the Senator from Louisiana that their game was blocked to such extent as to forbid their bringing any more seed under the conditions of the law and under the requirement of the advertisement made by the chief of this Department. As is shown by the report I hold in my hand, only $1,485 worth of seed was offered. The Secretary intended to carry out the law as far as he could with rugged honesty and rigid economy. Here was the amount of money appropriated by Congress, and he wanted to dispose of it in good faith even to the small extent offered.

He appointed three men, according to law, and they examined these seed. What did those men say in their report after examining these seed? I will presently read four or five lines of their report to show. But pray, who are these men? That I will also presently show. I will not go over the character of seeds, or grasses, or plants, or anything that were sent here to be purchased by this officer, because that has been done fully by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] in his speech opening this debate, in which he gave a vein of rich and grotesque humor that threw it into ridicule, especially the flower seed and grasses. As it was so impressed upon everyone who heard him, I shall not repeat or even allude to the ridiculous kind and amount of seed offered; but I wish to state how much of this $1,485 worth of seed, which was all that came under this advertisement, would be to each Congressman. I quote from the report:

This would under the law have been less than 10 pounds of field and farm seed to each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress if every pound offered had been bought.

Having received no bids that came up to the requirements of the statutes and offered anything worthy of consideration, the board rejected them all and submitted the following report:

Here is their report:

The undersigned board, appointed by you on July 1, 1895, to open and examine bids for seeds to be furnished this Department for distribution according to law during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1896, have the honor to report that we have opened and examined the bids received, and find that the same do not meet the requirements of the advertisement as printed, and therefore respectfully recommend that all bids be rejected.

What, then, was left to this officer but to follow the advice that was given by this board, a proper board, appointed from his own Department, and who were experienced seed men and experts in the business? I ask what was left the Secretary to do but that which he did? Nothing; and in acting as he did he has followed the letter and intention of the law. We have heard intimations by Senators that this board was composed of his "underlings." Who are they? This report is signed by Enos S. Harnden, F. L. Evans, and J. B. Bennett.

Who is Mr. Evans? I understand he is a gentleman who has been in, first the Bureau and then the Department of Agriculture, from his boyhood, and is a part and parcel of the machinery of that concern, against whom there has never been uttered a word of complaint, and he is kept there on account of his ability as an expert. Who is Mr. Bennett? He is a man brought there from Wisconsin by Secretary Rusk, a man of Secretary Rusk's own party, a Republican. The present Secretary of Agriculture found him there and kept him. Who is Mr. Harnden? A professional seed man, brought from the State of Illinois, and his salary was dependent upon the purchase and distribution of seeds. Yet that man, and I applaud him as a man of virtue and honor, when he found the condition of things, although knowing that his occupation, like Othello's, would be gone, provided the Department did not make any purchases of seed—yet he decides at once, along with the others, that it would be improper under the circumstances to purchase these seeds, or any such, and therefore he is out of his job, and to-day, for aught I know, is hunting employment.

That is the character of men by whom this report was written. They made a just decision, and I say it is a feather in their cap that they so decided the question and decided it on the facts they had before them. They investigated the seed and they found that many of them were old, and, furthermore, that the price was unreasonable, and they so stated in their report to the Secretary; and he refused to make the purchase. That is the history of this case.

In this connection, the Senator from North Dakota, who most persistently, vigilantly, and ably represents in part that State, wanted to know why there was not a readvertisement when only about $1,485 worth of seeds were received, which, under the statute, were not "rare and uncommon." He claimed to have found an antiquated statute authorizing it; but when produced it soon fell a victim to the legal mind of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], who first analyzed and then buried it, and it has not since been referred to. Therefore I assert there is no authority for a readvertisement. Not only so, but it would have been too late to readvertise, and if done would have been without any effect whatever. But the money was not expended, and it hurts the feelings of some executive officers to have public money in their hands with the privilege of spending it and not do it. The Secretary of Agriculture, however, is an exception to that rule. He takes care of public money when in his official hands; and, as his official reports show, has not expended the amount appropriated to his Department, but covered it into the Treasury.

As the Secretary is being so severely tried, you will pardon me for saying something in regard to his economy, for I want to see justice done him and that he has the benefit of truth and the law, however much I may differ with him in some of his opinions.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] most facetiously, most eloquently, and sarcastically, and mercilessly, if I may say so, criticised the Secretary of Agriculture for having extravagantly purchased flower seed and all that. I think the Senator is mistaken in regard to the quantity of money that was given for the purpose to which he referred, and I believe it ought to be corrected; and I have no doubt he will admit the correction when he learns the facts. The Senator said, in his speech delivered on the 5th instant, to be found on page 1508 of the RECORD:

But let us look further at the question of economy. He overlooked other appropriations made for his own Department, but struck out the $130,000 appropriation for the farmers. I find, from the report of the Secretary of expenditures made in the Agricultural Department for the year 1895, that $23,567.90 was expended upon the conservatories and grounds of the Agricultural Department.

That is correct, but then the Senator goes on to say:

For 1897, etc.

I do not understand why 1897 is referred to. It applies to the future, however, and I suppose it is not necessary to refer to that. I do not care to do so. The Senator continues:

Will some Senator tell me what human being is fed by this expenditure? Will some Senator point out to me what table of any poor man has been made more comfortable by reason of this expenditure of $105,000? Where does this tax money of the people go under the immediate eye of the Secretary of Agriculture?

The Senator says $105,000 was expended for these purposes "under the immediate eye of the Secretary of Agriculture." Then he proceeds to say:

It goes to the purchase of orchids, lilies of the valley, giant palms, and exotics that grace the banquets and receptions of the President and Cabinet officers in this city.

Mr. President, I have made inquiry into this; I have looked into the reports, and I have examined the law as to who has charge of these matters, and it may surprise the Senate when I state the fact that not a green sprig or an evergreen, not a rosebud bursting with its imprisoned sweets, not a full-blown flower laden with fragrance, nor any other floral product of the Agricultural Department since under its present chief, if ever, has gone from the Agricultural Department to the White House or to the tables of any of the Cabinet ministers. I challenge the contradiction of this statement, though I have no doubt the Senator believed it when he said it.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the propagating garden and the Botanic Garden do not furnish the flowers for the receptions and banquets of the President and the Cabinet officers?

Mr. BATE. I do; and I will show the Senator, if he will wait a moment, how he has made the mistake.

Mr. VEST. I want the Senator to understand distinctly what I said, as is shown in the RECORD. My criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture was that, while he was suggesting reforms, he failed to see the extravagance which was being perpetrated in every direction in his immediate vicinity. Whether he controlled these palms and flowers or not was not the point of my criticism at all; but when he started out as a reformer and boasted that he saved $1,350,000 in his administration of the Agricultural Department, I simply expressed my surprise that he could not see this profligate expenditure of money, as every intelligent man, I think, will believe it to be.

Mr. BATE. Is it the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to see how much money is expended in the Treasury Department, or in the Post-Office Department, or the other branches of the Government? He would be amenable to the very accusations made against him by the Senator from Missouri, and likewise the Senator from Louisiana, if he should go into the other Departments than his own in order to attempt to bring about reforms. I speak of his Department, and it was of that the Senator was speaking. What has the Secretary of Agriculture to do with the Botanic Garden at the base of Capitol Hill, which is visible to all as they pass and see the flowers and the greenhouses that decorate it? He has no more to do with it than has the Senator from Missouri, for the law places it in other hands. What has the Secretary of Agriculture to do with the propagating garden, which we find in its extent and its beauty laden with evergreens and flowers, down near the building of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing? What has he to do with the flowers grown in any other part of the city, in the parks, and other places, as to how they are cultivated, or as to the manner of using them? Nothing whatever; no more than you, sir [Mr. PASCO in the chair], or I have; yet he is held up here as a man who, if he wishes to make reforms, ought to interfere in other Departments to bring about a reformation.

I repeat that the Secretary of Agriculture has never himself, nor has anyone under him, ever sent a flower or a sprig to the White House from his Department; and there was no occasion for doing so. Who has charge of such? Colonel Wilson is known to have charge of the public grounds of the District. He controls the Botanic Garden and the flowers that grow there, and he can distribute them at will. He has charge of the other floral garden beyond the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and he has charge of the parks and of the greenhouses that grow the roses and pansies, and peonies and violets, and orchids, but not the dog fennel, as the Senator stated. These grow in other places than around the Department of Agriculture, which is under the immediate supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and Colonel Wilson is the man who has them in charge.

Look at the greenhouse, if you please, at the west end of the White House, its extent, and the variety of its plants and flowers; from this and all these Colonel Wilson has been enabled to gather all the flowers he wants to make beautiful displays whenever the occasion requires it at the White House or at any Secretary's table when he chooses to do so; and he holds himself amenable to the country for it, and I have never yet heard him criticised. He is a man of refined taste and performs these duties appropriately and gracefully.

What becomes, then, of this flourish of trumpets made by the Senator from Missouri in that very attractive, sarcastic, and, if I may say so, bitter criticism which he has visited upon the Secretary of Agriculture, like piling hot coals of fire upon his head? What the Senator said about carrying the roses in bloom and blossom to spread their fragrance at the White House under the brilliancy of chandeliers, when the wine is red, was poetry which came from the prurient fancy of my friend, and not from the facts of the case, or the law governing it.

The Secretary of Agriculture seeks to economize. I beg to submit to the Senate one or two facts upon the question of economy. While I disapprove of many things the Secretary of Agriculture has done, while I disagree with him upon some of the leading issues of the day, especially upon the financial issue, as broadly and as widely as does the Senator from Missouri, yet there is not a man who stands upon the truth of history and the record as made in the official reports who will say that Secretary Morton has been extravagant. He has been economical, it has been said, even to stinginess, and he protects the interests of the Government which have been given in trust to him in a safe, judicious, and honest manner. On this point I wish to read from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

ACCOUNTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Chief F. L. Evans has submitted a summary of the work of this division for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, together with a statement of appropriations, disbursements, and unexpended balances of the United States Bureau and Department of Agriculture from the fiscal year 1839 to and including the fiscal year 1895. His report is entirely satisfactory and could only be evolved from a service of great perfection over which he has with scrupulous economy and vigilance most efficiently presided.

The appropriation for the maintenance of this Department for the year 1895 was $104,476.94 less than the appropriation for 1894, and yet it was $183,420 more than the amount estimated for by the Department.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, there was covered back into the Treasury of the United States from the appropriation for this Department $185,497.64. Subsequently the sum of (in round numbers) $625,000 for the fiscal year 1894 was returned to the Treasury, and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, there is an unexpended balance amounting to about $500,000.

RECAPITULATION.

Five million one hundred and two thousand five hundred and twenty-three dollars and six cents was appropriated to the United States Department of Agriculture during the two fiscal years 1894 and 1895; and out of that sum $1,126,268.74 has been saved to cover back into the Treasury.

Then add to that saved sum the $185,497.64 returned to the Treasury out of the 1893 appropriation and we find that, with an unimpaired and extended and disciplined service in this Department, the aggregate sum of $1,311,766.38 is available for return to the Treasury since March 4, 1893.

The Secretary of Agriculture only got $29,500 out of $105,000, as I have said, and $23,000 of that goes for what? I turn over to that appropriation in the proper place and I find the only appropriation made for the Department of Agriculture from which such things could be purchased or cultivated is that made for the gardens and grounds of the Department, amounting in 1895 to $29,500. This includes all the expenses of maintaining the entire reservation, amounting to some 20 or 30 acres, I believe, upon which the Department of Agriculture buildings stand, and all expenses of maintaining roadways and walks, maintenance of greenhouses and seed testing; employment of gardeners, laborers, carpenters, painters, plumbers, and other mechanics; expenses of wagons, carts, horses and their feed, lawn mowers, sprinklers, etc.; lumber and hardware, glass, paints, stone, gravel, and other material required for repairs; blacksmithing, horseshoeing, repairs to implements and machinery; seeds, plants, and bulbs for propagating purposes; freight and express charges, and many other items needed in maintaining the buildings and grounds of the Department. All these are found in the act making the appropriation. Of this sum appropriated for 1895 the amount of $23,303.51 was actually expended. So the Secretary only had $29,500 to go upon, and not $105,000. The agricultural appropriation bill which has just come to us in print from the other end of the Capitol this morning has been laid on our tables, and I find it makes the same appropriation for 1896–97 as for 1895–96.

Now, let us see if I can not show something upon the question of economy which may exceedingly interest some Senators. Mr. Rusk, the former Commissioner of Agriculture, was not extravagant, but he was an honest, faithful, and just officer, so far as the records show and as I believe, and therefore I commend instead of criticising him; but let us look under his economical administration at what he spent upon the very things we have been speaking of and what has been spent by the present incumbent of the Department of Agriculture. I have here a table on this subject, which is as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds for the following fiscal years.

Fiscal year.	Amount appropriated.	Amount disbursed.	Amount unexpended.
1889	$104,200.00	$104,168.73	$31.27
1890	104,200.00	104,174.55	25.45
1891	105,400.00	105,090.94	309.06
1892	105,400.00	104,920.35	479.65
	419,200.00	418,354.57	845.43
1893	135,400.00	134,908.27	491.73
1894	135,400.00	119,664.90	15,735.10
1895	165,400.00	120,445.15	44,954.85
	436,200.00	375,018.32	61,181.68

Now, Mr. President, during the three years 1890, 1891, and 1892, when Mr. Rusk had charge of the Department of Agriculture, there was disbursed $314,185.84, with which amount 17,551,848 packages of seeds were bought, which would be an average cost of 1.8 cents per package. Let us contrast that with the three years 1893, 1894, and 1895, when the Department has been in charge of the present Secretary. During that time there was disbursed $375,018.32, with which amount the present incumbent purchased 26,788,914 packages of seeds. This would be an average cost of 1.4 cents per package. In other words, the seeds purchased during the present administration cost about four-tenths of a cent less per package than those purchased during the previous administration. What does that amount to? It represents a saving, on 26,788,914 packages to be bought, of $107,155.65.

I want to say to the Senator from Missouri, to the Senator from Louisiana, and also to the Senator from North Dakota, who seem to have been criticising the Secretary of Agriculture for not spending this $130,000 for the expenses connected with the seed transaction, that he has saved in three years in purchasing seeds $107,155.65 in contrast with the amount of seeds that were purchased by his predecessor.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Tennessee inform us how many of those seeds Secretary Rusk sent to his own State?

Mr. BATE. I do not know, but I understand before I came into the Chamber the Senator was discussing that matter.

Mr. VEST. And I gave the figures from a table I had before me.

Mr. BATE. I suppose if there were any seeds left over, after giving the prescribed quota, the Secretary would most naturally send them to his own State or to those Western States where it is said they were more needed than in the Eastern and Southern States.

Mr. VEST. As the Senator did not hear me, I want to say to him that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morton, shows that out of the whole allotment for the entire Union he sent within a fraction of one-ninth to his own State—1,133,754 packages of seed to Nebraska.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether there was not in the last year, or the year before, a special condition of most distressing drought in Nebraska, and was not Congress appealed to at one time to come to its relief?

Mr. BATE. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. BATE. I have not concluded, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I am astonished that a constitutional lawyer like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] should invoke in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture what the President of the United States has declared to be an unconstitutional appropriation. A good many of us here will remember very distinctly when $10,000 was appropriated to Texas on account of a drought in western Texas, and we remember the veto of the President, in which he declared that the Constitution had been trampled under foot and that he never would put his signature to any such bill; and there was not even a defense of that bill made on the floor of the Senate. It was killed effectually by that veto. Does the Senator pretend that the Secretary of Agriculture had the right to use the functions of his office to send seeds to Nebraska because there was a drought there?

Mr. BATE. I contend that he had the discretionary power, and if he thought the necessity was greater there than elsewhere he should have sent seeds there.

Mr. VEST. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture can violate the spirit of the Constitution when Congress can not violate either its letter or its spirit?

Mr. BATE. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to answer the question of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BATE. In a moment. I should like to know if the Senator from Missouri does not think that under this very act if the Secretary of Agriculture buys seeds which are not rare and uncommon seeds and to be used for experimental purposes, and sends them out to his constituents and mine, is it not straining the timbers of the Constitution? What is the difference in principle between that, I ask, and the granting of a bounty? Perhaps no man has been so eloquent and no man has uttered such tirades of criticism upon bounties as the Senator from Missouri, but, Mr. President, it is all right when it is done in one instance, though it appears to be all wrong in another.

How came this language in the statute, "Rare and uncommon seeds"? It was more to avoid the constitutional objection in procuring and distributing that class of seeds which would be for the general good of the whole country than it was to allow any opportunity to obtain seed that were as good in one place in the country as in another, and which the Government should not take hold of, and therefore they are in the provisions of the statutes.

I have already noticed the extravagant distribution and the practice going on in many instances in connection with seeds, but will again briefly refer to it. The argument against the purchase and distribution of seeds by the Government was—I do not make it, but it was made—at the time this system was being inaugurated, that Congress had no more right to buy common seeds in the country, send them off, and distribute them to the people out of the common fund, than they have to buy a rake or a hoe with which to cultivate those seeds in a garden, or to buy a calico dress for a farmer's wife, or a pair of shoes or a hat for his poor boy? I submit, Mr. President, is it not straining the constitutional timbers? What does the Senator from Missouri say to that?

Our people, notwithstanding, have decided otherwise; precedents have been established, and we have been following those precedents until abuses have grown up; and not only that, but it has now culminated in the abuse of a man's character who tries to economize by enforcing the law. The Secretary of Agriculture is a man pronounced in his opinions, and, having the courage of his convictions, he has taken the pains to analyze the law, and to do what he thought right under the law and facts when he finds what the law is. To this extent he has offended, and for which an attempt has been made to bring in every prejudice known to the catalogue against Cabinet officers, and even what has been done by certain auditors and other officials, in order to prejudice the Secretary of Agriculture, who is put, by argument and inference of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], on a par with the conduct of Mr. Bowler, who has been so severely criticised. All this is done simply because this man has had the courage of his convictions, and has had the nerve to come up and say that, notwithstanding I have for years distributed seeds, and notwithstanding it has been the course of my predecessor to do the same thing, I will test this matter and I will advertise in the terms of the law, under advice of the Attorney-General, and see what character of seeds I can secure, and will conform to the law strictly. He did advertise, with result already shown, and I will not repeat it.

Senators will see from what I have said in regard to the present Secretary of Agriculture and the economy which he has practiced that he deserves the commendation instead of the condemnation of this Senate.

Mr. President, there is one other point relating to this matter to which I desire to refer. If I know the Senate, it wants to be practical in its legislation. Is it practical at this time to enforce the purchase and distribution of seed for this season? I think not. Are we, on the 10th day of February, 1896, to pass a resolution calling for the expenditure of $130,000, the same amount as has been heretofore expended to purchase seeds and to distribute them throughout this country? It requires a considerable length of time to do this. They can not be distributed from here in less than from seventy to one hundred days, and it would require the same force that has been used heretofore by the Secretaries of Agriculture during that time before they could possibly get ready to do what is necessary in order to properly distribute these seeds. The seeds have to be bought, they have to be cleaned, sorted, packed, addressed, and then they have to be distributed, so that you see much time is required. How many packages would they have to send out? Twenty-six million and odd packages have been distributed in this country under the supervision of Secretary Morton in three years, which will give some idea of the number.

Now, the practical question presents itself to the Senate, Shall they direct—that is the language of the resolution—the Secretary of Agriculture at this day, when it is too late to accomplish anything practical, to make this expenditure and distribution?

I believe, Mr. President, in doing anything and everything we properly can do for the farming communities, for the agriculturists of this country. I have lived among them all my life, and I count among them many of my chief constituents and warmest friends, and I want to see them have all they are entitled to; but in my part of the country there could not one of them get a seed until after it was too late to plant this year. Before these seeds could reach them they would have planted their gardens, and their vegetables would have been cultivated, and in many instances would even be upon their tables for use, before the seeds from the Department could get to them.

I heard the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture under the cross-examination of the Senator from North Dakota and others, and I heard the statement made that the force in the Department could not be increased, for the reason that they did not have the necessary room to put the same force heretofore employed back there at work immediately after the passage of this joint resolution.

This joint resolution could not pass the House of Representatives for perhaps eight or ten days, and, my word for it, to say the least, it would be near the first day of March before it could become a law and the Secretary be authorized to make the purchase. What would be the result? He would have to buy the seeds wherever he could get them, and have to take them at the price at which they would be offered. It would then require,

at the least, sixty days to get them ready for distribution, and that would bring us to the first day of May, at which time, south of latitude 38, if not 40, we have nearly all kinds of vegetables on the table for use.

Upon the question of latitude, I will quote the act in relation thereto. It reads:

That the seeds allotted to the Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January.

That was a month ago, Mr. President. It is now the 10th day of February, and it would take more than two months to get them ready before they could possibly be distributed. Therefore it is a farce to urge that it should be now done. You might as well take $130,000 and throw it into the sea. It may be that people living in the extreme North may get some packages of these seeds that may be useful, and I suppose in North Dakota and in some others of the extreme northern portions of the country the seeds might be used, but in the Middle States and in the southern tier of Gulf States their gardens will have been grown before these seeds can be distributed. The State of Tennessee, which I, in part, represent, could not get a single package of early vegetables in time for use this season. The distribution, if it could be had at all, would be partial and unjust.

It is charged that this economical Secretary, who has saved the country this $314.185 in the purchase of seeds, did not readvertise for proposals. He ought not to have done so, and he has kept the expenditure down. If, however, Congress wants any change made in the law and wants to continue the practice in the future, it has but to say so, and it can be provided for in the coming Agricultural appropriation bill, but as for this year it is a thing of the past, and to use this money in the way that has been suggested would be but throwing it away.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I do not intend to prolong this already protracted discussion of the conduct of the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the distribution of seeds. I think it has already occupied more time than the importance or the magnitude of the subject justifies. But I am led to rise by the question propounded to me by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] during the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE].

I asked a question somewhat for information, somewhat for suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, as to whether the overallotment of seeds to the State of Nebraska, of which the Senator from Missouri seems to have complained, might not have been due to the exceptional condition of the agricultural interests of that State last year or the year before—I forget which it was—which were suffering from a most distressing drought, one which appealed to the whole country for relief, and for which, if I am not mistaken, some appeal was made to Congress for special relief.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, notwithstanding so much time has been taken in this matter, I think all the facts ought to be known. There was no drought in Nebraska last year. This distribution of seeds was for the season of 1895-96.

Mr. GRAY. I do not think I am mistaken.

Mr. VEST. It happens to be within my personal knowledge that Nebraska never raised such a crop—and the Senators on this floor from that State will corroborate my statement—as she did last year. If the Senator will permit, it is all a baseless assumption that the Secretary of Agriculture sent these seeds out in 1894-95 for the culture of 1895.

Mr. GRAY. Notwithstanding the assertion of the Senator from Missouri, I think he will find that he is mistaken, and that this overallotment of seeds of which he complains, if there was an overallotment—I do not know anything about the facts—occurred when there was this peculiar and distressiug condition of things in that State. Certainly there was a drought last year or the year before, and we all recollect the appeals that came up to us from those arid plains and the pictures of distress which were drawn to us in this body and in the public prints of the country in regard to it.

All I want to say now in regard to it is that since my attention has been drawn to this matter by the debate in the Senate I have examined the law pursuant to which this distribution of seeds has been made. Attention has been called to it by a most thorough and exhaustive speech by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], and it is not required, after having read that speech—I had not the pleasure of hearing it—that I should say a single word to supplement its force and its conclusions. But true it is there is not a Senator in this body who can take the Revised Statutes and show that under the law as the Secretary found it, and under the interpretation that was given it by the Attorney-General, he had any right to continue this indiscriminate distribution of the ordinary agricultural and horticultural seed that had theretofore been going on.

It is well enough to accuse the Secretary of inconsistency in having pursued the plan that his predecessors had pursued for years before; but the question is whether, when his attention was drawn to it, he should continue to violate the law or whether, as an obedient servant in a democratic country, he should say that no Cabinet officer, however high, was above the law, and, whatever the consequences might be, he was bound to conform his action to its plain provisions.

So when the law says that the Secretary of Agriculture must confine the distribution to seeds that are uncommon and rare, there is no power of dispensation in the President of the United States or in any department of this Government which can condone a violation of a provision and prohibition as plain as the words that I have just recited contain.

Mr. President, if there is any responsibility for the failure to distribute seeds—and I am not one who congratulates myself that the farmers and small gardeners of the country are not receiving seeds—let it rest where it belongs in common fairness, in common justice to the Secretary of Agriculture, and let Congress assume the responsibility of altering the law and making it what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] would have it, and what other Senators on this floor would have it—a general distribution of all the ordinary and common garden seeds of the country to the farmers and horticulturists of the different States.

Without detaining the Senate any longer I wish to call the attention of the country to the fact that if there is any responsibility anywhere for the failure of those seeds to go through the mail, as they have heretofore gone, to the farmers and gardeners of the country, it belongs to Congress and not to the Secretary of Agriculture, who has obeyed, as he was bound to obey, the plain letter of the law.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has offered a substitute for the joint resolution as it comes from the Committee on Agriculture. I believe the rule is that when a substitute is offered to a measure the friends of the measure have a right to perfect it before a vote on the substitute is taken. Is not that the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). Amendments to the text of the joint resolution will first be considered.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I ask that the vote be taken on the amendments reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and when those amendments are disposed of it will be in order to take up the substitute proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the order of the Senate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that the substitute offered by the Senator from Missouri is to take the place of the entire joint resolution, including the amendments of the committee. I ask the Chair whether, under those circumstances, it is not proper to submit the question upon the substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The friends of the measure have a right to perfect the original joint resolution before a vote is taken on the substitute; and that will be the order. The first amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4 of the joint resolution, before the word "directed," insert the words "authorized and," and after the word "directed" strike out "to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins," and insert in lieu thereof "to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years"; so as to read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution add the following proviso:

Provided, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them: *And provided further*, That he shall not be required to expend all the appropriation available for said purchase, but only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects of this joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. I have an amendment which I desire to offer. I will read it in the hearing of the Senate instead of sending it to the desk. Add at the end of the joint resolution the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That so much of the seeds, bulbs, plants, vines, cuttings, and trees which has heretofore been required to be distributed among Senators and Representatives shall be divided among the States in the proportion of the representation of each in the electoral college—

That makes it exactly as it is now, Senators and Representatives both being counted—

but giving to each Territory a share equal to the allotment for one member of said college—

That makes the law exactly as it is now, so far as the share of

each State is concerned, the difference being that instead of going to members of Congress it will go to the agricultural colleges—

and shall then be transmitted to the several agricultural experiment stations for distribution among the people of their respective States or Territories.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read from the desk.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the joint resolution the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That so much of the seeds, bulbs, plants, vines, cuttings, and trees which has heretofore been required to be distributed among Senators and Representatives shall be divided among the States in the proportion of the representation of each in the electoral college, but giving to each Territory a share equal to the allotment for one member of said college, and shall then be transmitted to the several agricultural experiment stations for distribution among the people of their respective States or Territories.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks on this subject. The speech made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] this morning developed a fact that I did not know before and makes the adoption of my amendment, I think, absolutely necessary. The Senator called the attention of the Senate to the fact that large portions of the seed allotted to members of Congress were not taken by them and distributed among the people of the States. He pointed out several States in which that had occurred, and he was kind enough to give me the table in which he had marked some eight or ten States in which the members of Congress had failed to discharge the duty imposed on them by law to distribute the seeds.

I have looked over the table further than the Senator had marked, and I find that there are twenty-two States, just about one-half the States in the American Union, the Senators and Representatives of which failed to take and distribute among their constituents the allotment made to them under the law. So we find this state of affairs to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate, that the method of distribution of seeds among the people of the United States now provided by law is ineffectual. Some of the members of Congress, a large number of them, do not discharge their duties in that respect. I will call over some of the States in which there is a deficit in addition to those mentioned by the Senator from Missouri.

I find that in the State of Kentucky there was a failure to distribute some thousands of packages of seed. In the State of Virginia there was a similar failure. In the State of California there was a similar failure. In Iowa there was a similar failure. So in Louisiana; and I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] who makes a great onslaught on the Secretary of Agriculture for not distributing the seed to the fact that the members of Congress of that State did not distribute among their constituents the seed which the Secretary of Agriculture gave them.

There is the State of Missouri, so ably represented by the Senator who makes this onslaught on the Secretary of Agriculture. Its delegation also failed, by 33,000 papers, to distribute the seed which had been allotted to that State by the Secretary under the law of Congress.

Then there is also the State of Illinois, in which there was a deficit. So in Indiana, so in Maine, so in Maryland, so in Massachusetts, where about 70,000 packages were not distributed; so in Michigan, about 50,000; so in New York, about 120,000; so in Ohio, about 70,000; so in Pennsylvania, about 50,000, and so in Rhode Island and Vermont. I think this failure on the part of Representatives and Senators to distribute seed among the people of the United States, as required by law, is a very good reason why we should require the distribution to be made by some other means.

Right here, while I think of it, I desire to call the attention of the Senate, and especially of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], to the fact that his criticism about the inequality in the distribution of the number of packages of seed is the necessary result of the law upon that subject. It has been a remarkable thing in this whole debate that Senators have assumed that there was default on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, and have condemned him, without at all referring to the law under which he is obliged to act.

Now, the Secretary of Agriculture would have been guilty of a gross violation of law if he had distributed those seeds by the number of packages, giving to each State so many packages. The law says he shall not distribute them in that way. I will read the law for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri, whose criticism is so severe upon the subject, and for the benefit of the Senate. It provides—

That the Secretary—

The Secretary of Agriculture—

shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be.

So the distribution is to be made according to the value of the seed and not according to the number of packages. As I have shown to the Senate in the first remarks that I made upon the subject, some seeds cost $30, $40, or $60 a pound, and others, like corn or cotton seed, cost $1 or $1.50 a bushel. According to the idea of the Senator from Missouri, the Secretary of Agriculture in distributing the seeds must send to each State the exact number of seeds according to its representation in Congress without reference at all to the value of the seed which is distributed, when the law says that he shall distribute the seeds according to value and not according to the number of packages. So that does away with that point.

I have only one or two other remarks that I care to make upon this subject. It is a matter of some importance, I admit, but it was so clearly demonstrated by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] that if we pass the proposed law now it will be of no effect or value whatever that I hardly think I ought to go much further in that direction. We are too late. We are ordering a thing to be done out of time, out of season, when with the regular rules or the regular necessities of the Agricultural Department in getting these seeds and distributing them it will be impossible to make the distribution so that the seeds may be effectual to the people who receive them.

I call the attention of the Senate especially to the emphasis placed upon the law, as found in section 527, by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. Only certain kinds of seed are authorized to be purchased. That purchase is not for the purpose of giving a bounty to every man who receives seed. It is a purchase for the purpose, and the sole purpose, of introducing new and uncommon seeds among the people, so that by actual experiment it may be ascertained whether or not the seeds so distributed are of any value. If you divest the law of that feature—and I desire to call the Senator's attention to this point—you would make the purchase of seed simply an eleemosynary institution for the benefit of such people as members of Congress may see proper to give the seed to. We have established the experimental stations, and we give each one of them $15,000 a year out of the National Treasury for the express purpose of testing various kinds of seeds in their respective localities, in order to determine upon what seeds the money of the Government is to be expended.

I happen to be a trustee of the Agricultural College of Mississippi, and I know something about the modus operandi of those experimental stations. They not only experiment with seeds on the grounds which have been allotted to them by the college, but they send seeds, plants, vines, and everything mentioned in this statute to persons in the State who apply for them and tell them they desire to make experiments on that subject. So I think it is quite evident now to every Senator that if we are to be governed by the purpose for which the law was enacted the best method of carrying out that purpose is to give the seed for distribution to the agricultural stations in each State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. MORGAN. If a vote is to be taken of course I will not interpose, but I want to ask the Senate to go into executive session for a very few minutes.

Mr. VEST. Let us take a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. Let us vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand there is a substitute lying on the table for the entire joint resolution, which I ask the Senate to vote on. I think it will take but a minute.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the substitute will not be adopted. There is a very important difference between it and the joint resolution as now amended; and I desire to call attention to that difference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CRAIN.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM H. CRAIN, late a member of the House from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *February 10, 1896.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. W. H. CRAIN, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of nine members of the House be appointed by the Speaker, to act with such Senators as may be selected, to attend the funeral of the deceased; that the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House shall take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased at his home, and that the necessary expenses attending the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I offer for adoption the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Texas will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. W. H. CRAIN, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of three Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and the Vice-President appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate, under the second resolution, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GALLINGER, and Mr. KYLE.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. John Thomas Martin, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant, February 1, 1896, vice Johnson, Fifth Artillery, retired from active service.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Charles Dodge, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain, December 4, 1895, vice Wessells, Twenty-fourth Infantry, resigned.

First Lieut. William Abram Mann, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain, January 1, 1896, vice Greene, Seventeenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Millard Fillmore Waltz, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain, January 9, 1896, vice Viven, Twelfth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. William Robert Dashiell, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, December 4, 1895, vice Dodge, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Eli Alva Helmick, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant, December 21, 1895, vice Littell, Tenth Infantry, appointed assistant quartermaster, who resigns his regimental commission.

Second Lieut. Charles Grant French, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, December 31, 1895, vice Pague, Fifteenth Infantry, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Robert Weldon Rose, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, January 1, 1896, vice Mann, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Clarence Bennett, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, January 9, 1896, vice Waltz, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

To be captain by brevet.

Second Lieut. Robert Goldthwaite Carter, Fourth Cavalry, brevet first lieutenant, United States Army (now first lieutenant, retired), for gallant service in action against hostile Kickapoo, Lipan, and Mescalero Apache Indians, at Remolina, Mexico, May 18, 1873.

Cavalry arm.

Candidate Corpl. Alvord Van Patten Anderson, Troop B, Sixth Cavalry, to be second lieutenant, February 5, 1896, vice Howze, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Edwin F. Uhl, of Michigan, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Germany, to fill a vacancy.

MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. William Henry Heuer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Missouri River Commission, vice Col. William R. King, relieved.

(This nomination is made to correct error in former nomination of Major Heuer, which was confirmed by the Senate January 14, 1896, and in which his name appears as Huer.)

POSTMASTERS.

Samuel B. Wheeler, to be postmaster at Westport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Joseph G. Hyatt, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

James W. French, to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa, in the place of Joseph H. Reynolds, whose commission expires February 16, 1896.

William C. O'Leary, to be postmaster at Hancock, in the county of Houghton and State of Michigan, in the place of M. R. Redmond, deceased.

William R. Odor, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri, in the place of Lauriston H. Condit, whose commission expired December 23, 1895.

F. M. Ranck, to be postmaster at Westerville, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio, in the place of Samuel E. Fouts, whose commission expires February 16, 1896.

Thomas P. McAndrews, to be postmaster at White Haven, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George Sackett, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1896.

AMBASSADOR.

Edwin F. Uhl, of Michigan, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Germany.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 8, 1896.*

The recess having expired, the House (at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Monday, February 10) resumed its session.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

The House, according to order, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

[Mr. HAINER of Nebraska addressed the House. See Appendix.]

[Mr. McDEARMON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

[Mr. CALDERHEAD addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have had so much difficulty in obtaining recognition. I do not, however, attribute this to any purpose of the Speaker to restrain those entertaining the views that I do, but to existing conditions and the desire of so many to address the House in so short a compass of time. I must confess embarrassment at having to speak so near a seat draped in the habiliments of mourning. My whole heart goes out to that queenly empire of the South, "Texas," at the loss of one of her great and bright statesmen. My surroundings are only symbolical of the country that is in gloom and despair from the frozen borders of Canada to the sunland boundary of Mexico, from the morning to the evening ocean, and it is for this entire country and all conditions that I desire to speak, and I am not speaking simply for home consumption, but to convert and convince, for my people are united in favor of free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 as it was fixed by our fathers and remained until 1873; under which our great forests were felled and turned into producing plains; under which the frail bark canoe was exchanged for the floating palace and the cry of the buffalo succeeded by the iron horse; under which our great cities were builded, our magnificent harbors developed, our wonderful commerce extended; under which Louisiana was purchased from the Spaniards, and Texas, that queenly empire (to which I have referred) which will always protect our southern border, was annexed from Mexico; under which our country has passed successfully through three great wars, including the late civil war, and under which prosperity abounded everywhere until 1873. When the noble six hundred made their famous charge at Balaklava, with unblanched cheeks and steady nerves, their's was to do and die, when like heroes they rode into the very jaws of death. As they saw their comrades falling before them, like autumn leaves in Vallombrosa or like ripening grain before the remorseless reaper, there went up a whisper along that line that some one had blundered; some one had blundered.

As I look out upon this sunset continent which was dedicated to God and liberty and whose civil government had its birth upon and within the territory I have the distinction of representing, out of which has been evolved a nation of marvelous civilization, of patent and latent forces capable of a wonderful future if not restrained and destroyed by the influence of British finances, a

country every page of whose history is marked by the valorous deeds and patriotic action of its plain, common people; a country naturally rich in the harvest of its wares, the harvest of its forests, and the harvest of its fields, the harvest of its mines, the harvest of its genius, brains, enterprise, and self-sacrificing patriotism; when I realize that its activities are paralyzed, its future eclipsed, its brains, genius, and enterprise restrained; when I see its commerce trammeled, its transportation over land and sea in the hands of receivers, its manufacturing demoralized, its business sensitive and restive, its Government bankrupt; as I see the plowman homeward wend his weary way after his day's work is done, as he gathers his loving family around his frugal fireside and contemplates that, though he may work from early dawn to dewy eve and exercise rigid economy, nothing remains to provide for the mortgage on the old homestead, to educate his children, or set aside for sickness or old age—as I look upon this sad but realistic picture, and as I hear these croakings of despair as they well up from the million of homes throughout the country, there comes not only a whisper, but the focalized wrongs of the people as certain and significant as the clap of thunder preceding a storm, that someone or some political party or some men in power and influence have blundered. I had rather put it that way than to criminate or recriminate any man or party. I do not believe in the policy of crimination or recrimination in conducting a debate or in outlining a party policy. But where and to whom to charge this blunder we may honestly differ according to our respective environments. We can all agree upon this pivotal point and fact, that a fatal mistake and blunder was made when this Government, with all its resources and commercial influence, consented to the demonetization of silver in 1873, as all now realize and admit that the effect of this legislation was to halve the price of all farm products and farming lands and double the burden of debt, Government expenses and taxes.

The result of this blunder has caused more wrongs and injustice to the human family than all the ravages of war, famine, and pestilence for the past two centuries. Its effect was first felt by the farming classes, covering 2,000,000 of the 4,000,000 farms with mortgages that can not be paid except under foreclosure, which has and is rapidly taking place; and under the red flag of the auctioneer homestead after homestead is passing into the hands of domestic and foreign land syndicates, which are creating a monopoly in the soil of the country.

The second class to feel the effect of this blunder—this legislation—was the laborers and wage earners of the country, and now fully 5,000,000 are practically or entirely unemployed. Their conditions have been manifested in strikes, riots, commonweal armies, and protective labor organizations.

The third class to come under its blighting influence are the tradesmen and manufacturers, the evidences of which are clearly visible to the most casual observer.

In asking recognition of the Chair and attention from members to comment upon these conditions, I am not ashamed to be classified as a Populist and to emphasize the fact that I support the Senate substitute as a distinct Populistic measure, one that the country would not have had presented in this shape except for the presence of the Populist balance of power in the Senate. It can not otherwise be intelligently and consistently considered, since both the Democratic and the Republican parties are committed by practice and policy to the single gold standard, and the Populist alone of the political organizations extant stands openly, boldly, and declaratively for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Their national platform so declares; their every State platform so declares; their every vote in both branches of Congress have been given as they have declared, and I now avow that it is the policy of the Populist to stand by this principle and to present the issue to the people from time to time until the truth of their course shall be ratified and sanctioned by a majority of the votes of the country, and thereby vouchsafe prosperity and happiness, not only to the American people, but to the entire human race. We feel under obligations to the silver Democrats and to the silver Republicans for their aid and valuable assistance in presenting in such a masterly manner to the public this issue in which is involved the civilization and safety of the entire human race. But you are all experienced statesmen, honorable, wise, and patriotic, and I have no purpose or inclination to impugn your motives or discredit your patriotism, and I can fully sympathize with your desires and hopes to have your respective parties enlist in this just quarrel of the plain, producing people against the gold trust and corporate monopoly. God grant that you may succeed, and long live the party, whatever its name is or may be, that will bravely take up and fight out to the finish this cause of the people.

But it is as clear as crystal, as clear as a mathematical proposition can be demonstrated, that both the Democratic and the Republican party will name a gold-standard candidate for the Presidency upon a declarative gold platform. After your parties take this action what is to become of your silver professions? Will you surrender these upon the advice of your party and witness the continued ruin and depression of your country, or will you act the part of patriots and place country above party and remain steadfast and true to the cause of silver, even if you have to serve in the livery of Populism? Our doors stand ajar; they will remain so for the reception of all men of all parties that have a desire of promoting the best interests of our common country and its depressed and suffering population. We need your leadership; we need your influence; we need your votes. We are indifferent as to your former political associations so your resolute purpose is to serve silver and country in the most practical manner. So, after your respective conventions have repudiated you and your silver convictions, as they are certain to do, then we invite you to St. Louis, that we may by conference adjust our differences and in a practical way devise such action as will be certain to secure a silver President and a silver Congress in 1896.

I want to assure you that the representative Populists that you will meet at St. Louis will be worthy of your consideration and association. I beg that you understand that they are not anarchists; they carry with them noble purposes and patriotic hearts, and not as you may suspicion, dynamite, ready to attack some weak point in our social condition. They are not socialists, believing that the drones should live upon the active bees; they only want a fair and equitable proportion of their own production that they may be enabled to meet their obligations and supply themselves and families with more comforts. In the cities they may live in humble tenements, even in garrets and in cellars. In the South and West they may live in humble farm homes and be compelled to follow the plow and carry the hoe, yet they are as true, noble, and brave men as ever followed Lee and Jackson or battled under Grant and McClellan to save the flag and preserve the Union. They have been brought into political existence by the conditions and exigencies of the decade, and they have a common grievance to redress. Some of them in their anxiety and impatience for relief may be indiscreet, but they believe in obtaining this relief not through the force or example of riots, strikes, commonweal armies, or by marching on Washington with rifles. They realize that in this hour of light, in this day of civilization, reform can not be accomplished either by the torch or bullet; that their only hope is through, by, and under the law as it should be declared at the ballot.

Soon after our independence from Great Britain was declared, our people had been so accustomed to a king there went inquiry through the colonies, "Who shall we make king?" It was a patriot and a patriotic thought that suggested that we will gather all the people together into one field and we will then altogether build a great tall statue; we will dedicate this to our whole country and name it "The Law," and we will make this our king. The Populists desire the continued reign of this king, and all the reforms accomplished by, under, and through this king, the law; and personally I have but little consideration for anyone or any party that would encourage the thought that they could or should be accomplished in any other manner.

We want the free American people to be unshackled from all sectional and partisan prejudices and passions and to exercise their franchises in the interest of this great American people and continent. This can be easily accomplished if free-silver leaders on this floor will only remain true to the cause and practice what they preach on the hustings and in Congress. But it can not be accomplished if they simply talk free silver on the hustings and in Congress and then vote gold-standard tickets. I entertain no shadow of a doubt that if the issue could be presented fairly, without party, race, and sectional prejudices or embarrassments, a decisive majority, both of the popular vote and the electoral college, would be recorded in favor of free silver at 16 to 1; the prosperity of the American people and the perpetuation of American institutions. Congress need not be deceived. The American people are intelligent, they are fairly well educated on this subject, theirs is the education obtained by hard and bitter experience and not that theoretical education that is so repeatedly exemplified on this floor. The farmer understands, what the theorist admits, that the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 will practically double the price of all staple farm products. They understand this as clearly as it was demonstrated yesterday by the able, eloquent, and very practical speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] through convincing words and still more convincing charts, explained by a master of the subject. The farmer understands that doubling the price of his products enables him to pay and meet his obligations, and brings him some of the comforts of life, the means to educate his children, and a surplus to lay aside for sickness and old age.

Under these increased prices his farm will be made more beautiful and more productive. These conditions bring more work for the farm laborer and better wages, and necessarily more comfort and happiness to the farm laborers of the land, whose present deplorable conditions cry aloud for relief. The merchants immediately feel the benefit of better prices for farm products; they

secure better sales, prompt payment of accounts, and more satisfactory profits. The manufacturer realizes at once, with prosperous merchants and farmers, a decided increased demand for the output of his mills; this necessarily means more constant work for his employees, with better wages and better profits to the capital invested. These results bring confidence to the capital and contentment and happiness to the employees. The prosperous farmer, merchant, and manufacturer increases the bulk of transportation, and producer and laborer have never been known to complain at passenger or freight rates when they were receiving an equitable share of the net result of their own production.

To summarize: If I should divide the country into sections and you admit that free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 doubles the purchasing power of the cotton crop of the South, that under free coinage we will receive in the aggregate three hundred million legal-tender dollars more than we do receive for this crop, it is idle to say that the farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and laborers of the South are practically unanimous for that policy that is certain to secure this result.

If I for a moment contemplate the great West, the granary of the world, and you assure me of a fact that I am convinced is true, that the price of her corn, wheat, and pork are doubled in price, then I need not be told that her laborers, her farmers are, and her merchants and manufacturers, if they study their own conditions, should be, in favor of this measure.

If I again contemplate the great North and East, with their invested capital, great cities, great industries, wealth, and influence, while I am not in a position to suggest to them a wise policy, at the same time I will be pardoned when I remind them that they are surrounded by discontented farmers, by miserable wage earners whose condition demands their consideration; I would also remind them that they are absolutely dependent upon the farmer and the laborers of the country, and their life is necessarily short unless they can vouchsafe prosperity unto those upon whom they are primarily and ultimately dependent.

If you wish, divide the country into cities and farms. In that instance the cities must realize their absolute dependence upon the country. To illustrate, you can throw an impassable wall around every city in this country, and within the short space of time as ninety days bats and owls would frequent and live in marble halls where once reigned human life in the revelry of wine, pleasure, and summary happiness. Your accumulated wealth might be in the shape of marble blocks, in Government bonds, or in the much-coveted metal, gold. All these would be powerless to support and maintain human life if you had no access to the country for food and raiment, while the country would and could live, be happy and prosperous, without the assistance of the cities. I only mention this to illustrate the interest that the cities should feel in the welfare and prosperity of the surrounding country.

If I am called upon to consider the country as a whole, the conclusion is irresistible that the greater purchasing power we can give to our balance of trade the larger that balance will be in our favor, and by the increase of this our solvency, aggregate wealth, and greatness will be recorded by the nations of the world. There is one class, and one class alone, that is benefited by the single gold standard; that class is the creditor class. I ask members to pause before it is too late and recall that there are other classes in the country that are entitled to their legislative consideration. There are the laboring classes, the farming classes, the manufacturing classes, the great middle classes, the property classes, each and all are entitled to your watchful care and consideration, and I protest against sacrificing them all to the merciless creditors. I believe in dealing with them fairly and repaying them exactly under the same conditions in which their debts were contracted, no more and no less, but I do protest against paying them under a standard that requires to pay twice as many hours of labor, twice as many bushels of wheat, corn, pork, and twice as many pounds of cotton and tobacco as it would have taken to pay the debt when it was created, for finally these constitute the hard-earned coin of the people in which they must redeem their obligations.

Edmund Burke, the great English jurist and statesman, said, when commenting upon conditions very much like those that confront us:

> It is to the property of the citizen and not to the demands of the creditor of the State that the original faith of society is pledged. The claim of the citizen is prior in time, paramount in title, superior in equity.

Congress should be ever ready to lend a listening ear to the plaintive wail that descends from the garret, ascends from the cellar in overcrowded cities, and is heard from remote fields of the country, and try to learn the cause of their common suffering. These constitute the grand army of producers of the necessities to maintain and sustain human life, and to model, shape, and fashion them to meet and suit the touch, the eye, the desire, the comforts and pleasure of man and society. Under present conditions this army of producers can only retain such a measure of their own productions that hardly afford them a miserable existence without the comforts necessary to make life endurable, while the traders upon and manipulators of their productions acquire such a proportion as results in their increasing colossal fortunes, that threaten still further encroachments upon the rights of the producers.

Some say I am an alarmist, or rather a calamity howler, and they call attention to the prosperity of the country as evidenced by the domestic subscription to the recent call for bonds. This only illustrates the deplorable condition of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures of the country at large and all of its enterprises that the money of the country can only be called out for Government investments at 3 per cent. This is done because they can find no better investment, as the business interest and enterprise of the people are at a discount, while the taxing power, the last resort of plutocracy and despotism, stands at a premium.

This debate has developed two admissions. One is that free silver at 16 to 1 will practically double prices. The other is that this result is desirable, and that free coinage at 16 to 1 should be adopted if it could be done by international agreement.

The cowards of finance say that we are too weak and not able commercially to accomplish this, which they admit would be to the advantage of every interest in this country and to the entire human race. Had our patriotic ancestors doubted or halted at Pitt, Mecklenburg, or Philadelphia, we would have remained dependencies of England, and yet I say to you that this condition would have been preferable to the condition we occupy to-day in having to submit to such prices as they may name for our muscle, products, and land.

In the evolution of economic thought, in the science of political progress, the time is at hand when the tares should be pulled from the wheat, the sheep divided from the goats, when we should know "under which king, Bezonian," will you serve, which flag will ye follow, the British or the American? Shall we regard you in the future alien or friend?

One course is admittedly independent and American and for the best interest of the entire American people. Then, why hesitate? Why doubt? When shall we grow stronger? Will it be to-morrow or the next day or when the next breeze that sweeps from the East shall bring to our ears the resoundings of clanking chains? I care not what course others may take, as for me, "give me liberty or give me death."

Gentlemen may say, let us have peace; but there can be no peace; there must be war, eternal war, until the wrongs of 1873 and 1893 are righted in the interest of God and humanity.

I have read in Roman history that the march of an entire army was stayed by the presence of a huge serpent, whose very presence poisoned the atmosphere.

Regulus, the Roman commander, halted his columns and dispatched a detachment to destroy this serpent in order that his army might be saved and permitted to proceed on its march.

There is admittedly immediately in our presence the single gold standard, the monopoly of money, and all those words mean in measuring value, and exchanging products and labor, and facilitating trading and commerce. Its presence ever in action, devouring like a blighting breath, poisons the very atmosphere by which we are surrounded, paralyzing every industry, enterprise, and hope of the people. We need a detachment, verily a mighty army of patriots, to destroy this serpent, that the people may be released from their slavery to the gold dollar and this great nation permitted to proceed in its march of progress, invention, and enterprise and fulfill its legitimate mission to work out a marvelous future.

Mr. Speaker, just a few moments in conclusion. It is very evident that you will defeat the Senate substitute, and your purpose is to adhere to the House bond bill to maintain the coin redemption fund. This you have denominated an emergency measure to meet the deficiency in the Treasury. I desire to call attention to the fact that I have introduced a measure (H. R. 4141) for the reduction of all official salaries 33⅓ per cent; that will in a practical manner meet the deficiency. At present it seems the expenses exceed the revenues. The practical way to meet this is to reduce expenses. My bill meets this exigency. In round figures there is expended for Government salaries three hundred millions. A reduction of 33⅓ per cent is a net saving of $100,000,000 per annum, and will bring our expenses within income. This is decidedly more effective and practical than the sale of bonds, which only increases our debt and burden.

By the introduction of this measure I do not desire to pose as a demagogue or a very economical man. The fact is, I do not believe in low or short prices for anything. I am rather a high-price man, believing in reasonable salaries, in high prices for labor and products. Out of this condition, in my opinion, flows more general prosperity, contentment, and happiness. But I do wish to serve notice on the official classes that if the single standard is to continue and remain the policy of this Government, bringing low prices for land, products, and labor, then there is no practical reason why

the official classes shall not accept for their services the same scale of prices. If the wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco growers are compelled to accept gold prices for these staples and the labor necessary to produce them, then the official classes, who are their servants, should be content with the same scale of prices. "A word to the wise is sufficient." The people who employ and have to pay official salaries are thinking and moving along this line.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, to-day I desire to raise my voice in behalf of the toilers of America against those men and measures which are robbing the many and bestowing the booty upon a favored few.

Knowing that I will be subjected to ridicule, vituperation, and anathema by those who are under the hypnotic influence of the favored few, I yet deem it my duty to exercise the right of an American citizen and speak for the great masses of the common people who to-day groan beneath a weary load of poverty and oppression, and yet whose appeals for relief are answered by silent contempt and covert sneers.

Sir, I have heard much on this floor about the interests of the bankers, the manufacturers, the business men, but scarcely one word in behalf of the laboring men of this country; not a single measure for the relief those who make it possible for the bankers, the manufacturers, and the business men to prosper and grow rich; no one to speak for those who toil in the fields, the mines, the mills; for those who produce all the wealth, and who must ultimately pay every cent of the bonded indebtedness which is now being saddled upon the American people.

I appeal to-day for justice for those who sow that others may reap, for those who toil in poverty, hunger, and rags that the American plutocracy may revel in wealth and luxury beyond the dreams of avarice. For my utterances to-day no party is responsible. I have consulted only my conscience and my God. If these approve my course the whole world may frown. I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as protesting in the name of the common people of the United States against the bartering away of their liberties to a few greedy, grasping gold gamblers. In their names, and the names of their children, and in behalf of generations yet unborn, I protest against this. I denounce those men who would make of our children hewers of wood and drawers of water as traitors to the American people.

What can I say of the man who sits in the Presidential chair? What words in the English language are strong enough to be used in dealing with the "lone fisherman of the White House," the Izaak Walton of modern Democracy, the man who in his political angling catches only suckers and mulletheads, and in his gunning expedition makes ducks and drakes of his own party, the base pretender who claims to wear the mantle of Andrew Jackson? He has accomplished only two great feats; one was to destroy the Democratic party, and this can be more readily forgiven, perhaps, than anything else he could have done, and the other is the unpardonable crime of wrecking his country financially, placing the Treasury at the mercy of Wall street gamblers, and fastening on the people a bonded indebtedness, principal and interest, of $497,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have often gazed enraptured upon this magnificent Capitol; I have admired its beauty, its splendor, when it was bathed in the golden rays of the setting sun; I have seen thousands of visitors look with awe and reverence upon this historic structure. But hardly one, amid all the countless thousands who have come here to learn of our national greatness, ever stopped to think of the vast granite bowlders way down in the earth, where the sun never shines, upon which this splendid pile rests. These foundation stones may not appeal to the æsthetic tastes; they may be crude and rough; but they have been tested. They are true and tried and faultless and flawless. They uphold and support all this greatness and beauty. If ever by any process they should be destroyed, then all the beauty, the symmetry, the splendor above would plunge to utter chaos and ruin.

We have also erected another structure, Mr. Speaker, and it, too, has its foundations, its bed rocks, and its chief corner stones. I refer to this great Republic of ours. How we admire it! How we praise it! How proudly we point to the Stars and Stripes! With what pleasure we discuss our magnificent cities, our railroads. How we delight to listen to the whistle of the locomotive, the whir of machinery, the music of the spindles. But ah! Mr. Speaker, what about the foundation stones? Is this structure founded upon a rock or upon the shifting sands? If the foundation fails our Republic will be destroyed.

The trouble with us is that we have forgotten the foundation; we have been decorating and adorning the superstructure; we have been legislating, if you please, to build up and strengthen the few, who sit in splendor upon the dome of this structure, at the expense of those below, the toilers of the country. We have made their burdens so great that they can not longer bear them, and already the foundation is failing, and I see grievous fissures in the edifice. I shall attempt briefly to show that the evils of our financial system are such as to destroy the farmers and the laborers, and that you can not destroy these without at the same time destroying the manufacturers, the railroads, the merchants, lawyers, and doctors, any more than you could dig away the foundation stones of this Capitol without causing it to collapse, and that the same forces now at work to destroy the farmers will also destroy the other classes already mentioned.

There are four propositions which I desire to lay down, and which I may call "cardinal principles." The first is from Professor Walker, "That prices will fall or rise as the volume of money be increased or diminished is a law that is as unalterable as any law of nature." The second is from Abraham Lincoln, "If a government should contract a debt, with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contract the volume of money before the debt was paid, it would be the most heinous crime a government could commit against the people." The third is from Mr. Garfield, "Whoever controls the volume of money in any country is absolute master of all industry and commerce." And the last is from Daniel Webster, "Liberty can not long endure in any country where the tendency of legislation is to concentrate wealth in the hands of a few." Ah! Mr. Speaker, how strange these utterances seem in the light of recent financial legislation!

At the close of the war we had almost $60 per capita circulating medium and, as a result, no private indebtedness, no millionaires, no tramps; now we have in actual circulation less than $10 per capita and, as a result, we owe $40,000,000,000 and have 4,000 millionaires and 4,000,000 tramps.

At the close of the war our national debt was $2,827,868,959. On this we have paid a sum which staggers the human mind, which palls the imagination; a sum which can hardly be expressed by arithmetic—the prodigious, the incomprehensible, sum of more than $2,635,000,000—and yet, Mr. Speaker, I assert the solemn truth to-day, when I say that it will take more cotton, more wheat, more flour, more pork, and wool to pay our national debt than it would have taken at the close of the war. In 1866 it would have required to pay the national debt: Of wheat, 1,486,842,105 bushels; of flour, 262,790,697 barrels; of cotton, 5,885,416,666 pounds; of pork, 99,576,313 barrels; of wool, 5,330,188,679 pounds.

At the close of the year 1895 it would have required: Of wheat, 2,133,620,689 bushels; of flour, 358,571,428 barrels; of cotton, 14,558,823,529 pounds; of pork, 150,915,853 barrels; of wool, 5,755,813,953 pounds. In other words, it will take more wheat, by 646,778,584 bushels; more flour, by 90,780,731 barrels; more cotton, by 8,673,406,863 pounds; more pork, by 51,339,540 barrels; more wool, by 425,625,274 pounds.

We have heard a great deal about the reduction of the national debt; but it is all a lie and a fraud. It may have been nominally reduced, but when measured by the price of these five staple commodities it has been increased.

It seems that there has been some devilish machinations of our finances. We have done that which Mr. Lincoln said would be the most heinous crime a government could commit against the people. We contracted a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then commenced to contract the money volume before the debt was paid, until to-day the dollar has a purchasing power three times as great as it had thirty years ago. Do you wonder that the farmer has been growing poorer each year, and that well-nigh all the farms are under mortgage?

Under the benign influence of the gold standard we find that the taxable value of real estate declined from 1893 to 1894 in the South and West $500,000,000. We also find that there has been a steady decline in the prices of farm products, and I allege that this is also properly attributable to the same cause, namely, the contraction of a currency. Our great financiers tell us that it is overproduction, but, Mr. Speaker, we have an overproduction of only two things in this country; one is political knaves to advocate such a doctrine, and the other an overproduction of fools to believe it.

To prove that I am right, let us take the corn crop for 1889, and we find that it was 2,112,892,000 bushels, and the average export price was 47.4 cents per bushel. In 1891 the corn crop was 2,060,154,000 bushels, and the average export price was 57.4 cents per bushel; while in 1894 the corn crop was only 1,212,770,052 bushels, or a little more than half the crop of 1891, yet the price was only 46.7 cents per bushel. In 1891 we raised 611,780,000 bushels of wheat, and the average export price was 93 cents per bushel; but in 1894 we raised only 460,267,416 bushels, yet the export price fell to 67 cents.

But, sir, we are told that we do not export enough of our commodities and that we import too much. That is another fabrication of the financial quacks. In 1894 we exported the largest per cent of our wheat production we have ever exported, and the largest per cent of our corn since 1880, and the largest per cent of our cotton since 1878. In 1894 we consumed 3.41 bushels of wheat per capita, the smallest per capita of wheat consumption ever recorded in this country. The wheat consumption in 1881 was 6.09; in 1883, 6.64; in 1885, 6.67, and in 1890, 6.09. Our consumption of corn per capita in 1894 was 22.76 bushels, the smallest since 1882.

A great deal has been said about the decrease in our exports for

1895 over those of 1894, the Republicans attributing it to the workings of the Wilson tariff law, while Mr. Carlisle says the cause is the improved crop conditions in other countries for the year 1895 over the preceding year, which accounts largely for the diminished exports of domestic produce in 1895. Are these great financiers blind, or would they intentionally deceive and mislead the people? The value of our exports in 1894 was $869,204,937, while in 1895 the value was $793,392,399 (that is, for the fiscal years ending, respectively, June 30, 1894, and June 30, 1895), a falling off in value of $75,000,000. But the decrease was not in the quantity of our exports of domestic produce, for there was an increase in quantity but a decrease in price, owing to the ruinous depreciation in the gold value of all property.

The total value of our ten principal agricultural exports—cotton, wheat, flour, corn, bacon and hams, lard, pork, beef, tobacco, and cheese—was $510,012,686 in 1894 and $452,719,941 in 1895, a decrease in the value of these exports of $57,292,745, or 11.2 per cent; but this decrease was not due to diminished exports, but solely to the fall in prices. If we had obtained for the quantity of all ten commodities exported in 1895 the average export price of 1894, the value of these exports would have been $552,486,345 instead of $452,719,941, and instead of a falling off in exports of $57,292,745 there would have been an increase of $42,473,659. In other words, because of the lower prices ruling in 1895 than in 1894 we received $99,766,404 less on our exports of these ten commodities than we otherwise would have done. The quantity of these ten agricultural products exported increased 8½ per cent, while the total value decreased 11.2 per cent.

Let us take the fall in prices of cotton, wheat, and wool (three of the principal farm products) for a period of twenty-five years, commencing with 1870. We will divide these twenty-five years into five periods of five years each, and will take the average price for the first period, that is, for the five years covering the periods from 1870 to 1875, and we find that for the twenty years from 1875 to 1895 the farmers lost, by reason of a decline in price of cotton, $5,179,000,000, and for the same period and from the same cause they lost in the value of their wheat $2,589,000,000 and in the value of their wool $950,000,000. Divided into periods, we find the loss in the second period (that is, from 1875 to 1880) to have been on the three combined products $208,000,000 per year, $374,000,000 a year for the third period, $501,000,000 a year for the fourth period, and $660,000,000 a year for the fifth period.

Here we have a total loss to the farmers in twenty years of the stupendous sum of $8,817,000,000, or more than $1,500 for each farmer in the United States.

Sir, the people's homes are under mortgage, and, with constantly falling prices, they are helpless, hopeless. Unless something is done to avert the calamity they will soon be reduced to serfdom.

It is the old story we learned in history when schoolboys.

We know how Rome had her $2,000,000,000 in brass and copper money, and with this large circulating medium she was queen of the world. Then the damnable system of contraction began, and was continued until there was only $200,000,000 in circulation, and Rome fell. Near the close of the last century England was engaged in a bloody struggle with France. Her exchequer was empty. Her army, unpaid, was mutinous. In her dire extremity she issued a large volume of irredeemable paper money, and a war commenced amid a combination of circumstances gloomy and calamitous terminated in a blaze of glory, and England became mistress of the seas and planted her standard all around the globe. During this most wonderful era of prosperity over 3,000,000 acres of unimproved land were brought under cultivation, and the landowners of the nation increased over 160,000 in number. But here the cupidity of Shylock began to show itself, and England commenced to contract the volume of her currency. Now want and famine stalked abroad in the land, and the number of landowners was reduced to 30,000 by 1861, and to-day half the kingdom is owned by a dozen men.

We, too, have had a like experience. At the close of the war Shylock appeared on the scene, grasping, greedy, hungry, demanding his pound of flesh. We began to destroy the money and contract the volume. The consequences I have already portrayed as they affect the farmers. Let us see how it has been with the business men. In 1866 there were only 500 business failures, in 1867 the number rose to 2,386. In 1868 there was withdrawn from circulation and destroyed $473,000,000, and there were 2,608 failures.

In 1869 there was taken from circulation and destroyed $500,000,000, and the result was 2,799 failures; and so it went on year after year, the people's money being destroyed and failures increasing, until, in 1893, the number rose to 16,650. In 1894 there were 12,721 failures, with $149,595,434 liabilities, while in 1895 there were 13,013 failures, with liabilities of $158,842,445, an increase in the number of failures of 292 and in liabilities of $9,247,011.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this work of death and devastation is now going higher up! The farmers have suffered in silence, or, if there have been groans, tears, and remonstrances, they have been unheeded. Now the merchants and manufacturers begin to cry aloud. In 1894 the total liabilities of manufacturers who failed was $67,363,775, while in 1895 the liabilities were $73,920,073, an increase of $6,556,298.

Even the railroads are beginning to feel the blighting curse, their gross earnings having decreased from 1893 to 1894 the sum of $142,331,275. Well may there be consternation among the manufacturers, for another foe now confronts them—the almost pauper labor of Japan and China. Add to the difference in cost of production the difference in exchange, by reason of these countries being on a silver basis, and there is a monster, Mr. Speaker, which will swallow up into his capacious maw not only the farmers and laborers of this country, but also the manufacturers of the East, and when New England has been devastated and laid waste, her wheels rusting, her mills falling to decay, and her cities depopulated, he will lick his chops and cry for more, more.

One other symptom, and the most alarming one, and then I will have finished. And here, let me say that the road over which we are traveling is so broad, the way so clear, and has been so often traveled before that a wayfaring man, though a fool, can not be mistaken as to whither we are tending. I refer to the rapid concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a few. One per cent of the population owns one-half of our wealth, while 250,000 persons own more than 80 per cent of it. Within thirty years 50,000 persons will own, substantially, the United States of America. The world has never before witnessed such a rapid concentration of wealth in a few hands as we have seen in this country in the last twenty-five years.

Daniel Webster well said that liberty can not long endure where these conditions are found to exist. Such is the testimony of the wisest of mankind through all the ages. Such is the lesson of history emphasized in the downfall of Egypt when 2 per cent of its people owned 97 per cent of its wealth; of Persia when 1 per cent owned all the land; of Babylon when 2 per cent owned all the wealth; of Greece and Rome when 1,800 persons owned the then known world.

It was startlingly emphasized in the sack of Constantinople, in the decay of Spain's magnificent Empire, and in the lurid fires of the French Revolution.

Will history repeat itself?

How will you remedy this concentration? How can you reconcile a nation of paupers to toil in the shadow of splendor and magnificence to support the idle, worthless few? How are you going to answer these questions, which are being put vehemently, wildly, fiercely? They must be answered. They demand an answer in thunder tones, and woe be to this nation if it does not answer them.

The Sphinx destroyed every one who could not or would not answer her question. History has done the same with every nation which did not answer these questions.

I have tried to state fairly and impartially the conditions in this country and to show the causes which have produced them, and I tell you to-day, gentlemen, that you may pile on the protection mountain high to build up the manufacturing interests, but unless you also increase the volume of money, so the farmers and laborers can buy the manufactured products, you are doing a useless and silly thing. I am in favor of protection, but it is cruel, shameful, and outrageous to protect the goods of the manufacturer, so that he can maintain good prices, and then deprive the farmer of fair prices by depriving him of a sufficiently large circulating medium, so that his wheat, his corn, his cotton, wool, and other products must be sold for half price.

Do gentlemen suppose that the farmers can be thus cruelly wronged and robbed and the other classes continue to prosper? I tell you nay. I tell you that the trail of the serpent is over all classes, and if this wicked programme be kept up the final act in the terrible drama will be the utter collapse and overthrow of this structure which we have erected. If you destroy the foundation, as you have been doing for years with fiendish persistence, the whole structure will dissolve like the baseless fabric of a beautiful dream.

Give us more money by the free coinage of silver, issue a billion dollars of full legal-tender, irredeemable Treasury notes, destroy the national banks, pay off the bonded indebtedness, and then you will have the most prosperous nation the world ever saw.

The crisis is upon us, and we must meet it. We must act, and by our acts decide for the weal or woe of this nation.

Mr. Speaker—

> There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

That tide has come in the history of this country. The tide of protest, of popular indignation against the unlawful encroachments of the money power. The murmurs have grown to curses, mingled with the prayers of starving women and wails of helpless children. The masses of the country are like a great, troubled, restless, heaving ocean. The tide rises higher, the breakers roar, the thunders of popular clamor are almost deafening. Do you

not hear? Ah! can you not see? Wake up from your long sleep and stay the swiftly onrushing tide by just and wholesome laws ere it be too late.

Mr. WOODMAN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: When a man becomes wedded to an idea his usefulness as a statesman is gone. He is then a "specialist," with his whole mind, his whole energy, his whole ability directed in one channel, to the exclusion of other interests which are equally deserving of his attention.

If his specialty happens to be a popular one, and if he has studied it closely enough to be well posted, his praises are rung from one end of the Republic to the other and the newspapers speak of him as a great man. If his position, however tenable it may be, chances to be an unpopular one, he is denounced as a demagogue, generally by those who lack the intelligence and the specific information to comprehend his ideas.

Several things are noticeable, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion which has been going on on this subject for some days. One is reminded of the distinguished statesman who, some years ago, confidently expressed the fact that he knew all about finance, having devoted three hours of the previous evening to a careful examination of the entire subject.

The "silver question," so called, according to my understanding, is at present simply a renewal of the old greenback idea—that of stamping something with the United States coat of arms and calling it money. Early in the war I shipped from San Francisco to Liverpool at a salary of $50 a month. Arriving, I received my pay and went up into Great Howard street to buy exchange. My salary was paid in greenbacks carrying the signature of that great statesman, Salmon P. Chase, and I was obliged to exchange $3 of them for $1 of gold. That trifling experience satisfied me of the futility of attempting to legislate nothing into money, and, while silver is not "nothing," it is equivalent, in the present sense, to half of it.

On the other hand, there are many facts to be taken into consideration. It will not do to forget that great banking syndicates have their clutches on the throats of the American people by virtue of the fact that their influence—hypnotic or otherwise—is sufficiently strong to enable them to largely control the action of the Executive. The Treasury Department insists on paying out gold on demand, and yet takes no steps to replenish the supply of the precious metal thus diminished. While it pays its obligations in gold, it receives its dues in any kind of money at the pleasure of the payer.

On the 1st day of February, according to the Treasurer's statement, there was in the Treasury of the United States about $50,000,000 in gold, $22,000,000 of silver, and $72,000,000 in United States notes—about $144,000,000 in all, not counting bank notes, fractional coin, etc.

One-half of this is paper currency. Of the coin, two-sevenths, in round numbers, is silver and five-sevenths is gold. If the Administration is committed to gold, why does it not require that a relative proportion of gold be paid to it in the duties on imports and in the amounts received by the payments on articles subject to revenue, and thus provide an equilibrium on which receipts and disbursements, which should be made in like proportions, may be based?

In other words, why should the Treasury of the United States be made the plaything of money changers? Why should a few European countries, while apparently keeping their currency at par (though through their secret agents paying a premium for it, in order to enlarge their store), continually force this country into repeated issues of interest-bearing obligations? The impression has been created over the civilized world that this country is bankrupt as to its cash, but on account of its wonderful resources its credit is good; that it has been driven to the sharks, the same as an English lordling with entailed expectations, but short of cash, to obtain the means to keep up his establishment.

Apropos, a story. When Napoleon was planning his great Russian campaign, studying maps, and plats, and forces, and channels of supplies, late into the night, he observed that his private secretary was busy and evidently worried over some private matters and papers. Finally the secretary fell asleep, and the Emperor, glancing over his shoulder as he sat with his head on his desk, slumbering, saw that the papers were duns from money brokers. Napoleon shook him by the shoulders and awoke him, saying, "You have been among the English," and the secretary confessed that, driven to desperation by his private troubles, he had patronized the money lenders, and that their usurious and other exactions and their importunities for payment had nearly driven him crazy. Napoleon replied that he would at once raise his salary till he could be rid of the English money lenders, pay his debts, and then warned him that if he ever borrowed money again to secure it from gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. We have borrowed money from the English till they are impressed with the idea that they run the finances of this country. Under this Administration they have evidently been doing so. But it only means that we are short of money. Raise enough revenue to pay them off, put intelligence instead of modiocrity in charge of the finances of this great Republic, make our income greater than our outgo, and we will have no difficulty with our gold reserve. The free coinage of silver has little to do with the matter. American silver might be coined; the greenbacks and Treasury notes might be retired. If done in equal amounts, no harm would be done and no contraction of currency result. If the Government should buy silver, coin it, and call in the five hundred millions of greenbacks and Treasury notes complained of by the President—pay for them in silver—no special evil would result except from the fact that the people would pay for the money one and a half times its value. They would pay its full value to get it, and pay one-half its value in addition in their contribution to the revenues which would enable the Treasury Department to secure it.

Money is a most remarkable thing. Were we an isolated nation, having no relations with foreign countries, the greenbacks or Treasury notes would be the proper medium of exchange. But we are not. Our immense imports and exports compel a recognition of the fact that our medium of exchange must be the same as that of the commercial nations of the civilized world. Gold is the only metal which has succeeded in maintaining that position. It may not be just, it may not be right, in theory, but we are dealing with facts, not theories, and this is the fact.

It is the duty of Congress to legislate not for a few capitalists, not for a few mine owners, but with an eye single to the best good of the greatest number of the people of the country.

The Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes a. m.) adjourned until 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *February 10, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. The Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN, offered the following prayer:

Give ear, O God, we beseech Thee, and hear our prayer. As thus in the midst of routine duties we pause, help us to consecrate our lives anew to Thee, that the work of this day may be acceptable in Thy sight.

We hear with profound sorrow of the death of one member of this House. Our hearts, our sympathies, go out to those who mourn his loss; and we pray Thee that Thou wilt comfort them as Thou alone can do. Help us all to be ready when the summons may come to us. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the sad event which has been brought to my notice since I came into the Hall, and also in view of the desire of some members to have a little further time for general debate on House bill 2904 than has already been ordered by the House, and in view of the further fact that to-day, under the rules, would belong to the Committee on the District of Columbia for District business, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow from the reading of the Journal until 5 o'clock, if such time may be desired by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be devoted to the consideration of business reported by that committee; that from 5 o'clock to-morrow afternoon during the remainder of the legislative day of Tuesday and also during the legislative day of Wednesday general debate on House bill 2904 continue in Committee of the Whole, to close at the termination of the legislative day of Wednesday; that on Thursday at noon the House in Committee of the Whole proceed to consider for amendment and debate under the five-minute rule the bill with the Senate substitute; and that at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon the House in Committee of the Whole proceed to vote on the question of recommending concurrence or nonconcurrence, without intervening motion and without further debate, and that the bill as it may have been disposed of by the Committee of the Whole be reported to the House.

Mr. HARTMAN. Does that cut off amendments?

Mr. DINGLEY. This proposition allows from Thursday noon until 4 o'clock on that day for offering and voting upon such amendments as may be in order.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Maine, if I understood him correctly, used a term which he did not intend to use. He spoke of the Committee of the Whole voting on Thursday next upon the question of concurrence.

Mr. DINGLEY. I meant that in Committee of the Whole we should proceed to dispose of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. And I presume if the District Committee should get through with their business to-morrow before 5 o'clock we should at once go on with this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir; that is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that to-morrow from the reading of the Journal until 5 o'clock, or so much of that time as may be necessary, be devoted to business from the Committee on the District of Columbia; that the rest of the legislative day be devoted to general debate upon House bill No. 2904, known as the bond bill; that the general debate continue until the close of the session on Wednesday——

Mr. DINGLEY. The legislative day of Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Until the close of the legislative day of Wednesday; that Thursday, from 12 o'clock until 4 o'clock, be devoted to debate and amendment under the five-minute rule, the final vote to be taken at 4 o'clock.

Mr. DINGLEY. On the question of concurrence or nonconcurrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not want to interpose formal objection if this proposition expresses the mind of the House; but it occurs to me that the reporting of the bill to the House had better be postponed until Saturday, the debate continuing until 4 o'clock of that day.

Many MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. DINGLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that Saturday is a bad day for taking the vote, so many members are then away.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the proposition as stated? The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 72) directing the Public Printer to supply the Senate and House libraries each with 20 additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

DEATH OF HON. W. H. CRAIN.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of one of its members, WILLIAM H. CRAIN, a Representative from Texas. I shall not detain the House further at this time than to say that I shall ask the House at some future day to pause in its deliberations in order to pay tribute to the memory of the deceased. For the present I shall content myself with asking the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. W. H. CRAIN, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of nine members of the House be appointed by the Speaker, to act with such Senators as may be selected, to attend the funeral of the deceased; that the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House shall take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased at his home, and that the necessary expenses attending the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the adoption of the resolutions just read.

The resolutions were adopted; and the Speaker announced the appointment of the following-named members as the committee on the part of the House, under the resolution:

Mr. PENDLETON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KYLE, Mr. MCDEARMON, Mr. MILES, Mr. MILNES, Mr. LEONARD, Mr. EDDY, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

And then, in accordance with the resolutions, the House (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Oconto Harbor, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting certain recommendations and communications relating to the purchase of certain land adjacent to the military reservation of Key West Barracks, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Hon. S. Wike, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Supervising Inspector-General and report of Board of Supervising Inspectors, in response to House resolution of January 21, 1896, relating to the safety of the public in ocean travel—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, replying to the House resolution of February 4 relating to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILLIPS (by request): A bill: (H. R. 5815) to provide for the better manning and equipment of vessels on the Northwestern Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5816) providing for gas buoys on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5817) to provide for the observance of the 4th day of July as a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A resolution (House Res. No. 162) authorizing the Doorkeeper to employ 15 additional folders—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5791) for the benefit of James W. Hall, of Grant County, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Julia A. Jameson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5793) granting a pension to Mary L. Tweddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5794) to pay Joel L. Baugh for services rendered to the Old Settler Cherokee Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 5795) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Segondollar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 5796) for the relief of Eli Rinehart, of Angola, Steuben County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) to pension Ellen D. Merrell, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting a pension to Mary M. Hyer, of Allen County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) to correct the military record of William Frederick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5800) to pension Elizabeth Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) to pension John Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) to pension Michael M. Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 5803) to quiet the title of certain lands in the State of Mississippi, and for the relief of Eli Ayres or his legal representatives, etc.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) for the relief of Henry S. Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5805) to pension Eliza Ann Bridges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 5806) for the relief of Adams & Wickes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 5807) to pension Solomon F. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 5808) for the relief of Leo L. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 5809) to correct the military record of John L. Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) to place the name of Sarah G. Almy, widow of Rear-Admiral John J. Almy, upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 5811) to correct the service record of James Marley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) to increase the pension of Richard Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) granting a pension to Abner Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Claverack, Hudson, Philmont, West Sand Lake, Wynantskill, and the counties of Columbia and Rensselaer, State of New York, in relation to the sale of intoxicants at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union,

of Claverack, Hudson, Philmont, West Sand Lake, Wynantskill, and the counties of Columbia and Rensselaer, N. Y., to forbid the sale of intoxicants at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BULL (by request): Petition of S. A. Steward, for an investigation of the courts of Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CRUMP: Resolution passed at a mass meeting of citizens of West Bay City, Mich., praying that the Government use upon the Christian powers of Europe all possible influence to end the Turkish atrocities—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Shipmasters' Association of Bay City, Mich., objecting to the passage of House bill No. 4331—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of F. H. Smith and 32 others, together with W. H. C. Henry and 72 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of 1,000 inhabitants of Oklahoma Territory, urging the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of 500 taxpayers in Lincoln County, Okla., praying for the passage of the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of R. A. Stratton, W. H. Abbott, A. M. Shartle, and others, of Conneaut Lake and Stony Point, Pa., urging a change in the immigration laws, and approving the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: Petition of Daniel Dyer and many other citizens of Hebron, Nebr., praying for a service pension to honorably discharged Union soldiers and sailors of at least $8 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Belfast, Fredonia, Little Valley, and Napoli, N. Y., asking for the prohibition of the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Belfast, Fredonia, Little Valley, and Napoli, N. Y., asking that the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island be forbidden—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HULING: Petition of various citizens of Kanawha County, W. Va., protesting against the appropriation of the public money for the use of religious sects—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of 247 citizens of California, requesting the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIEFER: Petition of Thomas B. Maloney and others, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the American Medical Association, urging Congress to inaugurate such legislation as will confer upon the officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy the same status, pay, and emoluments as are now accorded to the medical officers of the Army—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York City, asking for the passage of a general, practicable bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Unionvale, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Unionvale, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: Petition of ex-soldiers and citizens of Albion, Ind., urging the passage of the service-pension bill granting $8 per month to every honorably discharged Union soldier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the First Baptist Church of Winchester, Mass., against the continuance of the appropriations for sectarian Indian schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Protest of the Shipmasters' Association, No. 6, of Milwaukee, Wis., against bridging the Detroit River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of Harry H. Moore and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Resolutions of North Stonington (Conn.) Grange, in favor of legislation to regulate the manufacture and sale of "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Camden and Norway, N. Y., in relation to the sale of intoxicants at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Camden and Norway, N. Y., against the sale of intoxicants at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of the Toledo (Ohio) Post-Office Clerks' Association, in behalf of House bill No. 3273—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STAHLE: Resolutions of Post No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 306, for the relief of Union soldiers confined in rebel prisons during the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Shinar Commandery, No. 143, Knights of Malta, of Delta, Pa., denouncing the outrages in Armenia, favoring belligerent rights for Cuba, and favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Bishop E. Curtis, Calvin Griffin, William Hall, and 30 other citizens of Cass County, Mich., asking for the passage of a bill granting a pension of $8 per month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy during the war of the rebellion and was honorably discharged, and that the widows of said soldiers shall be pensioned at $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of H. E. Squier, M. O. Rowland, B. F. Heckert, T. M. Harvey, and 150 other citizens of Van Buren County, Mich., asking for the passage of House bill No. 1111, for the relief of William E. Keene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany a bill to correct the service record of James Marley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to increase the pension of Richard Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Abner Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of ex-soldiers and sailors residing at Ash Grove, Mo., for service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers concerning the Soldiers' Home at Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of ex soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the war of the rebellion, now residing in Piatt County, Ill.; also members of McPherson Post, No. 79, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, favoring the passage of a law granting a pension of $8 per month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war of the rebellion and was honorably discharged, and a pension of not less than $12 per month to the widows of such as have died—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of McLean County, Ill., urging that an act designed to secure a better grade of immigration, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE, be passed—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 11, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, of the 10th instant, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for printing and binding for the Navy Department, to be executed under the direction of the Public Printer, for the current fiscal year, $25,000, and requesting that it be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior in response to a resolution of January 23, 1896, calling for information as to the ways in which the existing laws are violated, the extent of such violations, the defects, if any, in the existing laws which enable such violations to occur, and suggesting such changes in the laws now in force as will enable the United States to regulate or prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Alaska, transmitting the report of the governor of Alaska for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, upon the subject; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Mrs. Browne, president, and Mrs. M. R. Ellis, secretary, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Jersey; a petition of the officers of the Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Camden, N. J., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ocean Grove, N. J., praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that liberal appropriations be made for the protection of the seacoast cities of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented the petition of Mark Orr and 16 other citizens of Dividing Creek, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by Appomattox Post, No. 72, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GORMAN presented a petition of the president and faculty of the Maryland Agricultural and Mechanical College, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 735, to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Committee on Philanthropic Labor of the Baltimore (Md.) Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, representing 3,000 persons, praying for the enactment of legislation to abrogate all United States liquor licenses in States, counties, and districts having prohibitory laws against the sale of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Committee on Philanthropic Labor of the Baltimore (Md.) Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to any Indian who is holding his land in severalty; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Philanthropic Committee of the Baltimore (Md.) Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, and a petition of the Ministerial Union of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent in the District of Columbia and the Territories from 16 to 18 years, and for the enactment of improved Territorial divorce laws; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Union of Baltimore, Md., praying for the establishment of a labor commission and for the substitution of voluntary arbitration for railway strikes; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Union of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Woodsboro, Leeds, and Childs, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. VOORHEES presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Christian Church of Marion, Ind., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, to prohibit the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of sundry watchmen in the Government Departments, ex-soldiers of the late war, praying for the passage of the bill proposing to advance the salaries of Government watchmen; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of sundry ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy, of New Castle, Colo., praying for the enactment of the service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORDON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., praying that an appropriation be made for the continuance of the improvement of the harbor at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, of Savannah, Ga., praying for the establishment of a harbor of refuge at some point between the Southern and North Atlantic ports; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of F. M. Lupton, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of A. W. Ward and 39 other citizens of Silver Brook, Pa.; of J. S. Edwards and 87 other citizens of Osceola, Pa., and of T. F. Ayres and 42 other citizens of New Tripoli, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of A. W. Ward and 39 other citizens of Silver Brook, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Everett, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting appropriations for institutions under ecclesiastical control; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of Mrs. Maria Galbraith and sundry other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, to prohibit the collection of United States taxes on liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., and a petition of sundry citizens of Marion, Oreg., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbia City, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dryad, Wash., remonstrating against the appropriation of moneys for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Vancouver, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Columbia River between the city of Vancouver and the mouth of the Willamette River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1242, to improve the merchant-marine engineer service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of King County, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Dwamish, White, and Black rivers, in that county; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of Mrs. S. H. Webb, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Florida, praying that a Sunday-rest law be enacted by Congress for the District of Columbia equal to the most efficient State law on the subject; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 686) to increase the pension of Francis M. Durham, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1323) granting a pension to Maria Somerlat, widow of Valentine Somerlat, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1189) granting a pension to Eliza Sandford, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1621) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1128) granting a pension to Isabella Morrow, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1232) to license billiard tables, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 700) for the relief of John E. Welch, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

bill (H. R. 162) regulating proof of death in certain pension cases, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1924) granting a pension to Carrie L. Yeaton, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Mary Newman, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. BRICE), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Caroline Stockton Brown, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yesterday an amendment proposed to be offered to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] and referred to the Committee on Pensions. The Committee on Pensions instruct me to report it back favorably, with a recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, without printing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. PALMER. The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 552) granting accrued pension to the surviving children of Shubal York, surgeon of Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteers, a bill which was introduced by my colleague [Mr. CULLOM]—I am not sure that he is present—directed me to report the bill back and recommend its indefinite postponement. I ask the permission of the Senate to make a brief statement.

The bill proposes to give a pension to the two surviving children of Dr. Shubal York, surgeon of the Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteers, who on the 28th day of March, 1864, was killed in a political riot at Charleston, Ill. An application was made by Mrs. Elizabeth York for a pension, which was refused by the Pension Bureau upon the ground that her husband, although at home on veteran furlough, was not killed in the line of his duty. In April, 1866, an act was passed by Congress giving to Mrs. York a pension of $25 a month and an additional $2 per month for each of her children. That act was approved April 17, 1866. Mrs. York drew that pension until June 5, 1877, the date of her death.

This bill proposes to allow a pension to the two surviving children of Mrs. York, who are now over 30 years of age, for the short period intervening between the 28th of March, 1864, the date of the death of their father, and the date of the passage of the act in favor of the mother, the 17th day of April, 1866. The Committee on Pensions direct me to report the bill back adversely upon the ground that these parties have no claim, and it would be but the mere payment of arrears of pensions. I will state that the bill is accompanied by a written report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Mallery, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Marion McKibben, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1743) to establish an additional land office in the State of Montana, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Fanny Moale Gibbon, to report it without amendment. I ask leave to file later a report in this case.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Leave will be granted.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 264) providing for the location and purchase of public lands for reservoir sites, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1380) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MANTLE, from the Select Committee on National Banks, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1804) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

OLD POST-OFFICE BUILDING IN CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. VEST. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1117) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the old post-office lot and building for the use of the commercial bodies of the city, to report it with an amendment in the form of a substitute.

Mr. TILLMAN. The bill has a favorable report, and I should like to have the unanimous consent of the Senate to put it on its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill and then the substitute reported by the committee.

The Secretary read the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the city of Charleston, S. C., is hereby given the right to occupy, use, and control the real estate in the said city purchased by the United States from said city on February 14, 1818, for the sum of $60,000, the building thereon being known as "The Exchange," and for a more exact description of which real estate reference is made to the deed of conveyance from the city of Charleston to the United States executed on the date aforesaid, and now of record: *Provided*, That the said property shall be used by said city for municipal purposes and by the public commercial bodies of said city, and if such use shall at any time be discontinued and abandoned, the control and occupation of said property shall be resumed by the United States, and all of the rights hereby granted to the city of Charleston shall cease and be terminated: *Provided also*, That said property shall be kept in good condition and repair by said city of Charleston during its occupancy thereof, natural and unavoidable decay excepted, and if at any time the United States shall determine to resume control and occupation of said property, the city of Charleston shall, after receiving 60 days' written notice to that effect, relinquish the rights herein granted, and deliver possession of said premises to the proper officials of the United States: *Provided also*, That the city of Charleston shall during its occupation and control of said premises pay all taxes or other charges thereon, and the United States shall in no event be held responsible in any way for any expense connected with said premises.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the amount to be paid?

Mr. PLATT. Nothing is to be paid.

Mr. VEST. It was purchased by the United States in 1818 from the city of Charleston for $60,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the city of Charleston refund that sum?

Mr. VEST. The city of Charleston gets nothing except the temporary use of this building. It remains the property of the United States. They simply want to use it for the meeting of the commercial bodies and for municipal purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is it used for now?

Mr. VEST. It has been used for a post-office, but was injured by the earthquake, and is not occupied at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I will state——

Mr. QUAY. If the Senator from Ohio will permit me, as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I will state that this is an old landmark in the city of Charleston, and that if sold it would be torn down and destroyed. I think it is more as a matter of sentiment than for any other reason that the people of Charleston desire its preservation. The bill merely places the building in the custody of the city of Charleston, as I understand it, until such time as the Government of the United States may desire to resume its occupancy.

Mr. PLATT. As the bill was read I did not hear any provision for the Government to resume its occupancy.

Mr. QUAY. I do not remember the wording of the bill, but that is my understanding.

Mr. VEST. I could not hear what the Senator from Connecticut said.

Mr. PLATT. I say I did not hear any provision read for the Government to resume its occupancy.

Mr. VEST. Yes, there is a provision, direct and emphatic.

Mr. QUAY. That was the understanding of the committee.

Mr. VEST. It provides that if at any time the Government of the United States desires to resume the control it is to give sixty days' notice in writing.

Mr. PLATT. Upon an examination of the amendment I see that is the case.

Mr. VEST. The bill is exceedingly well guarded in every respect.

Mr. HOAR. I think if this building could be presented to the city of Charleston as a memorial or token of the heroism of the people of that city at the time of the earthquake it would be a very excellent thing to do. I think the conduct of that city in the face of that terrible calamity was one of the most gratifying and brilliant examples in all American history.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant to the

city of Charleston, S. C., the use of certain real estate in said city on which is situated the building known as 'The Exchange.'"

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 2030) to provide for Government control of freight railways; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2031) to authorize the laying of subways in the streets, roads, avenues, and alleys of the District of Columbia, to provide for placing the present overhead wires therein, and to amend the charters of the Washington Gas Light Company and the Georgetown Gas Light Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK introduced a bill (S. 2032) to grant right of way over the public domain for pipe lines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2033) granting a pension to Mary M. Hemmenway; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 2034) to provide for the distribution of the official edition of the United States circuit courts of appeal reports; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2035) granting a pension to Julia D. Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2036) granting a pension to John Benjamin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CANNON introduced a bill (S. 2037) to provide times and places for holding terms of United States courts in Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2038) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay from the 35 per cent assigned by the Old Settler or Western Cherokees, for certain legal services rendered to them; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 2039) to authorize the private use of water power of the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2040) giving power to impose oaths and punish contempts and resistance to United States officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 2041) for the relief of the estate of Harry I. Todd, deceased, late keeper of the Kentucky penitentiary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2042) for the relief of David A. McKnight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2043) for the relief of the executrix of the estate of James J. Newell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2044) for a light-vessel off Fire Island, New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2045) granting a pension to Harriet R. Matlack; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 2046) to prohibit the issuance of bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government by the Secretary of the Treasury, or other officer of the Government, without the authority of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN introduced a bill (S. 2047) extending the time within which the University of Utah shall occupy lands heretofore granted to it; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2048) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims for property of residents of the United States destroyed by Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 2049) for the relief of Thomas Stack; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committtee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2050) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2051) for the relief of E. C. Trimble; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 2052) to correct an act entitled "An act to pension George Hunter"; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 2053) to provide better facilities for the Federal courts in New York City; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2054) for the relief of Rinaldo P. Smith, of Baltimore, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2055) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Christine C. Barnard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2056) to provide for deepening the channel from Hampton Roads to the navy-yard near Norfolk, Va., and making an appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2057) to authorize the purchase of certain manuscript papers and correspondence of Thomas Jefferson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2058) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of William B. Isaacs & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2059) for the relief of William Bushby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2060) for the relief of Briscoe B. Bouldin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2061) granting a pension to Ruth Prather; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2062) granting a pension to Thomas W. Moody; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2063) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Industrial School for Girls of Alabama; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 2064) to increase the pension of Emma O. Bacon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2065) for the relief of John F. Anderson and Cary C. Barr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 2066) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Galtney, deceased, late of Yazoo County, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CANNON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 75) providing for the disposition of certain property now in the hands of the receiver of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BONDS OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BRICE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4052) validating certain bonds of the Territory of New Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY C. ROSE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 366) for the relief of Henry C. Rose, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The applicant in the case, Mr. Henry C. Rose, has already been pensioned by the Department.

The motion was agreed to.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That on the 22d day of February current, immediately after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address shall be read to the Senate by the President pro tempore.

IMPRISONMENT OF JOHN L. WALLER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, in answer to the resolution of the Senate of December 9, 1895, a report from the Secretary of State, accompanied by copies of correspondence and other papers, in regard to the case of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States, at present in the custody of the French Government.

It will be seen upon examination, as would, of course, be expected, that there is a slight conflict of evidence upon some of the features of Mr. Waller's case. Nevertheless, upon a fair and just consideration of all the facts and circumstances as presented, and especially in view of Mr. Waller's own letters, the

conclusions set forth in the report of the Secretary of State do not appear to admit of any reasonable doubt, nor to leave open to the Executive any other course of action than that adopted and acted upon as therein stated.

It is expected that Mr. Waller's release from imprisonment will be immediately forthcoming.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 11, 1896.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provision of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 879) to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory;

A bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota;

A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889;

A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896."

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. QUAY. Let the resolution offered by me in reference to the revenue bill be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], coming over from a previous day.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. QUAY on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, yesterday gave notice that he would desire to-morrow to call up the revenue bill for consideration, and as the passage of the resolution to-day would merely embarrass him and delay the bill, I will agree that it shall go over without prejudice to await the pleasure of the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me to call up Senate joint resolution 43?

Mr. HALE. First let me get the appropriation bill up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be read.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the committee amendments as reached in the reading may be voted upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. What is the precise request?

Mr. HALE. It is the invariable practice of the Senate and saves one reading of the bill. It proceeds as if it had been read in full, the amendments of the committee being voted upon as they are reached. It saves the time of reading the bill. I have never known it to be objected to.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will not make that request at present, but wait until the bill is absolutely taken up. I wish to examine it for a moment.

Mr. HALE. The bill has been taken up. I will state that in the course of my experience in the Senate I have never known any question raised about the needless reading of the text of a bill.

Mr. HOAR. Of an appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. Of an appropriation bill. It is considered clause by clause, as other bills are not.

Mr. ALLISON. Every clause is read.

Mr. HALE. It is read, every clause, as we reach it. There is nothing to be gained as the result of an objection to this course, except that the Secretary rises and reads the entire text of the bill as he would read an ordinary bill that is not considered clause by clause. The Senator can, if he chooses, obstruct to the extent of taking up the time in reading the bill, but it has never been done before by any Senator who served in this body.

Mr. HARRIS. It is merely a waiver of the formal reading.

Mr. HILL. I simply suggested to the Senator, for I assumed he was going to allow the Senator from North Dakota to call up the seed bill, to wait a few moments. I saw other gentlemen rising to present morning business, and I was going to examine the bill, it being laid aside temporarily, that I could see how many amendments there were.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can take such course as he decides upon. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] gave notice yesterday that he would desire, at the conclusion of the morning business to-day, to submit some remarks to the Senate, and the rule is in such cases to grant that by courtesy to a Senator. I yield to him for that purpose. If after that the Senator from North Dakota, who is in charge of the seed bill, can secure a vote without any further debate, I am willing that that shall be done, and then I must ask the Senate to go on and finish the appropriation bill. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BLANCHARD rose.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will yield to ascertain what the Senator desires.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Louisiana if he will not kindly yield for a few minutes until a vote can be had upon what is known as the seed joint resolution. I think that an agreement has been reached among those who have participated in the debate which will result in a vote being taken at once, if I can have the time.

Mr. HALE. Not to lead to further debate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand there is to be no debate.

Mr. BLANCHARD. With the consent of the Senator from Maine, who has yielded to me, I am willing to yield to the Senator from North Dakota, provided there is no further debate upon the joint resolution.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The pending question is upon the substitute offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and distribute valuable seeds for the year 1896, as has been done in preceding years; and as the public exigency requires that the valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants to be purchased may be ready for distribution at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to procure them by open purchase or contract at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold: *Provided*, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GEORGE, the title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute seeds, bulbs, etc., as has been done in preceding years."

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. BLANCHARD Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution relating to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, being the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, may be temporarily laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution referred to by the Senator from Louisiana, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution reported by Mr. DAVIS from the Committee on Foreign Relations January 20, 1896, as follows:

Concurrent resolution relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That whereas President Monroe, in his message to Congress of December 2, A. D. 1823, deemed it proper to assert as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, were thenceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power; and

Whereas President Monroe further declared in that message that the United States would consider any attempt by the Allied Powers of Europe to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; that with the existing colonies and dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and should not interfere, but that with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and further reiterated in that message that it is impossible that the Allied Powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; and

Whereas the doctrine and policy so proclaimed by President Monroe have since been repeatedly asserted by the United States by Executive declaration and action upon occasions and exigencies similar to the particular occasion and exigency which caused them to be first announced, and have been ever since their promulgation, and now are, the rightful policy of the United States: Therefore

Be it resolved, That the United States of America reaffirms and confirms the doctrine and principles promulgated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, A. D. 1823, and declares that it will assert and maintain that doctrine and those principles, and will regard any infringement thereof, and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continents, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right of sovereignty or dominion in the same in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety by or through force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate, or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American Isthmus, whether under unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes or under any other unfounded pretensions, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and as an interposition which it would be impossible in any form for the United States to regard with indifference.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, in the debate upon our foreign relations had in the Senate during the present session up to this time two speeches have been delivered—one by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], the other by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]—both of which practically denied the existence of a distinctively American policy known as the Monroe doctrine.

They do not dispute that President Monroe, in his message of December, 1823, outlined a policy which he recommended this Government to pursue in a certain contingency which it was then thought might happen. But they do deny that he laid down a doctrine to be maintained in all the time to come as a distinct national policy.

Whether Mr. Monroe intended to announce a policy to endure for all time or merely one to meet the then emergencies is perhaps immaterial to the present discussion. It is sufficient that public sentiment among our people, both in the past and in the present, held and holds to the idea that the spirit, at least, of his message breathed a national policy which the honor, the dignity, and the safety of this Republic require shall be asserted and maintained.

American statesmen have differed in the past, as they do now, as to whether an enduring national policy was announced by President Monroe. The doctrine found its first advocacy in Congress from the eloquent tongue of Daniel Webster.

In 1853 Mr. Cass, leader of the Democratic party in the Senate, introduced resolutions asserting the Monroe doctrine in respect to Cuba, then, as now, torn by revolution.

Mr. Seward, speaking on the resolutions, said that—

As a practical question the Monroe doctrine had ceased to be.

From this we imply that he thought the policy recommended by Mr. Monroe was intended merely to meet the immediate emergency which drew it forth, to avoid the immediate danger then menacing. But why did Mr. Seward take this position? He gave the reason.

It is obsolete—

He said—

because on this continent we are sovereign.

But he was wrong in the confidence he then expressed, and he lived to see it. Ten years later he was Secretary of State in Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, when we ourselves were in the throes of revolution. He saw France, taking advantage of our domestic troubles, overrun Mexico with the troops of Napoleon III, and a brother of the Emperor of Austria seated upon the throne of Iturbide.

But a change came about. Our struggles were ended by the restoration of the Union. Relieved from concern over the domestic situation, the United States was free to act. Mr. Seward's opportunity had come. A hint to the Government of France by the American minister accredited to the imperial throne of Napoleon, and a few broad intimations whispered to the French minister here that what had been done in Mexico could not be tolerated by the United States, resulted in the withdrawal of French support, and down went imperialism in Mexico, red with the blood of the ill-fated Maximilian.

Mr. President, I hold, in common with the prevalent American idea upon this subject, that the message of President Monroe should be interpreted as announcing a distinct American policy which was to endure.

I hold, further, that if it did not assert such a doctrine, the greater the reason that an American policy relating to such matters should be now asserted.

At the time of this message the Republic ranked among the minor powers of the world, though enjoying security from its isolation.

Our voice, nevertheless, was heeded. The Holy Alliance desisted from the purpose of assisting Spain in the recovery of her revolted colonies, and the threat to assert the divine right of kings on American soil and to suppress democracy in America was abandoned forever. It has not been heard of since.

The true Monroe doctrine, developed into the new American doctrine, if you will, embodies the following:

No European power will be allowed to establish monarchical government upon the ruins of an American republic.

No European power will be permitted by conquest, cession, treaty, or negotiation to acquire additional territory in America.

Territory, whether on the mainland or in contiguous waters, now held by one European power, can not be transferred to another.

The Monroe doctrine, it is claimed, is not an accepted principle of international law. Neither is the doctrine acquiesced in by all Europe, known as the "balance of power," an accepted principle of international law. Yet if any nation should attempt by conquest or peaceable cession to acquire any territory in Europe not its own, every great power in Europe would fly to arms to prevent it. It would be tantamount to a declaration of war over there.

But when we on this side of the Atlantic invoke the same demand for America, everybody on the other side seems to regard it preposterous. And yet, Mr. President, the American doctrine, first promulgated by Mr. Monroe, is just as well founded and as capable of defense as the other.

Whether the Monroe doctrine was incorporated in resolutions adopted by Congress or not, it was accepted generally by the mass of our people as a virile American policy.

It may be true, and in the abstract doubtless is true, that public policies in this country can not spring into existence by the fiat of the Executive, nor derive shape and potency from a Presidential message. That the creation or adoption of a line of policy belongs more particularly to another branch of the Government is admitted.

But here was a doctrine proclaimed by the Executive for the purpose of warning certain European powers against the attempt to carry into execution certain evil designs meditated against certain American countries. This voice of warning crossed the Atlantic and was heeded. The menace of coercion of the derelict countries ceased. Thus was the doctrine enunciated by the President, even though not vitalized by the proper sanctions of legislative approval, brought to the test of actual application, and it stood the test. Henceforth it did not lie in the mouth of any American statesman to deny the existence of the doctrine.

The historical facts out of which were evolved the declarations of that message have been briefly stated by Senators who have, prior to this, addressed the Senate on the subject. A more comprehensive statement of these facts, however, would, I think, lead to a better understanding of the subject.

The Holy Alliance, which occupied the forefront of European politics for a decade of years, probably had its inception in the secret articles of the treaty of Chaumont, in March, 1814, and its policy was partially developed and defined in the deliberations of the Congress of Vienna and the treaty of Paris after the final downfall of the first Bonaparte.

It is difficult, at this distance of time, to affirm that this league had at the outset any distinct course of action marked out for itself. The Czar Alexander, under the influence of Mme. Krudener, seems at that time to have become the victim of a morbid or romantic superstition by which he erected an ideal confederacy of princes who were to be governed wholly by the precepts and principles of Christianity—as Christianity was understood by them—in all their dealings with each other and with their subjects. His fellow-sovereigns, seizing upon a whim which could be made a potent instrument for the development of absolute kingcraft, readily

humored this notion of a modern golden age, and together they entered into a compact by which they bound themselves, with the help of the Holy Trinity, to regulate their governmental practice and their intercourse with each other by the rules inculcated by religion and humanity; to consider themselves, in their control of their respective subjects, in loco parentis; to render to one another, upon occasion, the assistance due to neighbors and brethren; and, in short, to exercise their authority as the heads of Christian families, the government of which was a personal trust confided to them by the grace of the Almighty.

As a matter of course this Utopian scheme, containing, as it did, the essential germ of the doctrine of legitimacy, almost at once matured into a practical and operative line of conduct very different from that contemplated by the dreamy speculations of the great autocrat of the North, and the first outcome of which was the supervision of the then newly reinstated Bourbon régime in France. To this primary function was soon added the more extensive task of a general oversight of things political in the interest of monarchical institutions throughout continental Europe. The national constituents of this alliance were at first the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia, to whom the King of France was afterwards (in 1818) added. England, although never a formal party to this league, does not appear to have disclaimed its political principles as they were originally announced, and it was then understood that the reason of her not being one of the actual contracting parties at some time prior to 1818, arose not so much from any inherent objections to the plan of operations pursued by the alliance as from the technical disability under which the Prince Regent labored to affix his sign manual, along with the other sovereigns, to any political compact, his Government being compelled to act, under the theory of the British constitution, not through the personality of its monarch, but through the medium of a ministry which should at all times be accountable to the nation, at the peril of its political life in case of political misconduct.

This alliance was further developed and strengthened at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in the autumn of 1818, and its purpose was then clearly ascertained to be the reassertion of the doctrines of legitimacy and absolutism in all their rigor, and the strangling of popular or constitutional government whenever and wherever it might appear; although at the same time these allied rulers pledged themselves before the world to "the strictest observance of the law of nations." The good faith of this promise appeared in the declarations of these same sovereigns at the congress held at Troppan, in Silesia, in October, 1820—

That the European powers have an undoubted right to take a hostile attitude in regard to those states in which the overthrow of the government might operate as an example.

The Congress of Troppan was in a few weeks adjourned to Laybach, in Styria. The purpose of the conclaves was the intervention of the allied rulers against the further spread of the revolutionary spirit which had latterly become rampant throughout peninsular Europe. Revolution followed revolution, and in Naples, in Sardinia, and in Spain the constitution of Cadiz of 1812 was successively proclaimed. From the Congress of Laybach emanated a circular letter, under date of May 12, 1821, in which the Holy Alliance took the high-handed step of declaring—

Null and disallowed by the public law of Europe any pretended reform effected by revolt and open force.

In consonance with this declaration, and in obedience to the behests of the allied sovereigns, Austria at once dispatched an army to the Italian peninsula, crushed the revolutionary movements there with an iron hand, and delivered the people over to their absolutist rulers. The political situation in continental Europe still remaining exceedingly strained, and its tension being in no wise relaxed by the efforts of the Holy Alliance to reestablish purely despotic governments, the sovereigns composing that league deemed the occasion fitting for a new conference, and the result was the Congress of Verona, which assembled in October, 1822. The proximate cause of this meeting was the affairs of Spain, where Ferdinand VII was still hampered in his divine right of reigning by the beneficent operation of the constitution of Cadiz and the constitutional Cortes, to which, however, he had given his kingly word of assent; and these affairs received the early attention of the congress. As a text to justify their contemplated armed intervention to put down constitutional government in the Iberian peninsula, the allied sovereigns at the Verona Congress fulminated another circular letter, under date of November 5, 1822, in which they distinctly affirmed their purpose "to repel the maxim of rebellion in whatever place or under whatever form it might show itself." To give practical emphasis to this resolution, the Holy Alliance, selecting this time France for its tool, sent a French army, under the Duke of Angouleme, across the Pyrenees, which speedily overran the country, overthrew the regency of the Cortes, and reduced Spain to the arbitrary and unfettered rule of the king, who now claimed to exercise his authority only by divine right.

It will not escape notice that in the published utterances of the Holy Alliance care is taken to confine the enumerated occasions upon which the allied sovereigns declare their purpose to interfere forcibly, to cases of "reform effected by revolt and open force," of repulsion of "the maxim of rebellion," or of the "overthrow of the government." Ostensibly, then, the league was bound only to the maintenance of de facto governments and the established order of things. The insincerity of all this, however, and its lack of merit will appear when we remember that at this same juncture, when the King of Wurtemburg saw fit to give to his subjects a constitution, sua sponte and under no sort of compulsion, these members of the Holy Alliance, without exception, peremptorily cut off all diplomatic intercourse with him and ordered their ministers to summarily demand their passports and quit his capital. This fact alone showed to the world conclusively that the enmity of the Holy Alliance was to reform per se, in the abstract, whether peaceable or forcible, compulsory or voluntary, and quite apart from its dependence upon "rebellion," or "revolt," or "open force," or the "overthrow of the government."

Of course, long prior to the period in history to which we have now come, Great Britain had found it impossible to indorse the principles of the Holy Alliance as the same had successively been matured and reduced to practice. It is evident that she could give no assent to a doctrine which presupposed and implied that her Government had been but a series of usurpations ever since the revolution of 1688, and that for all that time she had kept her God-given rulers out of their undoubted inheritance. Accordingly her representative protested energetically against the armed intervention determined on at the Congress of Laybach to repress the constitutional governments erected in Naples and Piedmont. In like manner at Verona the Iron Duke was present to speak in the name of Great Britain against the iniquitous course of policy there foreshadowed in the interest of absolutism, and which was so inimical to the cause of human freedom and progress.

These doings of the Holy Alliance and the purposes of that league as they had then been ascertained rendered the declarations of President Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, relative to a contemplated extension of the field of the interference of the Holy Alliance to the Western Continent, not only pertinent and proper, but necessary. At that date the Spanish colonies in America had been in revolt against their parent country for a long time, and after a desultory course of warfare had substantially become independent States, or at least so far so that any attempt on the part of Spain, unaided, to subjugate them would have been confessedly hopeless. The United States had extended to them a full recognition of their independence, and Great Britain gave them such a quasi acknowledgment as de facto governments as arose from sending her consular agents, duly accredited, to their commercial ports. In this state of affairs the question of the armed intervention of the Holy Alliance for the purpose of restoring to the allegiance of Spain her revolted colonies in the New World as soon as the allied sovereigns should have succeeded in purging the mother country herself of all notions of governmental reform, had been mooted at the Congress of Verona. The legitimists in Spain were notoriously appealing to the allied rulers to extend their policy of repression across the ocean; to which course the latter were by no means disinclined. Indeed, within little more than a year after the promulgation of the Verona circular an invitation was sent by a confidential minister of King Ferdinand to the courts of the allied sovereigns, asking in the name of his master that still another conference be called, to meet this time in Paris, for the specific purpose of aiding Spain "in adjusting the affairs of the revolted countries of America."

Great Britain doubtless foresaw that this proposed meeting and the execution of its object, or something akin to it, would result from the agitation of the Spanish-American question at Verona, and that only the completion of the Duke of Angouleme's invasion of Spain was needed to bring the ulterior scheme of colonial subjugation to the foreground of European politics. And although her protests and remonstrances in behalf of the cause of constitutional government had thus far gone for naught; although she had instructed her minister to Spain, shortly after the termination of the Congress of Verona, to advertise the Spanish cabinet that in her judgment the substantial independence of the American colonies was a fact, with the further intimation that the armed interference of any European power other than Spain looking to their subjugation would not be by her permitted—still the call for a congress at Paris went forth, and preparations were evidently on foot for transplanting forcibly the doctrine of legitimacy to the American continent. Great Britain could not view these things otherwise than with alarm. Her commercial and industrial interests in the Spanish-American States were very considerable, and would be greatly jeoparded by the renewed presence of invading armies. But incomparably more important than all her material interests was her position as the arbiter of European politics, the reputation which she had theretofore acquired of standing as in some sort a barrier against the encroachments of absolutism, and the stake which she had in constitutional methods of government, and in frustrating the unholy practices of the Holy Alliance.

The United States, isolated geographically from the theater of European events, from her distant position looked upon them as a spectator—interested, indeed, but still not a gainer or loser by them—and this was true with regard to all the devious dealings of the Holy Alliance, so long as those dealings remained European and were no American. But when the arena of the contest between freedo m nd legitimacy was likely to be transferred from the Old World to the New, vastly different relations arose. In that event the United States, from a curious looker-on, would become a not indifferent party to the struggle; she would be the nearest neighbor of and naturally the deepest sympathizer with one of the antagonists; and quite aside from her interest in the cause of popular government, she would, in case of the victory of the absolutists over their former dependencies, become herself the inevitable next field for the operations of the Holy Alliance in the further performance of its self-appointed task of stamping out the rule of the people and elevating and fortifying kingcraft. It is evident, then, that to keep the threatened danger away from American shores and to confine it to continental Europe, so far as that could be done by moral means alone and without making his Government a participant in European politics, or entangling it in transatlantic leagues, was the problem which the inexorable logic of events had propounded to the Administration of President Monroe for solution. It was a task of no ordinary magnitude.

The peculiar danger to which the United States would have been exposed in the event of the Holy Alliance transferring its seat of operations to America may be inferred from the statement already made of the action of the allied sovereigns in suspending diplomatic intercourse with the King of Wurtemburg. That step discloses the animus with which their league was inspired. Their purpose was the destruction of constitutional government as such, and for the sole reason that it was constitutional government. Considerations other than this were studiously kept in the background. Their wars were waged, as said by Mr. Brougham in an oft-quoted passage—

Not against freedom on the Ebro, or freedom on the Mincio, but against freedom—against freedom wherever it is found, freedom by whomsoever enjoyed, freedom by whatever name achieved, by whatever institutions secured.

Plainly, then, consistency of policy on the part of the allied rulers would compel them to follow up their reduction of the revolted colonies of Spain by an attack upon the United States; for the latter had then existed for near a half century under a form of government framed and conducted in flagrant and somewhat ostentatious disregard for all the essential maxims of legitimacy; so that the contemplated invasion of the Spanish-American States not only menaced the cause of constitutional freedom there, but amounted to a threatened descent of hostile powers upon our own shores.

Moved by the community of interest existing between his Government and our own in this exigency, Mr. Canning, then the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, in the early autumn of 1823, proposed to Richard Rush, our minister at the Court of St. James, a joint declaration on the part of the two Governments represented by them, respectively. This declaration was to be threefold in its enunciations: First, that both parties to it disclaimed all purpose of obtaining any portion of the revolted territory for themselves; second, that neither would oppose any amicable settlement or reconciliation between Spain and her late dependencies; and third, that neither would be an indifferent spectator of an armed interference looking to the forcible return to Spanish allegiance of any of the revolted colonies on the part of a foreign power, or to the forced cession of any of those colonies to a foreign power.

Mr. Rush consented to join in this declaration at once, and without first communicating its terms to his Government, if Great Britain would at the same time announce her unqualified recognition of the revolted Spanish-American colonies as independent states. Mr. Canning declined to take this decisive step, for which his Government did not think itself prepared, and Mr. Rush submitted the proposal of a joint declaration to his home Government. President Monroe, with characteristic caution, laid the proposition before his Cabinet, which was an exceptionally able one, John Quincy Adams and Mr. Calhoun being among its members. Not only so, but the President sought the advice of Mr. Jefferson in his retreat at Monticello, and the result was an elaborate letter from the venerable ex-President under date of October 24, 1823, in which he counseled the joinder of the Administration in the proposed declaration, which he formulated thus:

That we aim not at the acquisition of any of those possessions; that we will not stand in the way of any amicable arrangement between the colonies and their mother country; that we will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way.

Neither Canning's proposition nor Jefferson's advice was adopted by Mr. Monroe. His Administration, acting in the light of then recent history, and of its probable self-repetition at no distant day, could not well undertake to commit the United States to a line of policy in which the declared opposition to any acquisition of Spanish-American soil by European powers, whether by conquest or voluntary transfer, was coupled with an equally emphatic self-renunciation of the same object. Florida had but just become ours; the great Louisiana purchase was then recent history, and it needed no prophetic eye to forecast the subsequent annexation of Texas, and the acquisition by conquest of New Mexico and Upper California, to say nothing of the long-continued coveting of Cuba. The insatiate territorial demands of successful slave labor, and of successful pro-slavery politics, were enough to make any Administration shrink from countenancing a foreclosure of all neighboring states south of us against a possible absorption by us in the future. Indeed, Mr. Jefferson, in the letter above referred to, warned the Administration of the possible impolicy of such a committal. He says:

We must first ask ourselves a question—do we wish to acquire any one or more of the Spanish provinces?—before we can unite in the proposed joint declaration.

And while the ex-President saw in the contemplated united action of the two powers an advantage overtopping any probable want of room on our part, Mr. Monroe declined to go to the length of assuming to bind his Government by a pledge which might cramp its future action at a time when it should act with the utmost freedom, but decided to adopt instead a course less radical indeed, but which, as the event seems to have proved, was a complete remedy for the mischief at which it was aimed. He left the British ministry to act in this exigency as it might list, with entire freedom, but alone, and in like manner he failed to act upon Mr. Jefferson's advice. But when Congress assembled at the beginning of December, 1823, he sent his annual message to that body, and in it announced the American policy which has gone down into history as the Monroe doctrine. I deem it unnecessary to reproduce it here.

The enunciations of this message were the product of the aggregate wisdom of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet, to whom they were submitted, and by whom they were, upon full consideration, approved. Such, at least, was the testimony of Mr. Calhoun at a time when he was the only surviving member of that eminent body.

For the foregoing clear statement of the case I acknowledge my indebtedness to a paper on The Panama Canal and Monroe Doctrine published in 1880 by Mr. Charles R. Grant.

It will thus be seen, Mr. President, that the declarations of the Monroe message sprang into being by reason of the imminence of a sudden and peculiar danger. This danger they were designed to meet and defeat. But they had still another purpose to serve. They were to furnish the foundation of an active policy in consonance with them to last for all time. The message was not merely a notice served at the time upon the Allied Powers of certain resistance to be offered to the extension of their operations to this continent. It went further. It posted a notice to endure as long as this Government endured, to be taken account of by all nations then existing and to exist, that American territory was not, and was not to be, the subject of further conquests or colonization by the powers of the Old World. With what territory those powers already possessed in America no interference was intended. But the message drew the line on further acquisitions.

This message of Mr. Monroe was received with satisfaction at home. It, too, was hailed with joy by every lover of free institutions in Europe. It reached England while Mr. Canning was still addressing the Allied Powers in terms of similar import and announcing the refusal of his Government to participate in or countenance the proposed Congress of Paris. It is not doubted that this action of Great Britain and America had a great effect in inducing a speedy abandonment of the designs of the Allied Sovereigns to subjugate the Spanish-American States.

It is said that the representatives of the Holy Alliance were in fact at the time informally convened at Paris. If so, the outcome of their deliberations there, if any there were, never became public.

We have the authority of Mr. Brougham, speaking from his place in Parliament two months after President Monroe's message had been sent to Congress, that as the result of the message the Spanish-American question had practically ended, and that it was a matter for the gratitude of every freeman in Europe.

Mr. Clay was Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress to which Mr. Monroe's message was addressed. In January, 1824, following the message, he offered the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of these States would not see without serious inquietude any forcible interposition by the Allied Powers of Europe in behalf of Spain to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America which have proclaimed and established for themselves, respectively, independent Governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States.

He did not ask its immediate consideration, but suggested that the resolution lie on the table for future consideration.

Plainly, the object of the resolution was to give legislative sanction to the declarations of the President's message. It remained on the Speaker's table until near the close of the session, when, on May 26, 1824, the House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. Clay said:

He would ask a single moment's attention of the committee while he said only one word in respect to a resolution which he had had the honor to present some time ago. The resolution to which he referred was that which proposed an expression of the feelings of Congress in regard to an attack supposed to be meditated by allied Europe upon the independence of Spanish America. He had offered that resolution in consequence of information disclosed in the President's message at the beginning of the present session of Congress; and most certainly, if the designs imputed to the allies had really been entertained, every consideration connected with the interest, the safety, and even the independence of this country called for the most deliberate attention to his proposition. But such a purpose, abominable as it would have been, ought not to be attributed upon any other than the strongest evidence. Events and circumstances subsequent to the communication of the message evinced that, if such a purpose were ever seriously entertained, it had been relinquished. For his part, while he was disposed to keep a vigilant eye on every movement of the allies, and to be ready to give his cooperation to every measure calculated to repel their aggressions, if any such should be attempted on the independence of any part of America, he was, on the other hand, unwilling to give them any just cause of offense against us. But to pass this resolution after all that has occurred—in the absence of any sufficient evidence of their now cherishing inimical designs on this continent—might be construed as unfriendly, if not offensive. Under the full conviction, therefore, that they did not entertain any purpose so diabolical as that would be of attempting to reduce Spanish America to its ancient subjection, or of compelling it to adopt the monarchial form of government, he should continue to abstain from pressing upon the attention of the House his resolution, and should allow it to sleep where it now reposes, on the table.

It will be observed that in the course of these remarks Mr. Clay stated that events and circumstances subsequent to the communication of the message evinced that if the allied sovereigns ever seriously entertained the design of subjecting the Spanish-American countries it had been relinguished, and because of this relinquishment, and only because of it, he abstained from pressing his resolution. In other words, President Monroe's words, having had the effect already of deterring the Holy Alliance, it was quite unnecessary for Congress to take any action on the message.

But that is not the case with which we are now dealing. Great Britain has peremptorily declined the request of this Government to submit her contention to territory claimed by Venezuela to arbitration.

This refusal was preceded by representations made by this Government that British aggressions in South America were in conflict with the American policy as outlined in the Monroe message.

The British premier, replying to this, had joined issue, denying the Monroe doctrine, or its applicability to the instant case.

President Cleveland's message to Congress was the response to this denial of the Monroe doctrine and this refusal of arbitration. Congress has met the President's recommendation of a commission to determine for ourselves where the true boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana should be placed, but Great Britain has not yet altered her position, and still stands on the inapplicability of the American doctrine of Mr. Monroe to this case.

It is unlike the case presented by Mr. Clay in his remarks on his resolution in 1824. There the allied sovereigns had desisted. Here Great Britain has not desisted. There the danger had passed and there was no necessity for action by Congress. Here the danger has not passed; there is nothing to show that England does not stand on her announced intention of ignoring our view of the Monroe doctrine and of denial of arbitration. So that ground does exist in this case for action by Congress.

If, in the English view, the doctrine announced by Mr. Monroe does not fit, then there should be given to the President's view of this doctrine the sanction of a full, precise, clear, strong, vigorous legislative expression, such as that embodied in the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

If it be true in any sense that the Monroe doctrine of 1823 does not meet this case of aggressive occupancy of territory under the guise of a boundary dispute, then the Congress should here and now, as is proposed, promulgate anew an American doctrine and policy that does meet it—an American doctrine so far reaching on this subject that it covers not only the instant case but all others that the exigencies of the future may develop.

Mr. President, without going into the history of the Venezuelan boundary dispute, let us examine the case to some extent in its relation to ourselves and to the American policy insisted upon.

The efforts of Venezuela to obtain a settlement of the dispute with Great Britain have been continuous and urgent. In 1876 she offered to close the dispute by accepting the Moroco line proposed by Lord Aberdeen in behalf of Great Britain. This was intended as a compromise, for her claims to the disputed territory carried her line much farther eastward. This offer was refused by Lord Granville on behalf of the then British ministry, who suggested a new line comprehending a large tract of territory not claimed for Great Britain in Lord Aberdeen's time. This was of course refused by Venezuela, and negotiations dragged along without result until 1882, when Venezuela sought arbitration as the only honorable course left open to her to settle the controversy. This seemed likely to be accomplished, for in 1886 a treaty was practically agreed upon with the Gladstone Government containing a general arbitration clause under which the parties might have submitted the boundary dispute to the decision of a third power or of several powers in amity with both. Before the actual signing, however, of the treaty, the administration of Mr. Gladstone was superseded by that of Lord Salisbury, which declined to accede to the arbitration clause proposed in the incomplete treaty. Since then Venezuela has continued to offer and appeal for arbitration, while Great Britain has steadily refused it, except upon terms that would concede to the latter territory the claim to which Venezuela could not admit. While these negotiations were still pending, new appropriations of Venezuelan territory continued to be made by Great Britain, whereupon Venezuela, in 1887, suspended diplomatic relations with the British Government, protesting before all the world against the acts of spoliation committed to her detriment by Great Britain.

This stand was alike dignified and creditable to the weaker power. Diplomatic relations have not since been formally restored, though, on account of continued British aggressions, negotiations were resumed by Venezuela through its minister to Paris and special envoys. These negotiations all failed, as the others had, through the stubborn stand taken by Great Britain, and Venezuela again filed with the British Government a second strong protest.

The Government of the United States took an active interest in these several attempts at amicably adjusting an ugly question, using its good offices to bring about such a settlement, and in December, 1886, Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, made a formal tender of the services of this Government in arbitration.

This offer of mediation, acceptable to Venezuela, was declined by Great Britain.

In 1890 Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, again urged upon the English Government the advisability of arbitration.

Nothing came of these renewed attempts, and since then Venezuela has again and again brought the controversy to the notice of the United States, has insisted upon its importance to us as well as to herself, has represented it as having reached an acute stage, making definite action by the United States imperative, and has continuously solicited the services and support of the United States in aid of its final adjustment.

President Cleveland brought the matter to the attention of Congress in his message of December 3, 1894; in February following, Congress, by joint resolution, "earnestly recommended to the favorable consideration of both parties in interest the suggestion of the President for friendly arbitration;" and in July following that, Mr. Olney's note to the American ambassador at London, after fully, clearly, ably stating the whole case, appeals again for mediation and demands a definite decision as to whether Great Britain will consent or will not consent to submit the boundary question in its entirety to impartial arbitration.

In this communication the Secretary of State gave distinct notice to Great Britain that the controversy is one in which both the honor and the interests of this country are involved.

It would seem, Mr. President, that language of this deep significance could not fail to impress the British Government that the acute stage of this dispute had indeed been reached, that it had come to a point beyond which it were not safe to go and yet keep the peace of the world. It implied in no uncertain way that if Great Britain continued her aggressions upon territory claimed by Venezuela, it would be considered here a cause of quarrel between Her Britannic Majesty's Government and our own. It was more than a protest; it was a warning.

In his reply Lord Salisbury declares the controversy is one with which the United States has no apparent practical concern, and that the disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any questions dealt with by President Monroe. He denies that it is an attempt at colonization of any portion of America.

There is no difference in practical effect between the planting of a new colony on territory seized for the purpose, and the advancing of the frontier of an old colony in disregard of existing territorial claims of another power. The difference is matter of form and not of substance, and the doctrine of Monroe, if pertinent in the one case, must be in the other also.

We do not assert, Mr. President, that Great Britain is in fact usurping dominion over Venezuelan territory. It is true Venezuela charges such usurpation, but Great Britain denies it. Our position is that until the merits of these contentions are authoritatively ascertained, the United States can take sides with neither. But we do insist upon this ascertainment, and meanwhile we demand the maintenance of the statu quo.

Who stands in the way of this ascertainment? Surely not Venezuela. Witness her strenuous efforts, first, for settlement through direct diplomatic negotiations with Grent Britain; next, her expressed willingness to arbitrate—aye, her urgent solicitations for arbitration.

No, the responsibility is on Great Britain. By far the greater power of the two, magnanimity, it would seem, would itself sug-

gest arbitration to her. But that is not English policy. She reaches out for what she wants, and this, too, with scant regard for the laws of meum et tuum, and once she gets it in her grasp, regarding not how she came by it, holds it fast.

The plain story in this case is, Great Britain, taking advantage of the indefinite character of her claim to territory in the western part of her acknowledged possessions in the northeastern portion of South America, as transferee of the Dutch holdings there, and doubtless taking advantage, too, of the rather indefinite character of the limits of Venezuelan territory adjoining her own, has laid rude hands on a big slice of that country and coolly announced her purpose to hold on to it.

Now, this is what the United States, with its traditional policy, can not tolerate with honor and dignity, and does not propose to tolerate.

It is a matter of principle with us. If arbitration decides, or any other fair method of settlement demonstrates, that this disputed territory really and justly pertains to the British Crown, the United States can have nothing further to say except to advise Venezuela to submit. We will, in that case, wish Great Britain joy of her full possessions.

If arbitration, or other fair method, decides that Venezuela has been encroached upon in her territorial privileges, we would see to it that her right of reoccupancy of this part of her country is vindicated.

If Great Britain stands firm, declining arbitration, refusing friendly mediation, denying compromise or amicable adjustment, as is her position now, we must of necessity go ahead with what we have begun.

The Venezuelan Boundary Commission, authorized by Congress and appointed by the President, will complete its work, will ascertain what is the true eastern boundary line of Venezuela, and will definitely report to Congress and the President. The line thus established will be adopted by this Government as the true boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana, and Venezuela will acquiesce in the same, withdrawing all pretensions to any territory eastward of the line. Thereafter any crossing of this line by an armed force for the purpose of holding or seizing territory thus determined to be Venezuelan, would be held by us to be tantamount to a declaration of war against both the United States and Venezuela, and would be resisted accordingly.

That is the inevitable logic of the position we have assumed. We do not shrink from it, because it is right; it is the bold assertion of a great national policy that we are prepared to enforce and feel ourselves able to enforce against the British Empire and all comers. It is the doctrine of America for Americans; it is the "balance-of-power" idea applied to America; it is the assertion of the principle that American questions are for American decision.

The leading nations of Europe have adjudged that it is right and proper and for their security and welfare to preserve what is termed "the balance of power" in Europe. That is the distinctive national policy for Europe, which they have announced and repeatedly enforced. It led to the Crimean war, where Great Britain, in alliance with France, successfully asserted it by force of arms against the aggressions of Russia on the independence of Turkey. Our Monroe doctrine is to America what this "balance-of-power" doctrine is to Europe. Justification can not be claimed for the one and denied for the other.

The United States is expected to stand aloof from entangling alliances with European powers. We are to have, it seems, nothing to do with European concerns, nothing with Asiatic, African, nor Australian concerns. We have heretofore steadily adhered to this line of policy. We have not sought "to play in the back yard" of any of the countries located on the continents of the Eastern Hemisphere.

And now when we propose to serve notice on the nations of the Old World that we will permit no "playing in our back yard," Europe stands aghast, and we are admonished by some of the overtimid or overconservative of our own people, aye, by some even in this Chamber, that we must not do it.

Shut out of participation in European policies, neither asking nor being invited to take part in the same, are we, too, to be deprived of the right to prescribe an American policy, to dominate an American policy?

On this point, Mr. President, the people of the United States are especially sensitive. And it is not confined to any section or class of our people. It pervades all alike; it leaps over party lines and rises above party feeling.

On the Atlantic seaboard in the Northeast the caution and conservatism of capital and the fears of business disturbance may for a moment stay this feeling. But those who count upon this for the display of extreme forbearance on our part may find themselves greatly in error. The strip of country 200 miles wide from Baltimore to Boston does not constitute the American Union. The outlying districts and States are not provinces nor their people provincials. American thought, intelligence, aspiration, popular sentiment, are not confined to the eastern seaboard, and its highest expression is not always found in the columns of metropolitan dailies. The seat of empire in this country, like the center of population, tends westward and southward. Go ask the people of the great West and those of the revivified and rapidly recuperating South, and they will tell you that the time has come for a broadening of the scope of the Monroe doctrine of 1823, and for a much more enlarged application of it. They will tell you that seventy-three years ago, when this doctrine was first proclaimed, the United States as a nation was in the period of its youth. It was was weak, undeveloped, not yet sure of its position among the nations of the earth. Its population then was but little more than 9,000,000; its resources small; its power unfeared. With some misgivings it announced an American policy to meet the exigency then upon it—a policy as firm as the youthful nation, feeling its way with care and caution, dared then to make it.

But the situation has changed. From 9,000,000 of people we have multiplied to 70,000,000. From meager resources we have plowed and planted, delved and mined, commerced and manufactured, builded and constructed our way to enormous aggregate wealth. In power and prestige, weight and influence, civilization and progress, we take front rank among the nations of the world. We feel our security. None can molest or make us afraid. We do not have to make a demonstration on land or sea to proclaim our power or mark our readiness for war. There is no need for us to display unusual activity in our arsenals and gun factories, nor to mobilize fleets, nor to prepare flying squadrons to sail at a moment's notice. We are always prepared for war. In the hearts of 9,000,000 of fighting men, animated with patriotic fervor and determination, you will find this readiness.

We do not, it is true, maintain great standing armies, as is done in Europe, but we can, on brief notice, mobilize them, full panoplied for war. As for fleets, we have the resources, and from these could quickly evolve the facilities for constructing ships of war in number, size, armament, and strength that would give us the dominion of the seas. Whenever the necessity arises, mark the prediction, this Republic, with its 23,000 miles of coast line on two oceans and a great Gulf, will become the first naval power of the world. It is not the true policy of other nations to provoke this necessity. The American Republic is indeed "a great reservoir of force for all purposes, a mighty engine of war, a most beneficent power for peace." In the words of a distinguished American:

> Secure in our isolation, supreme in our resources, unequaled in our reserve, and free from dangerous neighbors, we occupy among the nations of the globe a position so exalted and safe that to compare us with other countries would be absurd.

This Republic, Mr. President, is not "to act the big brother to each turbulent or revolutionary Republic or island in the Western Hemisphere and convulse the world about matters of far less importance than many decided at every session of Congress." Nor are we to act the part of the mother hen and cluck to a nestling place under our protecting breast all the petty States of Central and South America.

But it does behoove us to proclaim a distinctive American policy—a broad, comprehensive policy that includes within its scope the three Americas—North, Central, and South.

The United States stands at the head of the American sisterhood of States. She has an interest, at once direct and vital, in the settlement of every question that can arise affecting any portion of the American continent, or any one of the free States on the continent. Indeed, I go further, and declare she has an interest, direct and vital, in the settlement of every national or international question that can arise in the entire Western Hemisphere.

Nor does this position on our part militate against the right of any and all governments to protect its citizens in any part of America, or to enforce payment of debts, or to claim indemnity for wrongs. The Monroe doctrine, even in its present proposed enlarged scope, is not to be extended to interfere with the business relations between the American Republics and Europe.

We would not interfere if war broke out and such countries were overrun by foreign troops. But neither as the result of such war nor as the result of negotiation or treaty can any European power acquire additional territory in America. That is the point. War waged by England or any other European power with South or Central American countries on any just ground, is no concern of ours. Only such war must not be one of conquest. And the war ended, foreign troops must within a reasonable time evacuate. Otherwise the nation refusing to do so would come in conflict with the declared policy of the United States in reference to the American Continent, and must reckon with us. Neither would it be ground for us to interfere, under this national policy of ours, if one South or Central American country should wage a war of conquest with another.

The Central and South American States, desiring and perhaps invoking our aid to prevent acquisition by conquest of any of their territory by stronger powers, can not object if we insist that neither shall they dispose of their territory to foreign powers by

treaty, or sale, or other negotiation. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. They can not with good grace ask us to keep the big nations of Europe off of them and then claim exemption from surveillance and control by us should they attempt to dispose of, by negotiation or treaty, the same territory to prevent the conquest of which our aid was solicited.

To say that it is right for us to prevent the acquisition of American territory by conquest, but not right for us to prevent its acquisition by sale or peaceful cession, is to my mind ridiculous. If the American policy we assert be right, if it is to serve the purpose we intend, then it must cover both propositions: First, no conquest of territory; second, no territorial acquisition otherwise than by conquest without our consent.

The Monroe doctrine and no other American doctrine asserted by us would amount to anything or be respected by other nations except that we have the power to enforce it. Having, as we believe, that power, it behooves us only to inquire whether what we propose is, first, right and just; second, whether it is to our security, welfare, and advantage to do it.

Mr. President, we heard something said on this floor—and that in derision—of the turbulance that characterizes the people of South and Central America. Suppose in the Spanish-American countries revolutions are frequent; suppose one régime is quickly followed by another; that one faction rules awhile and is then overthrown by another. The countries still remain free and independent. No attempt to set up monarchy or empire is made. Occasionally some strong man may, under stress of extreme circumstances, declare himself dictator. But it does not last long. Those people are imbued with the republican spirit, they believe in democracy. The turmoil, strife, contention, revolution through which they are going is their road to higher development and freer, more stable institutions and government. We traveled the same road to reach the goal of our independence and to found here in this Western Hemisphere this matchless Republic, which is our boast and pride. All other nations have traveled it to reach the high ground of permanent, enduring nationality. No nation has gone through more frequent and bloody revolutions than has England to attain to her present exalted station of grandeur, glory, power, and freedom. The Anglo-Saxon race literally carved its way to civil liberty—the foundation stone of enduring Government. Magna Charta, the petition of rights, habeas corpus, trial by jury, freedom of opinion, of speech, and of the press were only established after centuries of effort, of toil, of sacrifice, and bloodshed.

The Senator from Colorado, who inveighs against the countries of South America because of their frequent revolutions, is, in his high station of Senator of the United States, himself a product of revolution. There would have been no Senate to sit in but for successful revolution. Give those countries a chance. Were those people of our blood, the Anglo-Saxon strain, they would doubtless work out their destinies sooner. That race develops more rapidly the germ of self-government, and ripens it to maturity and fruition sooner. But the Latin races are not incapable of attaining the highest standard; and I doubt not the womb of the future will bring forth in due time in South and Central America great nations of stable government, free institutions, and free people, marching in unison with the great Republic of the northern part of the continent toward the accomplishment of the manifest destiny marked out by the God of the universe for America.

No American, least of all an American statesman, should complain of revolution. The American people owe all they have to successful revolution. This Republic of ours was ushered into being amid the din and tocsin of war; its cradle rocked by revolution, its infancy inured to the shock of contending armies.

Nor can we be unmindful of the fact that in our maturer years the greatest revolution of modern times drenched our soil with the blood of millions of our countrymen, and resulted in the destruction of billions of dollars in property.

Mr. President, it is said that a formal declaration of an American policy is not necessary, and is even unwise. This, sir, is an un-American idea. The American people have never been afraid of declarations, have never been backward in maintaining them, and, indeed, are fond of them. They have served us to good purpose, and we have never made one yet that we did not afterwards, either by force of arms or successful civil action, crystallize into law or established policy.

We began with the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress in 1776. An eight years' war followed, but it ended with the declaration still standing and acknowledged by our adversary.

In 1812 we made another declaration, proclaiming exemption from search for American vessels on the high seas. War followed. It ended on the plains of Chalmette, near New Orleans, in my own State. Again the declaration stood, and again was its correctness recognized. No more American vessels have been searched.

In 1823 came the declaration by Mr. Monroe in his message now under discussion, or a distinctive American policy, which might be termed "America for Americans."

In 1861 came the fourth great declaration—that the Union must and shall be preserved.

In 1863 President Lincoln announced another great declaration—his emancipation proclamation, by which 4,000,000 slaves were freed.

Both these declarations stood the fierce ordeal of battle, and were crystallized into fundamental law.

President Cleveland, in his message of December, 1895, announced a sixth great declaration, which is a reassertion on an enlarged basis of the Monroe doctrine, and this has been followed by the resolution unanimously reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, which further and more largely develops the American idea upon this question.

Mr. President, the time has arrived for such a declaration; broad, bold, comprehensive; not made in anger, not menacing, but decisive.

The doctrine announced by Mr. Monroe should be promoted to the dignity of a rule of governmental authority by affixing to an enlarged scope of it the seal of Congressional approval. That doctrine, even in the restricted form in which it was at first couched, had "the element of nationality of principle." It is to be regarded, I think, as "a continuing protest" against any further European control, possession, or acquisition of American territory.

It should no longer be permitted to remain a mere dictum, but should be given a legal status by Congressional indorsement. And it is peculiarly appropriate that the Senate should first take action, for the shaping of our foreign policy resides more particularly in the Senate.

Adopting the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs would be doing now what was urged upon Congress in 1845 and again in 1848 by President Polk. In his message to Congress in the former year relating to the then recent annexation of Texas, and in his message to Congress in the later year relating to the Yucatan troubles, he recommended that the doctrine of President Monroe be given the force of a positive pledge, committing the United States to its observance as a settled rule of governmental conduct.

Washington first laid down the doctrine that this country would not intermeddle with affairs of the Old World. With the disavowal on our part of any intent to seek for territory or power in the Eastern Hemisphere, there must follow, as of course, first, the right to extend our lines upon this side of the Atlantic whenever suitable opportunity may arise, and, second, the determination forever to restrict all non-American nations to such territory on this continent as they already possess. But if we are to abandon or surrender what the people of this country have fondly looked upon ever since Monroe's day as the American policy, saying to the nations of the Old World, "Hands off," so far as America is concerned, then let us by all means abandon that other policy of non-interference in affairs across the waters, and, as one of the leading nations of the earth, make our power, weight, and influence felt and our voice heard in the settlement of every international dispute, or question, or contest that may arise, no matter what its origin or what its purpose.

Mr. President, the two English-speaking nations should be frank and sincere in their dealings, their intercourse, their contentions, the one with the other. I have spoken plainly and with much directness of language on the theme that occupied my attention to-day, but with no spirit of bombast or bravado. I have tried to contribute somewhat to a better understanding with our transatlantic cousins. I love the English character; my blood thrills at the recollection of the great achievements of the race.

Other European peoples may have developed earlier and made, perhaps, more rapid advances in certain forms of civilization, but none have surpassed, nor equaled even, the English-speaking race in the practical character and permanence of their progress.

Guizot says, in his History of Representative Government, that the true order of national development in every country is, first, to convert the natural liberties of man into clearly defined political rights, and, next, to guarantee the security of those rights by the establishment of forces capable of maintaining them.

Nowhere, as has been truly said, do we find better illustrations of this law of progress than in the history of England and of the colonies which England has planted. The principle that "all political power is a trust held for the public good" finds its highest development where the Anglo-Saxon race dominates. It is indeed the legitimate heritage of every nation of Anglo-Saxon descent.

I do not forget that English history is, in a very large degree, our history. I do not forget that England is, as Hawthorne called it, "our old home"; nor am I unmindful of the fact that if we go back less than three centuries the record of America becomes one with that of the mother country.

In descent by far the greater part of us are of English blood,

while in language, literature, law, legislative powers of government, and the essential features of civilization we owe to England a greater debt than to any other country. As said of England by an American historian:

Standing on her soil we possess practically the same personal rights that we do here; we speak the same tongue, we meet the same familiar names. We feel that whatever is glorious in her past is ours also; that Westminster Abbey belongs as much to us as to her; that our ancestors helped to build its walls, and their dust is gathered in its tombs; that Shakspeare and Milton belong to us in like manner; that they wrote in the language we speak for the instruction and delight of our fathers' fathers, who beat back the Spanish Armada and gave their lives for liberty on the fields of Marston Moor and Nasby.

Grave issues have arisen in the past to separate us, and we may now be confronted with grave issues. Yet, after all, our interests and our sympathies, like our national histories, have more in common than they have apart.

In the United States and the British Empire combined there are upward of 125,000,000 of people who speak the English tongue and are governed by the fundamental principles of English constitutional law. They hold possession of over 12,000,000 square miles of the earth's surface, an area nearly equal to the united continents of North America and Europe. By far the greater part of the wealth and power of the globe is theirs. They have expanded as no other people have. They have shown a greater capacity for absorbing and assimilating the millions of emigrants from every country and race and tongue than have any other people.

The inhabitants of the British islands, of Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Canada practically form one great Anglo-Saxon race. Separated though they be by distance, they everywhere exhibit the same spirit of intelligence, enterprise, and of steady, resistless growth.

The different branches of the English-speaking family are too necessary, one to the other, their interests too essentially the same, to permit of differences leading to rupture.

Archdeacon Farrar, in his address on General Grant at Westminster Abbey, in 1885, said:

Whatever there be between the two nations to forget and forgive; is forgotten and forgiven.

In like manner, I say, whatever there is of dispute or contention between the two nations, let it be settled along lines of kindred, friendship, and peace.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the order of business be now laid before the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Nebraska wait a moment? The appropriation bill was simply laid aside in order that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] might address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The Senate resumes the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the amendments of the committee may be considered as they are reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the amendments of the committee may be considered as they are reached. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from Maine to yield to me for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire the unanimous consent of the Senate to make a remark or two with reference to the joint resolution which passed the Senate this morning, requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the appropriation act of last year in regard to the distribution of seeds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to submit some remarks to the Senate in regard to the joint resolution which passed the Senate this morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. ALLEN. I shall occupy but a moment.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], in submitting some remarks in the Senate on the subject of the joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the appropriation act of March 2, 1895, used this language:

Without further preface, I call the attention of the Senate to a table found in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, on page 204. This table gives the allotment and distribution of seeds to members of Congress for the year 1894-95. It will be found by reference to the table that the State of Nebraska had allotted to it 131,856 papers of seed, and that there was distributed or given to members of Congress from that State by the Secretary of Agriculture 221,961 papers, being an excess of nearly 100,000 papers for his own State.

Again he said:

The table shows that the whole number of seeds distributed in that year aggregated 9,528,653 packages. Nebraska received 1,133,754 packages, or nearly one-ninth of the whole amount throughout the United States.

Again the Senator said:

When we come to Nebraska, according to this report, the Secretary allotted to Congressmen for distribution 221,961 packages, an excess of the just allotment to that State, as I have shown, of nearly 100,000.

Mr. President, it is due to the Secretary of Agriculture that some explanation be made with reference to this matter and go in the RECORD in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri and others, criticising the course of that officer.

In 1894 there was a drought in the State of Nebraska, which was quite general. That is a well-known historical fact. The people in the spring of 1895 were very poor, and many of them received the seeds from which they raised their crops this year from donations made by kindly disposed neighbors, and from various parts of the Union, and no doubt the Secretary of Agriculture furnished the people of the State of Nebraska as much seed as he could, consistently with his duties, in consequence of that fact. I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind that the Secretary of Agriculture in making these liberal allowances to the people of Nebraska was actuated by the fact that the people were in great distress, and I am sure that he had no disposition to promote his own personal or political interests.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. I am interested in what he is saying, though I have not participated at all in the general discussion which has taken place on this subject; but if the Senator knows of any special concession that was made to Nebraska I should be very glad to know of it, because I attempted and used every effort to try to get some seed for those people in the eastern portion of Colorado who were utterly ruined by the drought, and I was unable to get a single package additional, and I personally bought what I could get from the stores here of different allotments that were sold in the establishments around Washington. I was unable to get the slightest help from the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Senator from Nebraska can point to a single act of the Secretary where he did go out of his way to furnish seed to any section, I think it would go very far to redeem his management of the office, which is generally considered worthless in our section, from the contempt into which it has fallen.

Mr. ALLEN. I very much regret that the Senator from Colorado should reflect upon the Secretary of Agriculture. I am well convinced that the Secretary of Agriculture has performed his duty faithfully and well as he understood it.

I want to call attention briefly to a fact which was referred to by the honorable Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] yesterday, that the inequality in the distribution of seeds, to some extent, originated from the circumstance that the seeds were transferred from various members of Congress to their associates, by that means sending a larger portion of the seeds distributed from the Agricultural Department into some States and Territories than were sent into other States and Territories. As showing that fact I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD, without being read, a statement on the subject from the Agricultural Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Record of transfer of seeds.

To—	Vegetable papers.	From—
Hon. D. D. Aitken	10,000	Hon. Jas. McMillan, United States Senator.
Hon. W. V. Allen	1,400	Hon. M. W. Ransom, United States Senator.
Do	3,000	Hon. W. A. Peffer, United States Senator.
Do	1,400	Hon. Patrick Walsh, United States Senator.
Do	1,450	Hon. Edward Murphy, United States Senator.
Do	1,450	Hon. John W. Palmer, United States Senator.
Do	1,450	Hon. Eppa Hunton, United States Senator.
Hon. John M. Allen	1,250	Hon. John C. Hendrix.
Do	1,000	Hon. Franklin Bartlett.
Do	10,000	Hon W. Bourke Cockran.
Do	2,000	Hon. L. E. McGann.
Do	2,000	Do.
Do	3,000	Hon. Jos. H. O'Neil.
Do	2,500	Hon. Allen C. Durborow.
Do	2,500	Hon. Jason B. Brown.
Hon. C. K. Bell	10,750	Hon. Richard Coke.
Hon. John L. Bretz	500	Hon. D. E. Sickles.
Hon. J. W. Babcock	2,150	Hon. E. F. Loud.
Do	1,000	Hon. H. C. Lodge.
Do	16,417	Hon. D. D. Burnes.
Do	10,000	Hon. John C. Houk.
Do	3,000	Hon. Donelson Caffery.

Record of transfer of seeds—Continued.

To—	Vegetable papers.	From—
Hon. J. W. Babcock	2,650	Hon. E. F. Loud.
Do	5,000	Hon. Robt. Adams, jr.
Hon. Wm. Baker	1,500	Hon. Wm. Ryan.
Hon. Wm. H. Bower	4,000	Hon. L. T. Griffin.
Hon. J. H. Bankhead	2,000	Hon. L. E. McGann.
Do	7,500	Hon. W. D. Bynum.
Do	2,000	Hon. L. E. McGann.
Do	2,000	Hon. C. A. Cadmus.
Do	2,500	Hon. L. W. Turpin.
Do	2,500	Hon. C. B. Kilgore.
Hon. C. S. Brice	4,600	Hon. Tom L. Johnson.
Hon. J. W. Bailey	200	Hon. J. H. Goodnight.
Hon. S. B. Cooper	1,500	Hon. Levi T. Griffin.
Do	500	Hon. E. F. Loud.
Do	1,000	Hon. Jno. C. Hendrix.
Do	2,000	Hon. J. De Witt Warner.
Do	2,500	Hon. W. M. Springer.
Do	500	Hon. L. T. Griffin.
Hon. Chas. F. Crisp	2,000	Hon. H. W. Rusk.
Hon. C. A. Chickering	1,000	Hon. Thomas F. Magner.
Hon. N. N. Cox	2,000	Hon. S. J. Schermerhorn.
Do	2,000	Do.
Do	7,000	Hon. Wm. Everett.
Hon. Charles E. Coffin	500	Hon. H. W. Rusk.
Do	1,000	Do.
Hon. Charles Curtis	3,000	Hon. J. Frank Aldrich.
Hon. Charles Daniels	3,000	Hon. D. E. Sickles.
Hon. H. A. Dinsmore	500	Hon. John J. O'Neill.
Hon. George B. Fielder	2,000	Hon. Thomas F. Magner.
Hon. J. D. Hicks	2,000	Hon. Robert Adams, jr.
Do	2,500	Hon. Galusha A. Grow.
Hon. R. R. Hitt	15,000	Hon. Ed. J. Dunphy.
Hon. James K. Jones	1,000	Hon. E. F. Loud.
Hon. J. F. Izlar	2,000	Hon. C. A. Cadmus.
Hon. O. M. Kem	3,000	Hon. James F. Wilson.*
Do	4,000	Hon. W. M. Springer.*
Do	2,500	Hon. W. N. Roach.*
Do	11,000	Hon. Galusha A. Grow.*
Do	500	Hon. L. T. Griffin.*
Hon. J. C. Kyle	2,000	Hon. Adolph Meyer.
Do	500	Hon. James P. Pigott.
Hon. R. E. Lester	500	Hon. Josiah Patterson.
Do	500	Hon. Robert Adams, jr.
Do	1,000	Hon. C. A. Cadmus.
Do	2,000	Hon. George B. Fielder.
Hon. W. V. Lucas	5,000	Hon. William A. Sipe.
Hon. A. C. Latimer	5,000	Hon. John J. McDannold.
Hon. E. F. Loud	750	Hon. J. J. Gardiner.
Hon. Thomas Lynch	1,500	Hon. William Ryan.
Hon. William M. McKaig	500	Hon. Levi T. Griffin.
Hon. H. D. Money	2,600	Hon. Julius Goldzier.
Do	3,000	Hon. J. J. McDannold.
Hon. J. W. Maddox	1,250	Hon. J. C. Hendrix.
Hon. J. C. McDearmon	1,000	Hon. Julius Goldzier.
Do	2,500	Hon. J. H. O'Neil.
Hon. G. D. Meiklejohn	2,500	Hon. T. J. Henderson.
Hon. Howard Mutchler	6,000	Hon. William McAleer.
Hon. J. H. Outhwaite	2,000	Hon. D. E. Sickles.
Hon. H. W. Ogden	2,500	Hon. Adolph Meyer.
Hon. William A. Peffer	3,300	Hon. J. H. Gallinger.
Do	7,500	Hon. D. B. Hill.
Do	5,000	Hon. N. W. Aldrich.
Do	6,000	Hon. J. C. Burrows.
Hon. Josiah Patterson	2,500	Hon. S. W. McCall.
Do	2,500	Do.
Do	1,000	Do.
Do	1,000	Hon. W. J. Coombs.
Hon. H. H. Powers	5,000	Hon. S. W. McCall.
Hon. Lafe Pence	1,000	Hon. William Ryan.
Hon. Gaston A. Robbins	2,000	Hon. A. C. Durborow.
Hon. T. J. Strait	3,000	Hon. J. J. McDannold.
Hon. Jerry Simpson	1,500	Hon. William Ryan.
Do	3,500	Hon. Secretary of Agriculture.
Hon. W. C. Squire	5,000	Hon. T. J. Campbell.
Hon. J. S. Sherman	1,000	Hon. Thomas F. Magner.
Hon. F. C. Tate	16,480	Hon. P. J. Somers.
Do	15,000	Hon. L. E. Quigg.
Do	1,000	Hon. John C. Houk.
Do	1,000	Hon. William Ryan.
Do	5,000	Hon. John H. Graham.
Do	2,000	Hon. John J. O'Neill.
Do	2,000	Hon. Robert Adams, jr.
Do	1,250	Hon. J. C. Hendrix.
Hon. J. F. C. Talbott	2,000	Hon. William McAleer.
Hon. L. W. Turpin	500	Hon. Adolph Meyer.
Hon. W. L. Terry	4,000	Hon. S. W. McCall.
Hon. Joseph Wheeler	10,000	Hon. George B. Fielder.
Do	4,500	Hon. John De W. Warner.
Do	15,600	Hon. Isidor Straus.
Hon. J. W. Wadsworth	2,000	Hon. A. C. Durborow.
Do	500	Hon. Adolph Meyer.
Do	3,000	Hon. H. C. Lodge.
Do	6,690	Hon. M. A. Smith.
Hon. J. R. Williams	5,000	Hon. Joseph H. O'Neil.
Do	7,500	Hon. William Everett.
Do	1,000	Hon. Thomas F. Magner.
Do	7,500	Hon. J. De W. Warner.
Do	2,000	Hon. L. E. McGann.
Do	3,000	Hon. John J. O'Neill.
Do	3,000	Hon. Robert Adams, jr.
Do	7,500	Hon. Julius Goldzier.
Do	8,000	Hon. M. T. Stevens.
Hon. H. K. Wheeler	500	Hon. R. A. Childs.
Hon. E. O. Wolcott	5,000	Hon. H. C. Lodge.
Do	5,000	Do.
Total	441,437	

*Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. I also hold in my hand copies of letters by the Rev. Luther P. Ludden, secretary of the Nebraska State Relief Commission, and by Miss Clara Barton, president of the American National Red Cross Society, explanatory of the distribution of seeds, which I also ask to have published in the RECORD. They are very brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The papers referred to are as follows:

HEADQUARTERS NEBRASKA STATE RELIEF COMMISSION,
Lincoln, Nebr., March 12, 1895.

DEAR SIR: We beg leave to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 7th, notifying us of the forwarding of our seeds. They have commenced to arrive, and trust they will be a veritable blessing to the thousands of drought sufferers that we are compelled to supply with their garden seeds.

Respectfully, yours,

LUTHER P. LUDDEN,
General Manager.

D. MACCUAIG,
Chief Clerk, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

—

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 2, 1895.*

SIR: We beg leave to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 29th, contents of which are carefully noted. We have been having delightful weather for some time in Nebraska, and a very good rain in the past few days only makes the clamor for seed the louder. We note the way in which the seed is sent forward. We have sent it into the counties in lots of a hundred of each kind, and in that way obviated much of the wrapping and putting in packages that you refer to. We have the following organization in each county, and these committees can very readily divide up the work and place the seeds without all that labor of the extra packages.

Respectfully, yours,

LUTHER P. LUDDEN, *Secretary.*

D. MACCUAIG,
Chief Clerk, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

—

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 10, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: We beg leave to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 6th, notifying us of the completion of the work of sending us the Government garden seeds. I am instructed by the commission to extend very hearty thanks to you and your coworkers for the very courteous way in which you have treated us and sent forward the garden seeds. I know that the many thousand families who have received their garden seed in this way will appreciate the blessings that come to them from this source.

Possibly next summer, as day by day they eat the result of this seed sowing, they may not think of you; but they ought, and gratitude ought to well their hearts as the result of this work stands so clearly before them.

Yours, very truly,

LUTHER P. LUDDEN, *Secretary.*

D. MACCUAIG, *Chief Clerk, Washington, D. C.*

—

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 27, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: We beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 17th. While it calls for no letter, I want to say that it would do your heart good if you could see the great gladness brought to the many homes by the seed that you have sent us under the direction of Secretary Morton. We have already written Secretary Morton concerning this matter. We are hearing from all parts of the drought-stricken district almost every mail, and there is one general report saying the seed sent out by the Government is of excellent quality and doing nicely in their gardens. We have had some of the needed rain, enough to start the seed germinating well, but we are needing more rain now.

Very respectfully, yours, LUTHER P. LUDDEN, *Secretary.*

D. MACCUAIG, *Chief Clerk, Washington, D. C.*

—

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 27, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: I am directed by the commission to express to you our very hearty thanks for the splendid contribution of garden seed that you were enabled to send us from the Department. It was a veritable godsend to thousands of our needy farmers. I do not think there is a farmer in the drought-stricken district that was unable to procure seed but what we have been able to furnish enough for a large garden, either from what you forwarded us from the Department or from that which the several seed houses of the United States generously donated to us.

The season is well advanced with us this year, and the vast amount of garden seed that you have sent us has gone into the ground, and, as one little girl said a couple of days ago, "Oh, the seed that we got from Washington through you is all up," and when the inquiry was made if she hadn't pulled it up, she said, "No, we just put it in little trenches and poured in the water and covered it with ground, and it has just pushed itself up with a little green stem." I believe more and better gardens have been planted in Nebraska this year than ever before, and of course this brings a blessing to the many who have been compelled to live on flour and beans during the past winter.

On behalf of these many sufferers, to whom your contribution of seed will bring so many blessings, I tender their hearty thanks also.

Very respectfully, yours,

LUTHER P. LUDDEN, *Secretary.*

Hon. J. STERLING MORTON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

—

BEAUFORT, S. C., *October 9, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I pray you permit me to thank you for the quick response to my request for seeds sent through Hon. Senator Butler. For the reason that you can not see them given out to and received by these poor, helpless, desolated, home-destroyed creatures, standing unsheltered, and too often unfed, looking pitifully over the bare little garden spot that so lately was their pride and hope, neither you nor the good Senator will ever quite realize the comfort you have given nor the good you have done. There are 30,000 storm sufferers under our charge; five to ten thousand of these have gardens. We are getting the winter seed as fast as possible into their hands. The tight clutch of the fingers over the little package and the glisten in the patient eyes tell more plainly than words what the gift means to them. In six weeks from now their gardens all over the islands will be green, and I

am to-day informed by Mr. Fagan, of your seed division, that he has sent sacks of heavier seed, peas, beans, and corn, which we shall hold for them till planting time. Always thanking you, permit me to remain,

Respectfully,

CLARA BARTON,
President American National Red Cross.

Hon. J. S. MORTON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Mr. LODGE. What is the paper, Mr. President?

Mr. ALLEN. The first paper I offered is a statement of the Secretary of Agriculture showing the transfer of seeds from one Senator or one Representative to another, which accounts for the unequal distribution. To illustrate, I recall last spring having gone to my associates on this side of the Chamber, and possibly to some on the other side, who were representing States not afflicted with drought, and asking them to contribute to me a certain portion of the seeds allotted to them to be sent to my State, and I received, I think, something like six or seven thousand packages, which were transferred from their accounts by the Secretary of Agriculture to my account, and were sent into the State of Nebraska. That was practiced quite generally, and the statement which I have sent to the desk to be inserted in the RECORD gives an account of these transfers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska if it is not a fact that nevertheless these allowances were charged to the States to which they were issued? The statement made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], to which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] takes exception, is not traversed by any transfer of allowances, for the seeds are charged to the different States as they were originally issued from the Department, as I understand. If that is not so, I know the Senator from Nebraska will correct me.

Mr. ALLEN. I beg pardon of the Senator from Colorado. I think this is a fact: I think the States to which the allotments are made are, in the first instance, charged with the allotments. I think after that, where Senators and Representatives of those States have transferred a portion, or in some instances probably nearly all, of their seeds to Senators and Representatives of drought-stricken districts, those transfers are charged against the allotment to the State, and are accounted for in the statement I have sent to the desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. My impression is that that has not been done.

Mr. ALLEN. With these remarks, I think I have said all I desire to say.

Mr. HALE. I now ask that the urgent deficiency appropriation bill may be proceeded with.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I was astonished, Mr. President, to be called from my committee room by the announcement that the seed question was again before the Senate. The last I heard of it was the unanimous adoption of the joint resolution as it was amended, which had been pending here for some days.

Mr. ALLEN. I can explain to the Senator from Missouri what I was saying in a few words. There came into my hands a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture showing a transfer in detail of seeds last spring to various members of Congress and donations. In my own case I got donations of some six or seven thousand packages, which were sent into my State at my request. I have had inserted in the RECORD an itemized statement of those transfers which were honored by the Secretary of Agriculture, and also some letters from Rev. Luther P. Ludden, the gentleman in charge of the relief fund in my State, and a letter from Miss Clara Barton with reference to the distribution of some seeds down on the Sea Islands, where there was great suffering a year or so ago, as explanatory of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. That is the substance of all I have said on the subject.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, without detaining the Senate, and with the permission of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I wish to say a word in regard to this subject, without rising to a question of personal privilege, and I will ask the Secretary to read what the Secretary of Agriculture says himself in this morning's paper, which, I take it, is the highest authority in regard to his action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

MORTON'S REPLY TO VEST—WHY DROUGHT-STRICKEN NEBRASKA GOT MORE THAN ITS QUOTA OF SEED.

Being asked as to the charge made in the Senate yesterday afternoon by Senator Vest that the Secretary of Agriculture had distributed 150,000 more packages of seed in Nebraska than that State was entitled to last year, Secretary Morton said:

"Under the law, one-third of all the seed purchased was to be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture. In accordance with that provision, some years ago when there was great suffering along the Sea Islands of the Carolina coast, the Secretary of Agriculture, through Clara Barton and the Red Cross, gave a great portion of the one-third of the seed which he was authorized to distribute to the people whose fields and gardens had been ruined by the tidal wave. As to that very large distribution of seed to those Southern sufferers no complaint was made. Therefore, during the recent seasons of extreme drought in the Northwest the Secretary of Agriculture frankly confesses that he gave far more than the normal quota of seed to Nebraska, Kansas, and each of the Dakotas, and to Oklahoma. The Representatives and Senators from the States named and the Delegate from Oklahoma will verify that statement. This was a charitable and not a political distribution.

"The quotas for the drought-stricken sections were sent directly to and distributed by societies and persons designated by their respective communities for that charitable work.

"But single members of the House and Senate, as the records of the Department show, have distributed in a year several times as many seed in their respective States and districts as they were entitled to. And how and of whom did those liberal gentlemen get those great quantities of seed?"

The Secretary challenges the severest scrutiny of his intentions and his acts, and is delighted with the character of the enemies he seems to be propagating.

Mr. VEST. With the latter part of that statement I have not the slightest controversy. I am a well-known philanthropist, and I am glad to have contributed to the delight of the Secretary of Agriculture, as I should be to that of any other person; but I am disposed to inquire, when he claims that he has turned the Department of Agriculture into an eleemosynary institution, by what authority he has done it. It seems to me most astonishing that this stickler for law, who, after distributing seeds for three years, suddenly discovered that it was necessary for him to raise the question as to the legality of his action, and to inquire of the Attorney-General what was the condition of the law, should now, without the slightest authority which I can imagine, distribute for charitable purposes the tax money of the people of this country, and that, too, in the face of the well-known veto by the head of the Administration of an appropriation of $10,000 for the distribution of seeds in Texas a few years ago to meet drought conditions which the Secretary now speaks of in other States.

But, accepting his own statement, that he had the right to turn the Department of Agriculture into a charitable institution, he has simply made matters worse for himself by this public statement in the press of the country, as I shall proceed to show from his own report.

He says that he is charitably inclined, and found it necessary and proper to make a distribution to North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and Oklahoma, as well as Nebraska, where a drought existed at the same time and the same year. I now quote the figures from his report:

The Secretary of Agriculture, on his own motion, and under this claim that he had the right to distribute one-third of the seed, only sent 763 papers to North Dakota, to South Dakota 291,288, to Kansas he sent 304,010, to Oklahoma 79,990, making to three States and one Territory 676,051 papers of seeds, and to Nebraska 895,241—nearly 300,000 papers in excess of the other three States and one Territory. The excess to Nebraska was 219,190 packages, to speak accurately. The population in 1890 of Nebraska was 1,058,910; the population of the three States of North and South Dakota and Kansas and of the Territory of Oklahoma, by the same census, amounted to 2,000,457. The State of Kansas alone had 1,427,096 people in 1890, and received 304,010 papers of seed, while Nebraska, with only 1,058,910, received 895,241 papers.

Mr. President, if the Secretary of Agriculture is satisfied with that exhibit I am; and I am very glad to say it affords me intense delight to set him right before the public.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this is caput mortuum. The Senate this morning disposed of this entire subject.

Mr. VEST. I did not bring it up.

Mr. HALE. I know the Senator did not. I am very desirous of going on with the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine one question. Does he mean to call the Secretary of Agriculture a deadhead?

Mr. HALE. The Senator himself is entirely competent to answer that question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the Senator from Maine should give way a moment to a further discussion of this subject.

Mr. HALE. I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who said he only wanted two minutes, and apparently the whole general debate is going to be reopened. I can not yield for anything further, and I ask that the regular order be proceeded with.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from Maine to yield to me for one second.

Mr. HALE. I have just declined to yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] on the same subject-matter. I can not make any discrimination.

Mr. ALLEN. I merely want to say a word now, so that I shall not be compelled to consume the time in making my statement while the bill in charge of the Senator from Maine is under consideration.

Mr. HALE. I wish the Senator would make it then.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to say just one word, and then let the matter drop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. HALE. While the regular order is under consideration

the Senator will find his opportunity. I would not decline to yield if I had not just done the same thing to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading of "Office of Public Printer," at the top of page 2, to insert:

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

For printing and binding, to be executed under the direction of the Public Printer, as follows:

For the Department of Justice, $3,000.

For the United States Geological Survey, viz: For printing advance copies of papers on the economic resources of the United States, as provided in the sundry civil act of March 2, 1895, $4,000.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator in charge of this bill would not permit a brief statement in answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], with reference to the distribution of seeds, that it might go into the RECORD in conjunction with what was then said, but I have observed every time the Appropriations Committee walked into this Chamber with a bill that every other man is supposed to take a back seat and not question their authority or what they want, but to tamely submit to dictation—I was going to say obstreperousness, but perhaps the remark is a little too harsh—until the Appropriations Committee have got through and see fit to announce that they are ready to retire and consider other bills.

I want at this time to record my protest, however feeble it may be—and it no doubt is feeble—against the system which has grown up here—I do not know how long it has been in existence—of the Senator in charge of an appropriation bill walking into the Chamber, buttoning his coat up tight to the throat, and saying, "We want unanimous consent to consider all the committee amendments before any other man is heard," and after that is done to sit like a watchdog and object strenuously to every amendment which may be offered by any other Senator.

I am perfectly willing to concede, Mr. President, that the Committee on Appropriations knows much more than the entire Senate; I think possibly their selection indicates that and forecloses the question, and that we who are sent here to represent States which are not represented on the Committee on Appropriations are supposed not to be interested in the distribution of the public moneys of the country, and that our States shall have no voice whatever in such distribution, except as that voice may be indirectly represented by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I am a little bit loath to say this, because I have some favors to ask of the Appropriations Committee—not favors, but I have some measures which are to go upon appropriation bills, and I am a little loath under those circumstances to make this statement; but it does seem to me that the true and the natural and proper thing to do is to give the entire Senate, as representing the entire nation, an equal opportunity in the formation and enactment of appropriation bills. I do not think it was ever contemplated by the fathers of this country that two or three men should control the appropriations of this nation, amounting to $450,000,000 or $460,000,000 a year.

What I say is not prompted by any personal dislike for any member of the Appropriations Committee, for I think they are all my personal friends—I certainly feel friendly to them—but this practice is raising up in the Senate of the United States a government of the committee. We have been taught to believe, especially we who live away in the interior of the nation and are therefore supposed to know but little about public matters and public measures and public men, that this is a government by the people, for the people, and of the people; but, Mr. President, the American people must unlearn much they have been taught within the last few years. They must learn the great truth that, so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned, it is a government of the committee, by the committee, and generally for the committee, and not for the country.

What is there about these appropriations which are being brought in here from time to time which should give the honorable Senator from Maine, for instance, an opportunity to stand here like a slave driver and crack his whip over the backs of Senators representing other States that are interested in these appropriations? The Senator rises in his place and demands of the Presiding Officer to lay his bill before the Senate, as though that bill had the right of way and as though no other Senator dare open his mouth and speak out upon any subject unless he be a member of that committee.

Sir, the State of Nebraska is not represented upon that committee. We have a million and a half people who are interested in these appropriations and who pay their proportion of the taxes of this country. Why should this committee come in here and undertake to control the affairs of the Senate, and say to me or say to the Senators from any other State who have business before the Senate to be considered: "We are the Appropriations Committee; you must get out of the road. When we want a bill laid before the Senate, we are to have it; and no man dare open his mouth to protest against it."

I asked the honorable Senator from Maine a moment ago to permit me to make a single remark and put it in connection with the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri on the distribution of seed, and I was snapped off as though I had no right even in this Chamber, to say nothing about rising and addressing the Chair upon any subject. And what was that remark? The honorable Senator from Missouri, with whom I agree in many things, and with whom I agreed this morning in voting for the joint resolution to require the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, made a statement to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture had put into the State of Nebraska a greater amount of his distributive portion of seeds than he had put into Kansas, the two Dakotas, and Oklahoma.

Mr. President, that may be true; but what I wanted to correct the Senator from Missouri about—and I should have corrected him with fewer words than I am using now if the Senator from Maine had yielded to me—was the fact that the distribution was an equitable and honorable and proper distribution considering the portions of the States of Kansas and Nebraska and the portions of the Territory of Oklahoma which were drought-stricken, if precedent counted for anything. I am not a political friend or associate of the Secretary of Agriculture; I do not think he entertains a political opinion with which I agree; I think we are entirely antipodal in our political beliefs and political practices; yet, Mr. President, as the head of the Agricultural Department of this nation and as a distinguished citizen of my State, it is eminently proper, and it is due to him, that this statement should go into the RECORD in connection with the statement of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am more anxious to go on with the bill than to take up any old questions that have already been settled by the Senate with reference to the Committee on Appropriations. The committee has not taken up in an aggressive way the time of the Senate, or even asserted itself during this whole session. We are now in the third month of the session, and this is the first occasion on which the committee has taken up any time. There are four appropriation bills already reported, and the general demand, not by me nor the committee, but from the Senate and the country, is to proceed with their consideration. I have been very moderate about them in every way. I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska at his request to make his statement. Then I yielded to the Senator from Missouri to answer him; and then a general debate sprang up. The Senator from Colorado came in. Then the Senator from Colorado wanted to come in again, and I drew the line on him. I said this is dead matter and I must insist on the regular order. I did just what anyone would have done, and to-morrow the Senator himself, who is at bottom a good-natured man, will not think himself more justified for this little ebullition against the committee than anyone else thinks. He will see that I was very fair with him and very liberal and wanted to give him his chance, but I could not consent that a general debate, in which one Senator and another was springing up, should go on to the exclusion of the pending bill.

This is all I have to say. I hope the reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I trust the member of the Committee on Appropriations having this bill in charge will not think that I make any criticism upon the committee if I ask why it is that a bill which comes here from the other House for deficiencies carrying $4,421,000 in round numbers carries about $6,000,000 as reported by the Committee on Appropriations? The point to which my question is directed is not so much as to whether the items are necessary as it is to the point whether the House which originates these bills ought not to be made to appropriate for necessary items.

I am not going to inquire at present about the necessity of these items, but for years and years it has been our practice that appropriation bills coming over from the House were constantly enlarged in the Senate upon the plea that the items added in the Senate must be appropriated for in order to carry out law or to pay for expenses already contracted in pursuance of law. I think it is time that that should stop, and so upon this first appropriation bill which has come from the House to the Senate I think that the Appropriations Committee ought to have refused to appropriate for these items, at least to the extent which they have been appropriated for, and it is a good time to make that refusal, because these are deficiencies. This is not the last deficiency that we can or shall have. There are plenty of opportunities for the House to send us further deficiency bills, and they always do so. If these items are matters which the Government must pay, and which must be appropriated for, I would very much prefer for one that the Senate Committee on Appropriations had refused to add them and had taken the bill as it came from the House. I think if the

committee would do that and the Senate would do it we should very soon have a different practice from what has heretofore prevailed.

It is said here in the Senate—it has been said during the discussions relating to the distribution of appropriation bills—that the House deliberately sends bills here for less than they ought to amount to for the purpose of having the Senate add to them. It seems to me that the matter of originating appropriations belongs in the House; that it belongs to the committees of the House having the appropriations in charge, and that the duty of the Senate should be rather a supervisory duty with reference to the appropriation bills—an examination to see whether the items appropriated by the House are to carry out existing law or to pay for bills which have been contracted under existing law, and not to take up here in the Senate the business of the partial origination of appropriation bills, for that is what we are doing here, and what we have been doing every year.

For myself I wish that the practice might cease, and then, I think, there would be no discussion as to whether appropriation bills should be distributed here to different committees. If the Appropriations Committee and the Senate confined its duties to what I think were intended under the Constitution, to the examination of the bills sent here from the House and the correction of errors or the insertion of items which had been inadvertently omitted in the making up of the appropriation bills in the House, we should have no criticism of the Appropriations Committee, and we should have no desire on the part of other committees to get the appropriation bills, I think. But it is the practice which has sprung up here in the Senate to treat an appropriation bill as an original matter after it gets here that originates criticism, and I think accounts largely for the desire of other committees to have appropriation bills referred to them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question right there. I propose myself to oppose certain items contained in the pending bill, but I do not think I go so far as the Senator from Connecticut goes when he advocates the almost entire elimination of the Senate from the work of constructing these bills. Therefore I ask the Senator in reference to the proposed amendment of the committee on page 23, "For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress at its present session in Senate Document No. 70, $441,104.80." That is nearly a third of the Senate committee's addition. Certainly the Senator from Connecticut would not say that it was not a legitimate function of the Senate, if the House had omitted to make an appropriation to pay these final judgments of the Court of Claims, to add that item to the bill. What would the Senator say, following the line of argument defining his opinion as to the proper treatment by the Senate of these bills, as to that item, for illustration?

Mr. PLATT. I would say this about it. I do not know whether that report was made from the Court of Claims before the bill was sent to the Senate from the House, but if the certification of the judgments by the Court of Claims had been made to Congress before the urgent deficiency bill came from the House to the Senate, I would simply decline to consider it and let the House send us another urgent deficiency bill. I do not know whether it is true or not that that certification came to Congress before this bill came over from the House. I do not suppose that it did; but if it did it would illustrate just what I would have the Senate do in a case of that kind.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state to the Senator that Document No. 70 is a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury dated January 13, 1896, containing a list of judgments. They are nearly all final judgments for the extra pay of letter carriers. At the close of the document——

Mr. PLATT. Where is it?

Mr. CHANDLER. The item is on page 23 of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Where is it in the report?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have the report in my hand, and I will hand it to the Senator. On the last page there are a few miscellaneous judgments. Manifestly the Senator from Connecticut, who wishes to be discriminating and just on this subject, and not to undertake to bring the Senate within too narrow limits, would be in favor, I think, of having those judgments added to this bill whether the certification was in time for the bill in the House or whether it came afterwards.

Mr. PLATT. I am not speaking of items; I am speaking of the well-known practice which prevails in the House not to make appropriations as large as they are required to be made and sending the bills to the Senate for the purpose of having them increased in the Senate, knowing, as they suppose, that the items must be appropriated for, and then holding up their hands and talking about their economy and the extravagance of the Senate. I do not know how far the items added to the pending appropriation bill may justify the argument in this particular case, but that that matter has been going on here for years and years there can be no question.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has called attention to a condition that the Committee on Appropriations is continually meeting, and a condition that has given rise to a feeling of restiveness in the committee, sometimes of indignation and protest, at the practice which the House has of making inadequate appropriations and leaving it for the Senate, through its committee, at first to report the appropriations which are incomplete as they come from the House. The committee has felt restive under this practice. We have tried at different times, in some degree, to adopt a policy that would leave the bills as the House has left them. But the Senate itself and the Senator himself will see that the moment we do that we are beset both by Senators who discover the omissions of the House and by the Departments, who keenly feel the result of the omissions in the transaction of their business, to set right what the House has failed to do, and we are told that the discretion is as large in the Senate as in the House, and that the duty of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate is not simply to deal with the question as to whether the House has done its duty, but with what appropriations are needed for the running of the Government, and that we should take the broad view.

We are continually beset by these appeals, I say, from Senators and heads of Departments; and I think the Senator will see that, impatient as we are at the course of the House, the undoubted broad, general view that it is our business to do the right thing, whatever our neighbor does, is the view that ought to obtain. The Senator, I think, with the Senator from New Hampshire, goes too far; and I do not think, because the right of originating appropriation bills is in the House, that we should——

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not exclusively in the House.

Mr. HALE. I do not think that we should be narrowed simply to correcting errors and forms and leave the bills with them. We could no more do that than the Committee on Finance could——

Mr. COCKRELL. Why does the Senator say that the right to originate appropriation bills is in the House?

Mr. PLATT. I do not say that. I admit the constitutional right of the Senate, but the practice ever since the foundation of the Government has been that the House would originate the bills.

Mr. HALE. It is a practically conceded right, and I do not presume it will be ever raised again. I have my views upon the subject. I think the right exists there; but that question is not up now.

As I was proceeding to say, you can no more hold the Committee on Appropriations and the Senate to a rigid rule of only correcting errors and forms than you can hold the Senate and its Committee on Finance upon the undoubted question that the House is the sole body to raise revenue by a bill. The whole right of amendment is resting in this body and always has and always will be freely performed. The Senator from Connecticut himself, who is a member of the Committee on Finance, when the next tariff bill is reported to this body, with the undoubted right on the part of the House, which nobody questions, to originate that tariff bill, will not be content to resolve himself into one of a committee to correct forms and errors, but will in many respects revolutionize that bill. Why? Because he will believe that it is for the good of some section, it may be, or of the whole country to depart radically from the bill as passed by the other House. So the Committee on Appropriations finds itself in just that situation.

I agree with the Senator that in many cases the House fails to appropriate. I think it does it with its eyes open, and that there follows an arraignment of the Senate as an extravagant body for adding to its appropriations. Yet I do not see any remedy. I think we have got to bear that unjust reproach just as in human life many men find themselves constantly misinterpreted. They are trying to do the right thing, but their motives are misinterpreted and they are found fault with. The only thing, as the committee is trying to do and will continue to try to do as long as it is trusted by the Senate, is to get the appropriations as nearly right as possible, no matter what the House has done.

Now, in the line of this endeavor, the report which I have submitted with the bill shows pretty much all the additions which have been made. They are additions that were not made unless by the estimate of the Department, the certification of the court, or items coming down from the proper accounting bodies of the Treasury Department. Almost all of the items are included in three or four large clauses in the bill. The appropriations for back pay and bounty, claims certified by the Department, is an appropriation that we make in gross. These meritorious claims are pushing and they claim it as urgent. An appropriation is made for expenses of United States courts, brought in by the Department, duly certified to, owed to their officials and minor officers and pressing for payment; and we have got to pay them. The item for judgments of the United States courts, running on interest which we are paying, the courts certify to us through the Department.

The time of appeal has passed; it is a debt against the Government, pushing and pressing. We have always put an appropria-

tion to pay those judgments on the urgent deficiency bill. The House did not do it. I think in this case the certification came later than the passage of the bill by the House. But whether it did or not, if the committee had neglected it the result would simply be that we would have put it on some other bill. Therefore the committee, dealing with it in rather the large general way, overcame their own restiveness and impatience, which certainly is as great as that of the Senator from Connecticut, and put on that item.

Then the item for the Library building was put on, that noble structure which meets our eyes whenever we gaze to the east, in which we shall have great pride as Americans, which shall take our constantly increasing library in all its expansive rooms and corridors, and will in generatious to come present an accumulation of books, documents, and valuable treatises that will be the pride of the English-speaking nations all over the globe. The superintendent, a man whom nobody distrusts, has said to us that he is right now where he needs this money to perfect that work during the early spring months. We have got to appropriate it either now or at some other time. General Casey knows that of which he speaks. He is the one man who will be able at the end of the structure of a great Government building, after expending millions of dollars upon the building, to keep the figure inside of the original estimate and turn over money unexpended to the Treasury. He tells us, and the committee specially appointed to consider that subject, the Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, presided over by the veteran and distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], after investigating the whole subject, tells us that it is essential for us to put that item on the bill. We did not think that because the House committee failed to do it or because even the House would arraign us with extravagance because we had put it on, that that ought to be the only controlling element in our consideration of the subject, and so we put it on.

These three or four large items make up about $1,300,000 of the $1,500,000 of increase. Now, I am glad that the Senator has interposed at this point and made this objection, because it shows the difficulties that the committee encounters. One Senator complains that we put on too much, that we ought to hold the House down to their appropriations, and many other Senators will complain because we have not added to the bill much more than we have thought it advisable and desirous; because this is not a general deficiency appropriation bill. It is a general appropriation bill, but it is not the regular deficiency appropriation bill, which is what may be called the "cleaning-up" bill and comes nearly at the end of a session. The urgent deficiency bill is a bill that, as the Senator knows, has grown up in the custom and practice of the two Houses within the last half dozen years and takes up the items that are most pushing. Therefore it is that in regard to many items we have been urged to put upon this bill we have explained to Senators and to the Departments that they will go on the other bill; and in a reasonable manner they assent to that course, and so they expect that will be done. Now, I have given as well as I can——

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I know the Senator sees and realizes and feels restive under it, but does he not see that when it comes about that a bill for $4,000,000 is made five and one-half million dollars by the committee here in the Senate by putting on these items he opens the door and invites Senators to present to the committee items which they think ought to go on the bill, and then because the committee does not put on the items which Senators present to them and urge upon them it is criticised on that account?

Mr. HALE. No, I do not think that in any way it comes because we open the door. We have that condition constantly. We have to do the best we can. We had in these cases to discriminate as well as we could between the urgent deficiencies and those that would naturally go over to the regular general deficiency bill. I do not think the fact that we put on certain items has anything to do with the action of Senators. In fact, they do not know whether we are going to put them on or not.

Mr. PLATT. They understand it.

Mr. HALE. They seek to have their own items put on. They do undoubtedly understand that the committee will always put on more or less items. I wish sometimes that I could exchange service with Senators who I know in a good-natured way and not an unfriendly way to the committee make these strictures, and let them serve on the Committee on Appropriations for a time. Then they would see how difficult it would be to carry out a programme like that suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, not to add to the appropriation bills as passed by the other House. It would be practically giving up the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations representing this great body, and would leave the whole framework and passage of the great appropriation bills to the other House without their being subjected to the coordinate action of this body. I doubt if the Senate itself, or the Senator himself, on reflection, would go as far as that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question bearing on the precise point that he is discussing. Here is an appropriation for completing the Congressional Library building, which I am very much in favor of. I think the appropriation ought to be made, and that it ought to be made now, upon the pending bill. But it is equally true to say that it ought to have been put on in the other House. Now, was the request made that it should be put on in the other House, and——

Mr. HALE. The Senator——

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not fully asked my question. And is it not true that a great many officers of the Government and a great many individuals who want appropriations stay away from the House of Representatives, do not present there their claims or the subjects in which they are interested, intending to let the bills go through the House without having the items put upon them, and then come over here and follow up the Senate committee, and the Senate committee have the items put on in the Senate, because it is easier to get it done here, they think?

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], the chairman of the committee, knows a great deal more about these matters than I do. He is also a member of the Special Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress; and he will answer the question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state——

Mr. PLATT. Allow me to supplement what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, and then the Senator from Iowa can answer the whole inquiry.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. PLATT. Take the matter of claims arising out of Indian affairs. I presume that during the present session of Congress I have had as many as five or six persons representing matters pending before the Indian Affairs Committee say to me, "We suppose the best way to have the claim paid is by an amendment to the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate." They seem to have come to understand that the way to get their claims through is to have them put on the Indian appropriation bill by amendment in the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer first the supplemental question of the Senator from Connecticut. It has become a sort of custom to make the Indian appropriation bill an ominum-gatherum for all the claims that people have for Indian depredations or otherwise. The items are usually referred first in this body to the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which the Senator is a most distinguished member, and that committee straightway reports them back to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Appropriations, and thus they become in order.

Mr. HALE. That committee reports favorably.

Mr. ALLISON. It reports favorably. Then they are put upon the appropriation bills, especially upon the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the urgent deficiency bill is a new form of deficiency appropriation. Under the old practice it was the custom to bring in a general deficiency bill toward the end of a session, the bill covering all the deficiencies for the various Departments of the Government during the year, but, under the present practice, reprehensible or otherwise, of late years the appropriations for the fiscal year are so inadequate as respects carrying on the ordinary operations of the Government that it becomes necessary to have what is called an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I have no doubt at this moment (although I have not made inquiry especially in regard to these particular claims coming from the Department of Justice, but it has happened in past years, and is the case in the current year, I believe) that the courts of the United States in actual session are obliged to adjourn and postpone contesting cases, criminal and otherwise, pending before them, because there is no money to carry on the operations of the courts. Hence it becomes necessary that, in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill, these appropriations shall be made in order that the ordinary operations of the Government shall go on.

Now, recurring to the Library amendment, as was suggested, I happen to be a member of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] now in my eye is chairman. Soon after the pending bill came to the Senate I was notified to appear as a member of that committee at its session, in order to consider the question of an appropriation for the Library building. That committee met. General Casey, the superintendent of the building, Captain Green, the acting superintendent, and other gentlemen were present before it, and General Casey said to us that if he had this appropriation now it would make a difference of six months at least in the time of the completion of the new Library building; that it would take six months longer to complete the building if he had to await the appropriation in the sundry civil appropriation bill, so called.

This is only in part a deficiency, when you come to analyze it carefully. It is a necessary appropriation in order that the Li-

brary building, which has cost us nearly $6,000,000, shall be completed and the keys turned over to the two Houses of Congress by the middle of January next. He made a strong case before the committee. Having in view such inquiries as have been made here to-day by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Connecticut, I said to him: "General Casey, why did you not present your case before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in order that the Senate might not be subjected to the criticism of swelling these bills?" as the Senator from Connecticut now criticises us for doing. He said that he went before the committee as soon as he could get there, and that when he reached the committee he was told by the committee that it was too late; that it had considered the bill, that it had been passed upon in the House committee, and that he must go to the Senate committee and get the item put on in the Senate. They recognized the necessity for the appropriation and made no objection to it.

The Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress reported the amendment and sent it to the Committee on Appropriations. The subject was not only considered, therefore, by the Committee on Appropriations, but it was considered also by the Committee on the Library; and there was a unanimous judgment that as to an expenditure of this sort, of so great importance to the convenience of the two Houses and appertaining to a great building which had already cost five and a half million dollars, it would be unwise to postpone until June or July, perhaps, the necessary appropriation for the completion of the building, so it was put on the bill. Although the Senator from Connecticut criticises the Committee on Appropriations for reporting the amendment, I have no doubt that if we should have a yea-and-nay vote he would be the last man to cast his vote in the negative as respects so important an appropriation.

That reaches $480,000 of the increase that we have put on the bill. The principal other item of increase is $441,000 for judgments of the Court of Claims not appealed from. Those judgments draw 4 per cent interest, and were certified to the Senate—said to have been certified, and I have no doubt they were certified—after the appropriation bill had passed the other House.

Mr. PLATT. No, before; a week before.

Mr. ALLISON. Let me say that dates are not so important when you remember that those documents are sent to the table of the President of the Senate or the table of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and are referred to committees and immediately go to the Public Printer. They are not read in detail in the two Houses. They are simply presented, ordered to be printed, and referred to the proper committee. It is often a week or ten days after the date of the reference before any eye in any one of the committees can have an opportunity of seeing those documents. Therefore I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that this item also was not before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Now, here are two items, one of $480,000 and one of $440,000, the last one having interest charged against the Government at the rate of 4 per cent; and whatever we may say of the credit of the Government, it certainly is not wise for us to be paying the current rate of interest, 4 per cent, if in any way we can pay those claims. There are other items, but I do not intend to discuss them in detail. The principal other item is the one which the Senator from New Hampshire says it is his purpose to criticise, and of course that is proper. But the items as to the Department of Justice are important ones; and, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who expresses his purpose to criticise those items, that if we shall remain in session for two months longer, in addition to the deficiencies here presented to us, he will find other deficiencies for the current year to carry on the courts of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me a word at this point?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] spoke of the amounts proposed to be appropriated for the courts as expenditures already made and constituting an indebtedness already existing. I do not understand that to be an accurate statement, if the Senator from Maine will allow me. I do not understand that the amounts now proposed to be appropriated for deficiencies of the courts have already been expended. The officials intrusted with those expenditures have in a half or three-quarters of a year used up the appropriations for the whole year.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Hampshire is wrong.

Mr. CHANDLER. And now they come in and say, "Not that we owe so much money which you must pay, but we want to incur such and such additional indebtedness in order to carry on the courts. You must pay it or the courts must stop." Am I not right?

Mr. HALE. No; the Senator from New Hampshire is wrong about it. A great portion of the money we are now proposing to appropriate has already been expended. The Department has not the money, and the bills will come in for the next three or four months and will swamp a large proportion of these appropriations. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has indicated, before we get through the year there will be hundreds and hundreds of thousands more wanted upon other bills that will come in.

The Department is always behind. It comes from a very bad system of appropriations that the other House makes in this manner. They only appropriate about enough to carry the Department around to the 1st of January, and for nearly two months now the Department has not had money. So a great portion of the appropriation now proposed to be made comes for the past as well as the future.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me while we are on this subject?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The expenditures for United States courts have grown in ten years from about $3,000,000 to $6,000,000. For the current year $3,000,000 has already been appropriated and expended——

Mr. HALE. Up to December.

Mr. CHANDLER. And $3,000,000 more is proposed to be appropriated and expended, making $6,000,000. If the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Maine are right (and we will discuss that question more at length when those items are reached), before the end of the present Congress we will have to appropriate a million or two million dollars more, and that will make the expenditures for the courts during the present fiscal year $8,000,000 instead of $6,000,000, which is the highest amount they have ever yet attained. If the Senators are right that will be the result.

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt that if it were possible to clean up the Department of Justice to the 1st day of July, so as to start without any arrearages, in addition to what we appropriated last year, added to by what is proposed to be appropriated in the pending bill, a million or two million dollars more would be needed.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not intend to argue the question as to the courts at this moment, but I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire and to other Senators that it is impossible to arrange in advance or in time for the total expenditures of the United States courts. Here is the pay of witnesses, of jurors, of marshals and their deputies, with mileage, etc. Every one of those is an independent item, not under the control of the Department of Justice, not under the control of the two Houses of Congress, not even under the control of the courts. A new case arises in the circuit court of the State of Iowa, if you please, or of the State of Ohio, and a large number of witnesses are summoned, and the marshal has fees and mileage to and from distant points for the purpose of summoning those jurors and witnesses.

Mr. PLATT. Does not the Attorney-General make an estimate to cover probable increases?

Mr. ALLISON. He does make an estimate, and I am merely trying to show that it is always a flexible estimate and can never be accurately made. It has been made from year to year, but never has been found enough.

Now, if the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and his committee will so alter and arrange those laws that the marshals and the deputy marshals and the attorneys and assistant attorneys shall have specific compensation and none other, and that they shall not be allowed of their own volition to create fees by artificial causes or by real causes, and thus swell the expenditures of the courts from year to year, it will be different. Take certain States of the Union. Take, if you please, the State of North Carolina or the State of Texas——

Mr. PLATT. Or the Indian Territory.

Mr. ALLISON. Or the Indian Territory or my own State, Iowa, which I will include in order that there may be no discrimination as to States. You will find that the prosecutions in the States and Territories are enormous and are increasing as to illicit distilleries, the sale of intoxicating liquors, and so on. No court can absolutely regulate those charges and fees; no Attorney-General can estimate accurately what they will be, and therefore these estimates are from the necessity of the situation often wide of the mark. But whatever they are they must be paid when they have been incurred and audited by the proper accounting officers of the Government.

With the exception of two or three items, every item that has been put into the bill has been put there because it was regarded as urgent in its character, which ought to be appropriated for now. It is a misfortune that those appropriations were not provided in the other House, but they were not, and the Senate, having knowledge of the fact and of the needs of the Government, certainly can not abdicate its powers, because I do not agree with the Senator from Connecticut that we are a mere supervisory power, that we are to stand by and sit by and do nothing except to see that appropriations which are proposed to be made by the other House are wise appropriations.

If I understand the meaning of the Constitution of my country,

it is with respect to appropriations in this body as it is with regard to every other public question. There is no limitation on this body as to the power of amendment, not even to revenue bills, as was so well stated by the Senator from Maine. It is true as to revenue bills that the House of Representatives must originate them, but when they come here we can, if we choose, and we have done it many times, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert what we please as amendments to those bills.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] claimed that we could even originate appropriation bills in this body; and that has been for a long time a disputed question between the two Houses. But that we are to be limited as to the power of amendment seems to me to be a dangerous doctrine to be asserted in the Senate by so eminent a lawyer as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

ASSISTANT DOORKEEPERS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to submit a privileged resolution, which I have no doubt will be assented to by the members of the Senate. An amendment will be offered by a Senator on the other side.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Alonzo H. Stewart, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby, chosen assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. I offer an amendment to come in at the end of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the resolution:

And that Bernard W. Layton be, and he is hereby, chosen acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. I will state the reason why I offer the amendment to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio. The custom in the Senate, indeed in both Houses of Congress, has been that no matter which party controls the organization, on each side of the Chamber there shall be one officer satisfactory to the side. It is true that heretofore, since 1879, those offices have been filled by appointment and not by election, but I think myself that the better rule is to have both officers selected by a resolution.

The resolution and the amendment create no additional offices whatever. The resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio is simply to fill the vacancy created by the death of Mr. Isaac Bassett. The other officer, Mr. Layton, is here by appointment. It is proposed simply to designate both by a resolution, without any increase in the number of officers.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. HARRIS. Let the original proposition of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Alonzo H. Stewart, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby, chosen assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Now let the amendment be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the resolution:

And that Bernard W. Layton be, and he is hereby, chosen acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest that the Senator put in the amendment the State from which Mr. Layton comes.

Mr. GORMAN. Very well; I will insert the words "of Ohio" after his name.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the selection of these two officers of the Senate, but I have a profound objection to appointments being made or elections being had without any kind of knowledge, consultation, or consent on the part of Senators. The system of appointments being made by a few without the knowledge or the consent of or communication with Senators is, in my opinion, an exceedingly objectionable one; and for that reason, while I shall very cheerfully vote for the selection of these persons, and have no doubt of their competency for the positions, I shall ask that the resolution go over, in order that we may have further knowledge upon the subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Florida will not insist upon his request. The appointment of Mr. Stewart is to fill a vacancy, and there is no dissent in the Chamber——

Mr. CALL. I have not the slightest objection——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to say a word, and hear what I have to say? It is to fill a vacancy, and there is no dissent in the Chamber on that proposition.

Now, as to the other office; the amendment does nothing but confirm the gentleman in the place which he now fills. It gives him exactly the place he now has, with his present salary, and I do not see how the Senator can object to it.

Mr. CALL. I have said that I do not object on the ground of the competency of these two persons. I have sat here for many years, and I have seen additions to the committees; I have seen the service of the Senate filled, and never yet in seventeen years have I been consulted in regard to the appointment of a single page, nor has the State which I in part have represented for so many years ever had a single one upon this floor. Before I came here there was, I think, by the courtesy of the Republicans, a little boy from Florida here. But never have I had any knowledge whatever of the manner in which the business of this body is conducted.

Now, in deference to the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], I withdraw the objection; but I do protest, and I shall hereafter protest, against the secret methods by which the business of the Senate is conducted, for so far as I am concerned they are secret.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know whether there is a division of honors between the two parties; whether one of the gentlemen is a Republican and the other a Democrat.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state that I do not know the politics of either of the two gentlemen. I never inquired. I consider it the most nonpartisan measure that ever came before this body.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know whether or not what I have asked is the fact?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is due to the Senate to say that after consultation with our present very efficient Sergeant-at-Arms, who usually has appointed these officers, by common consent it was agreed that one should be chosen on this side of the Chamber and one on the other, and from among the young fellows who have really grown up from pages, passing through the experience Mr. Bassett passed through during his long period of service. I do not know the politics of either of the gentlemen. I know them by their faces when I see them. I know they are active, energetic, efficient, and will no doubt be better officers in the places proposed to be assigned to them than any new persons could possibly be.

I suppose the selection of the gentleman who sits on the other side of the Chamber was made by our Democratic friends. Mr. Stewart was named on this side by general agreement, I may say. As for his politics, I do not know that he has any. If there is any misunderstanding about it I would rather let the resolution go over until to-morrow, although I supposed a matter of this kind could be disposed of at this time.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to say a word?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. The young man named in the resolution who has been here nineteen years is a Republican. The other young gentleman who is named in the amendment is a Democrat who was put in here by the other side of the Chamber. They are both very satisfactory to this side of the Chamber, I think, and I hope there will be no delay in the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. VOORHEES. There is no objection on this side.

Mr. SQUIRE. I wish to say a word in addition to what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has stated. With the permission of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I will state that I understand that Mr. Stewart is really the only person now connected with the personnel of the Sergeant-at-Arms' office who is familiar with all the proceedings and methods of the Senate, he having been here all of these years. He is the only person who is familiar with the methods in vogue in the Senate on public occasions. He is thereby peculiarly fitted for the position and the best fitted of any person at present connected with the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Mississippi will allow me, I will state that I have known Mr. Stewart very well for the nineteen years I have been here. He is a very efficient young officer, but for any Senator to say that he is the only person who comprehends the duties is saying a great deal too much.

Mr. SQUIRE. I mean the only one connected with the Sergeant-at-Arms' office.

Mr. HARRIS. There is not a Senator here who does not know both of these young men. We have had ample opportunity to know them and to know that they are extremely efficient and very worthy.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not have occupied any time if I had been allowed to proceed. I merely desire to say that if Mr. Stewart is the choice of the Republican side of the Chamber it is very satisfactory to me. If the other gentleman is put forward as the choice of this side of the Chamber, I wish to say that I have never had an opportunity of expressing any choice on the subject. That is all.

Mr. GORMAN. After the statement of my friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I think it is necessary for me to make a statement.

Under the resolution of 1879 the two positions which are now about to be filled by a resolution of the Senate were made subject to appointment by the Sergeant-at-Arms. That is the rule of the body to-day. Under that rule Mr. Layton was selected as acting

assistant doorkeeper on this side of the Chamber when we organized two years ago, at which time every Democratic Senator in this body had as perfect and as full knowledge as I had of what was being done and acted upon all appointments made.

Now, our friends on the other side of the Chamber, after a conference among themselves, desire to fill the vacancy created by Captain Bassett's death by a resolution of the Senate rather than by appointment by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. GEORGE. They had a consultation. Why not let us have one?

Mr. GORMAN. And in order to put the two officers on an exact equality I have moved to insert the name of Mr. Layton as the acting assistant doorkeeper. He is now in office and is performing the duties. That is all there is of it.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to make only one remark in response to the Senator from Maryland. If the other side have taken the pains to select their candidate in caucus, as I understood they did, I do not see any reason why the Democrats should not have the same privilege. I am opposed to these little things that come around outside of the Chamber being disposed of without giving us a fair show. I have nothing against the gentleman, so far as I know, but I should like to go through the form, at least, of voting on the subject.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire whether the Senator's complaint is that this gentleman was selected according to the Mississippi plan?

Mr. GEORGE. The remark made by the Senator from Massachusetts is a very unusual one. It is a little fling which he has no right to make, and therefore I shall not make any response to it. But as a member of the Senate and as a member of the minority of this body, I say that whenever we go into the election of an officer the members of the minority generally have a right to be heard on the subject. I should like to go through the form of it anyhow, just to keep up appearances.

Mr. HOAR. The Mississippi plan, I understand, is a plan by which candidates are selected by the intelligence of the State and not by the numbers at large. That is all I meant to say.

Mr. GEORGE. The reply to that is that the constitutions of Massachusetts and of Mississippi are very much alike upon that subject, and everybody can vote in Mississippi who is entitled to vote under the law and the constitution of the State as much so as in the State of Massachusetts.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. GEORGE. I object to the consideration of the resolution for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over under the rule, and the Senate resumes the consideration of the appropriation bill.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. PLATT. This little episode having ended for to-day——

Mr. VOORHEES. If the Senator will pardon me, I am not anxious about this matter, but it seems to me that this is a question of privilege entitled to consideration and action at once—a question touching the organization of the Senate, and I do not understand that it has to go over a day under objection. I do not pose as a parliamentarian, but I should like to call the attention of those who are better versed than I am to that point.

Mr. PLATT. We were discussing the question of an appropriation bill when the question of privilege was interposed and resulted in it being discovered that there was some want of harmony on the other side of the Chamber. I desire now to come back to the matter of the appropriation bill, and I want to disclaim any purpose to criticise the Committee on Appropriations. I have been, I think, a hard and fast friend of the Committee on Appropriations in a good many battles that they have had to fight here in the Senate, and I do not wish to be understood as criticising them, nor do I wish to be understood as saying that they should abdicate any proper and legitimate function of the committee; and I hold, pretty radically, that we can originate appropriation bills here if we choose. We do originate appropriation bills every day; we pass bills originally here which carry appropriations, and very often large appropriations. So we are not disagreed upon that point; but nevertheless the trouble remains, and the committee admit it, and it is just as serious to them as it is to the other members of the Senate, that we are drifting along and drifting along until it comes to be understood not only by the House of Representatives, but by the Departments and by Senators, that the spot to get legislation upon appropriation bills is here in the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] says, in reply to a suggestion of mine, that that had come to be an understanding with regard to one bill which I know about, the Indian appropriation bill. He says that the Committee on Indian Affairs recommend the amendments, so as to have them in order. That is true, Mr. President. I do not suppose that the Senator from Iowa intended to criticise me as a member of that committee, because the Senator knows that very frequently I have been in the minority, and he will remember one very large item of $3,000,000 which I opposed, and which he opposed as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which was recommended by a majority vote of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

But under the custom which has grown up the recommendations of the committees of the Senate for amendments to be attached to appropriation bills so as to make them in order has come to be very much a matter of form, or a matter of courtesy, or a matter of favor to Senators who desire to have the amendments put in shape to be placed on appropriation bills; and the fact that so many committees do, as a matter of favor or of form, or, perhaps, upon a contest in a committee, by a majority vote recommend amendments to be placed on appropriation bills in the Senate, arises from the fact that it has come to be understood here that the appropriation bills are to be largely amended in the Senate. Nothing that has been said by the Committee on Appropriations meets this suggestion. It is a growing evil; and the more appropriation bills are amended here in the Senate the more it will be understood in the other House, in the Departments, and by Senators who desire to favor amendments, that here is the place for amendments to such bills. I would not have the committee abdicate their functions at all; I would not for a moment concede that we can not originate appropriation bills here in the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator mean general appropriation bills?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; I mean we can constitutionally originate general appropriation bills or any appropriation bills. I know the practice has been against it, but I have no doubt of our constitutional right to do it if we choose. I do not believe an appropriation bill is a revenue bill.

I doubt, Mr. President, whether General Casey would have waited to come here to the Senate for an amendment appropriating $480,000 to complete the Library building—which, I agree, is a very proper amendment, and which I shall vote for if it comes before the Senate—if it had not been for the understanding which has gone abroad that here is the spot to get amendments to appropriation bills and to have the necessary appropriations made.

I do not know how the committee are going to meet the difficulty, and I do not know how the Senate are going to meet it; but I do think that some action is necessary on the part of the Senate to let the House of Representatives understand, and let the Departments understand, that they must not wait and come to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to get the necessary appropriations for the support of the Government.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not like to detain the Senate from the practical business of dealing with the pending bill; but I should at some time like to say a few words on the question which has been adverted to by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Iowa, and perhaps I may be permitted to say what I desire now as well as at any other time.

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall originate bills for raising revenue. That was put into the Constitution when the compromise known as the Connecticut compromise was made, by which the States were to vote as equals in the Senate and be represented according to numbers in the House of Representatives. And it is an interesting fact that it is the only constitutional provision in regard to which General Washington, who was president of the Constitutional Convention, expressed an opinion. He is on record as saying that he thought that it was very important indeed that the convention should adopt that provision, he understanding, undoubtedly, that the compromise could not get through without it.

The House of Representatives has claimed that that clause in the Constitution prohibited the Senate from originating general appropriation bills on the ground that it was well settled in England that a provision raising revenue was always germane as an amendment to one for expending revenue, because the question whether you should appropriate a certain amount of money depended on the question whether or not you could get it by taxation. The House of Representatives insisting upon that and the Senate taking the other view, we have always been compelled to yield. Mr. Webster at a very early day declared that, while his opinion was otherwise, of course it was a matter which must be settled by the House of Representatives. That is apparent from the obvious consideration that the House will always on constitutional grounds simply lay on the table or refuse to deal with a general appropriation bill which we originate and send over to them. We can not do the same thing with their bills, because we admit they have the right to originate appropriation bills, and

therefore we can not refuse to pass such a bill on the ground that the House originated it, or on the ground that the House would be unreasonable toward some other bill.

So the thing, whatever may be the reason for it, is practically settled that the body which is represented according to numbers is entitled to originate general appropriations; and it is a very interesting consideration in regard to the income-tax debate. I came across the other day the copy of a paper in the handwriting of a near relative of my own who was a member of the convention that framed the Constitution and a member of the First Congress in General Washington's Administration. He had charge of the measure for the assumption of the State debts, and summed up the debate on that question. He said that one of the arguments which had been brought against the measure for the assumption of the State debts was that there was no principle on which the proper quota of the expenditures by the different States in the Revolutionary war could be ascertained. He replied that, in his opinion, the quota for the past was that which had been established by the Constitution itself for the future; that is, that the expenses of this Government were to be paid by the States in proportion to population. This clearly shows that he took it for granted, and that he was addressing auditors who took it for granted, that with the exception of those expenses which were paid for out of the sale of public lands and the duties on imports, all the other expenses of the Government were to be paid by the taxes which were classed in the Constitution as direct taxes and paid in proportion to numbers. That was the clear understanding of that time, in my judgment.

But, Mr. President, how has this thing worked? The House of Representatives in asserting this principle and carrying it to an extreme has most seriously and grievously impaired its own power, and has increased the power and control of the Senate, because, as this thing has worked for many years, for a time going beyond the memory of the oldest of us here in service, appropriation bills go into Committee of the Whole. They are discussed under their rules, under a provision by which every detail is open only to five-minute speeches, with one speech on each side and no more. So there is a very limited opportunity of debate. Then the bills go into the House. No vote by yeas and nays is taken in Committee of the Whole and they pass in the House under the previous question without anybody having an opportunity there to offer an amendment.

They then come to the Senate and the Senate adds "amendments as on other bills," to use the constitutional phrase, which makes the power of amendment absolutely unlimited, under full discussion, every member of the Senate knowing what is put in here by the Senate. They then go back to the House of Representatives, are nonconcurred in in a lump, and are referred there to a committee of conference. The reports of those committees are often made at midnight in the last two or three days of the session, and the House of Representatives never knows, never sees in print, never has an opportunity to debate or discuss them, and of course, under the rules, can not amend the reports of those conference committees. So the last person in the country to inquire of, the day after the 4th of March or the day of an adjournment of Congress, what is contained in an appropriation bill is a member of the House of Representatives, unless he has been on the conference committee. He could not find out by inquiry.

The House, therefore, has almost wholly surrendered that great function of the control over the appropriations of this Government, certainly the function of any control by the influence or power of any individual member moving his amendment and stating his objection.

Now, the House of Representatives are proceeding to surrender a further part of that function. That is, for the little, petty advantage, if that be the motive—and I shall not attribute that to the other House, but it is what the public generally attribute—of going on the stump and letting some gentleman who is a candidate for reelection tell his constituents, "We passed an appropriation bill which contained only $10,000,000 and the Senate put on $5,000,000 more. See what an economical body we are and what an extravagant body they are!"—a thing about which I do not believe the people care one snap. I never could see that it ever made any impression on any voter in the country.

The House are further surrendering the opportunity even of originating appropriation bills in regard to the great subject of public expenditures. They send up here a bill in regard to a class of public expenditures where they have not exercised their function of originating and shaping the amendment in the time when they have the debates in the other House upon it, and they surrender that power to the Senate. I do not see why my honorable and wise friend from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], as a Senator and a man whose fame and reputation and public service are identified with the power and dignity and authority of this body, wants to interfere with the House of Representatives if they want to do that. Let them send all their appropriation bills here in blank, or with nothing but an appropriation for paper and twine for their own use, and let us fill up the rest, if they choose. They have given up to us the greatest single function in the legislation of government; that is, the power of originating and giving the first shape to the appropriations which we are to pass.

If I were a member of the House of Representatives I should have something to say, I think, on that subject in opposition; but being a Senator and thinking that that class of expenditure is pretty wisely and well managed under the lead of my honorable friend from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and his associates on the Appropriations Committee, if the House want to surrender this function to us, I say, let them do it, and we will take it. I am not afraid of it, and I am not afraid that the people of the United States do not know enough about their Constitution to know when the House of Representatives omit to pass a provision for lighting St. Elizabeth's Hospital, or for completing the Library of Congress, or for paying the judgments of the Court of Claims, or providing for the expenditures of the Department of Justice all over the country, and send a bill up to the Senate—the people understand perfectly well that it is not a fault but a virtue in the Senate to add the proper appropriations to the bill; and they will think no less of any Senator, but very much less of the Representatives who have anything to do with that thing.

So I say again, if the House of Representatives choose to surrender this function to us, let us take it, and we will practically carry out the constitutional view of my honorable friend from Connecticut and my honorable friend from Ohio, which the House of Representatives have succeeded in baffling so long.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words upon these deficiency appropriations. It is impossible that the views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] shall prevail. The circuit and district courts of the United States for the State of Florida, I am informed by the United States marshal, are now in session, with a large number of witnesses, and are about to be compelled to adjourn, having gone to great expense in partially attending to the business of the court, for want of funds, because the appropriations have been necessarily exceeded by events which could not be foreseen owing to the increased number of cases and the increased number of witnesses, which no possible anticipation could have discerned or provided for.

In reference to the question as to the power of the Senate, the Constitution is of perpetual obligation. No custom can destroy its obligation and its provision. The Constitution makes but one limitation upon the legislative power in this body, and that is upon the orginiating of revenue bills, the laying of taxes, but not appropriations. The whole body of legislative power in the Senate consists in making appropriations. Every committee can originate a bill and bring it to the Senate, and can provide for the appropriation of money; and that is its function. If you deprive it of that, there is no Senate.

So the distinction between an individual bill and the collection of the work of the separate committees into a bill which may be called a general deficiency appropriation bill is not a distinction in principle; it has no place in the Constitution in the discrimination of legislative power. Therefore, to my mind there is nothing in the proposition of the Senator from Connecticut except that if he be right in his proposition, either as a matter of expediency or as a matter of law governing legislative power, this body is divested of its entire functions except those that pertain to the executive department in the confirmation of persons nominated for office.

Therefore there is no force in the objection that the Senate fails to perform its constitutional duty when it makes an appropriation for the necessary expenses of the Government. There can be no question that when my judgment is satisfied that an appropriation is inadequate to the proper maintenance of the Government it is my duty as a Senator, and it is an obligation which I can not avoid, to make that appropriation adequate for the necessary and proper purposes of the Government, whether the House of Representatives has or has not taken action upon it.

In regard, however, to the deficiencies appropriated for in this bill, and especially those in relation to the Department of Justice, I wish to say that in my own State now at this moment the marshal telegraphs me that there is an entire want of funds, and that unless this bill passes, and passes immediately, the courts must disband and the prisoners either be turned loose or their maintenance provided for by the private credit and funds of the officials.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 3, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five"; so as to make the clause read:

To enable the International Boundary Commission, appointed under the conventions of July 29, 1882, and February 18, 1889, to complete the survey and remarking of the boundary between the United States and Mexico by the preparation of the manuscripts, including tables and results, for the joint report, together with a map of the survey covering a belt of territory 2½

miles wide on the American side of the boundary, to be incorporated with a similar map of the Mexican territory prepared by the Mexican section of the Commission; also the preparation of the special reports of the American section, including astronomical and geodetic tables and results, and a geographical map, a work requiring the employment of expert draftsmen, a clerk, the rent of an office, and the expenses of the Commissioners, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

For the preparation of the report by Dr. E. A. Mearns, United States Army, with accompanying illustrations, of the natural history of the region covered by the survey of the boundary between the United States and Mexico, under the conventions of July 29, 1882, and February 18, 1889, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Matt W. Ransom, out of the appropriation for "Salaries of ambassadors and ministers," 1896, the sum of $2,806.48, being the amount of the salary of the minister to Mexico from July 1 to August 28, 1895, during which period he performed the duties of minister to Mexico and has received no compensation therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 24, under the head of "Treasury Department," to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to employ temporarily in the Treasury Department, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, not exceeding 25 expert money counters, at a rate not exceeding $80 per month each, $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask for some information as to that amendment? I see no reference to it in the report of the committee.

Mr. HALE. It is merely for arrearages which have accumulated in the Treasury Department in the counting of the old currency which has come in. It is covered by Senate Document No. 93 of the present session.

I will state to the Senator, if he does not desire to have the document read, that the Secretary of the Treasury came before the committee and stated what the actual trouble was, and that he needed this force in disposing of the bills which came in. We thought it was a very moderate amount, and reported in favor of giving it to him.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to understand this matter, and should like to be taken into the confidence of the Secretary of the Treasury and the committee before I vote upon the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Let the Secretary read the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a draft of a joint resolution providing for the temporary appointment of expert money counters, who through former experience are capable of detecting counterfeits and have become expert in the handling of public money in this Department, in order to bring up the work of counting and assorting currency sent to the Department for redemption, which is now $7,500,000 in arrears, and to request that said resolution be enacted into law as early as practicable.

The imperative necessity for the employment of the persons referred to is owing to the fact that this large quantity of uncounted money is now in the Department awaiting counting, and the owners are deprived of its use or any credit thereon. The accumulation of uncounted funds is brought about by a reduction in the regular force employed for the purpose through the decision of the Auditor for the Treasury Department that, under the act of August 5, 1882, there was no legal authority for the employment of 64 money counters then in the service and paid from the appropriation contained in the act of July 14, 1890, known as the "Sherman Act."

When this decision was promulgated the services of all the counters then on that roll was immediately dispensed with.

The Department is aware that some of those expert money counters are now in the city, and provision is made in the joint resolution for the immediate appointment of such as are best qualified as experts in that line of duty. Application has also been made for permanent provision for this assistance under the regular organization of the Department, but much time must necessarily elapse before the Civil Service Commission could order and hold an examination, mark the papers of the applicants, and obtain an eligible list, even were the necessary legislation already in force.

Respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

The VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Mr. HALE. I can add nothing to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee thought it furnished ample ground for putting the appropriation in the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Undoubtedly. I am not questioning the authority of the committee, but what I was trying to get at was this: The national-bank notes, as I understand, are redeemable at the Treasury in greenbacks.

Mr. ALDRICH. In lawful money.

Mr. DANIEL. Lawful money. Greenbacks are secured for the national-bank notes, and they are then presented and gold is taken out. The question with me was whether or not this additional force would not be made effectual to accelerate, aid, and abet the raids which we have had upon our gold reserve, resulting in the issue of additional bonds upon the people of the United States, and to suggest that it might be well in some of our financial bills—though I hardly see that it would be apropos now, and it is not, except by way of suggestion—to make such arrangement as to require the national banks to redeem their own notes, and not to facilitate this continual raid upon our Treasury and continual building up of a great public debt.

I shall not vote against the amendment, and I did not intend, in calling for the explanation, to make the least criticism upon the committee, which could hardly have done otherwise than it did; but this amendment covers what is an evil in our present system, and I desired to call attention to it in this connection.

Mr. ALLISON. It will be observed in the reading of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury that he says but 64 counters were formerly employed and paid for under the provisions in the act of 1890. The First Auditor of the Treasury decided that they could not properly be paid for out of that fund. I think the Auditor's decision was a correct one. These expert counters not only count national-banks notes, but greenbacks and Treasury notes, silver certificates, and every form of mutilated currency that appears at the Treasury, and new and fresh currency is issued in lieu of the mutilated currency which is so destroyed. Now, when that currency comes in, it must remain until it is counted, and if there is any deficiency in the number of people who are counting the money, of course the money is out of circulation and is not even accounted for in the Treasury balances. So it seemed the Secretary made a very good case. He wanted to pay the counters out of the fund provided by the act of 1890, which the committee thought an unwise provision, and therefore it is proposed to appropriate the money from the Treasury.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad that the diligent and vigilant Senator from Virginia has called attention to this item, because it leads us to the contemplation, through the means of the communication of the Secretary of the Treasury, of the overworked condition of the Civil Service Commission. The Secretary says that there is no time for him to get this additional force through the examinations under the civil-service rules, and therefore the committee, very properly, as I conceive, authorize him to select these expert money counters, male or female, as the case may be, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Now, right here, Mr. President, we see this much-vaunted Civil Service Commission, which I favor (I am only led to regret that it is so inadequate to the work before it), may be relieved of the duty of furnishing the expert money counters to whom the $7,500 is to be paid.

I had supposed that under the civil-service system the Commission had already examined a force of competent persons to be assigned to the different Departments when their services are wanted. I had supposed that they had, so to speak, material on hand all the time. Yet here we discover that the Commission has broken down on a few money counters, not experts in literature, not experts in geography, or in mechanics, or any other science, but expert money counters. The Civil Service Commission can not furnish them, and so Congress is appealed to to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to find the expert money counters without being hampered and limited by the civil-service rules.

Mr. President, I commend the committee (which needs commendation and help at this time as much as it ever did in its life) for granting this very proper request of the Secretary of the Treasury, which I shall support with pleasure. I assure you, Mr. President, that I shall recommend no money counter to him if this provision passes. I commend the committee for giving to the Secretary these expert counters whom he wants, and I only regret the feeble and dilapidated condition in which the Civil Service Commission finds itself because it can not do this work in order to enable the great bundles of money, which have laid there so long uncounted, to be promptly counted, and, as the chairman of the committee well said, paid for under the provisions of the act of 1890. It is of importance that the counting should be paid for from the right act.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, I think the giving of these money counters in this way, and removing them from the laws applicable to all other persons employed in the Department, can not be owing to the decrepit state of the Commission, because I am very certain that the registers and waiting lists of the Commission are amply supplied, and that there are a great many persons who have passed examination on those eligible lists who have been waiting some time for appointment, and from whom these persons could be perfectly well selected. The reason for taking them out of the law in this way I do not think can have anything to do with the decrepitude of the Civil Service Commission. I think it can only be done because the Secretary of the Treasury prefers to appoint them in this manner.

I have no desire to interfere with a little bit of patronage if the Secretary wants it, and I suppose that that is what it all amounts to, as it is merely a temporary appointment; but I think it should be known that these persons could be taken perfectly well from the eligible lists of those who are waiting for appointments and who have been examined with a view to being appointed to the departmental service.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I think so far from the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts being accurate, it is just the reverse. The Secretary of the Treasury does not desire this appropriation for the small amount of patronage conferred upon him. On the contrary, he has faithfully observed, I understand, the civil-service rules in all the appointments in his Department. But he finds in this case, as in quite a number of others which have occurred, that the civil-service rules and regulations operate to the detriment of the Government work; that if he were to rely upon the appointments made through that source he would be compelled to appoint ladies who were not skilled in the work, and it would require several months for them to become adepts in it.

No examination by the Civil Service Commission will determine the qualifications of a lady or a gentleman for this particular work. That can only be ascertained and the acquirements can be had only by actual practice. The Secretary of the Treasury had a corps of skilled persons engaged in this work. Unfortunately, the appropriation was small and he was compelled to dispense with their services, and the time has arrived when it is absolutely necessary to have a skilled force. He can not get them through the Civil Service Commission, and therefore he requests an appropriation to enable him, outside of that service, to employ these skilled persons, who otherwise could not be obtained.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury has applied to the Civil Service Commission and has been informed by them that they can not supply him with suitable money counters?

Mr. GORMAN. No; I do not make that statement; but I mean to say that the persons on the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission have never had experience and are not expert counters.

Mr. LODGE. How can the Secretary know if he has never inquired?

Mr. GORMAN. Oh, he understands, as we all do, that anyone can take that examination, whether he has ever had any experience or not. The examination does not embrace the actual skill in counting. It is one of those cases for which provision must be made, and this is not done for the purpose of getting a few appointments, but it is to facilitate the business of the country.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Secretary of the Treasury to say practically that it was necessary to have people who could quickly discern counterfeit money and who could count rapidly, and that such people are not on the eligible list, but that 64 people had been employed under the act of 1890 and were experts, and, therefore, without waiting for them to pass through the routine of the civil service and some of the impediments with which the Senator is familiar, it would be necessary for him now temporarily—that is, for the remainder of the present fiscal year (and that is all this item applies to)—to secure these expert counters by making such an inquiry as would secure them.

Mr. LODGE. I understand, then, he is simply going to make reappointments?

Mr. ALLISON. He said he would select from the 64 expert people.

Mr. LODGE. That is, he is going to reappoint persons who have already had experience in counting money?

Mr. ALLISON. I gathered precisely that from his statement.

Mr. LODGE. They are not to be new appointments?

Mr. ALLISON. Not new ones.

Mr. HALE. It simply shows that in the inscrutable dispensations of Providence occasionally there will come instances where there can be some exercise of human judgment and prevision outside of the board of Civil Service Commissioners. How it is that in the revolution of the spheres and the ordinary transactions of human life it has come about that the Government can run without the merciful dispensations of that board I am unable to comprehend, but that it has come to that I know and believe. Perhaps it is because that board of gentlemen has had upon it lately a new and green infusion, and that it is not so saturated with that elemental view of the transcendent superiority of that organization to all other human organizations as it will be when experience has been had. That I do not know, but we are unaccountably confronted with the fact that even the advocates of the absolute infallibility of that board are obliged to admit that here is an exception, and that we can get a man or a woman into the Department who will do his or her duty without going before that board.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Before the amendment passes finally, I merely wish to say that I did not mean to imply that expert money counters or other officers could not be gotten by the Treasury Department outside of the civil-service rules. The present Secretary of the Treasury has shown great capacity in that respect, disregarding the rules on many occasions, and I have no doubt he has obtained very suitable persons. I do not wish it to be supposed that I in the least grudge this very small morsel of patronage to the present dispensers of it. I am sure I think they need all they can get.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, before the pending amendment is placed on the bill, a remark has been made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] which it occurs to me needs some explanation. The Senator, as I understood him, said that the civil-service law was being carried out to its full extent by the Treasury Department.

Mr. GORMAN. As far as I know.

Mr. ALLEN. Now the Senator says as far as he knows, which is quite a qualification. I do not know much about the Treasury Department; I have but very little business with it, and no patronage connected with it; but I do know that there is universal complaint; perhaps I should not use that word—but there is general complaint that in every Department of the Government in this city the civil-service law is of constant and daily abuse, not only in the Treasury Department, but in every other Department. For instance, I understand it to be a common thing, and I never yet have heard it denied in this Chamber or elsewhere, for the head of a Department or some person standing close to him to indicate to employees of that Department, if they happen to be of a different political faith from the head of the Department, that the exigencies of the public service require them to take a reduced position.

If they are drawing a salary of $1,800 a year and happen to be Republicans under a Democratic Administration, they are very frequently required to take a subordinate position of seven or eight hundred dollars a year, and vice versa; and not infrequently where a position is wanted (of course to carry out the benefits of the civil-service law and not for party purposes) the occupant of the office is informed that his or her resignation would be acceptable; and if they are stubborn enough to persist in holding the office under the protecting shield of the civil-service statutes, they find eventually that their office is entirely abolished by order of the head of the Department, and they are permitted to walk out into the cold and seek employment elsewhere. I think it is due to the country at large that these facts should be understood. That is quite a common practice in all the different Departments of the Government, not only as they are represented in the city of Washington, but elsewhere.

Mr. GORMAN. Does the Senator from Nebraska understand that that is done in violation of the letter of the law? Can it not be done in conformity with the statute itself?

Mr. ALLEN. I understand it is in violation not only of the law, but preeminently in violation of the spirit of the law, and the spirit of the law is always the law when it is properly construed, for when the reason of the law ceases the law itself ceases. I am not very familiar with the beautiful workings of the system of the civil service. I infer, however, that the honorable Senator from Maryland, who stands so close to the Chief Executive, who is himself preeminently the advocate of this system, understands its beneficent workings and that he could enlighten the Senate and the country upon that subject.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I should like to disabuse his mind. If he has had that impression, he is the only one in the United States who has had it. I have had no connection whatever with the civil-service law. I do not think that is my reputation.

Mr. ALLEN. I am glad to be corrected. Mr. President, occasionally there has come in my mind the thought that possibly this law is being abused in some respects. I have sometimes thought it possible that the advocates were not really serious about its enforcement. I have thought at times that if the civil-service law, so called (for it is so only in name and not in fact, as I believe), were enforced in its full intent and purpose, in less than a third of a century this Government would be turned over entirely to a lot of cigarette-smoking dudes, whose only capacity for government in all its different forms would be their ability to tell whether "copy" should be spelled with one "p" or two "p's." I believe it to be one of the gigantic frauds of the age.

Mr. CHANDLER. Which way would you spell it?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know that I would spell it. I do not know that I would be eligible under the civil-service regulations to a position. But certainly, Mr. President, speaking seriously, there is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not know that the civil-service law is violated in its letter and its spirit every day. I can well understand how, in view of the encroachments of corporations and money influences upon this Government in its different departments, there can keep even pace with those encroachments a disposition to turn the Government over into the hands of a few men whose mere book education, limited as that may be, is their only recommendation for positions of honor and trust. Under this law a curly-headed youth of 21 or 22 years of age——

Mr. CALL. He need not be curly headed.

Mr. ALLEN. That was not meant at all as a reflection. [Laugh-

ter.] A youth of that kind, whose only fitness for public position is that he had been turned out, twisted in proper shape, by some common school, can meet advancement and promotion in the discharge of public duties and in the public service, whereas the man who has not enjoyed the opportunities he has enjoyed and who has given a lifetime in qualifying himself for the discharge of some particular branch of the public service is entirely ignored.

Mr. GORMAN. That is the case we are providing for now.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Maryland suggests that that is the very case we are providing for now. I heard the Senator from Maryland say a moment ago that the persons who are upon the eligible list, as he calls it, of the Civil Service Commission are not competent to discharge this duty; that this is one of the duties they are not competent to discharge; that among their duties in the counting of this money was their ability to discover counterfeit money readily and without the waste of much time. I suppose if that were true the best policy to be pursued would be to go to a school of counterfeiting and get the experts there and put them into the public service.

I rose, however, Mr. President, for the purpose of saying (and I do not know whether it is wise for me to say it or not from a personal standpoint, but I will take the chances anyway) that two of the most gigantic and useless institutions in this country that are constantly absorbing the public funds for their support are the Civil Service and Interstate Commerce Commissions. Here is the Interstate Commerce Commission, to which no man can be appointed unless his opinion is known in advance upon the subject of the Government control of railways. I say this with no disrespect to any gentleman upon the Commission, for I know none of them personally. It must be understood that his opinion is consistent with the interests of the railroads before he is ever elevated to a position of that kind. And what jurisdiction have the Interstate Commerce Commission? What power have they? They have the power to draw their salaries, and that is about the extent of it. A question is submitted to them; they pass upon it in a quasi judicial capacity, and they are as powerless as an infant six months of age to carry into execution their judgments and findings.

Look, if you will, at the Civil Service Commission. Whenever a Civil Service Commissioner develops the slightest amount of backbone or independence and believes that the law should be carried out in its letter and spirit and acts slightly independent of the ruling power, that moment he hears a voice from the White House telling him there is a vacancy in the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission is simply an instrument, a living instrument, in the hands of the ruling power to carry out its bidding.

Now, I do not believe that the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be given the power that it is proposed in this amendment to give him. I believe if the civil-service law is obnoxious to the people it ought to be made more so by being lived up to, and the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be required to go to the list furnished by the Civil Service Commission for his assistants in this case.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska takes an entirely erroneous view of this subject. The present Administration has extended the civil-service law and made it to embrace almost every possible employment, even the most inferior employment, and graded them according to the salaries, so that it is almost impossible, in the most meritorious cases, for a member of Congress, who may happen to have a constituent here who is needy and deserving and capable, to obtain any kind of employment for him. Therefore the criticism that the Administration or the Executive in power uses or may use the civil service for his own purposes is entirely without foundation.

Now, I am not an advocate of the present system of civil service. I think it is open to a great many objections, and if I had the power I would institute an entirely different system of eligibility and of continuance in office during good behavior, leaving the power to remove where it is now. But to say that at this time and under this Administration there have been abuses of the civil service in admitting persons into it contrary to the rule is, in my judgment, entirely inaccurate. The complaint has been that they have failed to appoint to office men of their own political faith.

I think it is the general impression throughout the country of those who have observed matters here that those persons belonging to the political party of the Executive and the Cabinet officers have not had any kind of favor shown to them. That may be very right in the administration of the civil-service law, but, in my judgment, it is a correct criticism. There has not been any kind of favor shown to the members of the political party in power. The action of the Executive has been to extend and cover almost every possible employment under the Government with the civil-service rules and require an examination. I believe, and I think I may say with perfect confidence, that so far as my own State is concerned, a great injustice has been done under the civil-service rules in their strict and rigid application and enforcement by excluding persons who ought to have been admitted as eligible upon its list.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question, if he will permit me.

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator well know that under this Administration and under previous Administrations, too, for that matter, it has been a common practice not to take the applicants according to the order in which they stand on the eligible list, but to jump way down the list over the first, second, third, and fourth and select some political favorites for the different positions? Has not that been the common practice?

Mr. CALL. I do not think it has been the common practice. If the Senator were Secretary of the Treasury or Secretary of any one of the different Departments and were required to determine as to the efficiency of a person for a particular duty and were confined to the list of eligibles, he would go on down the list until he found some one who was satisfactory to his judgment. There may have been abuses under this system, there are abuses under everything, but in my judgment the civil-service law and its rules have been unwisely extended and unwisely made rigid, and so a great number of people who are more competent to perform the duties, not in school knowledge, not in technical knowledge of books, but in actual capacity and in reasonable intelligence, have been excluded from being eligible to those positions.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida another question.

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it not the spirit of the civil-service law that, when the Commission shall have passed upon the eligibility of a candidate and have scheduled the candidates in the order of their application and examination, that becomes conclusive upon the Department into whose service the appointees are to enter?

Mr. CALL. No; that is not the law and it ought not to be the law. It merely makes them eligible and leaves the question of their special competency for special work to the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not believe that.

Mr. CALL. If there were any other law, if you were to make a man absolutely entitled to office because he had a more perfect knowledge of a few books or classes of learning than another one without reference to his special capacity for that work, it would be a great injury to the public service.

Now, in regard to this little matter here, I am not particularly in favor of the Administration in regard to these offices. I think great injustice has been done, but I defend them against the accusation of the Senator. But in regard to these little offices here, how can it be possible that a student who has answered correctly, having more perfect information than others, certain questions relating to arithmetic, or to grammar, or to geography, or to any of the several branches of learning, and who may be entirely proficient in them as a collegiate graduate, can be more expert than others in the counting of money, in the discrimination between the different kinds of money, in ascertaining what is genuine and what is not?

There is nothing in the proposition. It is impossible. Here is a great mass of money waiting. Persons send money to be exchanged, mutilated money, money that is soiled, which they wish to have renewed. It is not in gold, it is not in silver, but in the currency of the country. It is coming from all parts of the country. Are you to wait to take the employees from a list of eligibles who have been questioned in regard to grammar and arithmetic and geography and perhaps some other mathematics, and to be confined to that list? Mr. President, it seems to me there is nothing in this objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the interest in this discussion is purely academic, and I trust that if I occupy a moment or two of time I will not be considered as unduly prolonging the debate upon the measure, which ought to be passed. But I can not let go without protest some remarks made by our friends on the other side. The danger to this country and its interests is not through the Civil Service Commission. It is through the exercise by the Executive and his Cabinet of the power of removal and the power of appointment, which have been mercilessly exercised in the present Administration as never before in the history of the country.

In 1893 there never was a chance to prevent the passage of a free-coinage measure through the House of Representatives, which has now expired and about which I can now speak, had it not been for the power of patronage of the Administration, and especially the power of patronage as exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury. Colorado is to-day flooded with appointments, many of them unfit ones, made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of Congressmen who ratted on the silver question. Again and again have men whose constituents sent them here to vote for silver gone back upon their pledges to their constituents and their promises because the Administration has offered them

the patronage which belonged to it, and which has debauched them, and which they in their turn have sought to use to debauch their constituents.

I will tell you, Mr. President, that whenever we reach a fair administration of the affairs of this country it will be after we have deprived the President of the United States and unscrupulous Cabinet officials of the power of degrading and dishonoring manhood by promising offices for a violation of the pledges which members of Congress have given to their constituents. For my part, I look forward with great pleasure to the time when the civil-service rules shall be so extended as that fitness, and fitness alone, shall govern in the appointment of officers; and when public officers, such as we, shall not be compelled to hang about the doors of Cabinet officers or of the White House like servants to beg for our morsel of public patronage.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am somewhat inclined to make a suggestion, getting down from the sublime to the practical. I think there is a reason why the provision in the bill is more likely to provide efficient and competent clerks, ready to perform their duties in a few hours, than can be provided in any other way. But a short time ago there were 64 clerks in the Treasury Department who had some years of experience in the precise character of work which it is now an absolute necessity should be pressed through at the earliest day convenient.

Now, I chance to know that if the amendment shall be agreed to as it appears in the bill the rule that will be adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury will be that which will look to the efficiency record of those 64 clerks who had long months or years of experience in this precise work and select the 25 persons whose records show them to have been most efficient in the performance of these duties; and those are the persons who will be named as the clerks provided for by the bill.

What commission on earth could take a leap in the dark or guess upon any scholarly investigation as to the particular qualifications required for the specific duties provided for by the amendment that would be so reliable as the years of experience and the record that those persons have made in the performance of these duties? I think it is the wisest method that could possibly be adopted in selecting employees for the emergency that is now upon us. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if it is desired simply to reappoint experienced clerks under this provision, then under the law the Secretary has the power to reinstate, and there is not the slightest need to give him any additional powers as to the rules and methods he may prescribe.

Mr. GORMAN. Not after one year.

Mr. LODGE. He has power to reappoint——

Mr. HARRIS. Not after one year.

Mr. LODGE. Not after one year. If the Secretary desires to make new appointments and not to take them from the eligible list, of course it is necessary.

I spoke first in this matter merely to call attention to a point involved. It was a very small one, but since then, as usual when anything is said about the Civil Service Commission or the civil-service laws, they are made the subject of sneers. I think the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, when a discussion arises in regard to the civil-service rules, are the only places in the United States where education is sneered at. We have sat here this afternoon and listened to sneers at the people who come in because they have learned to read and write, as if it were discreditable to an American citizen to have a proper education, as if there was something in itself that was discreditable in the fact that they have what it is our boast to try to give to every American child, a knowledge of the rudiments of education. We have had it spoken of as un-American.

The discussion may be academic, but I desire to say once more what I have often said both here and in the other House—that patronage and favoritism are un-American. There is nothing you can find in our laws, our history, or our Constitution that makes the system of giving offices by political patronage American. It is, on the contrary, adverse to every American idea. I for one was glad to hear what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] said, with which I most cordially agree. I think a system which obliges the Representatives and Senators of the United States—elected to perform great public duties, which certainly are enough to occupy all their time—to pass their time in the antechambers of Cabinet ministers, hanging around the White House, giving their days and nights to appeals for office, not because the seekers are particularly fit, but on the ground of political service, is a system utterly degrading to the men upon whom it is forced.

We all know that where the offices are left open to patronage and favoritism no man can avoid dealing with them in that way. He is obliged to do so; otherwise his own constituents suffer. But the system is utterly wrong, and the more it is taken away the better it will be, not with a view of getting ideal persons—that is one of the sneers of its opponents—but taking the routine service of the Government out of politics, putting it on some decent and more respectable and more intelligent plane, and leave to the Senators and Representatives the duties for which they were chosen, which is to deal with the great legislative questions before the Government, and not be huckstering for places for messengers and tidewaiters all back and forth through the country.

Mr. HALE. If we can have a vote on the pending amendment, then the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] wants to have a conference report agreed to, and after that I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I should like to have a vote on the pending amendment if there is to be no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator desires to let the bill go over, all right, but I do not think we can get a vote on this particular amendment immediately.

Mr. HALE. Then I yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and after the conference report is disposed of I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

CHAPLAIN FOR MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

JOS. R. HAWLEY,
W. J. SEWELL,
E. C. WALTHALL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL,
GEO. B. McCLELLAN,
J. P. TRACEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAWLEY. One of the amendments is an amendment to the title, which the conference committee agreed to, of course.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the title be read as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, providing a chaplain for the Military Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the report.

The report was concurred in.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 12, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11, 1896.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Woodville Rockhill, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State, vice Edwin F. Uhl, appointed ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Germany.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Matthias A. Smalley, of Ohio, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Ohio, vice William C. Haskell, whose term expires February 14, 1896.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Jasper N. Morrison, of Missouri, to be judge-advocate with the rank of major, vice Davis, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

Edwin L. Coates, to be postmaster at Boulder, in the county of Boulder and State of Colorado, in the place of Samuel B. Border, whose commission will expire February 16, 1896.

William M. Dooley, to be postmaster at Highland Park, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois, in the place of William E. Brand, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

William O. Luce, to be postmaster at Caro, in the county of Tuscola and State of Michigan, in the place of Frank P. Ransford, whose commission expired February 8, 1896.

John G. Hoffman, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Samuel B. McLanachan, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1896.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Woodville Rockhill, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frank C. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Gloucester, in the State of Massachusetts.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William Galloway, of McMinnville, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Oregon City, Oreg.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

James S. McCabe, of Rhode Island, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Rhode Island.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William T. Swinburne, to be a commander.
Lieut. Arthur B. Speyers, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Gibson, to be a lieutenant.
Ensign Humes H. Whittlesey, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Lieut. Commander William H. Emory, to be a commander.
Lieut. Ebenezer S. Prime, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John A. Bell, to be a lieutenant.
Ensign Albert C. Dieffenbach, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS.

James McLean, to be postmaster at Cohocton, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Peter J. Kiernan, to be postmaster at Rosebank, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

Douglas C. Adams, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Elizabeth Wolf, to be postmaster at Peshtigo, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin.

John S. Tighe, to be postmaster at Avon, in the county of Livingston and State of New York.

Frank Pickard, to be postmaster at St. Johnsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

Marcus H. Ogden, to be postmaster at Carbondale, in the county of Jackson and State of Illinois.

Charles R. Brandon, to be postmaster at Litchfield, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois.

Francis P. Bogardus, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

William Heeb, to be postmaster at Newman, in the county of Douglas and State of Illinois.

Laora M. Rowe, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lagrange and State of Indiana.

Joseph J. Cannon, to be postmaster at Knox, in the county of Starke and State of Indiana.

Darby O'Malley, to be postmaster at Valley City, in the county of Barnes and State of North Dakota.

Thomas J. Dougherty, to be postmaster at Northfield, in the county of Rice and State of Minnesota.

Arthur A. Maynard, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Elmer Winner, to be postmaster at Liberty, in the county of Sullivan and State of New York.

A. B. Claytor, to be postmaster at Bedford City, in the county of Bedford and State of Virginia.

John R. Andrews, to be postmaster at Redlodge, in the county of Carbon and State of Montana.

Patrick Hurley, to be postmaster at Potsdam, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

Edgar F. Dell, to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

Thomas J. O'Sullivan, to be postmaster at Derby, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Hoyt H. Harden, to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine.

William P. Clancy, to be postmaster at Westerly, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island.

Henry C. Sargent, to be postmaster at East Aurora, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

George Cushing, to be postmaster at Hingham, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Wilber, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Somerset and State of Maine.

George R. Smith, to be postmaster at Kennebunk, in the county of York and State of Maine.

Arthur R. Moore, to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

Mary W. Chase, to be postmaster at Derby Line, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont.

Joseph W. Bean, to be postmaster at Derry Depot, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 11, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORTS OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to make a favorable report on the following Senate joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, etc., That the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, which section reads as follows: "There shall be distributed of monographs, bulletins, and reports of the United States Geological Survey, now in possession of said Survey, being publications prior to the year 1894, one copy of every such publication to every public library which shall be designated to the superintendent of documents, as follows: Two public libraries to be designated by each of the Senators from the States, respectively, two public libraries by the Representative in Congress from each Congressional district, and two public libraries by the Delegate from each Territory; such public libraries to be additional to those to which said publications are distributed under existing law," shall be extended to the monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey which were published during the year 1894, and to those which have been published since that year, and to those which may be published in the future: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to interfere with the distribution of memoirs and reports, so far as the same is provided for by the joint resolution "To distribute copies of special memoirs and reports of the United States Geological Survey," approved March 3, 1887.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for no additional printing and no additional expense to the Government. It is simply a provision for the distribution of these monographs, bulletins, and reports as heretofore. The last printing act having made no provision for the distribution beyond 1894, this is simply to continue the distribution. That is all there is of it.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI AT ST. LOUIS.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, by a special order of the House to-day has been set apart for the consideration of business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia——

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I beg the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield to me for a moment, to ask unanimous consent to offer a petition and make a brief statement. I will not occupy more than two minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a petition signed by 10,000 residents of the city of St. Louis, mostly from the district that I have the honor to represent on this floor. They speak, I dare say, not for themselves alone, but for at least 200,000 people, or fully one-third of the inhabitants of that city. The first six names on the petition are the names of well-known members of concerns which alone employ between four and five thousand laboring men.

They ask that the third bridge to be constructed across the Mississippi, and for the construction of which a company is now asking Congress for a charter, shall be located at South St. Louis. There are two bridges now spanning the Mississippi at St. Louis, one in the northern portion of the city and the other in the central portion. The south part of the city—South St. Louis—does not as yet enjoy bridge facilities, and for that reason my constituents ask that they may be granted what the other portions of the city already have.

I trust that there will be favorable consideration of their petition, and I ask unanimous consent that the petition be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for action.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University, and yield the floor to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who will explain the provisions of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Arthur MacArthur, Richard H. Alvey, Charles C. Cole, William B. Webb, Eugene Carusi, H. O. Claughton, Thomas Wilson, Matthew G. Emery, John Goode, Charles Lyman, John T. Winter, Howard H. Barker, and William C. Whittemore, their associates and successors, are hereby constituted a body politic and corporate, by the name of the National University, with power to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, and to have perpetual succession; to acquire, take by devise, bequest, or otherwise,

hold, purchase, encumber, and convey such real and personal estate as shall be required for the purpose of its incorporation; to make and use a common seal, and the same to alter at pleasure.

SEC. 2. That the aforesaid incorporators shall be and constitute a board of trustees for the said university, seven of whom shall constitute a quorum to do business, and which board shall be, and are, authorized to fill any vacancies in their number, to appoint such officers and agents as the business of the corporation shall require, and to make by-laws for the accomplishment of its purposes, for the management of its property, and for the regulation of its affairs. Said corporation is hereby empowered to establish and maintain within the District of Columbia a university for the promotion of education. The said corporation shall have power to grant and confer diplomas and the usual college and university degrees, and honorary degrees, and also such other powers as may be necessary fully to carry out and execute the general purposes of the said corporation as herein appearing.

SEC. 3. That this act may be amended or repealed at any time by the Congress at its pleasure.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following amendment: In line 8, section 1, after the word "name," insert the word "of."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will detain the committee but a moment.

The object and purpose of the bill is simply to incorporate the National University, which is in the District of Columbia. This institution is already chartered under the general acts of Congress, and has been in operation conducting two of its departments—the law and the medical departments—for more than twenty years.

The bill simply grants a special charter within the District of Columbia, but does not extend the powers or privileges that they now enjoy under the general charter. The only object in changing the form of the charter is because there is now pending a bill, which it is supposed will become a law, making it necessary for such institutions as are not incorporated by special acts of Congress to apply to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for registration and permission before they can have authority to carry on their business. If they have a charter, however, under a special act they do not need to make that application.

Mr. CANNON. This university is now in existence?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; and has been for twenty years and over.

Mr. CANNON. Under what name?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The same name, the National University; and it has two departments in operation.

Mr. CANNON. What additional power does this act bestow?

Mr. RICHARDSON. None at all. They are already operating under an act of Congress passed thirty years ago. This simply puts them under a special law and exempts them from the requirements to which I have just referred.

Mr. CANNON. Is the present charter perpetual?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; this is just the same as the present charter. Of course Congress reserves the right in all these charters to alter or amend at pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. I do not antagonize the bill at all, but I fail to understand the necessity for the legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Perhaps the gentleman did not hear what I stated, and I will repeat it. They ask for this charter under a special act of Congress, rather than under the general act, for the reason that there is a bill pending which will be reached directly by the committee, and all favor its passage so far as we know, which, if it becomes a law, will require all these institutions to apply to the District Commissioners for a license and a permit to conduct their affairs. Now, under the general act which is proposed, institutions chartered by special acts of Congress are excepted from its provisions. Therefore they want this special act, rather than a charter under the old law.

Mr. CANNON. That shows, then, that the general law you propose to pass ought not to pass.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, I think not.

Mr. CANNON. Because in anticipation of its passage you come and ask a special charter.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We will hear the gentleman on that when we reach it. That is only one incident in the law, and not the main purpose of it. Therefore this is asked by these gentlemen, some of whom I have no doubt the gentleman will recognize, if he will glance at the names of the incorporators, as leading citizens of the District—Judge MacArthur, Richard H. Alvey, Charles C. Cole, Mr. Claughton, Dr. Howard H. Barker, and others who are well known, being the patrons or managers of these two institutions that I speak of, the one law and the other medical.

Mr. CANNON. This institution has been established by these gentlemen?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It has been in existence for more than twenty years with the two departments, a law department and a medical department.

Mr. CANNON. I would ask the gentleman whether there is another institution of this same name or a similar name?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is an institution which has a bill pending here proposing to charter the National University of the United States; but this one is purely a local institution and does not go out of the District. The other, to which my friend refers, I have no doubt, is a bill to charter a great national university, which is to have its operations in all the States of the Union, possibly. This is purely local in its effect.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will state to the gentleman that this is an old institution, in very high standing.

Mr. CANNON. I understand.

Mr. BABCOCK. And they do not want to be put to the necessity of applying for a recharter under the general law. The other institutions here of like standing and age are all incorporated under special charters from Congress.

Mr. CANNON. I will not antagonize the bill, although I will say very frankly I fail to see the necessity for it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope we shall have a vote upon it. There is nobody objecting to it that I know of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ought to have stated what the amendment is. It is simply verbal. The word "of" was left out, and the committee suggested its insertion; so as to make it read: "The National University of the District of Columbia."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MARYLAND AND WASHINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to call up the bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, calls up the bill H. R. 4810, which the Clerk will report to the House.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company is required to complete and put in operation its railway in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act approved March 2, 1895, be, and the same is hereby, extended for the term of one year from the 2d day of March, 1896; and that all the franchises, rights, and powers conferred by said acts, or either of them, upon said railway company may be enjoyed and exercised as fully and completely as if said railway had been completed and put in operation prior to March 2, 1896.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RUSK] made the report and will explain the provisions of the bill.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read the report.

The report (by Mr. RUSK) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 87) providing for the extension of the time for the completion of the Washington and Maryland Railway Company, report:

The said company is in good faith rapidly constructing its road, but certain delays have arisen in connection with the condemnation proceedings in the District which may prevent said company from completing its work of construction by the time provided in the act approved March 2, 1896, and your committee therefore think the said Maryland and Washington Railway Company is entitled to the relief prayed, and recommend the passage of the accompanying bill as a substitute for joint resolution No. 87.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to the Washington end of the electric railroad now being regularly constructed between the cities of Baltimore and Washington. Certain legal delays prevent it from being completed within the time specified in the provisions of the act. It was necessary to acquire 13,000 feet more within the District of Columbia. The company has 11,300 feet and has about concluded proceedings relating to 700 feet more, leaving only 1,600 feet on Rhode Island avenue yet to be acquired, and it is the legal proceedings in reference to the condemnation of this 1,600 feet that may cause the delay. Upon 11,300 feet of the 13,000 feet the railroad has been constructed, and its construction has been made along the entire line between the city of Baltimore and Washington. It is only by reason of these legal delays that this company asks this extension, lest the delays of the appeals now pending on Rhode Island avenue should be prolonged beyond the time specified in this charter.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman state what route this road proceeds through the city as expressed by the authority given for its construction?

Mr. RUSK. On Rhode Island avenue to North Capitol street. The company acquires a right of way and donates it on Rhode Island avenue as it is acquired.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all they occupy in the District?

Mr. RUSK. That is all. Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a vote.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say that the committee have reported a substitute for the joint resolution.

Mr. RUSK. This is the substitute that was reported for the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. That is what has been read to the House, is it not?

Mr. RUSK. Yes, sir.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RUSK. I move that the joint resolution lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

LICENSE OF BILLIARD AND POOL TABLES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 5490) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to keep any billiard table, bagatelle table, shuffleboard, jenny lind table, pool table, or any table upon which legitimate games are played, in any saloon, room, or place of business within the District of Columbia for public use or for profit or gain, without a license therefor first had and obtained from the assessor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That every person taking out such license shall pay to the collector of taxes of said District a license fee of $12 per annum for each table. Said license may be granted or refused in the discretion of the assessor of said District, and all licenses so granted shall date from the 1st day of the month in which the liability began and expire on the 1st day of October in each year: *Provided*, That in all cases of refusal of said assessor to grant said license, or upon written protest of a majority or more of the property owners or residents of the block in which it is proposed to grant such license, an appeal may be taken to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, whose decision shall be final.

SEC. 3. That every person who shall own, keep, or use any billiard table, bagatelle table, pool table, or any table or board of the kind mentioned in the first section of this act, for public use or profit, without such license first had and obtained, shall, on conviction in the police court, be fined $20 or imprisoned not exceeding three months for each offense, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 4. That it shall not be lawful for the proprietors of billiard tables, pool tables, bagatelle tables, jenny lind tables, or other tables of the kind mentioned in the first section of this act, shuffleboards and bowling alleys, kept for public hire and gain in the District of Columbia, to allow any person under the age of 21 years to play at any game of billiards, pool, shuffleboard, or any game that may be played on such tables or boards, or play at bowls on said alleys, or permit such person to come into or remain in their pool rooms, saloons, or bowling alleys, where spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors are sold; and all such places shall be closed during the entire twenty-four hours of each and every Sunday, and also during the hours that barrooms are required to be closed.

Any person violating the provisions of this section shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than forty dollars, and shall in addition forfeit his or her license, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the report of the committee be read.

The report (by Mr. CURTIS of Iowa) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4148) entitled "A bill to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," having fully considered the same, beg leave to submit a substitute, with the recommendation that it do pass, and that the original bill be laid upon the table.

The present law on this subject only imposes a penalty for the keeping of billiard tables, pool tables, etc., for public use, profit, or gain. Under the decision of the courts the present law is essentially a revenue law, a tender of the tax is a constructive payment, and persons paying the tax or tendering the same are permitted to carry on the business without a license. The authorities are thus denied the power to prevent the conduct of such business by improper persons or at unsuitable places. This bill is designed to impose a penalty on persons doing said business without a license, and to provide necessary authority to exclude unworthy applicants by refusing to license them.

This bill differs from the original bill as recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia only in the following particulars:

First. The committee add to section 2 the following provision:

"That in all cases of refusal of said assessor to grant said license, or upon written protest of a majority or more of the property owners or residents of the block in which it is proposed to grant such license, an appeal may be taken to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, whose decision shall be final."

Second. The committee change section 4 of the bill by adding after the word "alleys," in the tenth line, the words "where spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors are sold," thus providing that it shall not be unlawful for the said proprietors of said tables, etc., to permit persons under 21 years of age to play at said games or visit such places where spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors are not sold.

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I notice an error of the printer in the tenth line of the fourth section. There should be an amendment after the word "pool." It should read instead of "pool rooms, saloons, bowling alleys," "pool or billiard rooms"; insert the words "or billiards" between the words "pool" and "rooms," in the tenth line.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment. What change is made in the existing law by this bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I will briefly explain the bill. The present law upon this subject is chapter 40 of section 29, and is as follows:

Proprietors of billiard tables, bagatelle, and jenny lind tables, for public hire and gain, and shuffle boards, shall pay $10 annually for each table or board.

It will be seen by the provisions of the law that the authorities are denied the power to prevent the location of such billiard tables or pool tables in undesirable places and by unsatisfactory persons. Under the decision of the courts the present law is essentially a revenue law, and the tender of the tax is construed a constructive payment; hence the bill is unanimously recommended by the Commissioners, and the substitute recommended by the Commissioners only differs from the original bill in two particulars, which are named in the bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is thoroughly well understood. If any gentleman present desires to ask any question I shall be pleased to respond.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question or two in regard to this bill. Does the law of the District of Columbia at the present time permit the running of a billiard table in the same room where liquors are sold?

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa. I think it does.

Mr. RAY. Well, now, does your bill that you now report and ask to have passed and which is being considered, permit the running of pool tables and billiard tables in the same room where liquors are sold?

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa. There is no change in the present law in that regard. The only law that I have been able to discover in the statutes upon this subject is the one which I read, by which it will be seen that parties who desire to do so may establish billiard rooms anywhere, and the authorities of the District are denied the power to prevent the location of such billiard tables, pool tables, or bagatelle tables anywhere within the precincts of the city.

Mr. RAY. Well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of any measure by the American Congress which either directly or impliedly permits the conduct of a pool table or a billiard table or anything of that kind in the same room where liquors are permitted to be sold is very objectionable. In the State of New York we have prohibited it and the result has been great good. In my judgment there is nothing more detrimental to the interests, to the peace and harmony of society, nothing more detrimental to the young men of the country, than permitting the conduct of pool tables, billiard tables, and other games and amusements of that character in the same room where liquor is sold. These games bring the young men together, who get excited; then the temptation is to ask each other to "have a drink," and the result is demoralization, especially of the young men, and frequently intoxication and the commission of crime. I believe, therefore, that the Committee on the District of Columbia would do the people of this District a great good if they would so amend this bill as to prohibit absolutely the conduct of a billiard table or a pool table, or anything of that character, in the same room where liquors are permitted to be sold. What objection can there be to an amendment of that kind?

Mr. BABCOCK. The committee in considering this matter did not take up the excise question at all. That is an entirely different subject, having no relation to this bill. Under the present law the Commissioners have no authority to deny a license for a billiard room. Anybody can tender his money and obtain a license authorizing him to open a billiard room. The committee have stated clearly why the pending bill is necessary, and I hope the gentleman will not embarrass its passage by insisting upon such an amendment. If he would put his proposition into a separate bill I would heartily support it, but the pending measure is a very necessary one and I trust the gentleman will not delay its passage by trying to amend it in that way. Let him prepare a separate bill and I can promise him that it will receive the prompt consideration of the committee.

Mr. RAY. But, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Committee on the District of Columbia is by this bill dealing with the subject of pool and billiard tables. Is not that true?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir; but not with the question of liquor selling; not with the excise law.

Mr. RAY. It seems to me that while we are dealing with the subject of pool and billiard tables we might as well legislate wisely upon that subject, might as well strike at the evil, if an evil exists, and it certainly is conceded by the chairman of the committee, and will, I think, be conceded by all good men, that the conduct of billiard tables or pool tables ought not to be permitted in any room where liquors are sold. I do not believe that a prohibition such as I have suggested in the form of an amendment will embarrass this measure in any way; and as the chairman of the committee concedes that if the amendment were in the form of an independent measure he would heartily support it, I can see no good reason why he should not support it now, or why it should not be adopted. I therefore move that the pending bill be amended by striking out of section 4, commencing in line 5 of that section, the words:

To allow any person under the age of 21 years to play at any game of billiards, pool, shuffleboard, or any game that may be played on such tables or boards, or play at bowls on said alleys, or permit such persons to come into or remain in their pool rooms, saloons, or bowling alleys, where spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors are sold.

And insert in lieu thereof the words:

To sell or to allow to be sold on said premises spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors.

That amendment will have a tendency to correct the evil of which I have spoken. It can do no harm and it will certainly result in very great good. It ought to be the law of this District.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to read the section as it will read if this amendment is adopted:

SEC. 4. That it shall not be lawful for the proprietors of billiard tables, pool tables, bagatelle tables, jenny lind tables, or other tables of the kind mentioned in the first section of this act, shuffleboards and bowling alleys, kept for public hire and gain in the District of Columbia, to sell or to allow to be sold on said premises, spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors; and all such places shall be closed during the entire twenty-four hours of each and every Sunday, and also during the hours that barrooms are required to be closed.

Any person violating the provisions of this section shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than forty dollars, and shall in addition forfeit his or her license, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that his amendment is very broad. It says "on the said premises." The question is, what will be held to be included in the word "premises." I understand the gentleman's object is to prevent the playing of these games in the same room where liquor is sold, and I suggest that, if he will, he modify his amendment in that way. I do not suppose there will be any objection to it. "Premises" might mean a whole block.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I would not permit the sale of any kind of intoxicating liquor in the same building where pool, billiards, or any of these games are conducted, but my present purpose is to prevent the sale of spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in the same room where these games are carried on, or in any room connected therewith and opening into such room. I will modify my amendment, if that is acceptable, so that instead of the words "to be sold on said premises" the language shall be "to be sold in the same room or in a room opening out of," etc.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman please put his amendment in writing?

Mr. RAY. I will do so. I do not think the committee will oppose an amendment prohibiting the sale of liquors in the same room or in any room connected with or opening out of a room in which any of these games are conducted.

The amendment of Mr. RAY, having been reduced to writing, was read, as follows:

In section 4 strike out all after the words "District of Columbia," in line 5, down to and including the word "sold," in line 11, and insert the following: "To sell or to allow to be sold in the same room or a room connected with and opening out of or adjacent to such room spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, allow me to state the evil which this bill was introduced to correct. Under the present law the authorities of the District have no control of billiard rooms and that class of establishments mentioned in the bill. The purpose of this bill was to give such control that these establishments might be under wholesome regulations. I fear that the amendment just read would not only defeat the original purpose of the bill, but would interfere with nearly every licensed place in the city where liquor is sold, including many of the hotels. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I can not see how the adoption of this amendment is to interfere with any of the rights of hotel keepers and saloon keepers in this District, nor can I see how it will peril the passage of the bill. We are now by this proposed legislation dealing directly with pool tables, billiard tables, shuffle boards, and all other kinds of machinery found in places which are largely resorted to by young men—the names of most of these appliances being quite unfamiliar to me. While we are dealing with this subject, it seems to me that we ought to deal with it sensibly and properly, in the interest of morality, and, I might say, of decency.

Mr. Speaker, every man in this House will concede that spirituous and malt liquors ought not to be sold in the same room or on the same premises where the shuffle boards, billiard tables, etc., are placed for public use, where young men are invited to congregate; where they do congregate. If liquors are sold at all it ought to be done in a room where no other business is conducted or carried on, unless it be to sell liquors in connection with the serving of meals.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think there is any greater objection to selling liquor in the places to which he refers than to selling it in the House of Representatives?

Mr. RAY. I have not discovered, Mr. Speaker, that spirituous or malt liquors are sold in the House of Representatives. If the gentleman has discovered that fact I trust he will make it known to the members of this House, so that we can cure the evil.

But I am opposed, and I trust this House is opposed, to the enactment of any law that will directly or impliedly permit the conduct of any of these tables to which the bill refers in the same room where intoxicating liquors are sold. To allow any such thing is a recognition by the American Congress of the doctrine that young men may be corrupted at will and without hindrance in the District of Columbia. It is the recognition of a bad principle——

Mr. BABCOCK. Does the gentleman understand that the language he proposes to strike from this bill by his amendment was what the subcommittee, after two weeks of patient examination, inserted in the bill to prevent minors going into rooms where billiard tables are used, whether liquor is sold there or not? The subject has been carefully considered by the Senate committee and a measure identically the same as this has been reported at the other end of the Capitol. But the gentleman's amendment strikes from the bill the language which our committee has considered absolutely necessary to protect minors—to keep them out of rooms where liquors are sold.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the pleasure of participating in the consultations of this committee. But there will be no harm done to the young men of this country by permitting them to visit a room where billiards are played, if that place is a proper place, and if it is disconnected from vicious associations—if these tables are conducted at places where intoxicating liquors are not sold. Shut out intoxicating liquors from these billiard rooms and you may let our young men gather there with perfect impunity; they will suffer no harm. But if you permit the sale of liquors of any character in rooms where you allow billiards to be played, and these other tables to be conducted, it will be in vain that you attempt to shut out young men.

The penalty proposed in this bill for the violation of section 4 is entirely inadequate. The penalty is merely $5. Who would pay any regard to a law with so trivial a penalty? If a boy of 5, 10, 12, or 14 years of age should visit one of these places it might not be noticed; but suppose that a child 10 years of age should stray into a billiard room, would the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] fine him?

What is the object of keeping young men under 21 years of age out of a billiard room? Is there anything wrong, immoral, or vicious in simply playing billiards? I think not. The vice lies in permitting billiards to be played and these tables to be conducted in the same room or rooms where liquors of any description are sold, where vicious associations are met.

The bill will be vastly improved by striking out the language to which I have directed attention and by inserting the proposition embraced in my amendment. The interests of young men will be conserved, the interest of all citizens of this District will be promoted. It will be a step in the right direction. It will not interfere with the rights of any man in the District of Columbia or of any minor in this District. The adoption of the amendment will carry happiness, I think, to all the firesides and homes of this District as well as to many people just outside of the District.

Now, I am not a Prohibitionist; I am not a temperance crank; but I do have an interest in the young men all over this land; I do have an interest in the young men dwelling in this city, and I do not care whether they are just under 21 years, or whether they have passed beyond the age of 21; I do not care whether the persons who visit billiard rooms be gray-headed or boys upon whose cheeks bloom the tints of youth. I say that wherever billiards are played, wherever shuffle boards are conducted, wherever any of these games are permitted to be carried on, we should prohibit the sale of all intoxicating liquors of every description, and at any rate, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect and deference to the committee, with all due consideration for their labors, I shall ask that the sense of the House be tested on this question whether or not the Congress of the United States will permit the sale of any kind of intoxicating liquors in the same room and in the same place where billiards and similar games are allowed to be played.

Let the saloon stand on its own legs. Let the billiard rooms stand on their merits; let the attractions and benefits of this amusement be its recommendation and attract its patronage if you will, but keep these places free from the contaminating influences of the bar room and the sale of intoxicating liquors. The world is moving, and in many of the States the law is as this amendment proposes to establish it here in the District of Columbia. This Congress can not keep step with the general advancement of morality and intelligence better than by adopting this amendment and showing that it is sound on the saloon question as well as on the tariff and money questions.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have heard no argument presented by the gentleman from New York in favor of his amendment that would in any way make up for the provision stricken from the bill. I sincerely hope the amendment will not be adopted; and now I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will not do that until we

have a little more understanding of what this bill contemplates.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BROSIUS. May we have the amendment again reported, Mr. Speaker?

The amendment was again read.

The question was taken on the amendment; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAY) there were—ayes 61, noes 60.

So the amendment was adopted.

The question recurred on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Debate has been closed by order of the House, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. PICKLER. I did not wish debate, but simply to ask a question.

Mr. WALSH. Would a motion to recommit be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would.

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to give persons interested in the matter in the District a hearing.

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope that motion will not carry. It seems hardly necessary.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the bill H. R. 148 will be laid on the table.

FALSE SWEARING, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That hereafter any trial board of the Metropolitan police force and of the fire department of the District of Columbia shall have power to issue subpœnas, attested in the name of the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to compel before it the attendance of witnesses upon any trial or proceedings authorized by the rules and regulations of the police force or of the fire department.

"SEC. 2. That any willful and corrupt false swearing on the part of any witness or person giving evidence before any trial board mentioned in the preceding section as to any material fact in any proceedings under the rules and regulations governing said police force and fire department shall be deemed perjury, and shall be punished in the manner prescribed by law for such offense.

"SEC. 3. That if any witness, having been first personally summoned, shall neglect or refuse to appear before any trial board mentioned in the first section of this act, then, on the fact being reported by the major and superintendent of police, or chief of the fire department, to one of the justices of the police court, it shall be the duty of that court to compel the attendance of such witness before such trial board in the same manner as witnesses are now compellable to appear before said court: *Provided*, That witnesses subpœnaed to appear before said trial boards, other than those employed by the District of Columbia, shall be entitled to the same fees as are now paid witnesses for attendance before the supreme court of the District of Columbia."

Mr. RICHARDSON. The object of this bill is simply to provide that the law now in force for the punishment of false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police shall be also extended to the fire department. It seems that in framing the original law this was left out, and that while provision was made for punishing false swearing before the police trial boards, false swearing before the trial boards of the fire department was not made punishable. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia ask this legislation, and I suppose there will be no objection to the passage of the bill.

I ask to incorporate with my remarks a letter from the District Commissioners.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 14, 1896.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners have the honor to recommend favorable action on H. R. bill 2654, to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892, which was referred to them, at your instance, for their views thereon.

The object of this proposed amendment is to make applicable for false swearing before trial boards of the fire department the penalities now prescribed for the like offense before police department trial boards.

The Commissioners would be much gratified if this amendment should be promptly enacted, as the legislation it contemplates is necessary to the maintenance of proper discipline in the fire department.

Very respectfully,
JOHN W. ROSS,
President Board of Commissioners District of Columbia.

Hon. J. W. BABCOCK,
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REASSESSMENT OF WATER-MAIN TAXES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, presents a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, in all cases where water-main taxes or assessments in the District of Columbia may hereafter be quashed, set aside, or declared void by the supreme court of the said District, by reason of an imperfect or erroneous description of the lot or parcel of ground against which the same shall have been levied, or by reason of such tax or assessment not having been authenticated by the proper officer, or by a defective return of service of notice, or for any technical reason other than the right of thepublic authorities to levy the tax or lay the main in respect of which the assessment was levied, to reassess the lot or parcel of ground mentioned in such defective assessment, with power to collect the same according to existing law relating to the collection of assessments and taxes: *Provided*, That where such assessments shall be so quashed or declared void by said supreme court for the reasons above stated the reassessment herein provided for shall be made within ninety days from the judgment or decree of the court quashing such assessment or declaring the same void: *And provided further*, That such reassessments shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date the original assessment should have been paid had it not been quashed or set aside.

The committee recommended an amendment to strike out the following:

And provided further, That such reassessments shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date the original assessment should have been paid had it not been quashed or set aside.

Mr. HULICK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to obviate a difficulty that occurs in cases where taxes have been assessed and the assessment set aside by the supreme court of the District. This bill provides for a reassessment of those taxes, and in order to more clearly set the facts before the House I ask the Clerk to read the report.

The report (by Mr. HULICK) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, report as follows:

The object of this bill is to obviate objections that might be urged to the reassessment of taxes upon property which has changed hands after the assessment had been quashed by the courts and interests of innocent owners become involved. The equitable right of the District to reassess and collect taxes under such circumstances is unquestionable. Legislation of the character recommended is advisable not only for the purpose of enabling the District to recover revenue justly due it, but to save the District and owners of property assessed the trouble and expense incident to litigation to secure the removal of such assessments, as owners of property thus assessed would not be encouraged to resort to the courts for the vacation of taxes on grounds which would not prevent the authorities from reassessing them.

The committee, however, recommend an amendment of the bill by striking out all after the word "void," in the twenty-second line thereof, as follows:

"*And provided further*, That such reassessments shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date the original assessment should have been paid had it not been quashed or set aside."

The committee fail to see the equity in charging interest upon reassessments from the date of original assessment. If the officers who are charged with the duty of levying taxes fail for any reason to make a legal assessment, the fault or failure should not be charged up against the property owner. It is the duty of the officers to make legal assessments. It is the right and privilege of the taxpayer to resist the payment of an illegal assessment.

Your committee therefore unanimously recommend that the clause charging interest on reassessments be stricken out, and, when so amended, that the bill do pass.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what will be the practical effect if the judgment quashing the assessment has been announced more than ninety days before the passage of this act? Would that property go entirely clear? I refer to lines 17 to 21 on page 2, in which it is provided that—

Where such assessments shall be so quashed or declared void by said supreme court for the reasons above stated the reassessment herein provided for shall be made within ninety days from the judgment or decree of the court quashing such assessment or declaring the same void.

Mr. HULICK. The provision is that where such assessments shall be so quashed or declared void by the courts the reassessment shall be made within ninety days.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I know; but that does not answer my question. Will the property be exempt in cases where assessments have been declared invalid more than ninety days before the passage of this act?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We can scarcely deal with matters of that kind which are already past. We are dealing with the future. It is not intended to make the bill retroactive.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The first portion of the bill is retroactive.

Mr. HULICK. The object is to limit the time within which the reassessment shall be made. It shall not be left unlimited, and the committee thought that ninety days was a sufficient time for the making of these reassessments, so the property would not be subject to this reflection upon the title.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I agree entirely with the gentleman on that point, but my point is that if an original assessment was quashed more than ninety days before the passage of this law would not that property go entirely exempt?

Mr. HULICK. Why, certainly, and it would only have the same advantages that all property has had in the past. There has been an embarrassment following the assessment of property, where the officers have by fault or neglect in some way failed to make a legal assessment, for instance, by failure to give the proper description, or for any other technical reason, over which the owner of the property has no control, and for the failure of which the owner of the property should not be held responsible.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then it is not the purpose to go into prior assessments?

Mr. HULICK. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to call attention to the fact that the language in line 6 of the first section provides for assessments which may hereafter be quashed, and not prior assessments.

Mr. HULICK. It does not affect questions of illegal assessments that have already been passed upon and set aside by the court. It is only to afford protection against any complications in the future where assessments for any cause may be quashed.

The committee thought further in regard to the matter that interest should not be charged upon reassessments that have been caused by failure or neglect of the officers to make proper descriptions or legal assessments. We have therefore recommended the adoption of the amendment set forth in the report, striking out the provision for charging interest on reassessments. It is not equitable; it is not just.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MEDICAL COLLEGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, calls up a bill which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any medical or dental college claiming the authority to confer, or actually conferring, the degree of doctor of medicine, or doctor of dental surgery, not incorporated by a special act of Congress, to conduct its business in the District of Columbia unless such college shall be registered by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and granted by them a written permit to commence or continue business in said District in compliance with the requirements of this act.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the proper officers of any such college, before commencing or continuing business, to apply to the said Commissioners for registration and a permit to commence or continue business; and said Commissioners are hereby authorized and required to make such regulations concerning the form of such application, the evidence to be adduced in support thereof, and the method of taking such evidence as they may deem best, and shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to give public notice of all hearings upon such applications; and no registration and permit shall be granted until after the Commissioners shall have, by the inquiry and hearing hereinbefore provided for and such other inquiry as they may see fit to make, satisfied themselves that all such medical or dental colleges are fully equipped, both by the character and fitness of the faculty and the sufficiency of their appliances, to give suitable and sufficient instruction in the theory and practice of medicine or dental surgery.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the proper officers of every medical or dental college not incorporated by a special act of Congress which is now doing business in said District to apply for such certificate and registration within thirty days of the passage of this act; and no such college hereafter sought to be opened in said District shall commence business without first obtaining such registration and permit.

SEC. 4. That such of the officers and of the faculty of any such medical or dental college now in existence, and of every such college hereafter sought to be opened in said District, which shall continue or commence to offer instruction without first obtaining registration and permit, as hereinbefore provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in the police court of said District, upon an information similar to that filed in the case of violations of the police regulations made by the said Commissioners, shall be fined not less than twenty-five nor more than two hundred and fifty dollars, and in default of payment thereof shall be imprisoned in the common jail of said District not less than thirty nor more than ninety days, said fines when collected to be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That in any case when such action shall be necessary in the opinion of the said Commissioners to give full effect to the intent of this act they shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to file in the supreme court of the District of Columbia, in the name of the said District, a bill in equity against the proper parties praying an injunction against the opening or continuance of any such college not registered and granted a permit as aforesaid; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear and determine such causes.

SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts and all charters heretofore obtained by any medical or dental college under the general incorporation laws in force in said District, so far as inconsistent with this act, are hereby repealed.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ODELL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the chairman of this committee if this bill is in substance and spirit the same as the laws of our States generally which prevent or might prevent improper persons from practicing medicine or dentistry?

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that this is not a bill regulating the practice of medicine and surgery, but it is for the incorporation of medical colleges—a general incorporation law.

Mr. HALL. I did not hear the reading of the bill, and I wish to know about that.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ODELL. I have the bill in charge.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman going to make a statement about it?

Mr. ODELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ODELL. This bill, with one of a similar character now pending before Congress, has for its object the regulation of and also raising the standard of the medical fraternity in the District of Columbia. This bill under consideration is a substitute for the bill H. R. 2656. The difference between the original bill and the bill under consideration is that it includes the dental fraternity as well as the members of the medical profession. Under existing law medical colleges can be incorporated either through direct act of Congress or under a general law, and it is for the purpose of reaching the latter class that this bill is designed. It is in harmony with laws that are in force in the different States. It gives to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia supervisory power, so that they may be satisfied at all times that the colleges are institutions that should issue diplomas for the practice of medicine within the District of Columbia. Under the general law any number or variety of medical colleges may be organized without any supervisory power, after they have complied with the original requirements. This bill gives supervision to the District Commissioners, who are authorized at all times to supervise and regulate any medical college not incorporated under special act of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there are a number of colleges now in existence in the District of Columbia incorporated under general law?

Mr. ODELL. Only three.

Mr. CANNON. What are those?

Mr. ODELL. They are the National University, the National Homeopathic Medical Society, and the White Cross University of Science.

Mr. CANNON. Are there any dental colleges in the District incorporated under general law?

Mr. ODELL. No, sir; I think not.

Mr. CANNON. Well, why require these three colleges to appear before the District Commissioners before they can proceed with business? They are incorporated under the general law.

Mr. ODELL. Simply because, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, their diplomas are worthless in every State in the United States; and we thought that the health of the people of the District of Columbia was as worthy of consideration as the health of the people in New York or in Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Why are they worthless?

Mr. ODELL. Simply because they are not accepted as diplomas by the medical faculty in other States, and are thus discredited because they are not under the direction of a competent supervisory board.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to ask, for information, if these three institutions that are now in existence are not incorporated under the general law? As I understand, they are.

Mr. ODELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. CANNON. This morning when a special act was passed under the charge of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], giving a special charter to the National University, he stated, as I apprehended, that that was passed in view of an act that was to pass. Is this the one?

Mr. ODELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. But this special act passed without knowledge, so far as I know, certainly without any upon my part, as to whether this institution that it is proposed to give a special charter to has equities or merits to take it out of the general law that it is now proposed to pass——

Mr. ODELL. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that I believe in the case he mentions the standard is all that could be desired, but it is also true that the standard of medical colleges in the District of Columbia has become a byword and reproach among the medical fraternity throughout the United States, and it is to prevent the incorporation of just such institutions in the future that we require that they shall have supervision, which will give them a standing and will give to the students who receive diplomas from such institutions the right to practice or to undergo examinations in any State in the Union.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend think it wise to enact legislation the proposed enactment of which—the proposed enactment of which, before it is ever considered in the House—breeds a special act to give a special charter to a medical college that would otherwise come under its terms? Is not that pretty conclusive evidence of the unwisdom of this act?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman will let me answer that. They do not object to the general law. The National University which was chartered this morning does not object to this amendment at all. They simply want it because they have been in operation for twenty years. As it now is any five gentlemen can associate themselves together and obtain a charter under the general law; and the idea was to make this law, which would operate to prevent institutions of that kind from doing business or carrying on their business without special permit of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the president, or the gentleman supposed to be the president, of one of these institutions named appeared before the committee and said that they neither had a building, faculty, nor students, and still they are an incorporated medical college of the District of Columbia, with the right to issue diplomas.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ODELL. I would like to qualify that statement so far as the National University is concerned. As I understand, that is a reputable college, but there are others here that are not in good standing. At the hearing before the District Committee evidence was given as to one of these institutions that the only students it had ever graduated were two, one of whom was president of the college. Now, the gentleman must concede that such an institution as that should not be allowed to exist.

Mr. CANNON. I have no desire that any bogus colleges shall exist, but it does strike me that if there be a reputable college, incorporated under a general law, having a building, professors, and appliances, and actually engaged in the business of turning out doctors with diplomas, it ought not to be necessary for an institution of that kind to come in and avoid the investigation before the District Commissioners that is here referred to.

Mr. ODELL. I think that this bill has the approbation of the medical fraternity of the District, and they generally regard it as for the good of the profession.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; all the physicians of the established schools of medicine favor it, and the District Commissioners approve it.

Mr. CANNON. I suppose there ought to be some safeguards thrown around the turning out of those who are to exercise the healing art, but there is great danger that those who claim that they are highly educated in that line and that other people are not may use this legislation as an engine of oppression. In the legal profession I have always believed that about as good a way as any was to let everybody practice law that thought he could get clients, because men are not apt to secure clients unless they demonstrate their competency; but it is possible that there ought to be some special safeguards thrown around the medical profession.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say to the gentleman that in his own State the course required for admission to the medical profession has recently been changed, so that now a course of three years of eight or nine months in each year is required instead of a two years' course of five months in each year. That is the standard which now prevails in the State of Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that; but let me say to the gentleman in reply that I am satisfied that as a rule no one school of medicine could found a college easily if it had to pass under the fire and supervision of those attached to another school of medicine, because the manner in which we are to be taken off, or the manner in which our taking off is to be prevented, is a matter about which there is very great difference of opinion between the several schools. [Laughter.] I simply wanted to be certain before this bill passed that there was no danger of setting up a war between those who would cure us without medicine and those who would cure us with medicine, because I have never been quite sure myself which of the several schools of medicine was the best.

Mr. BABCOCK. This bill has the approbation of the leading doctors of the different schools in this District.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know the object of section 4 of this bill. Is it to prevent the enlightenment of mankind, to prevent the spread of education and intelligence?

Mr. ODELL. No; it is to carry out the provisions of the bill as enumerated in the preceding sections, and to provide a proper penalty.

Mr. RAY. But is not section 4 entirely unnecessary in order to carry out the provisions in the preceding part of the bill? Section 4, as I read it, plainly provides that it shall be unlawful for persons being the officers or belonging to the faculty of any medical or dental college now in existence in this District to teach medicine, or to teach anything else, to give instruction of any kind in any branch of learning without first having obtained a license as provided in this bill.

Mr. ODELL. That applies to any medical or dental college not incorporated by general act of Congress.

Mr. RAY. But what good reason is there why the members of the faculty of these colleges should not go on instructing people in medical or dental science? Why make it a crime for them to give instruction? You have already by this bill prohibited them or the college to which they belong from granting diplomas.

Mr. ODELL. But suppose they do grant diplomas, what then? That is the case provided for in section 4, and is, I submit, a just and proper restraint.

Mr. RAY. But you have provided in other sections of the bill, under penalty, that they shall not grant diplomas. Under section 4 you provide—

> That such of the officers and of the faculty of any such medical or dental college now in existence, and of every such college hereafter sought to be opened in said District, which shall continue or commence to offer instruction without first obtaining registration and permit, as hereinbefore provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in the police court of said District, upon an information similar to that filed in case of violations of the police regulations made by the said Commissioners, shall be fined not less than twenty-five nor more than two hundred and fifty dollars, and in default of payment thereof shall be imprisoned in the common jail of said District not less than thirty nor more than ninety days.

That is what you do. You first make it a criminal offense for these duly incorporated institutions, or for the officers or faculty of these institutions as such, to give instruction in medical or dental science, or in anything else, and grant diplomas without a license. Now, what objection can you have to these people, as plain individuals, giving instruction in dental science, for example?

Mr. ODELL. If these colleges are up to the standard and will obey the provisions of the law, they will have no trouble. The law provides how they may get permits.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; if any such college chooses to go and get registration and a permit the penalties will not apply.

Mr. RAY. Suppose the Commissioners of the District will not grant a permit?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then they ought not to have it.

Mr. RAY. Why not? Suppose a duly incorporated college of medicine or of dentistry in the State of New York, or the State of Maine, or Massachusetts—an institution up to the standard of the State to which it belongs—should locate here——

Mr. RICHARDSON. In that case there would not be any trouble.

Mr. RAY. Or should come here and simply propose to give instruction in medical or dental science. What objection could there be to that? They would not grant diplomas.

Mr. ODELL. The objection is that while one good college might come here half a dozen poor ones might also come, and those half a dozen poor ones might do more harm than the other institution, which is up to the standard, could do good. We propose to treat them all alike. They must come in and take their chances.

Mr. HULICK. The inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], as I understand, is this: If a medical institution of New York or of Ohio, or some other State—an institution recognized by the laws of those States—should come here to instruct in medical science, why should they not be permitted to do so? Certainly they should be if these instructors are well qualified, are recognized by the laws of their respective States as qualified to give instruction, and are licensed by their State, because all of the States and Territories, I believe—at least 43—require such licenses.

Mr. BABCOCK. Forty-seven.

Mr. HULICK. Yes; 47 of them require licenses of this kind. Now, if any reputable medical or dental association or college should come into this District and hold themselves out to the world to give instruction, why should they not be required to go to the District Commissioners and obtain a permit to do so?

If only reputable and legitimate institutions should come here from the various States to give instruction, then there might not be any necessity for such a measure as this. But what would the gentleman from New York think if a man calling himself "a university" should appear here and acknowledge that his institution embraced merely himself as president and one other man as the faculty—suppose such a "university," without standing, without character, should hold itself out to the world as competent to teach medical science in this District, and should invite medical students to come and be taught, would not the gentleman think we ought to protect the citizens of this District against such an institution, existing as a "university" only upon paper? Now, a fact of just that kind was brought to the attention of the committee. Therefore it is quite evident that persons representing such institutions which may undertake to give medical instruction in this District should be required to go to the Commissioners for a license before being allowed to proclaim to the world that they are prepared to educate students in medical science. It seems to me there can be no objection to such a requirement.

Mr. RAY. Perhaps there is not; but it struck me as a novel proposition to make it a crime, as one section of this bill proposes to do, for the officers or faculty of a medical or dental college as individuals to simply teach medicine in the District of Columbia without a permit.

Mr. HULICK. The offense aimed at is teaching as a medical college or university, teaching in that capacity; and it ought to be declared a crime by Congress for one or two or any number

of men to come here and publish to the world that they have a university or a college and are qualified and authorized to teach medical science, when in fact they could not obtain recognition anywhere, in any State, if their true character were known.

Mr. BABCOCK. It would necessarily follow, if they were allowed to teach, that they would issue diplomas.

Mr. RAY. Not at all; because your bill prohibits that, and I have no objection to the prohibition.

Mr. HULICK. Let me say that there is nothing in this bill which would prohibit one man or a dozen men, or more, to come into this District and teach medical science as individuals; but they ought not to be permitted to come here and call themselves a medical university or college, and offer to give instruction as such in medical science. Whether a corporate body or not, they should be prohibited from publishing themselves in the newspapers as authorized to give instruction. Such advertisements can be seen now in almost every issue of our daily papers.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And they undertake to confer degrees.

Mr. HULICK. Certainly; they claim to teach medical science, to issue diplomas, confer degrees, and, as the main object in view, to get money out of the people.

Mr. PAYNE. They "steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in." [Laughter.]

Mr. HULICK. Well, I will not say they will "steal the livery of heaven"——

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the livery of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HULICK. But they come here to obtain money from citizens of the District without giving a proper return therefor. The object of the bill, it seems to me, is very commendable.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman from New York will listen a moment, I think I can make this matter clear. The first section of the bill, to which I call his attention, provides that—

It shall be unlawful for any medical or dental college claiming the authority to confer, or actually conferring, the degree of doctor of medicine, or doctor of dental surgery, not incorporated by a special act of Congress, to conduct its business in the District of Columbia, unless such college shall be registered by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and granted by them a written permit to commence or continue business in said District in compliance with the requirements of this act.

Now take the fourth section in connection with that——

Mr. RAY. Let me ask the gentleman whether the whole proposition is not covered by section 1?

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope the gentleman will wait a moment. I want to call his attention to the language of section 4:

That such of the officers and of the faculty of any such medical or dental college now in existence, and of every such college hereafter sought to be opened in said district—

This does not refer to a single man or a body of individuals who may undertake to give instruction without claiming to be the officers or faculty of a college or university—

which shall continue or commence to offer instruction without first obtaining registration and permit, as hereinbefore provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in the police court of said District, upon an information similar to that filed in the case of violations of the police regulations made by the said Commissioners, shall be fined not less than twenty-five nor more than two hundred and fifty dollars, etc.

If these two sections be read in connection with each other it will be found that the prohibition and the punishment apply directly to the officers and faculty "of any such medical or dental college"—not to individuals as such.

Mr. RAY. I have read the two sections; and the reading of them has suggested my criticism. Section 1 prohibits the college or society, or whatever you may call it, from carrying on its business here at all as a college or society. That applies to the association, and of course prohibits all of the officers of the society or incorporation, whichever you may call it, from carrying on the business of the incorporation or society by whatever name you may call it; and that covers the whole subject. Now, you are not satisfied with that; you are not satisfied with what you have done. You are not satisfied with driving the association out of business, and with outlawing the college, but you go further and attempt to strike down the officers of the faculty as individuals. Having prohibited the college from doing anything, you also outlaw and proceed to attack the officers as individuals, telling them if they have the impertinence to undertake to teach medicine or dentistry or anything of that kind in the District of Columbia they shall be felons, criminals, subject to fine and punishment under the provisions of this act. You prevent their giving private lessons.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a lawyer who has studied this bill who will not say at the first glance that that is the effect of it—first to strike down the college or society, whatever it may be, and having done that, in the second place to prevent any of the officers connected with it from teaching medicine or dentistry again in the District of Columbia as individuals.

Mr. ODELL. Oh, no, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. RAY. No, I am not; that is the logical and legal construction of the bill.

Mr. HULICK. Why, if the gentleman will allow me, I will call his attention to section 4, and if the gentleman will examine that section he will hardly make the contention he does. It says:

SEC. 4. That such of the officers and of the faculty of any such medical or dental college now in existence, and of every such college hereafter sought to be opened in said District, which shall continue or commence to offer instruction without first obtaining registration and permit, as hereinbefore provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

Now, unless you reach the individuals who undertake to form a corporate body for this purpose you can not punish the corporation, which lawyers know have no souls, and sometimes no bodies.

Mr. RAY. I deny the proposition that lawyers have no souls.

Mr. HULICK. I was talking about corporations having no souls.

Mr. RAY. I agree that corporations are usually soulless. But every lawyer knows that when you have prohibited an association, corporation, or society from doing a thing you have prohibited every officer of that corporation from doing the act prohibited in the name of the corporation, and if he attempts to do the prohibited act in the name of the corporation or as a corporation, he becomes liable to whatever penalties may be affixed. Therefore you have prohibited all you seek to prohibit by section 1.

Mr. HULICK. Will the gentleman from New York allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAY. Certainly.

Mr. HULICK. How would you punish the officers or agents of an association of any kind which was prohibited by law from doing an act, unless you acted with reference to them as though they were individuals?

Mr. RAY. But you have provided by section 1 that the penalties for violating section 1 shall not only be imposed on the society or college, but on each individual officer of it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York, with his consent. Suppose in line 4 of section 4, after the word "instruction," you insert the words "in such capacity." Would that not obviate the difficulty the gentleman suggests?

Mr. RAY. Well, I do not know that I have any objection particularly to the bill as it stands. Only it seems to me, as I have said, that it undertakes to go even further than the committee desires to go. The amendment suggested will obviate the trouble, I think.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That insertion would make them liable, not as individuals teaching, but as individual professors undertaking to teach in violation of this law.

Mr. RAY. It seemed to me to be rather drastic legislation to prohibit a college of this character from teaching, and then turn round and strike at the officers of the faculty as individuals.

Mr. ODELL. I disagree with the gentleman from New York, if he will pardon me for the interruption. I think the proper interpretation is that the punishment would only operate when the officers and faculty continue to act as such, and violate the law.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 4, line 4, after the word "instruction" by inserting "in such capacity."

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ODELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. W. H. CRAIN, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of three Senators be appointed by the presiding officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

In pursuance of the foregoing resolution, the Vice-President appointed as said committee Mr. MILLS, Mr. GALLINGER, and Mr. KYLE.

When, as an additional mark of respect, the Senate adjourned.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 43) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute seeds, bulbs, etc., as has been done in preceding years; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills and resolutions of the following titles:

On February 11, 1896:

An act (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and

fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and District of Columbia;

An act (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;*

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents.

JOHN L. WALLER.

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, in answer to the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 28, 1895, a report from the Secretary of State, accompanied by copies of correspondence and other papers in regard to the case of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States, at present in the custody of the French Government.

It will be seen upon examination, as would of course be expected, that there is a slight conflict of evidence upon some of the features of Mr. Waller's case. Nevertheless, upon a fair and just consideration of all the facts and circumstances as presented, and especially in view of Mr. Waller's own letters, the conclusions set forth in the report of the Secretary of State do not appear to admit of any reasonable doubt, nor to leave open to the Executive any other course of action than that adopted and acted upon as therein stated.

It is expected that Mr. Waller's release from imprisonment will be immediately forthcoming.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 11, 1896.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 28 last, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be directed to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the public interests, copies of all correspondence relating to affairs in Cuba since February last."

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State and such portions of the correspondence requested as I deem it not inconsistent with the public interests to communicate.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 11, 1896.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PRACTICE OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 5731) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be, and is hereby, created a board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia, which shall consist of the presidents of the three boards of medical examiners hereinafter provided for and two persons, not physicians, to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, each for a period of three years, or until his successor is appointed: *Provided*, That not more than two members of the board of supervisors shall be adherents of any one system of medical practice: *And provided further*, That said Commissioners may remove any member of said board for neglect of duty or other just cause, and that in case of the death, resignation, or removal of any member the vacancy for the unexpired term of said member shall be filled in the same manner as other appointments are made.

SEC. 2. That the said board of medical supervisors shall elect a president, a vice-president, and a secretary. Said board shall make, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, such regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act. Said board shall hold such meetings as may be necessary for the transaction of business. Said board shall supervise all examinations provided for in this act, and shall issue all licenses to practice medicine and surgery or midwifery in the District of Columbia. Said board shall keep an official record of its meetings, also an official register of all applicants for examination for licenses to practice medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia. Said register shall show the name, age, and place and duration of residence of each candidate, the time he or she has spent in medical study, in or out of medical schools, and the names and locations of all medical schools which have granted said applicant any degree or certificate of attendance upon lectures in medicine. Said register shall also show whether said applicant was rejected or licensed under this act. Said register shall be prima facie evidence of all matters contained therein. The secretary aforesaid may be elected by said board from others than its own members; said secretary shall also act as treasurer, and shall give such bond as may be required by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; said secretary shall have the power to administer oaths upon such matters as pertain to the business of said board; said secretary shall mail to the address of each applicant a notice of the time and place of examination, not less than seven days before the examination, and at a longer period if requested by the applicant at the time of making application.

SEC. 3. That from and after the passage of this act all persons desiring to practice medicine and surgery in any of their branches in the District of Columbia shall apply to said board of medical supervisors for a license to do so. Applicants shall submit to examination upon the following-named branches, to wit: Anatomy, physiology, chemistry, pathology, materia medica and therapeutics, hygiene, histology, practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, diseases of the eye and the ear, medical jurisprudence, and such other branches as said board shall deem advisable. Each applicant shall be certified by said board for examination as speedily as possible to the board of medical examiners whose members are adherents to the system of medicine which said applicant desires to practice; but said board shall not certify for examination any applicant until satisfactory proof is furnished that he is of good moral character and over 21 years of age, nor until he has presented a diploma conferring upon him the degree of doctor of medicine, issued by some medical college authorized by law to confer such degree: *Provided*, That said diploma, if issued prior to July 1, 1898, shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence that said applicant has studied medicine and surgery for not less than three years prior to the issue thereof, and if issued subsequent to June 30, 1898, shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence that the applicant has studied medicine and surgery for not less than four years prior to the issue of said diploma. All examinations shall be both theoretical and practical and of sufficient severity, to test a candidate's fitness to practice medicine and surgery.

SEC. 4. That said application for a license to practice medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia shall be made to the secretary of said board of medical supervisors upon a form prescribed by said board, and shall be accompanied by a fee of $20. Each application shall be in the hands of said secretary not less than two weeks before the day set for examination, and any application may be rejected for refusal to furnish any of the information called for, or for other irregularity. All applications shall be kept on file by said secretary.

SEC. 5. That immediately after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint three boards of medical examiners, one to be known as the board of medical examiners of the District of Columbia, and to be composed of five physicians in good standing, adherents to the regular system of medical practice; one to be known as the board of homeopathic medical examiners of the District of Columbia, and to be composed of five physicians in good standing, adherents to the homeopathic system of medical practice, to be selected from a list of not less than ten names, submitted by a majority vote at some regular meeting of the Washington Homeopathic Medical Society; and one to be known as the board of eclectic medical examiners of the District of Columbia, to be composed of five physicians in good standing, adherents to the eclectic system of medical practice, to be selected from a list of not less than ten names, submitted by a majority vote at some regular meeting of the Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia. Of the members of each board first appointed one shall be appointed to serve one year, two to serve two years, and two to serve three years, and thereafter each member of each board shall be appointed to serve three years, or until his successor is appointed: *Provided*, That no member of said boards shall have engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia for less than five years at the time of his appointment: *And provided further*, That in event of the failure of the Washington Homeopathic Medical Society or of the Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia, after fifteen days' notice by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to submit the list of names aforesaid, said Commissioners may appoint the members of the board of homeopathic medical examiners or of the board of eclectic medical examiners, or of both, as the case may be, without restriction as to nomination by the society or societies in default; *And provided further*, That said Commissioners may at any time remove any member of said boards for neglect of duty or other just cause, and that in case of the death, resignation, or removal of any member the vacancy for the unexpired term of said member shall be filled in the same manner as other appointments are made.

SEC. 6. That each member of said boards of medical examiners of the District of Columbia shall, before entering upon the discharge of his duties, take an oath to administer fairly and impartially the provisions of this act. Each board shall elect from its own members a president and a secretary. Each board shall hold a meeting for examination in the city of Washington on the second Thursday in January, April, July, and October of each year, and continuing so long as may be necessary to examine all applicants, and at such other times as the board of medical supervisors shall direct. Each of said boards of medical examiners shall examine, at the examination immediately following the receipt of the proper certificates from the board of medical supervisors, all applicants for licenses to practice medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia so certified.

SEC. 7. That the several boards of medical examiners shall, not less than one week prior to each examination, submit to the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia questions for thorough examinations in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, pathology, materia medica and therapeutics, hygiene, histology, practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, and gynecology, diseases of the eye and the ear, medical jurisprudence, and such other branches as said board of medical supervisors may direct. From the lists of questions so submitted said board of medical supervisors shall select the questions for each examination, and such questions shall be the same for all candidates, except that in the department of therapeutics, practice of medicine, and materia medica the questions shall be in harmony with the system of medicine selected by the candidate. Said examinations shall be conducted orally and in writing, in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the board of medical supervisors, and shall embrace the subjects as stated in section 3 of this act. An official report of the result of each examination, signed by the president, and the secretary and each acting member of the board of medical examiners conducting such examination, stating the examination average of each candidate in each branch, the general average, and the result of the examination, whether successful or unsuccessful, shall be transmitted to the board of medical supervisors within fifteen days from the date of such examination. Said report shall embrace all the examination papers, questions, and answers thereto. All such examination papers shall be kept for reference and inspection for a period of not less than five years.

SEC. 8. That if in the opinion of a majority of the board of medical supervisors, after a careful examination of the report of the board of medical examiners by which any applicant was examined, said applicant has fairly and successfully passed such examination as hereinbefore provided for, the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia shall, as soon thereafter as possible, issue to him a license signed by the president and the secretary of said board and attested by the seal of the District of Columbia, which license shall entitle said applicant, after it is registered as hereinafter provided, to practice medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That a license shall be issued upon application, free of cost and without examination, to each physician, a graduate of any medical college in good standing, who is registered at the health office of the District of Columbia at the time of the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That a license may be issued, under such regulations as the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners of said District, shall make, to any physician holding a license from any State board of medical examiners established by law which has required, before the issue of said license, qualifications and examinations equivalent to those required by this act for the issue of similar licenses. All licenses issued by said board shall be numbered consecutively, and a register shall be kept by the secretary showing the number of each license, the date of issue, and to whom issued.

SEC. 9. That the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia shall make, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of said District,

such regulations as may be necessary to determine the qualifications of women desiring hereafter to commence the practice of midwifery in the District of Columbia, and shall issue licenses to such as are, after examination, found qualified; but no fee shall be charged for the examination of any applicant for such licenses, and no applicant who has been rejected shall be reexamined within one year from such rejection: *Provided*, That a license shall be issued upon application, free of cost and without examination, to each midwife registered at the health office of the District of Columbia at the time of the passage of this act.

SEC. 10. That the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia may, by a vote of four members, refuse to grant or may revoke a license, and may cause the name of any person to be removed from the record of the supreme court of the District of Columbia and from the register of the health office for any of the following causes, to wit: The employment of fraud or deception in passing the examinations provided for in this act, chronic and persistent inebriety, the practice of criminal abortion, conviction of crime involving moral turpitude, or publicly professing, in such a manner as to deceive the public, to cure or treat diseases, injury, or deformity. In complaints under this section the accused shall be furnished with a copy of the complaint and given a hearing before said board in person or by attorney, and witnesses may be heard for and on behalf of the accused, and for and on behalf of the said board. Appeal from the decision of said board may be taken to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and its decision shall be final. Said board may at any time within two years from the refusal or revocation of a license, or the cancellation of registration under this section, by a vote of four members, issue, without examination, a new license to the person so affected, restoring to him all the rights and privileges of which he or she had been deprived by said board.

SEC. 11. That any person receiving a license as hereinbefore provided shall have it recorded in the office of the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia within three months from the date of said license, and the place and date of record shall be certified thereon by said clerk; and the holder of the license shall pay to the recording clerk a fee of 50 cents for making the record. The holder of said license shall, after the same has been recorded, exhibit the same at the health office, and register, in a book provided for that purpose, his or her name and address. Whenever a license is revoked by said board of medical supervisors the secretary thereof shall report that fact in writing to the clerk of said court and to the health officer of the District of Columbia, who shall thereupon cancel such registration.

SEC. 12. That this act shall not apply to commissioned surgeons of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine-Hospital Service, nor to regularly licensed physicians and surgeons in actual consultation from other States or Territories, nor to regularly licensed physicians and surgeons actually called from other States or Territories to attend specified cases in the District of Columbia, nor to the treatment of any case of actual emergency, nor to the use of ordinary domestic remedies without any fee, gift, or consideration of any kind being given in return therefor.

SEC. 13. That from and after the passage of this act any person practicing medicine and surgery or midwifery in the District of Columbia, or who shall publicly profess to do so, without first having obtained from the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia a license to do so and registered the same, as herein provided, or in violation of any of the provisions of this act or any of the rules and regulations made by authority conferred herein, or after his license or registration, or both, has been canceled by order of said board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished for each offense by a fine of not less than fifty nor more than five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the District jail for a period of not less than ten nor more than ninety days, or by both such fine and imprisonment. It shall be the duty of the United States district attorney for the District of Columbia to prosecute all violations of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 14. That the secretary of the board of medical supervisors shall be paid for taking testimony the same fee that is allowed to an examiner in chancery for the same service. The expense of said board and of the examinations shall be paid from the license fees herein provided for; and if any surplus remain on the thirtieth day of June of each year the members of the board of medical supervisors appointed as such shall be paid such reasonable compensation as said board may determine, and any balance then remaining shall be divided among the three boards of medical examiners in proportion to the number of candidates examined, each member of each board of medical examiners to receive such part of the entire amount paid as that board itself shall determine.

SEC. 15. That nothing in this act shall be construed to conflict with an act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, approved June 6, 1892, nor to interfere with graduates of standard dental colleges, registered under the provisions of said act, in the exercise of their profession to the extent and within the limits of the curriculum of such standard dental colleges.

SEC. 16. That all acts or parts of acts, general or special, now existing not in accordance with the provisions of this act, or inconsistent therewith, be, and are hereby, repealed.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill as reported by the committee is the result of more than twenty years of attempted legislation in the District of Columbia. It has been carefully prepared. The laws of 47 States and Territories have been presented for the use of the committee, for comparison with this measure, and for the first time in many years the different medical societies have reached an agreement as to the necessity for the passage of the bill.

There is only one State in the entire Union, outside of the District of Columbia, which has not a law regulating the practice of medicine and surgery. That is the State of New Hampshire. This District is the only other place in the country where the practice of medicine and surgery is not regulated. The effect of the laws in other States is to drive out irregular practitioners, and many come here to locate and practice in the District who would not be tolerated in Virginia, Maryland, and other States.

The bills that have been before Congress heretofore have been antagonized by various wings of the medical societies. Objections have been raised to different provisions, so that no agreement has heretofore been reached. This bill has been carefully considered, not only by the medical societies, not only by gentlemen representing the different schools of the profession, but carefully, section by section and line by line, by the committee, and the committee are unanimous in the opinion that a measure of this kind is absolutely necessary for the protection of the people in the District of Columbia. For that reason they have made a unanimous recommendation, and ask for its favorable consideration by this House.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if I understood him to say that all of the medical societies of the District have agreed to this bill?

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand that the two leading societies, the allopathic and the homeopathic, have agreed as a unit to the bill, and that there has been only a partial agreement reached by the eclectics.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the gentleman if this bill is not a discrimination against all who practice medicine and the art of healing outside of the methods employed by the three old schools—the allopathic, the homeopathic, and the eclectic?

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, no; any person who can pass an examination before any of these three boards can practice. I will read the latter part of the report:

> It permits the candidate to be examined, of his own choice, in that system of medical practice in which he has been educated, and having demonstrated the sufficiency of his education, it permits him to pursue absolutely any system which he may desire, whether among those named in this bill or not.

Mr. KEM. Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency upon the part of some practitioners of medicine in this country to assume that they are possessed of all of the knowledge there is to be had relative to the art of healing, and there have been efforts made along certain lines to secure to certain practitioners a monopoly of the right to heal ailing humanity. I want to say that while I am not a physician, nor the son of a physician, and do not pretend to know anything about the art of healing as a practitioner, I do know that that art is not an exact science. I know that the practice of medicine is not an exact science, and that all of the knowledge in regard to healing the ills of humanity is not possessed by any individual or medical fraternity. I object to any proposition that tends to monopolize the art of healing and give it into the hands of a select few who assume to know all there is to be known in regard to this matter, and who, to a certain extent, have become egotists and say, "Our way is not only the best way, but the only way, and if you want to practice the art of healing you must come to us and receive our consent before you can do it."

I have not examined this bill thoroughly enough to know positively that it does this, but I am afraid that it tends to do this, and I submit to this House that if it does it ought to be defeated, because we can not afford to do a thing like that. I wish now to submit and have read from the Clerk's desk a protest against this bill from the Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. May I ask the gentleman what the Eclectic Society of the District of Columbia is? What does it embrace?

Mr. KEM. It is a school of medicine peculiar to itself. I am not able to say just what it is.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Does it embrace all physicians who are not of the homeopathic or allopathic schools?

Mr. KEM. I think not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Hair doctors, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. KEM. It does not.

Mr. HARDY. Faith doctors and cranks?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Faith doctors, hair doctors, and corn doctors?

Mr. KEM. It does not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Has it any theory of medicine?

Mr. KEM. It has.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What is it?

Mr. KEM. I do not know. Mr. Speaker, I will simply ask the gentleman what that has to do with this question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. You presented a protest.

Mr. KEM. I do not pretend to know all the different theories of medicine. I am not a physician. I have stated that I am not; but I do lay down the principle that no man on earth, of any school of medicine, knows all there is of the art of healing.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I will answer the gentleman's question, if I may be allowed to. You present a protest signed by the Eclectic School of Medicine. I am not thoroughly informed as to all the schools of medicine, and I simply asked the gentleman what it is. I never saw an eclectic doctor in my life, although I have read the signs and the advertisements of a great many different kinds of doctors. I simply want to know if that includes all persons practicing medicine who are not doctors.

Mr. KEM. I do not pretend to know, as I have said, anything about this question. I am not a physician; but I do know enough about it to say that it does not embrace all the classes of healers that he has referred to. I ask that the protest be read.

Mr. STEELE. Is this body to be composed entirely of allopathic physicians?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There can not be more than two of any particular school of medicine on the board.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the reading of the protest.

Mr. STEELE. Do you say that this will not include the eclectic school?

Mr. BABCOCK. There are three boards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). It can be read as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. KEM. I ask to have it read as a part of my remarks.

The protest was read, as follows:

Objections of the Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia to Senate bill No. 325 and House bill No. 2652, "To regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia."

SECRETARY'S OFFICE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The Eclectic Medical Society begs to present to you its objections to Senate bill No. 325 and House bill No. 2652, "To regulate the practice of medicine," etc. These two bills are identically the same and are placed in both Houses simultaneously, under different numbers.

As the above bill is of vital importance to the people of the District of Columbia and their physicians, it being the object of its projectors to secure the exclusive monopoly of the practice of medicine, and every other curative means, to the three schools of physicians mentioned in the bill, and as we are included and made party to the scheme without our knowledge or consent as a society or individuals, we have taken the liberty of drawing your attention to these facts. As the projectors of the bill are in special haste to "railroad" the bill through Congress, and as the committees for the District of Columbia of both Houses are already overcrowded with work, we fear they will not have time to critically weigh the import of the bill and discover the intent of its several sections. As the time given for the hearing in the Senate subcommittee was less than two hours, and that in the House committee only one hour to hear all arguments pro and con, our representative had to retire with the major part of our objections unheard. We therefore beg to present our objections in condensed form for your critical and joint consideration.

First. We object to the false statement in the preamble of the bill, because there is a law to regulate the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia, which is just to physicians and humane to the people, and which amply protects the profession and the public from impostors, by fines and imprisonment.

We therefore protest and declare that there is no necessity for the passage of this bill. You will find the present law in volume 6, United States Statutes at Large, page 741.

Second. We object to section 5 of the bill, giving the Commissioners of the District of Columbia power to select the members of the three boards of medical examiners, because we consider that the three medical societies (under the present law), being composed of educated physicians, are much better qualified for that purpose than the said Commissioners. We object to the partial method of selection of said boards (lines 4 to 19), and also to five years' qualification for members of said boards (lines 24 to 27), as it may unnecessarily disqualify several able physicians from membership.

Third. We object to section 1, because it creates a board of medical supervisors, composed of three physicians, and two persons holding office under the Government of the United States, or the District of Columbia, thus giving the Commissioners an opportunity to select two-fifths of the board from uneducated and unsuitable persons. As the said board of supervisors is to supervise all examinations (section 2, lines 7 and 8) and to direct the boards of medical examiners (section 7, lines 8 and 9) and to select the subjects and branches on which candidates are to be examined, it is of the utmost importance that such a selected board should be composed of persons beyond suspicion as to educational qualifications and fitness for this censorship. We also think that the said board being composed of five members, it will prevent an equal representation of the three schools named in the bill. We protest that the said board of medical examiners would be an unnecessary and an expensive element in the examination of candidates for license.

Fourth. We object to section 4 (lines 4 and 5), authorizing the charge of $20 for examination, as it would be a burden and a bar to poor candidates. We also call your attention to section 15 (lines 4 to 15), setting forth the manner in which said fees are to be appropriated by said supervisors for their services. We think that such a method would be unfair and unjust to the members of the boards of examiners who bear the burden of the work of examining.

Fifth. We object to section 8 (lines 12 to 24), because it discriminates against and will debar from practice all physicians now lawfully registered and practicing in the District of Columbia, who are not graduates of colleges, that are at present in so-called "good standing." As there are only a few colleges which at present follow the curriculum prescribed in this bill (and we believe that prior to ten years ago there were no colleges nor State boards of medical examiners who had adopted the said curriculum), it is only reasonable to conclude that a large majority of those now lawfully practicing in the District of Columbia could not successfully pass such an examination. Therefore it is unjust to demand an examination from one class of physicians and exempt the other.

Sixth. We object to section 10, because it converts the board of supervisors into a court, with power to try any physician, without judge or jury, for the crime of advertising, etc. (the other crimes would come under our criminal code), and to inflict such punishments as would professionally and financially ruin their victim. The same section converts the Commissioners of the District of Columbia into a court of appeals, whose decisions shall be final. It also endows said Commissioners with the right to issue a license to practice medicine to those who have been refused a license or who have had their licenses revoked by the boards of examiners and supervisors; thus empowering them to license persons to practice medicine who, from lack of education or moral character, may be totally unfit to practice medicine.

Seventh. We object to sections 13 and 14, because they make it a crime for any physician who has had the degrees of M. D. or M. B. conferred upon him or her by any college or university to append the same to their names in the District of Columbia unless they shall first obtain a license to do so from the Commissioners or the board of medical supervisors.

Eighth. We object because it also deprives all physicians other than those of the three schools named in the bill from practicing their chosen lines of therapeutics. This prohibition is not simply confined to the use of drug medicines (see section 13, lines 4 and 5), but "any drug or medicine or other agency" for the treatment or cure of disease. This will stop from practice all botanic, hydropathic, bio-chemic, Turkish-bath, massage, vitopathic, magnetic, and Christian science specialists. These schools or sects in medicine have each their well-defined theories and arts in the science of therapeutics, and have an equal right to serve the people who may desire their services as those of the allopathic, homeopathic, and eclectic schools.

We therefore pray that you in your wisdom may deem it proper to use your power to lay aside and refuse to pass this bill and all future bills of like character.

We are, very respectfully,

THE ECLECTIC MEDICAL SOCIETY.
GEO. MACDONALD, M. D., *Secretary.*

Hon. O. M. KEM, M. C.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to call attention to a matter that has been read there. I desire to say that the section referred to there as objectionable, section 13, has been stricken entirely from the bill and it is not reported to the House.

Mr. KEM. If I heard right, when the bill was read section 13 practically contained the objection to which reference is made.

I will state that I am not here in the interest of any medical society. I am not here in the interest of any particular theory in the art of healing; but I am here in the interest of the whole people, because I believe that this bill seeks to monopolize, as I have said, the art of healing. As the gentleman acknowledged here, there are but two of the medical societies of this District who have agreed to this bill. It is practically their bill. It is not the first effort, Mr. Speaker, that they have made to monopolize the art of healing, as is well known by the older members of this body. They have been at it ever since I have been a member of the House, and they have sought in various ways to get bills of this nature passed, giving them a monopoly of the art of healing.

Mr. HARDY. Healing is not an art, but a science.

Mr. KEM. If this bill becomes law, it will prohibit, absolutely prohibit, the advancement of medical science and the art of healing except along certain lines laid down by the allopathic and homeopathic schools. For this reason I must object as strenuously as I know how to the passage of this bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I now understand the bill is open for amendment, I desire to amend this bill. I do not think that the gentleman in charge of the bill will object.

Mr. STEELE. Permit me to ask a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. I want to ask the chairman of the committee——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me get this amendment before the House and then I will give way. I wish to move that the bill be amended in section 3, line 16, page 4, by inserting after the word "he" the words "or she."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman state his amendment again?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask to amend by inserting in line 16, section 3, page 4, after the word "he" the words "or she"; and in line 17 of the same page, after the word "he," add the words "or she." I will send the amendments to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no objection to that.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to offer an amendment after that is disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let this be disposed of.

Mr. BABCOCK. We accept that.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 16, after the word "he" add the words "or she"; in line 17, same page, after the word "he" add the words "or she."

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no objection to that.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This gives females the same rights and privileges that it gives males.

Mr. DANFORD. Under the same restrictions as males?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. DANFORD. I was about to offer an amendment of that character.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if the particular objection made to this bill by the eclectic and homeopathic physicians has been stricken out?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I also desire to offer another amendment; after the word "him," in line 18, add the words "or her." As I understand, the gentleman in charge of the bill accepts the amendment, and without objection it is agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the additional amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 18, after the word "him," add the words "or her."

Mr. HULL. Is it not the construction of all statutes that the word "he" includes both sexes, and is not this proposed amendment a mistake?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not think it is.

Mr. HULL. I think it is.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought up in committee and the opinion of the attorneys there was that the present wording of the bill included both sexes, and that is why the committee did not report this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, the amendment puts it beyond question, and to remove any possible doubt I think we ought to have this amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE].

Mr. STEELE. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether the principal objections made to it by the eclectic

and the homeopathic physicians have not now been stricken out?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; it was the thirteenth section of the original bill that was objected to, so the committee struck out that section entirely and have submitted here a new bill, the original thirteenth section being omitted.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment, to which I think there would be no objection.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend section 13 by adding the following:
"*Provided*, That this act shall not apply to massage, the Swedish movement, and other similar methods of treatment without medicine."

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no objection to that.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer two amendments, which I will read:

Amend by striking out in section 3, page 4, of the bill, beginning with the word "nor," in line 17, down to and including the word "evidence," in line 25.
Also amend by striking out of line 27, on the same page, the language beginning with the words "prior to," down to and including the word "diploma."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk now read the language proposed to be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Clerk will report the provision as it will stand if amended as proposed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Each applicant shall be certified by said board for examination as speedily as possible to the board of medical examiners whose members are adherents to the system of medicine which said applicant desires to practice; but said board shall not certify for examination any applicant until satisfactory proof is furnished that he is of good moral character and over 21 years of age; that the applicant has studied medicine and surgery for not less than four years. All examinations shall be both theoretical and practical and of sufficient severity to test a candidate's fitness to practice medicine and surgery.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has just read that part of the section as it will stand if my amendment prevails, and I think it ought to prevail. I am quite in accord with the idea of requiring people who exercise the healing art to be competent to exercise it; but God made the people, and some people learn outside of medical or law colleges. This bill absolutely requires that before anybody shall be examined as to his fitness to practice medicine, even though he may have attended a medical college for a considerable period, he must produce a diploma from such college. Now, that is not necessary. All the diplomas on earth do not make a man competent to practice medicine or to practice law; and if a man has a knowledge of the healing art within the language of this bill and can stand the examination that this section, as I propose to have it amended, will make it necessary for him to meet, he is competent to practice medicine, as competent as many that may have dwelt in a medical college. In other words, I propose to strike out this restriction and let every man stand upon his own merits, upon his knowledge of medicine and surgery all along the line, and if he fills the bill, and takes the examination successfully, I say he ought not to be deprived of the privilege of practicing medicine. In other words, let us make this a bill which seeks to test the fitness of a man to practice medicine without necessarily burdening the applicant.

I offer this amendment for the reason that within my own knowledge, extending over thirty to forty years, some of the most eminent physicians and surgeons that I have been acquainted with (and I have been acquainted with a good many) were men who never had a diploma from any medical college. I have in mind some who had received some degree of training in medical colleges, but time and money had not been forthcoming to enable them to continue and get their diplomas. On the other hand, I have known some of the best physicians who never were inside of a medical college. What I propose is that each tub shall stand on its own bottom, and that, however a man may part his hair, or whatever may be the shape of his feet, or wherever he may have been educated or not educated, if he can fill the bill and stand the examination herein provided for, I would let him exercise his profession.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is adopted, it will be the adoption of an entirely new rule, a new departure in regard to practitioners in medicine. As I stated before, 47 States and Territories have enacted laws governing admission to practice medicine and surgery, and in not a single State or Territory out of the whole 47 is a physician allowed to practice without having first obtained a diploma from a medical college. Now, should we here in the District of Columbia, the last jurisdiction, with the exception of one State, to pass a medical law—should we here exempt persons desiring to practice medicine from the obligation of obtaining the necessary preliminary qualification of a medical education? I think not, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a very serious mistake to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman has not observed the scope of my amendment. Let me read the section as it will be if the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BABCOCK. I believe I understand it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I want the House to understand the effect of the amendment. This section, if the amendment be adopted, will read:

That from and after the passage of this act all persons desiring to practice medicine and surgery in any of their branches in the District of Columbia shall apply to said board of medical supervisors for a license to do so. Applicants shall submit to examination upon the following-named branches, to wit: Anatomy, physiology, chemistry, pathology, materia medica and therapeutics, hygiene, histology, practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, diseases of the eye and the ear, medical jurisprudence, and such other branches as said board shall deem advisable. Each applicant shall be certified by said board for examination as speedily as possible to the board of medical examiners whose members are adherents to the system of medicine which said applicant desires to practice; but said board shall not certify for examination any applicant until satisfactory proof is furnished that he is of good moral character and over 21 years of age; that the applicant has studied medicine and surgery for not less than four years; all examinations to be both theoretical and practical, and of sufficient severity to test the candidate's fitness to practice medicine or surgery.

Under my amendment, a man, in order to be allowed to practice medicine, must pass the prescribed examination; but under the section as reported by the committee he must have a certificate of graduation from some medical college. The latter requirement I propose to strike out.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] draws a very clean line; it easily determines the issue between him and the gentlemen who support this bill. According to the gentleman's amendment it is not necessary that a man studying medicine should ever enter a medical college at all——

Mr. CANNON. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. He may read medicine in the office of his father, who may be one of the medical advisers, or supervisors, or inspectors, and thus, by virtue of favoritism, he may become a full-fledged doctor when he is not qualified at all. This bill proposes to throw around the medical profession a strict line of qualification. If the practitioner of any profession in the world ought to be qualified, ought to be drilled, educated, and schooled, and have all the advantages that a collegiate course of study, together with observation and practice, can give him, it is the practitioner of the medical profession.

I know that there are throughout the country, as well as in this District, people who pretend to cure by laying on of hands—people who profess to cure by prayer and by faith. There are "hair doctors," and all kinds of so-called "doctors." But when I declare my judgment against such practitioners as humbugs and frauds I believe I pronounce the verdict of the sensible people of this country everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as reported is the unanimous judgment of the allopathic and the homeopathic doctors. I have always been associated with both classes of doctors, and this is the first time within my knowledge that these two classes of practitioners have ever agreed upon anything. When you get the allopathic or "old-school" doctors of the city of Washington and the homeopathic doctors to unite upon any measure pertaining to medicine and surgery that measure must be pretty nearly right. Therefore I for one am ready to vote for this bill as reported by the committee.

I can see no purpose to be accomplished by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois except possibly to let into the practice of medicine somebody who has not passed the proper tests. I believe that all the tests mentioned in this bill should be complied with. Not only should the medical student study medicine and study it diligently, but he should pass through some college created and recognized by the law. He should have a diploma. This bill requiring not only a course of medical study, but a diploma, does not, in my judgment, require too much. Indeed, I think that still other restrictions, reasonable in their character, might be added. The fact that lawyers are admitted after sufficient reading of law without passing through a law college has nothing to do with this case. Lawyers deal with the property of individuals, preachers deal with their souls, but doctors deal with their bodies, and they should be held to the strictest test of all.

CHAPLAINS AT WEST POINT ACADEMY.

Mr. HULL. I desire to submit a conference report and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). That is in order.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309 of the Revised Statutes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4.

J. A. T. HULL,
GEORGE B. McCLELLAN,
J. P. TRACEY,
Managers on the part of the House.
JOS. R. HAWLEY,
WM. J. SEWELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

Statement to accompany conference report on H. R. 4145, relating to chaplaincy at West Point Military Academy:

The House agrees to Senate amendment numbered 1, striking out the words "from civil life," so that the chaplain can be appointed either from chaplains now in the Army or from civil life.

The House also agrees to Senate amendment numbered 2, striking out the words "Secretary of War" and giving the President the power to appoint the chaplain.

The House also agrees to Senate amendment numbered 4, which amends the title of the bill.

The Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 3, leaving the pay of the chaplain the same as agreed to by the House, that of a captain, mounted.

J. A. T. HULL.
J. P. TRACEY.
GEO. B. McCLELLAN.

The report was adopted.

PRACTICE OF MEDICINE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The House resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5731) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLARDY], who is a member of the medical profession.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words in reference to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. If that amendment had been proposed fifty years ago there would have been some little reason for its adoption; but I do not think there is any reason why it should be adopted now. This is a day of great improvements in medicine, as in many other branches of science and study. In fact a doctor who undertakes to treat the physical frame of man in disease must know it in health; and while it may be true that some physicians in our country have become eminent in their profession without going through the curriculum of a medical school, such practitioners are at this time exceedingly few.

It is now a rare thing for a young man to undertake to practice medicine unless he has gone through a course of study at a regular medical school. Nor, Mr. Speaker, is it necessary that he should. The facilities now for learning, the colleges, are so many, they are so convenient to all of our people, that there is absolutely no possible excuse for any man going before the people and offering to take charge of their bodies in illness or disease when he has not subjected himself to the ordeal that his science and the proper practice of his profession demands.

There is no excuse for not attending the colleges. Such excuses as that might have applied years ago, but they have no force now. It is impossible for a man to become efficient in the practice of medicine, and especially in the practice of surgery, without attending these schools. It is impossible for a man in private life to obtain such facilities, such practical examples in his profession as he can acquire by the teachings of his school. He must study, for instance, anatomy; he must be familiar with physiology, and he must understand both of these to be able to examine into diseases and their nature. In order to understand his profession he must be familiar with anatomy, and this is particularly the case in regard to surgery, to enable him to understand what operations he may perform in treating the diseases of the men, women, and children that he may be called upon to attend. It is a matter of very great importance when we come to put our lives and our health in the hands of our physician. You want at least, under such circumstances, a reasonable assurance that he has passed through that experimental knowledge which will enable him to attend to the cases with some degree of success. In order to accomplish this he must have gone through a college where there are facilities for making post-mortem examinations, which would be impossible for a man who undertook to study in private life.

For these reasons I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I do not think that the restrictions imposed by the bill are too arduous or stringent for any man in this age and generation to submit to; and that unless men will submit themselves to the time and care in pursuing proper studies in the medical colleges, where facilities for studying are at hand, they ought not to be allowed to take the lives of our people in their hands. They should be restricted, at all events, unless they had been through this curriculum and had prepared themselves to do the life work of their profession.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KEM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], who was inclined to make merry over this suggestion of mine, that I did not refer to "hair doctors" and "corn doctors" or to any other doctors of that class. I have never employed in my life any hair doctor or corn doctor, and I do not think I ever shall, but if I should desire to, I do not want to be prohibited by law.

But I wish to say that we have the evidence before us, in my opinion here, that an attempt is made to hand over into the keeping of these two schools of medicine, the allopathic and the homeopathic, the lives and the health of the American people despite the fact that under the jurisdiction and control of these two schools—if I may be allowed that term—for years and years past every graveyard in this country has been filled to overflowing, and we have not the living, but abundance of dead, examples of their skill in treating the diseases of mankind and their inability to cope successfully with the ills that flesh is heir to. I submit, sir, in view of this silent but potent evidence, that it ill becomes any man or any committee on this floor to stand here and seek to hand over into the keeping of these schools the lives and happiness of the people of this country.

It is evident to all that the science of healing—the science of medicine—is not an exact science; and it is also evident that there is a great field yet to be explored along the line that these men never thought of; and what I wish to protest against in this connection is the shutting of the door to the appeal of men prompt and quick to take advantage of every improvement for the purpose of investigating further the condition of diseases, and saying to them, "No; if you want to learn how to heal mankind you must go along the old lines, the old traveled path laid down by us for you. You may not enter into new fields from which you might learn something new; you shall not enter any other territory, for we are possessed of all knowledge of the facts, and are pursuing the only true course, which you must pursue or else you can not come at all."

I want to say in this connection that this intolerance is along the same line of religious intolerance, the intolerance of the theologian, who lays down a certain method by which you must save your soul, by which you can only be saved, and unless you follow the strict line they lay down you are in danger of eternal damnation. Theological egotists and medical egotists lay down a line upon which every investigator must pursue his investigation, notwithstanding the fact that upon the other side of that line the secret of a successful treatment of diseases of mankind may be found ready to be picked up by the intelligent man who will take advantage of his opportunity of investigation regardless of theories or isms. But you dare not pick it up, for they say, "Oh, no, that is not according to our school," and consequently you must let it alone; it can not be true.

Let me say in conclusion that despite the slurs the gentleman from Pennsylvania sought to put upon every word said, outside of these schools, some of the greatest cures that mankind has ever been blessed with have been the result of a treatment wherein no drop of medicine was used, external or internal.

A MEMBER. Then it must have been a faith cure. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. No, it was not faith cure, either; and I want to protest against any proposition that seeks to restrict this investigation or hold it down to any particular lines. I want to say in my opinion the world, yea, the universe, is the field of investigation, and is still full of beneficial remedies and methods that will bless mankind if the investigators of our country and of the world who delve down deep into the secrets of nature from various standpoints are allowed to avail themselves of the facilities of nature for the betterment of mankind, and you should not impose upon them the arbitrary restrictions of certain egotistical men who assume that they are possessed of the only true means to benefit mankind.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question on the pending amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, can we have the amendment reported before the vote is taken?

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 17, beginning with the word "nor," strike out the following: "Nor until he has presented a diploma conferring upon him the degree of doctor of medicine, issued by some medical college authorized by law to confer such degree: *Provided*, That said diploma, if issued prior to July 1, 1898, shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence."

Also, in line 27, strike out the words "prior to the issue of said diploma."

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will turn to page 10, line 10, I should like to call attention to the following provision, to see what it means, so as to ascertain whether I shall want to offer an amendment. I refer to the words beginning in line 10, "or publicly professing, in such a manner as to deceive the public, to cure or treat diseases, injury, or deformity."

I wish to ask whether that would prohibit such advertising, by a skilled physician, who has passed this examination, as is usually prohibited by the "ethics of the profession," so called?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; I understand not. The very language itself says, "or publicly professing in such a manner as to deceive the public."

Mr. CANNON. Who is to pass on that?

Mr. BABCOCK. The court.

Mr. CANNON. My friend knows, by reputation, Dr. Flower, who, I believe, has his headquarters in Boston, and Dr. Saulsbury, whose headquarters, I believe, are in New York. There are various others like unto them, skilled physicians, or at least having that reputation. I am under the impression that they advertise

largely all over the United States and have many thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of patients, and there are many thousands of people who believe they receive great benefit from their treatment. I am not here to criticise anybody, but the regular profession speak of all people who advertise as "blessed quacks," or the opposite word to blessed. Now, suppose they come down to the District of Columbia and pass this examination, and go to advertising in the Post; take a whole sheet and fill it up with statements of cures that have been made and what they are competent to do? That, of course, would cut them out of the medical societies. Would that enable the Commissioners, under this law, to take from them their license?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, it would not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If you strike out the words "or treat," in line 11, so that the section will read, "or publicly professing, in such a manner as to deceive the public, to cure diseases," would not that remove your objections?

Mr. CANNON. It may be wise to strike out the words "or treat"; but I am merely challenging and inquiring, because we ought to be careful about legislating so as to clothe any regular society with the power to wipe out somebody who does not happen to belong to that society. That is all I want to say, and I have great sympathy with regular societies, as far as that is concerned; but the rights of the citizen, after all, ought to be protected.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have simply suggested an amendment which it seems to me would remove the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois. By striking out the words "or treat," in line 11, I think the difficulty will be obviated. It might be that if a man advertised to treat diseases his advertisement might be worded in such a way that some people would think he intended to deceive the public.

Mr. McCULLOCH. He ought not to be allowed to deceive the public as to treatment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If you strike out the words "or treat," a man's certificate could not be taken away from him for advertising treatment.

Mr. CANNON. Let the gentleman offer his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 11, after the word "cure," strike out the words "or treat."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me say first that I think a man who advertises to guarantee a cure—that he can cure a disease—possibly ought to have his certificate taken from him; but a man who undertakes to treat a disease ought not to be treated so harshly.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Although he does it to deceive?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. He can treat it at least.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has announced that he is in sympathy with the friends of this measure, and I know he is; and I am glad to have his intelligent cooperation; yet I think he attempts to make a distinction here that does not exist. He said a quack may come here and advertise that he is going to treat a certain disease, but he can not advertise that he is going to cure it. Now, I think there is just as much harm in giving him permission to advertise that he is going to treat such a disease as that he should advertise that he is going to cure it. It seems to me the distinction is utterly without a difference.

Mr. KEM. I would like to have the gentleman define a "quack."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Here in section 10 of the bill you have a provision that does not propose a penalty at all, but states the circumstances under which you can take a diploma away from a person who has been granted it. Now, here is the provision:

That the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia may, by a vote of four members, refuse to grant or may revoke a license, and may cause the name of any person to be removed from the record of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and from the register of the health office for any of the following causes, to wit.

And it enumerates them. Now, here is power lodged in four members, the board of supervisors.

Mr. McCULLOCH. With an appeal allowed to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. And there is an appeal allowed to the District Commissioners.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I catch the gentleman's point, and I will answer it. I think that the gentleman's objection will not be obviated by the gentleman's motion, because he wants to provide here that the party coming here may advertise to treat these diseases, but can not advertise to cure them. Now, if you accept the language of this amendment, you would permit these outside persons to come here as he has designated them and proceed in such a manner as to deceive the public by advertising they would treat diseases, but not to cure them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The gentleman will pardon me. You are misstating the proposition. One part of this bill provides that no man can practice medicine without he has a diploma. This simply provides the conditions of things which authorizes the board to take away the diploma. It does not authorize anybody to treat disease, but provides power to take away the diploma. Now, your criticism is not tenable, it seems to me; but an amendment such as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois has some force in it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Pending the count,

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE said: I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KEM. I renew it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is renewed.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 21, noes 42.

Mr. KEM. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point that no quorum is present. [After a count.] One hundred and eighty-two; a quorum is present. The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia a question; and I first desire to inquire under what regulations or laws are physicians now practicing in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BABCOCK. Practically none.

Mr. DINGLEY. Practically none.

Mr. BABCOCK. These societies can license anybody.

Mr. DINGLEY. But there are those who are practicing medicine, and they are now authorized to so practice under existing law.

Mr. BABCOCK. Under a license from the society to which they belong.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, having ascertained that, I want to ask you if those physicians who are practicing medicine in the District of Columbia to-day under existing law have to conform to these requirements before they can enter upon the further practice?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are they recognized and licensed without having to pass an examination and obtain a diploma provided for by this act?

Mr. BABCOCK. Those who are now practicing under the law are recognized by this act and are not required to take the examination.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then this only applies to the future.

Mr. BABCOCK. This only applies to the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BABCOCK. I move to reconsider.

Mr. KEM. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I make the point of order that it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it.

Mr. KEM. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. No such fact has been developed by a division or in any way. The ayes have it, and the bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, that is all the business the Committee on the District of Columbia have to offer to-day.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia announces that that committee has no other business to present at this time, and, under the special order adopted, the House, in Committee of the Whole, will resume consideration of the pending financial bill, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will please resume the chair as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] for ten minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the question now being discussed by the House of Representatives is a dead issue. Its death knell was sounded at noon on February 5, when in response to a call for bids for one hundred millions of coin bonds forty-seven hun-

dred persons from all over the land put in their answer, aggregating six times the amount required. No man upon this floor, no person in these United States, believes for a single moment that this would have been the case if in the judgment of this nation free coinage of silver was a possibility. Then why should Republicans discuss the question longer? Why waste the time of this House in trying to fit to a live Republicanism the last year's cast-off garments of a discredited Democracy.

A giant cracking nuts with a certainty that the meats within were withered and shrunken and all the sweetness gone would to me be no more absurd. This is a question for Democrats to settle, and by their actions on this floor and in the other House they are already weary of it, and are gladly thrusting it upon their opponents to breed dissension in our ranks. To exploit economic theories, to pay debts on the Christian science principle of believing that none exist, or by the exercise of faith to claim that 50 cents will cancel the honest obligation of a dollar, to run a government upon deficiencies and bond the seigniorage of a revenue tariff—these are the methods of Democratic statesmen. Why should Republicans try to emulate them?

We are within a year of Republican control of this great nation, great because for thirty years it was Republican, and great enough to survive, though grievously hurt, four years of Democratic blundering.

Free coinage of silver will not be an issue in this fall's campaign, except in the national convention of the Democratic party, and there it will be crushed to death in one more dying struggle for spoils and place.

This nation will not be treated to the spectacle of Southern statesmen exchanging power for principle, however dear it may seem to them. Already the shifting process has begun. The old speeches addressed to "my fellow-citizens" instead of the members of this House are being delivered over again and the permission to print is fully improved by padding the RECORD with the relics of a past campaign.

In the other House the tariff measure, patriotically framed to meet the daily expenses of the nation, is throttled by the Democratic garrote of another free-coinage bill, a running mate to this one upon which we are wasting time, and by more than two to one the Democratic members here will put themselves on record for a principle (or lack of it) which will be ignored or overridden when Grover Cleveland writes the platform for the July convention, and then they will all "line up" to push the fight for spoils as in the brave old days of yore. Think for a single moment what this renewal of a hopeless attempt to enact a free-coinage law has already cost this country.

If the overwhelming voice of the American people a year ago meant anything it was that protection should be the policy of this nation. Two months ago their representatives assembled here to enact that declaration into law. In disappointment with the result of his own party policy, with the Treasury sinking every day deeper and deeper into debt, the President frantically called on Congress for help and succor. Within four days this House passed a tariff bill to cover the deficiency in the revenue, and then provided for the maintenance of the gold reserve; but in doing that added to the bond bill a specific clause which practically compelled an increase of the customs duties by forbidding that the proceeds of the bonds should be used for current expenses. Then our friends upon the other side, knowing full well that the bill would pass this House, stood up side by side, gold-standard and silver men alike, and by a truly bimetallic vote made plain and clear the strength of their convictions now.

The failure of this bill, defeated in the Senate by those who might have saved it, and saved it, too, with no sacrifice of principle or personal honor, has already added fifteen millions to the interest debt of the United States and put Executive approval of the tariff act beyond the range of probability; for, with two hundred and eighty-one millions of cash at his disposal now for current expenses, why should he, with his peculiar views, permit the tariff bill to become a law when it shall have passed the Senate?

The substance of relief by a tariff act has been exchanged for the dim shadow of free coinage, and, as in the old fable told so many times, the result is nothing.

The living issues that Republicans must stand upon if we would win this fall and enter upon our inheritance are these:

First. Revenue, laid upon protection lines, to fully meet expenses and reduce the debt to some extent and develop the resources of the nation. Yes, more than that, to provide for the gradual extinguishment of the five hundred millions of promised principal and interest which this three years of misrule has cost the people—almost half a million dollars a day.

Second. We must present a sound system of national finance and give the business interests of the country peace.

Third. We must maintain the honor and protect the rights of the American people everywhere, abroad as well as at home, and give sympathy, encouragement, and hope to men who are fighting for freedom in other lands.

Fourth. We must remove the depression due to Democratic fogs and storms by bringing in the sunlight of confidence and consequent prosperity; and if we do these things, as I believe we can, our time will be fully occupied without a resurrection from the dead past of an experiment with coinage laws which have been repealed by every thriving, prosperous nation on the globe. [Applause.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to occupy the attention of the committee on this question, but the discussion has assumed some phases in consequence of which I think it proper to submit a few remarks. When the bond bill passed this House some people, maybe, supposed it passed because there was an imperative necessity for some such legislation. Since that time bids have been received and accepted for $100,000,000 of bonds; American labor has a new mortgage of $100,000,000 upon it, so that the supposed emergency—I never believed that any existed—so that the supposed emergency, if any did exist, has passed.

The bill went to the Senate, and was there amended so as to provide not for an issue of bonds, but for the coinage of silver, the utilization of what silver we have and the opening of our mints for the coinage of both the precious metals. In this condition of things, with the emergency, if any existed, past, with the need for such legislation, if there ever was any need, past, we still find the majority party in this House insisting upon this bond legislation. It is not for me to lecture this majority party, but I call attention to the fact that that party assumed to be in favor of this legislation solely because from its point of view and that of the President there seemed to be a special necessity for it.

Now, confessedly, that necessity, if it ever existed, has passed. Yet we find that party insisting upon its pseudo emergency legislation instead of accepting that which is proposed in the Senate substitute, legislation which looks to the future, looks to a permanent provision not only for emergencies such as that which was supposed to exist recently, but for the needs of all time, upon lines long tried and well proved by trial to be safe. It will hardly do to say to the country that the dominant party here is in favor of bimetallism and yet rejects bimetallism in favor of a permanent policy of issuing bonds. Nor will it do to say to the country that this Republican party, with its exceedingly large majority here, is unable, so far as this House is concerned, to do precisely what that party is in favor of doing.

The country will certainly understand—there can be no misunderstanding about it—that whatever is done by this House with referencee to this bill is what the Republican party in this House deliberately, not under the spur of some overpowering necessity, but deliberately, as a matter of judgment and conviction, desires to do with reference to the great questions involved in the bill before us and in the substitute for that bill. It ought not to be prejudicial to the party that while it has a great duty thrust upon it it has at the same time the great opportunity of speaking, and the full power to speak, in such a manner as that its voice may be clearly heard and its meaning clearly understood by the whole country.

Whatever you do, gentlemen, with reference to this bill will be taken, must be taken, as your deliberate judgment upon the great question of what should be done in financial legislation, and as a foretaste of what you will do if the people entrust you with a larger measure of power for a longer extent of time.

I was somewhat startled the other day, Mr. Chairman, to hear my colleague [Mr. HALL] declare in his speech in this House that he had heard from an official high in the Treasury Department that probably within the coming twelve months there would be issued United States bonds amounting to a thousand millions of dollars. A thousand millions of dollars in bonds! A billion dollars of debt to be fastened upon the people of this country in a single peaceful year! Why, and for what? I am not disposed to treat this merely as the vapid declamation of a sensationalist, because I have observed that as gentlemen change their views upon this money question, and as they get closer to the views that prevail at the Treasury Department and further from the views that prevail among their constituents, they become daily better authorities upon what is intended and what is likely to happen about the Treasury Department. [Laughter.]

Contemplate the picture! In time of profound peace, with no necessity resting upon us, with a country rich in all the resources with which any people ever were blessed, we are threatened with an issue of a thousand million dollars of bonds in a single year to carry out a particular Treasury policy; to force upon the people, willingly or unwillingly, a policy which has no hearty support in their ranks; a policy which could not be upheld if submitted to the people in any quarter of the Union, not even excepting the Northeast; a policy which is almost entirely without support in the South and the West.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague suggested some other things to which it seems to me, as a Missourian, I ought to give at least passing attention. I have nothing to say about my colleague's conversion. A man's conversion and changes of opinion are matters

resting with himself. I do say, however, that the people whom he represents and the people whom I represent, the people of the great State of Missouri, are not lacking in courage, judgment, or honesty, nor is it required that politicians shall go abroad among them to tell them what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is bad. They are a brave people; they admire courage. They are an honest people; they esteem honesty. They are a consistent people; they have respect for consistency. These people know some things and will continue to know some things, even if the politicians do not venture among them upon the broad, and philanthropic and courageous mission which my colleague would suggest.

Perhaps the crying sin of the day is that the politicians do not rise to the summit of courage to which this gentleman has mounted, and tell the people wherein they are in error, as he says. Perhaps that is true. But it has sometimes seemed to me that graver harm comes from the fact that some politicians, appearing before the people as the advocates of certain doctrines, obtaining the suffrages of the people upon certain pledges—after they are clothed with power by the people; after they are commissioned by the people to carry out the people's will, fall away from their professions, forget their teachings, turn their backs upon those who have given them honor and power, and join with those who are opposed to their constituents. [Applause.]

I say again that I have sometimes fancied the people suffer more from misrepresentation than they do from the lack of courage in those who essay to teach them what is right and what is wrong, what is wise and what is unwise.

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that distinguished men have changed their opinions. We have them among us. They are to be found everywhere. It is a common enough thing for people, great and small, to change their views. It is common enough for people, good and bad, to change their views, and change their course of conduct. But I think the conclusion is not an irresistible one that when a man changes his views and course upon some great question, he is large beyond the measure of ordinary men, or good beyond the goodness of ordinary men. That conclusion is not necessarily one which we must adopt, because history and observation do not coerce us into it.

I make no invidious comparisons or suggestions about these things; I merely think changes may be upward or downward. I know that some men stand conspicuous in history for having changed their course, and changed their professions, when the change, according to the judgment of mankind, has not been in the right direction. I know that through twenty centuries and by sixty generations of men the memory of Judas Iscariot and of the great betrayal has been kept alive, that upon it might be heaped, in perpetual freshness, the execrations of mankind. I know that Benedict Arnold, who shed his blood in the cause of freedom and afterwards turned against his country, is remembered as a frightful example, and, thank God, one of the few examples, held up for the condemnation and the execration of universal manhood and patriotism.

I know, too, that there are people who remain steadfast in views which they have formed upon deliberation and study, views which they believe to be correct, and which have been tested and tried, who can not well be rated as Chinese or as resembling the ignorant class in the East Indies or like unto some dark and benighted tribe in the depths of African jungles; much less may they be classed as belonging to the lower animals.

I do not attribute to my colleague any suggestion that he was sent here by representatives of any of those classes. I know that the men who sent him here, the men before whom he appeared as an advocate in season and out of season of the free coinage of silver, are as honest and as sincere as can be found anywhere in this Union.

I myself, like all men I suppose, have some admiration for courage. I can admire the man who, clinging to his own opinion, though it be newly acquired, is willing on account of it to surrender place and power, is willing to retire from the walks of public life to the shades of private life. And I can also imagine a case where perhaps the shades of private life may soon rest upon one without particular reference to his course upon this question or that question. There are such cases. When those cases arise, in those particular instances—I am not citing any at all—in those particular instances it may be seen that the surrender of great and good things is rather before the footlights and for the galleries than the actual giving up of anything which may be retained. [Applause.]

Now, I do not know what persons were referred to in my transformed colleague's allusions to the "feathering of nests." I know, Mr. Chairman, or I believe I know, that the person who obtains the suffrages of the free born citizens of Missouri by advocating doctrines to which they are devoted, and who then changes his views so as to turn himself against that which he advocated before them, and which they wished to have advocated and voted here, is liable to find no finer lining for his nest than the rough straw, unless some great duck-shooter shall drop a little down into that nest. [Laughter and applause.]

I wish to say—and I call upon gentlemen who doubt the correctness of the saying to note the event for the proof—I wish to say that when the Democrats of Missouri are heard, as they will be upon the 15th of next April, when their representatives meet to send delegates to the national convention, they will speak with no uncertain voice. I believe they will not speak in the apologetic tone of those who have been left to grope in darkness because of the cowardice of politicians who have failed to instruct them. I believe they will not speak in the voice of the courageous politicians, like my colleague, who are assuming to instruct them against their deliberate judgment, but I do believe that when the voice of Missouri is heard it will be heard again, as it has been heard heretofore, in favor of what the Missouri Democrats understand to be the doctrine of justice and right, the doctrine of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the old time-honored, time-tried, and time-tested ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us is really a very serious one. It is of vast moment. It is a question, I believe, which will be discussed in the next few months from ocean to ocean, and from the Lakes to the Gulf; a question upon which millions of men will vote in next November. Shall we shrink from it? Shall we dodge it? Shall we endeavor to evade it by subterfuge? Let us realize ourselves that the people of this country have begun to learn without the intervention of political teachers that he that is not with us is against us.

Now, my colleague gave some more very startling information to the House. I understood him to state that as many as eight Senators who voted for the free-silver amendment now before us said they believed that its passage was fraught with grave danger and serious harm to the country—I do not recollect the exact words he used, but that is the thought. As to this statement I know nothing. But the question was asked, Did he believe it? He replied that he did. The question, "Do you believe the charge?" was, perhaps, the precise one asked.

I think it likely that the word "charge" must have virtually been put into the mouth of my colleague, and that he did not utter it himself. Certainly "charge" is not the word that he would choose, for, unless he has been greatly misrepresented, for a number of months in last year my colleague was going through the State of Missouri discussing the question of finance and of his own enlightenment and endeavoring to enlighten the benighted people according to my colleague's ideas, newly developed. He is reported to have said that he had learned the error of his way and had become satisfied that the sound-money theory as interpreted by JOHN SHERMAN and Secretary Carlisle was the salvation of the country, and that he could no longer subscribe to the silver heresy, but, having been elected by a free-silver constituency, upon a free-silver platform, he would vote for the heresy.

I did not hear him say it. I do not know that he did say it. But I know that it was reported from all over my State that he did say so, that that declaration was made by him, and never did I hear a contradiction of the general report. Then may I not conclude that although the gentleman has, or may have, the information that he says he has concerning the declarations of the eight Senators which he seems to regard as so indefensible, he has no "charge" to make against them? Because, if it be true that they voted for the bill believing it to be wrong, and that following in the track of its passage would come the injury they are reported as saying would come, why should he make a "charge" against them when they were but doing what the gentleman, as reported, had a habit of saying he would do himself?

Yes, the people of Missouri are sturdy, honest, brave, deserving people. They are in favor of what they are in favor of, at home or away from home. At home and away from home, they are opposed to what they are opposed to. The man who faithfully represents that people has no special mission to instruct them, because they are not so densely ignorant. He should keep faith with them, speak with their voice, as he contracted with them to do when he obtained the commission which he still continues to hold for what it is worth to him.

If my colleague would go back to that magnificent Second district of Missouri which sent him here to represent it, and say, "Such a change has taken place in my judgment on this money question that I may no longer honestly vote for what I said I believed and advocated, and of course I can not misrepresent you by taking the other side; I return you the commission which you intrusted to me"—if he were to do that and go back to that splendid constituency in his new rôle as an instructor and advocate of that which all his life long, until the shadow of the Treasury fell over him, he condemned, he would hardly be his own successor to fill the vacancy caused by his own resignation. [Applause.]

These Missouri people have not changed, and so in resignation might be found some sublimity of courage; courage which parts with something, and not that courage which seems to part with something that is going anyhow. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing I might mention. In appearing before his constituents, especially if he has that lofty code for his own guidance which makes him the exemplar and teacher of his people, he should be exceedingly careful always not to ask credit of them or to take credit from them beyond his real deserts. For instance, if I were to go before the people whom I represent and claim that I was the author of the income-tax law, we will say, that I was the man to whom credit ought to be given for it, and if they should conclude that I was right about it, that I was talking according to the record, they would give me credit to which I am not entitled. I simply was one of hundreds in favor of that measure.

The income tax was not discovered lately. It was not invented recently. The ancients knew about it. It was in the law of our own country years ago.

So, likewise, if my colleague from Missouri were to pose, or were to allow himself to be posed, as the author of the income-tax law, knowing that he is not, he would be taking or receiving credit where it is not due. If he were to appear before his people as the midwife present when the income-tax law was born, as the wet nurse that cared for it in the hours of its puling infancy, as the godmother at its christening, as the steadfast guardian and protector of it in all the years that followed, and if the people were to give him credit accordingly he would get credit beyond his deserts. Because, like the rest of us, all except the gentleman who really drafted that income-tax provison of the tariff bill, he simply supported it, he simply advocated it as he advocated free silver coinage, and voted for one measure as for the other.

All these things, and a great many more, suggest themselves to our minds if we will allow ourselves to stop and reflect a moment. And all these things suggest to us, too, that perhaps we may make a mistake if we assume to be so much better than the people; that perhaps we may drop into error if we assume that we have acquired much wisdom that the people who chose us do not possess, and, in the pride of an empty self-sufficiency, take a course contrary to that which they directed us to take.

Speaking of the income tax, I might say further that perhaps as long as judicial history shall last, as long as men shall read of the decisions of courts and of those who made them, only one little thing connected with that income-tax law and with its overthrow will drift down the current of time and carry the memory of at least one man to the far-distant future, to be queried about and commented upon when the names of greater and better men shall have long since sunk beneath the floods of oblivion.

That law, Mr. Chairman, was to compel wealth to bear its share of taxation and to give to poverty a measure of relief from unjust burdens. That law had behind it the wish, the prayer, and the hope of millions of struggling men and women in this land. It had against it the concentrated power of wealth. It had for it when it was first passed upon by the highest court in the land one in particular of those who occupy seats upon that exalted bench. It had against it a few weeks later upon the same question, when the vote was decisive, the same person.

We all ought to be charitable in this matter, I think, of judging people on account of a change of opinion. I have cited some instances from history—some remote, some recent—to show, so far as one can show in this casual way, that merely because a man has changed in opinion or in conduct, merely because he faces in a different direction, we ought not, if the matter is of much consequence, to conclude out of hand, right away, and of course, that he has risen above the level of ordinary mortals, when, perchance, he may have dropped below that common level upon which so many men pass through this life.

I recur to the original proposition, having been somewhat discursive in my remarks. Mr. Chairman, what will your party do with the question now before us? Can the party so handle this matter as to stand in the East for the single gold standard and in the West and South for that much abused and little understood thing, bimetallism? I hardly think so. The party can declare now where it stands. The Republican party can vote for something and against something. Nothing but itself can prevent it from doing it. It has absolute power here. I think, though I am not the adviser of the party, I am not assuming this role of instructor—my colleague may do that—I say it seems to me that your party has a duty to discharge to itself and to the country. I know that in the West and the South there are thousands of men within the ranks of the Republican party who are in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon the ratio of 16 to 1. What will you give them?

I know, too, that in the same sections of the country the dominant element, the larger part, of the Democratic party is sincerely devoted to the same doctrine. Shall they be overborne again by the Northeast? Shall they, when the time comes for sending delegates to their own convention, send doubtful or uncertain men, or shall they send men who can be relied upon?

Will they test and try those offering for delegates before they commission them? Shall the voice of Missouri and Arkansas, whose people are overwhelmingly in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the old ratio be stifled by the minority, however respectable in character that minority may be? Or shall their delegates represent the sense, the judgment, and the will of the predominant element of the party?

I am in favor, Mr. Chairman, of having a spade called a spade in this next campaign. I am in favor of the parties declaring what they are for and what they are against. No party, I assume, should so declare itself that its utterances can be read in one way in one quarter and another way in another quarter, for I believe it will be held in each quarter to mean that which is intended for the other quarter. And I believe the party to which I belong, if it declares that which is in the mind and heart of the dominant element of the party, can go into the campaign with self-respect and with hope. I say with hope, because the skies are not so dark, the issue of the contest is not so fully foreshadowed, as that any man can confidently predict that this party or that party shall prevail without reference to what its nominations and platform shall be. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, this House passed and sent to the Senate a bill authorizing the issuance of 3 per cent bonds instead of 4 per cent bonds, as now provided by law, and also requiring that bond sales should be made in public. One good result has followed the passage of this bill in the House. The Republican press, with great unanimity, objected to any more secret bond sales. The greatest of the Democratic papers, the New York World, made such an assault from inside the Democratic party lines as to compel a halt on the part of the Administration, These various influences have resulted in an appeal by the President to the people of the United States. He called for one hundred millions of gold. They offered him nearly six hundred millions. These offers were made, not for gold-bearing bonds, but for coin bonds. This response from the people shows the absolute confidence in all parts of the country that the parity of our money will be maintained. Markets never flatter.

To the reasonable bill offered by the House the Senate has responded with a bill for the unlimited free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The great silver leader, Senator STEWART, announced that this was mere dress parade, that it meant nothing, and that the bill had no chance to pass this House or to become a law. Debate here will change no votes. This debate is for the country, not for the House.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE], with his chart and his pointing rod, has given us an exhibition from Coin's Financial School. His presentation of his case has been pleasing and ingenious. But the question we have to meet is a plain and practical proposition. At the end of the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota, with his flowery rhetoric and polished periods, a plain and practical question was propounded to him by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. In that question is the meat of the whole discussion. "What will be the result if we accept the Senate bill and it should become a law? Will silver rise to par and circulate side by side with gold, or will we go to a silver standard, as all other countries have gone which coin silver at a ratio of 15½ or 16½ to 1, at a time when silver is worth from 30 or 32 to 1?" The reply of the gentleman from Minnesota was that silver would be enhanced in price; that gold would probably go to a small premium. This is the substance of his answer.

If gold should go to a premium it would disappear from circulation as has gold in all silver countries. Should gold go to a premium we would be upon a silver standard.

Mr. KEM. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. I would like to ask him if gold is not at a premium now?

Mr. LACEY. Gold for a few days during the bond sale has been at a premium for a temporary purpose, a premium of less than one-half of 1 per cent; and now I ask my friend the question, has it retired because of that premium?

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. LACEY. I understand, as a matter of fact, that gold is not circulating so generally since that premium has been put upon it. And if its circulation is checked by a premium of less than one-half of 1 per cent, what would be the effect of its going to a premium of 47 per cent?

It has been repeatedly said that France maintained the double standard for the whole world from 1816 to 1873, and that we should follow her example. From 1816 to 1873 France, instead of maintaining silver in circulation by giving it a peculiar value through her mints, merely accepted the commercial ratio and coined accordingly. It is one thing to coin at the commercial ratio and quite a different thing to attempt to change the commercial value by coining at a different ratio. France in 1874 found silver declining and stopped her coinage. We are asked to follow France. It is precisely what we are doing and have done. We are coining silver in limited amounts and maintaining those limited amounts

at a parity with gold. Our country has no patent on her methods. She is simply doing what France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and other European powers have been and are doing. She is using both gold and silver in about equal quantities, and maintaining the coined metal at an equality upon the old ratio. Our ability to do this with a limited amount of silver has been demonstrated, as has the power of other countries to do the same, by an indirect method of redemption, by receiving the silver for customs and other taxes and limiting the amount of the coinage. Should we open our mints to coinage without limit at the ratio of 16 to 1 I have no doubt the result would be the same as it is in every other country which thus keeps open its mints. Experience teaches us that under such circumstances only the cheaper metal would be coined. In fact, our own experience has taught us the same.

Prior to 1873 the market value of the silver in a silver dollar was greater than the market value of the gold in a gold dollar. This explains why we only coined about 8,000,000 silver dollars, all told, prior to 1873. Only the cheaper metal is coined under these circumstances.

However plausible and ingenious the arguments may sound and diagrams may look, the stubborn fact remains, as it has remained in all ages, that the unlimited coinage of two metals at a ratio different from the commercial ratio will result in the single use of the cheaper metal. There never has been an exception to it in history, and no gentleman upon the floor of this House can point to a single instance where this rule has proved false. France changed her ratio more than twenty times in a single century in order to maintain the two metals in concurrent circulation. She did not attempt to create a commercial ratio, she simply accepted and adopted that ratio as she found it. She accepted the ratio as the world's markets declared the relative value of the two metals.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will my friend from Iowa, who is always so frank and candid, and always so well informed, state to the House what was the bulk of the two metals at the time France fixed the mint ratio at 15½ to 1; and then, as he has said France simply adopted the ratio which she found, will he tell us where she found it, and how she found it?

Mr. LACEY. The answer to that question would involve a lengthy discussion. From soon after the discovery of America down to 1873 there was no very wide divergence in the ratios; the different nations of the world adopted slightly variant ratios substantially agreeing with the commercial ratio; and I grant you that to a certain extent, with a moderate output of silver, the ratios adopted in the various mints would influence the price. But yet it was the effort of France, it was the effort of our own country when Alexander Hamilton discussed the question at the time of the opening of our mints after the Revolution—it has been the effort of all countries to ascertain the real commercial ratio and to adopt it if they desired to maintain the coinage of both metals in general circulation.

Mr. KEM. I wish to ask the gentleman whether the commercial ratio between the two metals is not always changing?

Mr. LACEY. The commercial ratio was not very changeable during the time when silver was not produced in such great volume. It fluctuated slightly.

For the five years preceding 1873 the entire output of silver averaged annually only about fifty or fifty-one millions in the whole world; in the year 1894 the product was $216,000,000. This enormous increase could not do otherwise than influence its commercial value.

Mr. KEM. And now, if the gentleman will permit me, I want to ask him is it not true that silver maintained its commercial value or ratio until it was destroyed by law?

Mr. LACEY. I claim that it was not destroyed by law. I shall show that the law in Mexico that opened the mints without any limit whatever to silver has not sustained or restored its parity. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] has conceded that the fact that 900,000,000 of the population of the world remain upon a silver basis has not maintained its value.

Mr. KEM. Was not the value of silver maintained in other countries until it was destroyed and discredited as money in the United States of America?

Mr. LACEY. Two hundred years ago silver was the standard of the world. Gold was measured by that standard. The world used silver rather than gold, and there was not anything like an adequate supply of either.

Mr. KEM. So long as we did not discriminate against silver it retained its parity with gold.

Mr. LACEY. There has been no discrimination against silver in this country. It has been coined in great volume, as I shall show.

Mr. KEM. And when discriminating legislation in favor of gold was adopted, then the depreciation of silver set in.

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. There has been no discriminating legislation in favor of gold. Gold has been coined, and silver has been coined. We have, as I have already shown, coined and put in circulation over $600,000,000 of silver in eighteen years, as compared with $90,000,000 in the previous eighty years. So that when the gentleman talks about discriminating against silver he is simply speaking against the record. We have, in fact, discriminated in favor of silver. No such superhuman effort has ever been made in the world as that made by the United States of America to restore silver to its old parity, to bring it back to the old value, in spite of the fact that $216,000,000 worth of the product was mined in the single year 1894, while $50,000,000 had been the average annual product a few years previous.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will my friend permit me to ask him a question pertinent to the issue? I do not ask it with any purpose of troubling or interrupting him.

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My friend said a few moments ago that it was impossible that the great increase in the production of silver could have had any other influence than to affect the change of ratio between the two metals——

Mr. LACEY. No; I said that it had decreased the value of the silver.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has changed the commercial relation between the two.

Now, will my friend tell me why it was that from 1847 to 1853, within the course of a period of four years, I think, when gold grew so enormously in production as to increase 146 per cent in one year—at the end of the period—the bulk ratio, which had been 28 to 1, came to be only 4 ounces of gold to 1 of silver, that it did not produce a change in the commercial relations of the two metals, but a change only in the value of the money?

Mr. LACEY. The effect of it was to produce a decline in the price of silver.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A decline in the value of gold, you mean.

Mr. LACEY. No; a decline in both gold and silver, and for the simplest of all reasons, as I will undertake to explain in a moment. Last year gold reached the enormous product of $180,000,000. Did that decrease the relative value as between gold and silver? No; not at all. On the contrary, as gold has increased in production we have found silver declining steadily. I used to believe that the great discoveries in Colorado and in South Africa would, in the end, restore the relative proportion in value between silver and gold by increasing the value of silver or decreasing the value of gold, or both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to have a little longer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended.

The request was granted.

Mr. LACEY. The increase of annual gold production has not had the effect of increasing the value of silver, but on the contrary has lowered it. Why? Now, I will give you an illustration. Take your own town of Yazoo City; suppose the people there preferred wheat to corn as food, and ordinarily only raised enough of both for their food. In a good year they would raise wheat enough to take the place of both. What would be the result? Why, they would use nothing but wheat and the price of corn would be influenced by the increase in the production of wheat. So it is as gold has increased. Instead of diminishing the value of gold only it has cheapened the price of silver, and we have seen silver decreasing in value as compared with gold all the time, while gold has been taking its place. The increased discovery of gold has simply allowed that many more dollars to be used in gold coinage, and it has been absorbed, because it is preferred by the people, and this preference can not be prevented by legislation. It is not a pleasing conviction for those of us who desire, and honestly desire, to see silver fully restored, but it is a stubborn fact that we must face. The first blow really struck at silver was by the accumulation of the vast products of Australia and California, that enabled France and other countries to obtain gold and supersede to that extent the silver that had been substantially their principal money metal theretofore.

It is argued that this country has shown itself hostile to silver since the so-called "crime of 1873." Gentlemen grow indignant over this unfriendliness to silver and show an excitement utterly unwarranted by the facts. Prior to 1873 the United States had coined and put in circulation of silver dollars about eight millions, of other silver coin a little over eighty millions, making an entire silver coinage during the whole history of this country, when it is said the country was so friendly to silver, of only about $90,000,000. From 1806 to 1836 not one single silver dollar was coined—a period of thirty years. Since 1873 this country has rapidly taken silver into its circulation until now we are maintaining $625,000,000 of the white metal in our currency, not as a debased and depreciated money, but maintaining it absolutely on an equality with the yellow metal.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] appeals to Congress to "do something for silver." He says:

You have done nothing for it. Show that you are friendly to the white metal.

Let us examine a few plain facts and figures. Including the uncoined seigniorage in the Treasury, there is to-day stored in the Treasury and subtreasuries of the United States $435,845,690 in silver bullion and coin. The greater portion of this metal is in representative circulation in the form of silver certificates. About 75 per cent of the silver coin circulates in the form of paper. On the other hand, the people hold the gold in kind. That the American people prefer gold to silver coin is evidenced by the fact that about 15 per cent of the gold circulation is in the Treasury and 75 per cent of the silver. This silver is doing good duty, better duty in the form of paper than it would in its own bulky condition of coin.

Do something for silver—
Says the gentleman from California.
This Government—
He says—
has shown itself hostile to silver.

On the contrary, there are to-day 13,500 tons avoirdupois weight of silver in the Treasury and subtreasuries of the United States. Under the Sherman law in three years and three months' time this Government bought nearly 6,000 tons of silver in the effort to furnish such a market as would restore the two metals to a parity at the old ratio. Personally I would be glad to see anything done that would tend to the restoration of the former unlimited concurrent use of gold and silver. But with the thirteen great commercial nations using silver only in limited quantities and maintaining their silver coin at a parity with gold, it is not a matter that we lone-handed can control. It sounds very patriotic to say, "Let us have an American system of finance; let us absolutely establish a relation between the two metals that exists nowhere else and compel the world to accept the valuation that the American Congress decrees." If we could fix values thus by law, there are other products that would deserve our consideration as well as silver. We should, if we had the power, legislate additional value into cotton and horses. The butter, eggs, and poultry products of Iowa exceed in a single year the entire silver and gold output of the whole United States of America. The silver and gold product of the United States for the year 1889 was of the commercial value of $79,445,120, while the poultry and dairy products of Iowa for the same year were $86,878,297. The silver-mining interest is a great industry, but is a small one when compared to many others.

Mr. KEM. When the gentleman talks about increasing the value of horses by law, let me say to him that if there was a universal law enacted by this Government compelling people to use nothing but gray horses, the value of gray horses would be greatly increased.

Mr. LACEY. No; the effect of that would be that the men who enacted that law would go out of business at the next election. [Laughter.] Why, a man from Nebraska the other day complained to me that electricity had "dehorsetized" the horse, and he was wanting a law passed by which the horse could be "rehorsetized"—restored to its old value. [Laughter.]

The value of coinage metals is not a local question. It is one affecting the whole world, and nothing short of the whole world can influence it. I will not burden my remarks with many figures, but will give a few that are worthy of the greatest consideration.

In 1873 silver, taking the ratio of 16 to 1, was at a slight premium of less than 1 per cent. The entire gold product of the whole world for that year was $96,200,000. The silver product of the world for the same year was $81,800,000. In 1890, the year that the Sherman law was enacted, the entire output of gold in the world, coinage value, was $118,848,700. The entire silver product of that year, coinage value, was $163,032,000. It will be seen that gold had increased in its annual product in seventeen years about 20 per cent, while silver had increased 100 per cent. In 1894 the gold product of the world was $180,626,100. The silver product, coinage value, the same year was $216,892,200. Comparing the world's product for 1894 with 1873, gold had increased 100 per cent upon its annual output and silver 150 per cent.

We constantly learn by observation and experience. We were told that the Wilson tariff law would produce a surplus of revenue. The actual test shows that it produces a deficit of from four to five millions a month, a fact which the radical silver men and Administration both alike ignore.

I formerly looked with great satisfaction on the increase of the output of gold. The fact that gold had increased in its output 100 per cent in 1894 as compared with 1873 gave me much encouragement that the increase of the gold product would tend to do away with the disproportion in the ratio between silver and gold. The results seem to have turned out differently, and the reason is simple. This increased gold output has displaced that much more silver, because the commercial nations all prefer it to silver; and thus we have precisely the opposite results from what we had been led to hope or expect. Nations have availed themselves of an increase in gold to substitute it for their silver currency, and thus depreciate silver still further.

The Sherman law was repealed in 1893, and we were told that it was a deathblow to silver. On the contrary, silver was higher in 1894 than it was before the repeal of the law. New methods of mining silver have not only increased the output, but cheapened the cost of its production. With silver at a little over 50 cents on the dollar, we had in 1894 the enormous product of $216,000,000 from the world's mines. It cost less than this to produce it or mining would have ceased.

A diminished revenue has affected the solvency of the Treasury. A mistaken tariff policy has increased our imports and turned the balance of trade against us. The nation is buying more abroad than it is selling there. The Treasury is paying out more than its income. This leads to timidity and lack of confidence along the whole line. A reserve that would be ample to maintain our credit when the revenues exceed the expenses and the exports exceed the imports is inadequate when these conditions are reversed.

It is said that a high measure of health is only necessary for unhealthy people, and so a strong reserve becomes necessary to support a Treasury in the condition that the Wilson bill has placed that of the United States. Individuals may escape punishment in this world; nations never do. There is nothing so sensitive as the public credit.

Addison, in his Spectator, described the public credit by an allegory:

A virgin sits at the end of a great hall. She is timorous, changes color, and is hysterical. She falls away from the plumpness of health to a mere skeleton in a moment. But her recoveries are wonderful. Secretaries sit at her feet reading dispatches to her from all parts of the world. As they read she changes color rapidly. Behind her are great heaps of money bags, vast piles of gold. A door flies open. Hideous phantoms enter; tyrrany, anarchy, and bigotry appear. The lady faints, the piles of money shrink, the gold turns to heaps of paper and fagots. Suddenly liberty, moderation, and the genius of the Government appear. Confidence returns. The lady revives. The money bags again expand. The paper and the fagots are changed again into guineas.

To have prosperity we must have confidence. With confidence, investments are made. With investments come prosperity. Under our present tariff law men hesitate to invest their money in business enterprises. The fact that $600,000,000 in gold is offered to the Government at a little over 3 per cent interest shows that there is a lack of proper opportunities for legitimate use of money. It is claimed that all these things will be reversed by the silver standard. The arguments for this bill are all based on the false assumption that the mere stamp of the Government alone creates value.

The true function of the Government's stamp upon metal is to guarantee its weight and fineness. Its value then depends upon the concurrent opinion and action of the whole world. If it is undervalued in one country and overvalued in another it flows to that country where it is overvalued and the equilibrium is restored. We can and do use gold, silver, copper, nickel, and paper. To maintain their value there must be some method of convertibility in the end into something that all the people want. Wampum was good money in New England two hundred years ago because the Indians valued it as an ornament. They exchanged beaver for it and beaver had a commercial value in Europe. The beaver was thus converted into gold or silver. Wampum, therefore, had a gold and silver value. And so it is we have methods by which our nickel, copper, and paper may be converted into gold; and although standard silver coin is not redeemed in gold, it is received for all public dues, the amount of its coinage is limited to an amount not beyond the ability of the Government to maintain the parity, and thus a method of convertibility is provided. This makes it as good as gold. Take away this convertibility and substitute free coinage without limit, and silver will be worth in coin whatever it is worth in bullion, and no more. All experience teaches us this. It has been so in all ages of the world.

Marco Polo, in the year 1254, gives us an interesting account of the first Chinese paper money, made from mulberry bark. I will incorporate it here in my remarks, as it is the first account we have in history of any substance of no recognized intrinsic value being used as money:

In the city of Kambalu is the mint of the great Khan, who may truly be said to possess the secret of the alchemist, as he has the art of producing money by the following process: He causes the bark to be stripped from mulberry trees, the leaves of which are used for feeding silk worms, and takes from it that thin inner rind which lies between the coarse bark and wood of the tree, this being steeped and afterwards pounded in a mortar until reduced to pulp, is made into paper resembling (in substance) that which is now manufactured from cotton, but quite black. When ready for use he has it cut into pieces of money of different sizes nearly square, but somewhat longer than they are wide. Of these the smallest pass for a denier tournois; the next in size for a Venetian silver groat; others for two, five, and ten groats; others for one, two, three, and as far as ten besants of gold.

The coinage of this paper money is authenticated with as much form and ceremony as if it were actually of pure gold or silver, for to each note a number of officers, specially appointed, not only subscribe their names, but affix their signets also; and when this has been regularly done by the whole of them, the principal officer deputed by the majority, having dipped into vermillion the royal seal committed to his care, stamps with it the piece of paper, so that the form of the seal tinged with the vermillion remains impressed upon it, by which it receives full authenticity as current money, and the act of counterfeiting it is punished as a capital offense. When thus coined in large quantities this paper currency is circulated in every part of the Grand

Khan's dominion; nor dare any person at the peril of his life refuse to accept this in payment. All his subjects receive it without hesitation, because wherever their business may call them they can dispose of it again in the purchase of merchandise they may have occasion for, such as pearls, jewels, gold, silver; with it, in short, every article may be procured.

Several times in the course of each year large caravans of merchants arrive with such articles as have just been mentioned, together with gold tissues, which they lay before the Grand Khan. He thereupon calls together twelve experienced and skillful persons, selected for the purpose, whom he commands to examine the articles with great care and fix the value at which they should be purchased. Upon the sum at which they have been thus conscientiously appraised he allows them a reasonable profit, and immediately pays for them with his paper, to which the owners can have no objection, because, as we have observed, it answers the purpose of their own disbursements, and even though they should be inhabitants of a country where this kind of money is not current, they invest the amount in other articles of merchandise suited to their own markets. When any persons happen to be possessed of paper money which from long use has become damaged, they carry it to the mint, where, upon payment of only 3 per cent, they may receive fresh notes in exchange. Should any be desirous of having gold or silver for the purpose of manufacture, such as drinking cups, etc., they apply to the mints and for their paper obtain the bullion they require. All his armies are paid with this currency, which is to them of the same value as gold or silver. Upon these grounds it may certainly be affirmed that the Grand Khan has a more extensive command of treasure than any other sovereign in the universe.

But the Chinese paper money, it will be observed, was kept good by redeeming it at the mint in gold, silver, or jewels, and by receiving it for all dues and taxes. After Marco Polo's time a succeding Khan made the mistake of assuming that it was the stamp on the money that gave it value instead of the methods of redemption. He worked up so much mulberry bark into this money that it became valueless.

I have in my possession, and which I exhibit to the House, a sample of coin from Guatemala. Guatemala has a paper basis founded upon silver. The paper has shrunk in value to 30 cents on the dollar. Silver disappeared from circulation, and in order to make it circulate side by side with paper, each half dollar was cut into three triangular pieces, and here we have a Guatemala half dollar worth about 9 cents, being the one-third of an original Mexican half dollar. They have not put the words "In God we trust" upon it, but have put the sign of the cross instead; and this is a half dollar in that country. I understand that prices there are in proportion to the actual commercial value of the bullion in this so-called half dollar.

We are confronted with a few simple and clear questions in voting upon the Senate bill. First, Will free coinage increase the amount of our currency? Second, Will free coinage contract the currency? Third, Will it put us on a single silver standard? If, as the gentleman from Minnesota admits, gold will go to a premium, of course it will cease to circulate, If the gold is retired from circulation the currency will be contracted $600,000,000. That it will retire from circulation if it goes to a premium will not be disputed by any member of this House. When gold and silver rose to a premium in 1861 it disappeared at once from circulation as completely as though it had been thrown into the sea. That the same result would follow were either one of the metals to command a premium can not be disputed by any intelligent financier. It will be so because it always has been so.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] says there are 1,250,000,000 people in the world, and that three-fourths of them are doing business wholly upon the silver standard. By adding our 70,000,000 to the 900,000,000 he thinks there would be no question about silver being restored to a parity at the old ratio of 16 to 1, notwithstanding the fact that the other 350,000,000 commercial people of the world refused to join with us in the effort; that what 900,000,000 fail to do 970,000,000 would be sure to accomplish. This is placing an estimate upon this country in commercial matters unwarranted by any facts in our experience. Adding one more nation to the 900,000,000 Asiatics, Mexicans, and South Americans could not bridge over the tremendous chasm of 47 per cent that now exists between the free-coinage dollar and the proposed parity. As a nation deeply interested in the production of silver, and desirous of bimetallism in its fullest sense, we should carry our part of the load, if it is to be called a load. But the proposition that we have the power, lone-handed, to change the present condition as to the ratio between these two metals at a time when the world's product of silver is over two hundred millions a year is a very daring one, and I do not believe that it can possibly be successful.

Last summer it was proposed by our Democratic friends in Iowa to adopt a free-coinage 16-to-1 plank and appeal to the country upon the question of the free coinage of silver. It was boldly stated that by so doing we could be "prosperous like our neighbor, Mexico," which is coining silver at the ratio of 16½ to 1. I had a curiosity to personally examine the experiment, and went to Mexico for that purpose. In the campaign of 1894 I bought 300 Mexican dollars and paid 51 cents apiece for them; I sold them upon the stump, as an object lesson, at two for a dollar, or 50 cents apiece. Since then those dollars have been worth as low as 47 cents, and are now worth 53, a fluctuation of 6 cents, or about 12 per cent in a little over a year. I was curious to see whether the unlimited use of this kind of money was of the great advantage that our friends insisted that it was.

When I crossed the line into Mexico I had purposely retained among my money silver dollars, subsidiary silver, gold, nickel, copper, greenbacks, Sherman notes, gold certificates, silver certificates, and national-bank notes. Entering a broker's office on the Mexican side I took out this miscellaneous assortment of money and received in exchange $1.85 in Mexican dollars for every dollar of my money, although my silver was coined at 16 to 1 and the Mexican silver at 16½ to 1. Even American copper and nickel was as good as gold in this exchange. Afterwards, at other points in the Republic, I sold drafts at a premium, realizing from $1.87 to $1.88 in Mexican money. I found that there was not a cent of gold in circulation in Mexico, that the great bulk of business there was done with copper coins, and all upon the silver standard. After I had been there a few weeks I cashed my remaining drafts and found that I had more dollars left than when I started from home after paying all expenses. But they were 53-cent dollars, and it was a rude shock to my finances when I exchanged the remainder of them for American money upon recrossing the Rio Grande.

Mexico is prosperous under this system—that is, she is prosperous for Mexico. But the prosperity of Mexico in her brightest hour would be considered hard times in this country, even under the darkest days of the present Democratic Administration.

While I was in the City of Mexico a young carpenter from Denver, no doubt allured by the rosy accounts of some of the Rocky Mountain papers, came there for work. He found that he had been deceived, and that from 60 cents to a dollar a day in Mexican coin was the best he could get in the capital of our sister Republic. A collection was raised among the Americans to help him back home to a country where they did not have the free coinage of silver.

In discussing the question of wages and conditions in Mexico it would not be fair to blame any of their hard circumstances upon the fact that Mexico has a silver standard. When the disparity between silver and gold commenced Mexico was upon a very low-wage standard, and it appears that these wages have not been improved by the use of the single silver standard. The silver standard has not produced the hard condition of the affairs of Mexico, in my judgment, but, on the other hand, it has failed to produce the good times and prosperity among the working people that the radical advocates of silver teach that it would do in this country. The land is full of beggars, with here and there a city where they are less numerous. In the town of Guanajuato I found the laborers working on the streets at the heaviest of work eleven hours a day for 22 cents a day, Mexican money, equivalent to about 12 cents of American money. This low-wage rate would not support life were it not for the fact that the food that they live upon is produced by other labor equally poorly paid, and the price of the food is accordingly cheap. I went around among these men when they were eating their meals and found that tortillas and frijoles (corn cakes and beans) were their only food.

I asked a coffee planter who had a large plantation near Jalapa how the silver standard appeared to him. Said he:

It is a good thing for me. I pay my workmen 37 cents a day in Mexican money. I sell my coffee for 32 cents silver a pound, the price being based upon gold value, as it is all exported; on this I get the gold price in silver and pay the same old wages as in 1873, and it only costs me about 7 cents a pound to raise coffee. The silver standard with low wages thus proves very profitable to me.

Such facts are not encouraging to the laboring men of the United States to adopt the silver standard.

President Diaz has given Mexico a sound, safe Government. He has turned the banditti into rural police, and the prosperity of Mexico to-day, as compared with her past, is mainly due to a stable form of government. Highway robbery has been suppressed, the building of railroads and the opportunity for the speedy concentration of troops has rendered revolutions impracticable, and the question of the standard of value cuts but little figure in the matter. It is true that the high rate of exchange has discouraged the importation of foreign goods, and this has operated indirectly as a protective tariff. The same results, however, could be obtained with an adequate protective tariff and a different standard. Mexico has the same trouble maintaining her silver in circulation that we have had with our gold. Whatever the standard may be, the balance of trade must be paid in some kind of commodities, and for the purpose of finally settling balances of national trade gold and silver are mere commodities.

During the year 1895 Mexico shipped to the United States over 6,000,000 ounces of silver in bullion form and 4,700,000 Mexican silver dollars. Now, why did these 6,000,000 ounces of bullion leave the country where they had the full privilege of mintage and come to a country where the mints were closed? Simply because Mexico owed us an equivalent and paid us with the bullion at its market price. She shipped the $4,700,000 coin in the same way and for the same reason. She made no difference between the bullion and the coin, because under free coinage they were of equal value. And their experience teaches that instead of the coin bringing up the bullion value under free coinage the coin goes

down to the bullion value. Mexico has no gold in actual use, and her entire per capita circulation is between five and six dollars. Unlimited free coinage does not expand their currency. It would not expand ours.

I asked a railroad man who had been in that country fourteen years how he liked the silver standard. He said it made no difference with him, for they had to pay him as much wages as he could get in the United States, or its equivalent in Mexican money, and something in addition to induce him to live there. I asked him why this was so, and why they did not pay Americans the same wages as Mexicans. He said they found it necessary to have some Americans in railroad work; that if a locomotive became disabled the Mexican would fold his hands and give up, while the American would go to work and repair the engine. I asked him then what would be the result if they fixed his wages on the Mexican basis. He answered, "I would go straight back to God's country." "And where is that"? said I. Said he, "Texas."

In the last Congress I proposed the experiment of coining the American product for three years, charging as the seigniorage the difference between the bullion value and the coinage value. This experiment I thought would be an aid in the effort to secure international agreement. But the proposition did not meet with favor among the silver men, who preferred that the seigniorage on this limited coinage should go the mine owners instead of into the Treasury. How much silver we can carry at par with gold no one can state with certainty. I believe it is our duty as a great silver-producing nation to coin so much of this metal as we can maintain at a parity; to go beyond this under existing conditions would be to change our financial system and adopt the single silver standard.

We have been assured in this debate that all prices are fixed by the amount of coin of ultimate redemption in stock in this country. It is claimed that silver is not recognized as money of ultimate redemption, and that this has reduced the prices of commodities. On the contrary, silver is recognized as coin, and therefore money of ultimate redemption, but it is true that the law provides that this coin shall be maintained by the Government at a parity with gold.

In 1873 we had no money of ultimate redemption of any kind, and had no immediate purpose of redeeming any of our promises.

In the future we hoped to arrive at a specie standard, but prices were as high in 1873 or higher than at subsequent periods after we resumed specie payment, thus disproving the theory that values are predicated wholly on the stock of money of ultimate redemption. We had our present monetary system in 1890 and 1891, and we had a prosperity that we would all like to return to. We have had no change in our monetary system, but have had a radical change in our tariff, and to this change is due much of our embarrassment, if not the whole of it.

No doubt hostile legislation in all the great commercial nations of Europe has seriously affected the price of silver, a legislation that we can not change, but the assertion that this country has greatly influenced this price adversely by its legislation is made without sufficient regard to the real facts. In 1873, when the so-called demonetization act was passed, we were on a paper basis, and had neither silver nor gold. We resumed specie payment on the 1st of January, 1879, but the Bland-Allison Act was passed in 1878, so that when we did return to a specie basis we coined both gold and silver with very great liberality.

That the prices of many products have declined since 1873 is beyond question. The decline has been in both necessities and luxuries. The discovery of the diamond fields in South Africa has greatly depreciated the value of diamonds. Bessemer's discovery, and the competition produced by building up mills under a protective tariff in the United States, has cheapened the price of all articles made out of steel. Cheaper methods of production and manufacture, and the use of automatic machinery, have lowered the prices of nearly all manufactured goods. The protective tariff in America heretofore gave us the home market, and the ingenuity of our countrymen devised machinery to cheapen production. Cheapness thus legitimately produced, and accompanied with better wages for the laboring people, is not a subject of regret. Cheapness produced by throwing into competition with well-paid labor the products of poorly paid workmen is entirely a different thing.

Much has been said by our Democratic friends about their platform of 1892. It was read and reread in the debates in the last Congress, and again discussed in the present Congress, and the most conflicting claims have been made as to what it meant. The fact that the gold-standard men of New York and the silver-standard men of Mississippi both stood upon it and claimed that it voiced their views shows that the hand that drafted it was that of a skilled workman who knew how to face both ways at the same time. This double meaning was well understood when the platform was drawn and adopted, and it was because of this equivocation that it was adopted. I am reminded of a lady acquaintance of mine, whom I will call Mrs. Smith (because that is not her name), who in war times went to the provost-marshal at Little Rock with another lady friend to take the oath of allegiance. Her friend took the oath first, and Mrs. Smith, who was a good Southern woman, hesitated. Said she, "I can't take that oath; you know how I feel." Her friend said to her, "Oh, go on, Mrs. Smith, and take it. God will know you don't mean it." And in the same spirit the Democratic party adopted the platform at Chicago.

The question, Mr. Chairman, before us now ought not to be one of politics. It is a plain, practical, business question. We are using silver, gold, and paper money to an amount of more than $1,600,000,000. We are maintaining them all as the equal of the most valuable money in the world. The proposition of the Senate bill is to abandon this system and adopt a method that of necessity will put us upon a single standard and retire one-third of our circulation. That this plan will be detrimental to the interest of the farmer, of the laborer, of the mechanic, of the manufacturer, and of the business men of this country I have no sort of doubt, and shall vote to nonconcur with the proposed amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the President in his annual message, calling our attention to the financial situation, stated that it was "in such a perplexing and delicate predicament as to require prompt and wise treatment." Ere this House had completed its organization, ere it had an opportunity to consider and deliberate upon that perplexing and delicate predicament, its counsels were disturbed by a second message, a bugle call of war's alarms. Its effect upon the country was magical. The old veterans donned their uniforms of blue, the "Johnnies" arose to the opportunity, and above the strains of "Dixie" were heard "America" and "Rally Round the Flag." [Laughter and applause.] Everybody was patriotic, and the front of grim-visaged war was no longer to be smoothed but wrinkled. Its influence upon this House was marvelous. All political lines were obliterated. Even our Populist colleagues, for the time being, forgot their calamities, the nation's "dire desolation," and the inherent cussedness of the old parties.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] fell upon the neck of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], while the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] silently invoked blessings upon both. [Laughter.] Even our Chaplain, remembering that his Master came into the world to bring not peace but the sword, constituted himself a recruiting officer, not alone for the service of the Lord. [Laughter and applause.] While in this blissful and beattic condition, a third message was received, and we were again Republicans, again Democrats, and the wail of the Populists was renewed in this Hall. [Laughter.] The message that produced this second great change informed us that, notwithstanding the beneficent workings of the tariff-reform revenue law, notwithstanding the fact that we had recently borrowed more than $162,000,000 in gold, partly by a private sale of our bonds to a speculative syndicate, the reserve fund had fallen so low that the paper of the nation was about to be discounted and dishonored in the counting houses of the world unless Congress should immediately authorize the President to sell gold bonds in quantities sufficient to redeem, cancel, and destroy the greenbacks.

The Committee on Ways and Means, just constituted, promptly recognized the perplexing and delicate predicament, and with a conception that was miraculous and a delivery unparalleled, although apparently painless, labored and brought forth twin children of remedy and reform. [Laughter.] One, the tariff bill, we speedily passed; but somehow or other it has become lost in the shuffle at the other end of this building. The other, this House bill, whose mutilation by the Senate the distinguished chairman of the committee so earnestly deplores. A number of us on this side of the House were unable to support this bill either by voice or vote. I shall not reiterate the reasons that prompted me to vote against it, but shall content myself with saying that if Democratic imbecility in the way of financial legislation has reduced this Government to such a state that it becomes necessary to sell bonds in times of peace, the recent opening of bids at the Treasury Department demonstrates that the laws upon the statute books are ample therefor. It also demonstrates that the plain people of this country have not only an abiding faith in the integrity of this nation, but in its ability to keep its every promise and redeem its every obligation. Again, the bid of J. P. Morgan & Co. for $100,000,000 of our bonds at a fraction over 110⅜ stamps the former sale to his syndicate at 104½ as unwise, if not infamous and in violation of public trust.

Mr. Chairman, the first section of this bill provides for the free and unlimited coinage of silver—the world's product—upon individual account, and this has involved the House in an almost unlimited discussion of the silver question in all its phases. I shall tax your attention briefly, first, because my time is very limited. Second, because every possible argument, pro or con, has already been presented upon this floor. Many gentlemen have not only exhausted the subject but themselves and the House. [Laughter.]

Third, because I do not deem it necessary to promulgate my views here in order that they may be seen and read by my constituents at home, for upon every stump in my district I proclaimed my opposition to the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon individual account, and I have had no occasion to change my views. Every dollar coined or issued by this Government must be the equal of every other dollar, not only for debt-paying but for purchasing purposes in the markets of the land. Every dollar heretofore coined or issued is now the equal of every other dollar, and to open the mints of this country to the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon individual account, brought from wheresoever you will and by whomsoever you will, will of necessity reduce us to silver monometallism. Such a policy is not founded in reason, justified by logic, or approved by example.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that a considerable quantity of silver can be coined and infused into the currency of this country with perfect safety. You can not determine the amount thereof to a mathematical certainty, or by an application of the theories of the doctors of finance of either school, yellow or white. I believe that the bullion in the Treasury ought to be coined, gradually, if you will, Mr. Chairman of the committee, yet coined, and when coined, should be used to redeem and retire the Treasury notes issued in payment of its purchase, to the end that they shall no longer be used by the speculator in robbing the reserve fund of its gold. Let us, then, both as an object lesson and as an experiment, open our mints to the coinage of our own silver, placing a duty upon all foreign bullion equal to the difference between its value as bullion and coin. Our rapidly increasing population, the development of new enterprises, the growth of business, trade, and commerce, call for the coinage of more silver to maintain our circulating medium at its present rate per capita, not to speak of the inevitable loss and destruction constantly occurring, nor to mention the use to which it can be put in the displacement of the smaller denominations of paper money.

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. CROWTHER, the time of Mr. BURTON of Missouri was extended.

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we who entertain these views will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG]. The bill, with that amendment, substantially embodies the views of a large majority of the people of my section, irrespective of political faith or party affiliation. To you, gentlemen, who are burning incense in the temple of the golden god, to you on your knees before idols of silver, we present this business-like, practical, American solution of this problem. Quit your dissertations, your metaphysical disquisitions upon a subject concerning which you can offer us nothing practical; join us upon this platform, do something, and a disgusted people will rise up and call you blessed. [Laughter and applause.]

[Mr. OGDEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2904, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CERTAIN SURVEYS, FLORIDA.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a privileged report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It is a joint resolution calling for surveys for a modified project in the State of Florida.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida.

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $1,500 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, for a survey and plans for the improvement of the entrance to Biscayne Bay, Florida, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his letter of February 26, 1895, and for a survey and plans for the construction of a breakwater at Palm Beach, Florida; and the Secretary of War is directed to report the result of such surveys, together with plans and estimates for contemplated improvements, to Congress at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. DINGLEY. As I understand, this is a resurvey of an old project and not a survey of a new project.

Mr. HOOKER. That is right.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOOKER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CONNEAUT HARBOR, OHIO.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present another joint resolution of the same character, relative to a survey of the harbor at Conneaut, Ohio.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is a resurvey also?

Mr. HOOKER. Yes; and the proposed project will cost much less than the one under which operations are now being conducted.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of War to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio, and to transmit the same to Congress at as early a date as practicable.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOOKER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following joint resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 72) directing the Public Printer to supply the Senate and House libraries each with 20 additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to the Committee on Printing.

Joint resolution (S. R. 43) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute seeds, bulbs, etc., as has been done in preceding years—to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota;

A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889;

A bill (H. R. 4991) to open forest reservations in the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims;

A bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory"; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896."

SUBSIDENCE OF THE WATERS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. HOOKER. I present one other resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the subsidence of the waters of the Great Lakes of the North has reached an alarming stage, reducing the depth of the water in the channels and harbors of said lakes to such a degree as to seriously interfere with navigation; and

Whereas great loss to those who are engaged in the carrying trade on these lakes is caused thereby, endangering their vessels and the lives of those who navigate them; and

Whereas the subsidence of the water has never been so great as at the present time, being a total of some 5 feet below the normal height; and

Whereas it has been proposed that a series of dams or jetties, constructed and maintained at or near the outlet of these several lakes, would necessarily raise the surface of said lakes: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives any and all information that he may have bearing upon this subject.

Resolved, That he be directed to give an estimate of the cost of making a survey of the outlet of Lake Erie at the head of Niagara River, of the outlet of Lake St. Clair at the head of the Detroit River, and of the outlet of Lake Huron at the head of the St. Clair River, with a view to the construction of such dams, jetties, locks, and such other work as may be necessary for the proper carrying out of the object aimed at in these reslutions; it being understood that these surveys shall take into consideration the feasibility of such constructions, and whether they would accomplish the desired object of increasing the depth of water in the lakes.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HOOKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUTCHESON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. HANLY, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. HENRY of Indiana, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. MORSE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and at 10

o'clock take another recess until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, the two sessions to be devoted exclusively to the discussion of the bill which has been under consideration.

The SPEAKER. In the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. DINGLEY. In the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and accordingly the House is declared in recess until 8 o'clock this evening; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will please occupy the chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes) the House took a recess.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by Mr. PAYNE as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that our Government commit itself to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, as proposed by this bill, is one fraught with untold danger to the future interests of our country.

On this question long speeches have been made, books and essays without number have been written on the subject, yet by a little reflection the whole question is very simple, may be told in a few words, and can be easily understood. In fact, by brevity and concentration the question can be readily solved, while, on the other hand, to expatiate and enlarge tends to obscure and confuse.

With the former aim I will give the substance of my views in the ten minutes' time allotted to me. At the same time I believe what I shall say will reflect the views of my constituents.

As I understand the question, the free coinage of silver means that the Government shall require the Director of the Mints, without charge and without profit to the Government, to coin all the silver and silver bullion that shall be brought to the mints for that purpose, and shall deliver to the owners all the coin which that silver will produce. In other words, that a man may carry to the mint $1,000 worth of uncoined silver, procure the officers of the mint to mold it into coin, and walk away with $2,000 in his pocket.

The measure is the same, be the amount hundreds or be it millions. Unlike the farmer who takes his grist to mill and goes away with the product of his wheat in the equivalent of flour, the silver owner goes to the mint and when his metal is stamped into coin goes away with twice the value of what he took there.

This act provides "that the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver," the dollars to be "of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver."

The mints, if this act should become a law, shall be opened to the owners of American mines for the coinage of their silver. In like manner they shall be open to the silver mines of all other countries and to the importers of foreign silver, who may all alike pour their metal into the mints of America, and forthwith receive in silver dollars double the value of their uncoined metal.

OVERPRODUCTION DEPRECIATED SILVER.

Mr. Speaker, the overproduction of silver has had the effect to depreciate its value. If it should become as plentiful as copper or lead its value would depreciate to the comparative value of copper or lead.

That silver has depreciated in value in consequence of its abundance is conceded.

You take a gold dollar and melt it, and the metal will sell in market for a dollar or thereabouts. You melt a silver dollar and you can sell the metal for only 50 cents or thereabouts (say 53 cents). Now, as one or both of those metals depreciates, there is no reason why the Government should stand good for that depreciation and continue to give to the mine owner as much for his produce as it did when the metal was twice its present value.

If this bill provided that the Government might purchase silver at its market value in sufficient quantities to meet the ordinary wants of commerce and then proceed to coin it and put it into circulation, I apprehend there would be little or no objection to it, except on the part of the few who own the large silver mines and those who are acting in their interest. The reason why there would be little opposition to such a measure is because the profit of the coin would be in our Treasury and thus inure to the benefit of the nation by adding millions to her revenue.

Silver dollars coined from such source would be as welcome to the public as if they had been the product of free coinage. Yes, more so, because the public would know that the Government was behind them and the more able to make its silver currency good, by reason of the profit of 100 per cent in the Treasury for all the silver coin thus placed in circulation, which profit would endure so long as the coin remained in circulation. It would be enjoyed by the Government, and through the Government by all the people of the United States, who compose the Government.

The proper course for the Government to take in the future coinage of silver, Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, is a plain, straightforward, honest course that will address itself to the judgment of every candid business man, namely, have the coinage equal to the wants of trade, but kept within that limit. When more silver currency is needed go into the open market with other purchasers of silver and buy as much as shall be necessary for the time being, and pay what it is worth. After having made the purchase put the metal through the mint and when coined put the silver dollars in circulation. In that case it is apparent that for every million dollars put in circulation, a million of dollars or nearly that amount of profit is added to our revenues, while at the same time the silver dollars in the hands of the people are worth their face value, and why? Because they bear the American eagle on one side and the Goddess of Liberty on the other.

Why is not that plain, fair-dealing, honest business way of treating the silver question satisfactory? I will answer that it is satisfactory to the mass of the people, but it is far from satisfactory to a few bonanza kings who would make sudden and colossal fortunes by the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the free and unlimited coinage of silver, if adopted by the passage of this bill, would bring untold disaster upon the financial condition of our country. Gold would take its flight or become an article of commerce. The silver of the world would flood the mints of the United States, and the American Government would perform the sorry task of gratuitously and incessantly coining their silver into a currency that doubles its profits to the owners without adding one dollar to the revenues of the Government.

If that state of things should come to pass it would not be inappropriate to take from the silver dollar the effigy of the American eagle, and in its place set a mill and Uncle Sam with great industry, but no wages, grinding out silver dollars to customers from the Pacific States of America, and also from Mexico, South America, Russia, Australia, and all other silver-producing nations of the globe, who, with smiling faces, depart, carrying away with them American silver coin double the value of the metal they had when they first visited the industrious grinder. [Applause.]

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest diffidence that I appear before this House to discuss the great question of the free coinage of silver. Nothing could induce me to do so but the great advantage which I believe the enlargement of the volume of our metallic money would produce among all classes of our people. Upon it I believe depends the prosperity of the farming interests of this land, and upon the success and prosperity of the farmer depends the prosperity of the people at large. Hence the discussion of the question involves the discussion of the depression of the farming interests and the causes which led to it. Just as we find the question of free coinage agitating the country, so we find the question of the depression in the farming industry thrilling the public mind.

Public men may be likened to physicians, who are supposed to apply remedies for known diseases or maladies to which the body politic has fallen heir.

The diagnosis of the disorder now afflicting this country has been made by many physicians, and remedies have been applied, but the disease grows in malignity and its effects are seen in the widespread and increasing bankruptcy. Solomon said, "Great men are not always wise," and while the chief physicians may be great in their professions, they are not infrequently wanting in wisdom in the application of remedies. As a plain business man, whose avocations have been in channels which might naturally have led me to different conclusions but for patient search for truth—as a layman, I may be pardoned for having the temerity to suggest that the remedy is the restoration of our silver money to its wonted place in our bimetallic system. What is the history of the silver dollar as unit of account? What is meant by free coinage? What are the advantages to be derived from its adoption? I find myself surrounded by some of the most distinguished silver men in the country, and it would be folly in me to go through that which, to most of you, would be considered the A B C of the silver question.

Both gold and silver have been used as money since the dawn of civilization, but the silver dollar piece is of modern origin. It was a silver coin to which the term "dollar" was originally applied. It was the silver dollar that our first ancestors' coining law made the unit of value. The silver dollar as it now exists is the only dollar we have ever had that is the same to-day that it was in the beginning, and if an honest dollar be desired it completely fills the definition.

The dollar originated in the sixteenth century in Joachim Valley in Bohemia. A nobleman—a German count, I believe—issued pieces of silver of uniform weight and fineness as a medium of exchange. They soon became popular and went broadcast into circulation. They took the name of valleyers from the valley in which they were produced. Thence came the German thaler, the Danish and Swedish daler, the Italian toller, and the widely known dollar, all of which, remember, were silver.

Now, let us come down to our own country. In 1786 the American Confederation seeing the need of money passed a law making 375.64 grains of pure silver the "unit of accounts." There was no mint, no United States coin, and so this was done to meet the 4s. 6d. or 54d. accorded the thaler. In 1787 the Constitution of the United States was adopted, and in that instrument Congress was authorized to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Not, however, till 1792 did Congress order money to be coined, and then it was directed that the unit of accounts should be the dollar; and this year gold was also coined, the ratio being fixed at 15 to 1, that is to say, 15 ounces of silver was equal to 1 ounce of gold. The dollar was fixed at 416 grains, .900 fine, halves, 206, etc.

In 1837, silver getting a little the advantage of gold, the ratio was changed to 16 to 1 and the number of grains in a dollar fixed at 412½, principally at the instance of Thomas Benton, and hence called the Benton dollar. Not until 1849 did Congress authorize the coinage of gold dollar pieces. In 1853 some apprehension was felt lest gold would drive the silver out of the country under the operation of what is known as the Gresham law, and so the halves and quarters were demonetized and debased. Silver dollars were at a premium. The Benton dollar was allowed to remain as it was—412½ grains .900 fine—but the halves instead of being 206¼ were placed at 192, remaining at the same to this day; the quarters, 10-cent pieces, and half dimes in the same proportion—two half dollars not even at this day being possessed of as many grains of silver as the one-dollar piece.

In 1873 a bill was passed through Congress without anybody particularly noticing it, doing away with the Benton dollar and substituting a trade dollar, and giving it a legal-tender quality for only $5. When this was done silver was worth 3 per cent premium in gold. In 1875 even this small legal-tender quality was withdrawn from it by act of Congress. Thus the silver dollar was assassinated and silver as a money metal destroyed for the time being; and here the history of the dollar stops until the Bland bill passed in 1878.

So far, then, we find the silver dollar was the unit of account. Indeed until the year 1895 it was never questioned.

Having gotten thus far with this historic coin, let us turn for a moment and inquire into some of the causes for national distress. Chief among them may be stated war, famine, pestilence, disease, despotism.

In the language of a distinguished Senator, "it is certain that twenty-five years of profound peace and abundant harvests" can not be a cause for national disorder.

From pestilence and disease, under a great and merciful God, we have been singularly free. But despotism—the despotism of the money power, the worst form of despotism—has fastened its poisonous fangs in the national body, and it is from this that we seek to be released, that the body may recover its strength and accustomed vitality. We hear a great deal about the dishonest dollar. I shall not dwell on this. It answers itself. It is difficult, however, to understand how it is that if a silver dollar is a dishonest dollar by what means strict honesty will be injected into it by international agreement. It is wrong to impute intrinsic value to money. It is the measure of value imparted to it by law.

It is, therefore, all wrong to impute intrinsic value to money, all wrong to attribute intrinsic value to gold and silver. It is a fact that there is not enough of either or both to make their intrinsic value an inducement to mine them. Miners would close the mines if it were only for the intrinsic worth as commodities that these metals were sought.

To-day we see great corporations issuing bonds maturing hundreds of years after date, payable in gold. Statistics show that the debts already contracted in the world payable in gold are as 95 to 5; that is to say, to be a little clearer, there is not 5 per cent of gold in the world to meet the legitimate demands of indebtedness that may be made on it on any one day at this time. In other words, the vast indebtedness of the world that matures from day to day and which is stated as redeemable in gold is really not so redeemable by over 95 per cent.

The mass of gold and silver metal is, as we know, small viewed as a commodity. Now, what would be the utility of this small mass of metal were it not that it was needed for money. It is made useful to man by imparting to it power by process of law.

That power which the law imparts to the metal is the power to pay debts, taxes, and fines, the power to discharge all assessments and measurements which the law enforces. This power increases the use of the metal, creates its social functions, and renders it a necessity to those who seek to meet their obligations.

The great Cernuschi said:

Price is value expressed in money; therefore if there is no money there is no price. "Money is without price;" its value has a special name called power. It is the law which confers on gold and silver the privilege of forced currency, and without the intervention of law there can be no forced currency and without forced currency there can be no money. Lawmakers can not increase the amount of gold and silver, but they can give it power, and nature does the rest.

Continuing, he says:

Silver being thirty-six times the volume of gold, but only eighteen times its weight, if the standard was silver only prices must be eighteen times more than if gold alone were the standard.

So he goes on and shows that paper money is nothing but money having power imparted by law in the way of forced currency; and while you are obliged to accept it, still you can require others to do so and thus far there is no difference between paper and metallic currency or money. But the difference is immense as regards issue, the issue of gold and silver being automatic and that of paper governmental. Says he: "Let all nations say that neither silver nor gold shall be money and the intrinsic value will at once sink to zero." Their utility does not compare with iron, lead, copper, zinc, but "the importance and fixity of their mass make them suited for forced currency and they are the only metals that do." By free coinage both metals are turned into money automatically when needed, going back into bullion or the arts when not. Accord silver the same privileges as are accorded gold, no more and no less, is what is demanded and of right should be granted.

The very day the President of these United States signs the bill providing for the free coinage of silver that very moment will silver bullion be par; that is, at a parity with gold bullion. As commodities in the raw state they can not then go below their denominational value, for the law will then treat alike and coin them into that value whenever and by whomsoever such transmutation is sought.

The advantages to be derived from the free coinage of silver are so many and varied that it is difficult to understand how the judgment of men can be so warped as not to perceive them; and I can only attribute their failure to do so to the vast and subtle influence exercised by the money centers under the stimulus of desire to increase the value of money by its contraction and to get cheaply the products of labor; and I can but feel strengthened in my own convictions when I find so many of the greatest and most disinterested thinkers of the world have thrown the weight of their judgment in favor of the continued use of both metals as money, such men as Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Webster, and a host of others whose names are household words wherever intellectual and moral supremacy are respected.

One great advantage of free coinage would be the rehabilitation of the farmer—the restoration of the great agricultural interests of this country. Sir Isaac Newton said, when one of his theories was confronted with a fact, "Theory must give way, as there is no arguing against fact." Now, the monometallist theory was that we might possibly stand the coinage of 50,000,000 silver dollars; beyond that he would not "seek to penetrate the veil," except to say that beyond this amount gold would be driven out of the country. Fact said after we had coined $400,000,000 we had more gold than we started with.

Theory said that coinage of silver would cause great exportation of gold. Fact said as silver coinage increased gold imports increased and silver exports increased.

Theory said the one standard of gold will give us good money and necessarily bring a ready and more profitable sale of farm produce. Fact said produce fell steadily just as silver fell, and the farmer was ruined. Theory said supply and demand are the great regulators, it matters not what is the medium of exchange. Fact said, notwithstanding the short crops of Europe, famine in Russia, and much increased demand for our wheat, it sold for less than when the demand was not so great and when these great exigencies did not exist. Now, what is applicable to wheat is applicable to all the export farm products of this country. If it can be shown that the great fall in agricultural products began with the demonetization of silver; that the greatest competitor of our farmer was created at the same time and contemporaneously with this outrage; that this competitor has, by reason of the fall of silver, caused by demonetization, been able to export his produce and undersell ours, when he had never been able to do so before; that, as silver continued to decline as a commodity, so did our farm produce; that pari passu with the decrease in our farm exports the exports of this competitor increased—if these things can be shown as facts, then it would seem that theory would have to give way to them. And the only sensible conclusion to come to must be, that if we would recover even in part what we have lost, we must retrace our steps.

Let us look at the example of India, which shipped only 250,000 bushels of wheat to England before 1873 and in 1885 had gained 49,000,000 bushels on us. In 1878 we sold England 153,000,000 bushels of wheat, bringing us $190,000,000; average, $1.24 per bushel. India this year sold England 4,000,000 bushels. In 1886 our sales dropped to 57,000,000 bushels, and India's were 39,000,000 bushels; India gained 900 per cent; we fell off 69 per cent. We lost $140,000,000 compared with 1878; India gained $49,000,000 thus compared, supposing wheat the same price in both instances. Wheat in New York in 1872, $1.30; silver per ounce, $1.32; in 1873, $1.17, and $1.29; in 1878, 95 cents; and $1.15; 1886, 77 cents and 99 cents, and so on. India shipped 250,000 bushels in 1873, 1,500,000 in 1875, 37,000,000 in 1882, 40,000,000 in 1884, and 50,000,000 in 1890. Now we see that the exports of our competitor have steadily in-

creased since 1873 and ours have steadily fallen off. We see the price of silver has year by year declined in price and so has wheat. But these facts have been worn threadbare.

When there are abundance of dollars in circulation he stands a chance to get some of them, just as the little urchin does to get some dimes for his tin bank. When either the dimes or the dollars are gotten, civilization is stimulated, because a want is created. The laborer gets stored away some silver dollars. He sees a lot and he buys it. He saves more and he wants a house, and so on. And, as was said by a distinguished Texan, every silver dollar carried a want behind it. These wants must be satisfied. Enterprise is stimulated and every enterprise enlarged. The man is a better citizen. Thrift will follow in the wake of effort, and he gathers fruit from the tree of prosperity and drinks of the well of happiness. Without free coinage he can not get the dollar. Let him see it and he strives to get it. Free coinage makes money elastic. It is the duty of Government to coin the metals and give it power, so that a sufficiency of paper issue may follow with both as a basis automatically convertible.

Let us look at the debts of the world. According to the census of 1890 the total debt of the world in June, 1890, in round numbers, was $28,000,000,000, less sinking fund. This is an increase over 1880 of $118,000,000. Of this the United States, including State and county debts, are responsible for $1,200,000,000. This includes city debts and school districts as well. It is very clear that there is not enough gold to meet our indebtedness, to say nothing of the debts of the world, for I have not included railroad debts, farm mortgages, etc. Great railroads are now issuing bonds payable one hundred years after date, and I have heard of one which offered bonds eight hundred years after date, all payable in gold. The date of maturity is being placed further and further off for obvious reasons.

If a grocer—

Says an exchange—

had only 5 eggs and were to take orders for the delivery of 100 on demand when he knew he was unable to obtain more, most people would consider him a fool.

Yet Governments are doing this thing and railroads are dodging it by trusting to finding a hen to lay them many years afterwards. What is to become of these vast debts unless silver is restored, the production of it stimulated, and that already extracted from the earth utilized as money metal? The time can not be far distant when the finances of the world will be shaken from center to circumference. In this country, even were the circulation not undergoing constantly a contraction, the increase of population is constantly decreasing our per capita. We can get relief from no source except from silver. We know that gold and silver maintained their parity for centuries, and under our Government till 1873. We know that England had her unit of value as silver till 1816, which was her silver pound; that until the United States demonetized silver every first-class civilized nation in the world, except England, allowed free coinage of silver; and that since that time all have followed in our wake in denying it, we being the principal producer of the metal. All these things have started the people to thinking. I have the honor to be one of the people, and attention is now riveted to this great subject. The farmer is thinking, the merchant is thinking, the mechanic and the laborer are thinking. A great wrong has been perpetrated on the people, and the people are crying for redress. They are conservative. They have waited patiently.

This despotism has blighted our farming industry until now the combination of the money power of England and the United states with the Republican party has left it without hope, enervated and dying. It has seized the governing power of this country, and we stand appalled as we see the grand old ship of state tossed on the ocean of financial uncertainty without a rudder and England bidding its captain to be of good cheer as she sees it drifting farther and farther from the harbor of safety.

Doctrinaires may preach to us of honest money and of sound money and use all the misleading ear-catching phrases that the vocabulary furnishes, but the fact remains that the disease is growing, the patient is becoming more enervated and the remedies less and less efficacious. If I were asked what should be done, I would say return to the treatment under which the patient prospered. I would say distrust, as imperfect, that spurious science which conflicts with experience and common sense, and caters to the imagination with vague phrases without clear or precise definition to explain them.

I would say, return to the money of our Constitution. I would tell the present-day financier that everything he prophesied has failed; that all he claimed for his schemes has been abortive; that when he said gold would be driven out of the country, it happened that the reverse occurred; that when he foretold better prices for farm products, lower prices were realized; that when he said that this was because the supply was greater, I would show him that in the very year when the supply was less the prices were less. I would tell him that when he said wages would advance, they declined; that when prosperity would prevail, lo! there was more depression and deeper ruin.

I would say to Democrats, look at your party record, your party promises, your party principles. Consider the experience of the past. Invoke your common sense to interpret the scenes around you. In what convention, in what Congress, in what assemblage, State or national, has the Democratic party discarded silver? There are those who have voted for free coinage of silver in this House, but now say they have studied the question and are for sound money. Sound money! Nice sounding phrase.

They have, like Saul of Tarsus, had their eyes opened and been converted. They have heard a "sound" from above and now condemn as a political crime that which before they deemed a virtue.

There came the

Harmonious sound on golden hinges moving,

so melodious that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming, and the hypnotic effect was instantaneous, and in the midst of our own party, which since the foundation of the Government has stood for free silver, we have the spectacle of a division in our ranks produced by the word "sound." Sound money means nothing but unsound money.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to show how the Democratic party has stood in the past, and hence to show the inconsistency of the position now attempted to be maintained by the gold-cure element of the party, let me call your attention to the striking similarity of the condition of our farmer now to that of the farmer in the time of Pharoah.

There was a great famine in Egypt and the land of Canaan, as you will recall. The farmers flocked to Joseph and told him there was no bread in all the land. Joseph was a farsighted man. He was a man of God, but with a "Wall street" eye. The Good Book tells us that he gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt and the land of Canaan, and exchanged it for corn. He had known that the famine was coming, and had saved up his corn from year to year. The next year the people again came and said, "Give us bread," and Joseph demanded money, which they had not, and so he demanded their cattle. They gave up their cattle to keep from starving. A third year found the famine unabated, and a third time the distressed farmers of Egypt and the land of Canaan came and said, "Give us bread or we perish." He demanded money, but they had none; he demanded cattle, but of these they had been stripped the year before. Then he demanded of them their lands; and so, hunger speaking through their distress, they gave up to Joseph their lands. Now they are no longer independent people, but want has made them slaves, and when they again appealed for bread, and knowing that a demand for money, cattle, lands, would be in vain, Joseph demanded their persons, and required that one-fifth of the product of their labor should be given him.

There is a money famine to-day among our tillers of the soil. They have no money, their cattle are gone, their lands are mortgaged, and more than one-fifth of what they produce must go to keep alive the despotism of the millionaire kings of this land—to kiss the hands that smite them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he must be blind who fails to see the analogy of our times to those of the day of Joseph. Here was the money power that exercised its despotic power over the people of that country till they were reduced to slavery.

He who looks back a quarter of a century and before silver was demonetized will not fail to recall the fact that tramps were unknown in that day. He will recall that it was a rare thing to see young ladies begging for employment and strong and muscular young men supplicating for work. He will recall that there was plenty of money elsewhere besides in banks; that prices were advancing and prosperity awaited industry; that labor traveled the same road with industry and both were linked with happiness; that bright eyes and rosy cheeks and ruby lips greeted him when he returned home after his day's labor; that the merry laugh of his little ones made his heart glad and his home happy.

How is it now? The sunken eye and lines in the careworn face tell in eloquent tones that misery and want sit side by side in this once happy home; that the little ones ask for bread and get a stone; that the monster death is welcomed and is not infrequently invited as a guest. Are such things to continue? Is there no remedy? In the one case the Democratic physician was in attendance for nearly one hundred years. In the other the Republican doctor.

Up to 1860 our finances were dominated by the Democratic party. Up to 1873 no change had been made in the money of redemption. The country still had the money of the Constitution. This instrument says:

No State shall coin money or make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts.

Gold and silver, mark you.
It says:

Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Clearly this refers to gold and silver, and not money till coined, and it is equally as clear that it was not intended that Congress should strip the States of the right to make gold or silver, as money, a legal tender.

Daniel Webster said:

Gold and silver at rates fixed by Congress consiitute the legal standard of value in this country, and neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace that standard.

I need not go over what was done by Congress in 1792 and on up to 1873. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said that fifteen times as much silver was coined under the Bland Act, or since 1873, as was coined from 1792 up to 1873.

This is an assertion not sustained by facts. There were $87,000,000 of legal-tender silver coined before 1873, or about one-fifth as much. But this does not affect the question; I merely correct the statement.

Up to February, 1857, certain gold and silver coins of foreign countries were legal tenders in this country. Hence the great necessity did not before that exist for our coins. Mexican, Peruvian, Bolivian, Chilean, Central American, French silver coins were full legal tender. From 1857 to 1873 our silver dollars were legal tender.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that in the Forty-fifth Congress 97 Democrats voted for the free coinage of silver, 10 Democrats against it.

In the Senate a substitute was carried requiring the purchase, etc., of silver and coining standard silver dollars.

A Republican President vetoed this and the bill was passed over the veto by 118 Democrats against 22 voting in the negative. In the Senate 25 Democrats for and 9 against.

The Matthews resolution, a free-coinage resolution, passed the Senate by 23 Democratic affirmative votes and 7 negative votes, and in the House 116 Democrats to 23 against.

Forty-sixth Congress: 100 Democrats voted for free coinage and 9 against it, and 107 to 4 for another free-coinage resolution.

Forty-seventh Congress was Republican.

Forty-eighth: Senate and President Republican.

Forty-ninth Congress: 96 Democrats for free coinage, 70 against.

Fifty-first Congress: 101 Democrats in the House voted for free coinage, 12 against it, and in the Senate 27 Democrats for and 3 against Plumb's free-coinage resolution; in the House 113 Democrats for and 22 against it.

Every Democrat in the House and Senate voted against the Sherman law, 1890.

In the Senate, 1891, 24 Democrats voted for free coinage and 1 against it.

In the Fifty-second Congress, in the Senate 20 Democrats for and 9 against free coinage; in the House, 118 to 64.

In the Fifty-third Congress 101 for, 116 against; in the Senate, 18 to 18.

In 1894 the seigniorage bill passed the House—136 Democrats for, 50 against.

Since 1840 national Democratic conventions have been held to proclaim the platform of the party and to name candidates.

Never till 1873 had the coinage laws been attacked. Since then the Democratic party has endeavored to restore silver to its legitimate place by the side of gold at the United States mints.

In 1880 our platform declared for honest money consisting of gold and silver.

Of 1884, "we believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution."

Of 1888, reaffirmed the platform of 1884.

Of 1892, we hold to the use of both gold and silver as standard money, etc., and, as Senator DANIEL aptly said, whatever meaning may be given to "we hold to," it certainly does not mean that "we let go."

The platform of 1892 was clearly intended to be a free-silver platform, as the inside history divulged after Mr. Cleveland's inauguration established beyond a doubt.

Here it is, and I have never seen any denial of it:

BAYARD, VILAS, M'PHERSON, AND WHITNEY FAVORED IT IN 1892.

DENVER, COLO., *September 3.*

The Rocky Mountain News publishes an editorial in which Mr. Thomas M. Patterson gives a full account of the action of the subcommittee on resolutions at the last Democratic national convention. The subcommittee consisted of Mr. Bayard, Senators McPherson, VILAS, and DANIEL; John Atkins, of Tennessee; L. F. Garard, of Geogia; Mr. Jones, of Missouri, and Mr. Patterson, of Colorado.

Mr. Patterson says:

"When the plank was first read and analyzed I suggested that it was uncertain and gave room to cavil about its meaning. To remove this uncertainty I requested that the words 'coinage of gold and silver, etc.,' be inserted. I distinctly stated that I would be content to omit the ratio for such coinage, leaving that to Congress; what I did want was the Democratic party clearly and unequivocally committed to true bimetallism. Senators VILAS and McPherson opposed this and so did Mr. Bayard. Each gave his reason. It was not that they were opposed to free coinage—on the contrary, they favored it—but the word 'free,' as applied to coinage, was so liable to be misunderstood in the East and Northeast that it would, through this ignorance, lose the party many votes, which should not be allowed. Mr. Bayard was particularly earnest in asserting his fealty to silver and told in graphic and pathetic language the service he had performed for the white metal."

Mr. Patterson says that after considerable discussion Mr. Atkins, a professed bimetallist, offered the following substitute for the money plank:

"We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver for the owners thereof, without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, etc."

"I realized in a moment," continues Mr. Patterson, "that it was a declaration for free coinage as clear as though the word 'free' was used a dozen times; but before committing myself I turned to Senators VILAS and McPherson and Mr. Bayard and asked, "What do you think of it, gentlemen?" They indicated that they wished to consider it.

He then conferred with Mr. DANIEL, who approved the substitute and said, in response to the assertion that the other side would not accept, "Yes, they will. They are honorable gentlemen, and when they say they favor free coinage and would declare openly for it, but that the word 'free' is dangerous and will lose the party many votes in the East and Northeast, they mean it. This amendment avoids their only objection, and we should adopt it." Mr. DANIEL then urged the adoption of the substitute and was much surprised when Senator VILAS announced that they had decided against accepting it, claiming that the original plank was a declaration for free silver. Mr. Atkins also voted against the substitute.

Mr. Patterson stated that Mr. Whitney came to the committee room, and in answer to a question was told to have the word "free" inserted in the monetary plank. Mr. Patterson continues:

"He studied the proposition a moment or two, and in a very decided tone exclaimed: 'That's a vote getter. They did not object to it? Let me talk to them.'"

He called Senators VILAS and McPherson aside and talked with them quite earnestly for fully five minutes. He returned apparently quite disappointed and said:

"It's no use; they object to the word 'free' because it is a very objectionable word in the Northeast in connection with money, and to adopt it would lose the Democracy of that section of the country. I then explained the Atkins amendment, whereupon he again said: 'They will certainly consent to that. I think they will. That's a vote getter. I will talk to them about it.' Again he held an earnest conversation with the Senators; returning looking more crestfallen than at first, he remarked, 'It's no use; they will consent to no change.'"

There is not a break in the Democratic line on this question in its history till the Fifty-third Congress and until the despotism of the money power of this country, backed, or rather governed, by England, issued its manifesto of its demands. Gold monometallism is the financial principle of Wall street, England, and the Republican party.

No convention, no party has ever thrown off the mask and openly avowed gold monometallism. Republicans generally and some who are partially Democrats advocate it. But none have had the boldness to propose it as a plank in a party platform. None have had the courage to offer a bill which, without some mantle to cover its meaning, would disclose its purpose and intent. The last and most ingeniously devised cloak is international agreement.

You who applauded to the echo Mr. Cleveland's message on the Monroe doctrine should pause before you go farther, and remember that the Monroe doctrine, while applicable to the encroachments of the Holy Alliance, which alliance has long since perished of its own weight, being crushed out of existence by the tread in the march of civilization, should be applied to despotism as well, and we are told that we must wait for international agreement. This is disingenuous. They mean England.

If England were to proclaim the free and unlimited coinage of silver to-morrow, would you wait for any further international agreement? You dare not. As says Rothschild or England so says Wall street or Morgan and Belmont. As says Morgan, etc., so says the Republican Congress and the money power of other parties. You speak of precedents, must we wait for them? Has the United States ever waited for precedents? Does she not make them? Do her people wait for them? Did they wait for precedents when that gallant commodore said, "Our country, may she ever be right, but our country, right or wrong"? Did they wait for precedents in Boston Harbor at the unfashionable tea? Did they wait for precedents at Lexington? Did Old Hickory wait for precedents at New Orleans, or old Fuss and Feathers at Lundy's Lane? Did they wait for precedents when they penetrated the primeval forest, crossed rivers, mountains, and lakes, and tracked the buffalo across the Rockies? Did they wait for precedents when the *Merrimac* and *Monitor* met in Hampton Roads and revolutionized the art of naval warfare? Did they wait for precedents when in two of their battles in the civil war more men were killed than have been killed in the English army for one hundred years? Did they wait for precedents when a Paul Jones, in 1812, made England lower her flag as mistress of the sea? Did they wait for precedents when another than Paul Jones, a Confederate privateer, swept the seas and causes England to pause now before going to war, because she knows that a hundred Admiral Semmeses would destroy her commerce? Do they wait for precedents when they appropriate more money for veterans than any nation in the world appropriates for its standing army—except Russia.

Did the Republican party wait for precedents, particularly from England, when they passed the McKinley bill and claimed that it placed American goods in every market of the world alongside of hers? Did the people wait for precedents when they paid their national debt, when they built 180,000 miles of railroad, when they established an internal commerce such as the world has never known? Did they wait for a precedent to steam up the Hudson under a Fulton, when they chained the lightning and obliterated time and space, when Edison whispers across the ocean?

Did we follow England's precedents in standing armies, in aristocracy, in religion, in penal laws, in policy of conquest, etc.?

When and in what particular have we waited for precedent?

International agreement! You mean only England, and you can not disguise it. She has us by the throat. She had us by the throat in 1776; we threw her off. She had us again in 1812; we beat her off. She now has a death grip on us; let us assert our manhood and strike. We are totally unlike, except in language. She has her standing armies; we none. She has her aristocracy, governed by a House of Lords; we a Government of the people. She has empire dispersed, severed, and scattered; we continuous and concentrated empire. She has no silver mines; we mine half the world's supply. Her agriculture is secondary in importance; ours is our greatest industry. We sell more than we buy; she the reverse. She has the Established Church; we religious freedom. She has her peasantry classes; here the poorest boy may become President. She has her policy of conquest; we just the reverse. We are the greatest producers of raw material; England the greatest consumer. She draws interest; we pay it. Her interest is to cheapen what she consumes; ours to enhance the price. She is dependent on us; we independent of her. She is for gold monometallism; if for no other reason, we should be opposed to it.

We raise millions of bushels of wheat, corn, potatoes, rice, oats, millions of bales of cotton, produce millions of tons of iron, and England rejoices to see that since 1873 prices of these commodities have fallen 43 per cent.

The great expanse of our territory, with soil unsurpassed in fertility, with means of transportation unequaled, a people the most progressive on earth, increasing with a rapidity unparalleled, should cause this to be called the American century.

Had one of you been born in 1800, you would have been 4 years old when an American revolutionized the trade of the world as he steamed up the Hudson in the first steamboat. Sixteen years of age would have brought you to the time when England demonetized silver, but in this same year 58 persons were under sentence of death in this same England, one of whom was a child 10 years of age.

If a man shot a rabbit he was hanged; if he injured Westminster Bridge he was hanged; if he cut down a young tree he was hanged; if he stole property valued at 5 shillings he was hanged. In this same year there were 223 capital offenses recognized by the law, and this, too, after 3,000,000 freemen in America had declined to be governed by England's precedents. When 22 years of age he would have seen the first iron plow, but when 48 years of age he would have seen a native of my own State—McCormick—revolutionize farming with his reaper. When 44 years old his heart would have swelled with pride that a fellow-American had made it possible to communicate thought by wire, and still another shortening the distance to be traveled over by the ocean birds by his storm and wind charts. When 73 years of age he would have looked back and seen that during that whole century gold and silver had been the money of the Constitution of the United States, and the ratio had been practically 16 to 1, and they had been maintained at a parity. He would have seen that this had been done for fifty-seven years, without waiting for a precedent from England. When 76 years had whitened his hair he would have seen the whole world with bated breath admiring your fellow-countrymen, Edison and Bell, who had achieved the greatest wonder of the age. When the allotted age of man had been reached he would have congratulated himself that he had lived under the Administrations of Adams, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Buchanan, Fillmore, Lincoln, Johnson, Grant; all free-silver men.

The unit of value then served its purpose well. The unit of value now has dislocated business and destroyed agriculture in this country. If one unit does not suit, common sense would suggest that another be tried. If uniformity in prices is not established by one let us try another. Mr. Lincoln always tried another general whenever General Lee defeated one of his generals. It is a common-sense rule that when one thing fails to produce desired results try another, more particularly when you have another that has produced desired results. Argument has worn threadbare. Nothing new can be said on the silver question.

Common sense teaches more than the erudition of doctrinaires on all practical questions. An old miner in the lead and zinc regions of Missouri told me that he had sunk more shafts than any man in Missouri, as many as 365 in one year, and he had never struck lead or zinc at a single location selected by a geologist. I took a location recommended by a geologist before I met this old man and I have got a hole in the ground now, but no zinc or lead.

Berkey says:

The essence of money is the immaterial principle or power to represent value. Money never reaches a point when it can be used as an article of real value.

Money, therefore, if issued by a stable government, a responsible one, whose people possess ample property and valuable products, the power (value) of the issue corresponds to the value of the property and products of that country.

The dollar of the United States represents property which the Government is entitled to receive when necessary for its wants, and a tax warrant will produce all the money ever issued by it, if it takes every dollar's worth of property in the country.

We can float any money at a parity with any other money when the United States, with its $65,000,000,000 of wealth and its 70,000,000 of people, are behind it. I have no fear on this point. We want more money, a larger circulating media, and that which will of necessity be more easily disseminated in the avenues of industry. One-thousand-dollar notes held in bank will not do. We are told that there is plenty of money in banks. Yes; and the reason is that people can make more by holding for lower prices, and hence it remains there.

We have 180,000 miles of railroads. In my old bullet-riddled, cavalry-ridden, battle-scarred State we have more miles of electric roads than England and France together; more than all Europe, except Germany.

Talk about maintaining silver at a parity with gold! Start a dollar on a straight line from the northwest corner to the southeast corner of Texas and it will travel a distance as great as from Chicago to Boston.

This State alone can support 50,000,000 people. On 165,000 square miles it can raise all the food products of the country; on 19,000 square miles it would produce the 12,000,000 bales of cotton for the world's supply and have a territory as large as the State of New York left for a cattle ranch, after deducting all of the desert land. No country presents such a field for internal commerce. Fifty million in Texas and population would not be as dense as it is in Germany. Place them in New Mexico—not as dense as in Belgium. In the Dakotas—not as dense as in England. We have over one-half of all the fresh water on the globe. Let a silver dollar start up the Mississippi River and then up the Missouri River and it will find duty to perform on a navigable stream for a distance equal to the distance from New York to Constantinople, on each side of which stream are broad fertile valleys capable of producing every known fruit, flower, cereal, or textile plant, with broad acres of virgin forest with every known wood.

Our country is composed of 18 republics as large as Spain. One of 31 States, each as large as Italy. One of 60 States, each as large as England and Wales.

East of the Rocky Mountains we have a river flow with 80,000 miles of river bank, counting no stream under 100 miles in length, while all Europe has only 34,000. Our area of arable lands is 1,500,000 square miles, while China supports 400,000,000 people on 1,300,000 square miles.

Take the whole of Europe, says a writer, except Russia, and mold it into one great empire and you can lay its map down on the map of the United States three times west of the Hudson. We compete with England in our varied industries in all the markets of the world, feed our own people, and have some to spare, this, too, whether we are a gold, a silver, or a bimetallic country. It is not strange that England and New England should be in harmony now, though very inharmonious on the tea question in years gone by. Both would starve without the West and South.

Look at Montana, that State which JOHN SHERMAN said, with the one exception of Alabama, he would call the treasure State of this Union.

Lay it down on the map of the United States and it reaches from Cleveland, Ohio, as far south as Richmond, Va., and this is no desert land. No Sahara here, but rich in mineral, timber, and agriculture. Idaho, if similarly placed, would reach down the eastern coast from Maine to middle North Carolina, its southern boundary extending to Columbus, Ohio, while its western line would reach Toronto, Canada. California would extend from London down well into Spain, or from Boston to Charleston. Look what an internal commerce we now have. It is 97 per cent of our whole commerce.

With that great expanse of soil, unequaled in fertility, boundless forests, mountains swelling with every known mineral, a people of such wonderful energy—need we go into the scientific researches of doctrinaires to proclaim that we will have our own system of finance, that we will coin silver and gold freely, limiting it only by the restriction of nature, and defy the world to prevent the two metals being kept at a parity?

These great States are developing with giant strides. Tell me that this great country and people will be compared with Mexico if we have free silver! One fact is well to observe here: In every silver-standard country in the world to-day the balance of trade is in its favor; in every gold-standard country it is just the reverse. In every silver country they are selling more than they buy; in every gold country they are buying more than they sell. Which is the healthier condition?

I need not answer. Tell me that free coinage would build a wall around us? What nonsense! That we could have no dealings and commercial relations with any other than silver countries? What absurdity! "It is better for a man to know less than to

know so much that ain't so." It is claimed that we would lose our trade with gold countries. This seems equally as absurd, for the reason if silver is a cheaper money, then nations as well as people are certainly going to the markets where they can buy cheapest, and if cheap money means anything it means that it induces trade. The trade between China and England would long since have ceased.

For a moment let us look at our carrying trade. Our carrying trade in American vessels is a commentary in itself on your financial views. (See Treasury Report Commerce and Navigation. See difference between the United States as a gold and as a free-coinage country.)

American vessels carried—	Imports.	Exports.	General average.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1859	64	70	70
1894	19½	8½	13

Difference in favor of free-coinage period, 44½ per cent, 61½ per cent, and 57 per cent.

In the same report you will see that our ships have some cause for felicitation—that there are some silver countries—for while they carry only 2.6 per cent trade to and from Europe, the great gold continent, they carry 50.7 per cent of that of North America, 19 per cent to South America, 18.3 per cent to China, 22.7 per cent to Africa, and 50.7 per cent to Oceanica.

One word about the Gresham law. Gresham lived in the time of Queen Elizabeth. A great many debased and mutilated coins got into circulation and Gresham claimed that such a state of things would drive good money out of circulation; that people would save up the good money and pay out the bad, and that it would seek foreign countries to pay for goods imported, because the bad money would not be received, etc.

Experience tells us that when we began the coinage of the silver dollar we had $168,000,000 in gold, and notwithstanding that the great exponents of the Wall street financiers predicted that we might coin $50,000,000 without driving gold from our shores, but more than that would certainly do it—notwithstanding this, we look ten years afterwards and we had coined 215,000,000 silver dollars and we had $612,000,000 in gold. To-day we have 415,000,000 silver dollars and hold some $650,000,000 in gold.

Mr. Blaine said—I quote him as being a wise Republican, as well as a great one:

In Europe and America the great mines of the Pacific Slope will be closed and dead. Mining enterprises of the gigantic scale existing in this country can not be carried on to provide backs for looking-glasses and to manufacture cream pitchers and sugar bowls. A vast source of wealth to this entire country is destroyed the moment silver is permanently disused as money.

Again he said—and these remarks will be found on page 821, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fifth Congress:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole standard or unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money.

Again he says:

It is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly ruinous to tens of thousands.

It is a very remarkable fact—and I refer to the Report on Commerce and Navigation for the detailed statement—that since the United States Government has kept the account of gold and silver separate, which has been only since 1864, there has never been a year or period embracing a number of years in which the imports of gold exceeded the exports except beginning with the year 1878, when we began to coin silver again. After coining standard silver dollars (250,000,000 of them) our gold, instead of having left us for foreign lands and having been driven out by silver, had actually increased $354,000,000; and then, just as if it had been established that the $625,000,000 of gold would be driven out of this country, it is triumphantly asked, "What would be the result of the withdrawal of one-third of our circulation?"

I would say in all candor that it would be very disastrous. But the application of Josh Billings's saying that it is better to know less than to know so much that ain't so comes in with peculiar force right here. If I assert that free coinage of silver will certainly produce an epidemic of smallpox, I might then immediately turn to you and ask, What think you of an epidemic of smallpox in America? One is just as probable as the other, and both equally unsupported by reason or argument or fact. But a gold monometallist is necessarily in favor of the withdrawal of the greenbacks and Treasury notes and the retirement of the silver dollar. What think you, may I ask, of the conditions of things if over one-half of our circulating medium is retired? I answer in his own language: Financial stringency, currency famine, commercial panic, business stagnation, wreck, and ruin. These are his own words, and they express just the condition of things which must obtain if his policy prevails.

I can hardly think that it will be insisted that the free coinage of silver, as well as gold, would not create as great a demand for silver as for gold. Certainly so in this country. Then if so (and the demand becomes unlimited as soon as free coinage is perfected) how is it possible for there to be such a thing as a commodity of silver except at an advance over its mintage value? This you must admit, for common sense will tell you that this is obliged to be so. Then the only danger that the United States would be subjected to is that flooding of the country with silver so often predicted by those with whom you are in sympathy. Now, I can not believe that even so zealous and so recent converts to gold monometallism as some of the Democrats here can believe that we are in a position to be hurt by any silver flood in this country. It certainly would not make things go down. It would make prices go up, coming nearer home. It is very true that twenty years ago, if you had been in Congress, it would have taken only 4,000 bushels of wheat annually to pay your salary. Now it takes 8,000; and it may be that a flood of silver would enable the farmers of this State to pay your salary with 3,500 bushels, and yet they would get more for their product.

Do you not know that there are 1,550,000,000 people on this earth, and that 1,250,000,000 of them, or four-fifths, use silver alone as money, and that only 280,000,000 use both gold and silver, the remaining 20,000,000 using nothing?

Do you not know that since the discovery of America—403 years—the production of gold and silver has varied not as much as $4,000,000 annually, and that at this time the difference in the amount of gold and silver money is merely nominal? Do you not know that the ratio of 16 to 1 in this country tends to take silver to those countries which have the ratio of 15½ to 1 and 15 to 1 instead of drawing it hither? There has not been a year since 1864 that we have not exported more silver than we imported. But be not deceived. Russia, Germany, England, France, Austria-Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Spain, and Portugal, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and the Netherlands all have use, and constant use, for the silver now on duty and on legal-tender duty too. They can not part with it if they wanted to; but if they could part with it, then in order to throw it on the mints in this country they would have to lose 3 per cent besides the freight and insurance, our ratio being 16 to 1, theirs 15½ to 1 and 15 to 1.

You know as well as I do that the price of wheat and other commodities is not regulated by the supply in a single country, but by the world's supply. Now, gold monometallists give the supply of gold and silver in certain years in the United States only. They say there has been a decrease in the product of gold. They have stated this, no doubt, with a view of showing that gold is on the decrease and silver very much on the increase, and hence gold is getting, by reason of scarcity, much more valuable, and the ratio should be very much greater than the one suggested and the one at present existing in this country. Now, what are the facts which are covered up in this statement? They are that gold has steadily increased since the year 1873, with the exception of a year now and then falling a little behind the year before, but this occurred seldom. Since 1890 the increase has been steady. For the three years 1891, 1892, and 1893 we have the following world's production:

Year.	Gold.	Silver.
1891	$130,000,000	$137,000,000
1892	146,000,000	152,000,000
1893	157,000,000	161,000,000

This is the world's supply, and when you speak of price you must not expect the product of the United States alone to regulate it.

Here is another remarkable statement: That the present silver dollar under free coinage would be worth only half of its present value. Do they really mean this? Are you not obliged to admit that prices will fluctuate more under a single standard than when both metals are used? Gold can be cornered much easier than both metals, and gold certainly does not circulate and silver certainly does. But they insist on rating silver as a commodity, when under free coinage it would not be a commodity except as the price would exceed the mintage price or value. How could hogs, wheat, and other commodities be regulated by the price of silver as a commodity, when silver would necessarily be without price as the unit of value? Money is without price, and price is value expressed in money.

It is certainly a strange fallacy which seems to have taken hold of old as well as new converts to gold monometallism, that law has nothing to do with the value of money.

Is it necessary for me to call your attention to the fact that commodities have come down steadily pari passu with silver since

1873? And yet in the face of this you insult the intelligence of the farming people of this State by likening our condition under free coinage to the Confederate money times. Metal money should be irredeemable; it is itself the redeemer. Confederate money was irredeemable paper. How can you see any similarity between the two? Nature limits the one, the other was limited only by the capacity of a printing machine. Do you think it is altogether ingenuous to spread before the people as a proposition that free coinage is likely to make silver dollars as plentiful as Confederate money; and if so, do you mean to say that it would be as worthless? Free coinage puts into circulation no money that is redeemable.

Now, about doubling prices for 50-cent dollars. It is said such "doubling" would certainly give the farmer no more than present prices for 100-cent dollars. Do they mean it, and is it possible that they give the farmer credit for so little intelligence as to suppose that he does not know this? If I said to him, "Sir, if you sell wheat at 10 cents a bushel, it will not bring you as much as if you sell it for 20 cents a bushel," I would not think that I had made a statement of very great interest to the farmer and one which it required much intelligence to comprehend.

But may I inquire who ever saw a 50-cent American silver dollar in this country? You must produce one before such propositions can be propounded.

There is about as much sense in the one as there is in the other. Both self-evident propositions; and the farmers are no fools to suppose that there are any very great metaphysics behind either of them.

But the farmer knows another thing: that there has never been in these United States a standard silver dollar that would not at any time purchase just as much as a gold dollar. I defy anyone to name the time and place. English capitalists offered Mr. Cleveland several millions of dollars more for the bonds of the United States if Congress would consent to that which no first-class nation has ever humiliated itself by doing, namely, to have inserted in the bonds that they would be payable in gold. Congress refused to do this, and hence our bonds were sold for 4½ premium; and notwithstanding these people said they would give more for them if gold was inserted (presumably they would not do so unless this was done), they did buy them, and these same bonds are now selling for 24 premium instead of 4½.

You are mistaken about these farmers of this country. This silver question is not such a mighty one as you would have them think now. They think that common sense and business judgment is the way to settle this matter, and it is the way it is going to be settled. The farmer knows that more money is needed to conduct the business of this country. He can not be fooled by your telling him that silver will be so plentiful that it will be as worthless as Confederate money. He knows better than that. He knows, too, that the quantity will be limited by nature, and he knows, too, that gold and silver are keeping pace with each other in the yearly production. He is not fooled by your talk of the production in America any more than he would be misled by talking about the production of wheat here. He knows as well as you do that the price of a commodity is regulated by supply and demand, and the supply and demand must be the world's supply and the world's demand. So it has not as much study about it as you would lead him to believe. Common sense! Common sense!

High-sounding phrases may fool us all sometimes, may fool some of us all the time, but they will not fool many of us this time. The old farmer knows something and he knows that there is to be no distribution of fifty-dollar packages of silver on court days to the people of any section. He has common business sense, and you have advised all to apply it. He knows that prosperity no longer exists in this country with the agricultural class. He believes it to be criminal to let the present condition of affairs remain as they are. The crucial test is approaching. He knows that his condition can not be worsted and can be improved. He is not apt to follow any financial theory that will further contract our money and consequently diminish further the prices of his products. And he means to be heard. He knows that time will set all things even and that he must treasure up the wrong. He can look only to the Democratic party. This party, my party, is treasuring up the wrong, and under the standard of free coinage for both gold and silver will correct it. We will yet achieve this great consummation. We will have to fight up hill and against strongly entrenched positions, but a battle won without struggle would be won without honor, and as our "fortune keeps an upward course," we are sure to be "graced with wreaths of victory." [Applause.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said by the advocates of free silver and so much written by them in relation to the marvelous prosperity of Japan and the wonderful growth of its manufacturing interests and extension of its commerce on account of the use of silver as a currency, that I desire to have read for the information of the House an extract from a letter of John A. Cockerill, a very intelligent and reliable newspaper correspondent, written from the capital of Japan to the New York Herald, and published in that paper a few days ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Having no prejudice on the financial question, I wish to state a few facts. Japan is not happy in her finances. I know that Count Okuma and other financiers of his school love to talk about the wealth that Japan is accumulating through buying in the markets of the world for gold and selling for silver, but the facts do not warrant their claims. Japan, by force of circumstances, belongs to the chop dollar sisterhood of Asia. Some five years ago, when she maintained her silver yen at something like par, she went along smoothly and she enjoyed fair prosperity. With the gradual decline of the yen her business has been demoralized and she is now entering upon, it is very generally agreed, a season of depression and hard times.

It has taken the people and the business world here quite a time to readjust themselves, but they are at it now with a vengeance. The penalty of depreciated currency is now being paid. For the last four months there has been a steady demand upon the part of salaried men for an increase of pay which would enable them to live comfortably. As the purchasing power of money has grown less the prices of commodities and the necessaries of life have steadily increased. The Government led off recently by doubling the salaries of all its foreign employees. This has been followed by a number of big corporations. Among the corporations doubling the salaries of their agents and employees may be mentioned the Mitsui Bussan Kaisha, the Nippon Tetendo Kaisha, the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, the Mitsui Bushi Goshi Kaisha, Japan Brewing Company, First and Third National banks, the Mitsui Bank, and the Naigai Yotatsu Kaisha. These are representative concerns in the mercantile, manufacturing, and banking departments of the country.

People who know Japan will see at a glance what they stand for. They have yielded to the demands of their people after the usual struggle, and this is the beginning. Wages are everywhere being pushed up and in all branches where skill is required. Men are lying down on their contracts and begging for concessions. Bankruptcy stares thousands of honorable business men in the face. This depression is not due in any sense to the war with China. Everybody knows that Japan made money during her war. The Government is richer than it ever was. The decline of silver has upset everything, and great uncertainty attends all business enterprise. The first thing that a business man does in the morning is to look at the value of the fluctuating dollar. It may be worth 53 cents or it may be worth 49. Exchange flutters and shifts, and considerable sums are lost to commercial men every day if they have foreign trade relations. Japan could not go to a gold basis, no matter how much she tried. That would mean universal bankruptcy.

Her general finances are deplorable and the condition must grow worse until business has settled down to the basis of a 50-cent dollar. Not a business concern in Japan will escape the effect of this curtailment of profit incidental to a 50 per cent increase in salaries and wages. The man who encourages a silver basis for the people of the United States by pointing to Japan as a glorious example is simply deceiving himself and his countrymen.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I know that my views on this financial question are not of importance either to my country or to my party, but I desire to call attention to a few facts that affect us particularly in the Southern country. In my district and in the South we need protection for our coal, our iron, our timber, and our marble, and I do not intend to follow off after this heresy of free silver. It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic party, or a great majority of the Democratic party, should be in favor of free silver. We remember that the Democratic party before the war stood in favor of State banks and wildcat money.

We remember that after the war, when we were heavily indebted, the Democratic party declared that the debt was so enormous it never could be paid, and advised the repudiation of the national debt. The Republican party, however, determined to readjust the finances on a basis alike just to the creditor and the Government. When the Republican party proposed to resume specie payment, the Democratic party, its statesmen, its newspapers, and its orators, declared that resumption was impossible. I remember that General Ewing, of Ohio, said that the morning Mr. SHERMAN undertook to resume specie payment in this country we would hear "the crack of doom." But specie payment was resumed.

Then commenced an era of unexampled prosperity in this country. Another fad soon after took possession of the Democratic mind in this country. It determined and declared in favor of irredeemable paper money; and you remember the noble fight that the Republican party made in Ohio and in the nation against that idea. The Republican party has stood ever since its existence, during the war and since the war, for an honest currency; and the Republican party stands on that platform to-day. The remedy, I insist, Mr. Speaker, for the evils that are now inflicted upon us, is not by the free coinage of silver, but by restoring to this country the general prosperity of the people. If the people are prosperous the Government will be prosperous, because the Government is dependent upon the people, and not the people upon the Government.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY] said that it is not safe to follow the doctrinaires of this country. I agree with him. I call his attention to the splendid development made in the Southern country since the war, due to a protective tariff. I point him to the example and experience of our people there, and say to him that if we follow along Republican lines, if we are given protection in the South and all over this country, prosperity will return to us and we will hear no more of this cry of the free coinage of silver. The Republican party is not unfriendly to silver. I believe, as the Republican party believes, in coining all the silver that it is safe to coin; all that is consistent with safety to the business interests and the currency of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well sometimes to appeal to history and

to appeal to the experience of this country. Let us examine a little the history of the Democratic party and of the Republican party in the history of this country on this financial question. The last Democratic President before Grover Cleveland was Mr. James Buchanan. We had lived during Mr. Buchanan's Administration under a free-trade tariff, and Mr. Buchanan was inaugurated into office under auspices of general peace and prosperity, strong in the confidence of a united, a triumphant Democracy; possessed of every aid and inducement to an honest, patriotic, brilliant, vigorous, successful administration of the Nation, but he retired from power amid general execration and disgrace, carrying into his retirement the official brand of public condemnation upon his forehead, leaving to the world as the only trophies of his Administration the National Treasury depleted; the country loaded with debt, increased in time of peace; his party disorganized and dismembered, and the perpetuity of the Republic a doubtful and appalling problem.

Why, sir, Mr. Buchanan himself, in the last message he sent to Congress before his retirement from the Presidency, said this:

With unsurpassed plenty in all the products and all the elements of natural wealth, our manufactures are suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is in a deplorable condition.

That is a description of the condition at the end of the last Democratic Administration prior to Mr. Cleveland's. That Administration went into power when the country was prosperous, and it left the country, as Mr. Buchanan himself says, with public works retarded, with private enterprises paralyzed and abandoned, with the Treasury depleted and the national credit at a low ebb. That was the condition of the country when Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated in 1861. The Government was without money and without credit; laborers were without employment, and farm products were at their lowest price in the history of the country for many years. What was the remedy that Mr. Lincoln applied? What was the remedy that the Republican party applied? It was the enactment of the Morrill tariff law, which carried this country through a great war and which, with slight modifications, has supplied us with revenue ever since.

After the war the finances of this country were readjusted on a basis honorable to all. Since that time we have paid off more than half the public debt, and have maintained our gold, silver, and paper money on a parity. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic party of late have professed a high appreciation of the greenback currency of the country. That very greenback to which they now profess to be so friendly they originally declared it unconstitutional to issue, and the Republican party was the creator and the defender of the greenback currency, which it made as good as gold.

Now, let us see what was the condition of this country when Mr. Cleveland came into power. The conditions that confronted Mr. Cleveland when he came into power were very like the conditions that prevailed when Mr. Buchanan came into power, and Mr. Cleveland will leave this Government in a worse condition, if possible, than that in which Mr. Buchanan left it. R. G. Dun & Co., in their weekly review of business conditions on the 30th day of December, 1892, said:

The most prosperous year ever known in business closes to-day with strongly favorable indications for the future.

This was at the end of the year 1892, at the close of a series of Republican Administrations of this Government. In December, 1893, when Mr. Cleveland had been in power less than a year, what was the condition of the country? The same authority, R. G. Dun & Co., in their weekly review of December 29, 1893, said.

Starting with the largest trade ever known, mills crowded with work, and all business stimulated by high hopes, the year 1893 has proved, in the sudden shrinkage of values, in commercial disasters, and in the depression of industries, the worst for fifty years. Whether the financial results of the panic of 1837 were relatively more severe the scanty records of that time do not clearly show. The year closes with prices of many products the lowest ever known, with mills and workers seeking in vain for work, and with charity laboring to keep back suffering and starvation in all our cities. All hope the new year may bring brighter days, but the dying year leaves only a dismal record. The reviews of different departments of trade given to-day exhibit a collapse of business which is almost without precedent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that instead of there being any improvement since December, 1893, matters have grown worse, until the prices of farm products are now at the lowest point, the laborers of this country are without employment, public works are retarded, private enterprises of all kinds are paralyzed.

Now, what is the remedy proposed by the Republican party on this occasion? The Republican party proposes, when restored to power, to return to a Republican, an American tariff system, such as carried this country through the war, which has enabled us to pay off more than half the public debt and to build up the waste places in this country, giving labor more employment and better wages than it ever had before; and particularly, Mr. Speaker, in my own Southern country we desire to have the benefits of this beneficent system of a protective tariff, and we do not intend to be led astray by this Democratic cry for the free coinage of silver. The Democratic party has undertaken to deceive the people on the tariff question and has declared for free trade, and now when it can deceive the people no longer by crying "free trade" it proposes to cry "free coinage of silver." I say that in my own country, in the South, our people will be found standing for sound money and against the free coinage of silver. We do not desire that the bonanza kings of the West shall feather their pockets at the expense of the people of this country. Give us protection, protection for our iron, our coal, our lumber, and our marble, and we will build up the South more than it has ever been developed in all the years of the past. [Loud applause.]

The Republican party believes in the doctrine taught by Daniel Webster in that magnificent speech in the Senate in 1846, when he said:

Proclaim it everywhere and make it a proverb that where there is work for the hands of men there will be work for their teeth. Where there is employment there will be bread. It is a great blessing to the poor to have cheap food, but greater than that, prior to that, and of still higher value, is the blessing of being able to buy food by honest and respectable employment. Employment feeds and clothes and instructs. Employment gives health, sobriety, and morals. Constant employment and well-paid labor produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content, and cheerfulness. The advancement of the United States is the world's wonder. The other nations of the earth can not furnish such a splendid exhibition of progress in any age or period.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party will, when returned to power, restore to the country its former prosperity, not by free and unlimited coinage of silver, but by giving the country a larger but safe use of silver, and by the adoption of a thoroughly American protective policy.

In conclusion, I indorse the sentiment of Senator FRYE at a Republican banquet held at Bridgeport, Conn., on the 29th of March of this year, when he said:

Give us Republican rule for a single decade, unlimited, uncrippled power, and we will show the people the beneficence of Republican legislation.

Every man who wants work will have it, and at the wages of the crowning year of Republican rule, 1892. We will place our flag on all the seas of the earth, restore the merchant marine in its place, and will increase our white, strong-armed squadrons so that they may command the respect of all nations. We will annex the Hawaiian Islands, fortify Pearl Harbor, build the Nicaragua Canal, and marry two great oceans. We will show people a foreign policy that is alive in every fiber, and hoist the American flag on whatever island we think best, and no hand shall ever pull it down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that I belong to a class of individuals entertaining views differing in many respects from those entertained by either of the old parties. In the discussion of the question before us I shall endeavor to present the Populists' view of the situation to-day, and what seems to us the proper course for this House to pursue in order to meet the issues of the hour. I shall pursue a different course from a majority of the speakers that have preceded me. I am going to suppose we are all patriotic citizens; that every man within the sound of my voice loves his country; that he has but one object in view, that object being to meet the needs of the hour for the best interests of all classes of our people.

A very pertinent question is, Can that be done? I answer, Yes. You naturally ask, How? I say that we should simply bring to bear the principles of practical common sense, based upon the experience of ages; we should utilize those principles in the financial legislation of the country in this her hour of need.

A few weeks ago we received a message from the President of the United States, informing us of the depletion of the gold reserve. The leading committee of this House hastened to prepare two bills. One of those bills submitted for our consideration provided for an increase of the revenue of the Government; the other provided for the issue of bonds to meet the needs of the Treasury at this particular time. I have felt it my duty to cast a negative vote against each of those bills. Not that I am not willing at all times to vote every dollar that is necessary to meet the actual needs of the Government; but I believe that with a nation as with an individual there are times when retrenchment should be the order of the day. That this was not the proper time to place additional burdens upon our people. To place in the hands of the President or his Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue bonds as provided in the bond bill would enable him to retire the entire amount of greenbacks that have been issued by the Government. But our Republican friends say, "We are opposed to the retirement of the greenbacks; and we have provided that when they are redeemed they shall be kept in the Treasury."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any difference in the effect upon the interests of the country between the destruction of the greenbacks and their retirement by locking them up in the Treasury and thus taking them out of circulation, I fail to discover it.

The fact is we need more money; we need honest money; we need sufficient money to preserve the equity of contracts and uniformity of prices, money that will meet the demands of the age. Now we are peculiar people. Some say that those who

think with me are in favor of going back instead of forward. No, my friends, you are grievously mistaken. Our principles are onward. Our idea is simply this—that an honest man will pay honest debts when he has the ability to do so; that an honest government, by just legislation, as far as lies within its power, will provide the means by which its indebtedness can be paid. Some of my Republican and Democratic friends do not differ from me in this matter; others of each party say: "We want honest money." We say that is just what we want. We say nothing but honest money will satisfy us. You ask me what is "an honest dollar." I answer "an honest dollar" is a dollar of the contract, an appreciated dollar is a dishonest dollar.

Why am I not in favor of the gold standard, you ask. I will answer that cheerfully. First, there is not sufficient gold as the basis upon which the credit of this nation and the commercial nations of the earth can rest. In the second place, if you destroy silver as one of the money metals that have been established in this country, you destroy one-half of the basis of money contracts and thereby destroy the equity of all contracts. If you will consult any of the writers of eminence on this subject, I care not who, you will find that by destroying one-half of the basis you double the debt; but in doubling the debt you double the value of all credit money in the country. Hence we say that by legislation that has been had in the past and by legislation that, I am sorry to say, is liable to prevail in this House, we are about to adopt a system by which the products of human labor will continue to depreciate from time to time.

I have carefully studied the history of the last fifty years of my country. I belong to old Revolutionary stock. In my earliest youth I was baptized in the spirit of love for my country. It was years before I could educate myself far enough away from my prejudices to examine into the conditions and the causes that were at work in this country of ours, that were depreciating on the one hand the labor of the tillers of the soil and other toilers throughout the land, while vastly appreciating the income of another class of our people. In this respect I entertain the same views that Daniel Webster did in his time. I believe that we can not long continue to be a prosperous or a contented and a happy people when the gulf is widening from day to day between the men who create the wealth of the nation and the men who possess it. I have no disposition to antagonize a rich man if he gets his money honestly, any more than I have any other class. I bid him godspeed; but, on the other hand, I say it is our duty in this Hall to create the conditions by which the masses of the people may enjoy the fruits of their labor that it may not be confiscated in the interest of another class of people.

Can that be done? Unhesitatingly I answer, it can. You ask me how? I will tell you with pleasure. Go back with me to 1850. Come with me down along the years that elapsed from 1850 to 1860. During that period the agricultural wealth of this country increased over 50 per cent; from 1860 to 1870 it increased over 60 per cent; but from 1870 to 1890, a period of twenty years, agricultural wealth in the old State of Pennsylvania, the home of my birth, depreciated $121,000,000, while she had an increase in population of nearly 2,000,000, if the reports of the census are worthy of credit. I am a farmer. From 1850 to 1860 we realized in New York City a fraction over $16 a barrel for our pork; and we realized an average of a little over 53 cents a pound for our fine wool. But from 1880 to 1890 we realized a fraction over $13 a barrel for our pork, and a fraction over 33 cents a pound on the average for our fine wool.

I say, then, Mr. Speaker, we must look further for the causes controlling this question. Facts are stubborn things. You want proof, and it is my province and pleasure to give it.

In 1860 we were not in a prosperous condition, as my friend from Tennessee has said. Whether the depression was caused by legislation or otherwise it is not my province to say; but at that particular hour in our history—in 1861—we were brought face to face with the most formidable rebellion of ancient or modern times. Brother unsheathed his sword and went to battle with brother. North and South for the next four years we heard the clashing of arms. What did we do? During that particular time we created a navy, we created an army, we created the means by which they existed. We subdued, and I am proud to say we did subdue, and I believe they are all with me in regard to that, the most powerful uprising in the history of the nations of the world; and we met on the field of battle the most gallant, most fearless soldiers that ever saw service under the flag in the history of the nations of the world. Be that to their credit. I belong to that class who have sheathed the sword and are living to-day, under the providence of Almighty God living, giving thanks for what has been done, and living to make this nation what it should be. [Applause.]

We created, as I have said, an army and a navy, and we fed and clothed them and paid them. We enjoyed at the close of the war, throughout the North, prosperity unparalleled in the history of the country; and I presume there is not a gold bug here or anywhere else who will call that statement into question.

What next? We commenced to build up homes, towns, cities, and railroads without parallel in history. But while doing this we commenced to reduce the volume of the currency. We commenced to disturb the currency of the country, and instead of creating in the minds of men the utmost good faith in our permanent prosperity, we proceeded to tear down and destroy. We commenced using the credit of the nation, the credit of the people. In 1865 we had 520 failures—not a bad showing. In 1870 we had over 3,000. In 1873 we had over 5,000, and then our financiers got together, rubbed their hands, and said, "There is something wrong; we have got to make a marked change. I will tell you the power that has been in our hands will not be retained unless we do." Did they make a proper diagnosis of the case, as they supposed? They did undertake to do it, and then said to the patient, We will dismember one of the limbs in order to effect a cure; we will destroy silver. Most of you are old enough to remember the panic of 1873, which followed soon after the demonetization of silver. You will remember also the report of the Commission of 1876; you remember the remonetization of silver at $2,000,000 a month in 1878, and you may doubtless remember the other fact that with little exception from 1875 to 1895, a period of twenty years, failures have increased at a certain ratio, and to-day there are 300,000 business men in this country who, under the adverse circumstances which surrounded them in that period, have failed and gone out of business. Some one said, "What do you want; what is your remedy? Do you want more money?" Yes, sir; I do. I want more prosperity and less misery. "Are you not in favor of paying an honest debt in honest dollars?" That is exactly what I favor, and when I hear a man say, "I will pay $10,000 that costs as much of the product of my labor and of my brain as the money I borrowed," I say that is the honest dollar he pays, and that there is but one honest dollar in existence, and that is the dollar of the contract.

Then, what would I do? I would adopt this bill now before the House. I would give the coin—the silver coin—the money power that belongs to it. I would coin the silver, every dollar of silver and of gold, and if I had not money enough I would coin greenbacks sufficient to enable every industry in this country to enjoy prosperity. "You would?" Yes. "Well, now, that is very strange, with 4,000,000 of unemployed, as we were told last Congress, in this country." Yes; I would; I would create a condition that every man willing to toil—every man—could enjoy if he desired; that every man who is willing to work could eat the fruits of his labor, and his wife and children have the benefit of proper clothing and comfortable homes—warm houses of their own which they could enjoy.

I have been told recently during the discussion of this question by our friend Mr. WALKER that the farmers were prosperous. I wonder how he would like the Massachusetts manufacturers to enjoy the same kind of prosperity. If so, he is differently constituted from any man I ever saw. He is certainly differently constituted from myself. I would like to see the manufacturers of this land prosper. The manufacturers, however, can never be prosperous unless the farmers of the country are prosperous. The basis of all wealth and of all prosperity rests with the farmers of the world. That is absolutely the basis. Give them prosperity, give them a good market, and what will be the result? It will enhance the value of everything else. They will buy twice the products of the manufacturer, and build up all the other industries of the country. Their looms will start up, and the man who anxiously seeks food and clothing for his family need not go hungry or without a fireside of his own, but there will be something of the same degree of prosperity that we had in 1865.

An eminent writer, in speaking on the subject of the national labor problem, and a nation entering upon a great degree of development, at the same time reducing the volume of money, declared that such a nation commits a heinous crime. That is the substance of the language, although not the exact text of it. Have we done so? We have, undoubtedly, in this country. Who are to be benefited by this process? It is true that our foreign trade amounts to about $2,000,000,000 annually, and that our internal trade amounts to $48,000,000,000, or twenty-four times as much. Shall the interests of our forty-eight billions of internal commerce be sacrificed for that of the two billions of foreign trade? We think not; we think that it is wholly unnecessary and wrong to sacrifice the interests of 95 per cent of our people for the 5 per cent that will be benefited. I want an American policy that will protect the interests of all of our people. I have no sympathy with that policy which would make our toiling people the serfs to England as are the Turks and Egyptians. They have gold monometallism. Contemplate them in all their glory, you who uphold the golden scepter in this House.

There is no nation in history in any period of time that has made the development that we have in the last fifty years, and my Republican friends, with great pride, point to the fact. I acknowledge that we have made wonderful developments, but if you will be equally honest and frank you will acknowledge that you have made some grievous mistakes. You and I both know

that crime has increased with a fearful velocity. You and I must confess that failures have increased at a terrible rate. You and I must acknowledge to-day that there is a burden of debt of many billions of dollars resting upon us which, if payment was demanded, we should be unable to meet at this time. Now the question is, What should we do? I am willing to vote for any measure that I believe will bring prosperity to my people and will honestly carry out a contract. I never stop to inquire where a measure has its origin. I ask myself the question, "Is that right? If that principle was carried out and engrafted into law would it accomplish the end for which it was created?" If I find it will it gets my support, I do not care where it comes from. But if, on the other hand, it is destitute of that, then I must be excused for casting my vote against it.

In regard to the tariff bill I could not vote for it because, first, the people are not able to buy the goods at present prices without an increase in tariff duties. In the second place, I believe it was our duty in this hour of trial to retrench, to reduce expenses. In the third place, I will vote for the amended bill as it comes from the Senate, because in that form it is calculated to give us a greater basis upon which the currency of this country will rest. It will give us more money, and, giving us more money, it will produce with us just exactly what it has with other nations in the past. I know the creditor will claim, on the one hand, that he is wronged, but we think that he has no ground for that complaint. We think that he has gained so much in the past that if he lost one-half he would still be the gainer to a very great extent. We believe the ends to be accomplished and the great gains to the whole country, as a country, will vastly compensate him for all, if he should suffer in any respect by this change in legislation.

Then, do you know what we should do? I will with pleasure tell you, because the Populist is never afraid to confess in open court. I should coin every dollar of gold that we could get. That is good money. It is the money of the Constitution. I should coin every dollar of silver that we could get. It is good money. It is the money of the Constitution. I believe in the money of the Constitution. And then, if we had not money sufficient to meet the needs of the hour, I should issue greenbacks or Treasury notes enough, and make them all interchangeable one with another. I say, Mr. Speaker, I would give the people the best money that it is possible for any people to have, and I would start the wheels of industry in all the length and breadth of this land of ours, and I would restore hope and confidence to those who are so greatly discouraged by the conditions now existing.

Mr. MOSES. In regard to the greenbacks, would you make every dollar of greenbacks redeemable in gold or silver?

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. I should not, unless by making them interchangeable. As I said before, I would make them interchangeable one with another.

Mr. MOSES. I have made the claim that the Populist party is not a silver party.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. In that you are vastly mistaken.

Mr. MOSES. I ask my friend because I have more respect for his opinion than that of any man on this floor on his side. I have claimed in the State of Georgia that your party does not believe in either gold or silver, that it is a fiat-money party. Mr. Watson in his book says that this money should be irredeemable, and I now ask on the floor of the House whether I have misrepresented your party or not.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. I will say this, I do not know in just what way the members of that party in Georgia may present their views, but a great many Populists—and possibly those are some of them—have the idea that the very fact that the money receives the stamp of the United States which says that it is one dollar makes it a dollar, and that at the very moment that it has paid a dollar of debt it has been redeemed, and that neither gold nor silver nor greenbacks need any other redemption; that when a dollar has paid a debt it has fulfilled its mission, just as a postage stamp, when it is placed upon a letter and been canceled, has fulfilled its mission in paying the way of the letter to its destination. That is the view that is entertained by a great many of our people. On the other hand, you know, the Good Book says, "By their fruits shall ye know them." Now, I have happened to be a member of this House since 1890, and I say frankly that we are the only party in this House who have been consistent silver men. My brother here will bear me out.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. We believe in the money of the Constitution; and I only wish all my Republican and Democratic friends could say the same. To-day they are a little like King Agrippa when Paul was before him. You know he said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." And so I wish to God, in the cause of humanity, that you could see this thing in the light of reason. The trouble is that a great many members of this House are hypnotized. You do not see things for yourselves. You see them through the eyes of somebody else. I say, divest yourselves of your prejudices. Look at the lowly farmer or the farmer of wealth. Look at the lowly mechanic or the skilled mechanic. Look at the failures. Look at the bonds and mortgages. Look at the chaos that now exists in our financial centers. Look at the vast accumulation of wealth on one hand, and then look at the demands that come to us from the money centers of this country and of Europe.

Look at the merchant, look at the banker, and see what your duty as citizens is, and you will agree with me that it is your duty as patriots in this particular time in our history to rise above all party considerations in the future, and cast your votes—as I believe you would if you would only look for yourselves in the way that I have suggested—cast your votes for the amended bill as it comes from the Senate. That will give a new inspiration to 60,000,000 of our people. There is a certain class it will hurt; that is unquestionably true, but I say it will benefit nine men to every one it injures, and I do not believe that in the end it will injure any man. Is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. We have had from time to time our attention called to the fact of the great prosperity that England is enjoying. I will concede without argument that England to-day is in a much more prosperous condition than we are. England is on a gold basis and we are on a silver basis, Mr. Speaker—are we? No, we are on a gold basis, too. England is on a gold basis and we are on a gold basis; England is a creditor nation, and she demands payment of her debts in dear money; we are a debtor nation, and have been foolish enough to yield to the demands of Great Britain and thereby doubled every dollar of indebtedness that we owe to Great Britain at her behest. I, for one, can not give my acquiescence to anything of that kind. I would pay her in the money borrowed. If it was borrowed in gold I would pay it in gold, and if it was borrowed in currency I would pay it in the currency of the country, and she would have to receive that in payment. So that we Populists want it to be distinctly understood that we are in favor of the money of the Constitution in the first place, and in the second place we are in favor of the money that maintains the equity of contracts. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I will add but a few words to the discussion that has already consumed so much valuable time in this House.

Soon after the opening of the present session we were called upon by the President to take prompt action for devising ways and means to meet a financial crisis. Not only had the gold reserve been reduced below the mark of safety, but the revenue of the Government had become inadequate to meet its expenses to the amount of more than $40,000,000 annually. This excess of demand above the income of the Government was being taken from the gold reserve. In a word, we were draining the Treasury of its gold at the rate of $40,000,000 each year, and thus the deficiency.

The future of our finances was indeed dark, with no remedy in sight. The President, realizing the danger, appealed to the lawmaking power to bridge over the gulf of bankruptcy toward which the National Treasury was fast drifting. The best financial brains of the majority in this House quickly originated and presented two bills—one an emergency bond bill with a low rate of interest and the other a revenue bill that would at least prevent the balance of trade from counting against us. These two bills, after mature deliberation, were passed by this body, thus fulfilling its obligations as servants of the people in remedying the evil and preventing its recurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I had strong hopes that the Senate would concur in our action. but after waiting a month the bond bill is returned to us with all of its provisions stricken out and a free-coinage measure substituted.

Mr. Speaker, while I am in favor of the largest possible coinage of silver consistent with safety, it must be on a parity with gold and the exchanges of the world.

We have no use for a depreciated currency in this country for the reason that all values are established on a basis of 100 cents to the dollar. Our private, local, State, and national indebtedness has all been incurred on this basis.

The adoption of this substitute would not only mean repudiation, but destruction financially. Its results would be freighted with disaster and ruin to the men who labor, and who are the backbone of the nation's prosperity. Humiliate the masses by a depreciated currency and you lower the standard of civilization.

Our currency should be fixed and stable and of a sufficient quantity for the full transaction of business and elastic enough to protect business interests and the interests of labor in every emergency.

Mr. Speaker, cause and effect are close companions, though often far apart. A robber steals your money, and the effect is you are impoverished.

The adoption of this substitute would have the same effect. The people would receive 50 cents for that which cost them 100 cents. For, Mr. Speaker, 50 cents' worth of silver can not pass current for a dollar without bringing all values to its level. Are we prepared for this? I think not.

This is not a party question. It concerns the welfare of, the honor of, and the integrity of the nation in the discharge of its honest obligations.

I do not believe that the wisdom of this body, fresh from the people as it is, will allow this unwise measure to pass.

Mr. Speaker, in the upbuilding of our industrial system is to be found the solution of the financial problem.

I can not vote for this substitute. It should not pass. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER Mr. Speaker, it is the special duty, it seems to me, of Representatives to approach the discussion of a question like the one before the House with a judicial spirit, rather than that of a special attorney. A special desire should exist to rather learn the truth than defend a case.

Certain things have been established in this connection beyond a doubt. They rest upon no hypothesis nor course of reasoning. They have gone into history, and no attempt is made on the part of any intelligent or fair-minded man to contradict or question them even. It is upon these that we must rely, rather than suppositions, or theories, or hypotheses, or wishes, or ought-to-have-beens, when dealing with so delicate a thing as credit and a matter so comprehensive as to involve every life-insurance policy, every deposit in a bank, every piece of property in the United States, every day's labor, and thus materially affect every man, woman, and child in the land.

Let us see, then, how many of these great milestones there are along the line of the financial experience of the United States. Let us stop theorizing and seek truths or facts without attempting to explain them away, until, at least, we have completed the line of investigation and are certain of our steps and can measure the consequences.

In the first place, it is a historical fact, established beyond question, that at the time the investigation was made for the purpose of establishing the ratio between gold and silver, in 1792, Alexander Hamilton, one of the most thorough and discriminating scholars the world has produced, found that the nearest approximate value of the two metals at that time was 15 to 1. It was established beyond doubt that owing to the slight difference of value gold disappeared from circulation.

Second. It is well known to everyone that in 1834, owing to the fact that gold had disappeared, another investigation took place and the ratio of 16 to 1 was established. It turned out that this ratio favored gold sufficiently to make silver a commodity, which fact led to the gradual disappearance of silver from circulation. So clearly was this established, and so certainly was all of our silver disappearing, being bought up and shipped out of the country because worth more than its face value, that the Government in 1853 reduced the coin value of our subsidiary coins for the purpose of insuring their circulation, and the plan was successful. The disappearance of gold in the first instance and of silver in the second disclosed no new truth, but only added our own experience to a well-established principle that the poorer always drives out the better money.

I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE], that nothing is more conducive to a full and satisfactory understanding of any question than a settlement of terms; indeed, that it is absolutely necessary for an intelligent discussion of any proposition. His definition of bimetallism was that—

Bimetallism is a monetary system where the mints are open to gold and silver on equal terms, at a fixed ratio, and where both have the same debt-paying power; the debtor having the option of the kind of money he shall pay.

"Bimetallism" is a new word, and so new as not to be found in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary of 1888.

It is interesting to observe, however, that the definition of bimetallism found in the Century Dictionary, now the leading authority on such subjects, is utterly at variance with the definition adopted by the gentleman from Minnesota, and is as follows:

Bimetallic.—This word and its derivatives are of recent origin, M. Cernuschi having been the first to use "bimetallique" in 1869 and "bimetallic" in 1876. Of or pertaining to two metals; specifically, pertaining to the use of a double metallic standard in currency.

Bimetallism.—Bimetallism pertains to the use of two metals as money at relative values set by legislative enactment: the union of two metals in circulation as money at a fixed rate. Specifically, that system of coinage which recognizes both coins of silver and coins of gold as legal tender to any amount, or the concurrent use of coins of two metals as a circulating medium at a fixed relative value.

From this it is apparent that there are two distinct definitions of bimetallism. The theoretical bimetallism opens the mints for the two metals, the dearer one never coining and the poorer one only circulating, while practical bimetallism secures the circulation of the two metals side by side, the dearer one carrying a margin of credit in the poorer one and the country having the benefit of both as money.

If there is any such confusion in the public mind as these two definitions would naturally breed, it is high time that the Republican party declared itself emphatically in favor of that bimetallism that actually bimetallizes both gold and silver. A bimetallism that does not bimetallize the two metals, but with absolute certainty monometallizes the cheaper metal and always drives out the better, is, in very truth, monomaniacal bimetallic monometallism—an intoxication with a theory.

It reminds me of the man who, in his trip around the world, had brought home the one bird of all others that filled the air with enchanting song. He waited two long years for the sweet warble of its most promising throat. One day, looking at its beautiful plumage with a friend, he remarked that he had at great expense and much pains brought this wonderful singing bird from the very interior of China, but he had a most striking peculiarity as a songster, and that is: "The damn thing don't sing." Now, the Republican party wants a bimetallism that bimetallizes both gold and silver. Let us here and now declare that we are in favor of the practical as against the theoretical, upon the same ground that we are in favor of protection as against free trade. Let us declare that we are in favor of that metal as a basis of our business transactions that is the least variable in value, and as a result of experience has been adopted by all the great commercial nations of the earth.

The gentleman from Minnesota, my friend, Mr. TOWNE, as a specimen of silver logic, declared that if a horse had sold for $100 in gold in 1890 and that he could obtain but $50 in gold for it to-day, it was just as proper to say that the gold had risen 100 per cent as to say that the price of the horse had fallen 50 per cent. And he makes this statement when every man, woman, and child from the Atlantic to the Pacific knows that the horse is not actually worth more than one-half as much in the market because of the bicycle, the cable car, and the use of electricity, while the hundred dollars in gold will buy practically the same amount of everything that the average man wants to eat, wear, or use that it did in 1890.

Third. It is a fact that in 1873, under the operation of this same law of the poorer money driving out the better, paper had driven out both gold and silver, and there was not a dollar of either to be found in circulation. Therefore, it is not true, as stated by one gentleman, that by demonetizing silver a double burden was thrown upon gold and thereby its value doubled. For how can you remove the burden from a horse when there is no horse in existence? Nor was its value affected in the slightest degree, for neither gold nor silver was doing any commercial work whatever, the whole of our money, every dollar of it, resting upon the credit of our country. It will be well to observe in passing that since silver was worth 104, there was no possible reason for demonetizing it, as the whole history of the country had shown that its price of 104 literally and absolutely removed it from circulation. Owing to these two facts, then—first, that neither gold nor silver was doing any money work; second, that silver was worth 104 and would not have been in circulation even if we had not demonetized it—it is absolutely true that no act of the Government did in any way affect silver at that time.

Fourth. The next great fact that is established beyond question, and about which there is no possible doubt, is that, owing to the decreasing value of silver, which in 1878 had fallen to 89 cents, the mine owners wanted the United States to again become a buyer, and the result was the passage of the Bland-Allison Act. By this act the Government, from 1878 to 1890, purchased 288,474,639.04 ounces, costing the Government $305,229,834.38, or an average of $23,479,218.03 per annum, about one-half the product. The bullion value of the silver dollar in 1878 was, as stated, 89 cents, from which price there was a constant depreciation until it had reached 74 cents in 1890.

Upon the passage of the Sherman Act, which consumed for the years 1891, 1892, and 1893 two-thirds of the product, it took an upward start, and in 1891 ran up to 92 cents, and then down to 74 cents, averaging 81 cents. From that date down to this year it has continued to fall, reaching the low price of 49 cents. Under the Sherman Act it will be observed that the Government purchased for the three years 1891, 1892, and 1893 a total of 156,757,023.75 ounces, at a cost of $147,215,480.93, or an average of $49,071,826.97. By referring to the table of production it will be observed that the amount of silver produced from 1878 to 1890 was $660,250,000, or an average of $50,788,923, and for the years 1891, 1892, and 1893, $235,094,000, or an average of $78,364,667, and, strange as it may seem, though we had largely increased the relative amount consumed of the amount produced, the price continued to fall.

Fifth. It is a fact about which there is no question that the Government did resume specie payments January 1, 1879, and that the Government has maintained a gold standard from that date

up to the present time. Now, it has been shown that if the two metals are both entitled to free coinage without making one of the metals carry a margin of credit in the other, as has been done in France and in this country since 1878, one of the metals, the dearer one, will at once disappear from circulation and become a mere commodity, and will furnish a basis for speculation and unsettle the value of the money of the country.

In this connection it is urged by the advocates of silver that gold has appreciated so much that it is a very great injustice to the debtor class of the country to have to pay their obligations in gold. This declaration is not a fact, but a mere assumption; nay, more, as investigation proves, absolutely untrue, contravening the conclusions of the Senate committee report, which proves just the reverse.

To give color to this assumption an attempt is made on the part of the advocates of silver to prove that gold has appreciated in value by comparing it with one or two or possibly three commodities, more particularly cotton and wheat, the observation having been made that there was a striking coincidence in the rise and fall of these two great staples and silver. The advocates of silver were wont to say that they never had varied in any considerable degree. This declaration came very much nearer being true one year ago than now; for, within the past twelve months, although silver has remained practically stationary, the value of cotton has increased 50 per cent at times, and wheat has made a similar gain, so that the charm that this declaration had for certain wheat growers and certain cotton growers has been broken, and the assumption founded upon a mere coincidence has been shown to be a shallow fallacy. This fallacy was also exposed by the fact that when compared with other great staples like corn and oats there did not seem to be the slightest resemblance in the movements, proving that there was no connection between cotton and wheat and silver except the mere accident of coincidence during a certain length of time. But there is one fact still remaining that more than any other, indeed, than all others combined, ought to satisfy all the people of this country, but more particularly the laboring classes, and that is this: That while the silver dollar was constantly falling, going from a value of 104 cents in 1873 down to 64.2 cents in 1892, and still lower to 45.7 cents in 1894, the wages of the laboring masses of our people increased from a standard of $1.47 in gold in 1878 to $1.68 in gold in 1891. Certainly American labor can not afford to change its gold wages for silver wages. It is absolutely certain, therefore, that gold has depreciated instead of appreciating.

By the Senate committee report, known as the Aldrich report, it was demonstrated that up to 1891, the last year recorded in the table, wages measured in gold had nearly doubled since 1850, had more than doubled since 1840, and had increased 14 per cent since 1873. It was also shown that the cost of the articles used by the average laboring man for food and clothing had depreciated from 1873 to 1891 10 per cent, while the fall of prices in the same articles from 1840 to 1891 was 3 per cent.

Now take, if you please, the wages of a laboring man in 1840 as $1, and assume that it was consumed for the necessaries of life, food and clothing, and the same man in 1891 would have received $2.04 for his wages and yet have bought these same articles of food and clothing for 97 cents, leaving him a clear gain of $1.07 as against his day's labor in 1840. Again, if in 1873 this same man had received wages in greenbacks equivalent to $2 in gold for a day's labor, he would have received in 1891 $2.28 in gold for his labor, and would have purchased food and clothing at a gain of 20 cents a day, giving him a net profit in 1891 on a day's labor of 48 cents against his day's labor in 1873.

From this it is clearly seen that gold has not appreciated, but that it to-day takes less labor to produce one dollar in gold than it did in 1873. Therefore, it is established beyond question that no possible injustice can be done to any man by the maintenance of the gold standard, although it may be true that there may have been such changes in some line of employment as to make it harder for a man to make a living than then, because there is not the same demand for what he produces; but the average demand for all labor, which is the best measure of value, shows that there has been a very great appreciation of labor and a corresponding depreciation of gold. This brings us to the consideration of the two distinct propositions of the advocates of silver.

First. There is the silver advocate who believes in free coinage 16 to 1, and asks us to place him or silver where it was in 1873. Mark this, he does not propose to put silver where it was in 1873 in point of value, nor does he propose to be as honest as Alexander Hamilton was in 1792, nor as old General Jackson was in 1834, when they studiously investigated the question for the purpose of determining how much each dollar should contain, in order that they might be as nearly equal in value as possible. He does not propose to make the dollar 32 to 1, but under conditions utterly different, after all the great commercial nations of the earth have discarded it, and when silver is worth just one-half what it was then, he proposes that the Government shall put silver back where it was in 1873. Talk about the dishonesty of bull and bear movements in the New York Stock Exchange. Never in the history of the world was there such a gigantic scheme as this bill proposes, nor was there ever so little reason or justification of hope for success as in this one. The chivalrous feats of Vanderbilt and Gould pale before it in magnitude and rashness. There is $4,070,500,000 silver money in the world, and they propose to enter upon a bull movement to make it worth $8,141,000,000. Nay, more, to double the value of all the silver in the world, about $8,000,000,000, making it worth $16,000,000,000, a slight gain of 8,000,000,000 dollars. It takes a silverized fancy to even dream of such a transformation.

I have wondered whether the silver advocates, who all admit that we would certainly go to a silver basis, have counted the cost of this measure.

Have they paused to contemplate that we are dealing with deposits in loan and trust companies amounting to $471,298,816, worth their face in gold; that we are dealing with commercial money of all the farmers and merchants in the United States now deposited in the national and State banks, amounting to $2,359,761,015, now worth their face in gold; that we are dealing with the savings of the great masses of our people now deposited in the savings banks of this country, amounting to $1,747,961,280, all worth their face in gold; that we are dealing with life-insurance policies belonging to the people, amounting to more than $1,200,000,000, all worth their face in gold; that we are dealing with the entire product of the labor of the American people, representing in concrete form the result of their daily toil, every year worth more than $12,000,000,000 in gold; that we are dealing with every dollar of property in the United States, from the little home of the prudent mechanic to the vast railroad interest that ties the Atlantic to the Pacific with its thongs of steel, amounting in gold value to more than $65,000,000,000; that we are dealing with vast exchanges of our commerce, involving every transaction, from the wages of a day laborer to the bank settlements between financial institutions of our great clearing-house centers, which amounted in gold value in 1892 to $60,883,572,438?

Take this step of 16 to 1 and we can not escape a most disastrous shrinkage in our circulating medium, as all must admit after a careful investigation.

The amount of money in circulation February 6, 1896, and the respective kinds were as follows:

Gold.	
Coin	$499,262,686
Certificates	49,847,849
Total	549,110,535
Silver.	
Dollars	56,629,678
Subsidiary	64,387,335
Certificates	331,614,339
Treasury notes	110,221,183
Total	562,852,335
Paper money.	
Greenbacks	245,745,840
Current certificates	28,925,000
United States national-bank notes	203,086,897
Total	477,757,737

or a total of $1,589,719,607 in the hands of the people and in the banks of the country.

Pass this law at the behest of the men who are claiming to try to give the people more money, and what will happen? Gold to the amount of $549,109,535 will cease to circulate as money, and we will then have among our people and in the banks, as money to do our commercial work with, but $1,040,610,072, silver and paper. Again, if this bull movement should fail to raise the price of the silver dollar above 50 cents, where it now is and where it is in Mexico and all over the world in silver-standard countries, the commercial value or working power of your $562,852,335 of silver money would be cut in two or reduced one-half, and your silver money with doubled prices would only be equal in power to effect exchanges of property to one-half what it is to-day, or $281,426,167.50. So that you can add the other half, or $281,426,167.50, to the gold already withdrawn, making a total shrinkage of $830,535,702.50. But this is not all. Your paper money has also gone to a silver basis and you must cut that in two, leaving you $238,878,868.50 of working power as compared with that money to-day, for it is equal to gold and doing the work of gold in the commerce of the country. Add, then, if you please, this shrinkage to that already suffered, and you have a total shrinkage in the working power of the money now circulating of $1,069,414,560, or two-thirds of all the working power of the money in circulation to-day has been dissipated by this mad struggle for money you do not need.

But we are promptly informed by the silver advocates that they propose to fill this awful gap, this frightful vacuum, with silver.

Silver from where? And how? And when? At the present value of silver it would take the United States alone, at the present rate of production, fifteen years to supply the economic or purchasing power we now have in our money; and yet we have too little to suit these same advocates. But suppose you could gather it from the four corners of the earth, what could you do with it? The bill which has come here from the Senate only provides that you may issue certificates after the silver is coined. Has it ever occurred to any one of these gentlemen advocating this measure to ask the Director of the Mint how much we can coin each year? I hold a letter in my hand signed by Mr. Preston, the Director of the Mint, which reads as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1896.

SIR: In reply to your letter of current date, I estimate the capacity of the mints for coining silver dollars at about $40,000,000 per annum, which, by working overtime, would admit of the necessary gold and subsidiary silver coinage being executed.

Respectfully, yours, R. E. PRESTON.

Hon. CHARLES N. FOWLER,
House of Representatives.

From this it is clear that while it would take the United States fifteen years to produce enough silver at present values to fill the bottomless pit, it would take the United States mints, run at their full capacity, twenty-five years to turn it out even if they had it. Oh, but, as one of the silver advocates said to me the other night, "We will have to issue paper money, and then in the course of time redeem it." What a picture this is to contemplate. Surprised at the possibility of such a condition of things, the ever fertile, imaginative, theoretical advocate of free and unlimited coinage protests that silver would rise. Rise! How do you know it would rise? If at all, how much will it rise? Will you stake your own fortune upon your guess when every man around you sets a different figure to which it may rise? No, gentlemen, we have no right to speculate and gamble with sixty thousand millions of property, which ought to have and would have been seventy thousand millions but for the maladministration of the Government during the past three years. Like prudent men let us figure all the chances against us in a matter of such moment, for the imagination in its dizziest flights can not paint the havoc and ruin that this step in the dark will bring to every home, rich and poor alike.

Now, as has been pointed out, there is a true and actual bimetallism, a bimetallism wherein the stronger, most valuable, and most invariable metal carries a margin of credit in the less valuable metal. Such is the system existing in this country and France to-day. One of the gentlemen discussing this question said that he would be satisfied if we had such bimetallism as they had in France, and therefore was in favor of this Senate measure and its operation until the amount of silver coined in this country should be equal to the amount now in use in France. He evidently thought this could be done by issuing silver without reference to the necessary protection of a gold reserve to insure true bimetallism. The gentleman seems to forget that the Bank of France holds over $404,700,000 of gold and only $250,160,000 of silver, and has but one hundred millions of uncovered paper money. If the proposition of this gentleman was comprehensive in itself and provided for the requisite reserve, we might possibly coin more silver.

Indeed, I am of the opinion that if the United States Government had begun in 1879 and added to the gold reserve one-third of the amount of the depreciation of the silver dollars as fast as the depreciation became evident, and after the passage of the Sherman Act in 1891 had added the same proportion of gold for the protection of these outstanding demand obligations, as we already had for the protection of greenbacks, we might have been coining silver to-day. That is to say, if the United States Government had a gold reserve to-day, or should have gradually accumulated a reserve as its demand obligations increased, amounting in 1893 to about $300,000,000, no question would have been raised with regard to the credit of the country, and the banks would have continued to furnish the gold for export, and there would have been no sale of bonds except the $133,000,000 to cover the deficit and pay the current expenses of the Government. The two hundred and seventy-five millions of gold that has gone into the Treasury has not been to protect the gold, but to protect the credit and replace the gold that had been there to protect the credit.

The second proposition is that we must have more redemption money. But does the country need more redemption money? There is more money in this country to-day than is in use or necessary to transact its present business. Gentlemen upon this floor and many people in different parts of the country mistake their want of more wealth-bringing income for a want of more money. I do not mean to say that under present conditions, when doubts hang thick and black over every enterprise because there is no adequate protection to American labor and American capital, anyone will take a venture in business nor that property can be sold for what it would reasonably be worth in prosperous times. But that is not a misfortune of the money condition as to quantity, but as to quality and the lack of confidence. If the United States should offer to and does refund all her obligations, making them payable in gold, this protracted agony would soon be over.

There is no doubt that our monetary system lacks facility and elasticity, and that we ought to have a system that is more particularly adapted to our conditions than the present one seems to be. We should have a system that, while the values are measured in gold, would incorporate the use of as large an amount of silver as business requires and credit would permit, and also a circulation based upon the property of the country, issued where and when needed to handle and remove the crops in the various localities—the cotton in the South, the wheat in the Northwest, the cattle, hogs, and varied products of the West and Southwest. The circulation should expand and contract as the circumstances require, every dollar of our money as good as every other dollar, and our best dollar as good as the best dollar in the world, and the credit of our nation higher than that of any other nation in the world.

It has been urged here upon this floor by certain gentlemen, and this seems to be a stock argument of the silver advocates, that the amount of standard money determines the price. If this were true in France, with her $34.39 per capita metal money, wages and the cost of living would be higher than in Great Britain, with only $17.06 per capita, but as a matter of fact they are lower, and in the United States, with her $18.17 per capita metal money, our wages in gold are 100 per cent more or double what they are in France and living under the same conditions, but slightly higher, possibly 25 per cent. The following table, showing the weekly wages and cost of living in the respective countries, is taken from Mulhall, the great English statistician:

	Mexico.	France.	England.	United States.
Wages	No record.	$5.25	$7.75	$12.00
Living	No record.	3.00	3.50	4.00
Net profit		2.25	4.25	8.00

It is further clearly established that the money in circulation has nothing to do with the price of articles or the wages of a country by the fact that from 1860 down to this hour there never has been a time when the per capita circulation of this country was much, if any, greater than it is now, and at one time it was as low as $10, and yet at no time during this whole period have prices been as low as they are to-day. The great advantages our people have over the laboring masses of Great Britain and France will enable everyone to discover how fallacious this claim is when the following figures are considered. We must not forget, in this connection, that the eternal song of the silver knight is that free coinage gives a larger per capita circulation. It will be observed that Mexico with but $4.71 is the only free-coinage country included in this table and has but $1 to England's $4; $1 to the United States $5.50, and $1 to France's $8, the very reverse of what is claimed:

	Mexico.	France.	England.	United States.
Gold	*$0.41	$21.54	$14.18	$9.09
Silver	4.1⅛	12.85	2.88	9.08
Paper	.17	2.31	2.92	6.90
Total	4.71	36.70	19.98	25.07

* Estimated.

The gentleman from California, my friend Mr. JOHNSON, cried out in his anguish yesterday:

Why don't you do something for silver?

It was an appeal that might be made to any one of us as men to help a beggar, but we are not here to help either cotton, or corn, or wheat, or silver, or any other interest, unless in helping the United States they happen to be favorably affected.

To ask this House to take even the silver of the United States, to say nothing of that of the world, which is worth but 50 cents on the dollar, and make it worth 100 cents simply for the sake of doing something for silver, is no more reasonable than to ask the United States to buy all the cotton up at 6 cents per pound and compel the people to take it at 12 because it was 12 in 1873; no more reasonable than to compel the United States, by legislation, to buy up all the wheat at 50 cents per bushel and sell it to the people at $1 per bushel because it was $1 a bushel in 1873; no more reasonable than to compel the United States to buy up all the horses and mules at $50 a head and force the people to purchase them at $100 per head because horseflesh was worth that price before the day of bicycles, cable cars, and electricity. Our duty is to the people, the whole people, and not to some one lo-

cality or some one interest, especially when such interest is so insignificant as silver compared with the other vast interests of our country.

Our annual silver product is worth but one-half of 1 per cent of all our other products; is equal to but 16 per cent of our wheat, 21 per cent of our cotton, 6 per cent of our corn, 5 per cent of our pork and beef.

We are not here to check inventions, paralyze improvements, and stop the progress of civilization.

Gold is the natural selection of modern commerce and only another illustration of that great natural law, "the survival of the fittest," and no legislation can change its ultimate place as the standard money of the world and the measure by which all values shall be determined.

We want as good money as any nation in the world. We want that of the highest standard and of the best quality; for we are the first nation in the world and must be up to date in the progress of the world. We want a basis of exchange that will leave no opportunity for bankers to squeeze the merchants out of 5 per cent on the pretense of doubtful money, or the cost of converting it into exchange. We want a basis that will leave no opportunity for merchants to squeeze 20 or 25 per cent out of laboring men under the same pretense. We want a money so good that not one millionth part of a cent can be deducted from the wages of the laborer because of a doubt of its goodness.

It has been established beyond question that poor or fluctuating money has always resulted in great profit to the banker and a corresponding loss to the people, and the nearer you get to the laboring classes and the lower every form of labor the greater is the loss to the laborer.

When gold payments were suspended by France in the years 1871, 1872, and 1873 the dividends of the Bank of France were 20 per cent for the second half of 1871, 32 per cent for 1872, and 35 per cent for 1873, proving again the fact that had been established times without number that all of the loss growing out of poor money, or any money poorer than the best, is always borne by the people. During that long period of suspension of specie payments from 1797 to 1821 by the Bank of England it was but dividends and bonuses taken out of the trades people and laboring classes of Great Britain.

Mr. Edward Atkinson, our most subtle and profound writer on economics, says that the cost of the suspension of specie payments in the United States in 1862, and the use of greenbacks up to the time of resumption in 1879, cost the great mass of the people an incalculable amount, although bankers thrived as never before or since in this country.

Every imaginable doubt arising along the line of the development of the untouched raw material to the most elaborate productions are capitalized by the merchant and banker and deducted from the wages of the toilers, and this is necessarily so, because any other course would lead to certain ruin and a still greater calamity to the laborers themselves. Bad and doubtful money would furnish more opportunity and occasion for such deductions than any other one cause, and therefore no member of society is so deeply interested in the absolutely safe and invariable dollar as the day laborer.

Again, as I understand the silver advocates upon this floor, the reason they urge above all others is that they want to increase prices and stimulate trade.

That being so, the one Englishman to whom you refer and upon whom you rely for popular and political support, A. J. Balfour, is utterly at variance with you. In his Mansion House speech, now so famous, delivered August 3, 1893, he used this language:

> I have heard it stated by those who object to the views which I shall venture to defend before you to-day that all persons who advocate a double standard are desirous of inflating the currency, and thereby of artificially raising prices. Now, I am not concerned to deny that possibly in the Western States of America there may be a body of opinion of some importance on which this criticism might truly be passed. I speak with no authority on this point, and I may be quite wrong, but from such literature as I have been able to peruse, I think it possible that the inconvertible currency which at one time existed in America has left behind it in the West certain traditions and sympathies in favor of what I believe they call "soft money," which are open to the objection that those who hold them really desire not to keep the standard of values stable, but to lower it in favor of the debtor as against the creditor. But whether this be or be not true of America, I most emphatically assert that it is not true of any body of opinion in this country. Nobody I know of, no responsible person whom I have ever met or ever heard of, desires artificially to inflate the currency with the view of stimulating trade, or relieving debtors, or of robbing creditors.

Do you say prices should increase? Prices of what? There is but one thing that should increase in price in this country and all over the world, and that is labor. I have a hope that labor will never get less, but always be getting more and more, until the perfect equation is found and reached between labor and capital. On the other hand, I hope that everything that the average American needs to eat or wear, or use for his comfort, and the house in which he lives, or ought to live, shall grow cheaper and cheaper, so long as it does not come out of labor to the extent of a farthing, until the great mass of the people of this country can enjoy their existence as human beings ought to in the twentieth century in this great Republic of ours. We want cheaper and cheaper necessaries of life, but higher and higher wages and earnings for the farmers, mechanics, and every other conceivable producer in the land.

The gentleman from Arkansas thought the other day that he was making an argument when he informed the House that out of 1,600,000,000 people in the world two-thirds of them used silver alone. I presume he would have spoken as much of the truth if he had said one-third of them did not use any money at all that was recognized by any of the civilized nations, even the silver-using people.

Considering the low state of civilization in much of the world and the absence of similar conditions in different parts of the world, it would have been just as pertinent for him to have remarked that of human beings, cattle, and horses in the United States two-thirds of them eat hay, and therefore we should all eat hay. It is apparent that the statement means absolutely nothing unless regard be had for the conditions in which human beings live. The truth is that from a state of barter to the use of some kind of metal—to the use of gold and silver—civilization has moved us along to the use of gold as a basis of value and an almost incalculable amount of business purely upon credit. There has been a gradual, constant, invariable movement in this direction on the part of the different nations of the earth, just in proportion as they have become civilized and have participated and become factors in the commercial world.

This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the one nation, Great Britain, whose commerce reaches into every bay and crosses every lake, and covers every sea around the entire globe, and whose capital and commercial center is the commercial center of the entire world, does not recognize silver in the slightest degree, except as subsidiary coin. Germany, too, as soon as she became a great power, feeling the necessity of adopting the same standard if she would participate in the commerce of the world successfully, saw that she must have that standard that the laws of international trade had inexorably demanded. France, too, claimed by some to sustain a higher civilization than any other country in the world, was driven to the same standard to escape being entirely eliminated from the commerce of the world. And so it will be with each succeeding nation as it comes to take an active part in the interchange of products, for they will learn by sad experience, if the people are civilized like our own and not peons, the frightful expense of doing business on a different basis is borne by them alone. Then, are we to disregard all that has been achieved in the world in this particular line of development when we discover all the more civilized nations have adopted gold as a standard? Does the ambitious young man who enters business emulate the methods and habits of that man in the community who possesses the least degree of intelligence and wrestles with necessity and grovels in poverty, or does he not rather emulate and imitate the most skilled mechanic, the most thriving merchant, the most successful banker?

It is admitted as a fact by all parties that the nations that have a silver standard sustain the lowest forms of civilization, and that there are distinctly two classes—the wealthy, or nabobs, and the miserable peons, constituting the great mass of the people.

It is also a fact that all of the civilized nations of the earth are gold-standard countries, and while there are some countries that are not in the higher plane of civilization, those exceptions only prove the rule and show that wherever the light of civilization is breaking, there just as certainly you find a tendency to the gold standard.

It should be observed in this connection that in the two most distinctively gold-standard countries, the United States and Great Britain, wages and farm products are higher than anywhere else in the world, while in the distinctively silver-using countries—Mexico, China, and Japan—farm products are lower and labor cheaper than anywhere else in the world.

Finally, our friends affect great alarm at what may happen in the so-called scramble for gold, and warn us that there is not gold enough to do what the commercial world is actually doing, and point to our financial gyrations and contortions as if that proved anything. Does England experience any difficulty? Does Germany experience any difficulty? Does France experience any difficulty? No. Nor would we if we placed ourselves in an unequivocal position of good faith and honesty in black and white, instead of trying to maintain a position that will enable us at some time in the future to both lie and steal. For that disgraceful, but apparently to us, as a government, inestimable privilege, we have paid during the past eighteen months about $200,000,000, and lost through the withdrawal of confidence and capital probably ten times that amount, and possibly fifty times. God only knows what stagnation and destruction we have suffered because we have not simply said as a nation, We are and are going to be absolutely honest and keep good faith with all the world, and acted accord-

Pages 1627 to 1630 missing

ingly. Can we afford to make the promise in the midst of the supposed scramble? There is no scramble, and we can always afford to be honest; we can not afford to be anything else.

But what about the supply of gold? All the leading nations of Europe, England, France, and Germany have had no difficulty in keeping all they needed or wanted. Russia, in the meantime, has increased her accumulation of $119,000,000 in 1872 to $175,000,000 in 1887; to $301,000,000 in 1894, and now holds $400,000,000 ready to plant herself upon the gold standard.

The accumulation in our own country is equally significant. To the $213,199,977 we held in 1878 we added enough to make it $443,342,011 in 1881, and June 30, 1895, held $636,229,825. Now, what of the future? Let the most distinguished French political economist of to-day, Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, tell us. In the Forum, December, 1895, page 397, he says:

The hesitation shown by so rich a country as the United States to adopt the single gold standard and reduce silver to the rank of subordinate or subsidiary coin is most surprising to Europeans. * * *

The lamentations of MM. Cernuschi and Laveleye, and numerous others less known, did, however, make some impressions upon numerous people. Certain statisticians admitted—erroneously, I think—an appreciation of gold, and in part attributed to it the fall in prices. Even Mr. Giffen, the zealous statistician of the British Board of Trade, adopted this opinion to a certain extent. To-day it has lost all value. The event confirming my predictions, which, however, were easily framed, has shown that the colonization of little-explored countries leads to the discovery of very productive gold mines. Since 1888 the production of gold has advanced considerably. In 1894 it exceeded 800,000,000 francs ($160,000,000), in place of the average product of 500,000,000 francs ($100,000,000) from 1881 to 1883. This production leaves far behind the average of the great auriferous period of 1850 to 1870. A new age of gold is opening, which will strikingly eclipse that which followed the Californian and Australian discoveries in 1850.

The production of gold is increasing in all countries—in the United States, Australia, and Russia; and it tends to become prodigious in South Africa. An able English banker of high repute, Sir Edgar Vincent, returned a few weeks since from the Transvaal and gave it as his opinion that that country contained 25,000,000,000 francs ($5,000,000,000) in gold, to be extracted in twenty years. In 1895 the product of the Transvaal alone will probably reach 250,000,000 francs ($50,000,000), and will probably reach 500,000,000 francs ($100,000,000) in four or five years, if not sooner. In a few years South Africa will produce as much gold as was produced in the entire world in 1883 or 1884. In the meanwhile the old auriferous countries, very far from being exhausted, are augmenting their production and reveal new deposits to prospectors. It is probable that Siberia will in its turn come upon the scene as a great gold-bearing country, when the transsiberian railway shall have been completed, as it will be in a few years.

If we reflect that from 1492 (the year of the discovery of America) to 1893, four centuries, the production of gold, according to the most trustworthy statistics, was only 43,000,000,000 francs ($8,600,000,000), and that the Transvaal alone is presumed to be capable of producing in twenty years 25,000,000,000 francs ($5,000,000,000), we shall understand how little question there can be—by the end of this century or the first quarter of the next, at the farthest—of the scarcity of gold, of the scramble for gold, of the appreciation of gold, and all the other formula that swarmed as scarecrows through the writings of the bimetallists from 1880 to about 1890. The situation is completely reversed. Within two or three years the world will yield more than 1,000,000,000 francs in gold, probably even 1,200,000,000 francs ($200,000,000 to $240,000,000) annually, and this will continue for twenty-five or thirty years, if not for fifty or more.

At the present time the total quantity of gold used in the entire world as money amounts to only $4,086,800,000. If the present annual output of gold, now exceeding $200,000,000, continues for the next twenty years, we will more than produce the amount now used as money. And in the next forty years, upon the same average, the world will produce more gold than it did from 1492 to 1893, a period of four hundred years.

This vast annual product of gold, now overleaping the two-hundred-million mark and reaching up to $300,000,000 per annum, is but the counterpart of that revolution in the relations of the great commercial nations of the earth, and the evolution in production and the distribution of all those things that man now consumes.

The last, the remotest, possible doubt with regard to the basis of value must now be removed, for the entire world is fast coming to be but one single neighborhood, the greater portion of it, commercially speaking, being more conveniently located than were New York, Boston, and Philadelphia fifty years ago. The merchant of New York, Chicago, or San Francisco within the business hours of a single day buys and sells goods in London, Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg, Constantinople, and the Orient.

The annual exports of domestic products of the United States, Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France amount to $4,000,000,000, and possibly every dollar of it is by balancing credits, and the margin of profits narrow, especially if the measure of value is certain and stable.

Mr. Edward Atkinson has made the following estimate of the productions of the various countries:

United States: Population approximately 70,000,000—producing within its own area an excess of food, fuel, timber, ores, and fibers—annual product computed at $225 per head	$15,750,000,000
Great Britain and Ireland: Population approximately 40,000,000—deficient within its own area in food, ores, and fibers—annual product computed at $170 per head	6,800,000,000
	22,550,000,000
Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands: Population approximately 64,000,000—food barely adequate, often deficient; also deficient in fuel, timber, and fibers—annual product computed at $125 per head	8,000,000,000
France: Population approximately 40,000,000—deficient in fuel, ores, and fibers; rich in agriculture—annual product computed at $150 per head	6,000,000,000
Total production, in round figures	36,550,000,000
These are approximate estimates only, which may serve to give a slight comprehension of the problem.	
Let it be assumed that one-fourth of this product is consumed where it is produced, without purchase or sale, and therefore without the use of money, say	9,550,000,000
Remainder	27,000,000,000

He significantly remarks that without doubt "in the transformation of the ores into mechanism and tools, of the timber into buildings, furniture, etc., of the grain into bread, dairy products, and meats, and of the fibers into clothing, not less than three times this vast sum of $27,000,000,000, or the incomprehensible amount of $71,000,000,000" of property has passed from man to man. Now, the one thing above all others combined that will insure to labor its full share is an invariable and unquestioned basis of value. Throw into this vast transaction the doubt of 10 per cent and the producers will be deprived of $4,100,000,000, which will be distributed among the middlemen, merchants, and bankers.

The advance in electricity, the telephone, and all material things has been no more phenomenal than the new order of things in the world of commerce. Shall we banish steam, electricity, and the telephone, returning to the primitive sailing vessels, stagecoaches, tram cars, and the horseback postmen; or shall we sweep on into the twentieth century holding fast to all we have gained and confident that the achievements of the coming century have hardly been foreshadowed in the nineteenth?

Our progress will certainly be along material lines conserving the comfort and welfare of mankind. All the peoples of the earth will be in daily conversation with each other by means of the telegraph and telephone.

Then "we may well deepen our harbors and widen their channels," and we may well remove every doubt hanging over our exchanges, so that "the ships that pass between this land and that shall be like the shuttle of the loom weaving the web of concord among the nations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived, the House, under the order, will take a recess until to-morrow at 10.30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for the completion of the coaling shed at the naval station, Key West, Fla.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for clerical force—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Public Printer submitting an estimate for printing Part II of the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5549) to prevent discontinuance of pensions, to restore pensions discontinued, to establish uniform rates of pensions, to facilitate the allowance of pensions in matters of proof, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 316); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred House bill No. 4800, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California, accompanied by a report (No. 317); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRODERICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred House bill No. 4441, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5820) to create a second division of the southern district of California for judicial purposes, and to fix the time for holding court therein, accompanied by a report (No. 318); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 319); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5633) to incorporate the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Indian Territory, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 320); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NOONAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 321); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims:

The bill (H. R. 354) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope. (Report No. 313.)

The bill (H. R. 4618) for the relief of owners or legal representatives of canal boats *Swan* and *Lewis and Butler*. (Report No. 314).

By Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of Frederick Van Guilder. (Report No. 315.)

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 4088) for the relief of the heirs of Matthew J. J. Cagle. (Report No. 322.)

By Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Patents: The bill (H. R. 1807) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company. (Report No. 323.)

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. AVERY, from the Committee on War Claims, submitted adverse reports on the following bills and petition; and the same were laid on the table:

The bill (H. R. 3710) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., and Henry C. Thomas. (Report No. 307.)

The petition of Isaac S. Myers. (Report No. 308.)

The bills (H. R. 5118 and 5119) for the relief of the estate of Fayette Hungerford, deceased. (Report No. 309.)

The bill (H. R. 557) for relief of loyal citizens therein named, of Loudoun County, Va. (Report No. 310.)

The bill (H. R. 3976) for the relief of James Lindsay. (Report No. 311.)

The bill (H. R. 1366) for the relief of Mrs. Laura J. Bemiss. (Report No. 312.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5818) to appropriate a sum of money to the Mount Vernon Avenue Association as assignee of the State of Virginia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5821) to extend the jurisdiction and powers of the Comptroller of the Currency within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 5822) to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 5823) to provide for the distribution of the official edition of the United States circuit courts of appeals reports—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 5824) to provide for the building and furnishing of a sanitorium for diseased volunteer soldiers at Hot Springs, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5825) to provide for the completion of the improvements of Rough River, Kentucky, authorized and begun under acts of Congress of September 19, 1890, July 13, 1892, and August 17, 1894—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5826) explanatory of an act entitled "An act to settle certain accounts between the United States and the State of Mississippi and other States, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5827) for the relief of the Indian Sabine soldiers of 1836—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 5828) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers," etc., approved March 2, 1893—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 5829) for the relief of the Muskogee or Creek Nation of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 5830) to amend the civil-service laws relating to probationary appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 5831) to maintain the honor of the United States with foreign Governments, defining certain offenses and increasing the jurisdistion of the Federal courts in certain cases, and defining the practice in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 5832) for the purchase of the statue of Salmon P. Chase, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5833) providing for the erection of a rostrum on the grounds belonging to the United States Government in the national cemetery at Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5834) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue breech-loading guns to the First Battalion of Artillery of the State of Minnesota in exchange for other guns—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5835) to reorganize the line of the Army, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5836) to establish engineering experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and acts supplementary thereto—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 5837) fixing the rate of duty on asphaltum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5838) extending the time wherein the Des Moines Rapids Power Company shall begin work one year—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5839) to regulate the pay of printers in the Navy and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5840) to regulate the pay of printers in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 5841) to amend section 5 of the act for the relief of certain appointed and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion, approved August 14, 1888—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5905) to amend the act authorizing the Washington and Marlboro Electric Railway Company to extend its lines into and within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 5906) to provide for the extension of letters patent for an "improvement in insulating submarine cables"—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) to carry out section 61 of the act of Congress of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 5908) to refund internal-revenue taxes paid by owners of private dies—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SKINNER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 111) to provide for the commemoration of the landing of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, in 1584—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 19) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to have printed reports, correspondence, charts, etc., relating to fur seal, salmon fisheries, etc.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 20) to authorize the printing of Bureau of Education catalogue of the American Library Association library—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (House Res. No. 163) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives to appoint a superintendent of the ladies' reception room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HITT: A resolution (House Res. No. 164) to print report of Anson Mills, United States Army, dated October 10, 1889, in regard to an international dam and reservoir on the Rio Grande del Norte—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OTEY: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Virginia for the construction of a bridge from Washington City, in the District of Columbia, across the Potomac River to the Arlington Reservation, in Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5842) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate J. Krepps, West Brownsville, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5843) granting pension to James M. Grisham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5844) for relief of David E. Haller, Company D, Third Regiment Guard Mount Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Dennis Tyron, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5846) granting an increase of pension to First-class Pilot Capt. James M. Herrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 5847) to increase pension of William Cleveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) for the relief of Charles Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5849) for the relief of Harmon Conley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 5850) for the relief of Ellis W. Joy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5851) to increase the pension of Edward O. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5852) to increase the pension of Josiah P. Bradbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 5853) granting a pension to Arminda Stucker, of Gallatin, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting a pension to John Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 5855) granting a pension to Emily Elliot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 5856) granting a pension to Michael O'Neill, of Manchester, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 5857) to increase the pension of Caroline V. English—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5858) for the relief of Joseph A. Brown, of Anderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 5859) to pay Laurena Opp, sole and only heir at law of Reuben Opp, for property taken and destroyed from the said Reuben Opp by the Federal troops at Helena, Ark., during the war of 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 5860) granting a pension to Harriet R. Matlack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5861) for the relief of John W. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) for the relief of Mary Elkin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) for the relief of James D. Bastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) for the relief of Mary E. Herd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) for the benefit of Mrs. Elizabeth Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5866) for the relief of William R. Ballard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5867) for the relief of Green B. Woodcock, administrator, etc., of William R. Boice, deceased, late a citizen of Boyle County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5868) granting a pension to Mrs. Bettie Wolford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5869) for the benefit of the Nicholasville Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of the heirs of Richard M. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5871) for the relief of the heirs of John P. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) for the relief of the administrator of John Engleman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) for the relief of George Trapnall, of Harrodsburg, Ky., his heirs or assigns—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5874) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Jacob H. Russell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5875) for the relief of E. J. Schackelford—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5876) for the relief of A. B. Ackerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5877) for the relief of Joseph C. Boxley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) for the relief of the heirs of Silas Burke, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5879) for the relief of Mrs. Albertine Schoenecker, widow of the late Capt. John W. Schoenecker, Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5880) granting an increase of pension to Greenville Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) for the relief of Bath County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

My Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5882) granting an additional pension to Oscar F. Hulser, late lieutenant-colonel Second New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5883) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of William A. Fuller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5884) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ingham, late an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5885) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Mason W. Presley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 5886) for the purpose of placing on the pension roll the name of Ellen E. Bloom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 5887) to pension Jason C. Chastain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5888) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Denman Rathbun—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting an increase of pension to Russell L. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 5890) for the relief of John F. Anderson and Cary C. Barr—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5891) to increase the pension of Charles O'Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) to pension Thomas E. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) for the relief of Ephraim B. Maple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) to pension Hannah Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5895) granting a pension to Anna M. Kendall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5896) to pension Henry A. Cook, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5897) granting a pension to Maria L. Philbrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 5898) granting a pension to Amanda M. Way, as army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5899) for the relief of Mary McGlone, mother of Henry W. McGlone, deceased, private in Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Thomas K. Ball, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5901) for the relief of William F. Evans, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 5902) granting a pension to Jane Christian Marge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5903) granting a pension to Mary A. Claffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5814) granting a pension to Cassie A. Davis, widow of James P. Davis and mother of Mary T. Davis, an invalid daughter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5904) directing the Quartermaster-General to settle with the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad Company, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of citizens of Cleburne, Tex., for the relief of certain book agents—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 98 citizens of Coal Center, Washington County, Pa., praying for the free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions adopted by Post No. 2, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill No. 306, providing for the pensioning of soldiers and sailors who were confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John A. Dage and 15 other members of Taylor Post, No. 628, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. B. Laughrey and 57 other citizens of Fayette County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of Post No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, in favor of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Maryland: Petition of numerous citizens of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of South Broadway Merchants' Association, Charles H. Thuner, president, and merchants and citizens of South St. Louis, for the erection of the third bridge at South St. Louis—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petition of Harlemville (N. Y.) citizens, favoring the Sunday-observance bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brunswick, N. Y., relative to the sale of intoxicants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition and affidavit of Margaret Durosit, of Barry County, Mo., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: Petition of citizens of Maryland, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 735—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa (by request): Petition of Le Grand Byington and other citizens of the State of Iowa, asking the House of Representatives to prefer articles of impeachment against certain Government officials—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Iuka Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellevue, Iowa, in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 80 citizens of Shenandoah, Iowa, in favor of House bill No. 2294—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of C. F. Kenniston and 57 others, asking for a survey of Boothbay Harbor, Me.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Bay State Agricultural Society, against the free distribution of seeds by the Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Association of Inventors and Manufacturers, for the registration of trade-marks, etc.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Franklin Post, No. 60, Grand Army of the Republic, for the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: Five petitions of numerous citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the city council of Eugene, Oreg., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oreg., asking for the better protection of the fishing interests in the Northwest—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Rev. Charles O. Jones and many others, praying for the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Petition of the Presbytery of Westchester, New York City, urging immediate measures to protect American citizens in Turkey and the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting at Yonkers, N. Y., urging action to prevent the outrages upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of citizens of Abbeville, Ala., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS: Petition of F. F. Parker and 154 citizens of Huron, Erie County, Ohio; J. L. Carrick and 53 others, of Melmore, Seneca County, Ohio; Leonard L. Sutton and 52 others, of Attica, Siam, and Scipio, Seneca County, Ohio; W. A. Daugherty and 140 others, of Bucyrus, Ohio, in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HICKS: Protest of citizens of Everett, Pa., against the sectarian appropriations of the Indian appropriation bill and others; also, a petition urging the passage of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States (H. Res. 11)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of Woman's Christian unions of the State of New York, asking the prohibition of the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of the Ministerial Association of Des Moines, Iowa, asking that the age of consent be raised to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Ministerial Association of Mansfield, Ohio, (1) to raise the age of consent, (2) to repeal the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma, (3) to enact a Sabbath law for the national capital, (4) to enforce compulsory education and suppress child labor in the District of Columbia, (5) to establish arbitration of railway strikes, and (6) to provide for a commission to investigate the labor problem—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESTER: Memorial of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, asking for an amendment to an act of November, 1893, relating to the navigation of vessels, known as the Harter Act—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition against the passage of the Sunday-observance bill, signed by Henry L. Davis and 34 other citizens of Shiloh, N. J.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Bay State Agricultural Society of Massachusetts, opposing the free distribution of seeds by the Government—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Preamble and resolution adopted by citizens of Garden City, Minn., relative to the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE: Memorial of the Ministerial Association of Wooster, Ohio, praying for the passage of a law to raise the age of consent to 18 in the whole jurisdiction of the National Government, to repeal the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of Ford McKinney and 46 other citizens, of Lincoln County, Okla., protesting against Statehood unless the Indian Territory is incorporated as a part of the State—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany the claim of William G. Edwards, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of citizens of England, Lonoke County, Ark., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of J. L. Hull and others, of Booty, Ark., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ODELL: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Grahamsville, Spring Valley, New City, Bloomingburg, Nyack, Piermont, and Hurleyville, N. Y., praying that the sale of beer and liquors be forbidden at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., asking that the harbor of refuge at said city be completed—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PARKER: Petition of Frank H. Snell and 185 citizens of Newark, N. J., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions in the State of New York, against the sale of intoxicating liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5349, to correct the military record of John Lavigne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIGG: Petitions of American seamen, protesting against repeal of the act of February 18, 1895, relating to shipment on merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAY: Petitions of officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Coventryville, Newark Valley, and Freeville, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of citizens of Burnet, Tex., favoring legislation for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPALDING (by request): Petition of G. F. Bell, Frank D. Smith, William Washington, and 116 other citizens of Adrian, Mich.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of citizens of South Bethlehem, N. Y., relative to the sale of intoxicating liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of A. L. Darling Post, No. 187, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brownsville, Houston County, Minn., praying for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of P. D. Inman, of Grinnell, Iowa, for further relief of ex-soldiers who have lost limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Batavia, Darien, Scottsburg, and Niagara Falls, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petitions of Rev. James C. Morris and 37 others, and Samuel W. Meek and 32 others, all of Nashville, Tenn., asking for the passage of the bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of James M. Dunn, of Chatham County, Tenn., asking reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1893—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 12, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution of January 23, 1896, calling for information as to what use, if any, was made by the Government of the plans and patents of Zebulum Parker in the construction of the canal around the Des Moines Rapids, Iowa, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers on the subject, dated the 7th instant; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an agreement made and concluded October 9, 1895, with the Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, in Montana, by William C. Pollock, George Bird Grinnell, and Walter M. Clements, commissioners appointed under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1895; also the report of the commission, the proceedings of councils held with the Indians, the report of Walter H. Weed, the geologist, on the mineral resources of the lands ceded, together with the draft of a bill prepared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of the General Land Office to ratify the said agreement, as shown by their accompanying letters; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an agreement made and concluded September 26, 1895, with the Indians of the Blackfeet Reservation, in Montana, by William C. Pollock, George Bird Grinnell, and Walter M. Clements, commissioners, appointed under the provisions contained in the Indian appropriation act of March 2, 1895; also the report of the commission, the proceedings of the councils had with the Indians, together with the draft of a bill to ratify the agreement prepared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of the General Land Office; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the American Academy of Medicine, praying for the enactment of legislation conferring upon the medical officers of the Navy the same status, pay, and emoluments as are now accorded to the medical officers of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of F. H. Smith and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., and the petition of Thomas B. Maloney and sundry other citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Mrs. A. C. Dunham, president, and Mary F. Davis, secretary, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ocean Grove, N. J.; the petition of Lydia Frick and Frances Holmes, officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dennisville, N. J., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Madison, N. J., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of James J. Nichols and 111 other citizens of Newark, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I present a memorial of the East Washington Citizens' Association, relative to the reclamation of the flats and the improvement of the channel of the Anacostia River. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS presented a memorial of sundry vessel owners and practical sailors of St. Clair, Mich., remonstrating against the construction of a bridge over the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of D. H. McFrederick and 84 other citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., and the petition of H. J. Connor and 65 other citizens of Orangeville, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLARK presented a petition of William Nelson Post, No. 97, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, of Douglas, Wyo., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the St. Louis Paint, Oil, and Drug Club, of St. Louis, Mo., comprising manufacturers and jobbers engaged in mercantile business in that city, praying for the enactment of legislation which will enable practical river men to speedily secure a permanent navigable channel in the Mississippi River from St. Louis to New Orleans; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GRAY presented a memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., to the President and Congress of the United States on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President of the United States
and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia respectfully represent:

That they have been deeply moved by the menace of war between our beloved country and the parent nation, and earnestly entreat you to take no step which may increase the danger of such a calamity.

We also respectfully protest against the passage of the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, giving the sanction of Congress to a development of the sentiment originally enunciated by President Monroe, but hitherto advocated without color of law. By implication, if not directly, there appears to be thus claimed for the United States a self-constituted protectorate over all the other Republics in this hemisphere.

We urge that the attitude assumed by the resolution above referred to is without sanction in international usage, without historic authority, and unwarranted by the other nations concerned. Furthermore, we believe it is not rendered necessary, as alleged, because of any threatened danger to this country, while it is in its spirit belligerent and unchristian. We therefore feel that the deliberate assertion of what must be regarded as a virtual protectorate, established by the lawmaking power of the United States, would be a grave mistake, and that it were far wiser to leave the subject, as heretofore, an unformulated popular sentiment.

We submit that the position taken by President Monroe, but since repudiated by eminent statesmen, is fraught with too momentous consequences to be safely adopted by Congress under the stimulus of the present exciting controversy as to the boundary of Venezuela, while its importance demands long, careful, and cool discussion. We are persuaded that the maintenance of peaceful relations with all nations is far more in harmony with the spirit of our institutions and more worthy of a truly enlightened people than any question of boundary or ownership among the Republics of South America.

Let us therefore entreat you to listen to the teachings of the "Prince of Peace," as plainly set forth in the gospel, and not commit our hitherto favored

country to a sentiment and line of foreign policy inimical to its highest interests.

Signed on behalf of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia.

SAMUEL MORRIS, *President.*
PHILIP C. GARRETT, *Vice-President.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *Secondmonth 3d, 1896.*

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of Johnson Post, No. 23, Department of Vermont, Grand Army of the Republic, of Northfield, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a service pension to all veterans of the late war who served not less than ninety days; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRICE presented a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, urging Government protection to Christians in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution No. 19. Asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia.

Whereas the Christian people of America and the civilized world have been shocked by the intelligence of the outrages inflicted and the brutal murders committed by the Moslem savages in Armenia since the commencement of the last massacres in September, 1894, since which time, it is said, as many as 75,000 persons, men, women, and children, have been put to death for no other or better reason than because of their devotion to the Christian religion: Therefore

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That we earnestly petition our Senators and Representatives in Congress to urge the adoption of such measures as will show to all the world our abhorrence of such atrocities as have been committed in Armenia, and extend to them such protection and material aid as is within the power of this Government and as will protect, in that and other fields, our missionaries from violence, outrage, and indignity, and will enable them to pursue their work of faith, labor, and love in the interest of a brighter and better civilization.

Be it further resolved, That the governor of the State of Ohio cause to be transmitted to our Senators and Representatives in Congress duly certified copies of the above resolution.

DAVID L. SLEEPER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted February 7, 1896.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 7th day of February, A. D. 1896,

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRICE presented the petition of J. L. Severance, president of the Euclid Avenue National Bank, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that a change be made in the postal laws increasing the rate for carrying second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of F. D. Leslie, president of the Scientific Machinist Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, and the memorial of G. H. Gardner, secretary and treasurer of the Cleveland Printing and Publishing Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed increase of rate for carrying second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

PACIFIC RAILROAD SINKING FUND.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a preamble and resolution with an accompanying statement of the reasons therefor. I desire to state that I am not sufficiently familiar with the subject to know the merits of it, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The paper was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preamble and resolution respecting Pacific railroads.

Whereas the obligations of the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, and of other Pacific railroad companies, designated by statutes of the United States as of lien indebtedness, prior and paramount to their indebtedness to the United States has matured; and

Whereas no public notice of the maturity of such indebtedness has been to the public or to Congress of the United States given; and

Whereas all interest accrued on bonds representing such paramount lien indebtedness for the purposes of the sinking fund have, by the terms of the statute under which they were issued, also matured; and

Whereas, without the lawful notice of maturity in respect thereof being given, such indebtedness must continue to increase at the rate of 5 per cent on the sinking-fund securities and of 6 per cent on the original bonds so secured by sinking fund; and

Whereas by reason of the premises, as well as for other causes of public good and justice, the powers provided and reserved to Congress in acts of 1862, 1864, 1878, sections 7 and 8, and of March 3, 1887, sections 4 and 5, are adequate to the protection by Congressional legislation of the joint interests of the United States and all "lawful and just creditors," as expressed in said sections 7 and 8: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to close up the sinking-fund accounts and to report the necessary appropriations, if any, to balance said sinking-fund account, and that the amount of the balance thereof be placed to the credit of the lawful and just claimants, known or unknown.

Brief. Respecting Pacific railroads.

All legislation by Congress upon the subject of the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, and other Pacific railroads, beginning with the act of 1862, reserved the right to further legislate upon the subject. Hence the act of 1864 merges the act of 1862; and again, in 1878, the Thurman Act repeals, modifies, and amends all prior legislation. See Sec. 1: "And the foregoing provisions shall be deemed and taken as an amendment of said acts of 1864, as well as of said act of 1862."

And again, in the preamble to the act of May 7, 1878, it is said "that said corporations have issued and disposed of an amount of their own bonds equal to the amounts so to them issued by the United States; and have secured the same by mortgages which are a prior and paramount lien in the respects mentioned in said acts to that of the United States."

And further, "the bonds of the United States were made payable in thirty years from the date thereof, with interest at 6 per cent per annum, payable half-yearly."

And further, the bonds issued by said Central Pacific, Union Pacific, and other Pacific railroads were issued and made payable in like manner, and on like terms, to wit: "Payable in thirty years from the date thereof, with interest at 6 per cent per annum, payable half-yearly."

It will be remembered that the act of 1864 so altered and amended the act of 1862 as to make the bonds already issued by the companies a paramount lien, notwithstanding a portion of them had been issued two years prior to said enactment of 1864. Hence these bonds of these roads have all matured, while some of the Government or subsidy bonds have not yet matured; and notwithstanding that all interest accrued thereon has also matured, yet no public notice has been given or report made to Congress of such maturity.

By the act of May 7, 1878, section 3, "there shall be established in the Treasury of the United States a sinking fund, which shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in bonds of the United States; and the semiannual income thereof shall be in like manner from time to time invested; and the same shall accumulate and be disposed of as hereinafter mentioned; and in making such investments the Secretary of the Treasury shall prefer the 5 per cent bonds of the United States, unless for good reasons appearing to him, and which he shall report to Congress, he shall at any time deem it advisable to invest in other bonds of the United States;" and

By the same act, section 8, "said sinking fund so established shall, according to the interest and proportion of said companies respectively therein, be held for the protection, security, and benefit of the lawful and just holders of any mortgage or lien debts of such companies repectively, lawfully paramount to the rights of the United States, and for the claims of other creditors, if any, lawfully chargeable upon the funds so required to be paid into said sinking fund, according to their respective lawful priorities, as well as for the United States, according to the principles of equity, to the end that all persons having any claim upon said sinking fund may be entitled thereto in due order."

Act of March 3, 1887.

SEC. 4. That whenever in the opinion of the President it shall be deemed necessary to the protection of the interests and the preservation of the securities of the United States, in respect of its lien, mortgage, or other interests in any of the property of any or all of the several companies upon which a lien, mortgage, or other incumbrance paramount to the right, title, or interest of the United States for the same property or any part of the same may exist and be then lawfully liable to be enforced the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under the direction of the President, redeem or otherwise clear off such paramount lien, mortgage, or other incumbrance by paying the sums lawfully due in respect thereof out of the Treasury, and the United States shall thereupon become and be subrogated to all rights and securities theretofore pertaining to the debt, mortgage, lien, or other incumbrance in respect of which such payment shall have been made.

It shall be the duty of the Attorney-General, under the direction of the President, to take all such steps and proceedings in the courts and otherwise as shall be needful to redeem such lien, mortgage, or other incumbrance and to protect and defend the rights and interests of the United States in respect of the matters in this section mentioned, to take steps to foreclose any mortgages or lien of the United States on such railroad property.

SEC. 5. That the sinking funds which are or may be held in the Treasury for the security of the indebtedness of either or all of said railroad companies may, in addition to the investments now authorized by law be invested in any bonds of the United States heretofore issued for the benefit of either or all of said companies, or in any of the first mortgage bonds of either of said companies which have been issued under the authority of any law of the United States and secured by mortgages of their roads and franchises, which by any laws of the United States have been made prior and paramount to the mortgage, lien, or other security of the United States in respect of its advances to either of said companies, as provided by law.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 674) for the relief of Jennie M. Hunt, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1183) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 277) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. QUAY subsequently said: I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 277) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., was indefinitely postponed. It was reported adversely from the Committee on Claims this morning by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. I merely desire that instead of being postponed indefinitely it shall go upon the Calendar with the adverse recommendation of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered and the bill will be placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1648) for the relief of Stewart College (now

the Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Holmes & Leathers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1590) for the relief of Edward H. Murrell, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 75) for the relief of St. Charles College, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1083) for the relief of George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 101) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle the mutual account between the United States and the State of Florida, heretofore examined and stated by said Secretary under the authority of the Congress, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 644) to refund certain import duties, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1032) to regulate the natural laws of supply and demand, and to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of revenue, to report adversely thereon. I ask for the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. CALL. I wish to state that I introduced the bill by request. It comes from a person of very great learning and great research into those subjects, a citizen of Florida, who feels a great interest in its presentation and its consideration by the Congress of the United States. I suppose it is of no use for me to ask that the bill should receive consideration at the hands of the Senate after its adverse report, but I desire to state that I shall move it as an amendment to any revenue bill that may be brought before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 69) authorizing the preparation of a subject catalogue of the books in the law library, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1999) to provide for the observance of the 12th day of February as a national holiday, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1651) for the relief of Theophilus Fisk Mills, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Philbrook, widow of Alvah Philbrook, major of Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW January 8, 1896, reported it without amendment:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be instructed, as now constituted, either by full committee or such subcommittee or committees as may be appointed by the chairman thereof, with the full power of such committee to continue during the coming recess of Congress the investigations authorized by the resolutions of May 13, 1890, and February 27, 1891, with the authority and in the manner and to the extent provided in said resolutions, and in the pursuance of such investigations to visit the several Indian reservations, Indian schools supported in whole or in part by the Government, and the Five Nations in the Indian Territory, or any reservation where, in the opinion of said committee, it may be necessary to extend their investigations.

Second. That said committee or subcommittee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses under oath touching the matters which they are hereby empowered to investigate, and may hold their sessions during the recess of the Senate at such place or places as they may determine; and the necessary and proper expense incurred in the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. MCMILLAN on the 5th instant, reported it without amendment:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, and to have printed the reports of such hearings as the committee may determine, the expenses of the same to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be put upon its passage.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2067) to provide for the erection upon the grounds of the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md., of a bronze statue of the late Hon. George Bancroft, formerly Secretary of the Navy and founder of the Academy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2068) to grant a pension to Emeline C. Sewell, widow of Chief Engineer George Sewell, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2069) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Darwin J. Sparks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2070) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Miles F. Durkee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Mary A. Swift; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2072) to provide relief for such employees in United States navy-yards as may be disabled by accident while in the performance of duty, and, in the event of fatal casualties, for the relief of surviving dependents; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2073) granting a pension to William W. Misuer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2074) granting a pension to Sarah L. Hively; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2075) granting a pension to William E. Mathews; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2076) granting a pension to Sarah C. Moody; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2077) granting a pension to Richard T. Seltzer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2078) granting a pension to Hamlet F. Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2079) granting a pension to Thomas Fox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2080) to amend "An act to authorize the Interoceanic Railway Company to construct and operate railway, telegraph, and telephone lines through the Indian Territory"; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2081) to correct the military record of Leverett Bradley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2082) to provide for the coin redemption of national-bank notes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2083) authorizing sale of the title of the United States in lot 5, square 1113, in the city of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2084) for the relief of C. A. Bjornstad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2085) for the relief of the Cut Head Sioux Indians at Fort Totten, N. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2086) granting an increase of pension to John Akers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 2087) for the relief of the legal representative of Franklin S. Whitney, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2088) for the relief of the owners of certain cotton shipped from Natchez, Miss., in August, 1863, on

the steamer *Gladiator;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2089) to authorize the purchase of the manuscript of William Vans Murray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2090) to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

CATTLE QUARANTINE LINES.

Mr. VEST. I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be directed to inform the Senate if any change has been made recently by order of the Agricultural Department in the quarantine lines heretofore established with regard to the transportation north of cattle from Texas and other Southwestern States or Territories; and if so, the nature and extent of such change, and the reasons therefor.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. VEST. I desire to call the attention of Senators whose constituents are immediately interested in the raising and sale of cattle to a statement which I have received from the largest cattle company in Texas, and which will explain fully my object in offering the resolution. I ask that the Secretary read the clipping that I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Special dispatch to the Globe-Democrat.]

FORT WORTH, TEX., *February 4.*

Railway people and cattlemen of this section are very much stirred up over the reception of a proclamation just issued by the Secretary of Agriculture making some very radical changes in the quarantine lines as they apply to this State. The new line has been established just beyond the Texas State line on the west and north, practically cutting off the movement of all Texas cattle beyond that line from February 15 to November 15, except for immediate slaughter. This will suspend the movement of Texas cattle to the maturing grounds of the Northwest and the feeding pens of Kansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENTS IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire and report whether, during the year 1895 or any portion thereof, any of the employees of the Post-Office Department, while receiving pay from appropriations for that Department, did, with the knowledge, connivance, or direction of any clerk or clerks, or chief or chiefs of division, levy and collect assessments of money on and from other employees of the Department to be used, and which was used, for political purposes in States where election campaigns were in progress at that time; whether any person or persons were employed and borne on the Department rolls as employees and regularly paid as such who, while pretending to be discharging the duties of inspectors in the free-delivery service, were in fact actively engaged in aiding and assisting one of the political parties in said election campaign; whether, during such time, in room 3 of the Interior Department building, or in any other room or rooms in said building or in any other building, any employee of the Department was directing or managing the employment of persons for the purposes aforesaid and receiving and disbursing the moneys so assessed and collected, and whether such manager or director kept an account of such moneys in his own name in any bank of the city of Washington or elsewhere.

The committee will inquire and report further, whether during the period covered by this resolution any person or persons were employed by any clerk or chief of division in the Post-Office Department and kept on the Department pay rolls and paid out of the Department funds, which payment was not authorized by law or by any lawful rule or regulation of the Department, and for which services no appropriation had been made by Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BOND SALES.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators, not more than two of whom shall belong to one political party, shall be appointed by the Vice-President, whose duty it shall be—

First. To investigate and report generally all material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

Second. To investigate and report specially what amount of available funds, classified, was in the United States Treasury and on deposit in other places, subject to the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the bonds were sold or offered for sale; whether there was or was not coin enough on hand to meet all coin obligations of the Government due at the time said bonds were sold or when they were offered for sale; what obligations were due at that time and the amount of each, stated separately; what was the reason for any unusual withdrawal of coin from the Treasury shortly before bonds were sold or offered for sale, if such unusual withdrawals were in fact made, and by what persons or classes of persons and for what purpose or on what account such withdrawals were made; who purchased the bonds, in what amounts, and where, whether in the United States or in foreign countries, and in what proportions, and from what persons or classes of persons the gold was procured with which to pay for the bonds, what the bonds sold for, and what was the market price of our Government bonds at the time, and what effect the bond sales had on the credit and business of the people of the United States.

Third. To investigate and report as to the manner of disposing of said bonds, by what authority, and what contracts, advertisements, or proposals were made by the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto; what agreements or contracts, and whether oral or in writing, and whether publicly or privately and secretly, were entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury and any other person or persons with respect to the sale and purchase of the bonds; whether any officer of the Government, or any person or persons for such officer and on his behalf and in his personal interest, and with his knowledge or consent, entered into any contract, agreement, or arrangement, directly or indirectly, with any person or persons, partnership, corporation, company, or syndicate, for the purpose of affecting the price offered or to be offered for said bonds or any of them, with the intent and expectation to receive commission or personal reward by reason of such contract, agreement, or arrangement; whether such contract or agreement had any and what effect on the prices offered for the bonds, what the effect was, and who, if any person, profited by it and to what extent.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER. I have asked that the resolution lie over under the rule. Let it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River in order that the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed may be acted upon. The bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from Virginia to yield to me for a moment that I may offer a resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate full information on the following subjects:

First. The number of miles of the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad Company as originally constructed and as it now exists, the estimated actual cost per mile of the construction thereof, its then and present capitalization, and any change that may have been made in its capitalization, and whether, and if so, when, and to what extent, its capitalization was changed or increased, and whether such change or increase was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States, the names and residences, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively.

Second. The number of miles of the Central Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the estimated actual cost per mile of its construction, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so, when and how often, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and whether such change or increase, if any, was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States; also the names and addresses, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, giving the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively.

Third. The number of miles of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company as originally and at present constructed, the estimated actual cost per mile of the construction thereof, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so, when and to what extent, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and if such change or increase, if any, has been, and whether it is, authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States; the names and residences, respectively, of the stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees thereof, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively, and whether such railroad was constructed on the line contemplated by the act authorizing its construction, and if not, whether its present line was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States.

Fourth. The number of miles of the main line of the Kansas Pacific Railroad Company as originally and now constructed, the estimated actual cost per mile of its construction, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so, to what extent, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and whether such change or increase was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States, the names and residences, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively, and whether said railroad was constructed on the line and from and to the points contemplated by the act authorizing its construction, and if not, whether its construction on its present line was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States.

Fifth. The names under which the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the Central Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, and the Kansas Pacific Railroad Company were severally constructed, and whether any changes in the names thereof have taken place since their construction, and if so, what names have been given to said respective roads and the names now in use by them, giving specifically all the changes in names and the consolidations, if any, that have taken place from the time of their construction, respectively, to the present moment, to the end that the Senate may be fully informed as to the several names under which these several railroads have been and are now being operated, and have exact information as to the consolidations and changes therein that may have taken place.

Sixth. What branches, if any, have been constructed or purchased by said respective railroads and added as feeders or otherwise to their respective main lines, giving the names of all of such railroads that may have been thus constructed or purchased by any of them, the cost of such construction or purchase, and the source from which the funds to construct or purchase the same were derived, and whether, and if so, what, sums of money were derived from the main lines of said railroads and used in the construction or purchase of any such additional railroads or feeders.

Seventh. The total amount of subsidy bonds issued in aid of the construction of said respective main lines, the total number of acres of land donated to each of them by the United States, and whether all of said lands have been selected and taken by them or not, or if any other corporation or company of persons has been formed for the purpose of handling or disposing of said ands, and if so, the names of said corporations or companies, the manner in which the lands have been disposed of by them, if any, and their present condition.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The resolution, in so far as the information sought to be obtained can be procured from the Secretary of the Interior, has my heartiest approbation, and if it be worth anything I shall be very glad to render any assistance in my power, if I could render any beyond my own vote, in securing it. But I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that he is undoubtedly asking for information from the Secretary of the Interior which it would be utterly impossible for him to furnish.

The Secretary would have very definite information as to the original grants to these companies, as to the names of the companies under which the grant was made. If official estimates preliminary to the grant were filed, the Secretary will have those, but it is doubtful whether they are in the possession of the Department. However, nearly all the other information which the Senator from Nebraska asks for the Secretary of the Interior not only can not furnish, but the information is as available to us individually as it could be to the Secretary of the Interior officially. For instance, the Senator from Nebraska asks that the Secretary of the Interior shall furnish a list of the stockholders and bondholders of the Union Pacific, the Kansas Pacific, and the Central Pacific railroads. I take it that the Interior Department has no record of the stockholders of those roads, and all the Secretary of the Interior could do would be to ask the officers of the companies, unofficially or officially, without authority to back up his request, to please send him for the information of the Senate a list of their stockholders at the time of their last election. The list of bondholders is not forthcoming anywhere, because there is no list of bondholders of railroad companies except such as are registered. The ordinary holders of bonds are embodied in no list held by the railroad company.

Then the Senator from Nebraska asks for a statement of the construction of the branches of the different roads and how the money was obtained. I apprehend the Secretary of the Interior can not tell any more than the rest of us where those people got the money to build branches and to extend their line, and what they gave in return for it. The Secretary of the Interior can tell us how much the subsidies are, and to what companies they were granted, and under what names they were granted, but even as to the increase of the capitalization of the companies he can not tell us about it.

He can give us the information the Senator asks for as to whether any of these proceedings were authorized by Federal law. He has the same access to the Revised Statutes of the United States that we have and no more. He has nothing in his office that will show an extension or an authorization for an increase of capital stock. It would not be in the office of the Secretary of the Interior; it would be in the Statutes at Large of the United States, which, as I say, are as accessible to us as to the Secretary. We are all of us looking for information about these different railroads, and we are all anxious to obtain it.

I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that what he is asking for it would be weeks, if not months, before he could obtain, and that he is seeking it through a channel from which it can not be forthcoming.

My only suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska is that he shall modify his resolution, if the suggestion meets his approval, so as to ask of the Secretary such information as he can give. The different committees of both the House and the Senate are holding meetings now, and for years they have held meetings. There have been report after report from all these railroad companies. There have been report after report from all these committees. All this information is embodied in different printed documents, which at one time or another have been before the Senate and before the House, except the list of stockholders which the Senator asks for.

I am ready to meet any suggestion the Senator from Nebraska can make that he thinks will furnish the faintest light on the existing situation, but, as I said before, I suggest to him that he so modify his resolution, first, that the Secretary be asked to give only such information as he has and is entitled to have; and, second, that it be so modified as to ask only for information which could be forthcoming within a reasonable time and within a reasonable compass. It would take months before this information could be furnished, and it would take a thousand pages or more to furnish it.

Mr. ALLEN. I may be permitted to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that if none of the information which is called for is in the possession of the Secretary of the Interior he can respond promptly to that effect. I am informed, however, that in the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands, and also in the office of the Commissioner of Railways, there can be found most of this information, though possibly not all of it. I have simply made the resolution broad enough to cover everything that the Secretary of the Interior may have in any of his Bureaus, and any information he can procure elsewhere for us to be used in legislation upon this subject. I think there can be no serious objection to the resolution in its present form, because the Secretary can readily state that he has not information on a given point or has not access to it, and can answer that portion upon which he has information.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I should like to see the resolution in print.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. ALLEN. Let it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be printed.

STENOGRAPHER TO COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, the expense of the same to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

IMMIGRATION INVESTIGATING COMMISSION.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,500 bound copies of the report of the Immigration Investigating Commission, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury under date of June 13, 1894, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 1,500 copies for the use of the Bureau of Immigration, Treasury Department.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I rise to a question of privilege. When the committee assignments were made some appointments were given to certain Senators on this side of the Chamber with the understanding that they would hold them merely until the Senators from Utah should arrive, and that then they would relinquish them in order to make places for the Utah Senators. The matter has now been arranged satisfactorily, so that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] will ask to be relieved from further service upon the Committee on Indian Depredations; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], from the Committee on Mines and Mining; the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE], from the Select Committee on Forest Reservations, and these three vacancies will be filled by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BROWN]. It has also been arranged that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will ask to be relieved from duty upon the Committee on Pensions; the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], from the Committee on Relations with Canada, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], from the Committee on Manufactures, and the vacancies occasioned in this way will be filled by the Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON]. The whole matter can be attended to now.

Mr. CAMERON was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. LODGE was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. SEWELL was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. MANTLE was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Select Committee on Forest Reservations.

Mr. PERKINS was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Relations with Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask that the vacancies be filled by the Vice-President.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to fill the vacancies. Mr. BROWN was appointed upon the Committee on Mines and Mining, the Select Committee on Forest Reservations, and the Committee on Indian Depredations. Mr. CANNON was appointed upon the Committees on Relations with Canada, on Pensions, and on Manufactures.

ASSISTANT DOORKEEPERS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. HALE. If the era of resignation has been completed——

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to announce that I shall not call up the resolution in regard to the employment of assistant doorkeeper——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will lay the resolution before the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. SHERMAN, as follows:

Resolved, That Alonzo H. Stewart, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby, chosen assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. At the request of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] I propose to let that matter go over until to-

morrow after the morning business; and I hope that Senators will be present at that time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the urgent deficiency appropriation bill be now laid before the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to state that I had the floor to call up the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed what is known as the memorial-bridge bill, and only yielded to morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is correct, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HALE. I do not propose, of course, to interfere with morning business.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator from Maine will allow me, I will state that I had called up the motion of the Senator from Missouri to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed what is known as the memorial-bridge bill, and yielded that other Senators might get through morning business. I hope the Senator will not take me off my feet, but will allow me to have that matter disposed of.

Mr. HALE. I shall not interfere with the purpose of the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. I now ask the Senate to proceed to consider the motion of the Senator from Missouri to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 176 was passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri to reconsider the vote by which the bill the title of which will be read was passed.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading will also be reconsidered.

Mr. BLANCHARD. What is the parliamentary status of the bill now, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate has voted to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and by unanimous consent the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading has been reconsidered.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to state that, at the instance of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], there was an amendment attached to the bill providing that the District of Columbia should pay half the expenses of the construction of the bridge, and a motion was entered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, in order that that amendment might be again acted upon by the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be regarded as reconsidered. The question now is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment is to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That one-half of the cost of said bridge shall be paid by the District of Columbia and one-half by the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is that an amendment offered to the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is an amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana, and is the pending motion.

Mr. SHERMAN. To insert that provision?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To insert that provision.

Mr. SHERMAN. I heard the reading imperfectly. Would that require the whole expense of the bridge to be paid by the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANCHARD. No, one-half.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that is right. I think the United States ought to pay one-half of the cost of that bridge, because the bridge connects the property of the United States on the other side of the river with its property in the District, and will enormously add to the value of that land owned by the United States. It is not right to put the whole expense of the bridge on the District of Columbia. I inferred when I rose that there was an effort to throw the whole expense upon the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL. It was provided by the amendment that half the expense should be borne by the District.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, when this bill was under consideration by the Senate a couple of weeks ago, I suggested the propriety of an amendment by which the revenues of the District of Columbia should be taxed one-half of the expense of the proposed memorial bridge. Some debate was had at the time upon this amendment and the Senate adopted it. In that shape the bill then passed the Senate. Following the passage of the bill, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. His purpose was to ultimately defeat the amendment which taxed the District with one-half of the expense of the structure. The bill is now before the Senate for its consideration anew, and the pending question is on the amendment I offered, heretofore referred to.

It is always an ungracious task to run counter to the wishes of those among whom one's lot is pleasantly cast to the extent that ours—those of us who hold positions in the legislative branch of the Government—is with the agreeable and cultured people who inhabit the District of Columbia.

Following the adoption by the Senate of the amendment I offered, much has been said among the people of the District and in the press of the District of criticism of my action and of the action of the Senate. I take this in good part. It is nothing more than a friendly difference of opinion.

No one is more proud of this capital city of our Republic than I. Everywhere we go, whether in our own country or abroad, meeting with anyone who has ever been to Washington, we hear always words of praise for the city of Washington, of the beautiful situation which it occupies, of its grand streets and avenues. We have cause to be proud of it. I believe it is destined to be the finest capital in the world. The Government of the United States should act toward it with no stinted hand. At the same time, Mr. President, we should be just to the body of the taxpayers of the United States in the matter of appropriations for the District and for District purposes. Care should be had that the Federal Treasury be called on to contribute no more than is just for public works here calculated to greatly benefit the District and private property in the District.

For the past eighteen years the Government of the United States has been paying one-half of the entire expense of supporting the District. That policy was adopted at a time when there were 100,000 citizens less in the District than there are to-day. When Washington was a small city, it was well for the Government to pay half of the expenses of the maintenance of the District, and in the earlier times to pay even more than half; but when Washington has grown from a small city to one having upward of 250,000 inhabitants, the policy which was justified by the conditions of the earlier period can not be justified now. As the city becomes larger and more wealthy less and less should become the proportion the Federal Treasury is called upon to contribute.

This matter of the relation of the Government to the District was considered by a commission appointed in 1874, and, after an investigation running through several years, on the 11th of June, 1878, they submitted a report, in which is given the conclusions of the commission as to the amount of the District expenses with which the Federal Treasury should be taxed. This report was that at that time a fair proportion of the expense of maintaining the District government to be borne by the Federal Treasury was 40 per cent. Congress, however, increased this to 50 per cent, and from that time to this the Federal Government has been paying 50 per cent of all the expenses of every kind and character in the District of Columbia. I will read the conclusions of the commission.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was it a House, a Senate, or a joint committee?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It was a joint committee, I think. I quote from the report:

> Your committee has been convinced that it is the duty of Congress to make regular annual appropriations toward the expenses of the District government, and from a careful examination of the estimated value of the property owned by the United States and that belonging to private persons and corporations the committee considers the fair proportional part thereof which the Federal Government should bear is not less that 40 per cent, and the remaining 60 per cent should be realized by taxation.

Mr. President, this was eighteen years ago. Since that time the city of Washington has increased in population 100,000. If it were proper in 1878, according to the report of this committee, that the body of the taxpayers of the United States should only be taxed with 40 per cent of the amount necessary to defray the expenses of the Government, a fortiori should that amount now be less, inasmuch as the number of taxpayers and the aggregate of taxable wealth in the District have both greatly increased. There are now 30,000 taxpayers in the city of Washington, and the aggregate of the assessment of property in the District of Columbia is put down by the assessors at $191,417,804. We all know that property is never assessed at its full value for the purposes of taxation; if it is ever done, the instances are rare. It is safe to say, therefore, that there is not less than $250,000,000 of taxable property in the District of Columbia. It is perhaps double what it was in 1878, at which time the 40 per cent pro rata was recommended, which Congress at that time increased to 50 per cent.

The assessors of the District have placed an estimate on the property which the Federal Government owns in the District of Columbia, and they make it foot up a total valuation of $198,058,139; but how do they arrive at this? In this way:

United States property: Value of land, not including streets and alleys	$98,705,639
Value of improvements belonging to the Government	99,352,500
Total	198,058,139

It will be observed that in order to reach this aggregate valuation they charge against the Government, at the usual price per square foot at which private property is assessed in the District, all the land included in all the parks of the city. Take the park in which this Capitol is situated. That is charged for against the Government at so much a foot. Take the Mall that extends from the foot of Capitol Hill to the river, including the grounds upon which the Washington Monument is situated, including the Agricultural grounds, the Smithsonian grounds, the Botanic Gardens; all this is charged against the Government in order to arrive at this aggregate assessment of $198,000,000. Lafayette Square, Franklin Square, Lincoln Park, Judiciary Square, the White House grounds, the White Lot, and all of the triangular spaces which are left where the avenues intersect the streets and which so beautify this capital city, are charged against the Government in order to arrive at the total valuation mentioned.

This is not fair; it is not just. The parks which adorn and beautify the city should not be taken into account as owned by the Government when the assessors come to figure up the amount of property held in the District by the Federal Government in order to ascertain the relative proportion of that property to the property owned in the District by private parties.

It would be fair to assess against the Government the grounds upon which the public buildings are situated, and a fair valuation should be placed upon the buildings in order to arrive at this relative proportion; but it is not just to charge up to the Government all the parks, which are common to all the inhabitants. Every city of the United States provides its own parks and maintains them. In the city of Washington the Government is not only charged up with the ownership of the parks, but, as I understand it, the expense for the maintenance of these parks, with certain exceptions, which I shall hereafter mention, is borne exclusively by the Federal Government. If that statement is correct, and I believe it is, then the Government not only furnishes to Washington all the parks in the city, but is called on to defray the whole amount of expense of beautifying and maintaining them.

The exceptions are the two parks known as the Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park. When it became advisable to acquire the property now known as the Rock Creek Park, embracing 1,515 acres, Congress in its wisdom saw proper not only to tax the District of Columbia with one-half of the expense of the acquisition of the property, but likewise imposed upon the District one-half of the expense of the maintenance of the park. So also as to the Zoological Park, which contains 166⅔ acres, the District of Columbia was required to pay one-half of the purchase money of the ground, and, as I understand, is taxed to defray one-half of the expense of the maintenance of the park.

The fact that the District was required to meet one-half of the expense of acquiring the ground for these two parks evidences, I think, the determination of Congress to depart from the old system of requiring the Government to meet all the park expenses of the city. Again, in 1893, when it was proposed to extend the system of avenues and streets in the city of Washington to the District outside of the city, Congress, in its wisdom, required that the cost of the extension of the plan of streets and avenues should be at the sole cost of the District and private land owners. I understand, however, recently one of the courts of the District has annulled this act as being, perhaps, unconstitutional, but that does not militate against the position I now take, which is that these several acts, the one acquiring the Rock Creek Park, another acquiring the Zoological Park, and the third extending the system of streets and avenues of the city out into the District, all evidence a departure by Congress from the policy adopted heretofore, under which the Government is charged with the full ownership of all of the parks and is taxed with the entire expense of their maintenance.

Down at the river, near the Washington Monument, are seven hundred to a thousand acres of land which the Government is reclaiming. It is to be made into a great driving park. The appropriations for this reclamation have been carried upon the river and harbor appropriation bill. They were originally placed there upon the idea that this was to improve the harbor of the city of Washington. Now we all know that the improvement of the harbor of the city of Washington by the reclamation of the Potomac Flats was but an incident, and that the acquisition of this 700 acres of ground, wresting it from the waters of the Potomac, was the primary purpose of the appropriations.

All this expense is being borne by the Federal Treasury. My recollection is that about two and a quarter million dollars have already been expended in reclaiming this ground, which will be added to the city and greatly adorn and beautify it. So it would seem that want of liberality by the Government toward the District can not be truthfully charged.

Mr. President, no one opposes the passage of this bill. I for one do not. I am heartily in favor of the construction of the memorial bridge across the Potomac River to connect the city of Washington with the grounds of the national cemetery at Arlington. It is a great work, that ought to be undertaken at this time. The only difference between myself and the Senator from Virginia, the author of the measure, is as to who shall bear the expense. He thinks it should come entirely out of the Federal Treasury. I believe that as this structure will greatly benefit and beautify the city of Washington, one-half of the expense of the structure should be paid out of the District revenues.

On the former occasion when this bill was under consideration I did not object to its passage, and I do not object to its passage now. I deemed it my duty, however, to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate in order to have it determined whether the Federal Government should pay the full expense of such a structure or whether the revenues of the District of Columbia should be taxed for one-half of the expense thereof. If the policy be right that the Federal Government should pay one-half of all the expenses necessary to maintain the District of Columbia, then I submit that it is but fair and just to the taxpayers of the United States that one-half of the expense of structures of this kind within the limits of the District should be taxed against the District revenues.

If the Federal Government was paying only a just proportion of the annual expenses necessary to maintain the District, which in my opinion at this time would be only about 33⅓ per cent instead of 50 per cent, there would be greater reasons for Congress to be liberal in respect to making appropriations out of the Treasury to pay the whole expense of such structures. But so long as the Federal Government is called upon to pay more than its just proportion of the expenses of the District, then structures of this kind should come under the same policy, and the District revenues should be taxed with one-half of their cost.

The last District appropriation act carried an aggregate of $5,745,443, and one-half of it, or the sum of $2,872,721, was appropriated out of the Federal Treasury. In other words, the Federal Treasury is contributing approximating $3,000,000 every year for the purpose of maintaining the District of Columbia. Every policeman on the streets of Washington is paid one-half of his compensation out of the Federal Treasury. The schools of the District are paid out of the Federal Treasury to the extent of 50 per cent of the amount appropriated for such purposes. In the last act making appropriations for the District of Columbia the improvement and repairs account, which includes sewers and streets, amounted to $1,152,100. The Federal Government pays half of it. For public schools the appropriation amounted to $1,137,616. The Federal Treasury pays half of it. For the Metropolitan police $558,745 was appropriated. The Federal Government pays half of it, and so on down the list—the fire department, the health department, reformatories and prisons, support of the insane, charities, and water department.

Now, all other cities pay, themselves, the full amount of such expenses, and fortunate indeed is the city of Washington that it has the Federal Treasury to share the cost of these things. I am far from objecting to a liberal policy toward the District, but I do insist that 50 per cent now is too much for the Treasury to contribute. It may have been just in 1878, when adopted, but is no longer so.

When a bill similar to the one which is now before the Senate was first introduced in 1894 in the House of Representatives it contained a clause reading "one-half of the cost of said bridge to be taken from the revenues of the District of Columbia." It is true that when the committee in the other body came to consider the bill it struck out the clause I have read, but the House, I understand, did not pass the bill at that time.

I again repeat that I have no purpose whatever to endeavor to defeat the passage of the pending bill. If the Senate in its wisdom should see proper to vote down the amendment providing that the District revenues should be taxed with one-half of the expense of the bridge, I will testify my desire that the bridge shall be constructed by voting for the measure anyhow; but if it were right and proper to charge the District revenues with one-half of the cost of the national parks known as the Rock Creek and the Zoological parks, as was done when those bills were passed, then I think it is wise and just and proper that the District should be taxed with one-half of the cost of this structure.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. The bill provides for a bridge to be called a memorial bridge. It is proposed to make it monumental in its character and of a high order of architectural merit.

So far as it is a memorial of course the Government should pay the whole expense, the same as it does for any of the monuments, the Peace Monument, or any other monument in the city. It has been suggested that the proposed bridge shall be called the Bridge of Peace—bridging the bloody chasm, symbolizing the reuniting of the two sections of the country. It is to be built entirely upon Government ground. It is to start from the Naval Observatory and to land on the Virginia side upon the Arlington estate. It seems to me clearly that for these reasons it should be exclusively a Government enterprise.

Again, it is not proposed to construct the bridge for the benefit of the people of the District, on which ground other expenses of the District are made, because the use of tramways, cars, the poor man's carriage, is expressly prohibited. It seems to me that for every reason it should be exclusively a Government undertaking. I am opposed to the amendment, and trust the bill will pass.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, one single word. I heartily agree with what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] has stated. I think we are a little too much in the habit of dividing with the people of the District things that belong to the national capital and which are undertaken chiefly because this is the national capital. I would not demand of the District that it pay one farthing of the expense of the bridge. It is for the general public use of the nation, and its commercial value, in one sense, is very small.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, this subject has been repeatedly before both Houses of Congress, and the question under discussion to-day has been repeatedly discussed, and always, so far as I know, determined upon the side of the report now made by the Committee on Commerce. The question was considered by our committee, and unanimously decided in accordance with the bill as reported by me the other day; in other words, that the United States should pay the entire expense of the structure.

As has been stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], if this is not a memorial bridge, but simply a commercial structure, then it should be considered upon a very different basis. If it is a memorial bridge, and if any sentiment enters into it at all, then the entire cost should willingly be paid by the people of the whole United States.

This city will always remain the capital of this country. That goes without saying. There are priceless traditions and memories connected with the establishment of the national capital here, which will always retain the seat of government. The great city in my own State some years ago was presented as a claimant for the capital of the Union, but the proposition was never seriously entertained, even among the citizens of St. Louis. I believe that on a popular vote to-day the city of Washington would be overwhelmingly and almost unanimously declared to be the eternal capital of what I hope is to be an eternal Government. It is useless to discuss that proposition, and therefore when any question of this sort comes before us it ought to be considered with reference to the perpetuity of the capital of the United States.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], with whom I have not the slightest controversy, says that when we made the District of Columbia pay one-half of the purchase money and one-half of the expense of the Zoological and Rock Creek parks, we established a precedent in regard to this matter. I beg his pardon. That legislation was extremely doubtful and was strenuously resisted, and it finally passed through Congress with protest against it by a very large minority in both Houses. But those cases are entirely different from the present. The Zoological Garden and the Rock Creek Park are upon one side of the Potomac River, and if it be assumed that they are municipal establishments, which I deny, there is a plausibility in the assumption that the District of Columbia should pay one-half of the expense.

Here, upon the contrary, is a bridge between Virginia and the District of Columbia. The farmers of Virginia in the vicinity of Arlington have urged en masse that the bridge should be constructed. They have called upon me personally as chairman of the subcommittee on bridges of the Commerce Committee and urged the necessity for this structure. I have here, and but for the limited time given us would like the Senate to hear, the report of the Secretary of War, which is one of a dozen made in regard to the bridge, in which he urges its construction for military purposes, and besides that because the value of 1,000 acres reclaimed in the Potomac Flats and the 1,100 acres in the Arlington tract which was seized by the Government and afterwards partially paid for to the Lee family would be immensely enhanced by the construction of this bridge.

So, even from a financial view, the argument is overwhelmingly in favor of its construction at the expense of the United States, because the property of the United States will be enormously increased in value by its construction. The cases are not parallel, and if the District of Columbia is made to pay one-half of the expense, striking out all sentiment, then the State of Virginia should pay the other half, because the people of Virginia, and particularly those in the vicinity of Arlington, are especially in favor of putting this bridge across the Potomac River.

My friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] speaks of the reclamation of the Potomac Flats. I had the honor to serve upon that committee fifteen years ago. Those flats were principally reclaimed for sanitary reasons. The evidence before the Potomac Flats Committee was overwhelming that the health not only of the citizens of Washington, but of the denizens of this city, including members of Congress and officials of the Government, was endangered from year to year by the existence of that swamp. It was absolutely necessary to reclaim those flats, and if, when reclaimed, they were not worth one cent to the Government of the United States, I repeat that for sanitary reasons the reclamation must necessarily have been made. It was urged and proved before our committee, when we made the first appropriation, that a portion of this city was becoming uninhabitable by reason of the vicinity of the Potomac Flats. We have now, after spending an enormous amount of money, reclaimed them, and given to the Government a thousand acres of valuable land. But that is infinitesimal compared with the importance of that improvement from a sanitary point of view.

That does not stand upon all fours with the present proposition.

I repeat, that if this in the first place is to be a memorial bridge it should be paid for by the Government of the United States as a national structure. If it is to be a commercial structure, one-half should be paid by the District of Columbia and one-half by the State of Virginia.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has alluded to the report of the assessment for the District of Columbia, and he has correctly quoted it. There is exempt from taxation in the District $198,058,139 of United States property, excluding streets and alleys belonging to the Government, while for the District of Columbia there is exempt only $3,653,820. Now, if it is insisted that these bodies, the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia, are separate entities, then look at the vast disparity in the ownership by the United States and by the District of Columbia of property in the District.

The Senator from Louisiana referred to the parks which are maintained by the Government, the ground upon which the Capitol is located, and the ground upon which the beautiful Library building is located. Does it not belong to the Government, and could we not sell it to-morrow? What is the difference between the ownership of the United States in this property and the ownership of any Senator in the real estate upon which he resides? What is the difference, if the argument of the Senator from Louisiana that these parks beautify the city of Washington is to obtain, between the ground and the building, which also beautifies this city and makes it attractive to visitors. What to-day forms a greater attraction than the magnificent Library building, like which there is nothing upon the Continent of Europe, a thing of beauty forever, an ornament, a matter of pride to every American citizen? That beautifies the city of Washington, but it belongs to all the people of this whole country.

Mr. President, I protest against the argument that the city of Washington is not the property of every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is our property. Any citizen of this country can come here and reside if he sees proper to do so, and because some of them have come here and have acquired property and become citizens of the District, why should they be separated from the balance of the people of the United States and be made to bear unusual burdens? It is our city, our capital, and when we put improvements here in the name of the whole people of the United States, we should pay for them.

I might read here repeated reports showing that when a private corporation applied to Congress for the privilege of building this bridge across the Potomac, it was denied, and it was denied upon the report of the Bureau of Engineers of the War Department that the structure should be built on Government ground upon both sides of the river and under the absolute control of the Government of the United States, that for military purposes it should belong to the Government, that it should be a governmental structure, as a matter of course to be paid for by all the people of the whole Union. I have no criticism to make of the statement or motives of the Senator from Louisiana; but, sir, I believe it is just and right that the Government should pay the entire cost of this bridge.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, just one word, because I am called out. I think a bill for this bridge has been reported three times from the Committee on Commerce. If I am mistaken the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] will correct me.

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir; three times.

Mr. FRYE. It has been unanimously reported every time, and no member of that committee ever made a suggestion that the District of Columbia should pay half the cost. That was done after consideration; it was with the full understanding of the purpose of the bridge—that it was to be a memorial bridge; that it was to be ornamented with statues of Grant, Lincoln, and other great men of the Republic. Where, then, is the sense or propriety, if it is to be a memorial bridge, of saying that the District of Columbia shall pay half? If Congress appropriates $25,000 or $50,000 for a statue of General Hancock, why, pray, should not the District of Columbia with the same propriety be compelled to pay one-half of the appropriation made for that statue? As the Senator from Missouri well said, if it is not a memorial bridge and is simply a commercial structure, then certainly Virginia must

pay half and the District of Columbia the other half. I was amazed when I heard that a proposition had been made here that the District of Columbia should pay one-half the cost of a memorial bridge which the Congress of the United States, representing all the people of the United States, compels the erection of.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Maine, as he is chairman of the Committee on Commerce, whether the committee did not fully intend to carry out his view and destroy any idea of its being a commercial structure by the latter clause of the bill, which reads:

Shall be used exclusively for foot passengers and vehicles, and prohibited to all tramways, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or other power.

Mr. FRYE. The committee intended it purely and simply as a memorial bridge.

Mr. FAULKNER. And so put in that clause, excluding the idea of a commercial structure.

Mr. FRYE. And put in that clause excluding all tramways, railway cars, and cars of every kind.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I agree fully with what has been said about the importance of this structure being considered as a memorial bridge, and I shall vote against the amendment; but I wish to move, in line 11 of section 2, after the word "tramways," to insert "or railroads," so that the dedication to the traveling public shall be complete, excluding tramways and railroads. It will then read:

Shall be used exclusively for foot passengers and vehicles, and prohibited to all tramways or railroads, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or any other power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSBROUGH in the chair). The Chair understands that the question is first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HALE. I do not propose to amend that; but if that shall be voted down then I will offer the amendment which I have suggested.

Mr. MILLS. Let us take the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the Senator from Maine does not desire to occupy the floor, I should like to take it for five or ten minutes.

Mr. HALE. I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, this proposed structure has been given a high-sounding title, and on that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] makes a patriotic speech—a great memorial bridge that is to span the Potomac River, uniting the North and the South.

Because it is gilded with this high-sounding title the proposition has no greater force than it would have without it. After all, it is but a bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River. You may call it a memorial bridge, or you may give it any other grand title, but a moment's reflection must convince anyone that this adds no additional weight to it. Every bridge heretofore constructed over the Potomac River or the Eastern Branch of the Potomac has been paid for one-half by the Federal Treasury, the other half by the District revenues.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will ask the Senator from Louisiana, if he will permit me, whether or not those are not all commercial bridges? In other words, we have a right to put over those bridges tramways, railways, street railways, and all other traffic. These are excluded by the very terms of the bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will answer the Senator from West Virginia. They are all commercial bridges, and so is this a commercial bridge, with the single exception that it is not to be made a bridge for the passage of street railways and tramways. Every wagon transporting freight or articles of commerce that comes along can cross the bridge. Every carriage, every footman, every bicycle rider can cross it. I agree with the proposition that street cars and tramways should not be permitted to pass over it. Confine them to the other bridges. But, because they are prohibited, that does not take this bridge out of the category of being a highway bridge for general purposes, and such it is. If it were right and proper to tax the District revenues with the expense of all previous bridges, why is it not right and proper to tax the District revenues with one-half the expense of this bridge?

The Senator from Missouri says it is because the War Department needs it for military purposes, and therefore the Government should have it all.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri perhaps forgets that under the Constitution of the United States Congress has exclusive jurisdiction in matters of legislation over the District. Congress could direct, in case of necessity, that all of the other bridges be set aside for military purposes. Because a military establishment is maintained at Fort Myer, on the other side of the river, is no reason why this structure should be any more denominated a military bridge than is the bridge above this proposed site which now spans the Potomac at Georgetown. That bridge is just as near Fort Myer as this one would be. It is true, and upon this the Secretary of War in his report lays stress, that it would be nearer the capital from the military post at Fort Myer over this memorial bridge than it would be over the Long Bridge or over the bridge at Georgetown. But the capital is sufficiently easy of access by means of the other bridges. It is rather straining matters to claim that justification for this structure rests on the necessity for a more direct approach to the capital by the military forces stationed at Fort Myer.

The Senator from Missouri, referring to the flats of the Potomac that have been reclaimed, says the main purpose of that work was not to reclaim seven hundred or a thousand acres of land, but to benefit the health of the city of Washington. Grant it. He says that it was a great sanitary work. Grant it. Should not the city of Washington or the revenues of the District have been taxed for doing something which was so greatly to benefit the health of the people who live here and who own property here? It seems to me so. That was eminently a work one-half of which should have been charged against the District, but it was not. No one ever opposed the reclamation of the flats. I have never done so.

At the other end of the Capitol, serving on the River and Harbor Committee, I time and again supported appropriations to continue this work; but, Mr. President, I always had the idea that it was a work one-half of which should have been paid by the District of Columbia. It was begun before I entered Congress. I found it a charge on the river and harbor bill, the Government paying the entire expense, and as chairman of that committee in the House I continued it on the bill. It should in the first instance have gone on the District appropriation bill. Two and a quarter millions have already been expended, and the work is not yet completed. It will take perhaps a million dollars more, every dollar of which is to be met by the body of the taxpayers of the United States.

Some reforms, Mr. President, are evidently needed. Under the theory upon which this capital was founded the fee simple in the land forming the parks is in the Government. But that is immaterial. The point I make is that when you come to consider what is a fair proportion of the expense that the Federal Treasury should bear in maintaining the District there should not be charged up against the Government the ownership of the parks in the city. It is not who owns the parks. If they are owned by the Federal Government they are here for the benefit of all visitors who come here, and they are here more especially for the benefit of the people who make the District their homes. The parks could not be more common to the use of the people of the District if the city itself owned them. They are public parks, and public parks are always exempt from taxation. Those in the city of Washington should be exempt from taxation, but in point of fact they are not, for the Government is charged with their ownership in order to arrive at a larger proportionate sum for the Government to contribute toward the maintenance of the District. If the parks were eliminated from calculation, a fair proportion of the expenses of the District chargeable to the Government would not be 33⅓ per cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Louisiana informs me that he is through with his speech. I ask that a vote be taken on the pending amendment.

Mr. HALE. And then let me offer my amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Let a vote be first taken on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HALE. Yes, we will vote on that first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHOUP (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. I do not know how he would vote and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEAR. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. I notice that he is not present and I withdraw my vote.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. Has he voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Iowa has not voted.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know how he would vote and I shall not cast my vote. I should vote "nay," if he were present.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 54; as follows:

YEAS—8.

Allen,	Berry,	Chilton,	Peffer,
Bate,	Blanchard,	Mills,	Pettigrew.

NAYS—54.

Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Brice,	Gallinger,	Mantle,	Sherman,
Brown,	Gibson,	Martin,	Smith,
Burrows,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Caffery,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Teller,
Call,	Hale,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Morrill,	Vest,
Cannon,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Carter,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Hill,	Platt,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Proctor,	Warren,
Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	Wolcott.
Dubois,	Lindsay,	Quay,	
Faulkner,	Lodge,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—27.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Kyle,	Squire,
Allison,	Elkins,	McBride,	Thurston,
Baker,	Gear,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	George,	Nelson,	Wetmore,
Butler,	Gordon,	Pasco,	White,
Clark,	Irby,	Pritchard,	Wilson.
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Shoup,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. I shall modify the amendment of which I gave notice, because the last clause of the bill, referring to the bridge, says, "which shall be used exclusively for foot passengers and vehicles, and prohibited to all tramways, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or other power." I am inclined to think that that would exclude persons riding, which ought not to be done. Therefore, after the word "bridge," in line 9, on page 2, I move to strike out all that follows and to insert:

The use of which is hereby prohibited to all tramways or railroads, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or other power.

That leaves it open to persons walking, driving, or riding.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to know whether it is intended to leave the bridge open to the carriage of freight by heavily loaded teams. If it is, the Senator's amendment does not cover that point.

Mr. HALE. The bill itself would include those. All vehicles are allowed in the bill as it now stands. I do not meddle with that at all; I only seek to exclude tramways and railroads, and to leave it otherwise, as was evidently intended, so that persons on horseback would not be excluded, as they might be by the language of the bill. I have not gone into the question about heavy teams, because they are included, of course, in the word "vehicles."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HALE. The unfinished business being before the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has asked me to yield to him for a moment, and I do so.

CAPT. GEORGE H. PERKINS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins. If there is any objection to the bill, I should like to make a very brief explanation; but I feel sure there will be no objection to it, inasmuch as a similar bill was passed by the Senate in a previous Congress and reported favorably by the committee of the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Capt. George H. Perkins, who was retired as captain after forty years' faithful service upon the active list of the United States Navy, as provided by section 1443, Revised Statutes, and who had honorable service in the late civil war, shall be placed on the retired list with the rank of commodore without the corresponding increased pay, but receiving only the retired pay of captain of the Navy.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions:

A joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892;

A bill (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University;

A bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the road of said company, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895;

A bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 5490) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 5731) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of War to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. Now let the unfinished business be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, to insert, after line 24, on page 3:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to employ temporarily in the Treasury Department, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, not exceeding 25 expert money counters, at a rate not exceeding $60 per month each, $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the beginning of the clause in line 10, on page 4, to insert the subheading "Custom-house building, Chicago, Ill."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 15, on page 5, the last clause read being an appropriation of $45,000 for the transportation of silver coin.

Mr. ALLEN. Before that provision is passed over, I think it requires an explanation from the Senator in charge of the bill. The provision is that—

In expending this sum the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transport from the Treasury or subtreasuries free of charge silver coin when requested to do so.

Under what circumstances would the Government be required to transport silver coin and to what places?

Mr. HALE. I have sent for the document in relation to that matter.

Mr. ALLEN. I might ask the Senator from Maine, in this connection, where there is any provision in this or in any other bill or law requiring the Government at its own expense to transport gold coin, and, if there is not, why gold and silver are not put upon an equality in this respect?

Mr. HALE. This matter was originally put into an appropriation bill at the suggestion of Senators who agree with the Senator from Nebraska with reference to silver. It is in the interests of the transportation of silver. I do not know now that any such provision in terms has been put in the law with relation to gold, but if the Senator believes that the privilege which is accorded here to the holders of silver should also be accorded to the holders of gold I for one have no objection to an amendment including gold.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] I think had something to do with this provision, and knows about it. It is, as I have said, in the interest of free transportation wherever silver may be wanted at the expense of the Government, and I do not object to gold being put on the same basis, although the committee has not authorized me to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. STEWART. Let us have the provision read.

Mr. HALE. Let the Secretary read the provision. I will say it is the same provision which is in the law now, and my impression is that it was originally put in at the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada. I am not certain about it, but I think so.

Mr. STEWART. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The provision referred to will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Transportation of silver coin: For transportation of silver coin, including fractional silver coin, by registered mail or otherwise, $45,000; and in expending this sum the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transport from the Treasury or subtreasuries, free of charge, silver coin when requested to do so: *Provided*, That an equal amount in coin or cur-

rency shall have been deposited in the Treasury or such subtreasuries by the applicant or applicants. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress the cost arising under this appropriation.

Mr. STEWART. I think I did have something to do with suggesting that provision of law. As I now remember, this was the object intended: It frequently happens that small silver coins are returned to the Treasury from different sections of the country, and there is frequently a great inconvenience for the want of small change in the trading community, which drifts into the Treasury. This provision was really for the benefit of the trading public who want small change. It does not apply to gold, for the reason that there is no like necessity in that case. Gold is not used, in the first place, and is not in common circulation.

Mr. HALE. It does not get into one's pocket.

Mr. STEWART. No; it is not used for that purpose.

Mr. ALLEN. Is this provision simply designed, in case where small banks and bankers want subsidiary coin, to cover the expense of transporting that coin from the Treasury or the subtreasuries to the banks?

Mr. STEWART. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no objection to it if that be the case.

Mr. CULLOM. It is helping to get silver into circulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed at line 16, on page 5. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 6, after line 13, to insert:

For the entire compensation of George R. Davis, director-general of the World's Columbian Exposition, in the work of preparing his final report, and for all sums expended or paid out by him upon such work, and for any sums due under agreements or contracts for assistants for such work, such sum to be in full for all claims therefor, $18,006.10: *Provided*, That the original typewritten or written manuscript of such work, all illustrations, diagrams, and plans incorporated in such work, and all plates and negatives of photographs taken therefor in the hands of the director-general shall be by him deposited with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, it seems to me that there ought to be some explanation of this item. I see in this bill that altogether there is something like $40,000 appropriated in connection with the World's Columbian Exposition. I have looked over the explanation of the matter in the report of the committee, and it seems that the national commission has not passed on this amount, and the director-general has received heretofore a very large salary. It seems to me that if there is any necessity for this additional appropriation it should be stated, and it would be interesting for the country to know whether this is the last amount that is to be appropriated on account of the Columbian Exposition.

Mr. HALE. It is not by any means the last call that will be made upon Congress in connection with the exposition. The experience we have had with this exposition is what is always found in all such cases. We proposed to limit the appropriations for all purposes to a fixed sum originally, but that was very largely exceeded, doubled, and I do not know but trebled; and to-day, with all the interest which the American people took in that great exposition, there has been no report made or published. At some time when we have more money with which to do our housekeeping Congress will be called upon to print and circulate among the people the reports of that great exposition, and it will be no small work; but the committee does not now ask Congress to enter upon that large expenditure, which will be some hundreds of thousands of dollars. That subject will come up hereafter, and the Committee on Printing at some future day will, on conference with the Public Printer, submit statements and estimates covering this work.

The item which is here, together with an amendment which I shall offer, covers the work which has been done and the money paid out in preparing these final reports largely by the director-general, Mr. Davis, of Chicago, and Mr. Palmer, who served with some of us here in the Senate, who was president of the commission. The committee has a detailed statement, which will be found in Senate Report No. 150, showing how this money goes, where it has been paid out, and for what purposes. So that if any Senator desires to know what makes up this sum he can look at that document.

I shall not go into any further detailed statement in regard to the subject, for I hope that what I have said will satisfy the Senator from Florida that the scope into which the committee has gone has been very narrow, and has been only the necessary incidental work in the preparation of the report.

Mr. PASCO. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if this is an addition to the salary which this gentleman has hitherto received in connection with the official position he held?

Mr. HALE. No, it is for work performed since his salary ceased; it is not a duplication.

Mr. CULLOM. And most of it is to reimburse him for money actually expended.

Mr. HALE. A large portion of it is to reimburse him for money actually paid out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I now offer an amendment to come in at the end of the amendment just adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment just adopted it is proposed to insert:

For entire reimbursement of Thomas W. Palmer for moneys paid by him for labor and expenses incurred in the preparation of a final report as president of the World's Columbian Exposition, as required by section 13 of the act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, approved April 25, 1890, $1,998.35.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 7, after line 16, to insert:

Life-Saving Service: Authority is hereby granted the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for commutation of quarters for officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service detailed for duty in the Life-Saving Service the sum of $5,160, or so much thereof as may be required, the same to be paid from the regular annual appropriation for the Life-Saving Service for the fiscal year 1896.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 10, after line 22, to insert:

Battle lines and sites for tablets at Antietam: For completing the improvement of the roads owned by the United States at Antietam, $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 21, to insert:

Horses for cavalry and artillery: Purchase of horses for the cavalry and artillery and for the Indian scouts, and for such infantry and members of the hospital corps in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, $30,000: *Provided*, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number on hand, shall not at any time exceed the number of enlisted men and Indian scouts in the mounted service, and that no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster's Department and an inspection by such department, all under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 22, to insert:

Back pay and bounty: For payment of amounts for arrears of pay of two and three year volunteers that may be certified to be due by the accounting officers of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1896, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 7, to insert:

Navy-yard at Brooklyn, N. Y.: For completion of dry dock No. 3, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 9, to insert:

Naval War College and Torpedo School, Coasters Harbor Island, Rhode Island: For repairs to roof of college building, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interior Department," on page 13, after line 13, to insert:

For the Capitol: For work at Capitol and for general repairs thereof, including wages of mechanics and laborers, $10,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 16, to insert:

Government Hospital for the Insane: For completing electric plant for lighting and ventilating, $19,349.64.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 22, to insert:

For the renting of additional rooms for the use of the engraving and printing division of the Geological Survey for a period of four months, beginning with the 1st day of March, $400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 8, to insert:

Payment for surveys of public lands: To pay F. W. Pettigrew for surveys executed by him and approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in excess of the limit allowed by his contract, No. 100, in the year 1894, $300.80.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 16, line 7, before the word "hundred," to strike out "chief of accounting division, six" and insert "clerk in charge of accounts, two"; so as to make the clause read:

For additional salary of clerk in charge of accounts, $200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 11, to strike out:

For printing and binding for the Department of Justice, to be executed under the direction of the Public Printer, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 17, line 3, after the word "attorneys," to insert "assistant district attorneys"; in the same line, after the word "marshals," to insert "deputy marshals," and in line 4, after the word "clerks," to insert "deputy clerks"; so as to make the clause read:

To pay the salaries and expenses of the judges, district attorneys, assistant district attorneys, marshals, deputy marshals, clerks, deputy clerks, commissioners, and constables of the United States courts in the Indian Territory, including the salary due James V. Walker, resigned, as district attor-

ney of the central district of the Indian Territory from April 1, 1895, to July 8, 1895, inclusive, at the rate of $4,000 per annum. And the salary due Lucius L. Stowe, now deceased, as marshal of the southern district of the Indian Territory from April 3, 1895, to July 27, 1895, inclusive, at the rate of $4,000 per annum, being a deficiency to the appropriation for the service of the fiscal years 1895 and 1896, $210,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senate has now reached the appropriations in the bill which it seems to me are very large and some of them objectionable. I am not prepared to state, I will say to the Senator from Maine, that I wish to vote against the House provision of $210,000 for arrears of judicial expenses in the Indian Territory, although I think it is very large. I fear it is excessive. The estimate is contained on page 327 of the Book of Estimates for this year, Appendix J. The regular pay roll for that district is 3 judges, $15,000; 3 marshals, $12,000; 3 attorneys, $12,000; 3 clerks, $9,000; 10 deputy clerks, $12,000; 18 commissioners, $27,000; 12 regular deputy marshals, $14,000; 33 special deputy marshals, $39,600; 18 constables, $10,800; 1 clerk court of appeals, $1,200, making $152,600. Then there is an arrear for the quarter ending June 30, 1895, of $10,000. The estimate proceeds:

It is perhaps fair to suggest that for incidental expenses there will be needed at least $50,000. The total appropriation, therefore, which should be so worded as to include the salaries of constables, should be, from the above estimate, $210,600.

I see that the other House has adopted that estimate. I am led not to say that I oppose the appropriation because I find that the amount appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, in the last appropriation act was only $50,000. I take it, therefore, that the committees of the two Houses expected a deficiency; that it must be apparent either that the expenditures now proposed are enormously excessive, or else, when Congress, knowing that this new court of three districts in the Indian Territory had been created, appropriated only $50,000 for the service of the year, it was known that that sum would be entirely inadequate for the performance of the business of the courts in that district.

I do not know whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has any recollection upon that subject, as to whether $50,000 was appropriated by the last Congress when it was known that $260,000 would be needed, that amount being purposely left unappropriated, or whether the Senator has any recollection on the subject.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will be through on this point in one moment. I do not know, either, whether the Senator or the committee can give any information as to whether 12 regular deputy marshals, costing $14,000; 33 special marshals, costing $39,600, and 18 commissioners, costing $27,000—I hope the Senator will note the figures—are needed. The other House proposes these appropriations, the Senate committee acquiesces in them, and Congress now proposes to say to the officers of the United States courts in the Indian Territory that they can spend for these 18 commissioners $27,000, for these 12 regular deputy marshals $14,000, and for these 33 special deputy marshals $39,600.

I take it for granted that the salaries of the 3 judges, $5,000 each, $15,000, must be paid, of course. The 3 marshals, $4,000 each, $12,000, must be paid, being salaries. The 3 attorneys must be paid $4,000 each, $12,000. The 3 clerks, $3,000 each, making $9,000, and the 10 deputy clerks, $12,000, must be paid. But I ask the Senator from Maine whether there is any need of spending the $27,000 and the $14,000 and the $39,600, including also in addition 18 constables, $10,800?

The Senator will say that because that amount is appropriated it need not necessarily be expended. But I say to the Senator there is not one probability that that money will be saved.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

Mr. CHANDLER. In one moment. It will all be expended, because it is appropriated. It will be used up in some way. We may be entirely sure. Now I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. My recollection in regard to the matter (the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] will correct me, however, if I am wrong) is that the act creating these courts also provided for a certain number of commissioners at a fixed salary of $1,500 each.

Mr. CHANDLER. Commissioners?

Mr. BERRY. Commissioners. It also provided for a certain number of deputy marshals at a fixed salary of probably $1,200 each. The proposed appropriations simply meet the requirements of that act for services already rendered by the parties under the law fixing the number of officers and the salaries to be paid.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I will ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. If all the sums I have read are for salaries, why did Congress appropriate only $50,000 to cover this $260,000 of expenses?

Mr. HALE. I can tell the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BERRY. As to why Congress did not appropriate more, I can only state what I remember as to what occurred at the time. The bill was passed very late in the session, just before the adjournment of the last Congress. There was no provision in the regular bill for the payment of any salaries. An effort was made on the House side to get an appropriation for the purpose. The committee in the other House put only $50,000 into the bill. It was so late in the session that it was impossible to correct it after the bill came here, though it was known here by all those who took any interest in the matter that that sum was wholly insufficient. Why the House did not put in any more than $50,000 I can not answer the Senator, because I do not know.

Mr. HALE. The act which is at the bottom of all this is the act of March 1, 1895, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes." That bill became a law March 1, 1895. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has said, it contained no appropriation of money to set the machinery on foot, and on the 2d of March the act to provide for the salaries of judges and other officers of the United States court in the Indian Territory was passed, which gave only $50,000, and which, of course, was nothing but guesswork.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does that act specify the salaries, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. HALE. No, it does not. The provisions for the appointment of judges, district attorneys, commissioners, deputy marshals, etc., are all contained in the original act, and not in the appropriation act. But if the Senator will examine that act he will find that all these are provided for, and the Department has gone on under the original act constituting this court with its surroundings.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that the salaries of commissioners and deputy marshals are fixed in the original act creating the court.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what I should like to have the Senator from Maine state; whether the number and the salaries of the commissioners, the deputy clerks, the regular deputy marshals, the special deputy marshals, and the constables are provided for. Does the act state their number and compensation?

Mr. HALE. The judges, marshals, attorneys, deputy marshals, and clerks are provided for in that way. The provision as to commissioners is found in section 4.

That each judge of said court shall have the powers conferred by law upon the United States circuit courts to appoint commissioners within the district in which he presides, who, at the time of their appointment, shall be duly enrolled attorneys of some court of record of the United States or of some State, and shall be competent and of good standing, and shall be known as United States commissioners, but not exceeding six commissioners shall be appointed for any district hereinbefore constituted.

There are three districts, and then there are provisions about present commissioners, etc. But I do not know of anything——

Mr. BERRY. I am sure the Senator will find either in that act or the other the provision fixing the salary of commissioners at $1,500, and of deputy marshals at $1,200.

Mr. HALE. Yes, that is the case. It is found in section 5, in which the salaries of constables and other officers are fixed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read that section?

Mr. HALE. It is as follows:

Each of said constables shall receive a salary of $800 per annum. Each of said commissioners and constables shall keep a careful account of all fees, fines, and costs collected by him, and shall settle with and pay the same to the clerk of the district at the end of every quarter, who shall pay the same into the Treasury of the United States. Said commissioners and constables, before entering upon the discharge of their duties, shall execute to the United States, for the security of the public, a good and sufficient bond in the sum of $2,000, to be approved by the judge appointing him, conditioned that he will faithfully discharge the duties of his office and account for all moneys coming into his hands; and he shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and to faithfully perform the duties required of him.

* * * * * * *

Each of said commissioners in said Territory shall receive a salary of $1,500 per annum, and all fees collected by him shall be paid over to the clerk of the district.

I have not read everything, but only that portion which is necessary to answer the question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Of course this has been almost terra incognita to the Department of Justice. It was new, an experiment that Congress deliberately embarked in, and it cost a great deal of money. I do not wonder that the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire has been drawn to this matter, because it costs a great deal more than it was supposed it would. But there has been the need, as the Department believes, of all this force, this paraphernalia of justice, and the Department has done its best to keep down the expenditures. The committee can only say that, taking the representations of the Department, as the House of Representatives did, and as the committee of the Senate did, it believes that those provisions to the extent they are found in the bill are necessary. I could wish that they cost less money, and I could wish in the future that they may be restricted and perhaps lessened. But that is a matter that must be largely dealt with in the discretion of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator from Maine to take notice of the fact that the words which he has read, "not exceeding," have had very little effect. When those judges were ap-

pointed, and two of them were ex-members of Congress, being left out of the present Congress, and went to the Indian Territory, they went with all the extravagant notions derived from residence for many years in Washington. They were not simple-minded, economical citizens of the Indian Territory or of the prudent and humble State of Arkansas, or of Texas adjoining; but they went with all the extravagant notions engendered by being members of a Democratic billion-dollar Congress.

When they came to appoint their officials, the words "not exceeding" imposed no limitations upon them. The Senator from Maine will notice 18 commissioners in the three districts, not exceeding 6 in each district. The whole 18 were appointed. There are 12 deputy marshals, regular. If the Senator will look, I think he will find that the act said "not exceeding 4 in each district." "Thirty-three deputy marshals;" the Senator will see that is nearly 9 for each district, and the words "not exceeding" are undoubtedly in the act. "Eighteen constables;" that is 6 in each district. So the judges appointed all that the law allowed them to do, and the total amount of expenses is to be incurred. When Congress adjourned the people had a right to expect—the Senator will not deny that—that the $50,000 would pay the expense of the courts in the Indian Territory.

Mr. HALE. I do not think the people generally, the sixty or seventy million people, knew much about it. I do not think that anybody who had anything to do with making the appropriation believed that $50,000 would carry this business through a year. It was thought that it might serve to run the courts until Congress met in December, and it was the hope, when that provision was made a law, that it would run them until December.

Mr. CHANDLER. Undoubtedly——

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly it did not. It was guesswork, as I have said.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is one of those cases where, imputing no special blame to anyone except as we are all to blame for the existence of this system, it was perfectly known except to the people. I will modify my expression as to what the people had a right to expect—because they had a right to expect nothing—but it was not known to the people (I suppose the Senator will not object to that form of expression) that this district for which $50,000 had been appropriated would cost $260,000 for its court expenses, yet the full limit of marshals, deputy marshals, and commissioners has been reached, and this amount of money will have to be paid.

Mr. President, I have not made these remarks without having some cause to complain of the expenditures in that district. I am not able at present certainly to make specific charges as to the method in which justice is being administered in that district, but I have heard complaints as to the expenditures there. I believe that the expenditures are extravagant and that all is not as it should be in that district.

Letters and oral suggestions have come to me in reference to the manner in which the court business is managed there, which lead me to believe that there is the same extravagance inaugurated in the Indian Territory in the management of the courts that clearly exists in various other parts of the country, and I make my suggestions in the hope that when the committee come to scrutinize the appropriations for the next fiscal year they will see to it that the appropriations are made specific; that they will make no more appropriations than are necessary for conducting the public business, and that the committee will, if possible, devise some means of making the appropriations which they grant in the regular bill last the year out, instead of being expended in the first six months of the year, Congress then being subjected to a demand for the doubling or the trebling of the appropriation for the succeeding six months in the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 17, after line 18, to insert:

Court of Private Land Claims: That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $16,000 made for salaries and expenses of the Court of Private Land Claims in the legislative appropriation act approved July 31, 1894, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1896.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 18, to insert:

For payment of fees and expenses of the United States marshals and deputies, fiscal year 1895, $230,573.34.

Mr. CHANDLER. The appropriation for this item, marshals and deputies, as it comes to the Senate is $960,000. The Senate committee proposes to add for deficiencies for 1895, $230,572.34. I now take occasion to call attention again to the enormous increase, the constantly growing increase, in the expenses of the United States courts.

In the first place, the appropriation for the current fiscal year was $3,455,600. The House present appropriation is $3,006,000, making $6,461,600. I speak now of the total appropriations for United States courts. The Senate adds $299,000, making the courts of the United States for the current year, if no additional deficiency is appropriated for, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] says there will undoubtedly be a further deficiency to provide for, cost the sum of $6,760,600.

The Attorney-General calls attention to this growing increase of the expenses of the United States courts. In the criticisms that I make I intend no reflection upon the Committee on Appropriations of this body, nor do I propose to make any remarks derogatory to the past or the present administration of the Department of Justice in Washington. I have no doubt the late Attorney-General and the present Attorney-General have been anxious to keep down expenses, but in spite of all that the heads of the Department of Justice have been able to accomplish the frightful increase in the expenses of the Department still goes on.

I read from the report of the present Attorney-General, submitted November 30, 1895:

The expenses of the Federal courts have steadily increased, as well as their business, as will appear by the following statement:

Fiscal year—		Total expenses.
1888		$3,864,898.15
1889		4,031,189.09
1890		4,761,204.60
1891		4,992,195.64
1892		5,049,778.96
1893		5,628,223.21
1894—		
Incurred and paid in 1894	$4,551,373.61	
Incurred in 1894 and paid in 1895	1,643,726.89	
		6,195,100.50
1895—		
Incurred and paid in 1895		5,412,718.91

And the Attorney-General adds in a note:

Amounts yet to be paid to be added as appropriations are available for two years after the year for which they are made.

The report of the House committee in charge of the bill, being Report No. 76, House of Representatives, present session, gives the amounts that they have inserted in the bill for United States courts as deficiencies at $3,242,582.19, and a table is given at the close of the report, headed "Appropriations for expenses of United States courts and deficiencies therefor, fiscal years 1885–1896," which I will insert in my remarks without reading the whole of it at this time:

Appropriations for expenses of United States courts and deficiencies therefor, fiscal years 1885–1896.

Regular appropriation for 1885	$2,760,000.00
Deficiencies	450,050.00
Regular appropriation for 1886	2,960,000.00
Deficiencies	560,266.00
Regular appropriation for 1887	2,904,400.00
Deficiencies	485,260.00
Regular appropriation for 1888	2,849,400.00
Deficiencies	1,024,728.00
Regular appropriation for 1889	3,505,600.00
Deficiencies	359,219.00
Regular appropriation for 1890	3,575,600.00
Deficiencies	1,156,289.00
Regular appropriation for 1891	3,616,600.00
Deficiencies	1,423,900.00
Regular appropriation for 1892	3,739,100.00
Deficiencies	1,391,123.00
Regular appropriation for 1893	3,330,600.00
Deficiencies	2,177,860.00
Regular appropriation for 1894	3,345,000.00
Deficiencies	2,758,402.00
Regular appropriation for 1895	3,595,000.00
Deficiencies	2,653,200.00
Regular appropriation for 1896	3,455,600.00
Amount in accompanying bill:	
For 1896	3,006,000.00
For 1895	180,238.12
For 1894	35,837.21
For 1894 and 1895	20,506.86

But going back to 1885, we have the regular appropriation, $2,760,000 and the deficiencies $450,050, making about $3,300,000. Now, ten years after, we have the amounts doubled already, making over $6,000,000 that is to be provided for when the bill passes, and we have the assurance of the Senator from Maine that that will not be the total appropriation—that there will undoubtedly be a further deficiency to provide for. So it is probable that the court expenses for the present fiscal year, instead of being a little over $3,000,000, as they were ten years ago, will be about $8,000,000.

I submit that Congress should take this subject into careful consideration, and see what the difficulty is and whether a remedy can be applied. It is folly to say that there has been any such natural increase of business as would produce these increased expenditures. The business of the United States in United States courts is not three times as great in 1896 as it was in 1886. It is to be borne in mind that this is only the expenses of United States business. This appropriation does not include the salaries of the judges, and in addition to the United States litigation, criminal and civil, is the large amount of civil business in causes between party and party which is done in United States courts.

There has been an increase of legitimate business, I know, but no such increase as that to which I have called attention. I read from the Attorney-General's report:

Great vigilance has been exercised and every effort made to keep down the expenses connected with the Federal courts. Excessive and illegal charges

can in some measure be avoided by watchfulness and laborious investigation, but arrests and prosecutions on frivolous charges and flimsy proof, to which part of these expenses is due, can not be prevented by this Department. This can be accomplished only by abolishing the system which, by making the fees of commissioners, marshals, clerks, and attorneys the source of their compensation, presents a constant inducement to unnecessary arrests and litigation.

The 40 per cent of unsuccessful prosecutions during the past year, which is less than usual, does not, of course, include the cases wherein persons arrested are discharged on preliminary hearing, or those wherein the charges are ignored by grand juries. Not only do the fees of commissioners, and those of marshals and witnesses, with mileage, in these cases, cause a large annual expense to the Government, but annoyance and loss of time are inflicted on those involved as parties and witnesses which indirectly work both material and moral injury to the public. Besides, a class of professional witnesses and informers grows up in many sections, to the scandal of the administration of justice.

The Attorney-General calls special attention to some frauds in connection with the business of the United States courts in the State of Alabama. I do not see either of the Senators from Alabama in the Chamber, but I send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read the clause in brackets which I have marked in the report of the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

The discovery in northern Alabama of a widespread conspiracy among commissioners and deputy marshals to defraud the Government by means of fraudulent charges of fees, and the recent conviction of such of the conspirators as failed to escape, only call renewed attention in a striking way to the evils of the fee system.

Mr. CHANDLER. I now ask the Secretary to read the marked passages in brackets in Report No. 76, to which I have alluded, made in the House of Representatives January 20, 1896, beginning with the words "This exhibit" and reading to the end of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

This exhibit shows for the period named a growth in the expenses of this branch of the public service of more than 100 per cent. The expenses for fees of United States commissioners have grown from $127,150 for the fiscal year 1889 to $340,000 for the current year, and the fees of witnesses have increased from $900,000 in 1889 to $1,500,000 for the current year.

That these expenditures are abnormal and that some reform in the law should be instituted the committee are well satisfied; but under the rules of the House they have no power in the premises other than to recommend the appropriations which are necessary to meet the demands of this branch of the public service as they arise under existing law, and to express the earnest hope and recommendation that the proper committee or committees of the House will take up the matter without delay during this session, with a view to the enactment of proper legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Coming now to the pending bill, I have in my hand a table which I will insert in the RECORD, showing what has been done in reference to the year 1896 and what is proposed to be done. The regular appropriation for the whole year for the fees of marshals, it appears by this table, was $675,000. The House of Representatives now insert in the pending bill a deficiency of $960,000. I desire the especial attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], as well as of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] who is conversing with him, to this point. Here is a deliberately made appropriation of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the last Congress, participated in by the Committee on Appropriations, participated in by the Senator from Maine, by the Senator from Colorado, by myself as a member of this body, and $675,000 was appropriated for the fees of marshals. The other House now insert in this bill a deficiency of $960,000, and the Senate committee propose to add $230,000 more. Now, I ask the Senators who are members of the Committee on Appropriations whether that is the way to do the public business.

Mr. HALE. No, it is not. Undoubtedly it is not. I referred to this matter before. It is a bad way. It comes from the other body. They did not last year claim or assert that the appropriations made for the purposes indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire would carry the Department through the year or even through half of the year; but the claim was that it might carry them around to December, and that then it could be supplemented by a deficiency appropriation bill. I think that is a very bad way, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. We had in possession of the Government a President committed to stand by the interests and promote the welfare of the common people; we had a House of Representatives elected in the interest of reform; and we had a Senate of the United States the appropriations of which were controlled by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] who I see in his seat, as he always is. That reform Congress decided that $675,000 was money enough for the marshals' fees of the United States courts for the whole year; and now the House of Representatives is obliged to add $960,000 to the marshals' fees for the current year, and the Senate committee, composed of the ablest Senators and embodying the best thought of the Senate, propose to add $230,573.34 to this appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Now I want to know why this is so. I want to hear from the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] as well as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] on this subject before this $960,000 plus $230,000 is swallowed by the Senate, which I trust will in the present Congress show some measure of reform.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator allow me to ask——

Mr. CHANDLER. I see the Senator from Nebraska is looking eagerly at me. After I hear from him I will be glad to hear from the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the Senator tell me what he wants me to state.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New Hampshire uses the expression "the best thought," which has a strangely familiar sound here. I thought I would ask him whether he meant the best thought, which is represented of course on both sides of this Chamber, upon the money question or upon questions of domestic economy.

Mr. CHANDLER. The question puzzles me, Mr. President. I will think it over and answer at length to-morrow. Now I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not understand exactly what the Senator from New Hampshire desired me to say.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want the Senator to state whether it was wise legislation to appropriate $675,000 for fees of marshals for the whole year and now to appropriate $960,000 plus $230,000 as a deficiency. Is that the way to appropriate money for United States courts?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether there was any wisdom in it or not. It is hard to tell. It is all we could get at the last session. It is all that would be allowed at that session.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why so? Why was not the Senate asked to appropriate the proper amount, unless $675,000 was enough?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senate appropriated as nearly all that was desired as it could get.

Mr. CHANDLER. The estimate was $1,400,000. The Senator was chairman of the committee, and he let Congress go away after having appropriated $675,000—less than one-half the estimate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly; there is no question about that.

Mr. CHANDLER. Could not the Senator help that?

Mr. COCKRELL. Help it! I have not yet been able to find a way to coerce those who differ from you and have equal power with you.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought the Senator did that frequently.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have never yet been able to do it. I should be delighted to know how it can be done. There are some stubborn and rebellious men here in the Senate on the silver question whom I would like to coerce and have them do something that was reasonable and just.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will accomplish more with me in that direction by coercion than persuasion.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, no; the whole truth of the matter is that there was the estimate; the committee in the Senate increased the appropriation, and in conference it would not be agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, that is what we are confronted with to-day. Six hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars was appropriated for the marshals, and it has gone. The other House now proposes to give them $960,000 more, and the banner of reform having been transferred from the other side of the Chamber to this side of the Chamber, it is now proposed by the Senate committee to add $230,000. Mr. President, for one I am going to vote against that addition of $230,000 if I vote alone, and I should like to vote against the appropriation of $960,000.

There was appropriated for attorneys' fees $250,000, and it is now proposed to appropriate $160,000 and $57,000 and $14,000, as will appear by the table, as a deficiency. The clerks were allowed by the bill of the reform Congress $175,000. The deficiency appropriation is $155,000, and for 1895, $38,000, and for 1894, $10,000, and the Senate committee propose to add $19,000 more, making all together, as in the case of the marshals' fees, more deficiency than the original appropriation.

Now, we come to the commissioners' fees, and I want the special attention of the Senator from Maine to the situation of the commissioners' fees. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] will allow me to have the attention of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CHANDLER. First I had to call off the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and now the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and I want the junior Senator from Colorado to see this. We appropriated $100,000 for commissioners' fees for 1896. Now the other House proposes to appropriate $240,000 for a deficiency, and $71,000, and $11,000, and $3,902.65. Now, I ask the two Senators if that is the way to do business.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the conviction that the Senator from New Hampshire has forced upon me is to rise in indignant protest at his statement a few moments ago that the Committee on Appropriations embody either the best thought or the most thought in the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has himself recently maintained that they embody the great bulk of wisdom and ought to have substantially all the power of the Senate.

We appropriated $600,000 for jurors' fees. We are now called upon to appropriate $200,000 more for jurors' fees. We appropriated $750,000 for witnesses' fees. The proposed deficiency appropriation in the bill as passed by the House is $750,000. We appropriated for the support of prisoners $275,000, and the deficiency appropriation is $365,000. Take bailiffs and criers. We appropriated $150,000, and the deficiency is $70,000. The table is as follows:

	Regular estimate for the whole year ending June 30, 1896.	Regular appropriation for the whole year.	Present House deficiency bill gives—	Senate committee's increase.
Fees of marshals	$1,400,000	$675,000	$960,000.00	*$230,573.34
Attorneys:				
1896	351,000	250,000	160,000.00	
1895			57,639.22	14,821.85
Clerks' fees:				
1896	290,000	175,000	155,000.00	
1895			38,898.35	19,615.52
1894			10,179.36	
Commissioners' fees:				
1896	290,000	100,000	240,000.00	
1895			71,934.28	3,902.65
1894			11,653.20	
Jurors' fees	700,000	600,000	200,000.00	*103.45
Witness fees	1,000,000	750,000	750,000.00	*30,722.38
Support of prisoners	640,000	275,000	365,000.00	
Rent of court rooms, etc.	112,000	50,000	50,000.00	
Bailiffs and criers:				
1896	180,000	150,000	70,000.00	
1895			1,698.46	
Miscellaneous expenses	240,000	170,000	25,000.00	
Assistant district attorneys, 1895	50,000	25,000	10,067.81	
District attorneys, special, 1894			14,004.65	
District attorneys, regular	121,000	100,000	31,000.00	
Receivers' expenses			20,506.86	

*For 1895.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine asked very properly: What is the remedy; what does the Senator from New Hampshire propose as a remedy? Of course, in view of all these excessive expenditures, as they have taken place in recent years, there have been under consideration bills for paying salaries to the district attorneys and the marshals instead of fees, but those bills have made no progress. I remember the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] reported a bill fixing the salaries for district attorneys, and if I am correctly informed, after the bill came into the Senate the Senator from Missouri was obliged to submit to increases of the salaries proposed by him all along the line, until finally, when the bill was overwhelmed by increases, the Senator from Missouri abandoned it, and we have heard no more from him. If we wait until by legislation fixing salaries and regulating the fees we succeed in reducing these expenses down to a proper point, we shall wait in vain. The men who are interested in this iniquitous fee system will manage to bring influences to bear upon you, Mr. President, and myself, and the other Senators on both sides of the Chamber, and upon the House of Representatives, and they will block all measures of reform in this direction.

Therefore it is time, as it seems to me, to bring about reform here by refusing to appropriate for some of these deficiencies; and I myself believe that a most effectual remedy could be administered by this Congress by refusing to appropriate for the deficiencies for the compensation of the district attorneys and the marshals. I would not advise refusing to appropriate for the fees of the jurors or the fees of the witnesses. Mr. President, they are not to blame. The jurors are summoned by order of the court; the witnesses are summoned by order of the court; and, although the deficiency for witnesses' fees is reported as being more than the whole allowance for the year, I suppose the fees will have to be paid, and the jurors' fees, which are a third larger than the regular appropriation, will have to be paid.

But, Mr. President, these enormous expenses are caused by a negligent administration of their offices by the district attorneys and the marshals. Fictitious and useless and unnecessary prosecutions are gotten up by district attorneys and by marshals; and the way to put an end to the unnecessary litigation, which is promoted and fostered by the district attorneys and the marshals, and for which they are responsible, is to refuse to appropriate for the deficiencies for the district attorneys and the marshals. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Appropriations will be willing in some portion of this bill to apply that drastic remedy, which I conceive is the only way in which the extravagances which are growing up in the conduct of the business of the courts of the United States can be restricted and put down.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I can perhaps assist the Senator in trying to reach——

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to say to the Senator before he speaks that I have heard the same complaints made in reference to the administration of justice in the courts of the United States in South Carolina that exist in reference to Alabama, that there have been fictitious prosecutions there, and litigation gotten up and promoted for the purpose of increasing the fees of officers. I have no data on the subject. I hope the Senator from South Carolina can assist me in that direction.

Mr. TILLMAN. Not being a lawyer, I have no facts except that two or three weeks ago I noticed in one of our State papers a very strong presentation by the district judge in his charge to the grand jury, or in some remarks to the grand jury, in regard to the abuses which are bringing about this enormous increase in expenditures. He charged the commissioners as being perhaps more responsible for it than anybody else, because if the marshal desires to institute proceedings—fictitious proceedings, you might say; those under color of justice, indeed, but merely to get a fee—unless the commissioner is in collusion he will throw the case out; he will not summon the witnesses, and will not bind the party over to court. Necessarily the commissioner and the marshal and the district attorney, perhaps all three working in collusion, bring about this condition, where the public money is wasted on witnesses. I have seen them around our courts there. They are habitual witnesses. I have known of them. They make their living that way. They go about over the country and try to bamboozle this negro or that into buying a bottle of whisky, and then they get the thing up and carry a whole team of negroes up to court, and get $2 a day, or whatever the fee is that the witnesses are paid. If you will pardon me, I do not intend any insinuation, or accusation of imbecility, or anything of that kind, but when you get up here and say that you do not know what to do, and try to put the burden on the Appropriations Committee, and say that they ought to stop recommending appropriations to pay this money, when the law permits it, I think is a confession that——

Mr. TELLER and others. Of imbecility.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, I think the Judiciary Committee ought to take hold of this matter, or some Senator, and bring in a bill here that would give us a system of salaries instead of the fees.

Mr. HALE. That is just what ought to be done. The Senator has it right.

Mr. TILLMAN. As long as we had trial justices in our State——

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me?

Mr. TILLMAN. In one minute, as soon as I make the point. As long as we had trial justices in our State, that being the system—in other words, when they were paid by the case—our dockets were kept burdened with cases against negroes for stealing this chicken and having that little rumpus or fight, or something of that sort. In self-defense, to keep from being bankrupted by court expenses, we simply gave those fellows a fixed salary, and said, "Here, you will get so much for the criminal business and you will not get any more." Then when anybody came to one of the trial justices and said that John Jones and Tom Smith had a fight, he would say, "Let them fight it out; I have got nothing to do with them. If you want a warrant, come up here and swear it out." He would not send a crowd around to hunt up all these little cases. So I say you can not do anything with this matter until you fix the salaries here and make it to the interest of these men not to have litigation rather than to have it, because, unless they get a fee out of it, they will not want to do the work.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say, since the question has been raised, that the Committee on the Judiciary has this question before it now. The chairman is not present, but I recollect that at the last meeting he stated that at the next meeting of the committee he should bring up the subject of fees as a special subject for consideration. I wish to say to Senators, however, that it is a very difficult question to determine what the salary should be in all the different marshals' districts, and what the salary of the commissioners should be and the salary of the clerks. It is no small job, as Senators will find out when the bill is presented here. I have no doubt that every Senator on this floor will find fault with the bill when it is brought in and insist that it is not a proper bill for his State; it may be all right for some other State.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what we all did before when the Senator from Missouri had his bill up.

Mr. TELLER. We had the same experience before in trying to adopt a different system, but we are still at it, and I suppose in due time we shall bring in a bill, and then I will expect the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators to insist that there has been a great lack of judgment in regard to fixing salaries on the part of the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to criticise the conduct of anyone in respect to appropriations. I believe that the present system of dealing with our appropriations is probably

more expensive and faulty than that of any other parliamentary government. The manner in which our appropriations is made is a very loose one. The Secretary of the Treasury is required by existing law to submit to Congress at the beginning of each session estimates for the ensuing fiscal year. In the English Government this is called the budget.

Although we do not often like to cite the systems of other Governments as superior to our own, yet the system of the English Government in dealing with appropriations is infinitely better than ours. What is called the budget is made upon the responsibility of ministers who hold that office at the pleasure of Parliament. Nobody deals with the estimates but the House of Commons. The House of Lords are not even allowed to cross a "t" or dot an "i." There is no appropriation bill that passes between the two Houses. The appropriations are dealt with by the House of Commons.

The budget of England is taken up in its ordinary course. It is made up in the most scientific manner, giving details not only of the expenditures for the coming year, but of the expenditures of the past year, and giving it in a simple, brief form; it shows the amounts and gives the figures, but not in a long document or bill such as is now introduced in Congress. Indeed, when I entered Congress as a member of the House of Representatives there was but one bill appropriating money; that was called the appropriation bill. The appropriations have since been divided into I do not know how many bills—ten, twelve, or thirteen. Then there are deficiency appropriation bills, which very rarely occurred at that time.

To consider the English budget the House of Commons would meet at an earlier hour than usual, only forty being required to attend to form a quorum, and they were generally persons connected with the financial affairs of the Government. They went over the various items one by one and they put down so many pounds, shillings, and pence for each particular item. That was carried through in committee of the House of Commons, and they rarely changed the appropriations. It was only under certain circumstances that they added to or deducted from the appropriations that were made, and those changes were noted in the budget. The budget at the close of its consideration was then reprinted. Thereupon an act of Parliament was passed, embracing probably a single page of printed matter, in which the House of Commons placed at the service of Her Majesty the Queen and her ministers this budget.

In a simple law of probably one page the different parts of the budget were contained. I have one of them here before me, showing the character in which they are made up. This is what is called the civil budget. Then they had the military budget and the naval budget. This is the precise form. [Exhibiting.] This budget shows not only the particular expense to be provided for, but the amount given for the current year, the amount for the coming year, and so on. It is simply this estimate that was enacted into a law of about one page or two pages. If there was to be any special legislation attached to the budget on account of the appropriations made by the budget that legislation was given. I have myself seen many of these. Therefore the acts of a session of Parliament of Great Britain would probably be contained in a thin pamphlet of 40, 50, or 60 pages. Those acts are carried into public laws of Great Britain. They do not publish the estimates in the laws.

The great objection now to our statutes is that more than two-thirds of the space is occupied in the printing of appropriations, when, as a matter of course, the appropriations made for one year at the end of the following year are of no account whatever; and yet we publish all the items in detail, and put them in our great folios, and thus cause an enormous deal of expense in printing and distributing the laws. If you take up the acts of a Parliament you will find that they are contained in a comparatively small volume. If you take up the acts of one of our sessions you will find it a great volume, simply because we print all these items in detail in the form of laws, all interest in which disappears in the course of twelve months.

Mr. President, this controversy between the two Houses is very unfortunate. As a matter of course, the Senate can not surrender its power to amend appropriation bills. The Senate has precisely the same power to originate and prepare appropriation bills as has the House of Representatives, and there is no provision of the Constitution which imposes any restraint upon the Senate in dealing with appropriation bills precisely as it deals with all other subjects of legislation. But the very fact that these two Houses are generally watchful of each other, and sometimes are controlled by opposing parties—the House withholding appropriations which are necessary to be made and forcing the Senate to consider and act upon them—engenders controversy and collision, until finally the controversy appears before a committee of conference, where, sometimes, great difficulties arise and large subjects may be stricken out or large appropriations may be added.

I do not know precisely the way in which this can be corrected, but my own idea would be that the Secretary of the Treasury should give specifically in his estimates of appropriation every item of expenditures approved by him, and that book ought to be the basis of the action of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses. The figures recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, who represents the executive department of the Government, of course should be subject to change, at their pleasure, by the House of Representatives, and items added to or taken from it. That budget, with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury, ought then to be sent to the Senate, and there additions may be made either in the amount of appropriations or in new appropriations or in reducing the old appropriations. The whole would be shown as in the English budget, contained in the book I hold in my hand, and all of the laws relating to appropriations could be then transferred to the general laws of the United States, where they would not fill the space that ought to be reserved for the ordinary legislation of the country.

I have often conversed on this subject with my friend from Maine [Mr. HALE], who, I believe, agrees with me in every respect, and also with my friend from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. They concur with me that this is a very difficult question to deal with. But, in my judgment, the Appropriations Committee could not do a greater act of wisdom or a greater act of utility to the Congress of the United States than by adopting substantially the English system in the mode and manner of making up their appropriations. If that were done the people of the United States could see exactly how much the executive department had recommended to be appropriated for certain purposes, and they could see how much the House of Representatives had authorized for such purposes, and then what the Senate did on the same subjects; and each branch would be responsible for their action as to the recommendations contained in the budget.

It seems to me that some such method, which could be easily adopted, would save an enormous sum of money now expended in printing the appropriation bills, with the long array of figures, which are not printed in Arabic numerals, but by letters; and this has to be repeated over and over again, because when a bill is reported to the House it will probably be amended, and then reprinted, and when it comes to the Senate it will probably be amended and be printed more than once, and finally carried, with all its multitudinous details, to the great volume of which I have spoken.

This is all wrong; and if the English system of the budget were adopted by Congress in substance, not perhaps in form, that budget to go through the two Houses of Congress, it would save enormous expense. The people could then see who were responsible for unnecessary expenditures or insufficient expenditures; they could see what the executive department had recommended, what the House of Representatives had recommended, and what the Senate had recommended, and then the action of the separate bodies, who must concur in the making of a law, and each of these bodies could be held responsible by the people of the United States. In my judgment the expenditures of the Government of the United States for the past ten or fifteen years have been far beyond the necessary requirements of the public service, and I say that with full knowledge——

Mr. COCKRELL. And yet the appropriations made by Congress have been every year from twenty to thirty million dollars below the estimates of the executive branch.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know that, but the executive department does not bind the Senator or anybody else here. I should be glad, indeed, to see published in the budget all these different details, so as to show who is responsible for unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. CULLOM. Does not the Treasury Department now practically make out what might be called a budget, that is to say, does not that Department report to Congress the estimates of appropriations desired by the Government in the different branches of the public service? So the country can now see what the Administration recommends and what each House of Congress recommends by the passage of appropriation bills. Therefore I am not sure that if the system suggested by the Senator should be adopted it would be any clearer to the public as to exactly what each House had done and what the Administration had recommended.

Mr. SHERMAN. My friend is mistaken in his conclusion. This document is not seen by 100 people outside of the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CULLOM. Suppose the Administration were required to make up what the Senator calls a budget, how would the people generally get to see that?

Mr. SHERMAN. They would get to see that because that budget would be followed by the action of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. Is not that so now to a great extent?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CULLOM. I think it is.

Mr. SHERMAN. The English budget is carried through until it is embodied in the law. All the appropriations in the budget

are made by the action of the House of Commons, according to the English system, but in our form of government the action of the two bodies would be shown in the budget, and their action would be printed in tabulated form in this way. [Exhibiting.]

Mr. CULLOM. I have seen that.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the essential difference between the English budget the Senator has in his hand and the United States Book of Estimates which the Senator from Illinois possesses?

Mr. SHERMAN. The budget is sent very much in this form [exhibiting], and it is only in slight matters changed. Here is the form of the budget as it appears and as it has been acted upon, together with the amount appropriated for the same object the preceding year. So that in England they have a much fuller account of what is done than have we.

I do not wish to find fault, but in my judgment the whole manner of making appropriations is unnecessarily expensive and involves the public in a large loss.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I am for any reforms that can be adopted consistent with safe legislation, and I agree with the Senator that there is very much printing done which ought to be avoided. The printing of appropriation acts in the statutes of the country, to be generally circulated, seems to me to involve a very large expenditure which might be dispensed with, but I am not very clear that the system which has been adopted and acted upon for a good many years in this country is not very nearly as good as the system of the British Government referred to by the Senator. Each Department of the Government makes out its estimates of the amounts that will be required in its judgment for the different branches of the service under its control, and those estimates are sent to the Appropriations Committees of Congress. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, I know those estimates have been the basis of the action of the committee in all matters for which estimates are made by the Government. We do not follow the estimates in every case, and as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] has said, the estimates of the Government are always very many millions beyond what the Congress of the United States finally appropriates for the different subjects which we are called upon to provide for, but if any improvement can be made in the system now in vogue I shall be entirely willing to favor it, as I said at the outset.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is probably my own fault that I am not able to appreciate the argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. If I understand him, he advocates appropriations in bulk, as is done in the English Parliament. It has been my impression, derived from an experience of some years in this body, that the only safety in the way of appropriations is in segregating the bills and giving as close scrutiny as possible to each item. If we desire to make limitless appropriations we should adopt the system of appropriation in bulk, and then Senators could absolve themselves from individual responsibility by throwing it entirely upon the Appropriations Committee.

I do not appreciate the statement of the Senator that there is anything in the appropriation bills or estimates kept from the public. Any intelligent man at the close of any session, and even during the session, can see what has been the action of both Houses. There are tabulated statements at the end of every session showing what the House of Representatives has done and what the Senate has done, and which body has increased or decreased appropriations. There is also a book of estimates furnished to every committee that has appropriations to make; for instance, to the Committee on Commerce as to the river and harbor bill, and the Committee on Appropriations as to the other appropriation bills, which shows what each Department thinks it requires to carry on its special business. There are also explanations given, and, if necessary, the head of a Department can be called before the committee in order to make his statement and defend what might be called his budget.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. HALE. As a part of the book of appropriations the very thing to which the Senator is referring is found every year. The bills from each House, the amount they carry, the additions which are made, the new salaries which are established, the reductions, and everything are found, as the Senator says, in that book, which is furnished to every member.

Mr. VEST. I so understand, Mr. President. I have never served upon the Appropriations Committee, but I have been a member of the Committee on Commerce since I have been in the Senate, and I know that is the unvarying custom in regard to the river and harbor bill, which gives rise to so much contention.

There is another feature of the British system about which we have had some discussion in this Chamber, notably by the late minister to Germany, formerly our colleague, Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio—the feature which enables cabinet officers to appear before the legislative body and defend their appropriations. It has never been adopted in the United States, and I am not prepared to say whether it would be a suitable reform or not. But that is foreign to the present discussion.

I rose principally to express my gratification that the attention of Congress has been called to the great abuse of the fee system. I was for some years a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I devoted myself with great zeal and some little industry to preparing bills giving salaries to district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of Federal courts, instead of the present iniquitous and outrageous fee system. After long endeavor, I succeeded in having one bill reported to the Senate. That was a bill fixing salaries for district attorneys, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and I found that in almost every district the salary was thought to be too small, although it had been estimated by the Attorney-General of the United States during President Harrison's Administration after careful examination and report. When that bill reached the Senate, I will not say every Senator, but I am almost prepared to say a majority of the body, offered amendments increasing the salaries of their respective district attorneys until the bill lost all shape and form as it had been reported, and I must say that I lost all faith in the bill. Since that time I have at every session during five Congresses introduced similar bills, and they are now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and I am glad to say are receiving the attention of both committees.

I could detain the Senate until my strength was exhausted, and certainly their patience, by giving instances of the abuse of the fee system, derived from testimony furnished by judges of the United States courts, and I have sent those letters to the Committee on the Judiciary. It has become a regular system of plunder and robbery, and the language is not too strong. There is a little coterie around every district court—I will not say every one, perhaps, but all with which I have any acquaintance in the West—of deputy marshals, hangers-on, creatures who subsist by dragging poor, ignorant men under pretended charges before commissioners who belong to the ring. They are then sent to jail in a distant town and kept there until everything they have goes into this maelstrom of official corruption. I have now in my committee room, received this morning in my mail, a letter from a man who I know to be as honest a man as lives, who lives in southeastern Missouri, whose little estate has been swallowed up under a charge that he had trespassed upon public lands of the United States. He was dragged 250 miles, put into jail, forced to employ a lawyer, made to pay exorbitant fees, and finally permitted to go out after all that he had was taken away from him and with a debt against him of over $300. This thing is not only of weekly, but of daily occurrence, and no district judge can prevent it. My old law partner is now the district judge of the western district of Missouri, and I have had a letter from him, which I sent to the Judiciary Committee, and I have conversed with him frequently with regard to it. He says he scrutinizes every item in those cost bills, cuts them down as far as he can, yet he can not prevent it, because those marshals are interested in making a case or a pretended case, the commissioners are interested in binding the man over, and the clerks are interested in keeping it in court, until at last the poor alleged criminal is turned out a bankrupt.

It is not only a crying outrage, but it is a standing reproach to the Congress of the United States that we permit this thing to go on, and I am exceedingly glad to know that others concur with me in the necessity for immediate action.

There is another thing we must get rid of, and I will refer to it now. The courts in the Indian Territory cost more than any other courts in the United States. I do not know—and I was about to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, when he was addressing the Senate, if he could tell from the report of the Attorney-General, which I have not examined this year—what is the cost of those courts.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator that that point was discussed on the first clause on page 17 of the bill. For the expenses of the courts $50,000 was appropriated, and the deficiency was $210,000, making a total of $260,000.

Mr. LODGE. They cost more than any other courts in the United States.

Mr. VEST. Two hundred and sixty thousand dollars, then.

Mr. CHANDLER. For the year.

Mr. VEST. I should like the Senator to turn to the southern district of New York, embracing Brooklyn and the city of New York. I do not know what was the cost there this year, but heretofore the Indian Territory courts have cost more than the courts for the southern district of New York. If anybody wants to see this marshal system completely illustrated, let him go to the Indian Territory, where it is a trade, a vocation—not a profession, for it does not rise to that dignity, but an ordinary vocation—to drag men hundreds of miles in order to take from them these fees.

Mr. PLATT. When we were discussing the courts last year I examined this question and discovered that about one-third of the entire expenses of the Government for criminal prosecutions was

expended in the Indian Territory. I do not know what is the amount for the past year.

Mr. VEST. That has been the result of my observation of the reports of the Attorney-General.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Missouri permit me a moment?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The courts in the Indian Territory at this time are on the salary system, and not on the fee system.

Mr. VEST. Of the western district of Arkansas?

Mr. BERRY. In the Indian Territory, of which the Senator spoke, they have been on the salary system this last year.

Mr. FRYE. The marshals are not salaried, are they?

Mr. BERRY. The deputy marshals are salaried. The commissioners, the marshals, and the district attorneys each receive a salary under a bill which was passed at the last session of Congress. I have not the figures with me, but I will go to the Attorney-General's Office in the morning and get them. I am informed by Judge Stuart, who was the judge of the court out there, but who recently resigned, that the cost under the salary system in the Indian Territory, with thirty-odd marshals, amounts to more than the cost of about 200 marshals while it was under the fee system, and the records of the Attorney-General's Office show it.

Mr. VEST. How is it for the western district of Arkansas?

Mr. BERRY. They are under the fee system, as they always have been.

Mr. VEST. How about the costs in that court this year?

Mr. BERRY. I have not looked at that. I was speaking of the courts in the Indian Territory. I will state that I have not the report, but I was so informed by Judge Stuart. I shall, however, call on the Attorney-General and get the official figures, and if I have made an incorrect statement, I shall correct it.

Mr. VILAS. By permission of the Senator from Missouri, I will say that a bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary in which it is proposed to restore in part to the Indian Territory the fee system with reference to marshals. By the bill which was adopted last year, after a great deal of consideration, salaries were provided for marshals, and it has turned out practically that the system is very inefficient, and at least as expensive as the fee system. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has had the subject under consideration, and have heard Judge Stuart and others in relation to it, and a bill will be before long reported in which an effort will be made to combine the two systems, with the hope that both economy and efficiency will be better secured.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, if you give to the judges the unlimited power of appointment or to the marshals with the approval of the judges, it is no reform at all. I supposed that I had something to do, in an advisory way anyhow, in regard to the bill as to the jurisdiction of the courts in the Indian Territory, and that we had limited the number of marshals. Perhaps we put the limit at too large a number.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. My recollection is that the statement of Judge Stuart was that under the present salary system there are fewer deputy marshals provided for, and that those salaries have cost more this year than about 200—I will not state the number specifically—deputy marshals cost under the fee system. If that is not correct I will correct it when I get the figures to-morrow from the Attorney-General's Office.

Mr. VEST. When I speak of the courts in the Indian Territory I mean to include the court having jurisdiction in that Territory which is located at Fort Smith.

Mr. PALMER. That has been taken away.

Mr. VEST. I understand it has been; but I spoke of the expenses as they had been. I remember very well that we have taken away that jurisdiction, and an attempt is being made, as I understand, to restore it. Great complaint has been made of the legislation had by Congress; but, in any event, there is no question, if we take the statements of the United States judges and of intelligent and honest lawyers, that the fee system is a reproach and scandal to the jurisprudence of the United States.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, it is evident, I suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill, that we can not finish it to-night, and I ask him to give way for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University;

A bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 5490) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 5731) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of War to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved May 11, 1892," was read twice by its title.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask that that bill may lie on the table and not be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the road of said company, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask that that bill may lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

BIRTHDAY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. HALE. I should like to have the Senate take up the bill providing for making the 12th day of February, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, a national holiday. I ask that it may be taken up and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be read for information.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1999) to provide for the observance of the 12th day of February as a national holiday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. I do not rise to object to that bill, although I had intended to propose an amendment to it. Under the peculiar circumstances in which it is presented now, I shall offer no opposition to it. The amendment I intended to propose I shall introduce as a separate bill, to create Jackson's birthday a national holiday.

Mr. HALE. I think it would be a fitting and perhaps a graceful thing that the bill should be passed to-day, this being the 12th of February.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not wish to come in ungraciously in this matter, I am sure, but I am opposed to creating any more national holidays. I think there is danger that we shall run into the extreme that we find in some countries, where there are so many saints' days that the people are seriously deprived of opportunities to work. I believe I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. HALE. Of course the bill can only be considered at this time by unanimous consent.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 13, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(Continuation of legislative day of Tuesday, February 11, 1896.)

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10.30 a. m. by the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion now before the House, Representatives have repeatedly stated that they were friendly to silver, but that they could not vote for a concurrence in the Senate amendment; that they were bimetallists, but that they did not believe that bimetallism could be maintained by free coinage of silver. Those propositions, Mr. Speaker, are as irreconcilable to my mind as would be a proposition to advance the doctrines of Christianity by building a temple to Mahomet. If there is anything of benefit to the people, or of benefit to the progress of civilization, in the coinage of the white metal, it does not lie in the maintenance of the parity of that metal on the same basis that we maintain a paper circulation. It does not lie in the fact that we can maintain a silver dollar in circulation by reason of the redemption of that dollar with a gold dollar.

If there is any benefit to be derived from the future coinage of the silver dollar, it must be in the fact that it is recognized as one of the money metals of the world on equal terms with gold. For many centuries these two metals, gold and silver, have together, by reason of peculiar properties by which one became the complement of the other, assisted in solving the great economic problem of supplying money for the world, but to-day there are gentlemen upon the floor of this House who maintain that because in 1872 an ounce of silver was worth $1.29, and because to-day it has fallen to a valuation of 67½ cents, those countries that maintain a monometallic gold standard have won the victory and silver has passed out of circulation as one of the money metals of the world. They overlook the fact that with increasing trade and commerce there has arisen a greater demand for metallic money, and that the mistake by which the bond of union between the two metals was arbitrarily severed becomes more apparent every day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposition that I believe and contend for is this: That although silver has been disgraced temporarily, that although it is no longer performing its functions as a money metal, the day will come, and is sure to come, when the world must once more recognize it in its proper function of making part of the money of the civilized world. I find from an examination of the figures that since 1493 there has been produced in the world only $8,500,000,000 of gold and $10,131,000,000 of silver. This gold and silver that was produced and has been coined into money of the world has disappeared to a great extent. It must be borne in mind that, although these metals seem to be imperishable, a dollar never passes from one hand to another but, by reason of the wearing of the coin, it loses part of its existence; that never a ship goes down at sea or a house burns down on land that does not destroy part of the coinage of the world.

Now, in our present civilization money is just as necessary to the onward movement of the wheels of civilization as it is necessary to oil the machinery of a great locomotive. In the first stages of the world's history men resorted to barter as a means of carrying on trade; but to-day money of some kind is absolutely necessary in order that the business of the world may go on.

The real question, Mr. Speaker, that is here for our consideration is a business question. It is not a question as to whether we are friendly to silver, whether we want to erect a temple and fall down and worship some particular metal, but it is a question as to whether we propose to do our duty to the people of the United States; whether we propose to put the money of this country on a safe and sound basis for the future; and if we propose to do that, Mr. Speaker, I contend that we must in the future recognize both of these metals as money units. If we fail to do so, then we must go to paper circulation and fiat money.

I find it stated by Mr. Muhleman in his work on the monetary systems of the world, which is considered good authority on this question, that there is at present in existence in the world $4,135,000,000 of gold; that the silver coinage of the world amounts to $4,494,000,000; that the uncovered paper circulation of the world amounts to $2,455,000,000. This makes the entire money of the world $11,084,000,000. That is the total amount of money in existence to transact the business of the world, containing a population of 1,450,000,000 of people. If we do not have sufficient money to facilitate the exchange of commodities, to that extent business must languish and stagnate. To illustrate: If ten thrashing machines will winnow the wheat of a single county, and it requires those ten machines to winnow the wheat for that entire county, and the work can not be done with a less number, then if you reduce the number of machines by one, leaving only nine, one-tenth of the wheat produced in that county must perish and be of no service to man. On the other hand, if the number of your machines remains stationary and your crop of wheat increases 10 per cent, then you can thrash only nine-tenths of the wheat raised in that county, and the other tenth must be left to destruction, and can not be used for the benefit of the community; and the same is true of business generally. Business is carried on by virtue of the ability of the business men of the world to obtain the money that is required to conduct their business. If there is a short supply of money in a country, or in the world at large, to that extent business interests must be hampered and prevented from expanding to the full extent to which they would otherwise. But, as I have shown, there is only about four billions of gold money in the whole world.

Now, if we go to a gold standard, if we propose to look to gold alone as the money metal of the world, it follows that we shall reduce our coin money more than one-half. I know it is contended, and contended by gentlemen here, that a large proportion of the business of the world is done on "confidence" money. Sir, I admit that it is; I admit that a great many of the business transactions of the world are settled with notes, with checks, with drafts, and, for the sake of the argument, I will admit that the contention of Mr. Muhleman is correct, and that 95 per cent of the business transactions of this country are settled not with money but with paper, or "confidence." But then the question arises, Is there enough gold to act as the other 5 per cent? Admitting that the theory of these gentlemen who contend for this confidence money is correct, it must be remembered that their theory is based on the proposition that we have the other 5 per cent in real money on which this confidence money is based.

Mr. Speaker, is there enough gold in the world to supply that 5 per cent of real money as a basis for this confidence money? I suppose that no one will contend that we have more money to-day in this country than we need. I take it that there is no gentleman here who will contend that we ought to contract the currency of the United States rather than expand it. To show how much money we need as a basis for this confidence money, I will call attention to the fact that from 1878 to 1892 the exchanges of the clearing houses of the United States increased from $27,814,000,000 to $62,109,000,000. In other words, there was an average increase of business, as shown by the clearing-house reports of this country, of over $2,500,000,000 a year within the period I have named. Now, of course that did not represent the entire expansion and increase of business in the United States. It represented merely the increase that is shown by the bank clearings, which was largely confined to the cities of this country. But admitting for the sake of the argument that these figures do show the expansion and increase of the business of the whole country, and admitting that 95 per cent of that new business is done on confidence, and that it requires only 5 per cent of real money to carry it on——

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. KENDALL, the time of Mr. UNDERWOOD was extended for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to take up the chain of thought where I left off, if this increased business, averaging $2,500,000,000 a year, requires for its proper transaction a 5 per cent increase of coin money, then we shall require over $100,000,000 of new money in the United States every year to carry on this additional business. Now, where is the new money to come from if we do not coin silver? If we are to drive silver out of existence as a money metal and to retain gold as the sole basis and unit of value, where is this new money to come from?

The statement of the Director of the Mint shows that in 1894 the entire production of gold in the world amounted to only $180,000,000, and that $33,515,000 of this gold was used in the arts, leaving only $147,000,000 for coinage purposes and to increase the money of the world. As I have already shown, if these clearing-house figures are correct, in order to serve as a basis for this increased business we must have over $100,000,000 of new money in this country alone; but there is only, as shown by the figures, $147,000,000 of gold produced in the entire world that is available for coinage purposes.

Now, if we consume $100,000,000 of that $147,000,000 of gold, where is the balance of the world to get its gold or its coin with which to transact its business; and it must be remembered that our share of this gold would be less than $5,000,000 if all get their share. I know it will be answered that we shall have bank notes, we shall have paper money redeemable in coin. But, Mr. Speaker, when you have paper money redeemable in coin you require more than 5 per cent as a basis of circulation. I understand the best authorities state that there should always be one-third of coin on which to base your paper circulation; it is not contended by anyone that banking business can be done on a safe basis unless you have one dollar of coin for every three dollars of paper. Thus it is shown that your pyramid of confidence transactions, of confidence money, will become top-heavy and must fall, unless the base of coin money is sufficiently broad to support it.

But, you say, "We are willing to coin silver as fast as we can"; but how? You want to coin silver and support it by reason of the fact that it is redeemable in a gold dollar. Mr. Speaker, I assert that if that is the basis on which you want to coin silver, then so far as the people of this country are concerned, so far as the civilization is concerned, you might as well wipe out silver entirely and simply issue paper notes; because when you support silver on that basis you are not given it its true function as a money metal; you are only supporting it by the fact that it has the credit of the Government to sustain it. You are not making the base of your currency system any more stable than it was before.

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Mr. COX addressed the House. See Appendix.]

[Mr. BRUMM addressed the House. See Appendix.]

And then, on motion of Mr. LACEY (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes a. m., Wednesday, February 12, 1896), the House adjourned unti 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 12, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN ALASKA AND BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred Senate joint resolution (No. 39) making an appropriation of $75,000 to defray the expenses of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and British North American territory, having considered the same, to report it back and recommend its passage without amendment.

I merely desire to say that, after a full consideration, the committee was unanimous in recommending the appropriation. I wish to yield a short time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY], who is a member of the committee, touching this matter.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory.

Resolved, etc., That in view of the expediency of forthwith negotiating a convention with Great Britain for marking convenient points upon the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude, where it forms, under existing treaty provisions, the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory, and to enable the President to execute the provisions of such convention without delay when concluded, the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, under the direction of the President, to defray the share of the United States in the joint expense of locating said meridian and marking said boundary by an international commission.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the committee, I desire to say only a few words in explanation of the purpose of this joint resolution, because there has been and is a good deal of confusion in the public mind, and possibly in the minds of some members of this House, as to what is the exact status of the controversy, in so far as it has become a controversy, touching the boundary line which divides the Territory of Alaska from British North America. By a treaty concluded between this country and Russia in the year 1867 all the Russian North American possessions were ceded to the United States, and the eastern boundary line of those possessions (now called Alaska) was declared to be the same boundary laid down in the convention or treaty concluded between Great Britain and Russia in the year 1825. That boundary line has two parts, and each of these parts has given rise to something of controversy; but these controversies have not yet reached an unfriendly stage.

By the treaties just mentioned, the eastern limit of Alaska is described as "Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called Prince of Wales Island," in latitude 54° 40′ north, and ascending to the north along the channel called Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude, and from this point following "the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude," and from that point of intersection following the one hundred and forty-first meridian to the Frozen Ocean.

But it was further provided—

That whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude shall prove to be at the distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the ocean, the limit * * * shall be found by a line parallel to the winding of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been found that in fact the topography of the country, from the commencement of this eastern boundary line to the point where it meets the one hundred and forty-first meridian, is different from what it was supposed to be at the time of the making of the Russo-British treaty of 1825, and therefore disputes have recently arisen as to the true location of that part of the boundary. In 1884 the Canadian authorities, abandoning the location shown by all published maps for many years, claimed for the first time in an official map that the line at its commencement, instead of ascending the Portland Canal, should ascend an estuary lying some distance farther west and called Behm Canal. This claim places in dispute a territory which has always been considered a part of the Territory of Alaska, and which equals in area the State of Connecticut.

Still later, in the year 1887, a claim has been made by the Canadian map makers that the remainder of this portion of the boundary ought to be pushed nearer to the ocean than previous maps showed it to be. This claim arises from the fact that whereas the treaty called for the "summit of the mountains" to be followed from the latitude of 56° in a northwesterly direction, subsequent surveys have demonstrated the fact that there is no range of mountains which will answer the description in that clause of the treaty. But, according to our contention, this makes it necessary to fall back upon the second branch of the description, which declares in effect that in case there shall be no range of mountains within the limit of 10 marine leagues from the coast, extending in a northerly direction from the latitude of 56°, the line shall follow the windings of the coast and be nowhere more than 10 marine leagues distant therefrom. That, in short, is one branch of the controversy.

In 1892 a convention or agreement was concluded between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, which had for its object a joint or coincident topographical survey of the southeasterly territory of Alaska, from the latitude of 54° 40′ to the point where the one hundred and forty-first meridian is encountered, in order to ascertain the facts and data necessary to enable us to determine where, according to the spirit and intent of the treaty, the boundary line should be located. That joint survey has been completed and a report was signed by the commissioners on the 31st day of last December, but the maps have not yet been engraved and the matter is not in a condition to be laid before Congress. I may say, however, that we are assured by the officials representing the Coast and Geodetic Survey that their surveys have demonstrated the fact that there is no range of mountains such as at the time the treaty was concluded between Russia and Great Britain was assumed to exist, and no range of mountains to which the language of the Russian treaty of 1867 can apply. Therefore the claim on behalf of the Government of the United States is and must be that the Territory of Alaska, that is, the southeasterly portion of it, shall be bounded to the eastward by a line distant 10 marine leagues from the coast and following the windings of that coast.

Mr. KNOX. Does the gentleman mean the coast of the mainland or the coast of the islands?

Mr. PITNEY. I was coming to that, Mr. Speaker. On the Canadian side of the question two claims are made. In the first place, they claim that while there is no range of mountains distant 10 marine leagues from the coast or thereabouts, there is a range of mountains very near to the coast of the mainland, and that the line should be run there near the coast, which would leave in British territory a large part of Taku Inlet and a large part of Lynn Canal, two great estuaries which extend into the interior. This would bring the British possessions down very close to the ocean, and at the same time the American Territory of Alaska would be dismembered, and it would be impossible for us to proceed by land from one part of that Territory to the other without the consent of the British authorities. Moreover, the British Government could establish fortifications upon tide water, could run a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Taku Inlet or to Lynn Canal, and could thus control those two great entrances into the interior of the country. The second claim on the part of the Canadians is that the 10 marine leagues, or 30 nautical miles, equivalent to about 35 statute miles, which are to be the limit of the width of this portion of our possessions, should be measured not from the coast of the main continent, but from the outermost edge of the archipelago which fringes the continent. The result of allowing that claim would be to throw the control of all these waterways into British hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to discuss the matter further to show to the House how great is the importance of this dispute. As yet the matter is in a friendly position between our Government and the authorities of Great Britain, and it is desirable that it should be left in a position of amicable adjustment between the parties.

The second great question between the British authorities on the one side and the Government and people of the United States on the other relates to the true location upon the surface of the earth of the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude, and it is to this branch of the subject that this present resolution mainly relates. In regard to that meridian no doubt arises from the language of the treaty. The doubt arises only in attempting to mark upon the earth's surface the location of the meridian. That location is to be ascertained by astronomical survey; not by the ordinary topographical survey, but by observation of the stars, and it is a very expensive operation and requires a great deal of time.

Now, money has already been spent under the authority of the United States Government, and some also by the Canadian or British authorities, for the purpose of ascertaining with such degree of certainty as human observation permits where the one hundred and forty-first meridian runs. At some points along the line both the Canadian surveyors and our own have made observations. At one point—at the crossing of Forty Mile Creek—the two surveys are only about 6 feet apart; in another place—at the Yukon River—they are 618 feet apart. The meridian has been located with this approximate degree of accuracy upon the prin-

cipal water courses which form the highways by means of which miners and other immigrants enter the country.

It is very desirable, in the opinion of the Department of State; in the opinion of the Senate, who have passed this joint resolution, and in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, who have reported it to the House, that this survey should be promptly completed by duly authorized commissioners on the part of the Dominion of Canada and duly authorized commissioners on the part of the Government of the United States; that an agreement should be reached and monuments should be set up at all the principal points along the one hundred and forty-first meridian, in order that settlers and others shall be able to tell whether any particular spot is in the British possessions or is United States territory. So soon as the principal points may have been ascertained by astronomical survey and monuments erected upon the ground, those points may be connected by lines run by the ordinary methods of triangulation.

This appropriation is called for in order to enable the engineers on the part of the United States to join with those on the part of Canada in completing this survey. The proposition was made to our Department of State last summer on the part of the Dominion of Canada that we should either join in the expense of a joint survey or that we should adopt provisionally the results of a survey which had been partially completed by Mr. William Ogilvie in behalf of Canada, and in the event that we did provisionally adopt his survey we should pay one-half of the expense incurred. It was thought best that we should enter at once into a convention or agreement in order to have a definite survey made and agreed to by both parties and to have the location of the one hundred and forty-first meridian marked by visible monuments. This is desirable not only with reference to the disputed territory on that meridian, but in order to lead to an amicable arrangement, which, it is hoped, may soon be entered into with regard to the disputed territory along the southeastern part of the boundary.

Mr. LOUD. I desire to ask the gentleman what powers are now vested by law in this commission?

Mr. PITNEY. None, as yet; no agreement has yet been made; no commission has yet been appointed.

Mr. LOUD. Would not the passage of this resolution empower that engineering commission to locate the line, and would it not thus become fixed?

Mr. PITNEY. That is the object of the appropriation. The passage of this resolution, however, does not conclude the Government of the United States in this matter. It simply enables the President to enter into a convention with Great Britain, subject to the approval of the Senate, and then to appoint commissioners to represent us in such a joint survey.

Mr. LOUD. Then this does not take the matter ultimately out of the hands of Congress?

Mr. PITNEY. No; not at all.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise only for the purpose of correcting a rumor that has gone out into the country and which I have seen printed in some of the newspapers—that the United States Government, or rather the Coast and Geodetic Survey, has adopted the survey made by the Canadian authorities in regard to the line running southeast of Mount St. Elias. That is not true. There have been parties at work in making that survey—the Canadian party and the American party. These two parties have been broken up into smaller parties. With each Canadian party there has always been a representative of the American Government, and with each American party always a representative of the Canadian Government; and the information we have is that the American parties have made about two-thirds of the survey, and the most important part of it.

Mr. PITNEY. Will the gentleman permit a statement? With regard to the topographical survey from the vicinity of Mount St. Elias to the vicinity of the Portland Canal the method adopted has been this: There have been about a dozen American parties in the field, and with each of them there has been a Canadian representative, and there have been ten or a dozen Canadian parties in the field, with each of which there has been an American representative.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. PITNEY. Each one of those parties has covered a certain section of territory. The American surveys have in that way covered the whole of the territory from the coast line to and beyond the 10-marine-league limit, and the Canadian surveys have covered the greater part of the same territory, each party having with it, as I have already said, a representative of the other Government.

Mr. SAYERS. The American parties have accomplished about two-thirds of the entire topographical survey.

Mr. KNOX. Will the gentleman [Mr. PITNEY] who last occupied the floor yield for a question?

Mr. PITNEY. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. Does this resolution provide for a resurvey of the line in southeastern Alaska?

Mr. PITNEY. No. The survey of the country in southeastern Alaska—the topographical survey—has been completed, but the maps have not been engraved, so that they are not available at this time.

Mr. KNOX. If that is the true line, whether it be the line of the coast or the continent, or the westerly line of the island, would there be any need of a resurvey?

Mr. PITNEY. As I understand your question, no.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and, being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1717) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the use of certain real estate in said city on which is situated the building known as The Exchange; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

CHRISTIANS IN ARMENIA.

Mr. SORG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to consider, or to have read and printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a joint resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of Ohio petitioning Congress for the protection of the Christians in Armenia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the execution of the agreement of the House with reference to debate upon the Senate amendment of the bill H. R. 2904.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me a moment to have re-referred a bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2904.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

BOND REDEMPTION FUND.

[Mr. DOLLIVER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. McMILLIN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, my attention was attracted awhile ago by a remark of my honorable friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] that there were many things relating to the money question which we did not know. Yet one of the conspicuous, and I may say interesting, features of this protracted discussion of the money question has been the sublime certitude at which all the speakers seem to have arrived in relation to all these complex and intricate problems. I was reminded of a colloquy between two characters in that inimitable play of Shakespeare, Henry VI, a colloquy between Plantagenet and Somerset. The former said that the truth on his side was so naked that any purblind eye could find it out. Somerset replied, "And on my side the truth is so clear, so shining, and so evident that it would glimmer through a blind man's eye."

It is not so with me. I am not vain enough to indulge the expectation that I can make my opinions so commanding, strong, and convincing as to overthrow the supremacy of prejudice or break the tyranny of preconceived opinion over any mind, or even to answer to the satisfaction of all the arguments advanced in support of the views tenaciously and honestly held by others. "Let him who thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" is scripture which seems to be addressed to those who think they have mastered the money question. I quite agree with an observation of Professor Perry, that the power to regulate our money could not be lodged in more dangerous hands than those of him who thinks he is competent to exercise it. The remark of Senator Dumas in the French Senate is equally pregnant with salutary caution.

Those—

Said he—

who approach this question for the first time decide it at once. Those who study it with care, hesitate. Those who are obliged practically to decide, doubt and stop, overwhelmed with the weight of the enormous responsibility.

So if I were required to decide all the disputed points in the age-long controversy on silver, I would exclaim with the sage: "Give me infinite wisdom or relieve me from the impossible task."

GOOD MONEY.

There is, however, no obscurity or intricacy about the proposition that the people of the United States desire good money—I may say the best money anywhere in use. This statement will probably meet with universal acceptance.

One of the requisites of good money is that its intrinsic or commercial value is equivalent to its coinage value, and is equal in purchasing power to that used by the leading commercial nations with which we deal, or is convertible at the pleasure of the holder into such money. For example, every dollar coined out of the standard money metal, gold, is good money. It neither lies nor cheats. It does not even prevaricate or suppress. It is honest and outspoken. Its value is equivalent to the debt it is commanded to pay. It stands the test of fire and hammer. It preserves its identity in the crucible and in the countingroom.

The subsidiary silver coins are also good money, though not possessing an intrinsic value equal to their coinage value, because they are redeemable in full-value money. The silver dollar is within our definition of good money as long as it is convertible into gold at the pleasure of the holder. There is no statute authorizing its redemption in any kind of money, but the faith of the Government is pledged to maintain it at a parity with and to keep it interchangeable with gold. In other words, it carries the Government's indorsement. If I take my note for a thousand dollars to a bank they will not discount it, but if I take it back with the indorsement of a responsible person on it, they give me the money at once. The silver dollar is worth 50 cents in its own right. The indorsement of the United States makes it equivalent to gold. But while the indorsement of a responsible person makes my note good in the banks, if it was known that said person was indorsing miscellaneously, even indorsing notes in blank for me to fill up at my pleasure, his credit would be gone and his indorsement would no longer make my note good. Similarly with the silver dollar; the Government must not indorse too many of them or somebody will suspect its credit. As long, however, as the number carried does not exceed the power of the Government to keep faith with the people, the silver dollars are good money.

All the paper money now in use is good money, because it is all redeemable in good money. It will remain good money so long and only so long as the volume of it is limited to the capacity of the Government to keep its pledge of redemption. One other qualification is pertinent in this connection, though no part of the definition of good money; that is, that it must be stable and not fluctuating in value. Its power in exchange should be the same as near as may be when the debt is paid as when contracted. Money too much contracted in volume is too dear; too much inflated is too cheap. An unlimited money is worthless money. Unduly inflated money cheats the creditor; when unduly contracted it cheats the debtor. It serves equitably all classes at all times when it is stable in volume and purchasing power.

These observations do not exclude the idea that money that does not square with the requirements of safety and soundness I have set forth may be useful and convenient in facilitating exchanges. Poor agencies are many times useful, but good ones are always better. Our continental currency was useful. The assignats of France were serviceable. Inconvertible paper money has in our more recent experience been useful and necessary, but it was not good money.

FREE COINAGE.

To keep our silver money good in the sense I have indicated, that is, to keep the silver dollar equivalent in purchasing power with that used by the commercial countries with which we deal, is not possible under free silver coinage at 16 to 1 by the United States alone.

This brings me face to face with the measure sent to this House by the Senate providing for the free coinage of silver, and which is now before us, and on which I crave the indulgence of the House while I express the conclusions at which I have arrived, and the reasons therefor, as briefly as I can.

The United States and the world need both the money metals. Neither can be dispensed with for monetary uses without causing the gravest consequences to the human race. To argue which could be more easily dispensed with would be a supreme folly, scarcely exceeded by that of the fond father who, desiring to know which of his three sons loved him most, sent them to a far country and anxiously waited to see which of them would show the greatest filial affection by bringing to his father the costliest present. One of them obtained a fairy's carpet that would carry you anywhere you wished to go over land or sea, another secured a magic medicine that would cure all diseases flesh is heir to, and the third, not to be outdone, purchased at great price a mirror in which you could see any person or place you wished. The dutiful sons, before embarking for home, compared their gifts. They looked into the mirror and saw their father sick nigh unto death at his home. On the fairy's carpet they were transported to the bedside of the dying parent, and with the magic medicine they restored him to health and to good sense as well, for he never again attempted to compare the degrees of affection felt for him by his children. He was satisfied by his stratagem that they bore him an equal love.

I am a bimetallist, and therefore I am opposed to the free coinage of silver by the United States alone at 16 to 1. My honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] who has just taken his seat says he, too, is a bimetallist, yet we are as far apart as the poles. In this connection I would like to say that I do not attach as much importance to statistics on the money question as my honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] seems to. I am much of the opinion of a writer whom I read not long since on the subject of statistics, who said, "There are three kinds of liars in the world. The first is a liar, the second is a damned liar, and the third is statistics." I do not believe that the figures with which we have been regaled in this protracted discussion throw much valuable light upon the inquiry. If I were a silver monometallist I would favor the Senate proposition, for it would place us on a silver basis as speedily as effects of that kind can follow their causes.

At this point, if I have the attention of my distinguished friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] and two or three others whom I know do not believe a word I say on this subject, I would be willing to dispense with the attention of all the remainder of the House, for these honorable gentlemen are the chief sinners in this matter, for they sin against light; and, as a preacher once said, "I am here just now to call sinners and not the righteous to repentance." My first proposition is that if the mints of the United States were open to silver at 16 to 1 the price of silver would be $1.29 per ounce, either in gold or silver. If in gold, all the surplus silver bullion of the world would come here for coinage, for it is self-evident that if 371¼ grains of fine silver could be purchased in any market or taken out of any mine for fifty and converted into a hundred cents by coinage every holder of silver bullion everywhere in the world would avail himself of that opportunity and ship his silver for coinage and take away gold or its equivalent dollar for dollar. The other alternative is the silver basis. That is, the price of silver would be $1.29 per ounce in silver and not in gold; in other words, the silver in a dollar now worth 50 cents in gold would be worth a hundred cents in silver. No one would sell for less, for he could have it coined for that. These alternative situations are illustrated in the United States and Mexico. In the former the silver dollar is on a gold basis, in the latter it is on a silver basis, the result being that our silver dollar, containing 412½ grains of standard silver, will exchange in Mexico for two Mexican dollars containing each 420 grains of standard silver.

It is thus seen that to express the status of silver in terms of dollars is one, and in terms of purchasing power quite another and different thing. In the United States the silver dollar is the equivalent of gold in purchasing power. It is held to that equivalence by the power of a people's faith in a nation's pledges. But on a silver basis its purchasing power would be measured by its bullion value in the world's market, as in Mexico. Now it walks, in part at least, by faith; then it would walk wholly by sight. Left to itself, it would be just what it is; what the world makes it. It falls to its own level as soon as it is detached from the supports of public faith, which hold it at the higher gold level. It would then be the money of account as it is in Mexico, as paper was here during the war, and is now in the Argentine Republic, though only worth 27 cents on the dollar in gold. All computations and calculations of value would be in dollars, but silver dollars, not gold ones. Gold would at once be at a premium because of silver being overvalued, and would gradually go out of circulation, to the serious contraction of our money volume. The deficiency could not be supplied with silver money for lack of coinage facilities, for the utmost capacity of our mints does not exceed $40,000,000 per year. In this event it is some solace to know that there would be no profit in sending foreign silver here for coinage, and none would come except in the usual course of commerce.

This is as clear a statement as I can make without greater elaboration of the event which is certain to supervene on the adoption of free silver coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the United States alone. The necessity for the argument has, I think, been superseded by the course of events and the notable concurrence of opinion on the subject among leading bimetallists in Europe and America. William P. St. John, president of the Mercantile National Bank of New York, the great silver champion of the East, said in his examination before the Banking and Currency Committee of the last Congress:

The free coinage of silver would place this country on a silver basis immediately.

Hon. A. J. Warner, of Ohio, the president of the Bimetallic League of the United States, said:

The free coinage of silver will ultimately put us on a silver basis.

But the conclusion at which we have arrived by our own reasoning is not only confirmed by the great preponderance of opinion among men of light and leading, but also by the experience of mankind as well. Secretary Carlisle, in his Memphis speech, said there was not a free-silver country in the world that was not on a silver basis. Indeed, more satisfactory arguments against the free coinage of silver by the United States alone could hardly be desired than the five propositions of the Secretary, which I believe have never been disputed, and which I reproduce as a suitable conclusion to this part of my argument. These are his propositions:

First. There is not a free-coinage country in the world to-day that is not on a silver basis.
Second. There is not a gold-standard country in the world to-day that does not use silver as money along with gold.
Third. There is not a silver-standard country in the world to-day that uses any gold as money along with silver.
Fourth. There is not a silver-standard country in the world that has more than one-third as much money in circulation per capita as the United States have; and
Fifth. There is not a silver-standard country in the world to-day where the laboring man receives as fair pay for his work.

CONSEQUENCES OF A SILVER BASIS.

Then if the silver basis is certain to ensue in the event of free coinage by this country alone, it is important to apprehend what that means to the United States. The considerations involved are numerous and their bearings, in some instances, not a little obscure, but some of the consequences are easily brought into distinct view and are calculated to excite apprehension in every discreet and well-ordered mind. The disadvantages we would suffer in our foreign commerce are the same as all countries in a like situation have experienced in the past, notably Mexico, India, our own country during the war period, and the Argentine Republic, at this time under a paper régime.

The instability of exchange would reduce our commercial intercourse with foreign countries to a colossal system of gambling. No American importer would know what to pay for a bill of goods bought on a credit of six months, or at what price to sell them on a corresponding credit, because of the fluctuations in the value of the money of account. Mexican importers have to pay near $2,000 of their money for an invoice of goods worth $1,000 in New York or London. The fall in silver liable to take place at any time may cause a rise in exchange which would entail serious losses upon the importer. The only escape he has is to run up the price on his customers to cover his risks.

Why, I heard the other day of a French company who had undertaken to construct a mechanical plant in Mexico for a large sum of money. They did not stipulate the kind of money in which the contract was to be paid, but when they came to talk about that the French company asked the Mexicans, "In what kind of money are we to be paid for this work?" And the Mexicans answered, "In silver money, for that is the kind of money we use in this country"; but the Frenchman said, "No, I can not agree to do this work and be paid in silver, for I can not tell what the contract would be worth when the debt matures, because I do not have any means of knowing how much gold could be bought by the silver named in the contract." And the Mexicans said, "We can not agree to pay you in gold, because we would have no means of telling how much silver it would take to buy the necessary amount of gold by the time the contract matured." So, as a matter of fact, they mutually agreed to declare the contract off, because the two countries that were trying to agree upon the terms of a contract were on different monetary bases.

Without enlarging too much the effects to be expected in the United States may be thus summarized: First, an increase in the price of all imported goods sold in our markets; second, a loss to the National Treasury in the funds sent abroad to pay interest and our foreign obligations; third, a loss to all American corporations whose bonds are held in Europe in increased interest rates; fourth, a loss to all American citizens temporarily sojourning abroad and receiving money from home for their support, this loss being equivalent to the depreciation of silver; fifth, a loss to every laboring man in the United States by diminishing the purchasing of a day's labor.

These afflictions are suffered by all countries whose money of account is depreciated below the level of the money of the commercial world. In the recent American monetary conference distinct expression was given by the delegates from the South American States of the serious difficulties, experienced, and the grave consequences suffered by the silver-using countries in their commerce with the United States on account of the great fluctuation in the value of the white metal.

The delegate from Bolivia regretted that there could be so little commerce between his country and the United States, in part because of the enormous discount on Bolivian money in this country. They paid, he said, for the petroleum, cotton stuffs, hardware, agricultural implements, and machinery imported from this country by drafts on London, the cost of which was so great that their Bolivian money was reduced to nearly one-half its value.

In India the disturbances due to the same cause are graphically described by her delegates in the International Monetary Conference of 1892. One of them, Mr. Strachey, said:

India has been the victim of the downward fluctuations in the exchange value of the rupee, caused by the alteration in the intrinsic value of silver in relation to gold. The situation of affairs is so strained that a serious agitation has arisen and pressure has been put on the Government to apply a remedy for the numerous difficulties which are regarded as being due to the fall in the value of the rupee, affecting not only the public finances and administration, but with equal severity numerous commercial, industrial, and social interests.

And the remedy agitated was the gold standard, provided international bimetallism was not attainable. Another delegate from India, Sir Guilford L. Molesworth, referred to these distresses as "the numerous and constantly recurring evils to which India is subjected, evils that are not merely financial, but political, seriously menacing her most vital interests." And yet India is better situated in respect to these disadvantages than any other silver country, for she has no trade balances to pay to other countries. The great strain upon her is the payment of her indebtedness to England, which must be paid in gold or its equivalent, and as the amount is a stipulated sum of many million rupees, collected from her people in taxes, the lower the price of silver the greater number of rupees are necessary to make the required amount in gold.

Our situation as a debtor nation would be similar to that of India in this respect. The large sums we have to pay abroad as interest on gold obligations, which amount to more than $100,000,000 annually, would be almost doubled with silver at its present price and we on a silver basis. Then these obligations when they mature must be paid in gold or its equivalent, and here again we would be subjected to a double burden, under which even so strong a country as ours might bend.

These are some of the consequences connected with our foreign commercial relations that would ensue upon the adoption of the free-silver policy unassisted by other countries. But the financial dislocation, I might almost say the monetary cataclysm, with the immeasurable confusion and injustice which that implies, it would cause in our domestic finances and industry beggars description and appalls the mind. The dramatic situation would occur of course immediately upon the passage of such a law. After the first effect was exhausted the evil would continue in a modified form and would operate with tempered severity, with some regularity and with a measure of mercy to vested interests. But from the shock of such a convulsion and the devastation of the upheaval who would be spared? If there is a man who stands in the naked attitude of a debtor who owes somebody and whom nobody owes, he would find an advantage in the calamities that would fall upon his neighbors and friends. If he had borrowed $1,000 worth of purchasing power or had purchased $1,000 worth of property at its gold value, he could pay the bill in silver with $500 worth of purchasing power. Whether he would avail himself of such a benefit at the expense of his creditors without reluctance or compunctions would depend on how he was brought up.

But the creditors, who are they? And here is the pathos if not the tragedy of the situation. Somebody on the other side—I do not recall who it was, but I strongly suspect it was my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM]——

Mr. BRUMM. Possibly; but I object to your saying that he is "on the other side." He is on the right side—between the two wrong sides. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROSIUS. I very gladly retract the offensive remark. I made it unwittingly. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMM. Very well.

Mr. BROSIUS. My colleague said, and he said it very eloquently and with a great deal of force, as though it were the vital point in his discussion of the subject, that for every creditor there must be a debtor. He never was more mistaken in his life than he was in the idea which he sought to convey, though as a verbal proposition of course it was a truism. In fact, however, there are ten creditors, aye, more than ten, for every debtor in the United States. Who are the creditors? They are the owners of every fixed charge, every debt, every annuity, every pension, every bond of the Government, and of every corporation and every share of stocks in banks and stock companies, and every deposit in all the savings and other banks in the United States. And who are the owners of these credits? Among them are found crippled and aged soldiers of the Republic, their widows and orphans; widows who live on dowers in their husbands' estates, and millions of meritorious citizens whose earnings are deposited and whose subsistence comes from fixed incomes, every dollar of which would lose a part of its purchasing power the moment our money of account changed from gold to silver.

In the savings banks of the United States are earnings of the poor in small deposits aggregating near $2,000,000,000. Every toiler who is a depositor is a creditor. The sum of these accumulated interests that would be affected by free coinage must be enormous. Some have estimated it at $25,000,000,000. But in the enu-

meration we must not omit the decreased wages of labor, which seems to be a concomitant of depreciated money everywhere. It is reckoned among the advantages of India and Mexico over other countries that wages are extremely low. Sir Mersey Henry Thompson, of England, the author of a prize essay on India's advantages over England, said:

Wages in gold-using countries are 100 per cent higher than in silver-using countries, and the manufacturer of India can obtain his labor at half the cost paid in England.

The same view was expressed by Señor Romero, the Mexican minister at Washington. He said:

The depreciation of silver has favored the Mexican capitalists by lowering the wages of their employees.

I need hardly say that any public policy which has for its recommendation the lowering of the wages of labor can not be honored with general acceptance in the United States. How much this immeasurable combination of interests would lose in purchasing power, let those calculate who will. I care not to dip my pen in the ruddy drops wrung from the crushed lives of the poor to figure up the sum that shall measure their distress and degradation.

It is so apropos to this part of the discussion, and affords so graphic an illustration of the effect upon the labor of the country which would ensue upon the adoption of free-silver coinage as a national policy, that I reproduce the statement of a distinguished Senator, as follows:

A day's wages at $1.60 in gold in 1891 would buy 10 pounds of coffee, instead of 3½ pounds in 1866; 6½ pounds of butter, instead of 3; 24 pounds of meat, instead of 10; 5 gallons of New Orleans molasses, instead of 1½; 26 pounds of rice, instead of 11; 26 pounds of soap, instead of 8; 50 pounds of refined sugar, instead of 15; 26 pounds of calico, instead of 5½; 3 pounds of two-ply ingrain carpet, instead of 1; 15 yards of denims, instead of 3; 26 yards of drilling, instead of 5; 23 yards of gingham, instead of 9; 24 yards of sheeting, instead of 6½; seven yards of women's all-wool dress goods, instead of 2½; 40 table plates, instead of 17; 46 pairs of teacups and saucers, instead of 22, and 6½ dozen glass goblets, instead of half a dozen.

It has been said that gold is the rich man's money. These figures prove that it is the poor man's money, and the money of everyone who works for wages. The wage worker is always cheated by any depreciated money, more by depreciated paper money, because it has no intrinsic value to check its expansion.

The wage worker always gets the most for his services when the dollar in which he is paid is the dollar of the commerical world. The whole people, except speculators and commercial gamblers, are injuriously affected by depreciated money of any kind, but the injury is felt with crushing effect by the man or woman whose life depends upon constant employment and daily earnings.

The census of 1890 shows that there were in the United States at that time 22,733,661 laborers, male and female, in all occupations. Of that number, 15,099,901 were wage earners who were paid in money for their services; 4,942,418 were hired laborers in manufactures; 3,004,015 were hired farm laborers; 1,443,399 were hired domestic servants; 639,413 were conductors, engineers, firemen, and other employees of railroad companies; 611,417 were carpenters and joiners; 556,900 were clerks; 341,811 were school-teachers; 368,502 were draymen and hackmen; 264,000 were salesmen; 248,443 were launderers and laundresses; 219,868 were painters; 205,315 were blacksmiths; 185,197 were tailors; 159,374 were bookkeepers and accountants; 133,518 were sawmill operators; 104,803 were physicians; 88,295 were clergymen; 84,976 were barbers and hairdressers; 86,454 were printers and pressmen; 74,633 were watchmen and policemen; 58,701 were commercial travelers; 63,348 were telegraph and telephone operators and linemen; 44,349 were boarding-house keepers; 44,110 were hotel keepers; 54,029 were hostlers; 72,601 were laborers employed in vineyards and nurseries; 70,734 were laborers employed by stockmen; 43,242 were civil engineers; 33,697 were wood choppers; 33,333 were stenographers and typewriters; 26,767 were livery-stable keepers; 17,498 were dentists. These are a part, and only a part, of the vast army of wage workers who are to be injured, and seriously injured, by the expulsion of the present standard and the adoption of any depreciated standard of value.

DEMONETIZATION.

It may not be unsuitable in this connection to try to disillusion the minds of some good people who believe that the act of 1873, the so-called demonetization act, in connection with similar acts of legislation in European countries, has halved the metallic basis of the world's money. This error has been ingeniously disseminated by a recent budget of half truths and whole errors called Coin's Financial School. A story is told by Senator PALMER of Illinois, illustrating the mischief this little book is doing. The Senator said he had received a letter from an old soldier friend who had served in his regiment, saying:

DEAR GENERAL: Two new books have come into my neighborhood lately, and they are playing hell with the Democratic party. One is named Coin, and the boys all read it; another is called Trilby, and the girls all read it.

Many fierce and savage epithets have been bestowed upon that act of 1873 by speakers and writers whose zeal is swifter of foot than their judgment. It is not style, however, in economic discussion that we are concerned with. It is a man's doctrine rather than his demeanor that interests us. There is no danger of discreet people mistaking vituperation for veracity, or imaginative fervor for economic fact. No one disputes the existence of economic disturbances or the serious consequences resulting from them in the last twenty years. Nor is it our purpose to inquire whether the act of 1873 was a trick or an open and honest performance of legislative duty, for its consequences, whatever they were, are the matter in hand, not the motive of the act. A surgeon diagnosing a gunshot wound does not need to know whether it was inflicted by accident or design.

All I propose doing is to look through the obscuring mass of vituperative verbiage with which enthusiasts have covered the subject and in the interest of historic truth find out what dimensions the demonetization of silver has in reality in the United States. There are people who make shadows on the wall with their own hands and then take fright at the horrid pictures. Wisdom admonishes us against a folly of that kind. I want to vindicate the United States against the aspersions cast upon her, that she is responsible by reason of her legislation for the demonetization of silver, the fall in prices, and the general monetary dislocation of the time. With a knowledge of the facts you can not fail to believe with me that our country is free from delinquency on this score and has fairly earned all the credit the world gives her for her heroic efforts to sustain silver as a money metal.

What actually occurred in 1873 was to drop the silver dollar from our coinage. That act was as harmless at that time as an act would have been forbidding the coinage of aluminum, for there were no silver dollars to speak of in circulation, and scarcely any had been coined for a quarter of a century, for the very sufficient reason that silver was worth more in bullion than in coined dollars and could not be coined without a loss. It is difficult to see how a circulation could be impaired by excluding from it a coin that had not been in for many years. Prof. Simon Newcomb wrote in 1879:

It is probably safe to assert that one-half of the citizens of our country born since 1840 have never seen a silver dollar. But if it had been a current coin in 1873, as the gold dollar was in 1891, to drop it from the coinage was in no real sense a demonetization of silver more than was the dropping of the gold dollar in 1891 a demonetization of gold, looking at these two similar acts of legislation dropping two coins from our system, one because it was too small and the other because it was too large. Apart from all else it does not appear to one of medium faculty that one was in any real sense more effective than the other in causing the demonetization of the respective metals.

But for the act of 1853, which effected demonetization to a much larger extent than that of 1873, there would have been a very small fraction of our silver money in any way disturbed. From 1853 to 1873 we purchased and coined $62,723,695 of demonetized silver; that is, silver money not of ultimate redemption.

The following is a statement of the several denominations of silver coined in that period:

Silver dollars coined from 1792 to 1853	$2,505,886
Half dollars coined from 1792 to 1853	66,321,636
Quarter dollars coined from 1792 to 1853	3,964,125
Dimes coined from 1792 to 1853	3,902,213
Half dimes coined from 1792 to 1853	1,824,623

All of this silver, except the dollars, was demonetized in 1853; that is, $76,012,597 was demonetized, leaving only $2,505,886 retaining the full legal-tender quality, which all the silver possessed prior to 1853.

In the same time we coined under free coinage 5,524,350 silver dollars, and during the same period we coined $611,810,808 of gold. To say that the two metals entered the mints during those twenty years arm in arm suggests the picture of an infant arm in arm with a California giant.

But this is not the full strength of the argument; that requires a view of the total coinage of denominations under a dollar from 1792 to 1873, and here it is:

Total silver coinage under the dollar from 1792 to 1893.

Half dollars	$128,391,220
Quarters	45,949,731
Twenty-cent pieces	271,000
Dimes	28,405,071
Half dimes	4,880,219
Total	207,897,231

This entire sum was demonetized by the act of 1853 and made token money, while the total amount of dollars coined from 1792 to 1873 which it is claimed was demonetized by the act of 1873 was a little over $8,000,000.

After the alleged act of demonetizing we began the policy of monetizing silver, and continued doing so from 1878 to 1893 at a more rapid rate than was ever known before in the history of the world. We purchased for monetary uses about 500,000,000 ounces (496,984,889) of fine silver at a cost of over $500,000,000 ($508,933,975), and coined about 420,000,000 silver legal-tender dollars—more than fifty times as many silver dollars coined in fifteen years after demonetization as in the eighty prior years. Is it not, therefore, as clear as demonstration itself that no other nation ever made such heroic exertions to uphold any form of money as the United States made for twenty years to maintain the honor and value of silver? Not only our own but the lips of other countries have generously praised our long-continued and persevering struggle to hold up the arms of the white metal. Mr. Montefiore Levi, the distinguished Belgian financier, who presided over the Brussels Monetary Conference, alluded in the kindest terms to the efforts we had made to avert the fall of silver. Bertram Currie, one of the delegates to the Brussels conference from Great Britain, said:

We have witnessed the heroic labors of the United States to sustain silver.

Sir Rivers Wilson, another delegate from Great Britain, said:

It is doubtful whether the United States can possibly continue indefinitely the gigantic efforts which it has made without effect for so many years to maintain and to raise the price of silver.

Dr. E. B. Andrews, one of our own delegates, in reply to an intimation that the United States was to blame for the monetary situation, aptly said:

To make such a charge is like indicting for murder a man who has bravely tried to save his fellow bent upon committing suicide. But we can not carry this fraternal effort much further. We shall not forever pursue alone the task of sustaining the price of silver.

Mr. Boissevain, a delegate from the Netherlands, said:

It seems to me unjust and contrary to historical facts to lay the burden of responsibility for the present situation upon the United States.

Senator JONES, another of our delegates, said to the conference:

The fact is, the price of silver has been maintained by the aid of the United States. It has the same value to-day it had when it had unrestricted access to the mints. Its purchasing power, its control over commodities, has not declined.

These are testimonies which effectually repel the imputation that the United States has been delinquent in not making proper exertions to uphold the price of silver, and they are all borne out by the figures I have already produced showing the enormous increase in the use of silver in the United States since the passage of the act of 1873.

Corresponding figures for the commercial countries of Europe furnish explicit and incontestable evidence of the absurdity of the suggestion that the world is suffering from a dearth of money because of the demonetization of silver.

The following statement is interesting and instructive:

Statement of the silver coinage in the countries named, from 1851 to 1870.

England	$31,243,217
France	103,307,957
Germany (from 1857 to 1872)	167,805,000
United States	63,254,676
Total	365,610,850

Statement of the silver coinage in the countries named, from 1870 to 1890.

England	$82,306,352
France	70,578,588
Germany	107,632,000
United States	485,889,912
Total	746,406,852

It thus appears that there was double as much silver coined in the four great commercial countries in the twenty years after 1870 as in the twenty years immediately preceding, every dollar of which retains a purchasing power equivalent to gold.

Does it not appear, then, to right-minded men that so far as the United States is concerned in responsibility for the demonetization of silver and the monetary disturbances of the past years on account of the fall in silver, it is a monstrous kilabaroo?

A friend of mine tells a story more suitable as an illustration in this connection than anything I can recall from history, fiction, or fable. A wag carried about a queer looking box to scare people with. He pretended there was a terrible animal in it that would eat people alive. He had it in New York on one occasion. The beholders asked him what it was. "A kilabaroo," he replied. "Where did it come from?" "It came from Africa." "What is its color?" "Green as jealousy." "What does it live on?" "It lives on snakes." "Where do you get the snakes." "I get them from my brother-in-law here in New York." "Where does he get them?" "Well, he gets them out of his imagination when he has delirium tremens." "Oh, then they are imaginary snakes?" "Oh, yes; it is an imaginary kilabaroo. There is nothing in the box, but it scares a great many people." [Applause.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for fifteen years the advocates of gold have been claiming that they are the friends of an honest standard, and have been charging that the friends of silver are the advocates of a dishonest standard. This claim for themselves and this charge against us have been repeated so often and with such emphasis that they have produced an impression upon the public mind; and it is my purpose, on this occasion, to show if I can that they are entirely unfounded. Indeed, I realize that I must do this in order to justify my support of the pending bill, for I know perfectly well that it would be worse than folly for the American people to abandon a financial system which preserves the integrity of their standard and adopt one which insures its debasement. Neither the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] nor the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] can be more earnestly in favor of an honest standard than I am.

WHAT IS AN HONEST STANDARD?

But, Mr. Chairman, what is an honest standard? Certainly I can not consent to the definition of it given by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] in his speech last Friday, when he defined "standard money" in these words:

In my judgment, the main thing is to arrive at a proper comprehension of what is meant by the term standard money. What is standard money, Mr. Chairman? I define it to be money coined out of a substance the commercial value of which is exactly equal to the purchasing power of the money after it is coined. It will be seen that free and unlimited coinage is necessarily the essential feature of standard money.

I respectfully submit to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] that iron will fulfill his definition of standard money just as well as gold. If to-morrow Congress were to establish as our unit of value an iron dollar, consisting of an ounce of iron, there can be no reasonable doubt that an ounce of iron would be worth the iron dollar itself. Of course the dollar consisting of an ounce of iron would not be worth anything like as much as a dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, but it would be worth neither more nor less than the iron in it. The mathematical axiom that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other is not more certain than that whatever can be converted into a dollar without cost will be worth a dollar. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asserts this to be true, for in opening the debate on this bill he said:

It must be conceded that under free and unlimited coinage of private silver bullion, after a sufficient time had elapsed to give an opportunity to get into full operation, there could be no material difference in the market value between 371¼ grains of fine silver in the form of bullion before coinage and 371¼ grains of silver coined into a standard silver dollar, for no owner of silver, here or abroad, would sell 371¼ grains of silver bullion for materially less than he could dispose of a silver dollar coined from such silver, when he could have his bullion converted into a silver dollar without cost to himself.

I leave these two distinguished gentlemen to reconcile this difference between them, while I propose the brief and simple definition that: The best standard money is that which is the most unchanging in its value. I take it that all thoughtful men who have studied this subject will readily agree to this definition; and if so, two points of difference are eliminated from this debate. I thoroughly agree with my friends on the other side as to the wisdom of having an honest standard, and they must, upon due reflection, thoroughly agree with me in my definition of an honest standard.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Our serious disagreement is this: They insist that gold is, and has been, stable in its value, and is, therefore, an honest standard, while I insist that for twenty years gold has steadily appreciated, and is therefore not an honest standard. If they are right on the question of fact—that is, if gold has been stable in its value—then the gold standard is an honest standard and ought to be maintained. On the other hand, if they are mistaken on the question of fact—that is, if gold has been appreciating for twenty years—then the gold standard is not an honest standard and ought to be abolished. Upon this proposition the ultimate decision of this controversy will depend. If we can not prove the appreciation of gold, we can not successfully assail the gold standard; because all of the ills which we ascribe to it flow from the one great evil of an appreciating money. But, sir, if we can prove the appreciation of gold, we thereby completely answer all of the arguments which our opponents have ever made, for they have never delivered a speech nor written a book nor published a pamphlet which has not been based upon the assumption that the value of gold has been stable, and if we can demonstrate this assumption to be false, their entire case falls to the ground.

HOW TO DETERMINE THE APPRECIATION OF GOLD.

How, Mr. Chairman, can we determine whether or not the value of gold has appreciated? It is certain that we can not determine it by using gold as our standard, because, of course, a thing must always be equal to itself; and no matter how high it rises or how low it falls, if it be treated as a standard, and all other things measured by it, the changes between it and other things will appear to have been brought about by a movement of the other things. It is not necessary for me to detain this House in exposing the fallacy of attempting to prove the stability of a standard by the standard itself. The question being whether or not there has been a change in the standard, the only possible method of deciding that question fairly and intelligently is to divest the substance which composes the standard of its quality as a standard, and then compare it with other commodities. Let us subject gold to this crucial test.

The relation between gold and other commodities, as exemplified by the level of general prices, was so clearly and so forcibly presented to the House by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] on Saturday last that I shall not attempt to add anything to what he has already said so well. I refrain from a further discussion of that phase of the question both because I could not hope to improve upon the manner in which the gentleman from Minnesota has discussed it, and also because our adversaries admit the fall in prices as evidenced by the Index Numbers, but claim that it is due to facts connected with commodities, and not to the appreciation of gold. With the fall admitted, it is only necessary for us to ascertain its cause, and this I shall endeavor to do by taking particular articles and showing that nothing will account for the fall in their price except the appreciation of gold.

Perhaps it will be proper, in order to avoid all misunderstanding as to my position, for me to say at the outset that I fully recognize that an increase in its supply without a corresponding increase in the demand for it, will inevitably reduce the price of any article. I also recognize that there frequently occurs such an increase in the production of particular articles as superinduces a fall in their price. But I regard it as most improbable that an overproduction could occur in all lines at the same time; and I regard it as well-nigh impossible that such an overproduction could continue through a long period of time. Certainly I can not accept such a theory without the most convincing proof of its correctness, and especially when the phenomenon which it is employed to explain can be explained upon another theory which is more probable in itself and more in harmony with the experience of mankind.

OVERPRODUCTION OF MANUFACTURED GOODS.

It would be difficult for any man to say that there has, or has not, been an overproduction of manufactured goods, because the data for such a calculation are so meager that no careful and conscientious investigator would feel much reliance in any judgment predicated upon them. Democrats, however, can not aver the overproduction of manufactured goods without flatly contradicting an argument which we have been making against the Republican party for years. We have declared from every stump and rostrum in America that under the system of high custom duties foreign goods have been excluded from our markets, and that the domestic manufacturers, secure against foreign competition, have regulated their production so as not to overstock our market. We have affirmed that syndicates, trusts, and combinations have been formed for the sole and only purpose of limiting production and maintaining prices. As for my part, I felt then, and I feel now, that our criticism was just, for repeatedly, when the output of their factories was sufficient to supply our home demand, I have seen the manufacturers close down their establishments and turn their operatives in idleness upon the public streets.

But, sir, a much stronger reason inducing me to believe that it is the appreciation of gold, and not the overproduction of commodities, which has produced the disastrous fall in prices is the fact that the fall is apparent nowhere throughout the world except in countries which measure prices in gold. Political economists have taught us that falling prices discourage production, while rising or stable prices encourage production; and, for a century, we have accepted this as an economic truth. We must, however, reject it now if we are to believe that overproduction explains the fall in prices; because the greatest overproduction appears in those countries where a continuous fall in prices has been the greatest, and no excessive production has occurred in those countries where prices have remained fairly stationary. If overproduction were really the evil that afflicts all gold-standard nations alike, that evil would have been remedied before this by curtailing production until it was made commensurate with consumption.

FARM PRODUCTS.

But, Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion as to the overproduction of manufactured goods, there is none at all in reference to the great agricultural products of wheat and cotton; for the statistics relating to them are so full and generally so accurate that we can draw our conclusions from them with the utmost confidence. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE], in the course of his excellent speech, demanded to know why cotton and wheat should be taken as the basis of comparison rather than corn and oats. The answer to that question is so obvious that I am astonished at his asking it. Our purpose being to ascertain whether or not the value of gold has appreciated, and it being true, as our gold-standard friends are constantly alleging, that the value of gold is fixed in the open markets of the world, it is plainly necessary for us to use in our comparison commodities whose prices are fixed in the same markets where the price of gold is fixed. It would be impossible for us to deduce anything like a satisfactory conclusion about the price of one article whose price is fixed in the markets of the world by comparing it with another article whose price is fixed in the local markets of a single country. The prices of corn and oats are fixed in local markets and under local conditions, and for that reason I do not use them as a basis of comparison. The prices of cotton and wheat are fixed in the open markets of the world, where the price of gold is fixed, and for that reason I do use them as a basis of comparison.

OVERPRODUCTION OF WHEAT.

In 1872 the price of wheat was $1.24 per bushel, and in 1894 it was 49 cents per bushel. Many gentlemen have argued that the chief reason for this great decline in the price of wheat is the reduction in transportation charges, but that argument is not pertinent, because the prices which I have given are the farm prices. The lower cost of transporting wheat from the farm to the export markets may be thought by some to account for its lower price in those markets, it is absolutely certain that it can not account for its lower price at the farm. Driven from this position, our gold standard friends next contend that the decline has been caused by the immense crops of late years; but this position is not more tenable than the other.

Our first crop to reach 500,000,000 bushels was the crop of 1882, which was 504,185,470 bushels. The crop of 1894—or perhaps I would better take the crop of 1893, as it makes a sharper contrast—the crop of 1893 was 396,131,725 bushels. That is to say, the wheat produced in 1893 was over 25 per cent less than in 1882. Our population had increased from 1882 to 1893 not less than 25 per cent, which of course created an enlarged demand, thus showing more people to eat wheat and less wheat to eat. If I should stop with a comparison based upon these two years, it might be suspected that I had picked them to suit my own purpose in the argument, and to free myself from that suspicion, as well as to make the argument more reliable, I will take the average of the six years beginning with 1882 and going forward to 1887 and compare it with the six years beginning with 1894 and going back to 1888.

The average crop of the first six years was 451,000,000 bushels, and the average crop of the second six years was 475,000,000 bushels, the difference in the average of the two periods being 24,000,000 bushels; or an increase of less than 6 per cent. During this same time that the production of wheat increased less than 6 per cent our population increased over 15 per cent, showing an increased percentage in the consumers of wheat more than twice as great as the increased percentage in the production of wheat, which conclusively establishes that there has been no overproduction of wheat. But we are told that while that is true of this country it is not true of other countries, and that the enormous crops in other countries have brought about the decline in the price of wheat. This explanation does not explain, because it is not true as a matter of fact. The wheat crop of the world in 1882 was greater than it was in 1893, and during the twelve years that intervened between 1882 and 1894 only four crops were greater than the crop of 1882 and eight crops were smaller, the average crop for the twelve years being 50,000,000 bushels less than the crop of 1882.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, with this decreased supply and an increased demand, the price of wheat ought to have been greater in 1893 than it was in 1882; but the Treasury statistics show that wheat was worth 88 cents per bushel in 1882 and only 53 cents per bushel in 1893. What is the explanation? We know that since 1882 there have been no special facts, such as improved methods of production, which have affected the price of wheat to any important extent, and that its price has been determined by its own supply and demand, coupled with the supply and demand for money. If the supply and demand for wheat had been the same in 1893 as in 1882, we know that there could have been no change in its price except such as ensued from a change in the value of money. And when we see that instead of the supply and demand remaining the same there has actually been an increased demand meeting a decreased supply, we know that there would have been an increase in its price if there had not been a still greater increase in the value of the money which measures its price.

LAW OF PRICE.

It will be perceived from this statement that I do not deny, nor do I attempt to discount, the great law of supply and demand. Indeed, I seek to establish my contention that the steady fall in the price of wheat through twenty years has been due to the constant appreciation of gold, by showing that this fall of price has been contrary to the conditions of supply and demand, and must consequently be attributed to some cause other than the conditions of supply and demand.

The trouble with our gold-standard friends is that they refuse to admit that there is any other cause, and blindly insist that its supply and demand alone determine the price of every commodity. They are almost as unreasonable as the fiatists, who iterate and reiterate that the volume of money controls all prices. The gold men and the fiatists are both wrong and equally wrong, because each takes into consideration only that element of price which supports his own theory of the question. It is certainly true that its supply and demand are potent factors in fixing the price of any commodity, but they are not the only factors. It is also true that the amount of money circulating in the markets where prices are fixed strongly influences but it does not entirely govern them. The correct statement of the principle is that "all other things remaining the same, supply and demand regulate prices"; and, stated in this way, the rule is not only correct, but it is universal in its application, and is as true of money as it is of merchandise. Assuming the volume of money and the demand for money to be fixed, then the price of each article will vary as the conditions of its supply and demand vary; or, assuming the supply and demand for any given article to be fixed, its price will vary with the variations in the volume of money as related to the demand for money; but in all cases the value of money must form one

term in every equation of price. When we say that a certain article is worth so much, we simply mean that a given quantity of that article equals a given number of dollars. If the value of money rises the same number of dollars will procure more of the article; or if the value of money falls, it will require a greater number of dollars to procure the same quantity of the article.

It is for asserting this plain and natural law of political economy that we are charged with proposing an artificial system of high prices. We propose nothing of the kind; we are simply opposing an artificial system of low prices. We know that even with an ideal monetary system, under which the value of a dollar would never change, there would still be changes in supply and demand, and consequent changes in price, against which no legislation can prevail and against which none ought to be attempted; but our contention is that business men and farmers, who must incur the risk of such changes in prices as result from a change in the commodities which they produce or in which they deal, ought to be exempt from the changes in price which grow out of a change in the value of money.

OVERPRODUCTION OF COTTON.

An examination of cotton production and cotton prices discloses much the same condition as exists in regard to wheat. In 1872 the price of cotton averaged over 20 cents per pound, and in 1894 it averaged less than 7 cents per pound. I use the price for 1894 because the Statistical Abstract for 1895 has not yet been issued, and as I desire to use only official reports, I use the price of the last year officially reported. It may be objected that the comparison of a single commodity based on any two years is not reliable—an objection which I freely concede—and in order to avoid making the comparison too narrow I will take the average for the last twenty-two years and abide the judgment to be formed in that way. The average price of cotton since 1872 has been 11.5 cents per pound, as against 22.19 cents per pound in 1872, and the gold dollar, which in 1872 would buy only 4½ pounds of cotton, would have bought during the last twenty-two years an average of 11¼ pounds, showing an increase in the purchasing power of gold over cotton of more than 100 per cent.

Our gold-standard friends admit this ruinous fall in the price of cotton, but allege that it is due to its overproduction. We admit that there has been a marked increase in the production of cotton since 1873, but we insist that the extension in its use has been equally as great, and that the relative supply and demand are not essentially different now from what they were then. If I can substantiate this statement I suppose that all reasonable men will agree that it is not overproduction which has brought the price of cotton from an average of over 22 cents per pound in 1872 to an average of less than 7 cents per pound in 1894. How can we decide this question? By what test shall we determine whether there has been an overproduction of cotton? A very respectable authority on the subject says:

> It is evident that the proper way to judge of the supply of any unmanufactured product is by the number of weeks' supply for the use of the manufacturers in the market at the close of the season.

This test is not only as fair and as safe as has ever been proposed, but is probably as fair and as safe as can be devised; and with this for our guide, we not only fail to discover the overproduction of which we have heard so much, but we actually find an underproduction. I have here a table which shows the supply, the consumption, and the surplus of each year from 1871–72 to 1893–94:

Cotton—supply, consumption, and surplus.

Year.	Surplus at beginning of season.	Supply.	Consumption.	Price per pound.
	Bales.	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Cents.*
1871–72	2,578,000	6,277,000	6,312,000	22.19
1872–73	2,453,000	6,366,000	6,425,000	20.14
1873–74	2,320,000	6,917,000	6,632,000	17.95
1874–75	2,525,000	6,525,000	6,656,000	15.46
1875–76	2,324,000	7,189,000	7,082,000	12.98
1876–77	2,346,000	6,830,000	7,140,000	11.82
1877–78	1,961,000	6,931,000	7,272,000	11.22
1878–79	1,540,000	7,035,000	7,223,000	10.84
1879–80	1,267,000	8,450,000	8,081,000	11.51
1880–81	1,548,000	9,356,000	8,648,000	12.03
1881–82	2,168,000	8,583,000	9,035,000	11.56
1882–83	1,616,000	10,408,000	9,499,000	11.88
1883–84	2,405,000	8,919,000	9,290,000	10.88
1884–85	1,939,000	8,429,000	8,597,000	10.45
1885–86	1,679,000	9,580,000	9,371,000	9.28
1886–87	1,800,000	9,928,000	9,757,000	10.21
1887–88	1,841,000	10,100,000	10,167,000	10.03
1888–89	1,614,000	10,429,000	10,524,000	10.65
1889–90	1,499,000	11,105,000	11,055,000	11.07
1890–91	1,434,000	12,658,000	11,726,000	8.60
1891–92	2,266,000	13,190,000	11,816,000	7.71
1892–93	3,540,000	10,644,000	11,470,000	8.56
1893–94	3,510,000	11,890,000	11,861,000	6.94

In constructing this table I have taken the price of cotton from the Statistical Abstract, and I have taken the supply, consumption, and surplus, except the last year, from a publication by Clapp & Co. I preferred this publication rather than the Senate report, because it gives the data as to the world, while the Senate report gives the consumption and surplus for only the United States and Europe.

This table shows that at the close of the cotton year of 1871–72 (and I will say in parenthesis that in the cotton trade the year closes on the 31st of August) the world's surplus was 2,453,000 bales, which was equal to about twenty weeks' supply for the factories, and which, with the single exception of 1874–75, was the largest number of weeks' supply on hand at the close of any season during the next twenty years. An inspection of this table will show that at the end of 1885–86, which was the first year after the war that cotton fell below an average of 10 cents per pound, the surplus on hand was only 1,800,000 bales, as against 2,453,000 bales for 1872–73.

Applying our rule, that the extent of overproduction is to be judged by the surplus at the end of the season, we find that in 1885–86, as compared with 1871–72, there had really been an underproduction of 33 per cent. This would lead us to expect a corresponding rise in the price, but instead of that we find a fall in the price from an average of over 20 cents per pound in 1871–72 to an average of less than 10 cents per pound for 1885–86. Passing down this table to the year of 1892–93, we find a surplus exceeding for the first time since 1874–75 the surplus of 1872–73—the surplus of 1892–93 being 3,540,000 bales. This surplus of 3,540,000 bales, however, constituted a smaller number of weeks' supply than the 2,453,000 bales surplus in 1871–72, and yet, sir, the smaller surplus of 1892–93 commanded less than 9 cents per pound, while the larger surplus of 1872–73 commanded over 20 cents per pound.

Our argument is not more conclusive when tested by the number of weeks' supply on hand at the close of each season than when tested by the per cent of the crop which remained as a surplus. A glance at the above table will show that the world's total supply for 1871–72 was 6,272,000 bales, of which 2,453,000 remained in the market at the close of the season, showing a surplus of about 35 per cent. The world's total supply for 1885–86 was 9,580,000 bales, of which 1,800,000 bales remained on the market at the close of the season, showing a surplus of about 20 per cent; or, if we take the great crop of 1891–92—the greatest ever produced in the history of the world up to that year—the total supply was 13,190,000 bales, of which 3,500,000 bales remained in the market at the end of the season, showing a surplus of less than 27 per cent, against a surplus of 35 per cent in 1872–73. In the face of these plain and incontrovertible facts I am unable to understand how any unprejudiced mind can still insist that the supply of cotton has exceeded the demand for it.

Not only, sir, do the facts completely disprove the theory of overproduction, but the highest authority, or, if not the highest, certainly one of the highest, in the cotton trade of this country has recently declared that an overproduction does not exist. I have here the report of Mr. Alfred B. Sheperson, who is connected with the New York Cotton Exchange, and who was employed by a Senate committee as an expert to investigate this very question. He follows an elaborate examination of tables giving the supply, consumption, and surplus of cotton with this statement:

> An examination of the number of the week's supply of cotton in the European markets at the end of each season does not confirm the opinion held by many persons that in recent years there has been a great overproduction of cotton.

Thus we present you the demonstration of figures, supplemented by the testimony of experts, that the world's demand for cotton has increased as fast as the world's supply of it; and therefore the fall in its price could not have resulted from changed conditions of supply and demand. The trouble is not in our cotton; it is in the money which expresses the price of our cotton. The world has not produced more cotton than it has needed, but the world has needed more gold than it has produced. The same amount of gold now buys more than double as much cotton as formerly, not because there is more cotton than enough to supply the demand for cotton; but because there is not enough gold to supply the demand for gold. If gold were worth the same to-day as it was twenty-two years ago the price of cotton now would not be greatly different from what it was then, for the last crop was not as large in proportion to the demand for it as the crop of 1872–73. Cotton is worth nearly the same in Mexico to-day as it was in 1873, and though we are told that the money in which the Mexicans pay 20 cents a pound for cotton is only worth 50 cents on the dollar, we know that the Mexican dollar is worth as much now, of everything except gold, as it was twenty years ago.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that all fair-minded and candid men will reject the explanation that the fall in the price of wheat and cotton is attributable to their overproduction, because I am sure that all fair-minded and thoughtful men who will examine the question must conclude that these commodities have not been overpro-

duced. With the overproduction argument rejected, it only remains for me to consider the other explanation that the fall in the price of wheat and cotton is attributable to cheaper methods of producing them.

This explanation is insufficient both in point of theory and in point of fact. The Ricardian theory that the cost of production determines the price of an article is not assented to by any eminent thinker of this age. It is perfectly true that a cheaper cost of production may influence price by influencing the extent of production, but in no other way. To illustrate what I mean, let us suppose that some new invention would enable 100 men to produce double as much of an article in a given time as they could formerly. This would probably reduce the price of the article—indeed, it would be certain to do so unless the invention should be too expensive, in which event it would not be used, and the old status would not be changed—but the fall in its price would proceed not from its cheaper production, but from its greater production; or, to phrase it differently, the supply being doubled, if the demand remained the same, a fall in the price would follow.

No commodity could furnish a more conclusive refutation of the doctrine that the cost of production determines price than the precious metals themselves. We all know that a large part of the gold in the world was produced, weight for weight, more cheaply than silver, and nobody supposes that the cost of producing gold and silver has, ounce for ounce, been more than 10 to 1, and yet, while it has cost as much to produce 10 ounces of silver as 1 ounce of gold, 1 ounce of gold is worth as much in the markets of the world to-day as 31 ounces of silver. There are many other proofs and illustrations which could be adduced to sustain my contention, but I forbear to dwell upon them, and shall content myself with reenforcing my own opinion by a quotation from the best book ever written by an American—and one of the best ever written by anybody—on the subject of "Money." In his great work Professor Walker says:

> Cost of production only affects value by affecting the actual or potential supply. A lower cost of production allows under given conditions a larger supply to be marketed. The higher cost of production diminishes the supply. This is the only way in which a change in the cost of production can influence existing values.

So much for the theory upon which these gentlemen allege a cheaper production as the cause of lower prices. But, sir, even if their theory were good, it is not supported by the facts. If we would agree that the cheaper production of cotton and wheat would reduce their price, it is not possible to prove their cheaper production. Not only would they be unable to prove it, but we are able to disprove it.

The cost of producing any article consists, first, of the capital invested; second, of the labor bestowed upon it; and third, of the incidental expenses, such as taxes, repairs, and insurance. Our census reports are not compiled so that we can ascertain either the capital invested, the labor bestowed, or the incidental expenses incurred in producing the particular articles of cotton and wheat; but they are compiled in such a manner as to show the entire capital invested, and the number of laborers engaged in agricultural pursuits, and we can approximately judge as to what part of the whole was employed in producing cotton and wheat. There being no census of the years of 1872 and 1894, we are compelled to take the census of 1870 and 1890. This, however, fully answers the purposes of a fair argument. According to the census of 1870, the value of the farms, including lands, fences, and buildings, was $9,262,803,861, the value of the implements and machinery was $336,878,429, and the value of live stock was $1,525,276,457, making a total of less than $11,200,000,000.

The Census report itself states that these were currency prices and that currency was at a discount of a fraction more than 25 per cent. Reducing the currency prices to a specie basis, the total capital invested in farming, including lands, houses, fences, live stock, and implements of all kinds, was less than $8,500,000,000. The number of laborers engaged in agricultural pursuits in 1870 was 5,922,471. In 1890 the capital invested in farms, live stock, and implements was $16,000,000,000, and the laborers engaged in farming were 8,565,920. Thus we find that the capital invested was nearly 100 per cent greater, and the number of laborers was nearly 50 per cent greater, in 1890 than in 1870. The exact figures as to taxes, insurance, and repairs I am not able to give, but no man will dispute that this expense was nearly double as much on $16,000,000,000 in 1890 as it was on $8,500,000,000 in 1870. We have, then, an increase in the capital of 100 per cent, an increase in the labor of 50 per cent, and an increase of 100 per cent in taxes, insurance, and repairs. And so, sir, to preserve the proportion between the cost of production and the selling price of farm products, they ought to have been worth nearly twice as much in 1894 as in 1872, but the reports of the Agricultural Department show that they were worth $1,890,000,000, in 1894, as against $1,625,472,543 in 1872.

Reducing the crop of 1872 to a specie basis, it was, in round numbers, $1,400,000,000, which shows an increase in 1894 over 1872 of only $490,000,000; and this increase was in corn, oats, hay, and other products whose prices are entirely local, and therefore do do not indicate the rise or fall in the value of gold. Looking to those farm products whose prices are regulated in the markets of the world and which therefore fairly measure the appreciation of gold, we find that the wheat crop of 1894, which was 460,000,000 bushels, was worth only $225,000,000, while the crop of 1872, which was only 249,000,000 bushels, was worth $310,000,000; or, the crop of 1894, though twice as large as the crop of 1872, brought the farmers who produced it less money than the crop of 1872. The cotton crop of 1872, though less than half as much as the crop of 1894, brought $301,087,500 as against $263,000,000 for the crop of 1894.

These facts, Mr. Chairman, I think clearly demonstrate that neither the overproduction of cotton and wheat nor their cheaper productions could have caused the fall in their price; and if I have shown that neither overproduction nor cheaper production accounts for the fall in the price, I have excluded every possible explanation except the appreciation of gold. Not only is it true, sir, that gold has more than doubled its purchasing power over cotton and wheat during the last twenty-two years, but the same is true of every commodity whose price is fixed in the open markets of the world, and whose conditions of supply and demand are relatively the same now as they were in 1872. I could easily make this statement good by a comparison, article by article, such as I have made in respect to cotton and wheat, but this would be a useless tax upon my strength and upon the patience of the House, as such proof would simply be cumulative.

THE REMEDY.

And now, Mr. Chairman, what is the remedy for this disastrous fall in prices? Our gold-standard friends propose none at all, and complacently assure us that falling prices are a national blessing. This may, or it may not, be true. It is true when the fall in price results from a diminished cost of production, because such a fall may benefit consumer and producer alike and become a distinct gain for humanity and civilization; but it is not true when the fall in price is due to an increase in the value of money, because such a fall benefits none except those who enjoy fixed incomes, and is an unmitigated curse to any nation. I shall not consume my time in arguing to this House that an appreciating unit of value is unjust to a large majority of our people and injurious to the best interests of our country, for I have never known a man in public speech or in private conversation who would deny it.

I know usurers who, to serve their selfishness, would multiply the unit by five every ten years, and I know spendthrifts who, to relieve their embarrassments, would divide the unit by ten every five years; but even these extreme types, deferring to common sense and common honesty, do not dare to ask what they desire; and like all other men profess a solicitude to preserve the stability of the unit. Amid the endless diversity and conflict of opinion on this subject that is the one point upon which we all agree. The gold-standard advocates, the friends of the double standard, and even the paper fiatists, all join in declaring that the first and most indispensable requisite of a sound monetary system is an invariable unit of value.

Believing that the great fall in prices during the last twenty-two years is largely due to an appreciation of money, and believing that this appreciation will continue under a single gold standard, we propose, as a remedy for the evil, a restoration of the double standard. In making this proposal we are actuated by no special predilection for silver, and we favor its free coinage purely as a means to an end. We know that the stability of our money can not be preserved by basing the unit exclusively upon gold, but we believe it can be preserved by basing the unit upon both gold and silver.

WHY WE FAVOR THE DOUBLE STANDARD.

We favor the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with the free and unlimited coinage of each, because we believe that together they will make our standard of value more stable than either one of them alone can make it; and in this opinion we are strongly confirmed by one of the ablest and one of the most ardent of all the gold monometallists. In that passage which has been quoted so often, but which can not be quoted too often, Professor Jevons says:

> A little reflection must show that MM. Wolowski and Courcelle-Seneuil are quite correct in urging that a compensatory or, as I should prefer to call it, equilibratory action goes on under the French currency law, and tends to maintain both gold and silver more steady in value than they would otherwise be. * * * At any moment the standard of value is doubtless one metal or the other, and not both; yet the fact that there is an alteration tends to make each vary much less than it would otherwise do. It can not prevent both metals from falling or rising in value compared with other commodities, but it can throw variations of supply and demand over a larger area, instead of leaving each metal to be affected merely by its own accidents.
>
> Imagine two reservoirs of water, each subject to independent variations of supply and demand. In the absence of any connecting pipe, the level of the water in each reservoir will be subject to its own fluctuation only. But if we open a connection, the water in both will assume a certain mean level, and the effects of any excessive supply or demand will be distributed over the whole area of both reservoirs. The mass of the metals, gold and silver,

circulating in western Europe in late years, is exactly represented by the water in these reservoirs, and the connecting pipe is the law of the 7th Germinal, an XI, which enables one metal to take the place of the other as an unlimited legal tender.

If Professor Jevons is right, and a unit based upon both metals is the most stable, then, sir, the double standard must be the best. Even if it is not as good as it ought to be, it can not be worse than the single gold standard; for the only system which can possibly be worse than one under which the unit doubles its value in twenty years is one under which it doubles its value in a shorter time. We do not claim that under a double standard the value of money will never vary; but we do claim that the variation will be very much less under it than under a single gold standard. Curiously enough, our opponents never address themselves to this view of the question, but simply assume as a fatal objection to our proposition that this Government alone can not maintain a parity between the two metals at any ratio fixed by law. The vice of this objection—and it is a vice which characterizes every argument which I have ever heard or read on the other side of this question—is that it places the parity between different kinds of money above stability in the value of money.

We do not contend that the free coinage of silver will prevent all variations between the metals. We know that their ratio varied when the mints stood open to both alike, and we expect that the ratio will vary if the mints should be opened again; but we believe that the open mint of a great country like ours will give a steadiness to their relative values, when once properly fixed, sufficient for all of the practical purposes of commerce. We know that from 1687 to 1873 the ratio between gold and silver oscillated, but through all that one hundred and fifty years the ratio never fell below 14 to 1 nor rose above 16 to 1, except in the three years of 1808, 1812, and 1813. We concede that similar fluctuations may occur again, but we unhesitatingly affirm that it is better to use both of the metals and suffer a slight fluctuation between them than to use one of them and suffer a wide fluctuation between it and all forms of property. In other words, Mr. Chairman, while it is important to preserve the parity between gold and silver, it is infinitely more important to preserve the parity between money and property. We do not procure gold in order to buy silver, nor do we procure silver in order to buy gold; but we procure either of them or both of them for the purpose of buying other and more useful kinds of property. I believe in parity, but I believe still more in stability, and if I am compelled to choose between parity without stability and stability without parity, my choice would be stability above every other consideration; and I would not hesitate one moment to take silver monometallism, if with it I could obtain stability.

SILVER MONOMETALLISM.

Why this undefined and indefinable dread of silver monometallism, if it be true that silver is a more stable metal than gold? Neither silver monometallism nor any other kind of metallism can be an evil if it furnishes a stable measure of value. I do not hesitate to avow my belief that the most stable standard is the best without reference to the metal which composes it, and I prefer it whether it shall be gold alone or silver alone or whether it shall be both gold and silver. I go further than this. I would unhesitatingly reject both of the metals and adopt a paper standard if a paper standard were more stable than a metallic one; for in some respects paper makes a better money than either gold or silver. It costs less labor to produce it and it is more convenient to use; but it can not be safely adopted as a standard, because the history of the world admonishes us that no nation can preserve its value when it is employed in unlimited quantities and to the exclusion of the precious metals.

Upon the same principle that I oppose the gold standard because it is an appreciating one, I oppose the paper standard because it would be a depreciating one, and I advocate a standard of both gold and silver because I believe it will be a stable one. I plant myself upon the broad and unassailable ground that no system with a variable unit can be a good one and no system with an invariable one can be a bad one, without the slightest reference to the material out of which the unit is coined. Gentlemen can not deny this without denying a proposition affirmed by every respectable economist who has ever considered the subject and without denying all they have themselves been saying for the last fifteen years. I have heard some of them argue against silver, and I have heard many of them denounce it, but I have heard none of them offer any serious objection to it except that it fluctuates.

If it is true, Mr. Chaiaman, as I have endeavored to show, that gold has doubled its value in the last twenty years, then it must be true that silver has varied very little, if any, in its value; and if we need an international agreement at all, we need it to keep down the price of gold and not to keep up the price of silver. If these gentlemen have been sincere in objecting to silver upon the ground that it is a fluctuating measure of value, they must object to gold, because the proof is that gold has fluctuated vastly more than silver. Or perhaps they think that it is a crime to advocate a money which goes down, without realizing that it is still more criminal to advocate a money which goes up. If money must go either way it is better that it should go down than up; for falling money means rising prices, while rising money means falling prices, and all men know that rising prices are better for the country than falling prices.

SILVER-STANDARD COUNTRIES.

But gentlemen exclaim that silver monometallism would degrade this country to a level with Mexico and the other silver-using countries of the world; thus assuming that the condition which exists in Mexico and other silver-using countries is traceable to their silver standard. The least reflection must convince any man that such an argument is utterly fallacious. The dullest man ought to know that the general condition existing in any country is the result of many different factors, and that a comparison between the general condition existing in a silver-standard country and the general condition existing in a gold-standard country can only help us to understand the effect of the two different monetary systems when the comparison relates to countries which are substantially alike in other respects. If, however, it is desired to study the effect of the gold and the silver standard as exhibited in the United States and Mexico, perhaps a fair lesson could be learned by comparing the two countries from 1840 to 1860, and then again from 1870 to 1890. Our advancement between 1870 and 1890 has been much less than between 1840 and 1860, while the advancement of Mexico between 1870 and 1890 has been much greater than between 1840 and 1860. Now, sir, if the gold standard has really promoted our growth and retarded the growth of Mexico, how could it happen that our progress since the adoption of the gold standard has been less than it was before we adopted the gold standard, while Mexico's progress has never been so great as during the past twenty years?

If instead of comparing Mexico with this country, which is so dissimilar in all other things as well as its financial system, we will compare it with some country closely resembling it in population, soil, climate, education, religion, and civilization, and having a gold standard, then we may hope to acquire some valuable instruction on the point at issue; for it is fair to suppose that if two countries are alike in all respects except one that this one difference may properly be considered as the cause of their different progress. If you would really know whether the condition of a country is worse under a silver standard than under a gold standard, we can obtain some light on that subject by comparing Mexico and Brazil, which are so much alike in their soil, climate, and population, and which differ in their monetary systems. There is no candid man living to-day who knows anything about conditions existing in these two countries who does not know that, judged by the progress of the last twenty years, Mexico has far outstripped Brazil. I have here an article contributed by the Mexican minister, Mr. Romero, to the June number of the North American Review, in which he says:

> We have more stability of prices, wages, rents, etc. Although our wages are low, there has been in recent years a marked tendency to their increase. Our factories are not only in operation, but they are being greatly extended, and new plants and industries are being established. Instead of dismissing our laborers, we find occupation for them all, and we need to import them for work to be done in some localities, and as our laborers find occupation and increased wages, we have no strikes.

Not only is the condition of Mexico, as described in this article, better than the condition of Brazil, and better than any gold-standard country on earth situated as Mexico is, but it is better even than the condition of many gold-standard countries having a higher civilization. Nor are the development and extension of her industries and her commerce the only advantages which Mexico enjoys in comparison with Brazil. The silver standard of Mexico is stable and admirably fulfills its part in the progress of her people, while the monetary system of Brazil, though it is a gold standard with a paper circulation, has for years been so unstable that no man could calculate what it would cost him to perform a contract two years from the time he made it.

If you think the comparison between Mexico and Brazil is unfair, perhaps you will admit the justice of a comparison between India and Egypt—India having a silver standard and Egypt a gold standard, and each having conditions of soil and climate not greatly dissimilar. If the gold standard is the cause of prosperity and the silver standard is the source of adversity, then Egypt ought to be more prosperous than India, but nobody will ask any well-informed man to believe that it is. Everybody who knows anything knows that during the last fifteen years India has progressed at an incomparably better rate than Egypt. Or if these two comparisons are not considered a sufficient test, let us compare Japan and Turkey—Japan being on a silver basis and Turkey on a gold basis. Not only has Japan so far surpassed Turkey in the past twenty years as to make a comparison between them seem almost ridiculous, but Japan's progress is proportionately greater than any gold-standard country on earth, not even excepting our own.

I desire to be clearly understood in this connection. I am not insisting that there is any special virtue in silver as such, nor any special vice in gold as such. I am simply showing that silver-standard countries have prospered more than gold-standard countries of like situation. That this is true is in perfect accord with the soundest laws of monetary science. The silver-standard countries have been living under a financial system whose unit of value has been fairly stable, and the gold-standard countries have been living under a financial system whose unit has been constantly appreciating. For this reason prices in silver-standard countries have not suffered any serious fall, while the fall in gold-standard countries has been such as to destroy all profits in agricultural and commercial pursuits. Under stable prices the silver-using countries have prospered, while falling prices in the gold-standard countries have been crushing their enterprising and energetic citizens, to enrich a class which Mr. Carlisle once denounced as the "idle holders of idle capital."

LABOR ARGUMENT.

The gold advocates lay great stress upon the fact that the wages of labor in this country are better than in silver-standard countries, and seek to impress us with the belief that this is a consequence of our gold standard. I do not myself attach the slightest value to comparisons of this kind, because I know that labor is more completely subject to its immediate environments than anything else. I know that the rate of wages in the same employment differs greatly even in adjacent States. The wages paid in Connecticut are very different from those paid in Maine, and the wages paid in Massachusetts are very different from those paid in either Connecticut or Maine. But, while I conceive a comparison of this kind more apt to mislead us than to lead us right, it must be deemed as good on one side as on the other, and since our gold-standard friends so constantly declaim about the great difference in Chinese and American wages, it is not improper for me to invite your attention to some other instances.

In the first place I would ask them to explain how it was that when we had the double standard up to 1873 we paid better wages than England, which has been on a gold standard since 1816. Or, coming to the present time, how will they explain that Mexico, which is a silver-standard country, pays better wages than Egypt, which is a gold-standard country? If the gold standard is such a benefit to the laboring man, why is it that the laborers of gold-standard Italy are in such a deplorable condition—so deplorable that in their towns and cities workmen possessing fair skill are compelled to buy not only second-hand clothes but second-hand food as well. The very coffee grounds from the tables of the rich are sold as a luxury to industrious men, and through all that magnificent valley of the Po—the richest land in Europe—the condition of both rural and urban labor is more wretched than the condition of the Southern slave ever was. And in Belgium, a rich and commercial gold-standard country, skilled mechanics gladly work for wages which are lower than similar grades of labor receive in Mexico.

This argument that a gold standard ought to be maintained for the benefit of the wage earner is a discreditable piece of demagogy, and is urged most vehemently by men who have never been known to sympathize with labor in any effort to ameliorate its condition. Many of those who have heretofore defended the rifle and the bayonet as a proper answer to the laborers' appeal for better wages are now protesting that everybody ought to be satisfied so long as the laborer is well rewarded for his toil. Not only is this argument demagogical, but it is too transparent to deceive intelligent workingmen, for they know that wages are simply the price of labor and are controlled by the same economic laws that control all other prices. They do not respond as quickly to influences, either good or evil, as the more perishable commodities, but in the end the wages of labor must share with the product of labor the fall in all prices which results from the appreciation of money. In the nature of things it could not be otherwise. The selling price of every article must be sufficient to cover the expense of producing it and return a profit to the producers, or else sooner or later its production must cease. The first item that must be met out of the money received from the sale of goods must be the fixed charges, such as taxes, insurance, rent, and interest on such borrowed capital as may be used. After these obligations have been discharged the remainder is then a fund to be divided between the owners of the plant and their laborers. It can hardly be expected that employers will be willing to forego their dividends in order that their employees may receive good wages. All that could be expected of the most generous employer would be that he should permit his profits and the wages of his employees to fall *pari passu*.

If the income from a business twenty-two years ago was $100,000 above the fixed charges, and was equally divided between wages and dividends, and if the same establishment now has an income of only $50,000, it is reasonable to suppose that it is still divided between the owners of the plant and the men who operate it, netting a clear loss to both the wage earners and the capitalist. To make my meaning even clearer, I will state that in 1890 this country produced commodities valued at $11,000,000,000; and in 1894 we produced less than $8,000,000,000, the fall being more in the price than in the quantity. But whatever may have caused the fall, it is absurd to suppose that labor received as much for producing $8,000,000,000 worth of goods in 1894 as it did for producing $11,000,000,000 worth in 1890. The commodities produced in 1894 and sold for $8,000,000,000 would have fetched at the prices prevailing in 1873 not less than $16,000,000,000, and will anybody ask an intelligent American laborer to believe that labor received as many dollars for producing $8,000,000,000 worth of commodities as it would have received for producing the same commodities if they could have been sold for $16,000,000,000? It is true that the rate of daily wages has been maintained in some branches of industry, but this is only true in those branches in which labor has greatly increased its skill; as where a few laborers now really produce more goods than a greater number of laborers formerly did. In some industries there have been such improvements in machinery that five men can now produce with a machine as much as fifteen formerly produced, and in this way the wages of the men who are still employed have been maintained and have occasionally been increased.

But in such employments many of the men who once found places are now idle; and though the individual laborers who work may even receive better daily wages, yet labor receives less compensation. The fifteen men before the improvement in machinery may have worked for $2 per day, making the total payment for labor $30 per day. Now the five men who, with the assistance of the new machine, can produce the same amount of goods, might be receiving $3 per day, which would make a total payment to labor of $15, or only half of what it was. It is plain to any man who will think on the subject for a moment that there may be a vast difference between the daily wages of a laborer who can find employment and the wages of labor which must comprehend a great number of unemployed laborers.

Descending from this general argument to a particular case, let us suppose that a cotton mill was established in 1872, costing $400,000, of which $200,000 was borrowed to run for twenty-five years. The capacity of such a mill would have been, say, 2,000 bales of cotton per annum. That cotton in 1872 would have cost the mill $110 a bale, or $220,000 for 2,000 bales. These 2,000 bales of cotton could then be converted into a finished product worth $450,000. Subtracting $220,000, the cost of the raw material, from the $450,000 received for the finished product, there was left $230,000 to meet fixed charges, pay wages, and declare dividends. Let us suppose that the fixed charges, including taxes, insurance, and interest on the $200,000 borrowed, would amount to $30,000, leaving $200,000 for wages and dividends.

Now, let us also suppose that that mill is as good in all respects to-day as it was in 1872, and that it still consumes 2,000 bales of cotton. That 2,000 bales of cotton to-day will cost $80,000, and can be converted into a finished product worth $160,000. Subtracting $80,000, the cost of the raw material, from the $160,000 received for the finished product, there is left $80,000 to meet fixed charges, pay wages, and declare dividends. The fixed charges are as much to-day as they were twenty-two years ago. The insurance is no less, the rate of interest, being fixed when the $200,000 was borrowed, remains the same, and the taxes, if anything, are greater; but estimating the fixed charges still to be $30,000, and subtracting that sum from the $80,000 left after paying for the raw material, the mill would now have $50,000 to pay wages and declare dividends. It is inconceivable that the labor in that establishment could be paid as much out of the $50,000 now as it was out of the $200,000 in 1873; and the mills which have attempted to pay the same wages out of their smaller receipts have passed into bankruptcy and their operatives are idle.

It is true, as Mr. Carlisle himself declared in his Memphis speech, that labor organizations have contributed powerfully toward maintaining the rate of daily wages, but they have not been able to control the number of men who should be employed nor the number of days which each employee is permitted to work. Three years ago I saw a very pointed illustration of how labor may suffer without its daily wages being changed. For some time after Mr. Cleveland's inauguration the Public Printer, who was a Republican, appointed many Democrats to places in the Printing Office without dismissing the Republicans, until the number of men was double as many as the work required. But the expenditures for that service were kept within the appropriation by allowing many of the printers to work only every other day. The management of many extensive corporations pursue this same policy, and after running on full time for a part of the year and filling such orders as have been placed with them, they then reduce their expenses, not by reducing the wages, but by reducing the number of their men. It is a mockery to tell a man who finds employment only half of his time that he is as well off as he was when he was continuously employed, simply because his daily wages are the same; for the question which most vitally concerns the workingman is not his daily, but his annual, earnings.

Whenever the manufacturer receives less for what his laborers

make, he will pay his laborers less for making it. Do I need to tell this House that the farmers of the South can not pay farm hands the same wages for raising 8-cent cotton as for raising 18-cent cotton? Do the Representatives from the great wheat-producing States of the West imagine that their constituents can pay their laborers as much for raising 40-cent wheat as they could for raising 80-cent wheat? Mr. Chairman, no socialism is more dangerous than that which teaches labor to believe that capital can continue to pay undiminished wages out of a diminishing profit fund.

I shudder to contemplate the future of my country if the fall of prices is to continue through this and the next generation. Already farming has been stripped of half its charm and all its profit; merchandising has ceased to be a risk and has become a certain loss; and manufacturing only escapes the general ruin through the favoritism of an unjust protective tariff. Thousands of men who once found agreeable occupation on the farms are crowding into our already overcrowded towns and cities, and when the farmers leave their farms, the merchant must close his store and the manufacturer his factory. In that evil day the farm hand, the merchant's clerk, and the factory operative will all be compelled to join that vast army of the unemployed from whose discontented ranks the anarchist recruits his pestilent society.

Mr. HARTMAN. I ask that the gentleman from Texas have twenty minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. The general debate will close within an hour.

Mr. BRUMM. We can extend the hour for the recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. You can not keep members here after 5 o'clock.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I object. There are other gentlemen who desire to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made by the gentleman from Maryland.

[Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2904 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and that at 10 o'clock another recess be taken until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, exclusively for the consideration of House bill 2904, and that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I understood that an order had already been made for this.

Mr. DINGLEY. It has not been made as yet.

Mr. BAILEY. Did not the order adopted the other day contemplate this?

Mr. DINGLEY. The order was not made for the evening session.

Mr. BAILEY. The order as made contemplated the consideration of the bill up to the time of taking a vote upon it. However that may be, I make no objection. But I desire to emphasize the fact that every request—and there were several—to extend the time of Republicans has been granted, while the only request made in behalf of a Democrat for an extension beyond the hour has been denied.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is an individual matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and at 10 o'clock the House take a recess until 10.30 to-morrow morning, for debate only on the bill H. R. 2904 in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none; and the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, will please act as Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAYTON for ten days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the unanimous consent already given, the House will now stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House was declared in recess.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reconvened at 8 p. m., Mr. PAYNE in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the pending proposition is to substitute a measure providing for the free coinage of silver for House bill No. 2904, which was passed to meet two existing emergencies; first, to secure needed additional revenue, and, second, to replenish the gold reserve from time to time, in order to confirm the good faith of the Government as set forth in the acts of Congress authorizing the issue of the legal-tender notes commonly called "greenbacks," and more especially to maintain the act of January 14, 1875, providing for the resumption of specie payments on January 1, 1869, the promise of which was in a great part responsible for the wonderful increase of property and wealth of the nation which continued almost uninterruptedly until 1893.

I was, and am in favor of House bill No. 2904 as it passed this House, not because it was a curative measure, but one intending to meet an emergency in response to the urgent appeal of the President of the United States. No one expects the bill as now presented to us in the form of a silver free coinage substitute will or can become a law at this session, hence I will not detain the House by discussing the merits or demerits of a measure proposing the free coinage of silver, but as the substitute brings before us the whole question of the condition of the Treasury, the status of the gold reserve, as well as the currency situation generally, I prefer as my contribution to this debate to submit some considerations looking to extricating ourselves from the dilemmas confronting us.

All good citizens desire the general prosperity of the people; hence all good citizens should favor such legislation as will best subserve that end.

It is impossible to secure unanimity, but under ordinary circumstances the judgment of the majority is finally concurred in, and the more freely if the methods invoked have been suggested or controlled by the intelligent portion of the community.

The present situation presents an anomaly. A widespread and apparently radical difference of opinion exists as to the relation of gold and silver to each other and to our currency. On the one side appears to be gathered the moneyed and property interests of the country and on the other appear to be gathered not only a large portion of the agricultural element, but all those who for any cause are discontented with the present order or any order of things.

There is also a widespread anxiety existing in regard to the gold reserve now necessarily held to redeem legal-tender notes, which condition is intensified by the fact that gold no longer flows into the Treasury from the custom-house, and hence the urgent claim that the legal-tender notes shall be retired.

I had the honor on December 12, 1895, soon after this Congress met, to introduce three very brief bills, the texts of which I shall incorporate as part of my remarks, but their substance I shall explain as I proceed:

A bill (H. R. 1431) to refund the outstanding United States and Treasury notes with bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after January 1, 1896, the United States notes (commonly called "greenbacks") now outstanding to the amount of $346,681,016, issued under the acts of February 25, 1862, July 11, 1862, and March 3, 1863, and the United States Treasury notes payable in coin now outstanding to the amount of $144,495,280, issued for the purchase of silver bullion under the act of Congress approved July 14, 1890, shall be fundable, at the pleasure of the holder, into bonds of the United States, payable in lawful money, bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, to the registered holder thereof.

The principal of said bonds shall be payable at the pleasure of the Government, but only after all interest-bearing debt of the United States carrying a higher rate of interest and payable in coin shall have matured and been paid.

The bonds herein provided for shall, until finally paid, be reconvertible into the same character of notes surrendered, and all exchanges shall be in sums of not less than $1,000, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and subject to the provisions hereinafter provided.

When any of the aforesaid bonds shall be presented to the Treasury for reexchange into the notes into which they are hereby made convertible, the interest accrued thereon for the expired portion of the then current quarter, and the interest that shall thereafter accrue until the notes shall again be presented for conversion into the bonds herein provided for, shall inure for the benefit of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish the necessary rules and regulations under which such notes shall be surrendered for conversion into such bonds, so that the party receiving the bonds shall pay to the Treasury the amount of interest which may have accrued on the then current quarter.

The notes herein made fundable and reconvertible shall continue to possess all the qualities now provided by law, except that on and after March 1, 1896, they shall no longer be receivable for customs nor redeemable nor exchangeable at the Treasury of the United States except by or for the bonds herein provided for.

—

A bill (H. R. 1453) requiring all duties on imported goods after March 1, 1896, shall be paid in gold coin, and repealing all acts inconsistent, etc.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after March 1, 1896, all duties on imported goods shall be paid in gold coin, and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

—

A bill (H. R. 1426) to increase the circulation of national-bank currency and to reduce the taxes thereon.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter national banks now organized or hereafter organized shall be entitled to receive, under the provisions of section 10 of an act to enable banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes, approved July 12, 1882, from the Comptroller of the Currency, circulating notes of different denominations equal in amount to 100 per cent of the current market value, not exceeding par, of

the United States bonds deposited under sections 5159 and 5160 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. That hereafter the taxes to be paid upon the average amount of notes in circulation of any national-bank association shall be at the rate of one-eighth of 1 per cent each half year.

It appears to me that these three bills, although independent, are in harmony with each other and in combination present a scheme at least helpful toward the end desired by all, viz, a sound basis for our currency, carefully avoiding all questions upon which honest differences of opinion may exist as to gold and silver, the maintenance of the parity between the metals, the volume of money needed for business purposes, etc., and largely eliminating the danger of recurring panics born of fear as to the future of the gold reserve and questions of redemption.

To proceed with a little more detail, let me say that H. R. 1431 is framed to accomplish several objects, but all related to the one subject.

It provides for the conditional funding of the United States legal-tender notes (commonly called greenbacks) and the United States Treasury notes payable in coin, issued for the purchase of silver bullion under act of July 14, 1890, into a bond payable in lawful money and bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum. The prime object of this conditional funding is to wipe out the necessity for maintaining any gold reserve for the purpose of redeeming these notes now outstanding and which, under the specie-resumption act of January 14, 1875, are payable on demand in "coin," which has been universally accepted as meaning gold coin, confirmed by the uniform practice of the Government since its foundation.

The act of May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes," authorized the reissue of any of these notes when received in the Treasury from any source. The object and intent of that law was to prevent any contraction in the currency by final resumption and cancellation.

This was prior to the date (January 1, 1879) when the specie-resumption act went into effect, and therefore referred especially to legal-tender notes coming into the Treasury in the ordinary course of business, although the terms of the act are equally applicable now, when, by the changed condition of the revenue from surplus to deficiency, legal-tender notes are presented at the Treasury for exchange into gold for export to meet the adverse balance of trade mainly resulting from the reduction of duties by the Wilson tariff bill, which, having been framed (as is claimed) in the interest of the people, brought panic and desolation to the manufacturing industries of the country and hunger and distress to the masses of our working people.

The various acts of legislation affecting the currency have aimed to maintain on a parity all the gold and silver coined, or the issues of paper money authorized by Congress.

One means used to accomplish this most desirable end was to make all legal-tender notes, Treasury notes, silver certificates, etc., receivable for customs dues, which latter had previously been payable only in gold coin.

The payment of customs in gold gave the Government all the coin needed for any demands upon it and until 1892 the matter of the gold reserve in the United States Treasury was one attracting no attention whatever, for the principal reason was that we were still dealing with a surplus of revenue.

As the production of silver increased in disproportion to gold the fear of a depreciated standard was carefully cultivated by the creditor nations of Europe, which influence extended to this country, and the claim was set up that the debtor classes at the bidding of the silver producers were intending to have laws enacted to repudiate debts contracted on a gold basis and liquidate them in silver, which was rapidly depreciating in value as compared with gold.

The first great shock to the commercial credit of the world known to the present generation was the failure of the Barings in 1890, in London, growing out of wild speculative ventures in the Argentine Republic. This forced a frightful liquidation in Great Britain and on the Continent, and it happened that the most available securities held abroad were American railroad securities.

Hundreds of millions of bonds and stocks were returned to us, and this necessitated enormous exports of gold.

The only substantial source of supply for gold for export was the United States Treasury. The means of getting it out of the Treasury was the simple presentation of the Government demand notes.

As the world was going crazy with fright at the difficulty of getting and keeping gold, as the banks and banking interests of Europe were exerting themselves to the utmost to accumulate the yellow metal against the possibilities of continued financial distress, as well as looking forward to the sudden bursting of war clouds ever and anon overshadowing the various continental Governments, people in this country began hoarding gold.

Instead of gold being freely used for payment of customs these dues were paid in "greenbacks," United States Treasury notes, and silver certificates about in the order named, until it has come to pass that practically no gold whatever is received into the Treasury through the custom-house.

All other dues to the Government are receivable in any form of currency outstanding, including national-bank notes.

We had not yet recovered from the disastrous effects of the Baring panic of 1890, although we suffered less than Europe, when a greater calamity befell our own people.

The summer of 1892 gave us a Democratic platform which declared there was no constitutional power to enact a tariff except for purposes of revenue only.

Notice was thus given to the great manufacturing and business interests of this country that with the advent of the Democratic party to power the fiscal policy which had been inaugurated at the beginning of this Government was to be utterly overthrown.

To the surprise of all a political cyclone swept the country, caused by the falsehoods of designing men, whereby the laboring classes were for the time persuaded that they were being oppressed and unfairly dealt with, and that a revenue tariff, or practically "free trade," would give them more work, higher wages, and shorter hours.

The seeds of the panic were sown in November, 1892, and the 4th of March, 1893, was anticipated with fear and trembling by all who had capital at stake in the business of the country.

The people were hoodwinked with the claim that the source of all our ills was the so-called Sherman silver law of July 14, 1890, and the extra session of August, 1893, as we all know, was called to repeal it.

Meantime, however, the panic had been precipitated by the intimation from the Treasury Department that Treasury coin notes might be redeemed in silver.

This attracted special and renewed attention to the question and condition of the gold reserve. The demands upon the Treasury were increasing, the discrimination by the holders of currency went on, gold and gold certificates practically disappeared from circulation, and the source of supply of gold to the Treasury from customs was drying up.

Still later the business of the country was paralyzed. Exports decreased and prices declined rapidly. The repeal of the so-called Sherman law did not restore confidence as expected, or bring ship loads of foreign gold to us, as had been so flippantly prophesied by those who desired to distract attention both from the direful effect of threat of tariff revolution and still later from the awful slaughter resulting from the enactment of the Wilson bill itself.

The reduced tariff did not increase but on the contrary brought reduced revenues, for our people had been deprived of a large part of their purchasing power.

No gold flowing into the Treasury, the demands increasing upon the gold reserve for purpose of export, coupled with the deficiency in the revenues of the Government, compelled the reissue of the legal-tender notes used for the purpose of taking gold out; hence the endless-chain process of which we hear so much.

The honor of the nation was at stake; for it is a source of just pride that, as the business world says gold is the highest standard, the United States Treasury has never proffered its creditors anything but gold on a coin contract.

We are thus brought face to face with a grave emergency and the public debt is growing apace. If we were sustaining a war it would be explicable, but thus to turn our backs upon the splendid record of the Republican party in canceling the national debt and still maintaining a full Treasury is a humiliating spectacle not only for our people but for the whole financial world.

We not only need more revenue but we need gold for certain purposes.

We have tried to maintain the gold reserve by selling bonds to replenish it from time to time, and the result is mockery.

We have had three bond issues prior to the one just arranged for, and without some change in the law and in our financial condition these promise to be repeated indefinitely.

House bill No. 1431 seems to meet the essential feature of the situation, viz, by the proposed plan of funding the legal tenders you get rid of the demand for redeeming (?) a note that is never redeemed, but merely exchanged and reexchanged.

The bill proceeds upon the theory that the people will not permit contraction of the currency.

It is proposed to fund the outstanding demand notes into a bond at the pleasure of the note holder, which bond, for the purpose of creating and maintaining elasticity in our currency, shall at the pleasure of the bondholder be reconvertible into the note previously surrendered; but when these notes are thus reissued they will lack the privilege of being redeemed in gold as now, but will only be redeemed or rather exchanged into the proposed bonds thus specially provided. In fact, the 2 per cent interest represents the purchase price paid for the present privilege and mode of redemption.

When money shall be worth less for current use than 2 per cent per annum the noteholder can have his bond, and when money is worth more than 2 per cent per annum the bondholder may ex-

change his bond for currency. During the period the currency is outstanding the interest accruing on the bonds will inure to the benefit of the Treasury. These notes will continue to possess all the quality of legal tender, and hence will be superior to a national-bank note, but they will no longer be receivable for customs.

A proper addition to this bill, therefore, would be the provision of House bill No. 1453, providing that after a certain date all customs dues shall be paid in gold coin.

With these bills upon the statute books the ever-recurring fear caused by gold exports and the drain upon the Treasury would disappear, to the great benefit of the business community, and the honor of the nation would be without a suspicion.

I do not believe any material portion of the legal-tender notes would be funded under this plan, except in times when, from extraordinary causes, there might be large accumulations of money at certain centers.

The privilege of receiving 2 per cent interest is, in my judgment, ample compensation, and would secure the much-desired end of eliminating the necessity for a gold reserve, and doing it economically and with satisfaction to the business community.

The reason I consider the low rate ample compensation is that these bonds become additionally valuable because their date of maturity will be the most distant, and they will always be worth par in money to the holder and readily exchangeable, which is a consideration of vital importance in periods of money stringency.

In the panics, especially of 1873 and of 1893, large premiums were paid to obtain currency for ordinary purposes, such as wage paying, etc., and the choicest securities were terribly sacrificed by savings banks and other institutions holding deposits subject to call, because of the pressing necessity for actual cash.

The convertible features of the bond proposed by bill No. 1431 would mainly obviate this element of demoralization which always accompanies loss of credit and creates a sudden and greatly enlarged demand for currency.

By these bills you not only make a gold reserve useless, but you release all the money now in the Treasury, leaving it subject to the ordinary demands of the Government.

You continue to the people the use of the larger part of the present noninterest-bearing debt which serves so fully the purposes of a sound currency available in every corner of this land, you restore the flow of gold into the Treasury through the custom-house, and thus furnish gold for all the needs of the Government, and actually cause a freer circulation of gold than now, because the Government would pay out gold to banks and others in the ordinary course of business as currency is now paid out.

Hoarding of gold would cease, as there would be no room for question as to whether the Government would or could maintain the parity.

These bills would meet an emergency without at all interfering with liberal and equitable legislation for the national banks as proposed in House bill No. 1426, nor would it raise any question as to legislating upon the subject of silver.

I would simply meet the demands of an anomalous condition of the currency growing out of a war and the rapidity of developments throughout the world, impossible to have been anticipated thirty years ago.

The silver question is fast adjusting itself by natural processes, for if the production of gold continues to increase as it has during the past six or eight years, tears may be shed over the depreciation of gold instead of silver.

As to the necessity of some such legislation as I have proposed in the bills referred to, gentlemen need only consider the means used to replenish the gold reserve since January, 1894, and the meager net result obtained.

By an official statement of the net gold in the Treasury at various dates from January, 1878, to November, 1895, it will appear by February, 1893, the amount had diminished to the lowest point since January, 1878.

Net gold in the Treasury:	
In February, 1893	$103,284,219
In January, 1894	65,650,175
In February, 1894	106,527,068
In July, 1894	54,975,607
In November, 1894	105,424,569
In January, 1895	44,705,967
In June, 1895	107,512,363
On February 8, 1896	44,483,126

The large increases noted for February, 1894, November, 1894, and June, 1895, were the result of bond sales aggregating $162,000,000, thus fixing an annual interest charge for thirty years, and yet on February 8, 1896, the net gold in the Treasury was at the lowest point reached since the resumption of specie payments in 1879. The bond sale just concluded provides again for more than $100,000,000 to be poured into the vacuum caused by the repeated presentation of the same notes at the counter of the subtreasury for exchange into gold; and, as I have already suggested, unless some change is promptly effected in the existing law, no man can anticipate what the condition of the gold reserve will be a year hence or even six months hence. I predict another sale of bonds before this Administration goes out of power.

The magnificent and inspiring spectacle of our people responding to the Treasury calls for $100,000,000 gold by offering nearly $600,000,000 should make us prouder than ever of our American citizenship, of the wonderful natural resources of the land conferred upon us by nature, and of the wisdom of our fathers in leaving us the heritage of such institutions as permit and stimulate our unexampled development and prosperity; and, above all, unite us in such brotherhood that at any call of duty the people rise as one man to tender fortune, honor, or life itself for the common weal.

The example of devotion just presented should, however, not be lost in mere sentimentality, but should cause us to most seriously consider the situation, and honestly, unselfishly, and in the spirit of a true and wise patriotism, propose, discuss, and finally enact such measures into laws as will prevent the necessity of diverting the energies and wealth of the people into the attempted maintenance of the national credit by means which tend to enervation and certain bankruptcy; for if the present methods of permitting deficiencies in the revenues continue, when our citizens are willing to be taxed for all proper purposes, or we continue the suicidal policies of favoring foreign manufacturers at the cost of poverty and ruin to our own people and of allowing the Treasury doors to stand wide open at the same time that we furnish the means for emptying the vaults of the gold with no other source of supply of that commodity than the waste of our substance through an increase of the interest-bearing debt, we shall reach one of two results, either an abnormal national debt without any real consideration, or open and flagrant repudiation.

Such possibilities should excite us to earnest endeavor, lest evil come to our people through our failure of duty and we be justly subjected to scorn for inefficiency or to execration for fiddling while Rome is burning. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, the condition which now confronts the House fully justifies the action of the gentlemen on this side who voted against the bill on its passage. It was an admitted fact that the act would never become a law. Whatever its necessity may have been, or whatever emergency called for its enactment, the completed negotiation of the one-hundred-million-dollar loan a few days ago leaves no reason for its further consideration. The dilemma in which we are now placed is whether we shall give our approval to an unnecessary or to a mischievous law.

There being now no occasion, in my judgment, for the bill in its original shape, I suggest that we ought not to stand on ceremony or dignity, but treat the Senate amendment or substitute as an independent bill, originating in that branch of Congress, and sent to us as any other measure. I trust our rules may be so construed as to permit us to do this.

I have only the objection to the third section, providing for compulsory retirement of national-bank notes under the denomination of $10, that it does not go far enough. If silver be a good money metal—and everybody here professes to be its friend—why should it not circulate among the people to the extent of its coinage, or at least to the extent of the demand upon it as a circulating medium? Why should the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to issue certificates against the silver dollars coined from so good a "money metal"? If they constitute such good "standard money," should they be aided by paper currency, whether issued by national banks or by the Government? If silver be inconvenient and burdensome as a circulating medium, is not that the strongest argument against its use as "standard money"? Why should the Government be subjected to the expense of building and strengthening vaults, in which to store the standard silver dollar if it be true, that the people favor its use and are anxious for its unlimited coinage? Money unsuitable or inconvenient for general use certainly ought not to be coined in large or unlimited quantities.

The real truth is, Mr. Speaker, that gold and silver ought to stand each on its own merits. Each has its inconveniences; each has its advantages. Both metals are indestructible; both as compared with other commodities are scarce. Gold is much more valuable, but it suffers greater loss by abrasion in its use as money. Silver is more bulky and less valuable, but its constant use is attended with but little loss. It has that advantage over gold, which, in a large measure, is lost by the action of the Government in issuing gold and silver certificates to circulate instead of specie. Neither the money of these metals—much less the metals themselves—should be stored at the expense of the Government, nor should the burden be cast upon the Government of printing and issuing certificates to circulate in place of either the money or the bullion. When it comes to certificates, gold has an undue advantage over silver, which enhances its comparative value.

If section 3 of the Senate substitute should be amended so as to authorize the taking up and canceling, never to be again issued in any form, all bank bills, gold and silver certificates, and Treasury notes of less denomination than five, or even ten, dollars, and then

adopted as amended, we would be doing "something substantial for silver," something practical, nothing visionary or purely theoretical. It would enlarge the use of silver by the amount of bills, certificates, and Treasury notes retired. It would necessarily cause an advance in the price of silver by this increased use. I am constrained to believe that it would cause no disturbance whatever to our financial condition or injuriously affect any business interest.

I am, therefore, willing and hope I may have the opportunity to vote for section 3 of the Senate substitute as a step in the right direction. I would more willingly support it if amended as above suggested.

I am also willing and hope I may be permitted to support by my vote an amendment to section 2, striking out that part which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue silver certificates against the seigniorage. If we should retire all gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of small denominations, the vacancy could be safely filled by coining the seigniorage. That would again be "doing something for silver," and I am persuaded that it would not cause its depreciation, nor disturb in the least the business of the country. I am willing to vote for section 2 thus amended.

I am unable, Mr. Speaker, to give the consent of my vote to the first section of this substitute. It opens our mints to the free coinage of the silver of the whole world. We are protectionists on this side of the House, not free traders. Every other commodity of this country which is produced in sufficient quantities to supply our wants should be charged with a duty, and we protectionists believe it should be a reasonably high one. Why let the foreign owner of silver bullion into our market without the payment of any duty, and then why, in addition, should we go to the expense of converting his bullion into coin free of charge? I will not speak of the enhancement in value by this coinage, but it is quite certain that under the provisions of this section, the foreign owner of silver bullion would have an advantage over the United States mine owner, and also have an advantage that the owners of other commodities do not enjoy.

I do not believe that we can at present maintain at a parity with gold, the silver product of the world. I am not willing by my vote to send gold to a premium, or bring about a state of affairs in which the country has two kinds of money of different debt-paying and purchasing power. I am not unaware that it is seriously contended, here and elsewhere, by many of the doctrinaires of free coinage that the parity of the gold and silver coins would not be destroyed. But one of its most eloquent champions on this floor admits that gold would under such circumstances go to a premium. Whether the one or the other be correct, I am unwilling to subject the country at this time to even the risk of going upon a single standard of silver.

It seems to me that at least those on this side of the House should unite in some efforts at legislation that will not only "do something for silver," but for the other interests of the country as well. We all say we are friends of the white metal. We would all like to see its free and unlimited coinage, if we knew the parity with gold would not be destroyed. We all wish to bring about the time when both metals will be treated at our mints with fairness and impartiality.

If we are to bring about this condition, if we expect to reach and maintain genuine bimetallism, we must make careful and sensible preparation for that event. We can not hope that it will come while the balance of trade is so largely against us or while we so largely patronize the "markets of the world," where gold is the only currency, and neglect the "home market," where silver as well as gold is current. We must patronize, and not break down by unfriendly legislation, the American woolgrower. He is willing to sell his product for silver. The Australian, from whom we have so lavishly bought of late, is a "gold bug." It is on a gold basis only that he sells us his wool. We ought to use the raw material of the United States for the manufactured goods that our people need, for the silver dollar will buy both the material and the goods. We ought to employ the workingmen and working women of the United States to manufacture those goods, for with them, the standard silver dollar is current without the intervention of a one, or two, or five, or ten dollar silver certificate.

Our farmers are ready to raise the cotton, and wool, and hides, and provisions to clothe and feed those laborers, and they are not asking better money than silver in payment. Can we expect to use a standard or a kind of money different than that current in the market where we buy our goods? Can we purchase in the "markets of the world" as largely as we have been doing the past year and avoid the use of gold, the only money of these markets? Can we open our market to the competition of gold-standard nations and allow our products to be shut out of their markets? Can we permit them to discriminate against our products, as they are now doing, without a thought of discrimination against them? Shall we allow them to discriminate against our silver and we do nothing in return, except to unanimously invite them to an international silver conference? Shall we adopt British free trade, and not expect to use the monetary system of free trade? If we construct and operate our tariff and revenue system on English ideas, can we expect to do business on any other than the English idea of a single gold standard? Are we to continue to replenish European coffers with gold from our Treasury, with our only source of supply from the sale of thirty-year 4 per cent bonds? Shall we continue to import goods that our own unemployed labor can manufacture? Shall we pay gold to the foreigner for those goods, and also for their carriage to our ports, and collect for our people in silver the smallest item of their cost, the duty? Shall we continually thus discriminate against ourselves and in favor of foreign nations, and then wonder or complain because the balance of trade is against us, or because those nations have demonetized silver? If we are willing to continue our business with them on a gold basis, buy their goods, spend our money in traveling and junketing among them, buy their titles and family names with millionaires' daughters lavishly dowered with United States gold, why should we expect them to join our conferences or remonetize silver?

If true bimetallism comes to this country protection will be its forerunner, not its follower. It will be a genuine protection that serves well our interests and industries—silver as well as all others. It will be attended by discrimination, for that is the best defensive weapon of protection and reciprocity. If discrimination is made in favor of such imported goods as are brought across the ocean in ships built out of United States material, by United States workmen, and manned by United States crews, we may expect again to see our shipyards busy and the United States flag on the ships of our merchant marine. We may also expect to save the $30,000,000 nearly in gold which we are annually paying to foreign shipowners for freight on imported goods. If discrimination is wisely made against the nations who have so harshly discriminated against United States silver, we may confidently expect those nations to be seeking us with invitations to silver monetary conferences—we will not have to hunt them.

I believe that time is coming, but we must first remove "cuckoo" and "mugwump" influences from the administration of our Government. Those influences are for a single gold standard, and for free trade as well. The happy work of their removal will be fully completed on March 4, 1897. Meantime we must keep good not only the credit, but the currency of the nation, and keep every dollar of that currency as good as every other dollar.

And now, Mr. Speaker, with slight apparent but not real inconsistency, the opponents of the original bill on this side of the House ought to vote against concurrence in the Senate substitute or amendment, as that body is pleased to call it. The original bill is quite harmless, if it should now become a law. The horse is gone. It can do no harm to lock the stable door. The amendment or substitute, as it comes from the Senate, is risky and dangerous, and without substantial amendment it ought not to be concurred in by this body. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, the only excuse I shall offer for encumbering the RECORD with any further remarks upon the silver question is that I hope to suggest a few, and a few only, of those points which have not been answered to my comprehension. I said here in the summer of 1893 that I was a bimetallist. I repeat that assertion. I am a bimetallist within my understanding of what a bimetallist is. I confess, however, that I have been somewhat weakened in my opinions as to whether bimetallism in the United States has any existence other than in name, for, having paid due heed to most of the definitions given during the course of this debate, I begin to doubt very seriously whether the person coming within the definitions does or can exist. Gentlemen who say they are bimetallists above and better and more certainly than any others declare that such a being exists only when he is in favor of having two metals of equal value in circulation side by side and at the same time, the one supporting the other. I repeat, I doubt whether the conditions called for by the definitions are possible, and therefore whether there is any such bimetallist.

Now, all the affairs of this life, Mr. Speaker, present conditions and problems not to be solved by academic theories, because nobody ever knows, and I fear none will ever know, just where those theories do and where they do not apply. As I have sat here day after day and heard gentlemen give their refined definitions, always resting upon that condition precedent to their philosophies, "other things being equal," I have been reminded of the opening of an address made many years ago by a disciple of Fowler and Wells. He said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Phrenology is an exact science. The proof of that is in the fact that, other things being equal, size is always the measure of strength. But since it never has pleased God Almighty to create two human beings in whom the other things were equal, our science is incapable of demonstration.

[Laughter.]

All the theories and primary propositions on this silver question depend on the old limitation, "other things being equal." It is beyond the comprehension of any man who has yet arisen upon this earth to determine in what cases the "other things are equal," and in what cases they are not; in other words, to measure and

define the modifications. So that it always comes back and always will come back to the question of the practical application of any theory or any doctrine.

Now, there is no method or proposition suggesting itself to my mind better calculated to present this question in its nakedness than a supposition that the United States hereafter should mint no coin, but that this Congress should pass a law providing that gold and silver should be henceforth admitted to the mints of the United States for free mintage and on equal terms; that gold should be minted in disks corresponding in size, weight, and fineness to the gold coins now standard, and that silver should be minted into disks of the fineness, weight, size, and form of the present standard silver dollar; that the United States, instead of stamping either one a dollar or five dollars, should simply certify by a stamp on the coin the amount of gold which the one and of silver which the other contained of standard fineness.

Now, consider that proposition adopted, and what would be the effect? Is there a member of this House who does not believe that a disk of the size, weight, and fineness of a ten-dollar gold piece, so stamped, would continue to circulate in this country for $10; that it would be received by every bank on deposit for $10; that it would pay $10 of adverse balance of trade in any nation on the earth? The fact that you demonetized gold to that extent and stamped the disks not as money, but simply to certify to its weight and fineness, would have no possible effect upon its value, except, possibly, to appreciate it somewhat in foreign countries. I do not believe there is any silver man or any other man in this House who will deny that proposition. That being so as to gold, what would be the effect as to silver? The effect would not be to raise its price one particle above the present commercial price. The effect of free and unlimited mintage on equal terms would be neither to lower the gold nor to advance the silver, if neither was a certified money. I do not believe anybody will deny that proposition.

Now, if both those propositions are true, what is the conclusion? Simply this, that the assertion that a standard silver dollar would go as a dollar means to measure the power of the fiat of the Government and make it cover the hiatus between the commercial value of the silver dollar and the 100 cents in real money. Does anybody believe that any piece of metal would circulate in that way on the force of that fiat? And I want to say right here, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the standard dollars do circulate now as dollars is no answer to that question. I have heretofore called attention to the fact that the Congress of the United States, for the purpose of inspiring confidence in all the money of the United States, put into the statute a declaration that it was the intention of the Government to maintain a parity between gold and silver, and does anybody deny that it was upon the faith of that pledge that silver money has since circulated upon a parity with gold? There was a promise there as absolute in its terms and more solemn in form than that printed on the greenbacks, and no man can say that the present standard silver dollar has ever circulated as a dollar because of the fiat of the Government. Its circulation has rested upon the pledge of the Government to maintain a parity between the two metals just as absolutely as the greenbacks and the silver certificates have rested upon that basis.

I have not been able to understand, either, Mr. Speaker, the force of the arguments of some gentlemen here who give as the only reason for the position they take the necessity for more money. Nobody admits that he stands up here and advocates free coinage for the sole purpose of making a market for the silver product of this country or any other. These gentlemen claim that they want more money; and to demonstrate the necessity for more money they quote the academic authorities to prove that the fall in prices is due to a scarcity of money; and they urge the ancient proposition that, "other things being equal," the price of all the property in a country is influenced by the amount of money of ultimate redemption present in the country.

Since nobody has thought it worth while to attempt to demonstrate here that that proposition can only be true when the value of the money is measured by itself, or the price of the products or commodities is measured by that money, I will. If you assume that there is an independent and unalterable standard, a standard that can neither rise nor fall, not one that is said to rise when goods fall and to fall when goods rise, but an independent, unalterable standard, by which money shall be measured, then, if there is any truth in that proposition, it follows as a necessary deduction that when the price of money shrinks the value of all the property in the country shrinks. Nobody can get away from that, in my judgment; and if it be a sound proposition, it explodes the proposition of Mr. F. A. Walker and other gentlemen of great reputation, on whose propositions the silver arguments in this House are based almost without exception.

But again, looking at the matter in a mere common-sense view, and not resting it upon any refined feelings, the meaning of which you never know until you have spent six weeks in discussing the definition of each term, what would be the effect of free coinage, judged by their own arguments? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a gentleman who has made as clear a speech on this subject, in my judgment, as has been made, said distinctly, not once only, but oftener:

> We do not pretend that we are going to bring silver up to the present price of gold, but we are going to pull gold down to meet it.

Who besides him believes that possible in the existing condition of the civilized and commercial nations? Going to drag gold down! Why, sir, their own propositions made in the same speeches refute it. They are going to bring all the silver of the world up by opening the mints of a single country! Are they going to bring all the gold of the world down and leave the mints of every civilized nation open to it? The two propositions side by side exhibit an absurdity. Pull gold down to meet silver, when you do not close a mint on earth to the coinage of gold, and then propose to bring silver up by opening the mints of a single country to it!

Now, I have said the fact that our silver dollars circulate as dollars rests upon the faith in the pledge of the Government to maintain all money on a parity. This is a very great country, beyond question, with resources almost beyond computation, and of its financial stability the world has little doubt. But in heaven's name who would contemplate for a single moment the Government taking upon itself the awful burden of guaranteeing the parity between the gold of the country and all the silver of the world coined into American dollars and put into circulation? I can not believe that anybody would propose that; and yet, strange to say, I am not aware that any mortal so far, in proposing free and unlimited coinage, has proposed to repeal the pledge of the Government to maintain all of its money at a parity. Free coinage without such repeal would bring on an immediate collapse.

Nobody could contemplate for an instant leaving that pledge stand in the face of a free-coinage measure. Nobody can contemplate for an instant, in the light of the arguments made in support of free coinage, that the opening of the mints of a single country is going to bring the silver of the world to a parity with gold. If anybody believes that, he is mistaken in thinking that he believes that it is going to lower the price of gold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as an abstract academic theory—and gentlemen seem to glory in abstractions—it would make no difference whether we had in a country little money or much money, if we stood by ourselves with all accounts settled. If it were true, as gentlemen assert in the propositions on which their arguments rest, that the amount of money in a country always bears a given relation to all the property of the country, then it would be of small consequence how much money there was in a country, provided all the debts were paid. But it is the debtor in whose welfare these gentlemen are interested. When the Fifty-third Congress opened, for several days the air was rifted with cries of the evil that had been wrought the Government by the lecherous bondholder in that he had received bonds for greenbacks worth 40 cents on the dollar and he had been paid in money worth 100 cents on the dollar.

I call attention to that chiefly to show the accuracy of the statistics which these gentlemen use. The same greenback which was used to buy a bond comes to pay it. The evil of which they complain, the "crime" which is denounced, of the demonetization of silver, happened twenty-three years ago. Now, there is a great deal of talk about the burden and shame, and none call it the crime, of the creditor exacting a different money from what he loaned. Would there be any offense of the same kind in compelling him to take a different kind of money from that which he loaned?

I do not remember that anyone in this discussion has called attention to the fact that it is altogether probable that most of the debts existing at this hour have been created within the twenty-three years, and created since the hour these gentlemen denounce as so fatal, when silver was demonetized, and have been created absolutely on a gold basis by their own theories. Now, what becomes of the argument as applied to the debtor class?

Mr. Speaker, I have already said that the question is not to be settled by fine-spun theories brought from the schools, because neither the professors nor anyone else have ever been, and probably never will be, able to show that their theories apply. It is true to-day in the United States, as it was in France when the wise Napoleon, having examined the theories of the French school, said:

> The political economists of France would grind the Empire to powder.

The money that the United States wants is the money that is good in the marts of the world. If it was only the mere question of getting more money, and if the fiat of the Government was so all powerful as these gentlemen seem to think, the proposition has been made in a simple form of doubling the supply by debasing the present gold coin. The question of money is to be solved in the light of history and the common sense of mankind, wherever that question arises, without regard to arithmetic or the books of philosophy.

You had just as well take a blackboard, a piece of chalk, and printed volume, and set about demonstrating why the squirrel hoards nuts as to undertake to demonstrate why mankind wants

money, and why, in a particular epoch in the world's history, he wants some particular kind of money. We can not trace it back to its origin, for the very first transaction we learn of in the history of man was connected with money, and I take it that in the last transaction that shall happen among mankind money will also be there. It is as much a part of us as any other faculty of the human mind, and is as undemonstrable, only when it can be done by mental philosophy and history, as any other faculty in us.

Now, we simply know we stand in a period of time when civilization is higher than we knew of at any other time; when commerce and manufactures, science and art, are in general in advance of what they ever were before, the exchange of commodities throughout and between the nations greater than at any other period of time, and when the great bulk of civilized mankind have determined upon the use of one money and one standard. Here in the United States we have gentlemen who argue that it is not right; that it can not be right. They say that it is not evolution, but conspiracy. No matter as to the questions whether they are right or wrong, the facts are that we are in the position where we can not help ourselves, save by some force which I think we can apply. It is as much beyond our power to break down the value of gold as a money metal among civilized men as it is out of our power to change the orbit of the stars.

The closing of our mints to it would not accomplish that result. Our refusal to use it would not do it, nor is there anything as far as we know or that anybody can suggest that would lower the value of gold one iota anywhere. Inflation increases the price of gold measured in the money of inflation. The only question remaining, then, is to what extent we can raise or lower the value of silver. I do not believe that when we look upon it as a pure question of money, when we divorce the question from a desire to do something for silver as a product, that anybody believes for a moment that it is in the power of a single nation to bring the silver of the world to a gold standard.

By what process can it be done? Can it be done by making it a legal tender? Nobody will take it except those that are compelled to. Will you support it by a pledge given to maintain it on a parity with gold? No. Are there twenty men in this House who will vote for the proposition of free coinage, backed by the pledge of the Government to maintain the silver on a parity with gold? I do not believe there are. If they refuse to do it what will be the reason? A dozen might be given, but the real reason would be a fear that it would impose upon the United States Government financial liabilities greater than it could bear; and can anybody admit that he believes that a pledge of the Government to maintain silver under free coinage at a parity with gold would be a burden upon the Government and then assert that he believes silver would go to maintain a parity?

One gentleman said it might drive gold out, and if it did it would make room for $550,000,000 worth of silver. Well, now, that is all right, Mr. Speaker, in the way of making room for silver; it is all right in the way of finding a place to put silver, but, as a money question, what would be the effect? The effect would be that of exchanging $550,000,000 of gold for $550,000,000 of silver. They want more money. How much more money would they have as a result of retiring $550,000,000 of par money and substituting for it $550,000,000 of money of lesser value? So one after another it seems to me that the propositions the gentlemen make, the grounds they rest upon, and their arguments crumble away. They can not stand together. They demolish each other.

Now, sir, I assert, in conclusion, that I should like to see bimetallism. I believe I said that once before. I should like to see the kind of bimetallism which gentlemen define—the bimetallism of the bimetallist's dream. It might be maintained, Mr. Speaker, and I am not prepared to assert that it could not be, if we start in making a silver dollar big enough to be worth a dollar, and then lighten it as we find its value increasing by being monetized, if it increase at all. No free-silver man would consent to that. I should like to see gold and silver circulating side by side interdependent upon and supporting each other, as somebody has said, and as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DINGLEY] has said, yoked together. But they never have traveled together in that yoke, except for short periods of time, when their commercial values kept together, and I am afraid they never will. If the United States desires bimetallism, if it will address itself to the task of bringing it about among the civilized nations of the world, I believe we can accomplish something in that way, but to talk about doing it alone and in the face of all the nations is to my limited comprehension perhaps the most egregious folly that I have ever heard propounded in statesmanship.

We can not lower the value of gold. How could we bring up the value of silver? We can do nothing toward equalizing these moneys beyond our own border, and if to-day, in the close-knit way in which the nations live, we can not do anything toward equalizing it beyond our own border, save by a pledge of the Government to maintain the parity, how much can we do within our own borders? I have heard nothing advanced except the gentlemen's statements that it is in the power of the Government to make silver a legal tender for the payment of debts. Now, that may be true to a limited extent only. There is no doubt that very many contracts, and just those contracts that excite the ire of these gentlemen most, are made payable in gold coin of present standard of weight and fineness.

Can the Congress of the United States impair the obligation of those contracts? Suppose, again, there is no expression as to the kind of money, and no interpretation can be extracted from the agreement as to the kind of money to be paid at a given time. What the courts would say about it when confronted with a tender of debased coin no man knows. So I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with great regret—that day after day we are here hearing that which they want and not that which is attainable. They want a very desirable thing. Day after day they are giving the groundwork of the theory of their desires, unstable, inconsistent, contradictory. Day after day it seems to me that statistics are being filed which demonstrate, if anything can be demonstrated in this world, that the thing which we desire is at this time beyond attainment by their methods. There is only one method to attain it. If I may not use the word "force," then I say by the method of pressure. Do it by discrimination, do it by any advantage within your power that you may exercise diplomatically and safely, but to do it by the mere method of proceeding to coin silver free and unlimited is a mathematical fallacy.

Behind all that, the question whether the progress of the world, the evolution of society, commerce and trade, banking facilities, and the increase in gold will continue to leave within the veins of trade the necessity for coining other metal, is a question which must be decided, in my judgment, by circumstances; for the propositions of these gentlemen themselves as to the relative values of money seem to demonstrate that there is no difference, after balances are once settled, whether there is some more money or some less. They seem to demonstrate that it is desirable that the nations of the world dealing with each other shall, if possible, have one standard. They seem to demonstrate that it ought not to be possible for anyone to disturb at will that standard and the relation of money to commerce or of money to prices.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is all I care to say, except to call attention to the climax in the argument of the learned gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] when he declared as the necessary conclusion of his preceding propositions that "the Mexican dollar is worth as much as it ever was, but the United States dollar is worth twice as much." The gentleman is generally very accurate. If he is right now, the United States laborer who is paid in the United States dollars gets double in his dollar what he would get if our dollar had remained on a parity with the Mexican dollar.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, while I am of the opinion that nothing that has been said, nothing I may say, and nothing that will be said during this debate will influence the final fate of this bill as it is now worded, I will take advantage of the opportunity offered me to briefly state a few of the reasons that compel me to oppose it and to finally vote in favor of nonconcurrence in the Senate substittute.

In the first place I was in favor of and voted for the original bond bill sent by this House to the Senate, which the Senate repudiates by this substitute, and I will not give the action of the Senate the approval of my vote in fovor of the bill as it is returned to us.

As I understand the bill as now returned to this House, it provides for the free and unlimited coinage of all silver that may be presented to the mints of the United States into coins to be called dollars; that such so-called dollars shall be paid and accepted in satisfaction of all obligations, public and private, and be, under the laws of the United States, of the same value and purchasing and paying power as the gold coins now recognized and honored throughout the world as dollars, regardless of the actual value in gold of the silver of which they are made.

In other words, while all the remainder of the civilized world treats silver merely as a metal of fluctuating commercial value, this substitute proposes to fix and maintain its value in this country at one-sixteenth that of gold and open a free and unrestricted market in this country where all the world may exchange its silver for our gold, or gold's worth, when it is conceded by all that 1 ounce of gold, or what 1 ounce of gold will purchase, is worth at least 32 ounces of silver. With this fact admitted and before us, how can anyone claim that by an act of Congress their relative values can be changed and their parity at the ratio of 16 to 1 be established or maintained? It would be as sensible to attempt to change night into day by legislative enactment. The ounce of gold would purchase 32 ounces of silver bullion, and the 32 ounces of silver bullion when coined into so-called silver dollars would purchase only 1 ounce of gold, or what 1 ounce of gold would buy. Sixteen ounces of the coined silver would not do it. We may give the word "dollar," when applied to silver, a new meaning, but we can not give to the silver dollar by this substitute a value it in fact will not commercially possess.

If this bill should become law there can not be any question

that the market for silver it would make would be abundantly supplied, at least until our gold would be exhausted and, as currency, forever depart from our sight, and until the commodities we have heretofore sold for gold, or its representative, advanced, nominally, to at least double their present price. Every ship approaching our shores would be laden with the silver our friends from the silver-producing States and Territories want us to "help," and they would leave us loaded with our gold and products purchased at half their value until our people learned that an enactment could not make a "parity," and that here, as in other parts of the world, gold was the standard and measure of values, and by that standard and measure they must fix their prices.

That it would advance the actual value of anything I deny, but that it would lessen the value of everything we have to realize on, land, labor, materials, manufactured articles, grain, credits, and securities, at least one-half, until the actual value of the so-called silver dollar should be generally understood, I affirm, and the laborers, farmers, producers, investors, creditors, and depositors would suffer the loss, and the capitalists, bankers, insurance companies, and speculators would realize the profit.

Labor, land, grain, and merchandise move last and slowest in response to the change in value of the currency for which they are sold, and labor the last and slowest of all. Every advance, although only nominal, in the wages of laborers is contested with dogged determination by the employers, and rarely obtained without organized and persistent effort. If this bill should become a law and the medium with which the laborer is paid is only worth one-half that he has been receiving, it will be a long time before the wages he receives will be increased in a corresponding degree. He will still be receiving from one to three dollars in name for his work, but in name only, and his expenses must be met by the actual value of the silver with which they are paid.

The laborer, as a rule, is without credit and deals on a cash basis, and confines his operations to the present. He has only his own money and muscle to invest, and on them, and them alone, he must depend for subsistence, with rarely a hope of anything more.

The capitalist operates on credit and deals with an eye to the future value of what he purchases and of the currency in which he will be required to pay. His credit to a great extent is his capital, and with that he makes his greatest profit. The banker uses the deposits of his customers and the insurance companies the premiums paid by their insured with which to earn interest, and the dealer in real estate often makes no more of a cash payment than is necessary to cover any probable shrinkage in the property he buys, and the cheaper each can get the currency with which to satisfy his obligation the more money he will make and the more the depositor, insured, and real-estate seller will lose. It is not the poor man that is the debtor, but the rich man, whose credit enables him to obtain the money of other men to use for his own benefit.

If it were known that this bill would become law, as it is known it will not, transactions would now be under way that would make greater profits and fortunes for men already rich and having credit with which to deal than have been made by any fluctuations during this or any other century, but the laboring man and man of small means would not share in any of them.

Purchases would be made and obligations assumed on the basis of prices now measured by the dollar of gold, in a short time to be paid and satisfied in the 50-cent dollar of silver, and the purchaser would only have to wait until prices adjusted themselves to the new value of the American dollar in order to obtain for the article purchased double what he paid for it, although its actual value had all the time remained stationary.

No more injurious law to the working class in whatever avocation engaged could be passed by this Congress.

Every surviving soldier, every widow and orphan of our soldier dead, receiving a pension is an honored creditor of the United States of America and its people, and if this substitute should become a law the purchasing power of the pension would be only one-half what it now is. In other words, every pension would be reduced 50 per cent, and the Government would not save one cent by its unfair action.

It is claimed by those favoring the substitute that it should be passed in order that the silver coined under it may become a part of our circulating medium, and in that way relieve us from the present money stringency, but the substitute substantially contradicts that assumption, as it provides that—

Whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

It does not contemplate the use of the coined silver as a circulating medium, but it does contemplate having the Government coin, store, and be responsible for it without compensation, and issue silver certificates on it to be used as currency. Not one of these advocates of this bill would do the same thing for the best friend he may have.

I fear the advocacy of this substitute is fathered by a somewhat selfish motive in the interest of those who have silver to sell or debts, contracted under the law as it has so long existed, to pay.

The gentlemen from the silver-producing part of our country may be pardoned for wanting the United States to declare that a certain amount in weight of their principal product shall be received and accepted as a dollar, and with equal propriety I might be justified in demanding that certain quantities of corn, wheat, and oats raised in the great agricultural district I have the honor to represent should be of the same value.

I am in favor of the use of American silver stamped in an American mint to the extent that the people may consider necessary or convenient, but I want every silver dollar as good as a greenback dollar now is, and that is as good as gold in every country in the world where commercial currency is used.

I will be glad if through the instrumentality of an international congress silver is made money at a fixed and permanent value, but I am not now in favor of attempting to give silver a fictitious value in this country alone for the benefit of all the other nations. I am not in favor of making this country a dumping ground for all the silver of the world, and I am not in favor of forever saying good-bye to gold.

We are too rich and great a people to Mexicanize ourselves at this late day, and our credit has been too good since the close of our great civil war to ruin it by semirepudiation now.

We know by experience that we have only to touch with our promise any circulating medium we desire to use as money to make it as good as gold, and do not let us cripple the faith the world has in us.

There is no trouble with our currency or the amount of it. It has been good in sunshine and shadow, and we had better let it alone. We have never known, and will never know, a better. We have more of it than we will use, and it will not be coaxed out of its hiding until there is a change in the administration of our Government. With an Administration that can not in a time of profound peace make the Government self-sustaining, but is constantly spending more than it earns, it is not strange that capital does not seek investment except in Government bonds it knows the Republican party will be in power to pay. The trouble is not with the currency, but with the un-American policy of this Administration and the laws enacted by a Democratic Congress and approved by a Democratic Executive.

We will not have to wait much longer. After the 4th day of next March the party that was troubled only with its surplus in the Treasury will be again in power, and then all this talk of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and the endless chain that is constantly depleting the Treasury will be remembered as legends of the dark ages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize any gentleman who wishes to discuss this question. [After a pause.] If no gentleman wishes to discuss the question, and if there be no objection, the House will now take a recess until to-morrow morning at half past 10.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the House took a recess until Thursday, February 13, 1896, at 10.30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the report of the Washington and Marlboro Electric Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a detailed statement of the expenditures of the contingent appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Marshall. (Report No. 327.)

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English. (Report No. 328.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Corigan. (Report No. 329.)

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher. (Report No. 330.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The

bill (H. R. 2151) to restore to the pension rolls the name of Agnes A. Blackman. (Report No. 331.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer G. Howell, late a private Company F, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteers. (Report No. 332.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2604) to increase the pension of Caroline A. Hough, widow of Brig. Gen. John Hough. (Report No. 333.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 5909) authorizing a one-story addition to the Buffalo post-office building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 5910) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5911) to direct the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to ascertain and report the facts concerning the taking of property for the use of the Army of the United States and destroyed at Cynthiana, Ky., on June 11, 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 5912) making appropriation for continuing improvement of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors,

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 5913) to amend section 3331 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 5914) to amend an act to authorize the Interoceanic Railway Company to construct and operate railway, telegraph, and telephone lines through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 5915) to provide for the revision and consolidation of the statute laws of the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. HULING (by request): A bill (H. R. 5916) to establish a United States assay office at Charleston, W. Va.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 5917) to provide an American register for the steam yacht *Ellida*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5918) providing for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of the First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5919) to provide for the acquisition of additional land and the erection of an addition to the custom-house, post-office, etc., building at Bridgeport, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 5920) to authorize the laying of subways in the streets, roads, avenues, and alleys of the District of Columbia, to provide for placing overhead wires therein, and to amend the charter of the Washington Gas Light Company, and the Georgetown Gas Light Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5921) to protect State antigambling laws from nullification through interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise, by extending to such gambling the penalties provided for interstate gambling by mail or express—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5922) granting thirty days' leave of absence with pay to the compositors and pressmen employed in the awards division of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SORG: A memorial from the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT: A memorial from the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A memorial from the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORD: A memorial from the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: A memorial from the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1147) to compensate George K. Kirchner for his stock of goods taken and destroyed by Federal soldiers in the year 1862—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 5425) to grant a pension to Charlotte O. Van Cleve, widow of Gen. Horatio P. Van Cleve—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4942) for the relief of Caroline V. English—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The memorial of the National Board of Trade favoring aid in the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of C. P. Nance & Son and 12 other citizens of California to build the Nicaragua Canal—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The service record of James Pebley to support the bill (H. R. 4936) for the payment of bounty—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5923) granting a pension to John W. Elwood, of Coal Center, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) to correct the military record of Samuel Crawford, of Independence, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 5925) granting a pension to Jonah R. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5926) granting a pension to Columbus C. Carter, of Zion, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5927) granting a pension to Henry A. Thoburn, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5928) for the correction of the military record of Patrick Moss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 5929) to remove the charge of desertion against Alfred Rebsamen of Olathe, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of Juan S. Hart, administrator of Simeon Hart, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 5931) to correct the military record of William C. Johnson, late member of Company F, Ninety-first Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 5932) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah H. Wood—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of William Norris—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5934) granting a pension to Thomas Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5935) granting a pension to Bethsheba McKinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5937) for the relief of Nathan Finnegan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) for the relief of Pricilla R. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 5939) to correct the military record of John J. James—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) granting a pension to Thomas E. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) for the relief of James O. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5942) for the relief of Fritz Dawes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) granting a pension to John D. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 5945) granting a pension to Friedericke Catherine Lessle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 5946) granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 5947) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to L. L. Eggleston Post, No. 184, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Deposit, N. Y., a condemned cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. W. Cole, late Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth New York—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Emily J. Miller, blind and helpless child of Robert B. Miller, deceased, late of Company C, One hundred and ninth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 5950) to remove charge of desertion standing against the name of Albert B. Ketterman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Andrew Matheny—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 5952) for the relief of James Farley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 5953) granting an increase of pension to James F. Rowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5954) for the relief of Adolphus D. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5955) for the relief of the residuary legatees of Mark Davis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) for the relief of James A. Johnston—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5957) to pension Theresa Kilpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick Welch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 5959) to restore the name of Jacob Coffer to the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5960) for the relief of Thomas F. Riley, of California, late captain, Twenty-first Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5961) for the relief of William Cecill, of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5962) to grant a pension to William Cecill, of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) to grant a pension to Joseph S. Morris, of Morgan County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Petition of soldiers of the Union Army and Navy during the rebellion, for a pension of $8 to all ninety-day men and $12 to widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Petition of Godfrey D. Clark, A. L. Mabbett, and others, of Rochester, N. Y., in regard to House bill No. 1429—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Charles A. Green, in regard to House bill No. 4566, on postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BULL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 928, for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COWEN: Petition of Charles T. Gawthrop and 34 others, of Baltimore County, Md., for the enactment of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRUMP: Protest of A. D. Porter & Co., against House bill No. 4566, relating to postage on second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club, for the passage of a general bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELS: Petition of Marie Antoinette Taylor and other officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New York, against the sale of liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DANFORD: Petition of D. K. Allen and other ex-soldiers of Belmont County, Ohio, urging Congress to pass the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of George H. Maintien Post, No. 133, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolution adopted by the Bay State Agricultural Society, against the distribution of seeds by the Government—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of J. W. Brown and others, of Moweaqua, Ill., against appropriating public moneys for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy, requesting Congress to pass a bill granting a pension of $8 per month to all who served not less than ninety days—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the State board of county commissioners and supervisors of the State of Illinois, favoring the recognition of the Cuban revolutionists—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: Evidence to accompany House bill No. 5183, for the relief of Wesley A. Pletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 5859, for the relief of Laurena Opp—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Paper of Mrs. Clara F. Camp, of Independence, Iowa, urging favorable consideration of House bill No. 1429—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper of Mr. J. W. Foreman, of Independence, Iowa, favoring House bill No. 1429—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KULP: Petitions of H. C. Conner and 63 others, of Orangeville, Pa., and vicinity; also J. M. Kehres and 74 others, of Rebuck, Pa., in support of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of L. S. Henning and 24 others, of Oklahoma, for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, to have discriminations against American vessels removed—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUGH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5880, for the relief of Greenville Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIGG: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Jacob Coffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROYSE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4421, for the relief of James Wattleworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petition of 37 of the largest shipowners, exporters, and importers of Massachusetts (sent through the secretary of the Boston Chamber of Commerce), protesting against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, known as the Maguire bills—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, in behalf of the passage of the House bill to abolish compulsory pilotage on American vessels in the coastwise trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of R. C. Foor and 17 other citizens of Bunker Hill, Ind., in favor of a service pension of $8 per month for all soldiers who served ninety days or more and were honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy during the rebellion, asking for the passage of a bill amending the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cohoes, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Ellis Island and at certain points on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petitions of citizens of Allegheny City, Frank, and Buena Vista, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Sharpsburg and Sherrett, Pa., and the counties of Allegheny and Clarion, Pa., for the improvement of the Allegheny River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Dansville and La Grange, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5891, to increase the pension of Charles C. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5892, to pension Thomas E. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5893, for the relief of E. B. Maple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5894, to pension Hannah Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOAKUM: Petition of 59 citizens of Quinlan, Hunt County, Tex., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 13, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CATTLE QUARANTINE LINES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant calling for information as to whether any change has been made recently by order of the Agricultural Department in the quarantine lines heretofore established with regard to the transportation north of cattle from Texas and other Southwestern States or Territories, etc., transmitting copies of the regulations establishing the quarantine line in the Southwestern States for the years 1895 and 1896; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CIVIL SERVICE CORRESPONDENCE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 29, 1896, the correspondence respecting the enforcement of the civil-service law between the Public Printer and the Civil Service Commission between the dates of July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895, with a detailed statement of all matters pertaining thereto, together with the correspondence between certain discharged employees of the Government Printing Office and the Civil Service Commission between July 1, 1895, and November 1, 1895; which, on motion of Mr. COCKRELL, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., to the President and Congress of the United States on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Winnebago County Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, of Rockford, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the late war who were confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens and members of the Board of Trade of Cairo, Ill., praying for the continuance of the Mississippi River Commission in charge of the improvement of that river; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition of the members of the faculty of the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts, in favor of the passage of the bill to organize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy, to increase the usefulness and numbers of the corps of naval engineers, to induce the scientific institutions to provide the naval engineering reserve for time of war, etc. The petition is signed by C. H. Pettee, dean and professor of mathematics; F. William Rane, professor of agriculture: C. H. Kinne, instructor in modern languages; H. C. Hodges, jr., instructor in military science; A. F. Nesbit, instructor in physical science; Charles L. Parsons, professor of chemistry; Albert Kingsbury, professor of mechanical engineering; C. W. Scott, professor of history and political economy; Fred. W. Morse, chemist, experiment station; H. H. Lamson, bacteriologist experiment station; C. M. Weed, professor of biology, and Charles S. Murkland, president and professor of English.

In presenting this petition I will venture to suggest that a casual examination of this matter leads me to the conviction that the passage of this bill will do two things: That it will encourage the technological schools of the country to give the highest possible training to these young men, thus fitting them to go out from these colleges well prepared for any position to which they may be called, and that it will open an avenue for these men to enter the Navy and to aid in materially increasing its efficiency. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORRILL presented the petition of Samuel Morris, president of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for protection to Christians of the United States in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, urging Government protection to the Christians in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution No. 19. Asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia.

Whereas the Christian people of Americh and the civilized world have been shocked by the intelligence of the outrages inflicted and the brutal murders committed by the Moslem savages in Armenia since the commencement of the last massacres in September, 1894, since which time, it is said, as many as 75,000 persons, men, women, and children have been put to death for no other or better reason than because of their devotion to the Christian religion: Therefore

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That we earnestly petition our Senators and Representatives in Congress to urge the adoption of such measures as will show to all the world our abhorrence of such atrocities as have been committed in Armenia, and extend to them such protection and material aid as is within the power of this Government and as will protect, in that and other fields, our missionaries from violence, outrage, and indignity, and will enable them to pursue their work of faith, labor, and love in the interest of a brighter and better civilization.

Be it further resolved, That the governor of the State of Ohio cause to be transmitted to our Senators and Representatives in Congress duly certified copies of the above resolution.

DAVID L. SLEEPER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted February 7, 1896.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 7th day of February, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wellington, Ohio, and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ripley, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ravenna, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., to the President and Congress of the United States on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented certain papers to accompany the bill (S. 2070) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Miles F. Durkee, heretofore introduced by him; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of James S. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation for his relief; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE presented the petition of D. A. Nunn, of Brownsville, Tenn.; the petition of Rev. J. H. Witt, of McKenzie, Tenn.; and a petition of sundry citizens of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a series of resolutions adopted at the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the National Board of Trade, held at Washington, D. C., January 28, 29, and 30, 1896, in favor of the uniform classification of freight. I do not know whether the resolutions are exactly in the proper form, but I present them for the purpose of having them printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. I present a preamble and resolutions of the Cotton Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., a commercial body of ability and enterprise, urging certain specific improvements in the navigation of the Mississippi River. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Wilmington, N. C., praying Congress for the passage of Senate bill No. 1159, introduced by Mr. SQUIRE, for the purpose of appropriating money to be used for the construction of coast defenses. The petition represents that the great commercial interests centering in our seacoast cities and our present defenseless condition require the speedy passage of the above-mentioned bill. The meeting, it is stated, was a large one, comprising nearly all the business men of Wilmington, lawyers, physicians, etc., and states that the petition can be taken as the unanimous sentiment of the people of Wilmington. It is signed by business men of the city of Wilmington and by the mayor. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of sundry business men of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1242 to improve the merchant-marine engineer service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 988, to remove contests and litigations in the United States Land Depart-

ment from that Department to the courts of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of McMurray, Wash., remonstrating against the appropriation of public moneys for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented certain papers to accompany the bill (S. 2084) for the relief of C. A. Bjornstad, heretofore introduced by him; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Christian Church of Marion, Ind., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, to prohibit the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. TURPIE. I present a paper as evidence in the contested seat of Mr. Du Pont, of the State of Delaware. It is a certified copy of the return of the election of William T. Watson as Senator for the county of Kent in the general assembly of the State of Delaware. I ask that it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paper will be printed and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 597) for the relief of Samuel S. Boyer, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1448) to withdraw from the Supreme Court jurisdiction of criminal cases not capital, and confer the same on the circuit courts of appeals, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 119) for the relief of William Stanley, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 485) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 593) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States," placing enlisted men on the retired list after they shall have served thirty years in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 186) to encourage American shipping, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 189) to encourage American shipping, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1699) for the relief of William Loring Spencer, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1945) granting a pension to Joseph Porter, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 490) to indemnify the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 191) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1075) for the relief of the heirs of D. Fulford, reported it with amendments and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 608) to amend the military record of John A. Miller, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 251) for the relief of Peter D. Staats, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 621) for the relief of the legal representative of George McDougall, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1205) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894, reported it without amendment.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bull, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORT ON IRRIGATION.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] on the 21st ultimo, to report it with a substitute. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Public Printer be, and hereby is, directed to eliminate from 10,000 copies of the Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States, Census of 1890, the monograph entitled "Report on agriculture by irrigation in the western part of the United States;" that he be authorized to print an appendix, the data for which shall be furnished by the Interior Department, bringing the water-supply information up to date, and an index; and that he bind the monograph thus enlarged in one volume in style uniform with the other final Census reports; that of this report on irrigation 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 5,500 copies shall be for the use of the House, and 1,500 copies for distribution by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if the volume embraces the publication on the subject of irrigation recently prepared by Professor Newell?

Mr. HALE. It takes that report out of the big volume of the Census, and publishes it by itself, eliminating it from the large volume.

Mr. ALLEN. Professor Newell has recently prepared a small monograph on the subject of irrigation and water supply. Does this embrace the publication of that monograph?

Mr. HALE. That I do not know. It is that part of the volume issued by the Census Bureau relating to irrigation, and covers the subject very fully. I will state that upon the suggestion of Western Senators, who are interested in this matter, it seemed to the committee a very proper course, instead of suffocating it in a big volume which nobody will read, to put it into a shape in which it can be distributed.

Mr. PEFFER. The resolution proposes to bring the work down to the present time, I understand the Senator from Maine to say?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported as a substitute by the Committee on Printing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL DEEP WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] December 30, 1895, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That there be printed at the Government Printing Office at the earliest day practicable, from electrotype plates to be furnished to the Public Printer by the within-named association wholly without cost to the Government, 3,000 copies, in separate form, of the Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the International Deep Waterways Association, for circulation, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the reports in these two cases be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reports will be printed under the rule.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE REPORT.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 65) to print the annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That section 89, second proviso, of the act of January 12, 1895, an act providing for the public printing and binding, etc., be, and is hereby, amended, by inserting after the words "tide tables, coast pilots," the words, "annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORMAN. I present a report upon the joint resolution, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed under the rule.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 2091) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Edward Hughes, who served as a private in Company C, Fifth United States Volunteers, and also as a private in Company D, Thirty-eighth United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2092) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edward Allsworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 2093) for the relief of Maj. Benjamin C. Shaw, of Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2094) to relieve James Poundin from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2095) regulating the removal of letter carriers, post-office clerks, and railway postal clerks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 2096) granting a pension to George B. Cock; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2097) granting a pension to Joel M. Gibson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2098) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid United States; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2099) removing the charge of desertion from the name of James Russell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 2100) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay, from their own funds, for certain legal services rendered the Old Settlers, or Western Cherokee Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2101) to extend the provisions of an act to provide for the muster and pay of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2102) for relief of the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Suffolk, Nansemond County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2103) for the relief of Josiah Booker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 2104) making Jackson's birthday a legal holiday; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2105) to extend the privileges of the act of January 5, 1893, to certain persons specified and described; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2106) granting a pension to William H. Lane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2107) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2108) to provide for the revision and consolidation of the statute laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 2109) for the relief of Joel S. Shropshire, of Butte City, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Dixon, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2111) increasing the pension of Fletcher S. Kidd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 2112) to extend the provisions of section 4631, Title LIV, "Prize," of the Revised Statutes, and of the act of June 8, 1874, in relation to prize money, to fleet officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2113) to repeal sections 4532, 4533, and 4534, and to amend sections 4516 and 4529 of the Revised Statutes, all relating to the employment, treatment, and payment of seamen on merchant vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR BARRACKS AND QUARTERS.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to cause the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to reexamine Treasury settlements Nos. 9672, 9686, 9667, 9668, 9671, 9673, 9676, 9677, 9683, 9688, 9690, 9678, 9687, 9679, 9693, 9697, 168, 9659, 9684, 9685, 9674, 9675, 9691, 9661, 9689, 9692, 9694, 9670, and 9680, being claims for barracks and quarters, certified to Congress for appropriation in House Executive Document No. 234, Fifty-third Congress, third session, for the payment of which no appropriations have been made, and if found correct to report the same to Congress at as early a day as practicable at the present session.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to return to the House the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," for the correction of a verbal error; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ASSISTANT DOORKEEPERS OF THE SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], which will be read.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the resolution is read, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to state, if the Senator will permit me, that the birthday of Washington is approaching, and I have been urged by the ladies who are incorporated by the bill——

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection at all to the measure, but as this is a privileged question, I think it ought to be acted on. It is the resolution concerning two of the employees of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Virginia later. The resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Alonzo H. Stewart, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby, chosen assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. I move to amend the resolution by adding at the end:

And that Bernard W. Layton, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. DANIEL. I will state that the bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has passed the other House. It has been examined by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and is recommended with two immaterial amendments. It is very desirable that it shall be put upon its passage, as the Daughters of the American Revolution wish to be incorporated before the 22d day of February, when they will have a meeting here.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, on page 3, line 4, after the word "Maryland," to insert:

Mrs. Francis P. Burrows (Mrs. Julius C. Burrows), Mrs. Mary H. McMillan (Mrs. James McMillan), Mrs. Emma Gregory Hull (Mrs. J. A. T. Hull), Mrs. Mary B. K. Washington (Mrs. Joseph Washington).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after the word "Congress," to strike out "said reports or such portions thereof as he may see fit" and insert "such portion thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance"; so as to make the first clause of section 3 read:

That said society shall report annually to the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings, and said secretary shall communicate to Congress such portion thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement as a matter of personal privilege.

I have been somewhat annoyed by a great many requests made to me and statements to the effect that I have been in some way connected with the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] in relation to the proposed investigation in the Post-Office Department, and some reflections upon the Postmaster-General, and the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Neilson. For the purpose of avoiding further inquiry upon the subject, I desire to state that I have no kind of connection and never have had with the resolution nor with moving the investigation. I have a high opinion of the Postmaster-General, of his ability and efficiency, and that of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

I did introduce, at the request of some of the employees and citizens of the District, a bill to increase the compensation and put upon the regular roll of the Department the employees in the mail bag repair division. I think their compensation ought to be increased, and I shall advocate it. I am in favor of a reasonable and sufficient compensation for all employees of the United States. Further than this, I have had no connection with the matter.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENTS IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. PEFFER. There are two resolutions lying on the table, one relating to an inquiry into the Post-Office Department, which I should like to have laid before the Senate, and the other, for the appointment of a special committee, I should like to have go over and retain its place, to be laid before the Senate to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER February 12, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire and report whether, during the year 1895 or any portion thereof, any of the employees of the Post-Office Department, while receiving pay from appropriations for that Department, did, with the knowledge, connivance, or direction of any clerk or clerks, or chief or chiefs of division, levy and collect assessments of money on and from other employees of the Department to be used, and which was used, for political purposes in States where election campaigns were in progress at that time; whether any person or persons were employed and borne on the Department rolls as employees and regularly paid as such who, while pretending to be discharging the duties of inspectors in the free-delivery service, were in fact actively engaged in aiding and assisting one of the political parties in said election campaign; whether, during such time, in room 3 of the Interior Department building, or in any other room or rooms in said building or in any other building, any employee of the Department was directing or managing the employment of persons for the purposes aforesaid and receiving and disbursing the moneys so assessed and collected, and whether such manager or director kept an account of such moneys in his own name in any bank of the city of Washington or elsewhere.

The committee will inquire and report, further, whether during the period covered by this resolution any person or persons were employed by any clerk or chief of division in the Post-Office Department and kept on the Department pay rolls and paid out of the Department funds, which payment was not authorized by law or by any lawful rule or regulation of the Department, and for which services no appropriation had been made by Congress.

Mr. GORMAN. I understand the Senator from Kansas does not ask to have the resolution considered this morning, but that it may go over without prejudice.

Mr. PEFFER. I am perfectly willing that it may go over without prejudice.

Mr. HALE. Let it be printed.

Mr. PEFFER and Mr. PLATT. It is already printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over, retaining its place.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BOND SALES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution, by Mr. PEFFER, providing for the appointment of a committee of five Senators to investigate and report generally all the material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that that resolution go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

PACIFIC RAILROADS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a series of resolutions submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions submitted by Mr. ALLEN February 12, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate full information on the following subjects:

First. The number of miles of the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad Company as originally constructed and as it now exists, the estimated actual cost per mile of the construction thereof, its then and present capitalization, and any change that may have been made in its capitalization, and whether, and if so, when, and to what extent, its capitalization was changed or increased, and whether such change or increase was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States, the names and residences, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively.

Second. The number of miles of the Central Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the estimated actual cost per mile of its construction, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so, when and how often, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and whether such change or increase, if any, was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States; also the names and addresses, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, giving the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively.

Third. The number of miles of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company as originally and at present constructed, the estimated actual cost per mile of the construction thereof, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so when and to what extent, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and if such change or increase, if any, has been, and whether it is, authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States; the names and residences, respectively, of the stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees thereof, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively, and whether such railroad was constructed on the line contemplated by the act authorizing its construction, and if not, whether its present line was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States.

Fourth. The number of miles of the main line of the Kansas Pacific Railroad Company as originally and now constructed, the estimated actual cost per mile of its construction, its original and present capitalization, and whether, and if so to what extent, its capitalization has been changed or increased, and whether such change or increase was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States; the names and residences, respectively, of its stockholders, bondholders, and mortgagees, and the amount of such stocks, bonds, and mortgages held by them, respectively, and whether said railroad was constructed on the line and from and to the points contemplated by the act authorizing its construction, and if not, whether its construction on its present line was authorized or sanctioned by the Government of the United States.

Fifth. The names under which the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the Central Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, and the Kansas Pacific Railroad Company were severally constructed, and whether any changes in the names thereof have taken place since their construction, and if so, what names have been given to said respective roads and the names now in use by them, giving specifically all the changes in names and the consolidations, if any, that have taken place from the time of their construction, respectively, to the present moment, to the end that the Senate may be fully informed as to the several names under which these several railroads have been and are now being operated, and have exact information as to the consolidations and changes therein that may have taken place.

Sixth. What branches, if any, have been constructed or purchased by said respective railroads and added as feeders or otherwise to their respective main lines, giving the names of all of such railroads that may have been thus constructed or purchased by any of them, the cost of such construction or purchase, and the source from which the funds to construct or purchase the same were derived, and whether, and if so, what, sums of money were derived from the main lines of said railroads and used in the construction or purchase of any such additional railroads or feeders.

Seventh. The total amount of subsidy bonds issued in aid of the construction of said respective main lines, the total number of acres of land donated to each of them by the United States, and whether all of said lands have been selected and taken by them or not, or if any other corporation or company of persons has been formed for the purpose of handling or disposing of said lands, and if so, the names of said corporations or companies, the manner in which the lands have been disposed of by them, if any, and their present condition.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope that resolution will be acted upon at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On yesterday I had some comments or criticisms of a friendly character to make respecting these resolutions. While I have no desire to interpose the slightest objection to the furnishing through proper channels of any information that will be of service to the Senator from Nebraska, or of service to the Senate, much of the information called for, as I explained yesterday, it seems to me is extraneous, and many of the facts are not within the knowledge, and can not be in the possession, of the Secretary of the Interior. I fear the resolutions, even so far as the information called for may be in possession of the Secretary of the Interior, are such that their purpose may be defeated by reason of the time it will take to procure the information. I have prepared an amendment which I shall offer, and which I trust the Senator from Nebraska will accept. I shall content myself with that. I think it will still save all he desires.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "subjects," the twenty-second word in the resolutions, it is proposed to insert:

So far as said information is on file in the Department of the Interior or in the possession of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of the Interior has appeared before the Committee on Pacific Railroads in another body on this very subject of the Union Pacific Railroad, in which he advocated that certain action be taken. I apprehend that what the Senator desires are facts, and this amendment to the resolutions will limit the Secretary in what he is to furnish to such of the facts as are in his Department or in his possession, and I take it that is all the Senator from Nebraska desires. If he desires information in the possession of any other officials, I shall be very glad to join him in a resolution which will direct them to divulge to the Senate such information as they have. I trust the amendment will not be objected to.

Mr. ALLEN. I regret very much that the Senator from Colorado should undertake to disembowel the resolutions by his amendment. The Secretary of the Interior no doubt has much valuable information in his possession with reference to the land grants to these various railroads, the amount of land that has been taken up under the grants, and their disposition.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I do not interrupt the Senator, that all comes in under the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no doubt there is much valuable information on the subject in the offices of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Commissioner of Railroads that can be compiled and sent to the Senate with reasonable speed, which will be valuable to the Senate in the determination of the disposition to be made of these railroads and the Government liens.

I beg to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that if the resolutions call for information which is not in the possession of the Secretary of the Interior, he can inform us of that fact in his answer to the resolutions quite as well as we can anticipate that he does not possess the information.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is simply to rob these resolutions of their force, and by that means prevent the Senate from having the information that we are justly entitled to, and which we need before we can intelligently act upon legislation that may be brought before us. The Senator from Colorado suggests that much of this information is open to us. It may be. I do not know where it is, however.

Mr. BRICE. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me for a moment, I will inform him that the Committee on Pacific Railroads made a partial report at the last session of Congress, embodying almost all the information asked for in these interrogatories, and their report is a printed document of the Senate. In listening to the reading of the resolutions, I think I may say that nine-tenths of the questions asked are answered in that report formerly made, and are now in print. As to the remainder, the other tenth, or whatever percentage it may be, neither the Interior Department nor any other Department of the Government is in possession of the information.

Mr. ALLEN. What part is that?

Mr. BRICE. Anything which is not contained in the report of the Committee on Pacific Railroads is not in the possession of any officer of the Government, because that report was made after about eighteen months of examination and conference between the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney-General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and various members of the Committee on Pacific Railroads. If the information desired is to be obtained, it can be done, in my judgment, much more expeditiously and with much more certainty if the Senator from Nebraska will amend his resolutions so as to direct the Committee on Pacific Railroads to make a report, as the resolutions involve subjects not contained in their former report, with power to send for persons and papers and to take testimony in order to inform themselves on those points. In that way the information which the Senator desires can be obtained.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think I shall take advantage of the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, if the resolutions can pass without any opposition, and ask that the resolutions may be directed to the Committee on Pacific Railroads and amended by striking out "the Secretary of the Interior" and inserting: "That the Committee on Pacific Railroads be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate," etc.

Mr. BRICE. And add "with power to send for persons and papers and to take testimony"; otherwise the information desired by the Senator can not be obtained.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that if he allow the resolutions to pass, as the Senator from Nebraska now proposes, and the Committee on Pacific Railroads find that they require authority to send for persons and papers to get any part of the information, they will report undoubtedly what they possess, and ask for authority to send for persons and papers if necessary. It is not necessary to embarrass the resolutions now by putting that authority in, for of course the resolutions would then have to go to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator from Ohio will comply with the request of the Senator from Massachusetts and not press the amendment.

Mr. BRICE. I do not insist upon it at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is impossible to understand the private arrangement being made by Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. I will say, for the benefit of the Senator from Rhode Island, that if he will turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issued to-day, page 1638, he will find the resolutions which I offered printed.

I now propose this modification to my resolution:

That the Committee on Pacific Railroads be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with full information on the following subjects—

and let the remainder of the resolutions stand as they are.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That will do.

Mr. ALDRICH. That will, of course, be done without any expense to the Government?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know whether that can be done without expense to the Government or not. After looking over the construction of the Committee on Pacific Railroads I have faith to believe that those resolutions will be examined in good faith, and that with due and convenient speed the committee will report the information; or, if there is any portion of it which they can not obtain, they will act in good faith and ask power of the Senate to send for persons and papers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I beg to assure the Senator from Nebraska, in the absence of the chairman of the committee—and I know I am authorized to express his views, and I think I know the sentiment of the committee generally—that the committee are extremely anxious to furnish to the Senate and to the Senator from Nebraska all the information he asks for so far as it is obtainable, and if it shall so be that such testimony can not be obtained without sending for persons and papers, I have no question but that the committee will so report and ask the judgment of the Senate upon that.

Mr. ALLEN. Indulge me in one more word. I have noticed by the press from time to time that the Committee on Pacific Railroads has had certain witnesses before them for examination, and I hope the committee will not construe my words as any reflection upon them when I say that I have failed to observe that any of the patrons of the road have been brought before the committee and examined. Their examinations thus far seem to have been confined to stockholders and bondholders of the road, and their agents and attorneys, who come here for the purpose of being heard.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will kindly outline to the Senate what particular light a patron of the road could, because he is a patron of the road, furnish to the committee in the line of a proper bill for the reorganization of the properties?

Of course the committee is extremely desirous of obtaining all possible information, and up to this time the committee has heard everybody who has appeared. There have been delegations of citizens opposed to any pending plan. We have heard them patiently and considerately, and have had postponed meetings in order that others might be heard. Everybody who has presented himself has been heard, but of course we can not send for the patrons of the roads; we can not advertise for them, as they are not known by name; but if the Senator can suggest any particular patrons of the road who have valuable information in their possession—I speak in the absence of the chairman—I have no doubt the committee will send for them and give them an opportunity to be heard. Anything valuable in the line of reorganization that can be procured by sending for patrons of the road I have no doubt the committee would be swift to adopt.

Mr. ALLEN. In reply to the Senator from Colorado, I think I can shed some light on this matter. I fail to observe that the boards of trade, the associations of wholesale merchants, or the grain dealers or stock dealers along those lines of road have been invited to appear before the committee and give their views on reorganization. I have not the slightest doubt that persons in the cities of Omaha, Cheyenne, Denver, and other places where the Union Pacific Railroad runs and where the Kansas Pacific Railroad runs would be able to furnish valuable information to the committee. In fact, I think I know that they possess information that would be of great value to the committee, and which would shed much light upon this very dark problem. I beg to express the hope that the committee will now turn its attention from bondholders and stockholders and mortgagees and stockbrokers and attorneys and lobbyists and give the honest patrons of the road some opportunity to be heard.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Without objection, the resolutions will be modified in the manner indicated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and the question is on agreeing to the resolutions as modified.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood the Senator from Nebraska to say that he was willing to have the matter referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir. The resolutions are a direction to the Committee on Pacific Railroads to furnish the Senate with this information.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MORGAN. I move to amend the resolutions by adding what I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the resolutions:

And that the Committee on Pacific Railroads shall have authority to send for persons and papers, when necessary, in conducting any investigation into the subjects within their jurisdiction and to administer oaths to witnesses.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that he offer that as a separate resolution; otherwise it will carry the whole subject to the Committee on Contingent Expenses and postpone action.

Mr. MORGAN. It does not carry anything to the Committee on Contingent Expenses. It does not propose any appropriation at all.

Mr. PLATT. It proposes an expenditure.

Mr. MORGAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. HARRIS. It creates a charge on the contingent fund, I suggest.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no occasion for any expense in administering an oath to Mr. Huntington when he appears before the committee to make a statement.

Mr. HOAR. I believe that all committees, by statute, have the authority to administer oaths to witnesses, but the sending for persons and papers, I suppose, involves the public obligation to pay the expenses of the persons sent for and to pay the expense of sending for them.

Mr. MORGAN. The difficulty with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is this: The Senate has not directed the committee to make any investigation. We have no more authority to make an investigation than any other committee of the body, and I do not think we can put any and every man on oath who happens to come before the committee to make a suggestion. If we have authority to administer oaths, which this amendment gives, then to-morrow when the committee meet and Mr. Huntington and other gentlemen appear there to make their statements, we can put them under oath, and I want them under oath. There is no appropriation in that at all, and it need not go to any committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That I may understand the matter, do I understand the effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to send the resolutions and amendment to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] says he thinks it does, and we value his opinion very highly over here.

Mr. HOAR. Thank you.

Mr. PLATT. Let the rule or the statute be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the rule on the subject.

The Secretary read paragraph 4 of Rule XXV, as follows:

A Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of three Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or creating a charge upon the same.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will read the section of the Revised Statutes to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers:

SEC. 101. The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or a chairman of a Committee of the Whole, or of any committee of either House of Congress, is empowered to administer oaths to witnesses in any case under their examination.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that there must be a case under examination, but whenever there is a case under examination there is no need of inserting in the resolution authority to administer oaths to witnesses, because that is provided for by the statute.

Mr. MORGAN. That means an examination by order of the Senate, of course, but the committee can not voluntarily institute an examination, and that gives no legal standing to the examination whatever. If the authority is granted and if a man should swear to a lie before the committee we could put him in the penitentiary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask if the President of the Senate has passed upon the question whether the amendment would carry the resolutions to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the suggestions of Senators upon that point.

Mr. GALLINGER. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses, of which I happen to be a member, I will venture to suggest to the Chair—and I do it very modestly—that it seems to me that the passage of the resolutions will necessarily create a charge upon the contingent fund. If that be so, under the rule or the statute, as read, the resolutions ought to go, and must necessarily go, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is inclined to think that under the last clause of Rule XXV, which reads "to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or creating a charge upon the same," the resolutions will go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate——

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the amendment been adopted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the event of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. That is the judgment of the Chair upon the question.

Mr. HOAR. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to lay upon the table the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLEN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would that motion, if agreed to, carry with it the resolutions already adopted?

Mr. HOAR. I appeal to the Senator from Alabama to make his amendment a separate resolution. It would be just as forcible then as in the form of an amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. If I can get an assurance from the committee that the men who are coming up to testify shall not be heard until a resolution is passed by the Senate giving us power to conduct an investigation, so that the witnesses can be put under oath and held responsible for what they say, I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. HOAR. I think that is all right.

Mr. MORGAN. Very well.

Mr. HOAR. I withdraw the motion to lay on the table and will let the members of the committee settle it in their own way. Whatever they desire to do will be satisfactory to me. I withdraw the motion to lay on the table if I may be allowed to do so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama. Does the Senator from Alabama offer it as a separate resolution?

Mr. MORGAN. I withdraw it as an amendment and offer it as a separate resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. PLATT. As modified?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. As modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is the pending resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. I will modify the resolution by striking out so much of it as provides for sending for persons and papers, so that it will merely contain power to conduct an investigation. We have volunteers so far. It is not necessary to send for anybody.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution be read.

Mr. MORGAN. The resolution will not be referred, I suppose, under the ruling of the Chair, if I modify it so as to obviate any possible necessity for expense.

I will state to the Senate very briefly what I want to do. Up to this time the investigations before that committee have been conducted by the voluntary attendance of men who are there for the purpose of promoting their own interests in connection with these railways. When they are there, and come under such conditions and such circumstances and for such purposes, I want the Senate to give us the authority to conduct an examination, so that we can put them under oath and have whatever advantage that may be to the country in the outcome.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if any portion of the investigation thus far has been conducted under oath?

Mr. MORGAN. Not a bit of it.

Mr. ALLEN. Nobody has been sworn?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. MORGAN. I modify my resolution as I have suggested.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska? The suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama, it seems to me, is extremely pertinent.

In answer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], however, I think it is proper to say that I think the committee has undoubtedly possessed the right throughout all its investigations up to this time to put any of its witnesses under oath, had it seen fit to do so.

Mr. COCKRELL. Has it done so?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As a matter of fact nothing has come before the committee except on the general line of suggestions of schemes by counsel which they announce they intend hereafter to present to the committee by way of bills for their consideration.

Nobody familiar with the facts, nobody whose testimony would have added value if it was sworn to, has appeared before the committee. We have not reached that stage of the investigation. But the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama is extremely pertinent, and in my opinion it should be presented in the form of a separate resolution, because then it will not limit the committee to the questions asked in the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], but will enable us to make a general investigation of all phases and sides of this question. I have no doubt that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate will make prompt report upon it.

I can assure the Senator from Nebraska that when anybody who has anything to say, whose testimony would have added value if it were sworn to, appears before the committee, he will unquestionably be compelled to verify his statements by oath. But up to this time nothing but the usual and formal introductory statements by people of something they intended hereafter to do has been submitted to the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. I infer from what the Senator from Colorado has said that all that has been done thus far has been to listen to the promulgation of schemes of reorganization.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, that is all.

Mr. ALLEN. There has been no investigation into the facts embraced in the resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. None whatever.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution as modified will be read.

The SECRETARY. As modified the resolution will read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Railroads shall have authority, when necessary, to conduct any investigation into the subjects within their jurisdiction, and to administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I renew the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

SETTLERS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota.

The bill simply proposes to allow the settlers on certain Indian reservations in the State of South Dakota additional time within which to pay for their homesteads, and as some of them would have to do it this month the necessity is great that the bill should be considered at once.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill an additional section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the time for making final proof and payment for all lands located under the homestead laws of the United States upon any lands of any former Indian reservation in the State of South Dakota be, and the same is hereby, extended for the period of one year from the time proof and payment would become due under existing laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes."

MARYLAND AND WASHINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask that the bill in relation to extending the time for the completion of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill from the House of Representatives indicated by the Senator, which will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I move that the joint resolution (S. R. 56) extending the time for completion of Washington and Maryland Railway be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

WITNESSES BEFORE POLICE TRIAL BOARDS, ETC.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent, without displacing the unfinished business except temporarily, to call up a bill received yesterday from the House of Representatives, in relation to false swearing before police and fire department trial boards in the District of Columbia. It is identically the same as the bill on this subject reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I move that the bill (S. 323) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE LITERATURE, ETC.

Mr. VILAS. By consent of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I ask leave to call up Senate bill 1675, in relation to obscene literature. I will state that a similar bill passed the Senate during the last Congress.

Mr. HALE. After the matter suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin is disposed of, I think I shall have to insist upon going on with the appropriation bill. It is very desirable that it shall be passed to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1675) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, and was interrupted by—

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it requires unanimous consent to take up this bill, while I have not the slightest desire to postpone its consideration, I should like to look it over a little before it comes up for passage.

Mr. VILAS. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to object to the passage of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know whether I do or not. I have never read the bill. Has the bill been before the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. VILAS. The bill was passed by the Senate during the last Congress. It has been very carefully considered by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did it pass in the form in which it is now presented? I understand not.

Mr. VILAS. There are some amendments made by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. VILAS. The bill as it stands now was reintroduced after the Committee on the Judiciary had carefully gone over it in re-

spect to terms, and so as to present the bill just as the committee thought it ought to be enacted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator from Wisconsin has stated that the bill was passed during the last Congress. If the Senator will state that the bill as now offered has heretofore passed the Senate, I shall not have a word to say.

Mr. VILAS. With the exception of the amendments which were made to its terms by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; but it is an amended bill.

Mr. VILAS. It is somewhat slightly different and improved, as it was believed by the committee, from the way in which it was passed at the last session.

Mr. HOAR. It is made less harsh. If I recollect aright, we struck out the minimum punishment as well as a provision leveled at persons who received such matter from the express companies for distribution in a State. We thought that properly belongs to the States. It is merely the giving to express companies knowingly of obscene matter which is made punishable. There is nothing in the bill in the way of penalty which was not in the former bill, if I recollect it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he allow the reading of the bill to be completed and then let the bill go over for a day, during which time the Senator can look at it.

Mr. MILLS. That is a good idea.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will not be necessary to read the bill again to-morrow. If the Senator wants to look at it, I do not think its consideration should be urged at this time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not wish even to appear to object to the passage of a bill of this sort. At the same time I have not read it and it has not been referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee, where bills affecting the carrying of goods would naturally go. Probably it is a perfectly just and upright measure, and I do not like, as I say, to seem even for a moment to object to the bill. I shall not object if the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the bill ought to be passed at once without investigation.

Mr. VILAS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Colorado investigate the bill, and the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire is entirely satisfactory to me if the Senator from Colorado wishes the time to examine it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I ask that the reading may be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. VILAS. I will pursue the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and with the consent of the Senate, ask that the bill may be considered as having been read and stand over until to-morrow morning or some convenient time for disposition; and if there is any objection at that time it can be heard.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

GAINESVILLE, M'ALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that the concurrent resolution of the other House requesting the return of a bill be laid before the Senate and adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House Senate bill 879, for the correction of a verbal error.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, to insert after line 18 on page 18:

For payment of fees and expenses of the United States marshals and deputies, fiscal year 1895, $230,573.34.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, on yesterday while speaking in reference to the fee system the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] alluded to the courts in the Indian Territory as being an example where the fee system had been shown to be peculiarly extravagant. In the course of his remarks he also made some reference to the court in the western district of Arkansas which has jurisdiction over felonies committed in the Indian Territory.

I made a statement at that time in reference to the comparative cost of the two systems as they refer to the courts within the Indian Territory. I did not have the accurate figures, but I have since then obtained them from the Attorney-General's Office, and I wish to make a statement now with reference to what has occurred within that Territory.

When the court was first created within the Indian Territory it was under the fee system, but on the 3d of March last additional courts were created and the whole was put under the salary system. During the last six months it was under the fee system the cost of the marshal's office was $36,074.50. The cost for the first six months under the salary system was $37,800, being more than $1,000 more under the salary system than it was under the fee system.

I wish to suggest, also, that under the salary system, which cost $1,000 more for six months than the other, there were only 45 deputy marshals, while under the fee system the average number of deputy marshals was 175. Yet under the salary system the cost was greater for the 45 deputies than it was for 175 under the other system.

Mr. President, I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I understand it to be the opinion also of the Attorney-General, that the best mode of dealing with this matter would be to make the salary system apply to the marshals, district attorneys, and office deputies, but the salary system can not be made effective within that Territory without tremendous cost if it is to apply to what is known as the traveling deputies. It would require such a large number of them that if you were to place them on a salary the cost would greatly exceed what it has ever been under the fee system. So far as concerns the marshals, district attorneys, and office deputies, I think it would be better that they should be under the salary system rather than the fee system, but the salary system can not be applied economically to the riding deputies or traveling deputies in the Territory, because it requires such an immense number of them to enforce the law and keep the peace.

The Senator from Missouri yesterday, in speaking of the expense of the courts of the western district of Arkansas, compared it with the southern district of New York. The Senator from Missouri knows that no such comparison can be made. The court of the United States for the southern district of New York has no jurisdiction over murders, larcenies, robberies, and other felonies committed within the State of New York, while the court at Fort Smith has entire jurisdiction over felonies of every character and description.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator means in the Indian Territory?

Mr. BERRY. Within the Indian Territory. It has entire jurisdiction over felonies committed within certain portions of the Indian Territory, and every class of the higher crimes. If the Senator from Missouri would take the expenses of the State courts having criminal jurisdiction in the southern district of New York and add them to the expenses of the United States courts for that district, and compare those expenses with the expenses at Fort Smith, he would have something like a just comparison. But there can be no comparison between the United States courts in New York and the court at Fort Smith. The court in the southern district of New York, I suppose, tries only a few criminal cases, robberies of post-offices, counterfeiting cases, probably smuggling cases, and a few of that character; but the court at Fort Smith has all the felony jurisdiction within certain limits of the Indian Territory.

For the information of the Senator from Missouri I wish to show him something about the business before the Fort Smith court during the year ended June 30, 1895. There were 909 cases disposed of within that court; 662 convictions were had; 158 acquittals; and 89 nolle prosequis or dismissals. Now, bear in mind that with the exception of the whisky cases these are felonies—murders, robberies, rapes, larcenies, and every other character of felonies known to the law. These parties were tried at Fort Smith. The only misdemeanors were those for introducing whisky into the Territory, I think, which may be a felony or which may be a misdemeanor.

Mr. PLATT. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas a question, in order that there may be no mistake?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. These are cases which came from the Indian Territory to Fort Smith?

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir; I understand they were; that is, the district attorney made his report, and they cover the cases within the Indian Territory.

Mr. President, the court for the southern district of New York has no such jurisdiction and no such number of cases. It is wholly different. The expense attending the service of process in New York is comparatively small. There are to-day, as I believe, about 250 persons confined in the jail at Fort Smith charged with felony. The number has sometimes reached 300; it has not been less than 200 for years, so an employee at the Attorney-General's Office told me. Judge Parker works from 8 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening every day, day by day, almost the entire year; and notwithstanding that fact, there were a short time ago between 40 and 50 men charged with murder in that jail.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday stated that this is the most expensive court in the United States. It is the most expensive, and it could not be otherwise under the cir-

cumstances. It does more business than any other court in the United States. The entire Indian Territory has within it, in addition to 75,000 Indians, something like 300,000 white men, and among them are some of the most desperate felons who have ever been known in the United States. They are men who have taken refuge there from other States. They are desperadoes of the very worst character. It is absurd to talk about four deputy marshals, a dozen marshals, or fifty marshals keeping the peace and enforcing the law within that Territory. Those desperadoes a few months ago while engaged in robbing trains and murdering citizens numbered far more than this.

In regard to the marshal at Fort Smith, Mr. Crump, I wish to state that I have known him from his boyhood. I have been associated intimately with him for nearly forty years. He is a man of high intelligence, a man of high sense of honor, and of as high character for integrity and honesty as there is within any State. He has used every exertion and finally succeeded, something less than a year ago, in breaking up the nest of robbers who were located there. Many of them have been sent to the penitentiary for life. Two of them, Cherokee Bill and Henry Starr, who were the leaders, were convicted, and are to-day under sentence of death. One or two others have been already hung, and the band has been broken up.

If any Senator imagines that there is any similarity between that court and any other court in the United States he is wholly misinformed as to the situation. No more efficient set of officers, no more honorable gentlemen than the district attorney, Mr. Reed, and the marshal live within the United States, and the record of convictions shows that they have one of the best records that has been made anywhere. The Attorney-General says, when you take all of the cases throughout the United States, about 40 per cent of them were noll-prossed. In this court during that year there were only a little more than 10 per cent noll-prossed, and many of those cases were where the parties had been indicted more than once. And any intimation that they have used their offices to increase their fees is not warranted by the facts.

The expenses of that court have not been excessive during the last year. If the Senator from Missouri will take the record in the Attorney-General's Office and take the amount of cost there, he will see that the court has been run in as economical a way as it was possible to enforce the law. The marshal has enforced the law and has broken up the robbers; many of them have been sent to the penitentiary and some have been executed, and some are now under conviction.

Now, I wish to say another word. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] was not in his seat a moment ago, and I wish now to restate the figures. I say in regard to the deputy marshals it is not possible to enforce the law with a limited number, and if you put the whole number on a salary of $1,200 a year the cost will far exceed the fee system. The court to which the Senator alluded, the court for the western district of Arkansas, bears no resemblance to the courts in which he says parties are dragged for minor offenses. There are no minor offenses tried there, for the jurisdiction has been taken away from them so far as it applies to misdemeanors, except in whisky cases, as I have heretofore stated, which may be a misdemeanor or which may be a felony.

While I am on my feet I wish to say that I think the time has come when there should be legislation in regard to that Territory. I believe a Territorial government should be established within the Indian Territory; that a governor should be appointed, a legislature provided for, and that all the machinery of the Territorial government should be put in operation at the earliest date possible. But until that is done we will be compelled to retain that felony jurisdiction at Fort Smith and Paris with the courts there now. With the jurisdiction of misdemeanors that is placed upon them, if you also add the jurisdiction of felonies now at Fort Smith and Paris, it is not possible that the law can be enforced with the means at the command of the courts now in the Territory.

The Senator from Missouri said it was understood that a proposition is going to be made to extend the time when the jurisdiction shall be taken from Fort Smith and Paris. Unless there is legislation of another character, looking to the Territorializing of that government, it will be absolutely necessary that the time shall be extended. If you to-day take those courts and put upon them the additional jurisdiction now held by the Paris court and the Fort Smith court in felony cases it is not possible that the law can be enforced or that trials can be had for years to come. Those courts are already behind with the misdemeanor jurisdiction, and, as I have said, there are to-day in the jail at Fort Smith more than 200 desperadoes charged with felonies. There are no jails in the Territory in which to keep those felons. It is not possible in the present conditions that peace and order and quiet can be restored and kept there unless some radical action is taken changing the form of the government, or unless the courts at Paris and Fort Smith shall retain for the time being the felony jurisdiction.

So far as I am concerned, I would not vote to retain the jurisdiction at Fort Smith and Paris if the laws could be better enforced in the Territory; but until a Territorial government is created it is absolutely necessary for the protection of life and property. I have no desire or disposition to take one foot of land that belongs to the Indians. No Senator upon this floor, as I hope, wishes to wrong one of them in any way whatever. But the conditions which exist there all sensible men who live in that locality know can not be continued, and until Congress takes charge of it and legislates in the only way, as I believe, that will be effective, to establish a Territorial government, these expenses will continue, and these deputy marshals, not a dozen, not 40, but from 100 to 200, will be an absolute necessity.

I thought proper to put these statements upon the record because of the remarks that were made yesterday.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the subject of miscellaneous suits in the United States courts in the Indian Territory, and ask him whether he can give me any light on that subject. I am not prepared to criticise, from my own knowledge, the conduct of the criminal business in those courts, notwithstanding the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. As I said yesterday, I have had some complaints sent to me in connection with the expenses of the courts of the Indian Territory which I have been unwilling to bring in here without further examination. I have only the records of the Attorney-General's Office, which I have been able to examine cursorily, and I am now looking at the report of the miscellaneous suits in the report of the Attorney-General for the year 1895, pages 153, 154, 155. I will read the number of the suits in some of the States where they are the fewest: California, northern district, 10——

Mr. BERRY. What page is the Senator reading from?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am reading from page 153 of the Attorney-General's report.

California, northern district, 10; California, southern district, 11. The aggregate sued for in the northern district in the 10 suits is $15,242,451.93. I suppose that includes the suit against the Stanford estate. Connecticut, 3 suits, amounting to $1,000; District of Columbia, 1 suit, $287.44; Indiana, 18 suits, no amount given; Illinois, northern district, 28 suits, $12,666.58; Illinois, southern district, 7 suits. Maine—the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will notice—Maine has brought 6 miscellaneous suits; amount sued for, $4,500; Massachusetts, 35 suits, $5,486.28 sued for; New York, northern district, 39 suits; New York, western district, 18 suits; New York, southern district, 38 suits; Pennsylvania, eastern district, 28 suits; Pennsylvania, western district, 21 suits; Rhode Island, 16 suits, $18,931.30 sued for.

Now, I turn to the number of suits in the Indian Territory. Indian Territory, northern district, 428 suits; Indian Territory, central, 432 suits; Indian Territory, southern district, 419 suits.

Mr. President, that is something remarkable. Perhaps the Senator can give some explanation of it. There are other large numbers given. For instance, in western Arkansas there were 232 suits brought; in North Carolina, the western district, 567 suits were brought; in Oklahoma, which is a separate court, I suppose, from this Indian Territory court, 864 suits were brought; western Virginia, 242 suits. In all the other States the number of suits is comparatively limited, but the moment you strike Oklahoma you have this enormous number of 864 suits. In western North Carolina there were 567 suits. As Alabama was referred to, I will state the number in the districts of Alabama. Alabama, northern, 214; Alabama, middle, 177; Alabama, southern, 118. Now we come again to the Indian Territory, and there in the three districts we have 1,500 suits brought, probably about one-fourth of all the miscellaneous suits brought in behalf of the United States throughout the whole section of the country.

Mr. BERRY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire an answer?

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait one moment.

Mr. PLATT. I understand the figures which the Senator from New Hampshire is now reading do not include the Fort Smith cases, which go from the Indian Territory to Fort Smith, but only those cases which are brought in Arkansas.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, there are found in the western district of Arkansas 232 cases. I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas in a moment. I only want to ask him, in all good faith, whether he can account for this extraordinary number of suits brought in the Indian Territory, which, according to the same table of results reached, judgments rendered, judgments collected, seem to have been unproductive of any considerable amount of good to the Government, in whose behalf they were brought?

Mr. BERRY. The remarks that I made were principally with reference to the western district of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire understands that the court at Fort Smith is located on the border of the Territory; that it has jurisdiction over a certain part of the Indian Territory in felony cases and the remainder of the jurisdiction in felony cases in that Ter-

ritory is in Paris, Tex. It was with reference to that court that the remarks I made were in answer to the Senator from Missouri principally. However, I did make a statement showing the cost in the Indian Territory courts outside of the Fort Smith and Paris courts. There are three courts within the Indian Territory which have jurisdiction of misdemeanor cases and have civil jurisdiction also between parties where one of them is a white man and the other an Indian located within the Territory. They are different entirely from the western district of Arkansas; but the Arkansas court has the usual jurisdiction of United States courts in the western district of Arkansas, and then has, in addition, this felony jurisdiction within the Indian Territory. Now, as to what is intended by using the words "miscellaneous suits" by the Attorney-General, my attention has not been called to it before, but I imagine that they refer to the civil suits pending between various parties in those courts, because those courts have the same jurisdiction between Indians and white persons in the Territory that the State courts have in New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that these are suits in behalf of the United States.

Mr. BERRY. It does not so state.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will examine he will see that no judgment was rendered in any one of the Indian cases, either for or against the United States, but I imagine that those in the western district of Arkansas refer to trespasses upon the public lands, as cutting timber where it was not authorized, in the State of Arkansas. There may be some of them that refer to some suits for violation of the revenue laws. I do not know about that, but from the fact that Oklahoma has 800 cases, I would imagine if you will investigate it you will find it includes the civil jurisdiction that is reported under these miscellaneous judgments. I know nothing about Oklahoma except in the general way the Senator knows it; but if there are 800 cases there, I imagine that it applies to the Territorial jurisdiction given to those courts which is generally given in the States to State courts. The Senator can investigate that for himself. I do not know of any extraordinary number of suits that could be brought in the Indian Territory by or against the United States except it might be suits on forfeited bonds, or something of that character, or some violation of the revenue laws in some way which I do not know about. The Senator has the same information about that that I have. In looking at that report, where the columns run up in the judgments rendered or dispensed with or disposed of, the Senator will see there is nothing said in regard to the Indian Territory.

Mr. CHANDLER. My belief is that those are all United States suits, and of course I thought the Senator from Arkansas might know how we could account for 1,300 of those suits in the three Indian Territory districts, and how we could account for the 800 in the Oklahoma district. Whether they are suits inter partes or whether they are United States suits, of course there is an expense connected with them; and the question at once arises whether litigation is not being increased and lawsuits multiplied there for the purpose, may it not be fairly suspected, of increasing fees and costs, notwithstanding the burden that is thereby imposed upon the United States Treasury?

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me one moment? In regard to these civil suits, if it refers to civil suits, and I take it it does, these courts have the same jurisdiction that your State court in New Hampshire has between citizens of your own State, because this is a Territorial court, and where one of the parties is an Indian and the other a white man suits are brought in these courts. Whether these are civil suits or a suit by the United States I do not know, but if they are United States cases I can not imagine where 800 would come from in the Territory of Oklahoma.

Now, one other word in regard to the purpose of the marshal and the district attorney in trying to increase their fees. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will give me his attention. That conclusion may not be inferred. I have already stated to the Senator that inside of that Territory the marshals and their deputies are on a salary. It is a fixed amount, and no profit could come to them by reason of trying to get up cases. Upon the contrary, I was informed in the Attorney-General's Office this morning that since they have been put on a salary many of them fail to execute the law because they get the same amount whether they ride or whether they do not.

Now, in regard to the Fort Smith court. They are under the fee system; but neither the marshal nor the district attorney could have any reason there to try to increase the suits for the reason that the maximum sum which they can receive as compensation is $6,000, and you will see that the fees in each case amount to more than $10,000. It has never failed to come up to the maximum sum. It is not necessary to hunt business to bring it up to $6,000. It runs over it always, and has done so for years. The fees in both cases during the fiscal year ending in 1895 for the district attorney and the marshal amount to more than $10,000, though of course under the law they could only retain the $6,000, and the balance was covered into the Treasury.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have been requested by the officer attached to the courts of the southern district of Florida to say a word upon this subject. The judge of that court has gained the confidence and respect of the people of that State. He is a Republican and has been an incumbent of the office for many years, and he is regarded with very high respect and esteem as a man of integrity, of learning, and an able judge. The marshal and the district attorney are men of very high character. Against none of those officers can there be any kind of imputation by suggesting that they have by any indirect methods sought to increase their legitimate compensation. They are very desirous of the passage of a law making these offices salaried offices and giving to them a reasonable compensation.

In that State, where the distances are very great and the commissioners necessarily live at a very great distance from each other, the expenses of even a small number of criminal cases are necessarily very large, and while this can not be avoided in any other manner than by their changing the character of the commissioners who are appointed, or diminishing their numbers, or limiting their jurisdiction, the fault is not to be found with the presiding judge or with the marshal or district attorney, but in the law itself. The marshal has no power of issuing a warrant. It must come from the commissioner and upon cause, and the number of cases which the jurisdiction of the court is extended to must be diminished if you wish to reduce the cost which is incurred in the discretion of this commissioner.

But, Mr. President, I hope that this subject will be brought to the consideration of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate, and that immediately and without delay in those districts where it can be done advantageously to the Government salaries may be provided for the officers and the fee system dispensed with. I am authorized to say that this is the universal sentiment of the courts and officers connected with them in the State of Florida. That is the information which I have, and I have been urged to bring the subject to the consideration of the Senate and urge its immediate and favorable action.

Upon the general subject of the increase of judicial expenses I have here a petition sent to me from southern California by Mr. Blanton Duncan, a citizen and lawyer of ability, which contains within it the decretal order of a judge—Judge Ross, of southern California—granting an injunction against the railroad employees of the Southern California Railroad Company, commanding them to continue in the performance of their contracted work or duty as stated by him, and imposing pains and penalties for refusing to work for the corporation. I will not detain the Senate to read it, but will print a few lines from it. There was a service of this order upon three citizens of the State of Illinois by telegraph to the marshal of Illinois, and as I understand this statement it embraced all the employees of the Railway Union in that region of the country, numbering a great many thousand.

The order of injunction is as follows:

> And each of you and each of your agents, servants, and assistants, while remaining in the employment of the Southern California Railway Company are hereby enjoined and restrained from refusing to switch, handle, or assist in switching or hauling any cars or train of cars belonging to or in possession of or under control of the said Southern California Railway Company.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Your affiant states that subsequently the said Ross delivered a charge to the grand jury, as follows [Exhibit 4], and that this judge instructed the filing of proceedings in this district against three citizens of Chicago in the name of the United States and had service made upon them by telegraph to the marshal of Illinois, as follows [Exhibit 5], a usurpation of power never before known by affiant, the members of the American Railway Union, as affiant is informed, numbering many thousands, and resident in about thirty States of the Union, and none of their names being given except three. [Exhibit 5.]

Now, if there be no restraint upon an exercise of this kind of judicial power, saying nothing whatever in regard to its expediency, its constitutionality, or its lawfulness—I say if there be no restraint upon the exercise of this power, which is nothing more than the old lettres de câchet existing in France previous to the revolution, the expenses of the judicial tribunals of the United States will amount to many, many times more than they do now. They will increase up to the amount necessary to sustain even a standing army of employees. Injunctions addressed to a hundred thousand men, and embracing within their scope action encouraging their fellows in certain lines of duty or of conduct, illegal or legal, whichever it may be, will increase the expenses of these tribunals until there will be no satisfying them by appropriations.

But the Senator from New Hampshire must of necessity be wrong, because whatever jurisdiction the courts exercise, the number of cases which come before them can not be estimated. They are exceptional; they arise from exceptional circumstances; and the judge, who is the presiding officer charged with the supervision of these accounts, can alone exercise a just supervision over them, and even he is not enabled to do it, because the com-

missioners having authority to issue these warrants can not submit each case to him, nor can he, when the law is complied with and an affidavit made of the commission of an offense, say to the commissioner, "You shall not take cognizance of this case for which probable cause is alleged before you." Therefore you can have no reliance except in diminishing the jurisdiction of the court and diminishing the number of criminal offenses.

For myself I am free to say that the jurisdiction of all courts is too greatly extended to minor offenses, which ought not to become matters of judicial cognizance. The good morals and good order of a community are not increased by creating a jurisdiction over every small immorality or offense. It is better to leave these to public opinion, to the ministers of religion, and to the great agency of the sound and correct judgment and thought of the people. Therefore you have only two methods by which you can accomplish this reduction of expense, either by diminishing the numqer of cases of a trivial character over which the courts have jurisdiction or by elevating the character of the officers before whom these offenses come for the original issue of warrant and process.

This much, Mr. President, I desired to say.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is most astonishing that we can not discuss any change in the laws of the land without bringing in the defense of individual officers. In what I said yesterday I did not think of any particular official nor did I intend to make any personal charge against anybody. I spoke of the system. If we are not permitted to discuss the laws of the country and the system established by law, then our functions ought to stop. I have not spoken of any particular marshal or any particular judge. The marshals and the judges of the two districts in Missouri are my personal and political friends, and I was not thinking about them nor about any particular marshals. I do not know who the officials at Fort Smith are, nor do I care. I know, I believe, two of the judges and one of the district attorneys in the Indian Territory, but the remainder of them I know nothing about.

But you can not change men. Their motives will remain the same until the millennium. If you give them inducements to put money into their pockets, those opportunities will be embraced. I do not mean to say that the head officers will do so, but that the subordinates will; and I affirm here again—and every lawyer who practices in the Federal courts knows it—that around these tribunals and around the marshal's office and around the commissioner's office are a gang of hangers-on waiting for jobs to take prisoners to the penitentiary and to the jail, semidetectives, who go out and hunt up these miserable, trivial, little offenses, such as cutting timber on the public lands, selling a pint of whisky without license, infractions of the internal-revenue laws, and dragging innocent and ignorant men hundreds of miles and taking from them all they have. That is what I complain of, and I shall continue to do so as long as I remain a member of this body.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] that the crying evil of the Indian Territory is that we do not change the autonomy of their government. The time has come when the United States, as a matter of self-preservation, must take charge of that Territory and break up the tribal relations of the Indians. It is absolutely necessary to the peace and tranquillity and welfare of the whole country, and especially of the States lying immediately contiguous to that Territory. This is so well known that it is not necessary to do anything else than to refer to the Dawes report, which gives a picture of lawlessness and of bad government unparalleled in the history of the United States. Yet there are lobbies here fighting any reform, any change, and demanding that the existing state of things shall continue. We shall never get rid of these evils until we change the government there.

I have myself always opposed these outside courts. I have opposed them, not so much upon the ground of expense—although that is bad enough—as on account of the effect upon the Indians themselves. We claim to be the great exemplars of civilization and Christianity and law; we advocate trial by jury, that every man shall be tried by a jury of his peers, and a republican form of government for the people. Do you expect to make these Indians respect our civilization by dragging them away from their Territory and trying them before juries that have no sympathy, no like opinions, no habits the same? Can we teach them Christianity and law by any such mode as that? Yet we drag them down to Fort Smith and to Paris, Tex., hundreds of miles, and we try them by tribunals where all the tracks go in and none come out.

They do not think it is any hanging at all at Fort Smith unless a half dozen to a dozen are hung. The last I heard of the executioner there he kept his tally on death; he had reached 98, and he hoped to make it an even hundred. Any such system as that ought to be denounced. I do not know the officers. I have very slight acquaintance with the judge there, who formerly lived in the State of Missouri, but I do know that that court, and the records show it—I have not looked at the Attorney-General's report this year, for I have not had the time—but I do know heretofore that that court at Fort Smith has cost more than the courts in the southern district of New York, embracing the cities of New York and Brooklyn.

The expenses that have come from the fees of the marshals constitute one of the smallest of these details of expense. It is in the witnesses; it is in the general expenses that come from the system that has obtained. When you make it to the interest of a deputy marshal to arrest some poor devil and drag him off to jail, the commissioner gets his fees, the clerk gets his fees, the hotels participate in the plunder, and the saloons, and all these combine to make a system that is obnoxious to free institutions and to the administration of justice as it should be.

I repeat, I have always opposed these outside courts. Finally, I am glad to say, I was enabled to do something toward bringing out a compromise by which these outside jurisdictions are to be terminated in a few months from this time; and I want to say now, whenever the proposition comes here to renew that jurisdiction, if I am a member of this body, I shall oppose it to the full extent of my power. It is wrong in principle; it is odious in practice; it increases the expense. I do not care how honest those officers may be—I have nothing to say about that—the whole fee system that puts a premium upon arrests for misdemeanors is wrong and vicious. It says to the officer—and we know the character of these officers; they can not be men in the higher walks of life; they are semidetectives—"Arrest this man and it puts money in your pocket, and it puts money in other people's pockets." We have to-day all over the country, and especially in the West and South, glaring instances of individual wrong, a narrative of which would almost excite consternation in this Chamber and among all reflecting people.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] asked information about these miscellaneous suits. I will tell him what they are. Those are suits by the United States Government against trespassers on the public lands and for violations of the internal-revenue laws.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator tell me what trespass there can be on the public lands in the Indian Territory, where the Government owns no land? The suits in the Indian Territory can not be suits for trespass. My attention was never called to them until the Senator from New Hampshire named them, but I am confident those suits can not be on that account, because the Indian land there does not belong to the Government.

Mr. PLATT. I will venture to suggest that most of them will be found to be prosecutions upon bonds which have been forfeited, where persons have been arrested, or for the collection of a penalty for the violation of a statute, which is to be recovered by a suit rather than by prosecution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas will allow me a moment, since this subject has arisen I have looked at the report of the Attorney-General with care, and on page 145 he says the contents of the tables which he enumerates embrace suits in which the United States is a party, or is interested, and not embraced in the other classes; and on page 153 is Table No. 6, report of miscellaneous suits, from which I have read. So these 1,300 suits in the Indian Territory are United States suits.

Mr. BERRY. I am certain that they are not, and that it is a mistake. I shall see the Attorney-General, however, and ascertain.

If the Senator will permit me one other word, I have nothing to say in regard to the statement of the Senator from Missouri as to the Fort Smith court, and that he will oppose it, etc. That is his right, in case there should be an attempt to have it extended. The Senator says it is indefensible because of the small suits which are instituted in order to make fees for the officials.

Mr. VEST. I will not say that about the court at Fort Smith. I spoke generally. I know very well what the jurisdiction of that court is, as I had something to do with framing the law; but the great evil at Fort Smith is in the expense attending the fees of witnesses. I can show the Senator one case there in which the fees of witnesses and the court expenses amounted to more than $12,000.

Mr. BERRY. That was at Paris.

Mr. VEST. At Paris, then. It is the same character of jurisdiction. One court is at Paris, Tex., and the other at Fort Smith. People were dragged from the State of Kansas and from the northern portion of the Indian Territory and kept for weeks and months, until the fees amounted to the enormous sum which I have named. The United States is a party to those suits, as the title of them shows in the table which was cited by the Senator from New Hampshire.

I have no doubt, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] suggests, that a great many of those suits were for forfeitures upon bonds. I do not mean to say that they were for trespasses upon lands in the Indian Territory, but I have no doubt that a

great many of the suits in Oklahoma are for trespasses upon the public lands; for that is a favorite mode of extorting money from ignorant persons who do not know where the lines are and get upon Government lands. They are seized by a detective, carried before a commissioner, dragged off to jail, and made to give up all they have got in order to secure their liberty.

In North Carolina I have no doubt that a great many are prosecutions for what is called moonshining, and forfeitures upon bonds given by persons who are arrested under the excise laws of the United States; but all the United States suits in that table belong to the same class; they are misdemeanors, trivial offenses. It is that class of cruelty and oppression and outrage of which I complain in the name of the poorer classes of the people of this country. Because a man happens to have gone across the line to get two or three sticks of timber on Government land, to drag him hundreds of miles away from his family, incarcerate him in jail, and then turn him loose, broken possibly in health, and certainly broken in fortune, is a cruelty which can be defended by nobody, and to cite the high character of United States marshals does not answer my objection. The courts are compelled to use these deputies.

The Senator from Arkansas tells us that the salary system has not saved money in the Indian Territory. I have not examined it, but I have no doubt his statement is true. When, however, we consider the salary system and the fee system, it requires no argument and but little inquiry to show that the difference is in favor of the salary system. By its adoption you do away with the incentive, the temptation to oppression, and that is worth everything else in a free government, such as ours is supposed to be. The personal liberty of the citizen is worth everything else to him, and any system which permits a deputy marshal to seize a man, drag him before a commissioner, and then drag him off to jail for a miserable little misdemeanor like this is wrong, and must be odious to all right-thinking people. I attack the fee system as to United States marshals, clerks, and district attorneys. It is wrong in principle, it is outrageous in practice, and the people of this country and all intelligent lawyers who have watched the practice under it must come to the conclusion that it ought to be done away with.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have become a convert to the opinion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] in regard to the system of compensating marshals throughout the country generally by salaries, instead of fees. I have always favored having the district attorneys and clerks paid by salaries, and not by fees; but there is a difficulty in the case of marshals. You are not going to get a man to go out at the risk of his life to arrest a buccaneering expedition; you are not going to get him to go out at the risk of his life to hunt up unlawful distilleries where he may have a bullet come from a thicket as he rides along, and you are not going to have a man watch against smuggling on a cold winter night on the New England coast, where he is in great personal danger, or, at any rate, is to suffer very much, on a salary where he gets just as much if he does not perform that duty as if he does. At the same time the evil, which the Senator from Missouri has so graphically and so frequently depicted, exists, and is the subject of great complaint all over the country. I think the opinion of the intelligent men who watch the workings of United States courts is that between the evil which I have imperfectly and briefly suggested and the evils pointed out by the Senator from Missouri in general there will be less public evil by having the salary system for the marshal and his principal deputies. At any rate, it is best to try it for a time, and I hope the bill providing for it will be laid before the Senate very soon.

But as to the Indian Territory, I think almost all the persons who have carefully examined that think it must be made an exception to the general rule. I believe that is the opinion of the Department of Justice. The present head of the Department of Justice and his predecessor have been very zealously in favor of the general reform, and the judges in the Indian Territory, I think, all agree that in the outlying, sparsely settled parts of that Territory you can not on a salary support marshals who will be ready for all emergencies. At the same time, certainly in the present lawless and disturbed condition there, you must have some officials representing the United States and ready instantly and promptly to interfere in case of any violation of the law. The only way you can do that will be to have, in addition to the regular force of officers of the court, a few deputies who shall be compensated by fees, endeavoring to have a maximum that they shall not go beyond, which will not be likely to exceed what the necessary exercise of their authority will require. So this evil will be prevented, so far as may be, by a strict and rigid maximum to which they may be confined in their revenues in any one year or in any one month. I think the Senator from Missouri will himself be of the opinion, on going thoroughly into the condition of things in the Indian Territory, that we must have a few deputies there paid by fees.

Mr. CALL. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that there are many judicial districts where the compensation is paid in fees, where the officers act with strict integrity and fairness, and without straining the law, and those fees are insufficient to compensate a man of valuable qualities for the service. I refer to the State of Florida. The fees there, where the law is administered without harshness and without interfering with the just rights of the people, are not sufficient to compensate men of the character that the courts must have to rely upon to fairly execute the law.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Chair what amendment is now under consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, after line 18, it is proposed to add:

For payment of fees and expenses of the United States marshals and deputies, fiscal year 1895, $230,573.34.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Maine to an amendment which is proposed by the Senate committee. As I understand, the committee proposes to add $230,573.34 to the House item for fees of marshals and deputies for a deficiency for the year 1895. That, then, is undoubtedly an appropriation for audited accounts for that year.

The Senator on yesterday was understood to say that the whole appropriation inserted by the House of Representatives of $960,000 was for audited accounts already rendered, for work already done and expenditures already made. The Senator said that, but I think he overlooked the proviso in the appropriation which I shall now read:

For payment of the fees and expenses of the United States marshals and deputies, $960,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding $500,000 of this appropriation may be advanced to marshals, to be accounted for in the usual way, the residue to remain in the Treasury, to be used, if at all, only in the payment of the accounts of marshals in the manner provided in section 856, Revised Statutes.

I understand from that clause that $500,000 is to be advanced to the marshals and is not already expended. Bills for $460,000, or substantially that amount, have already been incurred, and $460,000 will pay those bills to the marshals by Treasury certificates in the manner provided in section 856 of the Revised Statutes.

Now, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the estimates for the marshals' fees for the whole year ending June 30, 1896, are only $1,400,000. The committee proposes to appropriate $675,000. If the committee had appropriated the whole amount estimated for they would only have appropriated $725,000, which would have made $1,400,000, the full estimate. The House of Representatives has appropriated $725,000, which would make the total amount originally asked for $960,000, and I understood the Senator to say that in his belief there would undoubtedly be a further deficiency appropriation asked for before the close of this session. Now I venture to ask the Senator, why not make this appropriation $725,000 instead of $960,000? The Senator proposes to appropriate $230,573.34 for the bills in arrears for 1895. Why, then, not limit the appropriation at this time for the present fiscal year to $725,000 instead of $960,000, as proposed by the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I give notice that I shall move at some later stage to reduce the appropriation of $960,000 to $725,000, which was the original estimate.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 19, line 3, after the date "1895," to strike out "$57,639.22," and insert "$72,461.07," so as to make the clause read:

For 1895, $72,461.07.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 10, after the date "1895," to strike out "$38,898.35," and insert "$58,513.87," so as to make the clause read:

For 1895, $58,513.87.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 21, after the date "1895," to strike out "$71,934.28," and insert "$75,836.93," so as to make the clause read:

For 1895, $75,836.93.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a word about these commissioners' fees. The amount asked for the present year was $290,000. The regular appropriation was only $100,000, which was, of course, a deliberate, but arbitrary, cutting down of the estimate. The House of Representatives have provided as a deficiency for $240,000, making $340,000 at least to be expended, when only $290,000 is estimated for, with a probable deficit in the future. I call attention to the vigorously expressed opinion of the present Attorney-General on page 6 of his report in reference to the commissioners:

There is now no limit to the number of commissioners which the courts may appoint. In some places more seem to have been appointed than are

required, and many of them appear to think that appointment entitles them to a living support from the Government. The number of commissioners ought to be limited at all events.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 20, after line 3, to insert:

For fees of jurors, fiscal year 1895, $103.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 7, to insert:

For fees of witnesses, fiscal year 1895, $30,722.38.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 11, on page 22.

Mr. CHANDLER. This appropriation, I think, requires some explanation. It is an appropriation to pay money of the United States for taking care of property in the hands of receivers in United States courts. I ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to tell me, if he knows, how much has hitherto been appropriated, in addition to the proposed deficiency appropriation, for such expenditures for protecting property in the hands of receivers?

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from New Hampshire will let this item be passed over for a moment, I will have the original provision hunted up, and we will go back to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 22, after line 11, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, UNITED STATES COURTS.

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suit, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," certified to Congress at its present session by the Attorney-General in House Document No. 157, which have not been appealed, $22,866.25, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made: *Provided*, That none of the judgments herein provided for shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress at its present session in Senate Document No. 70, $441,104.80: *Provided*, That none of the judgments herein provided for shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is a very large portion of the addition made by the committee to the bill as it comes from the other House. The report to which I alluded yesterday, Senate Document No. 70, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, being a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, shows that nearly all the judgments which are to be paid are those on account of extra pay for letter carriers. At the close of the document there is this large judgment:

Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company, December 8, 1890, $95,004.36.

It was presented for payment December 10, 1890, the claim being for patent devices for converting muzzle-loading into breech-loading firearms. There appears to be included "interest on this judgment from December 10, 1890, to March 4, 1895, at 4 per cent (26 Stat. L., page 537)."

I desire to ask the Senator from Maine whether he knows anything more in reference to this judgment than what is contained in the document I have here, and why there has been this delay in the payment until the sum of $16,000 in interest has accumulated on it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has the papers in the case, and he is not at present in his seat. I can only say that it was a suit of importance, involving some hundred thousand dollars. It took a long time in consideration and went up to the final court. The committee has put in enough to cover interest at the rate of 4 per cent, which is the rule in all judgments, and I suppose the amount—I did not figure it myself—is cast properly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to know whether the delay in payment has been on account of any idea that the judgment ought not to be paid or whether it is interest on the sum during an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ALLISON entered the Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. I see the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is now present.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Iowa has the papers.

Mr. CHANDLER. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that there has been some five years' delay in paying the Berdan judgment, during which time there has accumulated interest to the extent of $16,075.26. I ask the Senator from Iowa whether the delay has been on account of any suspicion that the judgment ought not to be paid or whether it has been on account of an appeal to the Supreme Court? What has been the condition of the case since 1890, when the judgment was rendered?

Mr. ALLISON. This is a case where General Berdan sued the Government for the use of two or three very important patents. It was very closely contested before the Court of Claims, and judgment was rendered, I believe, in 1890 or 1891. The case was appealed by both parties to the Supreme Court, neither being satisfied with the judgment of the Court of Claims. The final judgment of the Supreme Court, I think, was rendered as late as May, 1895; certainly after the 4th of March, when the last Congress expired. So, of course, the judgment drew interest during the pendency of the litigation after the judgment of the Court of Claims. That accounts for the large amount of interest which appears here.

Mr. CHANDLER. The payment which the committee now propose shall be made is only after a final judgment by direction of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. ALLISON. After final judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, rendered, I think, in May, 1895, or possibly in April, 1895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 23, after line 9, to insert:

LEGISLATIVE.

BUILDING FOR THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

For completion of the building for the Library of Congress and for each and every purpose connected with the same, $480,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after the amendment just agreed to, to insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ three additional assistants, at the rate of $75 a month each, for the remainder of the fiscal year 1896, $1,125, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after the amendment just agreed to, to insert:

SENATE.

For compensation and mileage of Senators, $5,000.
For salaries of officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, $6,000.
For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $10,000.
For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1895, $2,392.29.
For fuel, oil, and cotton waste, and advertising, for the heating apparatus, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1894, $5.42.
For purchase of furniture, $2,500.
For repairs of furniture, fiscal year 1895, $35.23.
For services in cleaning, repairing, and varnishing furniture, $1,500.
For repairs to Maltby Building, fiscal year 1895, $10.75.
For amount due the Washington Gas Light Company, for coke, fiscal year 1894, $29.52.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to state to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] that I telephoned to the Department of Justice to know what the 800 suits in Oklahoma, contained in the table on page 153 and following, and the 1,200 cases in the Indian Territory referred to. He said they were criminal cases, misdemeanor cases, including some forty or fifty suits on bond.

Mr. CHANDLER. But United States cases in every instance.

Mr. HALE. The reading of the bill having been concluded, there are certain amendments which I desire to offer. On page 13, after line 9, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: For additional amount for coaling shed, $4,000, and the appropriation of $10,000 for this object made by the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1895 is hereby continued available for the same purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 13, after line 12, I move to insert:

Increase of the Navy equipment: Toward the completion of the equipment outfit of the new vessels heretofore authorized by Congress, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 15, after line 8, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. After line 8, on page 15, it is proposed to insert:

Commission, Puyallup Reservation; reimbursable: For continuing the work of the Puyallup Commission, appointed under the act of March 3, 1893 (26 Statutes at Large, 612), to select and appraise such portions of the allotted lands within the Puyallup Indian Reservation, Wash., as are not required for homes for the Indian allottees; and also that part of the agency tract, exclusive of the burial ground, not needed for school purposes, and for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said commission, the sum of $10,000, to be available until expended, and to be reimbursed to the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of the agency tract and allotted lands, as provided in said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 15, after line 14, I move to insert:

To pay the audited claim of Alonzo Gesner, United States deputy surveyor, for surveying the public lands in Oregon under contract numbered 608, dated April 17, 1893, $3,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Following the amendment just adopted, I move to insert:

To pay the audited claim of C. Clifford Stevenson and David O. Stevenson for surveying public lands, fiscal year 1893, $3,298.27.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Following the amendment just agreed to, I move to insert:

To pay the audited claim of F. W. Pettigrew, United States deputy surveyor, for surveying public lands, fiscal year 1893, $298.21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 16, after line 25, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. After line 25, page 16, it is proposed to insert:

Miscellaneous:

Defending suits in claims against the United States: For defraying the necessary expenses incurred in the examination of witnesses and procuring of evidence in the matter of claims against the United States, and in defending suits in the Court of Claims, including the payment of such expenses as in the discretion of the Attorney-General shall be necessary, and for making proper defense for the United States in the matter of French spoliation claims, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 22, after line 5, I move to insert:

For payment of services and expenses of special assistants to the Attorney-General in cases appealed from the Court of Private Land Claims to the Supreme Court, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 23, line 6, after the words "document numbered seventy," I move to insert "and ninety-nine," so as to read: "In Senate document numbered seventy and ninety-nine." It is another document.

Mr. CHANDLER. The amount is not changed?

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. And the word "document" in the same line should be changed to "documents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That change will be made.

Mr. HALE. In line 7, page 23, I move to strike out "one hundred and four" and insert "eight hundred and ninety-one"; so as to read: "$441,891.80."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I believe those are all the committee amendments.

Mr. QUAY. If the committee amendments have been gone through with, I desire to offer an amendment, to come in on page 16, between lines 4 and 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 4, on page 16, it is proposed to insert:

That the Auditor of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and required to state the account of Col. A. Wilson Norris, late pension agent at Philadelphia, and the balance found due shall be paid to Mrs. Mertie M. Norris, widow of the said A. Wilson Norris, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. After line 14, on page 3, I move to insert:

For payment of cost of transportation furnished by certain railway companies in connection with the failure of the scheme for the colonization of negroes in Mexico, necessitating their return to their homes in Alabama, as reported to Congress at its present session by the President in House Document No. 169, $5,087.09.

This amendment is proposed in pursuance of House Document No. 169, which is a message of the President asking Congress to appropriate this sum of money. Accompanying the message of the President is all the correspondence relating to the matter, the substance of which is that a number of colored people were induced under contract to migrate to Mexico, and did so migrate. Many of them died and others were in a starving condition. The Government was appealed to to give them aid. After a great deal of correspondence in various ways between the State Department and the consul in Durango, the President of the United States, on the 26th day of July, 1895, addressed a telegram from Buzzards Bay to the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Adee, as follows:

War Department will issue rations for one week, and in the meantime, if return to the colony is not practicable or consistent with humane considerations, let the consul assure the railroad company that payment for transportation of sufferers to their homes will be strongly recommended to next Congress, and probably allowed, and if such assurance will not accomplish the purpose, every possible effort must be made to pay for such transportation from emergency fund or some other fund in the State or Treasury Department.

In pursuance of that telegram from the President, the Acting Secretary of State made various efforts to secure the transportation of these colored citizens from the State of Durango to their old home in Alabama. There are several railroads that performed this work at the uniform rate of 1 cent per mile, except that a railway in Mexico, the Mexican International Railway Company, transported these people over their lines at about three-fourths of a cent per mile in our money, amounting perhaps to twice that sum in Mexico.

The matter was called to the attention of the committee after the pending bill had been reported. The Senator from Maine in charge of the bill, finding a long document on the subject, asked me to look into it, which I did. I am satisfied that this money should be paid. I think there is a special claim for its early consideration owing to the fact that the railway companies transported these poor people at the rate of 1 cent per mile on the faith of the Secretary of State that they would be reimbursed. I think it is not a matter that we can very well afford to delay.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to offer an amendment. On page 16, after the amendment already adopted, I move to insert:

Eleventh Census: For salaries, rents, and necessary expenses in continuing the work of compiling the results of the Eleventh Census, to continue available until exhausted, $15,000.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Superintendent of Census, dated January 18, 1896, to the Secretary of the Interior, requesting this appropriation to be made, and also a letter from the Commissioner of Labor, in charge of the Census, to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], dated February 3, 1896, stating the importance of having the appropriation made at this time. It is the intention of the Commissioner of Labor, in charge of the Census, to finish all the work of the census before the end of the present fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION,
Washington, January 18, 1896.

SIR: I respectfully ask you to recommend that the amount of $15,000 be incorporated in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the use of this division, for the following reasons, to wit: There has been deducted at the Treasury Department from funds to our credit the sum of $3,923.49, and applied to the payment of railroad transportation of special agents of the Census Bureau over subsidized roads. These claims are five and six years old, and it was supposed had long since been settled. I was totally unaware of their existence, and their payment was not anticipated.

There will also be presented for payment a claim of about $1,300 for telegraphic service, due the Postal Telegraph Company. This claim was not anticipated. The company declined to accept what was known as the "Wanamaker rates," and said claim has been in abeyance for several years, unknown to this office.

I also beg to say that it will take the sum of $10,000 to finish putting the census schedules in perfect condition. Whether bound or not, this work is necessary to be done. When finished, as I have before stated, I do not think it will be necessary to bind them, thus saving about $30,000 to the Government.

I see no reason for asking for any further appropriation for the completion of the Eleventh Census, as I think the amount now to the credit of the Census Office will enable us to complete all the clerical work.

Very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in charge.

The Honorable THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION,
Washington, February 3, 1896.

MY DEAR SIR: A member of your Committee on the Census has called my attention to objections to the amendment submitted in the Senate January 21, 1896, by Senator CHANDLER; the bill H. R. 4321 being bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies, etc., this amendment by Senator CHANDLER covering $15,000 for the Eleventh Census.

Of this sum which we now stand in need, $3,923.49 is to be applied to the payment of railroad transportation on subsidized roads. The claims amounting to this sum are five and six years old, and were, as I supposed, long since settled. I was totally unaware of their existence, and their payment was not anticipated in any recent appropriation. The sum of $1,300 is for telegraphic service due the Postal Telegraph Company, a claim that was not anticipated. It comes under what was known as the "Wanamaker rates," and has been in abeyance for several years, a matter unknown to me. These claims have now been charged to us, reducing the appropriation to our credit for clerical and other work.

The balance of the money called for is for the purpose of putting the census schedules into perfect condition for permanent preservation. This work was provided for last year and the sum of $10,000 added to an appropriation for that purpose, but with the understanding that it might not be sufficient. It proves not to be and is practically exhausted, so that this work will have to be suspended unless provided for at once. With the provision asked for in the amendment this feature of the census work can be completed by the 31st of March. Should it be delayed for the general deficiency bill we should be obliged to suspend this work, discharge the clerks now familiar with it, and then take it up again in the middle of the summer. I submit that this would entail a loss and a delay in closing the work of the Eleventh Census.

The balance of appropriations for clerical work heretofore made is now $25,000, and is, I believe, ample for all clerical work in completing the small amount of copy not yet sent to the printer. To draw on this small balance, however, for putting the schedules into permanent condition would leave us in such shape that before the general deficiency bill could be passed all the work would have to be suspended. I sincerely trust, therefore, that Senator CHANDLER'S amendment will be inserted in the pending urgent deficiency bill, for it is entirely in the interest of efficiency and the early completion of the census work.

I am, very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor in charge.

Hon. EUGENE HALE,
Chairman Subcommittee on Deficiencies,
United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. After line 2, on page 11, I move to insert:

Five hundred dollars, to be expended under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, to open Jupiter Inlet, in Florida, for the passage of boats and small vessels; to be immediately available.

I will state that this is an emergency amendment. It has been submitted to the members of the Committee on Commerce and

approved by them and by the Department. The necessity for the appropriation arises from a late storm, which has filled up the passage into Indian River from Jupiter Inlet and prevented access to the light-houses which are necessary to be maintained there. It has the approval of everybody.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. I propose an amendment, to come in on page 10, line 22, after the word "park." I move to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no monuments or memorials shall be erected upon any lands of the park or remain upon any lands which may be purchased for the park, except upon ground actually occupied in the course of the battle by troops of the State which the proposed monuments are intended to commemorate, except upon those sections of the park set apart for memorials to troops which were engaged in the campaigns, but operated outside of the legal limits of the park; and the regulations of the commissioners of the park, as approved by the Secretary of War, promulgated December 14, 1895, are hereby affirmed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to offer an amendment to come in after line 12, page 13. After the amendment already adopted at that point I move to insert:

Award of Secretary of the Navy: For payment to the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works its audited and adjusted claim for damages and losses incurred in the construction of the armored battle ship *Texas*, $80,049.35.

Mr. HALE. That is a large sum. Does the amendment come from any committee?

Mr. DANIEL. It is an estimate of the Secretary of the Navy of his award. I submitted it to the subcommittee which had charge of the pending bill. I am informed that there is no objection to the item, except as to the question whether it should go upon this bill or another. It has been examined carefully.

Mr. HALE. I wish to state that the committee did not consider that this was of such an urgent nature as to require its embodiment in the pending bill, but it considered that it was proper for the consideration of the next deficiency appropriation bill, which will not be very far off. Therefore, I can say to the Senator from Virginia that, it being a regularly audited claim, I have no doubt it will be incorporated in that bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia whether it has been passed upon by any committee of the Senate at the present session.

Mr. DANIEL. It has been examined by the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It was reported to the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the members of the Committee on Appropriations indorse this one, that is one thing. If they do not, and no other committee of this body has passed upon so large a claim as it is, I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that it will be impossible to get it through. I received a letter this morning about this claim calling my attention to it, and whatever I may think of the merits of the proposition when it comes up for consideration I shall certainly object to its adoption until it has the sanction, the explicit sanction, of some committee of this body.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Virginia will withdraw it as an amendment to this bill——

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to make a brief statement on the subject.

Mr. HALE. He will then have an opportunity of getting what the Senator from New Hampshire suggests, the report of the committee in addition to what it has already done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Maine to make a point against the amendment?

Mr. HALE. I do not. I do not think I will need to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to make a brief statement about the amendment I have proposed. This is a large sum, and it is all the more important that it should be paid to a plant which is engaged in active business and which has been delayed in its work for two or three years owing to the failure to receive money needed in current transactions. A denial of the prompt payment of a sum recognized to be due by the Government, which has been fully audited, is a species of repudiation which inflicts great hardship upon those who have to stand waiting for those funds which are necessary as a part of their capital to the successful operation of great business affairs.

The Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works is a comparatively new enterprise. It takes a vast amount of capital to establish a plant which can take a contract for such work as is needed in the construction of our ironclad ships; and in the commercial stringency which has existed for several years to be kept out of their money, as they have large transactions to keep up with, and when it is difficult to get accommodations to so large a degree in bank, is equivalent to putting a very serious impediment upon their success. If there were the slightest doubt as to the validity of this claim, if any thought were suggested which called in question any item of the claim, if there were anything to be examined that anyone seriously thought ought to be examined, I would think, of course, that opportunity should be given for that purpose, and I would not wish that in the slightest degree there should be undue haste or lack of scrutiny in passing upon it.

This is an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. This is an urgent claim, and it is of that kind which ought to be put on an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Some deficiencies are of such a character that it makes no great difference whether the amount be paid to-day or to-morrow, but this is a matter which has arisen out of the action of the Government in delaying for nearly two years the work which had been contracted for by a plant which employed hundreds of workmen and which stood ready to execute its part of the contract.

This amendment was promptly referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, in addition to that, I took occasion to see each gentleman on the subcommittee who dealt with this matter, and I was informed by them that there was no objection to this claim. Here is the letter of the Secretary of the Navy. A year ago this matter was referred to him to consider and audit and report. He reported December 20, 1895. There has been no lack of opportunity for Congress, for its committees, for its subcommittees, to see the whole matter and to sift it to the bottom. They are perfectly satisfied about it, and the only question which, as it seems to me, is before the body is whether the Congress will delay the payment of this claim to some future day or pay it now.

The delay is a great hardship, I repeat, Mr. President, to a new plant established by large capital and not in a great money center like New York or Philadelphia, where large sums of money are constantly being handled and are accessible—but a new plant in the State of Virginia, where we have not the opportunities to command the capital which are so fully realized north of us. It seems to me, sir, that as he who gives quickly gives twice, he who pays quickly in this case pays twice, and he who does not pay quickly does not pay at all fairly. The company want this money; it is due, it is urgent, and the urgency of a citizen in his situation before a Government which recognizes that it owes the money is as much to be respected as any urgency in the Government itself. It is just as urgent as any claim in this bill, and I ask the Senate to adopt the amendment if it is satisfied that there is no objection to any of the items forming the gross amount proposed to be appropriated by it. I have laid this report upon the desks of Senators. I have called attention over and over again, as far as I could go without indelicately obtruding myself upon the attention of gentlemen who were much occupied, and I have yet to hear the first suggestion against any item of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The suggestion of the Senator from Virginia that this claim ought to pass now and here, because he gives twice who gives quickly, if literally acted upon in this body would wipe out not only the Committee on Appropriations, which has been subjected to some criticism, but every other committee of the body. All that would be necessary would be for the Senator interested in a claim to get a recommendation from the head of a Department and bring it here and move it upon any bill, and when asked, "Has this had the scrutiny of any committee of the body?" reply, "Not at all; the recommendation of the head of the Department has been printed and laid upon the desks of Senators. It is urgent; it ought to be paid, and he gives twice who gives quickly; let us pay it now."

Mr. DANIEL. I beg to state to the Senator from New Hampshire that this amendment has had the scrutiny of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am coming to that. I am surprised that the Senator from Virginia, who is usually entirely right-minded upon all questions, both of fact and of manner of procedure, should think that this appropriation ought to be made upon the pending bill. As I understand it, this company made a contract with the Navy Department to construct marine engines.

Mr. HALE. For the *Texas*.

Mr. CHANDLER. The engines for the *Texas*.

Mr. DANIEL. The machinery and armament for the *Texas*.

Mr. CHANDLER. And the company has been paid, under the appropriation, every dollar of the original contract price. The Secretary has allowed extras; he has allowed sums for delay in the execution of the contract. So I infer from the letter I received this morning, and so I think Senators will find if they will look at the printed document, which I have not had time to examine. Now, the allowance of those extras, the allowance of these sums which impose an expense upon the United States for alleged delays on their part, hindering the Richmond company from performing their work, we are asked to make an appropriation for, without, I repeat, the claim having had the scrutiny of any committee of this body. The Senator says he showed it to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. If the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations——

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator will allow me to be accurate in the statement. The amendment was referred to the whole committee and by that committee, or its members, I was referred to the subcommittee, and it was specifically shown to each one of them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I do not doubt that any more than I doubt that the Senator has had the document carefully put upon the desks of Senators and has taken the pains to call it to the

attention of Senators upon this floor. I know the Senator from Virginia would not undertake to have a measure of this kind passed without its being understood by the Senate, if he knew it. But, as a matter of fact, the amendment has not been examined by myself; it has not been examined by many Senators. I undertake to say that as a matter of fact it is not here with the indorsement and approval and recommendation of any committee of this body. If it is, then the Senator has the right to press it now. If it is not, then I am right. I am pleading only for due precaution and for the preservation of the rules and customs of the Senate. The Senator from Virginia ought not to press this claim upon the Senate at this time, even if it is in order, because it is not here with the report of any committee in favor of it. It is not here with the indorsement of any committee of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator from Virginia will, perhaps, do better if he withdraws the amendment, and the committee will consider it on the regular deficiency appropriation bill.

The reason why the committee did not give more examination to it in the present instance is because it determined that it would consider it in on that bill, and therefore it is true, as has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the committee has not examined it, omitting to do so not in any spirit of hostility, but because it deemed it proper to come as an amendment on the regular deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. DANIEL. I will accept the suggestion and withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have concluded not to move to reduce the appropriations in connection with the United States courts which were made by the House of Representatives. It is to be seen by looking at the amendments proposed by the Senate committee that in no case does the Senate committee increase the House appropriations for the current year. The amendments proposed by the Senate committee are for deficiencies of prior years in every case, and, as has been correctly said by the Senator from Maine, those appropriations are to meet the audited accounts for work done and expenditures incurred during past years. It is proper that those appropriations under the circumstances should be made.

The House of Representatives, in the exercise of their power and their judgment, have determined to make these enormous allowances to the Department of Justice for the work of the United States courts for the remainder of the present fiscal year. In accordance with the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, I bow to the judgment of the House. I hope the Senator from Maine is wrong when he says that after having appropriated $3,000,000 to begin with, and now having appropriated $3,000,000 more, carrying the expenditures up to $6,000,000 (when ten years ago there were only $3,000,000 appropriated), he thinks there will be additional deficiencies to be provided for at the end of the present fiscal year.

I think if there is any danger that there will be, it is the duty of the House and the Senate, it is the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary of this body, to set about framing a law that will put some limit upon these enormous and growing expenditures. If that can not be done the function of the Senate committee and of the House committee, of the Senate and of the House, is nothing; we might just as well make an indefinite appropriation for the expenditures of the United States courts, and say to the judges and the clerks, and the district attorneys and the marshals, and the commissioners and the bailiffs and the criers, "Spend as much money as you, in your good judgment, see fit to spend, and we will pay the bills." Mr. President, that is the existing condition practically, and no remedy is applied either by the regular committees of this body by changing the existing system or by the Committees on Appropriations of the two bodies or by the two bodies themselves.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, only a word. I hope that I shall be found mistaken in my forecasting about the extent of the deficiencies, but I am very much in fear that when this bill becomes a law, as it will not before the 1st of March, pretty much all the appropriations made in it will be covered by services and claims and bills up to that date, and that between now and the close of the present session we shall be called upon again for more money for this Department as the bills come in.

I agree with all that the Senator from New Hampshire has said about the necessity that something shall be done which will effectuate a remedy, and I am glad to know that the Committee on the Judiciary is considering this subject. I hope that committee will report some measure that we can pass so that we may try and see if we can not keep these expenses down. Then the Committees on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate ought to recommend what they believe to be ample appropriations for the entire year, so that if there are any deficiencies they shall be not nominal deficiencies, resulting from a failure to appropriate for the entire year, but actual deficiencies.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. SHERMAN. My colleague upon the Committee on Finance, the chairman [Mr. MORRILL], is absent. He understands that after the deficiency appropriation bill should be acted upon the unfinished business would be the tariff bill. Was that the understanding? I should like to know.

Mr. TELLER. It was not mine.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. TELLER. I supposed we were to dispose of the three appropriation bills that were ready.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there has been no motion carried to proceed to the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Did he not give notice of a motion of that kind? I do not want to interfere with the appropriation bills, but at the same time I think that action should be taken upon the tariff bill one way or the other.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Florida will allow me a moment——

Mr. CALL. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me to make a statement, I will say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Colorado that there was unanimous consent given that at the conclusion of the deficiency appropriation bill the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to Cuba should be made the regular order. I ask that those resolutions be laid before the Senate as the regular order, and then we can give way to any appropriation bill that may be ready.

Mr. TELLER. I was not myself aware of any such understanding.

Mr. CALL. The RECORD will show it.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] upon leaving the Chamber a few moments ago stated to me—I have had no opportunity to inform the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. SHERMAN. I was not in at that time.

Mr. ALLISON. He stated what he desired, that at the conclusion of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill the tariff bill should be made the regular order of procedure. He thought, at least he had reason to believe, that unanimous consent would be given for that purpose, and that then the tariff bill would be laid aside until all of the pending appropriation bills are disposed of. I hope it will be the sense of the Senate, without objection, to pursue that course.

Mr. CALL. The regular order of the Senate, by unanimous agreement, is the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. That agreement will be found in the RECORD. I ask for the reading of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will remember that the discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. PLATT. I should like——

Mr. CALL. I call for the regular order.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to inquire where that alleged unanimous agreement is to be found in the RECORD? Has the Senator the RECORD?

Mr. CALL. It was made two days ago. It is well known to Senators around me here. I ask the clerks to look up the RECORD of our proceedings two days ago.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am sure that I knew nothing about such an agreement.

Mr. PLATT. Certainly no one about me here has had any knowledge of it, or heard of it at the time.

Mr. ALLEN. Those resolutions were certainly made the special order.

Mr. CALL. There is no question about that.

Mr. ALDRICH. A special order is a different thing.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the RECORD be examined; and I call for the regular order.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Florida will gain nothing. Suppose that in accordance with a unanimous agreement taken at a time when few Senators were here the Senator succeeds in having the resolutions laid before the Senate in pursuance of that alleged agreement, the moment that that is done the Senator from Colorado will move to take up the appropriation bill and that will displace the Senator's resolutions, so that he will gain nothing whatever.

Mr. CALL. If the resolutions are laid before the Senate, I will give way at the request of the Senator without displacing the resolutions.

Mr. HALE. I do not know whether the Senate will give its consent to that course.

Mr. CALL. If the Senate does not give its consent, of course that ends it for the present. I think, however, the Senate should consent to do so, because the Senate gave that consent. It was formally asked for and formally given. I do not know how many Senators were present at the time, but there were quite a number.

Mr. TELLER. If that has been done, I certainly do not want to interfere with it.

Mr. CALL. That was done. There is no question about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the agreement may be read.

Mr. CALL. I can not find it in the RECORD, but there is no doubt about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the agreement, as stated in the RECORD.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the pending business, which I understand to be the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the war in Cuba and involving the question of belligerent rights and the recognition of the independence of the Cuban Republic may be taken up for consideration and be made the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. That is correct.

Mr. TELLER. That seems to settle the matter.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the resolutions be laid before the Senate, and then I will give way to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Colorado to withdraw his motion.

Mr. TELLER. I withdraw it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I give notice that I shall move to take up the tariff bill.

Mr. MORRILL entered the Chamber.

Mr. SHERMAN. I see the Senator from Vermont is now here, and I leave the matter with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the unanimous agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions referred to, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. Resolutions by Mr. MORGAN, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to the deplorable war in Cuba.

Mr. CALL. Now I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. TELLER. I ask, unless the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] wishes to interpose, that the pending matter may be laid aside informally and the Military Academy appropriation bill be taken up.

Mr. MORRILL. I have been waiting for two days in order to move to take up House bill 2749. I gave notice that I would move to take it up yesterday. I have only waited until the disposition of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to make the motion. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2749.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not make that motion. The tariff bill will probably provoke a discussion of many days here, and the resolutions which have been laid before the Senate can be disposed of one way or another without any great consumption of time.

Mr. MORRILL. I am here at some inconvenience to myself, and I ought to be at home. I shall not consent to any other business being interposed to prevent the consideration of the tariff bill if I can get a vote to that effect. I make the motion now to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency.

Mr. CALL. I will ask the Senator from Vermont if he will not request that the vote be taken at a particular time without debate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Debate is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island demands the regular order. The question is on the motion to take up the bill the title of which has been stated.

Mr. CALL. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. ALLEN responded.

Mr. BERRY. Do I understand the proposition is to take up the tariff bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on Finance, known as the tariff bill, upon which the yeas and nays are being taken.

Mr. CALL. I wish to state that if agreed to that would displace the regular order, which is the resolution in regard to the Cuban question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Debate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], but he authorized me to vote on the Cuban resolution, as I am personally interested in it. I vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. I do not see him in his seat, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and vote "nay."

Mr. SHOUP (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SQUIRE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], and as he is not present, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. I will transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], which will enable the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and myself to vote.

Mr. BACON. Very well. Then my vote in the negative may stand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under that arrangement I vote "yea."

Mr. HALE. I am paired generally with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BROWN] and vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I suggest to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN], who is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], to transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON], who is absent, and the Senator from Michigan will then be at liberty to vote.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Under that arrangement I vote "yea."

Mr. BACON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE] to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and I vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I inquire if the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has voted.

Mr. GEORGE. I have voted. I inquire if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] has voted? If he has not I will withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has not voted.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If the Senator will allow me, I will transfer the pair of my colleague to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], so as to enable the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] to vote.

Mr. SQUIRE. Under that arrangement I vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE. Then my vote in the negative may stand.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCBRIDE] is detained from the Senate by indisposition. If he were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. If present, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). Since announcing the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], another transfer has been made that makes it necessary for me to withdraw my vote. I will therefore stand paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is not recorded.

Mr. HILL. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], and will vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that an arrangement has been made whereby the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] will stand paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], which will permit the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] to vote.

Mr. CARTER. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER. I announce that I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] on political questions.

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the affirmative). I withdraw my vote, because the Senator from Utah [Mr. BROWN] has come into the Chamber since I transferred my pair to him, and I stand paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. If he were here, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. BROWN. I will vote upon this question, unless I have been paired in my absence. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. SEWELL] is paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL]. If my colleague were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. VILAS. I wish to add that my colleague [Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin] would vote "nay."

Mr. TURPIE. I am permanently paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent. I propose transferring my pair with him to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], who is not paired, and who, I am informed, would vote "nay," if present. I vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I suggest that the pairs be read.

Mr. GEORGE. Before that is done I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] if his colleague [Mr. MCBRIDE] has been sufficiently taken care of as to his pair?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. He has been. My colleague is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If he were here, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE. It is my duty to take care of him.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to know how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not recorded at all.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Aldrich,	Frye,	Nelson,	Sherman,
Allison,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Squire,
Brown,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Warren.
Cameron,	McMillan,	Platt,	
Clark,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Proctor,	
Cullom,	Morrill,	Quay,	

NAYS—29.

Allen,	Chilton,	Mantle,	Turpie,
Bacon,	Cockrell,	Morgan,	Vest,
Bate,	Dubois,	Pasco,	Vilas,
Berry,	George,	Peffer,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Gorman,	Pugh,	Walthall.
Butler,	Gray,	Roach,	
Call,	Hill,	Smith,	
Carter,	Jones, Nev.	Teller,	

NOT VOTING—39.

Baker,	Faulkner,	Kyle,	Sewell,
Blackburn,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Shoup,
Blanchard,	Gear,	Lodge,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Gibson,	McBride,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Gordon,	Martin,	Tillman,
Cannon,	Hale,	Mills,	Wetmore,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Wis.	White,
Daniel,	Harris,	Murphy,	Wilson,
Davis,	Irby,	Palmer,	Wolcott.
Elkins,	Jones, Ark.	Pritchard,	

So the motion was not agreed to.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TELLER. I now ask that the pending order may be informally laid aside, and that the Military Academy appropriation bill may be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado asks that the business before the Senate be informally laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and will be read.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations be acted on as they are reached in the reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and such is the order of the Senate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask the Senator to yield to me to call from the table Senate joint resolution No. 73, in order that I may submit some remarks upon it.

Mr. TELLER. I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] desires to submit some remarks on the joint resolution to which he has referred; and, if I may be allowed, I yield to him for that purpose, with the understanding that the appropriation bill is merely laid aside informally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the business before the Senate will be informally laid aside, and the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from South Dakota will be laid before the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I send to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 500 additional copies of Senate Report 141, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, being the majority and minority reports of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations relating to hostilities in Cuba, with a copy of the substituted resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the resolution will have to go to the Committee on Printing unless the Senate orders otherwise.

Mr. MORGAN. The superintendent of the document room, who I suppose understands what the printing of such a document would cost, said that the resolution would not have to go to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the resolution will be considered as before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have it read again.

Mr. MORGAN. It is merely to print 500 additional copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations made in regard to Cuba. The edition is exhausted, and the superintendent of the document room asked me to have the additional copies printed.

Mr. FRYE. What will it cost?

Mr. MORGAN. The superintendent says about $10.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to inquire of the Senator who introduced the resolution whether the report embraces the correspondence?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no.

Mr. PLATT. Has not that correspondence been submitted to Congress?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, and printed by the House of Representatives. I have an advance copy of it, but it is not quite complete. We shall have it to-morrow.

Mr. PLATT. We are going to be able to have it to-morrow morning?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

The resolution was agreed to.

UNION AND KANSAS PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I now ask that Senate joint resolution No. 73 may be laid before the Senate and read at length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 73) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to foreclose the Government lien on the Union Pacific Railroad and the Kansas Pacific Railway, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to foreclose the Government lien upon the Union Pacific Railroad and the Kansas Pacific Railway, and pay the prior lien upon said roads, and take possession of the same for the Government of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury shall also pay the floating debt of said railroad companies, and take up the bonds and stock pledged as security therefor, and take possession of all branch lines that have been constructed in whole or in part out of the earnings of the Union Pacific Railroad. Said Secretary is also directed to take possession in the name of the Government of all the lands granted to said railroad and not conveyed to innocent third parties for a valuable consideration.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this resolution, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in ten years after their date. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish to call the especial attention of the Committee on Pacific Railroads to this resolution, for I think it outlines a method by which to solve this much discussed question in a businesslike manner, and in the only way it can be solved with credit to the Government. We have only the interests of the whole people to consider. There are no equities in this case in favor of the present stockholders of these roads, and I will show that the reorganization committee of the stockholders of the roads are entitled to no consideration whatever, as they represent the heartless and unscrupulous scamps that have been robbing the Government and the public for a generation, casting reproach upon our Government and our people that must make every honest citizen blush with shame.

The stockholders and owners of the first-mortgage bonds on the Union and Kansas Pacific Railroad have appointed a committee to reorganize the road and to settle with the Government for its second mortgage upon the property. This reorganization committee proposes to issue one hundred million of fifty-year 4 per cent bonds on about 1,900 miles of road; that is, the road from Omaha to Ogden, which is the main line of the Union Pacific, and about 400 miles of road from Kansas City west, which is the Kansas Pacific Railroad. They also propose to issue seventy-five millions of preferred stock upon this 1,900 miles of road, and assess the present common stock of these companies, which amounts to $60,000,000, at 15 per cent, and thus raise $9,000,000. The preferred stock represents nothing. All of it but $20,000,000 goes to the manipulators of this proposed swindle. If this plan is carried out, then we will still as a Government be in partnership for fifty years with the same men who have been our partners for the past thirty years. As our partners in the past they have swindled us, stolen our property, bribed, debauched, and disgraced our servants, plundered the people along the line of road by extortionate rates, while at the same time by a system of rebates and discrimination they have enriched a favored few, and where these favored few were private persons they were men who it was supposed had influence in the community where they resided and could influence public opinion; but usually their favors were bestowed upon corporations engaged in trade whose stockholders were the officers and directors of these railroads.

We are now asked to continue this partnership, to continue to have relations with these same men, and upon what basis? Upon a basis of fraud; upon a plan by which this Government is to be a party to the issue of stock for which no consideration is paid, and upon which the public will be called upon to pay interest. There are 1,900 miles of road, one hundred millions of bonds, seventy-five millions of preferred stock, and sixty millions of common stock; in all, two hundred and thirty-five millions of bonds and stock, or $123,600 per mile.

This 1,900 miles of railroad can be reproduced for $23,600 per mile, and yet the Government of the United States is asked to go into partnership with a party of dishonest men and bond and stock the road for $123,600 per mile, and the public whom this road serves is to be called upon to pay interest on this vast sum. That any set of men could come to Congress with any such proposition as this and expect it to be ratified by the representatives of a free people is an impeachment of the integrity of the people of the United States. But these men have so learned the habit of making corrupt propositions to each other by which the public shall be plundered and robbed in the reorganization of overstocked companies of every sort that they do not hesitate to make the proposition now in open daylight to the American people, and it seems to me it is a matter for severe comment and censure that a committee of either body of the Congress of the United States can be found who will entertain it for one moment.

But they go further than this, and tell us how they will distribute this vast amount of stocks and bonds. They propose that the Government shall take $34,000,000 of the bonds, which is just equal to the principal of the Government's claim against the roads, and shall take $20,000,000 of the preferred stock in full payment for all the defaulting interest; that the first-mortgage bonds, which amount to $34,000,000, shall be taken up and a like number of these new bonds issued in their place; and for every $1,000 of bonds issued to the present holders of the first-mortgage bonds of these roads $500 of preferred stock shall be issued as a bonus, the remainder of the stock and the remainder of the bonds to be the property undoubtedly of the conspirators in this stupendous transaction.

Let us see who are the men who compose this reorganization committee of the Union and the Kansas Pacific railroads. This reorganization committee is composed of five members, Louis Fitzgerald, T. J. Coolidge, and Oliver Ames being three out of the five members of the reorganization committee (who represent the old management of the road, the Goulds of New York and the Ameses of Boston), the other two being Marvin Hughitt and Chauncey Depew. While every one of the receivers who are now managing and operating the road is in the interest of this gang of highwaymen who have plundered the public with this instrumentality in the past, three of the receivers, namely, S. H. H. Clark, who was formerly manager and for years president of the road, has been and is the representative of the Gould interest; Mr. Mink, of Boston, was comptroller of the company, and has been for years its vice-president, and is also an executor of the will of the late Fred L. Ames, and is, of course, the direct and immediate representative of the Boston crowd of highwaymen who, through the use of this highway, the Union and the Kansas Pacific railroads, have robbed the public and the Government for the past thirty years. The third receiver, who has always acted with this interest, is E. Ellery Anderson, who has also been for several years a Government director, and was placed there for the purpose of protecting the Government's interests, but has never undertaken to protect the Government's interests, but has always acted in the interest of the old and dishonest management. The other two receivers of the road, Coudert and Doane, seem to have a leaning in the same direction, for they have been Government directors, and have never remonstrated against the frauds which have disgraced the management of these roads and of which they must have had knowledge.

Mr. Anderson, one of these receivers and one of the Government directors of the road, stated to the Senate committee that the net earnings of this system of roads were, in 1894, $4,000,000, and in 1895 $5,000,000, yet they refused to pay the interest on the first-mortgage bonds and caused the default, evidently for the purpose of allowing the representatives of the first-mortgage bonds to foreclose their mortgage and take possession of the whole property. If receivers would manage private property in this manner almost any court in the land would insist upon their immediate removal; yet these men, with impudence and impunity, seem to have set out deliberately to assist the reorganization committee or the people they represent to carry out a conspiracy to swindle the Government out of its whole claim.

If this reorganization plan is carried through with the assistance of the Government the road will have to earn 4 per cent on $100,000,000 of bonds and 5 per cent, at least, on $75,000,000 of preferred stock, and the people along the line of the road will be charged a rate sufficient to accomplish this result, even if no dividend whatever is paid upon the $60,000,000 of common stock. This interest charged, then, will amount to $7,750,000 a year, which would be an unjustifiable burden upon the people who are served by the road. The only reasonable and proper thing for the Government of the United States to do is to take possession of the road, issue its own bonds bearing 3 per cent interest as provided by the resolution which I have offered, pay the first-mortgage bonds of $34,000,000, refund to the Government of the United States the $53,000,000 now due the Government from these companies, take up and pay the floating debt of these roads of $12,000,000, and thus get possession of the bonds and the stocks which are held as collateral security for this floating debt, and thus acquire title to $98,000,000 par value of the branch lines' bonds and stock, the market value of which is at least $42,000,000 at the present time, thus taking possession of all the branch lines of these roads, amounting to 4,000 miles of track, and operate the whole as one great system.

In this way the Government would realize every dollar these roads owe it. The interest charged would only be 3 per cent on $100,000,000 of bonds, or $3,000,000 per annum, instead of $7,750,000 under the plan proposed by the reorganization committee. The rates for carrying freight and passengers could therefore be much less. There would be no incentive for discrimination in favor of persons or places; every man and every town would have an equal opportunity, and the scandals of our Government connected with the Union Pacific management would disappear from the pages of our history.

I think it is well in this connection to call attention to the methods of the management of these roads in the past if we are going to determine whether we wish to continue that system of management in the future. In the past we have been simply creditors, but under the plan now proposed by these men we become parties not only to the issue of stock for which there is no consideration, but partners in a transaction the future of which will be described as the past has been described. I read from the report of the Union Pacific Railroad commissioners of 1888, by Robert E. Pattison, one of the commissioners, in which he says:

> The aided companies combined with others to tax the communities which they served, and they forced the consuming classes in all sections of the country to contribute to the payment of interest and dividend upon the fictitious capital which they had created. They increased the cost of living. They laid proprietary claim to the traffic of large sections of the country. They squandered millions of their money to "protect" their territorial claims, while expending other millions in encroachments upon the territory claimed by other companies. They constituted themselves the arbiters of trade. They attempted to dictate the channels that trade should follow and fixed rates of transportation that were extortionate. They charged all that the traffic would bear, and appropriated a share of the profits of every industry by charging the greater part of the difference between the actual cost of production and the price of the article in the market. They discriminated between individuals, between localities, and between articles. They favored particular individuals and companies. They destroyed possible competitors, and they built up particular localities to the injury of other localities, until matters had reached such a pass that no man dared engage in any business in which transportation largely entered without first soliciting and obtaining the permission of a railroad manager. They departed from their legitimate sphere as common carriers and engaged in mining articles for transportation over their own lines. They exerted a terrorism over merchants and over communities, thus interfering with the lawful pursuits of the people. They participated in election contests. By secret cuts and violent and rapid fluctuations in rates they menaced business, paralyzed capital, and retarded investment and development.

And yet they come and say that we should continue this partnership and become owners with them in the preferred stock, they having a majority of it, so that they can control its operations and continue this method of doing business.

Mr. GALLINGER. From what document has the Senator been reading?

Mr. PETTIGREW. From the minority report of Robert E. Pattison, of the United States Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if the Republican party is not directly responsible for this condition, it having been in control of the Government from the time of this report until 1893?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not care to furnish campaign material for the Populist party in Nebraska. The people of Nebraska may settle that question among themselves.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator decline to answer?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have made all the answer I care to make to the Senator on that subject.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I infer from his remarks that he is in favor of the Government taking possession of this road. Is that correct?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Most certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. And owning it?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I can see no possible objection to the Government owning the road and operating it.

Mr. ALLEN. I then beg to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that is paternalism and Populism, according to the Republican definition of those two words.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not know whether or not that is the Republican definition of the two words. Perhaps it is the Populist definition.

I can see no objection to the Government owning the road and operating it. It seems to me that the railroad management of this country has been a total and complete failure. Our system of government is that every man shall have an equal, fair, untrammeled chance to do business, that the law of competition shall prevail. Yet in this respect not only these railroads but the railroads throughout this country have pursued a course that has hindered and prevented the exercise of the law of competition between individuals and between cities and towns. If the Government should own this road and operate it, how different would be the picture when peace and quiet prevailed, when fair and equal opportunity was bestowed upon all the people and all the towns along the line.

But if it is not thought best that the Government shall own the road and operate it, if it is not thought wise that we shall try the experiment and compare Government ownership, now when the opportunity is so easily offered, with private ownership, we should foreclose the mortgage and take possession of this property. There is no reason why we should not do it, even though the Government should afterwards conclude not to operate the road.

I appeal to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, who are considering this question, to dissolve forever this partnership with these corrupt manipulators, to refuse to deal or to have any further business relations with them whatever. If there is a strong prejudice against the Government ownership and operation of the roads, let us at least reorganize them upon an honest basis, upon a plan that will not disgrace us as a people; let us purge them of all association with the corrupt management of the past; and when this is once done there is no doubt but the roads can be sold and the Government realize every dollar it has invested in them. By so doing we would recover also several million acres of land which have not been patented to these companies and are still held by them. The plan which I propose would require the issue of $46,000,000 of 3 per cent Government bonds in addition to the present Government claim against these railroads, and with this $46,000,000 we would cancel the prior lien or mortgage upon the property; we would pay off the floating debt; we would secure title to $98,000,000 of bonds and stocks of branch lines, the market value of which is $42,000,000; we would secure, free from incumbrance, 1,900 miles of road, and also recover 7,000,000 acres of land, and, above all, we would have dissolved a partnership which has been a disgrace to the nation.

What individual would entertain for a moment a proposition to renew a partnership for fifty years with a man or a set of men who had for thirty years previous thereto been engaged in systematically plundering him, not only of the profits of the business but of all the interest upon his original investment, by the practice of almost every crime known to the law? And yet this is just what these men propose to the Government of the United States, and a committee of this body is seriously entertaining it, holding conferences day after day with these men, instead of pursuing the honorable, upright, and manly course so apparent to all. Not only ought we to take possession of these roads and reorganize them in the interest of the public and in the interest of public morality, but suits should be commenced against the estates of the original conspirators who are deceased, and against all the individuals who are living, to recover the money diverted to their own use fraudulently, and also to recover the $24,000,000 converted by them when the Kansas Pacific and Union Pacific were consolidated. These questions I will make the subject of another resolution.

Mr. President, I have not aimed to discuss this great question on this occasion, but to briefly outline a plan, which I hope the committee will at least consider, by which the people of the United States could at least escape disgrace in this connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senator from South Dakota in regard to the resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have it referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from South Dakota addressed the Senate under a unanimous-consent agreement that applied only to himself.

Mr. ALLEN. I did not know there was a unanimous-consent agreement that applied simply to one Senator. I hope the joint resolution may lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask unanimous consent of the Senate, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], to call up Senate joint resolution No. 54. It is a mere matter of detail with respect to carrying out a contract.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. FRYE. I merely desire to say that the joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Commerce after investigation.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES IN ARIZONA.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona. It is a short bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That no lease shall be made for a longer period than five years, and all leases shall terminate on the admission of said Territory as a State: *And provided further*, That all money received on account of such leases in excess of actual expenses necessarily incurred in connection with the execution thereof shall be placed to the credit of the public school fund of said Territory and shall not be used for any other than public school purposes.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lands reserved for university purposes, and all of the school lands in the Territory of Arizona reserved by law for school purposes, may be leased under such laws and regulations as may be hereafter prescribed by the legislature of said Territory, but until such legislative action the governor, secretary of the Territory, and superintendent of public instruction shall constitute a board for the leasing of said lands under the rules and regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for the respective purposes for which the said reservations were made, except that it shall not be necessary to submit said leases to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval; and all necessary expenses and costs incurred in the leasing, management, and protection of said lands and leases may be paid out of the proceeds derived from such leases: *Provided*, That no lease shall be made for a longer period than five years, and all leases shall terminate on the admission of said Territory as a State: *And provided further*, That all money received on account of such leases in excess of actual expenses necessarily incurred in connection with the execution thereof shall be placed to the credit of the public school fund of said Territory and shall not be used for any other than public school purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota." The bill was suggested by the Secretary of the Interior, and after

having been passed by the other House was considered and reported unanimously by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. If the bill does not lead to debate I shall not object to its consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. PLATT. Is there not an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment from the committee.

Mr. NELSON. No; there is no amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I thought there was an amendment changing the name of one of the towns where advertisements were to be made.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC AGREEMENTS.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask unanimous consent to call up Order of Business 146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves to proceed to the consideration of a resolution which will be stated, temporarily displacing the business before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. PEFFER, directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to inform the Senate whether there has been a custom, rule, regulation, or agreement a long time existing among railroad companies and associations engaged in interstate traffic whose lines extend to or through Missouri River points, etc.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it a Senate resolution or a concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a Senate resolution. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER January 27, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether there has been a custom, rule, regulation, or agreement a long time existing among railway companies and associations engaged in interstate traffic whose lines extend to or through Missouri River points, which custom, rule, regulation, or agreement establishes and maintains different rates of charges for carrying passengers and freight east and west from said points, and whether such difference in charges is reasonable and warranted by law.

Second. Whether such agreement affects alike companies running through lines to and beyond said Missouri River points, as well as companies whose lines terminate there, giving the names of roads engaged in interstate traffic to and through such places.

Third. Whether an agreement or traffic arrangement was recently made or entered into by and between any railway companies or associations, naming them, whereby charges for carrying grain and other farm produce from points in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory to points in Texas and Mexico were advanced; whether such advance charges are now in force; what was the reason or purpose of the advance, and whether it is reasonable or unreasonable and in violation of the provisions of the interstate-commerce law.

Fourth. Whether, in case these agreements have been made and these proceedings had, there is, in the opinion of the Commission, any additional legislation required to better protect the public interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. BRICE. If the Senator from Florida will allow me, I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent, without displacing the pending order, to take up for consideration——

Mr. PLATT. Did the Chair declare the result on the motion of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to call for a division on the question.

Mr. PLATT. The vote has not been declared on that motion, I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. It was declared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair declared that the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from Connecticut ought to be allowed another vote, but it was certainly declared by the Chair.

Mr. PLATT. There was such confusion in the Chamber that certainly it was not heard here.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will again put the question. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I call for a division.

Mr. BRICE. If there is any objection, I will withdraw the motion. I made it at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Pacific Railroads. We are to have an important meeting of that committee to-morrow. If there is a desire to go on with the business of the Senate to-morrow I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio withdraws the motion.

LANDS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent, without displacing the pending order, to call up the bill (S. 824) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the bill read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That patents shall be issued to the persons in possession and occupation of all lands settled upon under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of east Florida," approved on the 4th of August, A. D. 1842, where the land has been in the occupation and possession of the person who actually settled thereon, his widow, or heirs at law, or assigns, from whom a right of possession to said land under said act has been derived for the period of twenty years next preceding the approval of this act.

SEC. 2. That the right and title of all persons embraced in the first section of this act is hereby confirmed to them, their heirs and assigns, to the 160 acres embraced in the original settlement under the said act of Congress.

SEC. 3. That proof of the possession and occupation of said land for the period of twenty years, and of the fact of application for settlement under the said act of Congress, shall be held to be conclusive as against the United States, of settlement under the said act of Congress, and of compliance with all the requirements of said act.

SEC. 4. That all persons claiming the benefit of this act shall be required to make the proof required herein within two years from the date of its approval, before the officers who are authorized to take similar proofs under the homestead laws; and the requirements of these laws as to notice, contests, appeals, and the course of procedure, shall, wherever they are applicable, apply to all cases arising under this act.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Quite a number of the members of the Committee on Public Lands are not present. That seems to be a very important bill, and I think it should go over.

Mr. CALL. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that the bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands by my colleague [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have no doubt of that fact.

Mr. CALL. A similar bill was passed at the last session, and there is no kind of objection to it. There is not a person in the world who would object to it. It relates to——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to say a word. The bill relates to settlements that were made forty-five years ago under the armed occupation act. It simply provides that twenty years' continuous possession, as far back as the memory will go, shall be proof of the original settlement and occupation; that is all.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that Order of Business 190, being Senate resolution 81, which has been favorably reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, be taken up and agreed to.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, in making the inquiry concerning the prices of armor for naval vessels under the resolution of the Senate of December 31, 1895, be authorized to employ stenographers and to send for persons and papers, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid upon proper vouchers from the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Senate.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF SPRAGUE, WASH.

Mr. MANTLE. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1804) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported

from the Select Committee on National Banks with an amendment, in section 1, line 11, after the words "*Provided*, That," to insert:

Said bank increase its capital to $100,000, so as to conform to the requirements of the law regulating national banks, and that it send.

So as to make the section read:

That the First National Bank of Sprague, now located at Sprague, Lincoln County, State of Washington, is hereby authorized to change its location or place where its operations of discount and deposit are carried on to the city of Spokane, Spokane County, State of Washington, by and with the consent of the Comptroller of the Currency, whenever the shareholders owning two-thirds of the stock of said bank, at a meeting called for that purpose, determine to make such change: *Provided*, That said bank increase its capital to $100,000, so as to conform to the requirements of the law regulating national banks, and that it send a duly authenticated notice of said vote and of the new location shall be sent to the office of the Comptroller of the Currency; but the change of location shall not be valid until the Comptroller of the Currency shall have issued his certificate of approval of the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WHARF AT SITKA, ALASKA.

Mr. PERKINS. With the consent of the Senator from Colorado, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1693) for the rebuilding or repair of the public wharf at Sitka, Alaska.

Mr. TELLER. I do not object, for I see I shall not be able to do anything to-night with the appropriation bill I have in charge. I understand that there is a desire to have an executive session in a few moments.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORIENTAL MANUFACTURES.

Mr. QUAY. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado, to offer a resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to inquire respecting the alleged invasion of our markets and the menace offered to American manufacturing industry by the products of cheap Oriental labor, and to determine what is the cause of this menace and what means should be adopted to avert the threatened injury to domestic producers.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. QUAY. I have stricken out at the end of the resolution the ordinary and what may be the necessary clause for the employment of a stenographer and the authority to send for persons and papers, leaving that to the Committee on Finance to ask for it if it thinks proper. In support of the resolution, and in explanation of it, I send to the desk and ask to have read the proceedings of the National Association of the Manufacturers of the United States in convention in Chicago on the 22d of last January.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the paper be printed as a separate document.

Mr. QUAY. I should like to have it go in the RECORD with the resolution. I think the proceedings are important and will interest the Senator from Missouri as well as other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania ask that the paper be read or that it go in the RECORD?

Mr. QUAY. Let it go in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The paper referred to is as follows:

At the meeting of the National Association of the Manufacturers of the United States held in Chicago last week, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas intimations have been given in the public press of an extraordinary recent development of manufacturing industry in Eastern countries, particularly in Japan, and of the appearance in the American market of the products of this industry, which products are offered at unusually low prices:

"*Be it resolved*, That the president of this association appoint a committee of three to inquire respecting the matter and to report to-morrow to the convention what action, if any, should be taken by the association with reference to the alleged menace to American manufactures."

The committee the next day made the following report:

"REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORIENTAL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY.

"The committee appointed to inquire respecting the development of manufacturing industry in the far East, and particularly in Japan, desires to make the following report:

The movement for the establishment of manufactures in the countries referred to is of a remarkable character. It began within the last ten or fifteen years, and it has continued with accelerated force until the present time.

In 1863 the first cotton spinning mill was erected in Japan, with 5,456 spindles. The business did not at first show signs of rapid growth; but in 1883 there were 16 mills, with 43,700 spindles. In the report of the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce for May 5, 1894, the following statistics were given:

At the end of 1883 there were 16 mills, with 43,700 spindles.
At the end of 1888 there were 24 mills, with 88,140 spindles.
At the end of 1892 there were 39 mills, with 403,314 spindles.
At the end of 1893 there were 46 mills, with about 600,000 spindles.

The same report adds; as still more rapid increase is expected in the near future, large orders, it is known, have been placed for more machinery, some for yarns of the finer qualities.

This promise of increase has been fulfilled. New cotton mills are being erected, and Japan threatens to become a bold and large competitor for the trade of the world in cotton fabrics. The Japanese use the latest improved American and European machinery in this and other industries established by them. They begin with mechanical appliances that are superior to those found in some American mills. But Japan does not confine herself to spinning cotton. Her people are introducing a great variety of manufacturing industries, all using improved machinery, and they are imitating the patterns and inventions of the Western nations with impunity, because there is no protection for either the patents or trade-marks of foreigners in Japan.

Recently the French consul at Yokohama, Mr. Klobukowski, reported to his Government as follows:

"There is no country in the extreme East which will not be invaded by goods made in Japan in imitation of European wares. Some of them are still inferior in quality; the greater number, thanks to modern machinery, are quite equal to ours. Both are of a cheapness which the high price of our labor will never permit us to attain. Then, again, our trade-marks are unprotected in Japan. The natives have only to imitate or copy your articles without necessarily acknowledging their obligation. Their amour propre does not brook the accusation of being mere imitators; they introduce, therefore, some trifling alteration in our machinery, and thereupon, with an easy conscience, take out themselves a fresh patent in their own country."

In confirmation of this report of the wide diversity of the new Japanese industries Sir Ernest Sutow, the British representative at Tokyo, in a report to his Government, says:

"The most marked advance is, however, shown (by the Japanese) in 'manufactured products,' the value of the export of which in the first half of 1895 exceeds that of the corresponding period of 1894 by no less than $8,592,860. Matches, floor matting, straw plaits, cotton carpets, cotton yarn, and silk handkerchiefs, all show very considerable advances, while the export of silk piece goods has more than doubled itself, the value having increased from a little over $3,000,000 to nearly $8,500,000. The list of imitations of European articles now made in Japan is a long one, and is steadily increasing. Among those shown at the Domestic Industrial Exhibition, held this year at Kioto, were blankets, carriage rugs, shawls, shirts, cotton and silk socks, cotton towels, felt and straw hats, boots, saddles, harness, portmanteaus, clocks, thermometers, harmoniums, optical, musical, surveying, and surgical instruments, photographic cameras, woolen flannel, and cloth, lead and slate pencils, and a host of others. In fact, it may be safely said that there is nothing of common use produced in Europe which can not now be imitated with more or less success in Japan."

A correspondent in Japan of the London Times, referring to the wonderful sudden development of manufacturing industry in those islands, mentions that the Japanese are now producing felt hats, upon American and European patterns, of the best quality. He says that we may buy at retail in Japan for 87 cents a hard or soft felt hat which in London would sell at retail for $2.62 and probably in this country for $3. The Japanese also are beginning to make boots and shoes for export with improved modern machinery. Before long the American shoe that is sold for $3 at retail is likely to have a rival from Japan which will be offered, probably, for about 75 cents. The correspondent referred to reports that highly skilled Japanese workmen employed in producing such articles earn about 81 cents a week, or, say, one-third as much in seven days as a fairly good American workman now earns in one day.

In an article upon this subject under date of October 28, 1895, the London Times said:

"Meanwhile Japan has determined to supply her own wants. It is stated that only one-fourth of her requirements are now imported, as against 67 per cent six years ago. Even more striking is her determination to get rid of European help in the actual work of production. 'Since the date, now four years ago,' says the Bombay Gazette, 'when the foreign mill managers all received notice on one day that their services would no longer be required after the expiry of the notice, not a single man of Western birth has been engaged in the cotton mills, and the half million odd spindles at work are entirely under indigenous direction. There are 2,100 miles of railway open and 400 miles more under construction, but the only foreign assistance in their working is that of a solitary Scotchman, whose ties to the country have been strengthened by his marrying a Japanese girl." Even in the arsenals, with their rapid turn-out of arms of precision, only two or three Europeans now remain. The coasting trade has passed entirely into the hands of Japanese shippers and engineers. A similar process is going on throughout the whole merchant navy of Japan, and is only retarded by the expediency of having captains and chief engineers who hold English certificates, with a view to securing favorable insurance rates. But at any moment the Japanese Government may organize a system of marine insurance which will oust the British employees from this last foothold in Japanese enterprise. The results already attained justify Sir Alfred Lyall's forecast of the new era when the industrial inventions by which Europe has hitherto prevailed over Asia will be turned against their inventors."

The Times further said:

"Japan is trying to capture the markets of the far East. The new treaties which recognized her equality with the Western trading countries as a civilized mercantile power, her establishment of a consul-general at Bombay, the creation of steamer lines which shall defy Western competition by the aid of State subsidies, the dismissal of foreign employees in her factories, arsenals, and railway workshops, and the development of her mill and engineering productions on an enormous scale, form the industrial side of that long-prepared advance of which the military aspects recently startled Europe. As European statesmen are now compelled to recognize in Japan a predominant factor in Eastern politics, so British capitalists and Indian mill owners are being forced to acknowledge her successes in the great commercial struggle of the nations."

Are the products of the Japanese factories to be sold only in Eastern markets? By no means. They are already appearing in the markets of the United States. In a letter dated November 30, 1895, Mr. M. Benker, editor of the San Francisco Daily Report, said:

"Articles of Japanese manufacture since the close of their war are being received of equal quality with American manufactured goods, and at prices so low that our manufactories of these articles must close unless relieved by Congressional action. Report stated that H. E. Reynell, of Kobe, Japan, established an agency in San Francisco, in the Crocker Building, Mr. Edward O. Burns being their agent, for the sale of Japanese manufactured goods for the purpose of underselling American products. Similar agencies are being established East and West now by representatives of Japanese houses. The agency here is now selling the best parlor matches in tin-lined box, in box and case lots of 50 gross in a case, delivered to the merchant freight and duty paid, at 30 cents per gross. He also sells doors, sashes, blinds, and all articles of wooden ware, cooperage stock, etc., of Japanese manufacture at from 30 to 50 per cent less than they can be manufactured for in this country, with all freight and duty paid by the Japanese importers; also clocks, watches, bicycles, boots, shoes, clothing, hats, caps, gloves, fancy goods, and notions on similar terms. Their agents are buying cotton-mill machinery and shipping to Japan, and will take our cotton from here to Japan and send it back manufactured for less than it can possibly be manufactured in this country.

They also take cargoes of Pacific Coast lumber, manufacture the same in Japan into wooden ware, etc., and return same here manufactured at 50 per cent less than our manufacturers' wholesale prices."

Articles of Japanese manufacture have appeared in our Eastern cities, rivaling and underselling American articles suitable for similar purposes. Japanese matting is now crowding out cheaper kinds of Philadelphia carpets. Japanese rugs made in imitation of American patterns are sold in great quantities in preference of American rugs of higher value. Brushes are sold at retail in Eastern cities for about the American value of the manufactured bristles. American watch-case makers are selling to Japan cases for excellent movements made there for this market.

There can be no concealment of the fact that some of our manufacturing industries are gravely menaced by this rivalry of a country where skilled labor may be had at a cost of 10 or 15 cents a day, or less than one-tenth of the cost of such labor in our own country.

Your committee does not care to discuss the causes of this menace or the methods by which the peril may be averted. We believe that the National Association should, however, take cognizance of the matter and should ask that Congress shall investigate the subject in a thorough and comprehensive manner, so that the people may fully understand it. We therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved by the National Association of American Manufacturers in convention assembled in Chicago January 22, 1896, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to appoint a commission, or to direct one of its own committees, to inquire respecting the alleged invasion of our markets and the menace offered to American manufacturing industry by the products of cheap Oriental labor, and to determine what is the cause of this menace and what means should be adopted to avert the threatened injury to domestic producers."

The resolution was unanimously adopted, and the following persons were appointed a committee to bring the matter to the attention of Congress: Robert Dornan, president, and Charles Heber Clark, secretary, of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VILAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to have a little bill passed. It will take only a moment.

Mr. VILAS. Certainly. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws the motion.

WILLIAM MORGAN AND HARRISON MOORE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1320) to confirm the title to certain lands in William Morgan and Harrison Moore and to require the issue of patents therefor. It has been favorably reported by the Committee on Public Lands and is recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. VILAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. CHANDLER, it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m) adjourned, the adjournment being until Monday, February 17, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1896.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

J. Kearney Rice, of New Jersey, to be attorney of the United States for the district of New Jersey.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. George H. Gooding, of Virginia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Daniel J. Ainsworth, of Virginia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Daniel W. Andrew, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Plymouth, in the State of Massachusetts.

John H. Brocklesby, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Hartford, in the State of Connecticut.

POSTMASTERS.

Selden B. Palm, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Trumbull and State of Ohio.

J. L. Fulcher, to be postmaster at Waynesboro, in the county of Burke and State of Georgia.

John N. Leithold, to be postmaster at Postville, in the county of Allamakee and State of Iowa.

William A. Wagoner, to be postmaster at Sabetha, in the county of Nemaha and State of Kansas.

F. M. Ranck, to be postmaster at Westerville, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio.

Sarah A. Bachman, to be postmaster at Slatington, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania.

Reuben R. Freeman, to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Ross and State of Ohio.

Edmund W. Nutter, to be postmaster at East Bridgewater, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Samuel B. Wheeler, to be postmaster at Westport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Thomas P. McAndrews, to be postmaster at White Haven, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(*Continuation of legislative day of February 12, 1896.*)

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10.30 a. m., Thursday, February 13, 1896, by the Speaker.

[Mr. DOOLITTLE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

[Mr. GROUT addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I fear I have nothing new or novel to offer in the discussion of this measure. If the quality of the speeches already made is in keeping with the quantity, I am sure no new fields of argument is left unexplored. It is not my purpose to descant upon the science of wealth or to theorize upon the relative value of gold and silver. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us, and I hope to confine myself to a practical discussion of the subject before us.

I will hasten to correct the impression in some quarters that all those who recently voted against the bond bill when it was pending in the House are advocates of the unlimited coinage of silver.

When the bond bill was pending before this House in December last I saw proper to cast my vote against it, for reasons satisfactory to myself and which it is not now necessary to state.

The pending measure comes to the House from the Senate in the form of a substitute for that bond bill, and we are asked to support a proposition for the free and unlimited coinage of silver independent of all other nations of the earth. This proposition, in the shape it comes to us, I can not consent to support. I am not one of those who attribute the unprecedented hard times and the panicky condition of the country for the past three years to what is so frequently miscalled the demonetization of silver in 1873. The act of 1873 did not demonetize silver. It only changed the unit of value from silver to gold, and by subsequent legislation by the Republican party silver was infinitely more used as money than was the case from the foundation of the Government down to 1873, the time it is alleged that the white metal was robbed of its money power. In point of fact, during the eighty years of the existence of this Government down to 1877 the Democratic party had been in control more than three-fourths of the period, and during all this time there were coined only a little more than eight million of silver dollars, and, in addition, the subsidiary silver coin. On the other hand, from 1877 to October, 1893, there were coined more than 400,000,000 silver dollars, or their equivalent was put into circulation in the shape of silver certificates and Sherman notes.

At the date the Democratic party returned to power, March 4, 1893, there were being added to the circulating medium of the country about 50,000,000 silver dollars annually; and let it be remembered that the very first legislation enacted by our Democratic friends was the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, thereby discontinuing the further use of silver for coinage purposes, excepting in subsidiary coins.

The Democratic party in their Chicago platform of 1892 had declared the Sherman law a "cowardly makeshift," and demanded its repeal. These are indisputable facts, and I challenge their successful contradiction.

Now I come to the question, Are the present conditions of the country, and as they have existed since March, 1893, attributable to the legislation of 1873 changing the unit of value from silver to gold? Without hesitation I answer, no.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to call the attention of the House to the condition of the country after thirty-two years of Republican administration from the day Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated in 1860 up to March 4, 1893, the day Mr. Harrison's Administration closed.

During this period the wealth of this nation increased from $16,000,000,000 to more than $62,000,000,000, a sum so vast that the human mind is utterly incapable of its comprehension—an increase of 400 per cent. Such prosperity is unparalleled in the history of the world. Our railroad mileage increased from 30,000 miles to more than 100,000 miles. The South produced only 90,000 tons of pig iron in 1868, and in 1892 the production increased to

more than 1,000,900,000 tons. In 1870 the South spun 100,000 bales of cotton, and in 1892 more than 800,000 bales. And thus I might go on, but these serve to demonstrate the proposition that the period from 1860 to 1893 was the most prosperous in the history of this great country, and the last year of this period was the most prosperous known in business in the history of this country, if R. G. Dun & Co.'s Review of Trades is to be credited.

Thus we were going steadily forward from prosperity to greater prosperity as each succeeding year passed by when the country was overtaken by a Democratic simoom of free-trade wild-cat money and an insatiable thirst for office. Note the change! And what a change it was.

From 1892, the most prosperous in the history of the nation, we are driven headlong into disaster after disaster, and in the language of Dun's Trade Review:

> Starting with the largest trade ever known, mills crowded with work, and all business stimulated with high hopes, the year 1893 has proved, in sudden shrinkage of trade, in commercial disaster, the worst in fifty years. The year closes with prices of money product the lowest ever known, with millions of workers seeking in vain for work, and with charity laboring to keep back suffering and starvation in all our cities.

What! The last year of Republican rule the most prosperous ever known and the first year of Democratic rule the worst for fifty years! This is a sad story for our Democratic friends, and sadder yet for the country; but it is true.

The American Economist of October 12 publishes a most startling condition of affairs for 1894. It is a table giving the number of hands employed for the first six months of 1892 and for a like period in 1894, together with the wages paid and output. Note the result. The number of hands employed from January 1 to June 30, 1892, decreased 30 per cent for a like period in 1894. The amount of wages paid decreased 45 per cent. The average earnings per hand in 1892 were $250, while in 1894 they were only $195. To cure all these ills that they have brought upon the country our Democratic friends now offer us the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

In 1893 they proclaimed that the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law would stop the then pending panic and save the country from the unparalleled disaster into which it was rapidly being driven by the threat of the Democratic party to place the country on a free-trade basis, coupled with the power to execute this most unfortunate and un-American doctrine. The repeal of the Sherman law brought no relief, nor did it stay the oncoming of the expected crash in the business world, with all the ills that that word implies. I assert that the repeal of this law was absolutely barren of any good results to the country. But, on the other hand, it stopped the coinage of more that fifty millions of silver dollars per year and prevents that sum being annually added to the volume of our currency.

If I understand the object to be attained by the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver by the United States, it is to increase the volume of ultimate money. That this would not be the effect beyond the amount of silver coined from the silver product of the mines of the United States seems to me to be too plain to admit of an argument. And I assert that the volume of the currency of the United States would not be increased 1 farthing by the free and unlimited coinage of silver beyond the amount of silver coined from the mines of these United States.

The free coinage of silver means coinage on the private account of the owner of the bullion and without cost of mintage. This being true, the owner of silver bullion, whether he is a citizen of this country or of Europe, Asia, or Africa, South America, or Mexico, or of whatever country, would be at liberty to bring his silver bullion to our mints, owned and operated by this Government, at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and have it coined into silver dollars. It was the property of the individual before coinage and it is his afterwards, to do with as he wishes. He may choose, if an alien to this Government, to take it with him to his own country. He may choose to exchange it for our greenbacks, gold or silver certificates, or for gold, and then he would remove it from the country, and, in point of fact, this Government would not realize 1 farthing from this transaction in the way of increase in the volume of our money or otherwise, while we would be out the expense incident to its coinage, and charged with the burden of maintaining it on a parity with gold.

On the other hand, every dollar coined from silver owned and produced by the citizens of the United States would remain here, go into circulation, and thus augment the volume of the currency.

Silver is one of the money metals of the Constitution, and I believe it is the duty of the country to utilize every dollar of it possible as such that is consistent with sound money and sound credit.

And I ask leave to print the accompanying table, based upon the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, showing the products of silver of the world and of the United States, and the coinage thereof, from 1864 to 1893.

Production of silver by the world and by the United States during thirty years.—Demands on this silver by the mints of the world and of the United States.—Proportion of silver coin to all money in circulation in this country.—Value of silver as measured in gold.

Calendar year.	Production of silver (coinage value).			Coinage of silver.				United States net exports of silver, year ending June 30.	Money circulating in the United States July 1.				Average ratio of gold to silver.	Average bullion value of silver dollar.
	World's.	United States.	Per cent of world's product.	World's.a	Per cent of world's product.	United States.b	Per cent of United States product.		Silver.c	Per cent of silver to total money.	Per capita total money.	Per capita silver.		
1864	$51,700,000	$11,000,000	21.28			$609,917	5.54	$2,796,064			$19.67		15.37	$1.041
1865	51,950,000	11,250,000	21.66			691,005	6.14	5,950,349			20.57		15.44	1.035
1866	50,750,000	10,000,000	19.70			982,409	9.82	12,342,931			18.99		15.43	1.036
1867	54,225,000	13,500,000	24.90			908,876	6.73	16,796,136			18.28		15.57	1.027
1868	50,225,000	12,000,000	23.89			1,074,343	8.95	15,936,833			18.39		15.59	1.026
1869	47,500,000	12,000,000	25.26			1,266,143	10.55	15,459,574			17.60		15.60	1.025
1870	51,575,000	16,000,000	31.02			1,378,255	8.61	10,157,475			17.50		15.57	1.027
1871	61,050,000	23,000,000	37.67			3,104,038	13.50	17,369,317			18.10		15.57	1.027
1872	65,250,000	28,750,000	44.06			2,504,489	8.71	25,302,543			18.19		15.63	1.023
1873	81,800,000	35,750,000	43.70			4,024,748	11.26	26,953,369			18.04		15.92	1.005
1874	71,500,000	37,300,000	52.17	$96,194,210	134.53	6,851,777	18.37	23,636,216			18.13		16.17	.989
1875	80,500,000	31,700,000	39.38	119,776,751	148.79	15,347,813	48.41	17,947,241			17.16		16.59	.964
1876	87,600,000	38,800,000	44.29	114,436,053	130.63	24,503,308	63.15	17,385,280	$21,055,128	2.89	16.12	$0.47	17.88	.894
1877	81,000,000	39,800,000	49.14	71,076,328	87.75	28,393,046	71.34	15,043,683	37,884,853	5.25	15.58	.82	17.22	.929
1878	95,000,000	45,200,000	47.58	155,629,037	163.19	28,518,850	63.09	8,044,571	55,127,573	7.56	15.32	1.16	17.94	.891
1879	96,000,000	40,800,000	42.50	96,891,767	100.93	27,569,776	67.57	5,738,775	69,383,023	8.48	16.75	1.42	18.40	.869
1880	96,700,000	39,200,000	40.54	75,093,304	77.66	27,411,094	69.93	1,227,980	68,682,345	7.06	19.41	1.37	18.05	.886
1881	102,000,000	43,000,000	42.16	99,401,743	97.45	27,940,164	64.98	6,297,477	76,181,776	6.84	21.71	1.48	18.16	.881
1882	111,800,000	46,800,000	41.86	102,147,327	91.37	27,973,132	59.77	8,734,263	78,783,769	6.71	22.37	1.50	18.19	.878
1883	115,300,000	46,200,000	40.07	100,946,872	87.56	29,246,968	63.31	9,464,203	82,125,749	6.68	22.91	1.53	18.64	.858
1884	105,500,000	48,800,000	46.26	87,771,023	83.20	28,534,866	58.47	11,456,481	86,351,008	6.94	22.65	1.57	18.57	.860
1885	118,500,000	51,000,000	43.54	114,629,518	96.74	28,962,176	55.30	17,203,006	82,789,890	6.41	23.02	1.47	19.41	.823
1886	120,600,000	51,000,000	42.29	109,161,871	90.52	32,086,710	62.91	11,660,912	98,842,613	7.89	21.82	1.72	20.78	.769
1887	124,281,000	53,350,000	42.93	144,144,629	115.98	35,191,081	65.96	9,036,313	104,132,586	7.90	22.45	1.77	21.13	.757
1888	140,706,000	59,195,000	42.07	123,390,329	87.69	33,025,606	55.79	12,634,280	105,889,710	7.72	22.88	1.77	21.99	.727
1889	162,159,000	64,646,000	39.87	101,956,940	62.87	35,496,683	54.91	18,011,033	105,934,463	7.67	22.52	1.73	22.09	.707
1890	172,235,000	70,464,000	40.91	d154,983,268	89.98	d54,950,877	77.98	13,840,945	110,311,336	7.72	22.82	1.76	19.76	.810
1891	186,447,000	75,417,000	40.45	d176,811,293	94.83	d81,281,990	107.78	4,564,108	117,045,399	7.82	23.41	1.83	20.92	.764
1892	197,741,000	82,101,000	41.52	d199,509,255	100.89	d76,293,746	92.93	12,855,473	120,111,166	7.50	24.44	1.84	23.72	.674
1893	209,165,000	77,576,000	37.09	d170,116,993	81.33	d57,635,524	74.30	17,544,067	122,399,539	7.67	23.87	1.83	26.49	.603
1864 to 1873	566,025,000	173,250,000	30.61			16,544,223	9.55	149,064,591						
1874 to 1893	2,474,734,000	1,042,949,000	42.14	2,413,468,511	97.52	707,215,867	67.81	242,326,307						
1864 to 1893	3,040,759,000	1,216,199,000	40.02			723,760,090	59.51	391,390,898						

All figures are based upon official reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.

a No reliable data as to the world's coinage could be secured for years previous to 1874. The amount of silver recoined each year was subtracted from the total coinage to give the figures of this column.

b Includes both silver dollars and fractional silver.

c There was no silver in circulation after 1862 until 1876, except a small amount on the Pacific Coast. The figures given include silver dollars and subsidiary silver.

d Includes silver bullion to the (coinage) value of $181,996,498 purchased by the United States under the act of July 14, 1890, but still uncoined. This comprises $15,747,969 in 1890, $53,763,133 in 1891, $63,652,668 in 1892, and $48,832,728 to November 1, 1893, when the purchasing clause was repealed.

From the history of this country I am convinced that all the silver produced by the mines of the United States that is not used in the arts and sciences can be safely coined into dollars or used as money without impairing our credit or disturbing the parity of gold and silver. In other words, I believe that this country can maintain the parity of gold and silver with the free coinage of silver limited to the product of the United States. And hence, Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk, to be read for information, an amendment which I propose to offer to the first section of the pending bill at the proper time.

Insert at the close of section 1, in line 13, page 3, after the words "now provided by law," the following:

Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only, and that a duty be imposed on all silver that may be imported into the United States, whether in bullion or in other forms, including ores containing silver in quantities sufficient to make them valuable for smelting for the silver therein contained, at a rate equal to the difference between the commercial and coinage value of silver on the day of entry.

I have already said that I was not one of those who attributed the hard times and the panicky condition of the country to the financial legislation of 1873, nor do I believe the depleted condition of the Treasury can be justly charged to that legislation. But, in my opinion, the Treasury has been depleted and the Government compelled to borrow money by the sale of bonds for the first time since the war because of the threat of the Democratic party to place the Government on a free-trade basis, and their attempt to carry into execution their declared purpose by the enactment of the Gorman-Wilson tariff law, with the result that the revenues raised thereunder are inadequate to meet the current expenses of the Government. Our imports have largely increased and our exports decreased, or, in other words, we have been buying from abroad largely more than we sold abroad, and this balance of trade against us had to be paid in gold. Whereas, under the Republican tariff law, we sold largely more than we purchased abroad, and the balance of trade was with us and foreign countries paid to this Government this balance in gold, and hence there was but small demand upon the Treasury for gold to ship abroad.

From 1865 to 1893 there was never a year when the revenues of the Government were not more than its expenses. At the close of the last Republican Administration there were $124,000,000 in the Treasury, and since that time there has not been a month that our expenses have not been more than $2,000,000 in excess of our income.

During the four years of the Harrison Administration we not only raised enough revenues to meet current expenses, but there was paid during these four years $296,000,000 of the principal and interest of our bonded indebtedness, retiring about two hundred and sixty-two millions of bonds. Since March 4, 1893, the Democratic Administration has fallen behind more than $2,000,000 each month; it has not paid off one bond, but, on the other hand, this Democratic Administration has sold $262,000,000 in bonds to get money to pay our current expenses.

So we see that when the revenues of the Government are equal to or in excess of its expenditures there is no deficiency in the Treasury and no bonds sold; but when the revenues are below the expenditures, then there is a deficiency, and enormous sums of bonds are sold to meet this deficiency. Hence, it is clear to my mind that the financial legislation of 1873 did not produce the present approximately empty Treasury.

Let our revenues be increased so as to meet our expenses, and the Treasury will not be depleted again, and no more sales of bonds will be indulged in for the people to pay who are to follow us.

Mr. Speaker, I am intensely American. I believe in the American people. I believe in America for Americans. I believe in our flag, our money, our mines, our manufactures, our workshops, our furnaces, our farms, and our wage earners. I believe in bimetallism, the use of both gold and silver as money; that every dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, should be as good as every other dollar in the pockets of every man who may chance to hold it. This is the doctrine of the Republican party. We had a prosperous country, growing in wealth and in population and in business. Our currency should be a constantly increasing one, keeping pace with our constantly increasing population and commerce. I believe our per capita should be constantly and gradually increased, not by unwise inflation, until it shall be $40 per capita; but let this increase be made with an eye single to its soundness and to the necessities of the country.

Let us return to the doctrine of protection, and at the same time to the doctrine of the use of the silver of the United States as money, which will come with the incoming Republican Administration, and the people will again be prosperous and contented. Commerce and manufacture will again wear an air of prosperity, and the country will resume the march to the achievement of greater and nobler things.

The amendment which I propose is neither gold nor silver monometallism, but it is bimetallism. This policy would enable this Government to take care of her own silver in her own way without undertaking to take care of the silver of nations that refuse to take care of it for themselves. This policy could be continued until such time as would prove its wisdom, or until other nations should care to join with us, and thus broaden the use of the white metal by international agreement. We can not regulate the money of the world, but we can and ought to regulate our own; and in my humble judgment this country will settle this question for herself on the lines indicated in the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, this discussion is being carried on with no hope of an immediate solution of the problem before us. We all know that there is not the slightest possibility of this bill becoming a law. This fact was well known at the time it was under discussion in the other branch of Congress, and yet it injuriously affects the business interests of the United States. The fact that there is a considerable sentiment among the people and their representatives in Congress in favor of so radical a change in the financial system of this country as is proposed by the pending measure is sufficient in itself to alarm those who believe that its adoption would be disastrous. We all know that business is based to a great extent on confidence in the stability of things and that both business and capital are timid. If a storm threatens, they get to cover as far as they are able: if a new system of finance is introduced or radical changes are proposed in the old one, they await developments. They want to know what is going to be done, and then they are extremely cautious until it is ascertained by actual experience what effect the changes will have.

But the threat of such legislation in its influence upon the business of the country is as nothing in comparison with the effect that its consummation would have. It is the most radical of measures and goes to the foundation of our present financial system. No middle ground is taken by its advocates; no position of conservatism looking to a more general use of the white metal as a part of our monetary system is satisfactory to those who are urging the passage of this bill. With protestations that they are in favor of bimetallism, they are advocating the passage of a measure which in my humble judgment will force upon this country silver monometallism. I am not among those who can see nothing but weakness in our present system. I believe that if we could get rid of the financial doctors who are constantly insisting that the Government is sick, each one of whom is trying to dose it with his particular nostrum, we would be largely relieved of the present difficulties. If the healthiest gentleman in this House were to be accosted on the way to the Capitol by a dozen of his friends, each of whom with solemn face would tell him how very badly he looked and ask him if he were not sick, there are ten chances to one that before night he would go to bed and send for a physician. Do you wonder that the Government is sick financially, when the country is full of people who are declaring it is on the verge of bankruptcy? There comes from the distinguished gentleman who presides at the other end of the Avenue the charge that all of our financial woes are the result of our system of finance, and he urges the immediate retirement of the greenbacks and the substitution of interest-bearing bonds for that part of our circulating medium. He further contends that our policy with reference to silver has added largely to our misfortunes and heaped difficulty upon difficulty. On the other hand, there comes from the other end of the Capitol the charge that financial ruin is staring us in the face and that free silver is what we need, and they propose to give us more of that which the President says is like a stone about our neck.

As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who opened this debate, this House sent to the other branch of Congress a bill intended to relieve the present embarrassment of the Treasury, an embarrassment which, in my opinion, has been wholly caused by the assaults that have been made, first, upon the industrial system inaugurated by the Republican party, and, secondly, upon the credit of the country. To this bill, framed in response to what seemed an urgent demand for relief, there comes back to this House the reply that as a remedy we shall open our mints to the silver of the whole world at a ratio of 16 to 1. The country is suffering, says the President, from too much silver; then, say the financial doctors at the other end of the Capitol, we will give it more, evidently upon the principle that like cures like, showing that they belong to the homeopathic school of finance. I am more than amazed at the financial vitality of this nation, in view of all the circumstances.

And what is the proposition contained in this bill? It is to throw open the doors of our mints and extend an invitation to the people of the world to bring their silver here and have it coined into dollars at a ratio of 16 parts of silver to 1 of gold. It starts out by absolutely ignoring the commercial value of these two metals. I do not recall a single instance in the history of any nation where the ratio between these two metals has been fixed without taking into consideration their commercial value. Their commercial value was not always, at the time the ratio was fixed, precisely equal to their coin value, but approximately so. But

now the silver in the silver dollar is worth, commercially, only a little more than one-half the value of the gold in the gold dollar. It is proposed by this bill to legislate nearly 50 cents into the silver dollar by putting the Government stamp upon it and by saying that it shall be a legal tender for all debts, public and private. To that extent it is pure fiatism.

There is no doubt but that it can by this process be given this additional debt-paying power. The Government would likewise have the power to say that 100 grains of pure silver shall constitute a dollar and be receivable for all debts, public and private, and yet there is probably no one who would advocate such a proposition. And yet why not? If the Government can make a dollar out of 50 cents' worth of silver and can maintain that dollar at a parity with gold and have them circulate concurrently, why may it not do the same with 25 cents' worth of silver? As the advocates of the free coinage of silver have not been deterred by the fact that silver has fallen about one-half in value, there is no reason to suppose that they would cease their demand for this measure if it should further decline. In fact, the history of this movement shows that the cheaper silver gets the more persistent are they in favor of its free coinage by this country, independent of any other, at the ratio of 16 to 1.

But the payment of debts is not the only purpose for which it is used. It is also used as a medium of exchange, and every time it is depreciated in value its exchange power is decreased. While you are making it easier to pay debts that have already been contracted upon a different basis, you are cutting down the purchasing power of the money. While you are increasing the price of things that people have to sell, you are at the same time increasing the price of those they have to buy. I suppose that a measure which would enable everyone to get a high price for what he had to sell, and to get what he had to buy at a low price, would be a very popular measure; but it is hardly possible that statesmanship will ever be able to devise such a one. Nor will the depreciation of the dollar add anything to values. Legislation does not create values. They depend upon the cost of production and the supply and demand. Nothing whatever was added to the values in this country during the war by the depreciated paper currency we had then. Prices were raised because everything was measured by a depreciated standard, but nothing was added to the value of the wheat or corn or labor by that kind of currency.

An act of this Congress can add nothing to the wealth of the country. Its wealth is in what it has produced and in its means for further production. You may change the standard by which that wealth is measured, but you can not increase it. Gentlemen talk about doubling values by doubling the money of the country, but in doing so they confound prices with values. There may be a wide distinction between them. Prices mean the value expressed in the accepted standard of measurement and change as that standard is changed, but real values are governed by the cost of production and the supply and demand. Prices rise when money is cheap, because people will not part with their property for cheap money as readily as when it has a larger purchasing power. In the South during the war property, as measured by the Confederate money, rose to enormous prices, but who would contend that the wealth was increased thereby? If it had been the people of the South would have been richer than any other people in the world. You might make a man 12 feet high by changing the standard foot from 12 to 6 inches, but in doing so you would not add one cubit to his stature.

The money of the country is no fair index to its wealth. It is an ipsignificant proportion of that wealth, indeed it may be a charge against that wealth, as in the case of credit money. The man who looks only to the circulating medium of the country to ascertain the basis of its prosperity does not look deep enough. Back of that and below that, in the rich lands and their productions, in the manufactories and their productions, in the mines, and, above all, in the honest labor of the people, is found the basis of wealth. Money is but a part of the machinery, and a very small part, too, by which exchanges between the people who own this wealth are facilitated. This machinery must be adapted to the work it is intended to perform, and for the purpose of encouraging these interchanges among the people it must have their confidence. The confidence of the business world must be behind every financial system to enable it to perform its proper function. There can be no confidence without stability, hence the introduction into our money system of an element that will disturb that confidence, instead of encouraging business, retards it; instead of extending, it contracts it; instead of bringing prosperity, it invites disaster. There can be no more effectual way of contracting the circulating medium of a country than by undermining the confidence of the business world. The moment confidence begins to depart that moment the best part of the money begins to disappear from the channels of trade and goes into the vaults for safe-keeping. The moment confidence is restored it comes out of these vaults, enters the channels of trade, revives business, starts the factories, employs labor, and helps to restore prosperity.

But it is contended by the advocates of this measure that by reason of the demonetization of silver in the different countries of the world that it has greatly depreciated in value, and that gold, by reason of the great demand for it, has appreciated, and that consequently the prices of all farm products particularly have fallen. I have not the time or the inclination to enter into an extended discussion of this question. Both sides of this proposition have been ably presented by different gentlemen upon this floor, and I was particularly interested in the charts exhibited on the one side by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] and on the other by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and another gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCLEARY]. Without undertaking to reply to these arguments, I want to say that there are so many influences that may operate at different times to change the prices of products that it is impossible, in my humble judgment, to say what may have been at any particular time the sole cause of their rise or decline. Indeed, I am rather disposed to believe that in most, if not all, cases the rise or fall of prices of products is attributable to no one cause alone, but to a variety of influences which operate to bring about the result. We do know, however, that an increased supply of any article without a corresponding increase in the demand for it will put down the price. We also know that when the supply and demand are both increased and there still is a decline in the price of the product that it may reasonably be attributed to the increased supply or the decreased cost of production, or both.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to one or two facts in connection with the decline in the price of silver, and I am free to admit that this decline was caused in part by its demonetization, not by the United States, but by the other countries of the world. In the year 1873, at the time of the commission of the so-called crime against silver, the commercial ratio between the two metals was about 16 to 1—16 ounces of silver being worth a little more than 1 ounce of gold. By reason of the undervaluation of silver it had for years disappeared from the circulating medium of the country, and there was none in circulation at that time. The act of 1873 withdrew no part of the money of this country. It did not contract the circulation by the withdrawal of silver, because there was no silver in circulation to be withdrawn. It did not decrease the demand for silver by dropping it out of the coinage, because there was no demand at that time for it for coinage purposes.

The law of 1873 simply recognized the fact existing at that time independent of the law. Notwithstanding this, silver commenced to decline in price at about that date, and continued to go down until 1894, when the commercial ratio of the two metals was about 1 to 33. If that was the only noticeable fact in connection with the decline of the white metal, and if the conditions had remained during the whole period of its decline the same as at the beginning, it would be reasonable to draw the conclusion that its demonetization was the cause of that decline. But it appears that for the period from 1866 to 1870 the average annual production of silver in the world was $55,663,000, and for the period from 1871 to 1876 it was $81,864,000, and for the period from 1876 to 1880 it was $101,850,000, and from 1881 to 1885 it was $118,955,000, and that it continued to increase in about the same ratio until 1894, when the annual silver product of the world was about $215,000,000, or nearly four times as great as in 1873.

Is it possible that this enormous increase could have had no effect upon its value in the market? I am not arguing that this was the sole cause of its decline, but I do contend that it was the prime cause. This position is sustained by the fact that after the discoveries of gold in California and Australia that metal declined in value, although there was no decrease in the demand for it. In 1846 the commercial ratio between gold and silver was 1 to 15.90. In 1852, during which time the annual gold supply had increased from about $38,000,000 to $150,000,000, the commercial ratio of the two metals went down to 1 to 15.32. If the increased production of gold at that time caused a decline in the price of that metal, may it not be reasonably assumed that the enormous increase of silver has been the prime cause of its great decline in value? Nor did the world cease to use silver as money at the time it was demonetized. In fact, the United States used more of it and coined more after that date than it had in all the time since the organization of the Government. During the period from 1873 to 1894 the total silver introduced into the circulating medium of this country amounted to nearly $540,000,000, and the total silver coinage of the world during that period amounted to $2,756,423,015. For the same period the world's coinage of gold amounted to $3,404,703,469, being in excess of the coinage of silver by $548,280,454. This does not indicate, as it seems to me, that silver has been ignored or that the demand for it has been lessened by the legislation referred to in any such way as to account for its heavy decline in price during that period. To me it seems much more

reasonable to believe that its decline is attributable chiefly to the enormous increase in the production of the metal and the decrease in the cost of that production.

But it is said it is not the intention to increase the value of the silver dollar so much as to decrease the value of the gold dollar. That the latter has appreciated in value greatly since 1873 by reason of the unusual demand for it, and that this accounts for the low price of everything and general stagnation of business. I would not undertake to say that the circumstances and conditions are not such as to justify the belief that gold has appreciated to some extent, but I believe if there has been any appreciation at all it has been so slight as to have had but little or no effect upon prices. It is said that farm products have gone down in price. So they have at times, and at other times they have gone up. When wheat, and corn, and hay, and pork go up in price it is attributable, say the free-silver advocates, to some local considerations or a general decrease in the supply, but if they go down it is charged to the demonetization of silver. A better and more satisfactory test, as it seems to me, is to measure the gold dollar by wages. A single large crop of wheat may fill the granaries of the world and force down the price of that cereal. Unfavorable weather in the corn-raising districts, while that crop is being grown, may cut it short, thus lessen the supply and increase the price. Not so with labor. The supply of and demand for labor is not so likely to fluctuate. Now, how has this so-called appreciation of gold affected wages?

From the report made by Colonel Wright to the Senate Committee on Finance in 1893 it appears that the purchasing power of a day's wages has risen from 138.5 per cent in 1873 (starting with 100 per cent in 1860) to 175.4 per cent in 1891; so that the purchasing power of wages was greater after the demonetization of silver than it was before. If the so-called crime against the white metal was the cause of the decrease of prices in farm products, why did it not at the same time cut down the purchasing power of wages? This fact furnishes another reason for the maintenance of a stable circulating medium—one that is not constantly fluctuating. There is no better index to the prosperity of the country than the employment of its labor at good wages. When labor is employed and well paid the country is prosperous, because it is increasing its wealth. The report which I have referred to shows further that during the depreciated-currency period, between 1862 and 1879, prices all increased as measured by the new standard, but wages did not increase in proportion.

The laboring man was the first one to feel the effect of the increased prices of the articles he had to buy for his daily consumption, but was the last one to get the benefit of it in the increase of his wages. Prices rose from 100 per cent in 1860 to 190.7 per cent in 1865, while wages only increased during the same period from 100 to 148.6 per cent, which gave a purchasing power of only 77.9 per cent as compared with 1860. Nominal wages were higher than ever, but the wage earner was actually making less than he was in 1860. It is sometimes said that silver is the workingman's money, but the workingman is as much interested in having a stable standard of value as anyone else. He lives by his daily labor and with his wages he purchases each day the necessaries of life. He is the last one to get the benefit of a rise in prices. It touches everything that he eats and wears before it touches his wages. He needs a dollar that will not fluctuate in value, because he can not change his wages to suit the fluctuations. It is always a difficult thing to increase wages; it is sometimes done, but ordinarily only after a strike or a lockout. Everything that he buys, however, responds very quickly to changes in the quality of the money, so that it is to his interests to have as few of these changes as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the question presented by this measure is one of great importance to the American people. We all concede that, some of us from one standpoint and some from another. I believe the representatives of this great nation, North, South, East, and West, are equally patriotic in their earnest desire to solve this question so that it will redound to the eternal welfare and happiness of this great people. It ought not to be a question of what will benefit this section or that, but what will increase the prosperity of the whole people. All sections are so intimately connected with each other, so allied by ties of commerce, patriotism, friendship, and hope for the future, that whatever injures one part of the country affects to a greater or less degree the whole. Nor should it be a question of what will benefit this class or that. We are not here as the representatives of a class, but of all the people. To me it seems to be a question of the stability of our monetary standard. It is not a question of larger use of silver as a part of our monetary system, but it is a question of whether we shall undertake to absorb the silver product of the world in case it shall be presented to our mints for coinage.

In what I have said I have argued on the assumption that the enactment of this measure would bring the country to a silver basis. That there is a possibility of this result from the passage of this bill is virtually conceded by some of those who advocate it. That this would be the result appears to me to be as clear as that the night follows the day when we consider it in the light of our experience and the experience of other nations. This country adopted the double standard in 1792 at a ratio of 15 to 1, but in this ratio gold was slightly undervalued, and very soon, according to a law as inexorable as that of growth and decay, the gold began to disappear from circulation and by 1817 there was none left. From that time until 1834, although legally we were on a bimetallic basis, as a matter of fact and for all purposes of business we were on a silver basis.

The act of Congress passed for the purpose of establishing bimetallism was as ineffectual for that purpose as the blowing of the east wind. An attempt was then made in 1834 to reestablish the ratio by increasing the amount of silver in that dollar and to bring the legal ratio more nearly in harmony with the commercial. By that act the ratio was fixed at 16 to 1. At that time the commercial ratio between the two metals was 15.73 to 1. The effect of this was to drive silver out of circulation, because that metal was undervalued by the mints of the country. A metal, just as any product, will always go from the place where it is undervalued to the place where it can be exchanged at a higher valuation. From 1834 until the passage of the act of 1878 we were substantially without silver as a part of the money of the country. Now, if we were not successful in securing the concurrent circulation of these two metals at a ratio of 16 to 1 when their commercial ratio was about 15.75 to 1, how can we expect to do it when the commercial ratio is 32 or 33 to 1?

But it is said that the silver dollar circulates now with gold and has as large a debt-paying power as the gold dollar. So it has, but it is because of the policy inaugurated by the Republican party of maintaining the two metals at a parity. Silver dollars are limited in amount, and are receivable by the Government for taxes and customs dues, and this makes them equal with gold.

It is contended by some that a silver basis would be infinitely better for the country than the present condition of our finances, and Mexico has been cited as a country that is prosperous with a silver circulating medium. God save this country from being Mexicanized! It is true that Mexico has prospered to some extent in the last few years, but this can be said only when her prosperity is considered on the Mexican basis. If the conditions prevailed here that now prevail in Mexico we would think they fell far short of prosperity as we understand that term. The present prosperity of Mexico is accounted for, not by her monetary system, but by her protective system. It is the invasion of that country by American enterprise, encouraged, as it has been, by her protective laws, that has given an impetus to Mexican commercial affairs despite her money system.

I have no particular fondness for gold as gold. I would rather see the two metals circulating concurrently in every nation of the world, and I would welcome an international agreement that would bring about that result. I would welcome an international agreement between this country, Germany, and the nations composing the Latin Union for the free and unlimited coinage of the two metals at a ratio having some relation to their commercial value, because I believe that such an agreement might result in establishing the value of the cheaper metal so that it could circulate as a companion with gold. I would not wait for England to join us in such an arrangement, because I believe that if we would wait for that it would never be accomplished, and I do not regard her assent absolutely necessary. I would also be glad to see the bills of small denominations withdrawn and their place taken by silver. But when it is proposed that this country, single-handed and alone, shall undertake, by opening its mints to the silver of the world, to double the value of that metal, I must enter my protest on behalf of a constituency that has so recently spoken with great emphasis against such a course.

I confidently look forward to the day, not far in the future, when the Republican party, returning to power in every department of the Government, will place upon the statute books a law that will protect American interests, revive American industries, and place this country upon the high plane of prosperity that it once occupied. The present measure would be no fit companion for that. The two would not go hand in hand. This would counteract the beneficial effect of that; it would put us out of gear, so to speak, with the other commercial nations of the world. We are a great nation, capable of accomplishing great things, I will agree, but let us recognize that there are some things that we can not do. We can not change economic laws. To those of you on this side of the House let me say that there is no safety, either for the country or the party, in a departure from one of the cardinal principles of the Republican party, namely, that a parity between all the dollars in circulation must be maintained. I am in favor of as large a use of silver as can be maintained to that standard; but I must oppose this measure, because I believe it means a return to a depreciated dollar, with all its attendant evils; be-

cause I believe it would put us on a silver basis, and deprive us of the gold which now gives stability to our money; because I believe that instead of giving us bimetallism in fact it would give us that only in name, and we should have silver monometallism in fact; because I believe it would be in conflict with the expressed purpose and announced principles of the Republican party that every dollar should be as good as every other dollar, and because I believe it would undermine public confidence in our monetary system, and thereby seriously injure the business interests of the whole country. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to add to the illumination that has already been furnished to this subject by so large a number of gentlemen who have ably discussed it. I do not rise for that purpose; but I want it understood that there are a certain number of objections that arise in my mind from a general view of the subject which I would like at least to allude to in my remarks; and I shall vote accordingly. With my present convictions, the bill before us does not recommend itself at all to my approval; and the speeches that have been made upon it, while many of them have been splendid specimens of forensic eloquence and have presented a marvelous array of facts and historical allusions, they have not convinced me that I should be safe in voting for the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

I have noticed that those who deal with this subject in the affirmative, especially, not to mention those who take the other side—that those who advocate the free and unlimited coinage of silver have decorated the discussion with everything that was splendid in the line of speech making, sometimes to the exclusion and damage of convincing argument. We have had logic, history, and rhetoric, and map illustrations, and almost everything possible to create dramatic impressions upon the minds of the House; but after looking over the whole line of arguments and listening to all the discussion I have concluded that it would be unsafe to be controlled by those manifestations.

I confess that I was incomparably charmed with the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE], who stood in his place for more than an hour and threw the fascination of his eloquence over this listening assembly, and without deliberate and calm criticism one might have been disposed to be carried away by his persuasive utterances; but when the blood got cool and the argument was looked into, it was found not to be so cogent and so potent as at first indicated. I felt proud of that gentleman as he made his speech here. I felt an inspiring self-gratulation that Almighty God had endowed the human mind with such faculties of perception and arrangement and a being with such power of utterance that a speech like that could be produced on so dry a subject as that of the currency and finance. And I thought to myself, I am glad, furthermore, that this gentleman belongs to the ranks of the same great party to which I belong. I congratulated myself that that was in a great measure the kind of stuff that Republicans are made of; and I thought if this man should be carried away from our ranks by philosophic abstractions and untried vagaries, I should regret it deeply, if he should fall out by the way, like the angels that followed Lucifer in the lapse from paradise, always beautiful, but always unfortunate. And then when he brought out his map I can not tell you how picturesque the whole scene appeared to me.

When I saw his little red line of silver, I believe it was, that ran from 1792 to 1873, and then leaped apparently over a chasm, I thought of all those beautiful visions in material nature that appeared to me in days gone by—of the magnificent Falls of Montmorency, of the bridal veil in the Yosemite Valley, falling a thousand feet at a stroke, and of the great Niagara, with its thunderings, and I tried to imagine whether I could not hear the echoes from the chasm into which it fell; but I could not repress another vision which crossed my mind at that particular moment, a vision of a deeper and a darker chasm. I saw great multitudes of the American people marching toward it, and I listened and thought I heard arising the sounds of desolation and the voice of the battling winds, and at the bottom thereof there were bankruptcy, business stagnation, congestion, and national ruin; and that, further, all these perils were undiscovered until it was too late to beat a retreat.

We have had, too, that fascinating figure of the circulation of the blood, which I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] very adroitly and successfully handled when he said that the circulation of the blood would be of no good without the action of the heart—the confidence of the people of the nation. And then I thought of the manifestation of confidence that had been made with regard to this matter within the last few days, when five times the amount asked for by the Government upon its bond loan had been offered by the American people; and I queried whether or not this confidence grew out of the expectation that we should pass a free and unlimited coinage bill or whether it grew out of the assurance that we would resist so radical a measure.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] very aptly referred to that part of the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] where he rang the changes on the demand, "Do something for silver." The idea struck me that the attitude of silver in this particular regard furnishes the keynote of the argument and the key to the situation. The position of silver to-day is that of a nursling, and we are nursing it. It needs to have something done for it. And I was amused at the plea that the gentleman from California made, that he would have us "do something" for the sake of doing something—do something for the sake of movement—keep moving whether you succeed or not. And I can not but recall the unfortunate illustration with which the gentleman emphasized his position—the illustration of a negro trying to jump through a stone wall. I did not notice that in the gentleman's narration the negro ever got through. I do not think he did. That reminds me of the ancient philosopher who, doubting his identity, attempted to prove it by bumping his own head against a wall, and instead of making a hole in the wall made a hole in his head.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIS. I thought I was to have twenty minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten minutes was the time allowed the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. I have not fairly got into the merits of this question; and I have been waiting a week for the opportunity to say something.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware be allowed ten minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not sympathize with that kind of faith illustrated by the gentleman from California in his story of the negro attempting to jump through a stone wall. I do not believe, and never have believed, that the Almighty God requires any man to do anything he can not do. He does not recognize a faith that points to the impossible, and neither ought we.

We do not ask the little brook
To turn the wheel;
Unto the larger stream we look.
The strength of steel,
We do not ask of silken bands;
Nor hearts of oak from willow wands.
We do not ask the wren to go
Up to the heights the eagles know;
Nor yet expect the lark's clear note
From out the dove's dumb throat.

But the gentleman from California does seem to expect that we shall undertake to do something that can not be done, and that is to coin all the silver in the world that may be brought to us and keep it at a parity with gold.

Another thought has occurred to me. It has been intimated here that it would be a lamentable thing for us to fall upon gold monometallism as a permanent condition. Now, I want to ask if there is more danger or less danger from our present attitude of going to gold monometallism than there would be of going to silver monometallism with the free and unlimited coinage of silver? Of course I am brought to the choice between the two horns of the dilemma. If we are to come to one or the other I think I had better stay where I am.

This idea of "doing something for silver" presents itself to my mind in this way. We are upholding $600,000,000 of silver to-day, and these advocates of free and unlimited coinage of silver wish us to uphold all there is. The question is, can we do it? We have already performed a herculean task. The camel can bear his load if you do not put on the last feather that breaks his back.

Another inquiry that arose in my mind is this: Are we as a nation ready to stand out in an isolated position against the solidarity of the nations of the world on this matter of silver coinage? We cultivate close and intimate relations with those nations in everything else. Shall we separate from them in this regard? We propose to reciprocate and affiliate and aggregate in the matter of trade; shall we separate and segregate in the matter of money, which is the measure of trade?

This question has been very properly illustrated in this debate by a reference to the Scriptures. "No man liveth to himself." And the remainder of the passage might well have been cited: "No man dieth to himself." That is applicable to this subject as well as to many others. I do not think we are prepared to take that isolated position in reference to the people of the world. We may lead in other things; we may lead in governmental ideas; we may lead in promulgating the great truths of free and popular government, the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity. But the question is, are we strong enough to lead in this matter of finance and to take an isolated position? If we are, then the proposition presents itself to my mind, if we are strong enough to force silver coinage alone then we are strong enough to force an international standard; and that is what we want. I repeat, if we are powerful enough to force on the world free and unlimited coinage we are powerful enough to force an international standard, which I earnestly advocate.

One other thought. It is a formula of the advocates of free silver that money is the creature of law. I agree to that. I believe that the law of custom and legislative law together have made money

what it is. But what are the limits of the law? Are they bounded by a single country or a single continent? What is the law but a universal law of the leading monetary and commercial nations of the world? And if we are to move in obedience to the law we must hearken to the law as we find it.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had one or two quite interesting things to say; some interesting incidents with reference to this last point. The last point is this: I do not like the affiliation of the doctrine of free silver; and I would not speak here offensively to any gentleman nor concerning any gentleman. I do not say harsh things or use harsh terms myself. I have always noticed that those who do are apt to receive them again in return. But I am apprehensive concerning the affiliation of the doctrine of free silver. I find it in company with some of the most radical and revolutionary measures that the country has ever known. You know that in 1832 we had nullification, in 1860 we had secession, and since that time we have had Populism, socialism, spiritualism [laughter]—we have had the single-tax heresy.

Don't let that gavel fall, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.] I have got one or two of the best stories to tell you you have ever heard. [Renewed laughter.] Let me get through with them and I have about finished what I wanted to say.

Down in Delaware some time ago there was one of these "single taxers" who came along. People did not know what the thing meant, and he never succeeded in explaining it to them. I was going into town when I caught up to him, took him into the carriage and drove him in. He said, during the conversation that followed, "I have often heard of Delaware, and wondered why I did not see, when I got here, a lot of the blue hens and chickens running around." [Laughter.] He says, "Does it not seem strange that I have not seen them?" I replied, "Why, my friend, that story is a little myth that grew out of the Revolutionary war." He says, "You do not tell me so; I thought it was really a breed of chickens of that kind." [Laughter.] I said, "You tell me that you are a free-silver man?" He said, "Yes, sir, I am; and I know all about it, and I can satisfy these people in Delaware and show them the rights of the matter without any difficulty." "Oh," says I, "that is all right, I like to find a man with the courage of his convictions when he has founded them on extensive knowledge, on large experience, and common sense, it is then a virtue and a force to any man. But when it is only the surmounting of ignorance, and is fed by the secretions of an engorged liver [laughter], it is as disgusting as a jewel of gold in the swine's snout;" and then I put him out. [Great laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Why, I have the best story to tell you you ever heard. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes' extension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is entitled to recognition, but the Chair will submit the request.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Let him go on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Two or three nights ago I attended a spiritualistic lecture in this city——

Mr. DOLLIVER. What were you doing in a place like that? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. Well, now, that is none of your business, my friend, for after you have delivered such a magnificent speech as you did on yesterday you have much more to do than to ask me questions of that kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, go on and tell us about the lecture.

Mr. WILLIS. I listened to the man on spiritualism. He made a very good talk from his standpoint. He dwelt largely on what he called the "reciprocity of molecular action" [laughter] and proved by it or explained the vibrations of a steel bar, the photographic art, the telephone, the phonograph, and spiritualistic manifestations. He said they all came from the same source. He said that the spiritual consciousness of an individual projected itself by that law of reciprocal molecular action upon the spiritual consciousness of another, and thus manifested itself sensibly. And with this theory he swept away the Bible, the church, the preacher, Jesus Christ, and God himself. [Laughter.] That, he said, was a spiritual manifestation. I thought I would like to have one. However, he told a story of Seth Winchell, who died in Libby Prison, and whose spiritual essence was projected upon the spiritual consciousness of the speaker through the medium of a certain lady. God bless the women! It seems that no great thing can be achieved in the world without some relation to the women. He said the presence of this lady was the medium through which the spiritual consciousness of Seth Winchell projected itself upon his spiritual consciousness.

Seth Winchell revealed to him the fact that twelve years before he had died in Libby Prison; that he died of starvation; that he had been looking for him ever since; that he had written him a letter by the hand of a certain individual, which letter, it seems, he had never received. He went on with that story.

After the lecture was over I said, "I am going to look into this thing," and I went upon the platform, and I said, "My friend, I want to ask you a question." He said, "All right." "When you had the spirit of Seth Winchell there, talking to him, why on earth didn't you find out all about that other country? Why didn't you ask him concerning its latitude and longitude?"

A MEMBER. And its temperature. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; "its temperature, and all that sort of thing. I have been wanting to know about that, and I have thought that if ever I found a house with a ghost in it I should buy it, if God would help me, because I wanted to communicate with some of these spiritual beings that come from the undiscovered country." "Well," he said, "this man's intelligence was of small compass, and he could not do much in that line." "Why," I said, "he had brains enough to tell you he had died in Libby Prison, and that he starved to death, and that he had written you a letter and sent it by another person, and all that. I should think he could tell you some things about the topography of the glory land, or otherwise, as the case might be. But, however," said I, "I want to ask you another question. Are you for free silver or agin it?" [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, he caught me by the hand, and said he, "You bet I am for it every time and all through." Said I, "I am satisfied." [Laughter.] "I do not like the affiliations." [Laughter.] But, sir, there is a great conservative force that stands between the American people and the confirmation of this idea. It is the epitome of the equation of righteousness; it is the embodiment and aggregation of the best political opinion that the world has ever known. It is the great Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I should like consent that the gentleman from Delaware occupy the remainder of the time, and I will take my chance in the five-minute debate to give the gentleman at least some understanding of what the single tax is, and to answer his argument. I think it would spoil his speech and not help me much to interrupt him at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIS. During the other evening session I heard the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT], and I have learned to like him very much. I am glad that you did not censure him the other day. I do not think he meant anything wrong at all. I am glad you did what you did with that resolution in sending it to the Judiciary Committee. I thought I heard him say—I suppose it was "in the heat of the moment"—that the Republican party had ruined the country for thirty years. That is a wonderful thing. It "ruined the country" when those fellows were trying to tear down the house over our heads, to destroy the old family mansion, when it stood in the forefront and met their brave legions successfully, and then hung out the white flag, hung up the "bruised arms for monuments," and displaced the roll of the battle drum and the loud clarion of war with the sweet music of friendship and peace and good will. [Applause.]

It "ruined the country" when, through the tortuous methods and times of reconstruction, it steered the old ship safe until we were one people again. It "ruined the country" when it provided for the stretching out of the great ægis of its protection over the industries of America, until the chimneys smoked in every valley and on every hill, and the bread cry ceased in the streets of every city, and the soup houses were closed, and the poor man's table was supplied with bread, and the firesides of the American dwellers were happy from the east to the west, from the north to the south.

It "ruined the country" when, in 1878, it provided for the resumption of specie payments and put the American currency on a solid, living, and healthy basis, so that to-day in every land beneath the sun where monetary transactions are conducted any of our money, whether paper or otherwise, is as good as it is here at home.

It "ruined the country" when, in 1892, it had the largest exports and the largest imports that it ever has had in all its history, and when the exports were $180,000,000 more than the imports, and the currents of trade, and consequently the currents of exchange, were toward our shores. The Treasury was not bankrupt, and the cry did not go forth for the issuing of bonds. "Ruined the country!" Why, sir, the nations of the world stand still and look with wonder upon her prosperity. She has become the cynosure of the observers of creation, and I doubt not that those in the invisible land are well pleased to know that there is a country where every man may be free and prosperous, and where all men may be brothers, and where liberty, equality, and fraternity are the touchstones of peace and the assurance of happiness. [Applause.]

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes a. m.), Thursday, February 13, 1896, the House adjourned until 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 13, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman from Maine will——

Mr. HITT. Will the gentleman from Maine allow me to present a report on a privileged resolution? It is an inquiry.

Mr. DINGLEY. If it is privileged, of course it can come in.

Mr. HITT. It is privileged.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois.

BERNARD CAMPBELL.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report back to the House with a favorable recommendation, with one amendment, a resolution which came from the House January 27, and to ask for its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the public interest, the correspondence with the Government of Haiti concerning the claim of Bernard Campbell, of Boston, Mass., for injuries inflicted upon him by Haitian soldiers in endeavoring to force him by Haitian into the naval service of Haiti.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "by Haitian," in line 11 of the resolution, after the words "force him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

RECALL OF A BILL.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House Senate bill 79, for the correction of a verbal error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 2904.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate has been closed by order of the House, and the Clerk will report the Senate amendment to House bill 2904.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, before making the motion to nonconcur in the Senate amendment, as instructed by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, I may say that it is the intention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to move to concur, and as that motion would take priority, the motion to concur will be the question in order in the Committee of the Whole. Under the order that has been adopted by the House, the bill is to be considered in Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule until 4 o'clock, and at 4 o'clock the question is to be taken on what will then be the pending motion, to be made by the gentleman from Georgia, on concurrence in the Senate amendment, which is to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert another bill, as sent over by the Senate; and as the negative of concurrence will be nonconcurrence, that will be the only vote taken at 4 o'clock, and that if the committee should recommend nonconcurrence, the bill will be immediately reported to the House with that recommendation. But under an arrangement made between myself and the gentleman from Georgia, who represents the minority of the committee, he desires to close debate in behalf of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means to-morrow rather than to-day. If he should then occupy one hour, another hour would be occupied by members representing the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. That would bring the roll call, the vote by yeas and nays, to-morrow soon after 2 o'clock. The votes to-day will be in Committee of the Whole, and, being in Committee of the Whole, the yeas and nays of course can not be called.

I desire to make a simple statement, further, in reference to the parliamentary situation of the bill under consideration in Committee of the Whole this afternoon until 4 o'clock. After the gentleman from Georgia shall have made his motion to concur the bill will be open to a motion or motions to concur with an amendment. The only motion that would then be in order would be one to concur with an amendment, and when one shall be disposed of, then another, and at 4 o'clock, the other motions having been disposed of, the vote will be taken in Committee of the Whole on the question of concurring or nonconcurring, as I have already said.

I have thought it proper, Mr. Chairman, to make this statement of the parliamentary situation, so that gentlemen who are preparing amendments which they desire to offer may be enabled to put them in the parliamentary form of moving to concur with an amendment in the Senate amendment, which is to strike out all of the House bill and to insert instead the Senate bill.

In this connection, I desire to say that, on account of the parliamentary situation, gentlemen will observe that the bill is not in a condition that amendments of a vital character can be properly offered, because that would involve concurrence in the Senate amendment, which, I take it, the majority of the House is unwilling to do. The majority having deliberately passed a bill here, I take it that they do not intend to recede from their action thus deliberately taken. Even if amendments be such as, under other circumstances, as separate measures, the Committee of the Whole or the House would be ready to adopt, they can not safely be accepted in the present condition of the bill. I shall ask, therefore, that the Committee of the Whole reject all propositions to concur with an amendment, in order that we may be brought to the straight question of concurrence or nonconcurrence in the Committee of the Whole; and if there are propositions of sufficient merit to deserve the consideration of the House they should be brought forward as separate measures. Having made this statement, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN].

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, I was going to direct attention to a fact which has been brought out by the gentleman from Maine in his last remarks, but possibly not with the distinctness it deserves. While the gentleman has stated the parliamentary situation up to the last stage correctly, the fact remains that as the motion that is to be made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to concur in the Senate amendment may be pending at any time with a motion to concur with an amendment, the way for the committee to get at whatever it wants in addition to what the Senate bill carries is, when one amendment to concur with an amendment is voted down, to make another motion to concur with an amendment and vote upon that, and so on.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think I have stated that. When one motion to concur with an amendment shall have been rejected, then another motion to concur with another amendment will be in order until 4 o'clock, when the vote must be taken on the straight question of concurrence or nonconcurrence in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BRUMM. Is there any way by which we can get a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. DINGLEY. You will have that in the House on the Senate amendment.

Mr. BRUMM. But I mean on the amendments that may be offered?

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all; unless an amendment should be adopted in Committee of the Whole. If no amendment is adopted in Committee of the Whole, then the only vote to be taken in the House will be the action of the committee on the motion which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] proposes to make, on which there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the committee that I misunderstood the arrangement as set forth in the RECORD of Monday and presumed that the final vote would be taken this afternoon at 4 o'clock. In order to be present on that occasion I have twice postponed matters of a business character that necessarily call me away, and, without any further statement now, and while I can not be present at the vote, I desire the RECORD to show that if I were present I would vote not to concur in the Senate substitute, and would vote also against all amendments that may be proposed.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I wish to ask the gentleman from Maine a question in regard to the parliamentary situation. If I understand him correctly he says that all amendments must be offered with a motion to concur.

Mr. DINGLEY. To concur with an amendment.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will it be in order to move to concur and strike out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. DINGLEY. That is the amendment of the Senate, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the Senate bill.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. My question is: Will it be in order to move to strike out all of the Senate proposition, leaving only the enacting clause, and to insert?

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all. The House bill has been completed by the House and is not subject to amendment here. You can not touch the House bill; all you can touch is the Senate amendment.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, will it be in order at some stage of the proceedings to offer a substitute for the Senate bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. That would be to move to concur with an amendment.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, certainly; a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment would be in order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of the Whole report to the House a recommendation of nonconcurrence in the Senate amendment to the House bill.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of the Whole report this bill to the House with the recommendation that the House concur in the Senate amendment. I do not propose now to discuss that question. At a later period, under the arrangement that has been made, I shall have an opportunity of doing so. Pending the consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole, of course any gentleman may move that the House agree in the Senate amendment with an amendment. Naturally that motion takes precedence of mine, because if my motion shall prevail the matter will be ended and no vote can be had on the other proposition. I suggest, therefore, on behalf of the committee, that if there are a number of amendments which gentlemen desire to offer and on which they wish to have votes taken in Committee of the Whole, it will be necessary for the committee, when a proposition is presented, to discuss it briefly and vote upon it, so that other propositions may be disposed of in the same way; because when the hour of 4 o'clock arrives the consideration of the matter in Committee of the Whole will be closed under the order of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] moves that the Committee of the Whole report this bill back to the House with the recommendation that the House concur in the Senate amendment. That question takes precedence.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting as follows, to wit:

"SECTION 1. From and after the 1st day of July, 1896, the mints of the United States shall be open to the unlimited coinage of silver the product of mines situated in the United States, upon the same terms and conditions as the same was coined prior to 1873.

"SEC. 2. From and after July 1, 1896, there shall be levied and collected an import duty of 10 cents per ounce upon all silver the product of mines situated out of the United States."

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the last part of that amendment, the part dealing with tariff duties, that it is not germane to the bill. This bill does not deal with tariff duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard upon the point of order? The gentleman from Maine makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is not germane to the Senate amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is put in a wrong form for any of it to be in order. It should be a motion to concur with an amendment. You can not move to strike out all after the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to concur with the amendment which has been read.

Mr. DINGLEY. If that is his motion, to concur with an amendment, is his amendment intended as a substitute for the Senate substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand as to that. The gentleman from California will perhaps answer the question of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is owing to the condition of my health that I have failed to understand either the Chair or the gentleman from Maine as to whether the point of order is made against my entire amendment or only against the second section of it.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition of the gentleman from California is practically to nonconcur, and therefore the motion is out of order, because the motion to nonconcur has been already made. The gentleman calls his proposition a motion to concur, but it is really a motion for nonconcurrence. He moves to strike out all of the Senate proposition after the enacting clause. That is not concurrence; it is nonconcurrence.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think the gentleman from California can probably modify his amendment so as to bring the first part of it within the rule. He must put his amendment in the form so that it shall be an amendment of the Senate substitute, not touching the House bill, which is not open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I intended to do, Mr. Chairman. My motion was to amend the Senate substitute. The intention that I had was to move to concur in the Senate substitute by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting an amendment, or a bill, providing for the coinage of American silver and levying a duty upon foreign silver. That was what I wanted to do, and if my motion is not in order and gentlemen will tell me why, I shall be much obliged and will try to change it so as to make it in order.

Mr. DINGLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he moves to strike out all after the enacting clause, which takes the whole of the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am perfectly willing to take it all out. [Laughter.] I did not vote for it. It is not my child. I am willing to kill it at any time or in any way. I am not acquainted with the rules which teach how not to do it. I am acquainted only with the rules which teach us how to do it, not with those rules which teach us how not to do it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out all after the first section and inserting the amendment which I send to the desk. Is that in order?

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman want to leave in the free-coinage provision? It occurs to me that the gentleman will accomplish his object by moving to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out that amendment commencing with section 1 and inserting what he sends up.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was what I intended; but the Chair, as I understood, ruled the provision out of order.

Now I will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the portion of the gentleman's amendment which relates to customs duties is not germane to this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I withdraw the second section, so as to have a vote simply on the other. Following the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine, I move to concur in the Senate substitute with an amendment striking out that substitute and inserting a provision for the coinage of American silver. I withdraw the second section of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California state the proposition again?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. At the suggestion of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT], who is an expert parliamentarian in Massachusetts, whatever he may be in Congress [laughter], I ask permission to withdraw my motion temporarily, so that I may write it out in a shape which will represent my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California, as the Chair understands, will present his amendment later.

Mr. LONG. I move to concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 1 of the Senate substitute add the following:

"*Provided*, That this section shall apply to the coinage of silver mined in the United States of America only."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG].

Mr. DINGLEY. As I understand, this amendment leaves the free-coinage provision just as it came from the Senate.

Mr. LONG. This confines free coinage to the product of the silver mines of the United States only.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, money adds no value to anything without preexisting labor. Law, within its jurisdiction, fixes the debt-paying value of money by making it legal tender; but real value in money for trade and commerce is no more the creature of law than is value in flocks, herds, and cultivated fields. Law fixes the unit of value, but can not fix or make the value in the unit. That is done by the dealers in the commodities for which money is exchanged, and it is graded according to the cost of production, the supply and demand of money, and the commodities at the time of the exchange. The dealer in the products of labor fixes the value of what shall be received for them. The woodchopper on the banks of the Mississippi River, near the close of the rebellion, when hailed by a steamboat captain, who asked whether his wood was for sale, answered, "Yes." The captain inquired, "How much a cord?" "How do you propose to pay?" "In Confederate money." "Then cord for cord." [Laughter.]

If it were possible to pass a law which would be sustained by the courts providing that every 3-year-old steer should pay a debt of $20, that would be the debt-paying value of the steer; but the butcher, if he bought it, would pay only what its meat, when

dressed, could be sold for to his customers. Law can compel the creditor to receive from his debtor what the law says shall discharge the debt. But law can not compel a dealer in the products of labor in the course of trade to exchange his ownership for anything that he does not at the time consider an equivalent of what he parts with.

When contracting a debt, if the seller knows what he must receive his debt in and does not believe the article worth in real value the commodity he is selling, he adds to the price of his commodity so as to make it even; and the greater his doubt or distrust, the greater per cent he adds, until the distrust makes the proposed article of exchange worthless. So every dealer in commodities judges for himself as to the value of articles in actual exchange. But when the value of his commodity is put into a debt, then he must take in its discharge what the law declares legal tender.

Legal tender creates no value; it simply declares what shall pay a debt. A thing of no commercial value is not an equivalent of a product of labor, and no legislative enactment can make it such. It may be used as such temporarily, under the stress of some overruling necessity; but if continued any length of time will, by the inevitable expansion and contraction that must follow, end in bankruptcy and financial ruin. The question before us is whether it would be wise for this Government alone, without the cooperation of any other nation, to open its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, stamping 371¼ grains of pure silver as a dollar? When it is thus stamped with the unit we have fixed by law, its debt-paying value is fixed at $1, but its commercial value is not changed. If it were, what would be the use of putting the stamp "One dollar" on 371¼ grains? Why not stamp that amount of silver as $1,000? We could do it just as easily.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Many MEMBERS. Go on!

Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROW. I thank the committee, Mr. Chairman, for its courtesy, and I will proceed as speedily as possible with my illustration in reference to the unit value of money.

For successful business at home and in trade with the nations, debt-paying value and commercial value ought to be the same. And it is essential that a standard or measure of values should be recognized alike by all the dealers in the commodities or real values for which the standard or measure is exchanged. Money is the commodity used to facilitate the exchange of other commodities and to settle the difference in the values of the commodities. Its chief employment is to pay balances in business. The standard or measure of values should therefore retain the same value when paid out that it had when it was received; otherwise somebody would be the loser by its use. And it should contain the greatest amount of commercial value in the smallest space; for weight and bulk affect the convenience and expense in its use.

Gold [holding up a twenty-dollar gold piece] represents what the commercial nations of the earth, or the most of them, have adopted as a standard or measure of value. In this gold piece there are twenty units of value by our law; and in this roll of twenty silver dollars there are the same number. But the bulk of the silver is over twenty times greater and the weight is sixteen times greater. The value of the twenty units in the silver, if there was no pledge of the Government to keep them on a parity in the markets would to-day be about one-half of the commercial value of the same units in the gold dollar, while the debt-paying value is the same in each. If, then, there is to be but one standard of value the gold would be preferable by reason of its greatly less bulk and weight. If the two standards of gold and silver could be kept equal—that is, interchangeable in purchasing power—then it would be best to have both, for thereby the silver could be added to the volume of circulation.

If our mints were now opened to the free and unrestricted coinage of silver at 16 to 1, what would be the result? A merchant in France, Germany, or England owing our citizens $1,000,000 could bring silver and have it coined here, and if the commercial value of silver, 371¼ grains, in his country was 50 cents he could have what cost him $500,000 stamped at our mint for $1,000,000, with which he could pay his debts. But an American merchant owing in either of these countries could not do the same thing by taking the American silver dollar there. His $1,000,000 in standard American silver dollars would pay his creditors there $500,000.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROW. I should be very much pleased to have the further indulgence of the committee for five minutes, and then I will yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceeding for five minutes longer?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I object.

Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in December last this House, in partial response to the urgent call of the President, passed a bill, which has been nominally returned to us by the Senate, but which is not really before us. The House has the power to originate revenue bills and the Senate has the power simply to amend them. Under a claimed power of amendment the Senate has struck out of the House bill everything after the enacting clause and has sent us an entirely different measure. If such a proceeding was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution when they gave the Senate the power to amend revenue bills then the right of the House to originate such measures is not worth the ink required to write it into the Constitution.

When the House bill was sent to the Senate there could be no question as to the truth of two propositions: First, that the Secretary of the Treasury then had the power to issue bonds; and second, that it was necessary for him to exercise that power in the near future, in order to prevent a collapse in the Treasury. The House gave him no new authority, but simply modified that which he already possessed. Instead of requiring him to issue thirty-year 4 per cent bonds, or a bond for a shorter term at a higher rate, in order to provide temporary funds, it gave him the power to issue five-year 3 per cent bonds, and the bill was passed with a speed which the urgency of the situation required.

After six weeks of delay and of academic debate on other questions, the Senate returns to us a new measure. The Secretary had already been compelled to act, and the cost to this country of the failure of the Senate to adopt the House bill can be pretty accurately measured. The total minimum interest charge that must be paid by the people on the one hundred-million-dollar loan recently placed will be $116,000,000. The total minimum interest charge on a loan of that size under the House bill would have been $15,000,000. It is a significant fact that the House measure of relief was set aside against the votes of Senators who represent a majority of 10,000,000 of the American people. Such is the unequal composition of that body that the people will be compelled to pay an excess of more than $100,000,000 of interest, nearly equal to the cost of the Revolutionary war, on account of the contemptuous levity with which the House bill was treated by the Senate, and against the protests of the great majority of the people through their representatives in both Houses of Congress.

It seems to me that this indicates the propriety of our discussing to-day a change in the composition of the Senate rather than the free coinage of silver, and if it can not be made a more modern or representative body on account of the peculiar provision of the Constitution with regard to the equal representation of the States, then it may be pertinent to discuss the question of reducing the powers which that body has under the Constitution.

The Senate bill, while ostensibly for bimetallism, is really for silver monometallism. It requires a change in our standard of money which would produce a financial revolution in this country. Ever since the 1st of January, 1879, our dollar has been worth the intrinsic value of the gold in a gold dollar, for, in effect, gold is our money of ultimate redemption. If the Senate bill should pass, there can be no question that our dollar of redemption would be the silver dollar. There is nothing more unsocial than currencies of different values, and it is beyond the power of any Government to compel moneys of different values to circulate on terms of equality. So that, beyond all question, the unit which would measure all debt and all values in this country under the Senate bill would be the value of the bullion in the silver dollar.

Admit, for the sake of the argument, everything that has been said by the advocates of free coinage with regard to the stability of the value of silver and the increase of the value of gold, and they have not justified in any degree such an abrupt and revolutionary change in our standard of value. But their arguments to prove the stability of the value of silver utterly fail. It is doubtless true that the common articles of use have decreased in value since 1873, as compared with gold, but it must be remembered that the methods of production have improved and have been greatly cheapened. If new inventions enable us to produce shoes or cotton cloth at one-quarter of the labor cost of 1873, it would be absurd to ask that we should use a standard of value which would maintain its par with the old and exploded methods of production. The unit of production is human labor, and if you will compare the wages of 1873 and those of 1893 with gold, you will find that all grades of labor received higher wages in gold in 1893 than in 1873. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Mr. MAGUIRE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. BLUE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE], in his remarks a few moments ago, accounted for the maintenance of our silver circulation at a parity with gold by the pledge contained in the act of 1890 declaring that it was the policy of this Government to maintain all of its circulation

at a parity, and some gentleman on the other side of the House, in addressing himself to this question in this debate, accounted for it in the same way. I think, sir, there is no support for this contention, because if the declaration contained in the act of 1890 is all that sustains the parity of our silver circulation now, the question arises, What sustained it from 1878 to 1890, when no such pledge existed?

When the Bland-Allison Act was under consideration in the Senate and in this House, it was argued by some of the greatest men of the nation in both Houses that, according to all known laws of finance, the dollar which was going to be issued under the provisions of that act being a depreciated dollar would necessarily drive out all money intrinsically more valuable, and result in placing the country on a silver basis, with silver as our only circulation. It was contended that as the silver which would make up that dollar was not worth at that time more than 90 cents, the operation of Gresham's law, which it was argued was invariable, would produce the results which I have stated. And it seemed, Mr. Chairman, that that argument was perfectly logical, the only answer made to it at the time being that made now, that the increased use of silver, to result from its restoration to coinage even in this limited way, would cause such a rise in its value that it would not become depreciated as money.

But those who opposed the law failed to take into consideration this fact, that while the dollar which was going to be issued would be intrinsically worth less than its face called for, no more of such dollars could be issued under the terms of the proposed law than uses could be found for at a parity with gold. So long as the circulation of that money is thus limited, so long it will be at a parity with gold, and whenever that limit is passed it will cease to be at a parity with gold. The United States takes from the people of the Government every year between five and six hundred million dollars for the payment of the expenses of the Government. There were being issued at that time, under the provisions of the Bland Act, about $2,000,000 per month. Of course the money thus issued would be worth its face in gold, because every dollar of it would serve the purposes of a gold dollar, and the same condition of things has existed until now.

As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BLUE] has just said, there is not a nation on earth which limits the circulation of its silver to an amount that can be used that does not maintain it at a parity, and there is not a nation on the earth that exceeds that limit, there is not a nation that permits the unlimited coinage of all the silver brought to its mints, that is not to-day upon a silver basis, with its money not worth one cent more than the market value of the metal contained in it. If these be facts, and I believe no one denies them, our ability to bring about a different result, that is, to maintain the parity of silver with gold when admitted to coinage without limit and cost, must depend upon the assumption, and only upon the assumption, that the greatness and power of the United States are sufficient to supersede the operation of the well-known laws of finance which control matters of this kind throughout the world.

I do not see, Mr. Chairman, that that assumption rests upon any rational conclusion which can be drawn from admitted facts. No nation ever has been able to control financial laws by legislative enactments. We can not by a statute of Congress give a value to a piece of metal which it does not possess except in the way I have indicated. So long as we keep the total issue of silver circulation within the limits which I have referred to, that is, sufficient to pay the taxes and to a certain extent for exchange purposes in the United States, so long the dollar will be worth 100 cents in gold. But the very moment you pass that limit you follow the example of all the nations—many of them with more population and using as much money as the people of the United States—that have by the unlimited coinage of silver put themselves and kept themselves upon a silver basis.

All the powers of this Government and of the people of the United States, great as they are, are insufficient to permanently negative what may be called the natural laws of trade and finance, and our present financial condition proves the truth of this statement. Notwithstanding the declaration in the act of 1890 that the United States will maintain the parity of its circulation, notwithstanding the fact that her silver money is full legal tender for all debts, and that every dollar of it is practically redeemed annually by being absorbed in payment of taxes, yet as a matter of fact this very money is discredited. While it is the equal of gold in debt-paying and purchasing power, it is not the equal of gold as a repository or depository of value, and hence does not as freely and equally serve all the functions of money. From this fact, and this fact alone, that silver is intrinsically worth less than it calls for, no one keeps it longer than he can get rid of it. No one will exchange gold for it in any considerable sums, because gold will do to keep and it will not.

It is as good as gold to pay debts and taxes, hence is in active circulation; it will not do for a rainy day, hence it is not put away by those who are providing for such weather. An illustration of this feeling recently came under my own observation.

A farmer who was an ardent free silverite, and, I think, a Populist, made a sale of some cattle, and desiring to put away the money, stipulated that the price should be paid in gold. He did this, he said, because, while he believed silver was as good as gold, he might be mistaken about it, and he didn't want to run any risks.

If with a circulation of less than five hundred million, which the United States is not only pledged to maintain at par, but which it redeems every year by accepting for taxes, the unrest in the public mind has resulted in the practical depreciation of one form of money to which I have referred and the consequent hoarding of the other form, intrinsically more valuable, what would be the result if all limit was taken off and the country confronted with the fact that silver would be added to our circulation so long as the bullion was less valuable than the coined money?

One of two results would be inevitable—we would either raise the silver of the world to a parity with gold at a ratio of 16 to 1 or our silver would descend to the level of its bullion value as fixed by the markets of the world.

In the former case the hopes of those who think all blessings flow from a depreciated circulation would be sadly disappointed; the latter would entail losses almost beyond computation.

Mr. Chairman, the idea has been industriously cultivated that the volume of money controls values, and that the mere addition to our circulation of silver, or any other kind of money, would have the effect to increase the prices of products and restore general prosperity; and it is because of this conviction in the minds of the people that they give so strong a support to the demand for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. In my judgment the facts of our own history explode the theory. Cheap money raises prices, whether the volume be large or small, that is when the volume is sufficiently large to displace all that is, more valuable, but abundance of money, intrinsically worth as much as its face value, while it stimulates trade does not inflate values.

This fact is proved by the effect upon our markets of the issue of greenbacks during and after the war between the States.

As this form of circulation (not money, because it never was money and is not now) declined, prices rose. After the resumption act was passed and greenbacks began to appreciate prices declined until the greenback price represented the gold price. Meantime there had not only been no contraction, but on the contrary a gradual increase in the volume of our circulation; in fact, we have now more money, in the aggregate and per capita, in the United States than we had during the period of the highest inflation in the years immediately succeeding the close of the war or any period prior to the resumption of specie payments.

In the light of these facts how can it be expected that the mere addition of silver in any quantities to our circulation can increase prices, unless the money thus added is depreciated? If the silver dollar continues to be worth as much as a gold dollar no one will part with it unless he gets in exchange the value of a gold dollar.

This fact, Mr. Chairman, is again illustrated by existing conditions. A pound of American cotton is worth, say, 7 cents, whether paid for in gold or American silver. If sold for Mexican silver it is worth 14 cents, or about that, simply because 14 cents of that silver is the equivalent of 7 cents in gold or American silver.

Now, if our free-coinage friends could enact their ideas into law and maintain, as they claim, the parity of our circulation, we would still receive 7 cents in gold or silver for our cotton. If, on the contrary, our silver should depreciate to the level of the silver of other countries, we would receive 14 cents in silver, but it would be worth in purchasing power only 7 cents of our present money. I think, sir, these deductions are fair and reasonable, and show the fallacy of the usual free-silver arguments.

In ancient times men wasted their lives and fortunes in the vain effort to discover the process by which nature formed the precious metals, and seemed oblivious of the fact that the mere discovery of the secret of nature would destroy the value of the product.

Then, as now, the vain effort is being made to overcome natural laws and create riches by legislation instead of by labor.

The people have been indoctrinated with the idea that values are created by law, and that legislation can dispense with effort. I do not believe in any such doctrines nor that any class of our citizens would be benefited by the degradation of our circulation, except those who might be enabled to pay their debts in depreciated money. All disclaim any desire to do so, and common honesty would forbid the adoption of any policy which would lead to such a result.

Neither do I believe, sir, that it would be possible to avert such financial disturbances as to paralyze the business of the country for years if we agreed to the Senate amendment. In discussing this subject in the last Congress I took occasion to say that in my

judgment the national platform of the Democratic party did not contemplate the enactment of such legislation.

After quoting the platform, I said:

This, sir, could only be accomplished by an act which, while it limited coinage by such conditions as would avoid the danger of placing the country on a silver basis, would recognize silver as a money metal and not treat it as a commodity, as was done by the act of 1890.

The experience we obtained from the operation of the Bland Act proves conclusively that silver coinage limited to the needs of the country can be sustained on its own merit, and without being convertible into gold, and no law which falls short of admitting silver bullion to the mints, to be coined into money on a ratio fixed by law, can restore it to the value lost by being demonetized.

There is not a line or syllable of that law (the Bland Act) which makes the Government in any way responsible for the dollars coined under it, or the certificates issued against their deposit in the Treasury. They are legal tender for debt only, yet notwithstanding their bullion value depreciated 40 per cent, they continued to circulate as freely as Treasury or bank notes. Mr. Speaker, the clear duty of the Democratic party, in my judgment, was to enact such a statute. We could not go to the length of free and unlimited coinage without running the risk of having more silver coined into money than the business of the country would sustain at par. I do not say that such would have been the result, or that I believe it would, but if the arguments of those who advocate the single standard be true such would have been the consequence. Under the limitations of the platform we were not authorized to make the experiment or run the risk. We did not promise the people that we would. On the contrary that by the safeguards of legislation we would insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in payment of debts.

These remarks were made on the 1st of November, 1893. Since then the views I then expressed have to some extent been modified. I did not feel certain then that the unlimited coinage of silver would result in silver monometallism. I firmly believe it now, and I have become convinced that the double standard, so called, is a fiction of the imagination—a myth which has no existence in fact. We may measure transactions by gold or by silver, but not by both, unless they are at a parity. Then you have at best one standard.

I maintain now, as I did then, that a law providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver is not called for by the platform of my party; that it would be ruinous to the best interests of the country, and I shall therefore vote against the Senate amendment.

Mr. HUTCHESON obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I rise to a point of order. I submit that further debate on this question is out of order, and I refer the Chair to paragraph 5 of Rule XXIII. I do not want to cut off anybody who may want to address the House, but I should like a vote on this question within a reasonable time. If a general agreement can be reached that the debate be limited to ten minutes, I make no objection to the continuance of the discussion; otherwise I must insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is familiar with the rule to which the gentleman refers, but under the practice in the Committee of the Whole it is usual to allow the five-minute debate on an amendment to run on, under the theory that gentlemen desiring to speak will move to strike out the last word or make some other pro forma motion, until a limitation of time is fixed. That has been the practice.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that debate on the pending amendment be limited to fifteen minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Chairman, I have not troubled this House during this session with any remarks; and as this debate has been limited to fifteen minutes, I should like to have ten of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON] be extended so that he may have ten minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to occupy the last five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON] be allowed five minutes additional time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCLEARY] who spoke on this subject yesterday is in the Hall; he was here a few minutes ago. I desire to answer for him the question which I asked him in the course of his speech and which he very properly declined to entertain because he had not time. But I considered that question adjourned until such time as I might be able myself to answer it.

Gentlemen who saw the figures and the maps exhibited to this House by the gentleman from Minnesota will recollect this statement made by him: That never in the history of this country had human labor and the wages paid to human labor been able to buy more, and the laborer to consume more, than in 1891, just preceding the time the Republican party passed out of power. I put to the gentleman this question: If that was true, how was it that the Republican party sustained such a signal defeat in 1892? The gentleman replied that it was because the people did not know that they had a good thing when they did have it.

The gentleman was pleased likewise to illustrate his argument by the figure of an elephant; and though I have not an artist here to draw an elephant, I ask the gentleman to carry the elephant in his mind and I will show him what constriction upon that animal caused the people of this country to defeat, and justly defeat, the Republican party. I will show him that while the proportions of the animal in tail and ears and trunk and proboscis were what they had ever been, that except in the capacity and power to consume, that animal was shrunken into such a condition that he did not look like an elephant, but like an elongated weasel, to the people of the country.

I propose to introduce some statistics from the same source to which the gentleman referred and to demonstrate that the people of this country had been reduced to a condition of consumptive capacity beneath what has ever existed in this country from 1873 up to to-day under any Administration, Democratic or Republican.

I refer the gentleman to the table which is to be found in the Statistical Abstract, page 281. In that abstract it is shown that the capacity of this country for the consumption of wheat for fifteen years had been something over 5 bushels to the man, reaching sometimes as high as 7 bushels to the man; but in 1891 it was reduced to 4.58 bushels to the man—less than it had been during fifteen years. And because the people of this country who had been able to eat 7 bushels of wheat were under your Administration able to eat only 4.58 bushels, they drove the Republican party out of power in order that they might get to eat more wheat. [Applause.] And that is not only true with regard to wheat, but of other articles of consumption.

Gentlemen will say that the reduced consumption of wheat was compensated for in some other commodity. I deny it. Take the commodity of corn. The people of this country had been able to consume from 35 down to 28 bushels each, but in the good year 1891 they came lower than in twenty years. They consumed only 22.79 bushels of corn per man. Therefore, because your party stood between them and the corncrib the people of the country drove you out of power. [Applause.] And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but in coffee, in tea, and every other commodity, except that commodity to which a man goes in suffering, and that is the swill cup. Notwithstanding every commodity that furnishes fruit for nourishment to the human body had been reduced, and his capacity to consume diminished, so desperate had become his condition that he went to whisky and beer drinking, and from a capacity theretofore to consume of distilled spirits only 1.26 gallons he immediately became driven to consume 1.42 gallons, in order to drown the sorrow brought about from being denied the wheat, corn, and other necessities of life in this country.

He was not content, however, with simply drinking that much more spirits, but in the same ratio he increased the amount of malt liquors consumed by him from 10 to 15 gallons. You drove him from the capacity to live upon the commodities and necessities of life and forced him to subsist upon stimulants, and in his lucid moments from drunken orgies he at last saw the truth that you were driving the country to bankruptcy and a condition in which it would be impossible for any man to live.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I always yield with pleasure to my friend.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. I simply wish to ask the attention of my friend to two questions. First, is it true that they voted the way they did because they were drunk? [Laughter.] And second, why was not the money paid for whisky used to buy food and clothing?

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Chairman, a man forgets his own selfishness when he is drunk, and, waking from his debauch, he recognizes the error of his many Republican sins and transgressions, and in true penitence returns to at least transient reason and rights a wrong to himself and the country. [Applause.]

I wish I could follow this further. I could show that this particular condition continued with reference to all matters relating to progress; but the debate is limited. I recognize the fact that I stand here to-day at the burial of silver by this Congress, and possibly by this generation. [Applause.] I have never been an extremest. I have always doubted the power of the Government to coin at 16 to 1; but as against the greater calamity I stood prepared to vote on that question.

I have listened to the attitude of gentlemen from the Republican side on this question during this discussion, and when I have defined it I will take my seat. Speaking in the language of Mr. BROSIUS, and using the gesticulations of Mr. DOLLIVER, their attitude to the silver question is that they feel toward silver that it is the spiritual cognoscence of psychological irrefragability connected with the concuitant ademption of uncolumnient spirituality and the etherialized contention of subsultory concretion. [Great laughter and applause].

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring the Committee of the Whole back to the consideration of the pending amend-

ment. The pending proposition is to concur with the Senate amendment, with an amendment to the first section to the Senate amendment limiting the free coinage of silver to the American product solely.

My first objection is, even were this such a provision as I would be prepared after appropriate consideration to legislate upon, that the adoption of the motion would be in effect to set aside entirely the bill which passed the House over a month ago—a bill intended to reduce the rate of interest on bonds issued under the act of 1875, to shorten the time during which they should run, and to provide that the proceeds of the bonds should be used only for redemption purposes. Now if we should concur in the pending motion we should vote to recede from all that we have done in that direction.

My second objection, coming to the merits of the amendment, is that if we were to adopt that policy it would be necessary to accompany it with provisions to protect the revenue and the mints. It would be necessary first to provide a duty on foreign silver. It would be necessary in the next place to provide very careful restrictions and limitations for the purpose of ascertaining the American product, even if it were practicable to ascertain the same. But to do it in this way, with this simple, loose provision, would inevitably invite fraud and invite a large amount of foreign silver, admitted free of duty, to be placed in American mines surreptitiously and brought forth as the American product.

My next objection to this amendment is that it has none of the merits of bimetallism. Whatever merits there are in full bimetallism—and I accept them within reasonable limitations—depend entirely on having one uniform commercial ratio of silver throughout the world; and unless that is secured you do not obtain the benefits which have been presented—and which to a certain extent I accept—from full bimetallism. This is not full bimetallism. It does nothing at all to affect the value of the standard, unless you propose to have the two metals part company under this plan. That, I take it, is not the contemplation of those who advocate it.

If, then, this is a proposition looking to the preservation of the parity of gold and silver, I say to you that it is a most unjust provision; for if the parity is to be preserved you are to admit 50,000,000 ounces or thereabouts of American silver to be coined free of charge, and the profit of that coinage to go to the owner of the silver bullion. If you are to coin in that way, and the Government is bound to maintain the parity between gold and silver, then coin precisely as was done under the act of 1890, and let the whole people of the United States, the Government, have the benefit of the coinage of 50,000,000 ounces a year. Therefore I say that from any point of view the proposition to simply coin the American product, and to give the profits of that coinage to the private owners of the silver instead of giving it to the Government, can not be maintained.

Mr. BRUMM. Will my friend vote for such a proposition as he has indicated?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask that the pending amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House concur in the Senate amendment, with the following amendment: Add to section 1 of the Senate substitute the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall apply to the coinage of silver mined in the United States of America only."

The CHAIRMAN. Those who favor the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG], to concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment just read, will say "aye."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BRODERICK) there were—ayes 41, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

At the end of line 16, section 2, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That when the commercial value of either gold or silver bullion shall be less than the coinage value of the same, then the seigniorage upon all coinage of gold or silver bullion shall be retained by the United States, equal in amount to the difference between the coinage value and the commercial value of the same when presented at the mint."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] desire to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. BRUMM. I do; but I desire to conclude the discussion upon it.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, as an advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 by the United States, independent of any other country, I gladly and cordially indorse and shall support by my vote the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM]. I will tell you why I do so. Our contention always has been, and is now, that the opening of the mints of the United States to the free and equal treatment of gold and silver will place the market value of those two metals upon a par. I believe that to be a fact, and I believe that by the time you open your mints and have the gold and silver deposited there for coinage there will be no disparity between the market and the bullion value of the two metals.

If I am wrong about it, then I am willing to concede that it is only right and proper and fair that the difference between the coinage and market values shall revert to the Government and not to the owner of the silver bullion. I hope that every advocate of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 can convince himself of the absolute consistency of that position and cast his vote in support of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that the difference between the coinage and market value of the silver shall go to the Government of the United States. We must be fair about this proposition. If there is no difference, then there will be no seigniorage to go to anybody, and if there is a difference then this seigniorage should very rightly and properly go to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the distinguished gentleman from Maine had offered some solution of the present difficulties. We have had propositions made from other sources, but none from him. Those of us who are advocates of the free coinage of silver, straight and independent, by the United States have offered you a system that for four thousand years has been demonstrated to be a safe one. It is true that the Populist party has had a number of different remedies for the situation; and I am advised that they are about to add three additional planks to their platform. One of them is to make a cross between a lightning bug and a honeybee, for the purpose of enabling the bee to work at night. [Laughter.] Another one is that of breeding the centipede with the hog, for the purpose of having a hundred hams to each animal. [Renewed laughter.] And I am also told that they have the further visionary scheme of budding strawberry plants into milkweeds, so that everybody can have strawberries and cream from the same plant. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARTMAN. I always yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Do you think that that exceeds in economic ridiculousness the coinage of free silver at the present relative value of silver bullion to gold?

Mr. HARTMAN. I think these ideas are on a parity with those of the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, I think we ought to accept this amendment. I think we ought to meet the gentleman from Pennsylvania upon this floor on this equitable ground, and I hope that every gentleman who entertains similar views will cast his vote for this amendment.

[Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. ANDREWS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. DINSMORE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to twenty minutes. I desire to occupy five minutes at the close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. BRUMM. I desire ten minutes as the author of the amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. It has always been the custom for the member in charge of the bill to close the debate upon the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, there is more before this House than the mere silver question. The House of Representatives of the United States proposed to the Senate that the interest on Government bonds should be reduced. It was a distinct proposition, asking a reply. The Senate gave us no reply, but asked us in return that we agree that every man who had 50 cents' worth of silver the world over may be allowed to mark it a dollar and pay it out as such.

I have no doubt of the tremendous importance of this last question. I believe—some of my friends do not—I believe that if this be done the dollar will buy less, will pay less wages, will be worth less, and that this practically will effect partial repudiation of debts, both public and private. I believe both as to gold and silver with that most practical of men, even if he were a poet—

> The rank is but the guinea stamp,
> The gold's the gold for all that.

But I believe there is more in this question. When in reply to a proposition we receive no answer, when we receive only a counter question, it is of grave importance whether we have not

the right and duty to ask that our own proposition shall be first answered.

The House bill is not to raise money or to issue bonds. It only asks that the interest on the bonds of the United States already authorized shall be reduced. Why was it not answered? I hope it was not because any members in the other body were unwilling to embark upon financial legislation until the House should be forced to agree with their will. I hope not. Any such purpose would be a grave departure from the duties of constitutional government.

It is well known that the lower house of the English Parliament, as a last resort, has refused to pass measures until grievances were redressed. But that house represented the whole people. In this case, 47 Senators who voted or were paired for the substitute represent a population of less than twenty-five and one-half million, and 40 Senators paired or voting against the substitute represent over thirty-five and one-third million—I do not speak of property now, but of the number of people represented. On the average, each Senator voting for the original House bill and against the substitute represents 881,000 people, while 12 of the Senators who voted for the substitute represent together less than 715,000 people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SETTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey have an extension of his time for five minutes.

Mr. BRUMM. I shall have to object unless the time of general debate is extended. If the time is extended, I should make no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I am impressed with the belief that there should be some remedial legislation by this Congress. I can not vote for the substitute offered by the Senate, because I believe that it would ruin the American industries. But I am in favor of treating the white metal with all kindness and to use it as far as it may be practicable to maintain it upon a parity with gold.

I know of but three rational, reasonable ways to treat this question. One is to stand, as we now do, with the coinage of silver suspended. The second is to so change the ratio as to make the value of one metal equal with the other. The third is to take silver out of competition with gold. I am in favor of the latter. I refer members of the committee to the manner in which we to-day treat the half dollar, the quarter, and the dime, intrinsically worth less than the dollar. Yet who ever heard of any question as to the value of these subsidiary coins? My proposition is—and I offer it specially to the gentlemen upon the other side of the House, upon whom the responsibility of legislation rests in this Congress—to so change our coinage laws as to take silver out of competition with gold. In furtherance of this proposition, whenever it shall be in order, I propose to amend the first section of the Senate amendment by striking out all of that section after the word "gold," in the tenth line on the third page of the printed bill, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That the silver dollars coined under the provisions of this act shall be a legal tender only in the payment of debts in the sum of $100 and less.

The adoption of this provision and the retention of one of the provisions in the Senate substitute which prohibits the issuance of any national-bank notes under $10, and carried further so as to prohibit the issuance of any currency except silver in sums less than $10 and thus prevent gold or other money from coming into competition with silver, and also prevent the competition of silver with gold. I respectfully submit by thus limiting the legal-tender quality of silver, taking the two metals out of competition with each other, would give a field for silver where it would be useful as money and at the same time would relieve it from competition with gold. This would be offering something in behalf of silver which has been so loudly called for by the advocates of free silver on this floor. I believe, sir, that we could risk some experiment in this direction. I believe that by testing it we would at least make some movement in the direction of solving this difficult question.

If, however, forced to take position simply between the bill as passed by the House (which as an original proposition I do not approve or advocate) I should prefer it as a choice between two evils. I shall therefore vote against the Senate amendment as between those propositions. But I insist, Mr. Chairman, that it would be far better to take the substitute now before us from the Senate, amend it, and meet this silver question squarely while it is before us. Let us enact some legislation upon the subject. I believe that either of the two plans I have mentioned would be preferable to our present status of doing nothing, simply suspending the coinage of silver. I would prefer my second proposition to this policy, but think the most sensible and judicious way of treating the subject is to take silver out of competition with gold, which can be done in the manner indicated. I will gladly vote to open the mints of this country again to silver in this or any other manner which will reasonably insure the maintenance of a parity between the two metals, but prefer the present status to a depreciated currency.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a practical one and I hope the members will consider it as such. I believe it is a way out of all of our difficulties.

I want to say to my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who urges us so strenuously to insist upon the original House bill, that there certainly is no reason now for the adoption of that measure, since our bonds have been taken as they have been, unless you contend that this must be retained as a perpetual measure, and, as the bill says practically, only for the redemption of the greenbacks and Treasury notes. My dear sir, that is not stopping the endless chain. It simply means that when you have them redeemed you must again issue bonds and repeat the issuing of bonds.

Mr. DINGLEY. Unless you have revenue enough.

Mr. BRUMM. Having revenue enough will not touch the question at all. That is the great point upon which we differ. This is not a question of revenue in the Treasury exclusively; not at all; but it is a question of this endless chain, for the reason that it is not a question of the expense of running this Government. It is a question of the Government being a hopper in which all exchanges are made upon all securities that are thrown back on our country from the entire world. There is where we are making the mistake, and I beg of you to consider it. As it is now, the great danger and the evil that we are suffering under, in my judgment greater than in any other, is, as I said the other day, the fact that our Government is assuming, and has always assumed, the banking function of exchange. Whenever there is a panic and stocks are thrown upon our market, they go to the Treasury and they say, "These bonds and stocks and securities are payable in coin, but you are fool enough to give us gold with which we can throw our stocks upon the market and get gold for them." What we ought to stop first is the making of our Government a bank of exchange.

There is not another Government in the world that is a bank of exchange; anywhere you can go—to France, and they will pay you just as much per cent and just the kind of money they want. You can go to England, and the Government does not pretend to exchange; they raise the discount, and they are always masters of the situation.

Mr. DINGLEY. But does not my friend know that France does not issue demand notes redeemable in anything? It is the Bank of France.

Mr. BRUMM. I know they do not; but we do, and there is the trouble. We do that which is an impossibility; and for this reason. My friends, this Government alone has produced $2,000,000,000 of gold in the last century—$2,000,000,000 of gold——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have time to finish his remarks.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate upon this amendment be extended for five minutes, and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes more.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BRUMM. We have produced $2,000,000,000 in gold in the last century. It has all gone from us except, I believe, about $400,000,000. The highest estimate is $500,000,000; and it has gone to countries principally that do not produce gold. Now, the reason for it is that we undertake more than we ever can do. You may try it until doomsday, and you will meet this great obstacle at all times. Do you know, sir, that the individual liabilities of the people in this country to foreigners and the expenditure for interest amounts to very nearly a million dollars a day, and you can not make it up. It is only a question of time. Now, then, you pass this amendment, and not one ounce of foreign silver can be coined in our mints.

This amendment says that when you take your silver to the mint you shall receive from the Government the market value of it, not a mill above it; and when the silver is taken to the mint the owner or holder of it will not get a farthing more for it than the market value, and the owners of silver in Japan, China, England, or anywhere else will not bring it here. They would only bring it under the free-silver craze. There is the trouble. You will have to come together on a common-sense basis. Let the Government pay for the silver at the market value and you have nothing to deal with but the American product, because it will never pay people to bring it from foreign countries unless they can bring it here at a profit.

But gentlemen tell us that the revenues of the Government will answer the purpose. The revenues of the Government can not go to an unlimited extent. For paying the current expenses

of the Government they will do very well, and if you add but one clause to the Senate amendment, to wit, that which makes the payer, the Treasurer, the judge as to what kind of money shall be paid, you will remedy the evil. These are the two great propositions. Let the Treasury decide what kind of money they want to pay, then let them coin every dollar of American silver, and in my judgment you will have a parity of value inside of a year from the time that you put that system into operation. It is the only practical solution of this question.

The Republican Senators voted for it—aye, Father SHERMAN and the rest—and I ask the Republicans of this House to stand with us and vote for it. One word more. Give us reciprocity with it, and that reciprocity will enable us to settle our balance of trade with the silver countries in silver. What I mean is this: The balance of trade that is against us is not against us with the gold-producing countries, but is against us in the silver-producing countries. Give us reciprocity and we can get rid of every ounce of our silver by paying that mighty balance of trade with Mexico, China, and the other countries that are silver countries. Of course that must be done in a separate bill, but that is the starting point. Start with us. Give us this amendment. Finish up the balance by a proper revenue bill with proper reciprocity. Make that the banner of Republicanism in the next campaign, and your work is done when your Congress adjourns. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the first place because the motion which he makes is to concur in the Senate amendment striking out the whole of the House bill. I take it that this House is not ready to recede from the action which it took in passing that bill only six weeks ago.

I am opposed to the amendment, in the second place, on its merits. What is it? It is practically an unlimited-purchase act. That is all. It provides that an unlimited amount of silver may be brought to our mints and coined, and that there shall be issued therefor silver certificates; and that whatever may be the difference between the market value and the coinage value shall be covered into the Treasury. That is practically nothing but an unlimited-purchase act. We tried a limited-purchase act to the extent of 54,000,000 ounces a year, from 1890 to 1893, and even that we thought it wise to repeal in 1893. Whether that act ought to have been repealed or not, if it had been an unlimited-purchase act we certainly should have been forced to disaster long before the three years had expired.

Now, I take it that this House, in Committee of the Whole, is not prepared to go into any such policy as that which is proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, undertaking to purchase silver without limit—for that is what it amounts to—and issuing certificates for all the silver that may be brought to our mints; for if it fell upon the Government to maintain the parity of all the silver which would be purchased under such a law, as it must fall, we should be undertaking a job such as no other Government ever undertook. We had hard enough work to maintain the parity with what silver we had under the law of 1890, but an unlimited-purchase act would destroy the parity, and, without any of the possible advantages of bimetallism, would bring us to disaster by driving out gold.

I take it that this House is not ready to enter upon any such far-reaching legislation as that, especially when it is proposed simply as an amendment to the pending bill to be acted upon with only a few moments' debate. The proposition is altogether too far-reaching to be disposed of in that manner, and I trust that the Committee of the Whole, even without considering the conditions which exist at this time, will reject the amendment and insist upon the bill which the House passed six weeks ago.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. May I ask the gentleman from Maine a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Is there any proposition for the coinage of silver which the gentleman would agree to except one coming through an international agreement?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have said that the only plan by which we can accept free coinage of silver and secure both gold and silver as our full legal-tender money is by obtaining the concurrence of the commercial nations on an international ratio under free coinage, and that means international bimetallism.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. When do you think Great Britain will meet you on that proposition?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not think that it is indispensable, perhaps, provided all the other commercial nations can be included, that Great Britain should be brought in; but I do insist that we can not maintain the parity under free coinage except with the concurrence of such commercial nations of the world, and until we have that I believe in coining just as much silver as we can and maintain the parity, but I do not believe in going to silver monometallism.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Let us understand what nations you would be willing to make that agreement with.

Mr. BRUMM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BRUMM, the Chair declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRUMM. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 85; so the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out all of section 2, and add to section 1 the following: "*Provided*, That no silver bullion shall be coined under the provisions of this act unless the owner thereof shall show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that it is wholly the product of the United States: *And provided further*, That when the commercial value of such bullion shall be less than the coinage value of the same, then the seigniorage upon all coinage shall be retained by the United States equal in amount to the difference between the coinage value and the commercial value thereof."

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time for the discussion of this amendment be limited to five minutes, of which I desire to occupy only two minutes myself.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CORLISS. I do this, Mr. Chairman, because the amendments that have been already offered, two separate ones, have virtually embraced my amendment, although, in my judgment, they do not extend so far as the amendment proposed by me, nor do they fully accomplish the object that I have in view. My only purpose in offering this amendment is to define my position. The amendment provides that the coinage shall be limited to the American product and that the seigniorage shall be retained by the Government of the United States instead of by the mine owner.

Now, I simply want to say as a Republican upon this floor that in my judgment two-thirds of the American people are to-day demanding action upon this question [applause], and that in my judgment this House should take some action upon it. Are we to stand here forever waiting for other nations to act?

Mr. PICKLER. When we know that they will not act.

Mr. CORLISS. Should not we demand of the President of the United States that he call a conference on this subject? I think that the people of this country demand some action, and I believe the wisdom of this House is sufficient to give them relief upon this question. It is true that we need revenue, but that is not all——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a slight modification of some others that have been offered, but the great objection to it, without going into the merits of the question, is that in concurring with an amendment, even though we might be willing to accept some of its provisions, we should simply set aside all that this House has done on this subject, and therefore, if any proposition is worthy of consideration, it should come here in a bill by itself, be carefully dealt with by the House, considered in all its parts, and acted upon. I trust, therefore, that as the gentleman's amendment is practically a purchase act of what may be called the American product of silver—whatever that may be, for it would include, I take it, all the silver that could be imported and smelted in American works—I trust, I say, that this proposition, or any proposition of this nature, will not be acted upon hastily. A proposition of this character requires careful consideration, looking to the question of the duty upon the foreign product and many other matters which can not be properly considered at this time.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I desire a moment more to ask a question, and in view of my voluntary limitation of my time I trust the gentleman will grant it to me. Can we be sure that there will be some action taken by the Ways and Means Committee, or coming from that committee, or from any other committee of this House, looking to an early conference of the nations upon this question, the United States taking the initiative?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that gentlemen are aware that at the last session of Congress an act was passed, or rather there was inserted in the sundry civil act a provision drawn by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], in his own language, looking to the assembling of an international conference. Following up the line of that provision, I am in favor of such action being taken as shall on our part invite the leading commercial nations either to a reassembling of the conference of two years ago or unite in a new conference.

Mr. CORLISS. That is what I want to know.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. CORLISS was rejected.

Mr. TOWNE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TOWNE moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment changing sections 1, 2, and 3 so as to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That any person may deposit for coinage in any mint of the United States gold bullion or silver bullion not less than $50 in value, and

sufficiently pure not to require refining before being coined; and the same shall be coined free of charge, the gold into the coins authorized by existing law and the silver into dollars containing fifteen and a half times as many grains of pure silver as there are grains of pure gold in the gold dollar, and nine-tenths fine, being 359.91 grains of pure silver and 39.99 grains of alloy, a total of 399.9 grains of standard silver.

SEC. 2. Said depositor, in exchange for such bullion, shall receive, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, either coins similar to those into which the metal deposited is coined, or Treasury notes of convenient denominations promising to pay an equivalent number of dollars, which notes upon presentation for redemption shall be payable in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. The gold coins, silver dollars, and Treasury notes herein provided for shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private. The existing silver dollars shall be retired and recoined according to the ratio herein provided, the profits accruing therefrom to be applied to the expenses of maintaining the mints.

SEC. 3. This law shall become operative when the Governments of France and Germany shall have adopted laws under which gold and silver, at the ratio of 1 to 15½, shall have equal access to their mints, and the full legal-tender function be conferred upon the gold and principal silver coins; and upon the passage of such laws by said Governments of France and Germany, the President of the United States shall make proclamation of the fact, and thereupon this law shall take effect and be in force.

And by striking out section 4 of the Senate amendment.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only one word in support of the proposed amendment. It provides in brief for the free coinage of both gold and silver at such time as the Governments of the United States, France, and Germany shall have agreed upon our proposition, our agreement to be signified by the passage of the proposed amendment, and the agreement to go into effect when those other two Governments shall have passed similar laws.

The ratio is placed at 15½ to 1 for the reason that the coinage of those countries is upon that basis; and all that would be necessary to put this provision into effect among the three nations would be that they open their mints. And such recoinage as should become necessary by us could be done in a way to make the recoinage defray its own expenses, by reason of the difference between the 15½ ratio provided in the amendment and our present ratio of 16 to 1 or thereabouts.

The amendment is substantially the bill that was agreed upon by a conference of European bimetallists in Paris a few months ago, and which either has been or will be introduced into the English Parliament, into the Reichstag, and into the French Chamber of Deputies. But I have omitted Great Britain from the proposed agreement upon the understanding, in which I think every man of any information upon the subject will agree, that it is absolutely futile within the present generation to expect Great Britain to agree to any such arrangement unless she is compelled to do so by the action of other nations of great commercial importance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And also because history proves that her concurrence is unnecessary.

Mr. TOWNE. I believe, without entering upon the merits of that argument—and I think there are a great many gentlemen on this floor who agree to that proposition—that with the open mints of Germany, France, and the United States behind the coinage of free silver, and with the right in all these countries to use silver and gold interchangeably and with equal dignity and power in the payment of debts and in all commercial uses, there can not be the slightest doubt—whatever doubt gentlemen may entertain with respect to the power of the United States alone to do it—there can not be under those circumstances the slightest doubt that the parity would be maintained. The amendment commits the United States to no definitive action until those Governments shall have opened their mints; therefore it is not liable to some objections that have been urged here.

I have said all that I care to say, and will only add that I hope gentlemen will vote upon the merits of the question without regard to the fact that the proposition appears here as an amendment to an outworn bond proposition.

[Mr. MOSES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Senate substitute and shall vote against it. First, because it is a measure entirely foreign to the one sent to the Senate from the House. Second, because not a single man who has favored it on this floor believes for one moment that it can become a law should the House concur. Third, because I do not believe it will afford the relief to the Treasury the original measure was designed to afford nor the relief to the business of the country which its friends so confidently expect, but would result in driving one-half of our metallic money from the country and reduce it to a condition of monometallism, a condition so much dreaded by the friends of the measure. Now, I am a bimetallist, and believe in the concurrent use of both gold and silver as money.

I know the men who pose as the especial friends of silver in this Chamber are in the habit of calling all those who do not adopt the idea of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 "enemies of silver," "gold bugs," and "monometallists." But I am not an enemy of silver. I am not a "gold bug" in any sense of the word, nor am I a monometallist. I am a practical bimetallist. "But," say the 16 to 1 men, "what is bimetallism if it does not mean open mints to both gold and silver on equal terms?"

True bimetallism means one of two things—either the coinage of gold and silver as redemption money at a ratio equivalent to the market value of their bullion, or it means the coinage of the two metals as money of commerce at some ratio and under such conventional regulations as will keep the two coins at a parity with each other.

Bimetallism under the first condition is the one demanded by free-silver advocates. It is the method tried in England for three hundred years and failed. It was tried in France and in the States of the Latin Union and failed. It is the one tried in the United States from 1792 to 1873 and most signally failed.

Bimetallism under the second condition is the system now in operation in France, and it has enabled that country to keep in circulation about $500,000,000 in silver at a parity with gold. It is the system now in use in the United, States and has enabled this Government since 1878 to put in circulation six hundred millions of silver and keep every dollar of it of equal value with every other dollar of our currency.

The first is theoretical bimetallism, the bimetallism of the books and colleges and of our free-silver friends. And it has always, at all times and in all countries, been a failure. The second is practical bimetallism, the bimetallism of the Republican party in the United States, and for almost twenty years has proved a success.

I am a Republican, and stand squarely for practical bimetallism on the platform of the party that has done so much for silver, and which, when it comes into power again in 1897, as it certainly will, may confidently be trusted to do more for it, and to correct the evils, if any exist, in our currency system, rebuild the shattered fortunes of our people, revive our prostrate industries, give employment and fair wages to American workingmen, and bring back to our distressed country the prosperity of 1892. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. AVERY having expired, by unanimous consent (on motion of Mr. HOPKINS), he was allowed to conclude his remarks.

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Alabama—and I call him my friend in no perfunctory sense, because we have been warm friends for thirty years—criticises that part of my speech in which I said this country was on a gold standard from 1850 to 1860, and then from 1880 to 1890. Now, I maintain that a bimetallic standard can only exist where gold and silver remain in concurrent circulation, coined at a ratio without restriction as to either. Suppose we were to enter upon free coinage of gold and silver at a ratio of 50 to 1, that would give us unquestionably a gold standard. Suppose we adopt the ratio of 16 to 1, that would give us unquestionably a silver standard. So you can not maintain, according to my theory, a bimetallic standard where the coinage and the commercial ratios differ.

From 1850 to 1860 they did not correspond. We had no silver practically in circulation. I mean legal-tender standard silver. We coined only 1,700,000 silver dollars from the days of Andrew Jackson down to the suspension of specie payment on the 1st of January, 1862, and we coined in the same time $353,000,000 in gold. Now, I say this historical truth, about which there can be no controversy among intelligent men, bears me out in the statement I made on last Friday, that the country was from 1850 to 1860 practically, to all intents and purposes, on a gold standard.

From 1880 to 1890 we had no free and unlimited coinage of silver. We had a limited coinage of silver. It was then that silver was discredited, as it is now, and the purchasing power of the silver dollar did not depend upon the commercial value of the substance out of which that silver dollar was coined, but it depended upon the power and the ability of this Government to maintain that silver dollar on a parity with gold. Therefore, I repeat the statement, that this country was on a gold standard from 1850 to 1860 and from 1880 to 1890. It is now upon a gold standard. The only trouble is that the commercial world is in constant dread and alarm as to the ability and the disposition of this Government to maintain gold payments. The apprehension is that the Government will suspend gold payments, that gold will go to a premium, and by the very force of circumstances the country will be precipitated to a silver basis.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have but five minutes.

Now, that is precisely the question, precisely the idea, that I desire to convey in this connection, and I repeat that for all practical purposes this country was upon a gold standard from 1850 to 1860; and I further say, that in a Democratic Congress in 1853, when George S. Houston, a distinguished Alabamian, was chairman

of the Committee on Ways and Means, a bill was reported for the coinage of subsidiary silver coins, and that the members of that committee stated upon the floor of this House that the country was then practically upon a gold standard, and it was the purpose of the committee in reporting the bill to keep it on a gold standard, and to make silver subsidiary to gold. [Applause.]

[Mr. SWANSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Mr. Chairman, this bill, or this substitute, and all the amendments proposed that I have heard, proceed upon the assumption that the American people are willing to decree the payment of all their debts, both public and private, at 50 cents on the dollar, or else it assumes that this Government of ours has the power to so monetize silver as to make 50 cents' worth of it equal in value to 100 cents. The first assumption, I believe, no honorable man will stand upon for a single moment. The second assumption depends upon the power of government to monetize a metal. I deny that there exists in any organized government under God's sun the power to monetize or demonetize any given substance which mankind chooses for its medium of exchange. [Applause.] No emperor, prince, or potentate, no legislative body can ever accomplish that. God grant that we might have such power. God grant that this Congress might make 50 cents worth 100. I would like it first-rate. [Laughter.] That old curse of Adam, which I first realized in my childhood, that "by the sweat of thy face shalt thou earn thy bread," has always been a stumbling-block to me throughout my life. [Laughter.] But the American Congress can not repeal that decree, and, on the whole, I do not know that it ought to be repealed, though personally I have always wished it out of the way. [Laughter.]

No, Mr. Chairman; mankind, when it wants a medium of exchange, selects the commodity which the greatest number of people desire. Massachusetts selected its codfish; on the banks of the Potomac tobacco and whisky were the circulating media of exchange at one time. As our civilization advanced we have seen selected as a medium of exchange from time to time that commodity which has best served our purposes and the purposes of an advancing civilization, until we have reached the gold standard. We have looked patiently and industriously for years to find out the rascally conspirators who committed the "crime of 1873" [laughter]; and we have looked in vain. And when my friends find those gentlemen they will be very close upon the heels of those colonial conspirators who demonetized codfish on the shores of Massachusetts Bay, and demonetized whisky and tobacco on the Potomac and the Chesapeake. [Laughter.] One was demonetized on precisely the same principle that the other was demonetized. And when mankind finds something better than gold it will adopt that for its standard.

I have heard something in this debate about the cost of the gold standard. Have any of you figured the cost to this nation of the silver craze. The report of the Director of the Mint tells us that we have purchased since 1878 about 600,000,000 ounces of silver, costing about 78 cents on the dollar. To-day that is worth 50 cents or a little less.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. I should like a little more time.

Mr. LACEY. I ask that my colleague be allowed five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Mr. Chairman, we have already lost because of the difference between 78, the price at which we purchased that silver, and 48 or 49, its present value, something like $175,000,000, which has been paid to the silver miners alone. Every dollar's worth of silver bullion that has been bought since 1878 and coined and put into circulation has got to be redeemed ultimately by this Government of ours or it will be covered with dishonor. If I had time to make the calculation I could show that this silver legislation has cost this country over a thousand million dollars. In the infamous bond purchase of last year we could, but for the silver craze, have made those bonds which the President issued payable specifically in gold, and he informed this House that if he had had that authority $16,000,000 and upward could have been saved. We were receiving gold on that loan. Is there an honest man in the United States who expects to pay that loan in anything other than the best money in the world—the money which was received for it? I do not believe there is.

I repeat, the cost of the silver craze has exceeded one thousand million dollars, and it all comes from one fundamental error; that is the idea that Congresses and Presidents can add anything to the value of any commodity on earth.

Silver has not been demonetized. Even public opinion has not demonetized silver, for when the act of 1873 was passed there was not in circulation over $50,000,000 of silver. I think there was almost none in circulation at that time. To-day we have in circulation, either in the form of silver dollars or of fractional silver, or of silver certificates, some four hundred or five hundred million dollars. The talk about the demonetization of silver is arrant nonsense and is entirely outside of the scope of truth.

Gentlemen say that we want more money. So we do. So does every nation seeking its material prosperity want more money. How are we to get it? Not by decreeing that 50 cents shall be worth 100, but by setting to work all the vast industrial forces of this great country at profitable employment. [Applause.] Stop sending our money to Europe for those things which we can produce ourselves. [Applause.] Use all the vast resources which nature's God has possessed us with. Put every pair of willing hands in the United States at work at profitable employment, and we can make a stream of gold flow into the lap of our country from every gold mine and every commercial nation throughout the world. [Applause.]

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I can but esteem it fortunate that we are not reduced to the alternative of choosing between those two children of evil—the alleged bond bill as it passed the House, and the Senate substitute that we are now considering. I congratulate the country that the assured defeat of the one will result in the speedy demise of both. Neither of them, in my judgment, was intended to serve any useful purpose; and both of them in their way are alike calculated to injuriously affect the credit of the country. The bonds provided for in the first were meant to be paid in gold, but shrunk from declaring its purpose in the text. It meant covertly and by indirection to retire the greenbacks without providing a substitute to take their place, but had not the courage to declare its meaning to the world.

The bill passed by this House providing for a 3 per cent five-year bond, had it been crystallized into law, would have yet left upon the statute books another law authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury in an emergency to place on the market a long-time higher-rate bond. Hence, it seems to me, it would have been absolutely sure that had the proposed low-rate short-term bond been offered by the Government the market, realizing the necessities of the Government, knowing that it had only to refuse that bond in order to get the most advantageous bond that the Government was authorized to sell, would have declined to bid for the first in order to get a chance to name its own terms upon the last.

It seems to me the Republican managers on this floor did realize the utter, the sheer impossibility of disposing of the bonds for which their bill attempted to provide, inasmuch as they failed to provide for a repeal of the law of 1875, thus making it plain that for a temporary partisan advantage they were willing to force the Government of the United States to offer the market a bond that could not be sold and to see it humiliated by the failure to sell its own bonds in its own market.

But, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, your contemporaries of the Senate, realizing the situation, have seen your play and gone you at least one better. They have swept aside the farce with which you attempted to impose on the country, under the guise of patriotic legislation, and substituted in its stead a tragedy of graver import. How that result was accomplished is a matter of but small moment. What an analysis of the roll call upon the passage of the bill we are considering as the substitute of the Senate would reveal is a matter of no vital importance. The world does not interest itself very much in roll calls. It looks only to results. It sees the Republican party in control of that Senate—the Republican party that is the vaunted champion of honest money—deliberately trading off the great coinage committee of that body to the Populists in exchange for a few petty doorkeepers and pages to satisfy the rapacity of some lean and hungry followers. [Applause.]

It sees that party able to secure the votes necessary to capture a few miserable offices, but utterly unable to get votes enough to secure for the people helpful legislation. [Applause.] It sees that once august body—once the greatest tribunal on this earth—now under Republican control, delibetately and complacently following the leadership—the brutal leadership—of one who, describing himself as a farmer, finds a fitter correlation with the farmer's small lieutenant, the bug that bears his burden backward.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, to this complexion has it come at last. Our country in peril, our credit menaced, and yet a day or two ago I heard the gifted gentleman from Iowa crying out to his discontented party associates, "Write no new party law; sit supinely down; an election approaches; do nothing now that might imperil the chances of the Republican party to control the offices for the next four years."

Mr. Chairman, I take it, with many others who have debated

on this floor the pending question, that all the time and all the words, that all the eloquence and all the invectives delivered upon the subject has been time wasted. I say wasted because, while I would not assume to affirm the faith of any man, yet I can not bring myself to believe that there is upon the floor of this House, or upon the floor of either House of this Congress, one single individual who, in his heart, believes that in the absence of an agreement among the nations the mints of the United States will ever again be open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. And why should he believe it? Why should he expect this nation, greatest now of all earth, a nation able to cope with the world in arms—why should he expect such a country as that to deliberately turn away from its associations with the great mercantile and industrial nations of the earth and voluntarily array itself with the almost semibarbarous nations of the world that are without influence as they are without trade.

In my judgment the party that to-day binds itself to the dead body of free silver need not hope for the confidence of the country for a quarter of a century, no matter what its course may hereafter be. I do not believe the Democratic party will ever commit itself to such an inexcusable folly. I regret immeasurably that in this matter I must part from and differ with a number of my party associates and friends upon this floor. But while I differ with them I have no quarrel with them. Their purpose is as honest, their means of information perhaps greater; but I can not consent that their conclusions are sounder or so likely to receive the assent of the party that we together represent.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that that party, when it meets this year in convention, may meet beneath the impending shadows of defeat. But, sir, it may be in the accomplishment of some wise purpose if it can meet even under the shadows of assured defeat, undazzled by the hope of success, and yet unawed by the prospects of disaster. It will meet, I believe, in the months to come, and build a platform, safe and broad, upon which, in the years to follow, it can and will appeal to the conservative intelligence of the people, an intelligence which, in my judgment, must of necessity control the future of this country. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised in looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday to find that a colleague of mine [Mr. DE ARMOND] had expressed himself very indignantly and very bitterly against me on account of an address that I had delivered, I believe, on last Saturday. He uses the names Benedict Arnold and Judas Iscariot in a very indirect way, without the apparent courage to make a personal application. It would have been far more complimentary to his courage, if he intended me personally, to have used the language directly. He seems to desire to create the impression that I am a Washington convert to the sound-money doctrine, that I have come here to Washington and within the period of the last month or two become a convert to this doctrine.

I think the gentleman read enough of the papers of our State to know that during the last spring and summer I had a standing challenge in my State to meet any man upon the stump, in Missouri, in favor of the sound-money doctrine. Not only that, but that I did meet every comer who was willing to have a joint discussion in my State on the stump.

The gentleman says that I mean to charge my Democratic, Republican, or Populist colleagues on the floor of this House with personal corruption. Nothing was ever further from my intention. There is no body of men that I have ever been associated with in the period of the last three years toward whom I have a kindlier personal regard than the members of the Fifty-third and the members of the Fifty-fourth Congresses. I have no charges to make against them personally. I desire nothing more strongly than their good will. But why should the gentleman feel that he had been hit? I made no reference to him in my remarks. I called no names. Then why should he make a personal attack on me? I can not answer the question, unless the solution is to be found in the old adage that the "hit bird flutters." I know of no other explanation.

The gentleman then goes into the realm of making an attack upon me on account of what, as he charges, appears in the newspapers, and he says that I fail or refuse to answer them.

That is as to my connection, if any it may be called, with the income-tax legislation of the Fifty-third Congress. I have nothing to conceal with regard to that matter, have never desired to conceal anything. The statement that I now make is one in which the older members, especially those who were not rushing to the front and claiming the credit for matters that they had no credit or connection with, will bear me out, and is as follows:

When I first came to the Fifty-third Congress I am confident that I talked with as many as a dozen, and probably eighteen, of the leading Democrats of the House upon the importance of income-tax legislation. I found a perfect lethargy. Nobody desired to take hold of it in any form or shape. When I would speak to an old leader of the party or an old member of Congress of any party with regard to the matter, the reply seemed always to be one way, that there was no hope for such legislation. I then went to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and asked for a hearing before that body. It was accorded me, and I had the honor of appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe, as far as I am able to find out, it was the first time that that matter was agitated in any committee or on the floor of the House. My argument was something like an hour and a half or two hours in length. I went to the expense of having it printed and circulated among the members of the House. I did not desire to push myself forward, because I did not want the hostility of the older members, which always rises against a new member who tries to push himself forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. I hope the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. I do not know that I will abuse the patience of the House that long. The next thing I knew in connection with the matter I received a communication from the editor of the New York Forum, who asked me to contribute an article to that journal in favor of the income tax. I contributed the article. I suppose that it is not improper for me to say in this connection that the editor in his letter stated that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had referred him to me as being the one who would be most likely to contribute an article satisfactory to him of the kind that he desired.

The article appeared in the number of the Forum in which the income tax was opposed by Mr. David A. Wells, my article being in favor of the bill. Then the Cotemporary Club, a very able, a very learned literary organization of the city of Philadelphia, asked me to deliver a lecture upon this question at its annual meeting. This I did; and in this connection the papers noted my name and my action and my work in this matter. I argued the matter before members of the Cabinet and everybody that I could get to listen on that important question; and I did with it as I have done in everything that I felt interested in, worked in every way possible to forward the matter. Now, the gentleman takes these facts I have stated and says I am pluming myself upon borrowed feathers. That I believe is all the explanation I desire to make. I make it because he seems to have thought I was making a personal attack upon him, when no thought of him ever entered my mind.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, now that the gentleman, my colleague [Mr. HALL], has been caught in his seat [applause], that I am not responsible for his having been out of his seat when I made the comments to which he has just taken exception. Neither do I feel that anything that the gentleman said "struck" me, nor was I conscious of "fluttering." But as one of the Representatives from the State of Missouri I felt when I spoke before that when this newest convert from that State to the so-called sound-money doctrine saw fit, as my colleage did in making formal proclamation upon the floor of this House of his momentous conversion, to talk about the "Chinese," "the people from the East Indies," and from the "depths of Africa," and "the lower animals" as typical creatures in the category of those who do not change their opinions, perhaps it was not inappropriate to suggest that there might be changes of opinion—and I think there are and have been such changes—which would evidence no tremendous exaltation in the transformed one above some of those classes thus referred to. [Laughter.] I felt that the gentleman's insinuation might be understood abroad, if allowed to go unchallenged on this floor, as a reflection upon the true men who have honored and trusted him and me; and I felt, as a loyal Missourian, proud of my State, proud of the people who have honored me, and proud of the people who have honored him (mistakenly, I think), that I ought not, in justice to them, to allow his remarks to pass without notice.

As to the income-tax business, I say again that the gentleman has paraded himself and allowed himself to be paraded as the author of the income-tax measure, when he knows he was not, and I call upon everybody here who has read the newspapers, everybody who knows anything about the gentleman's pretenses and something about the facts, to bear witness to the truth of my statement. The gentleman himself has not denied it.

I have no doubt that the gentleman "spoke to perhaps eighteen of the older members," as he now claims. For, of course, I remember well, and so do all who were here then, that when the gentleman came to Congress he spoke about many things, in season and out of season, to this man and to that man, to every man who would give him audience, as though he were the man who understood all these things, and the only man who understood them. [Laughter.]

I know—everybody here knew—that the gentleman was plenteous and prompt with his advice; that he assumed, as far as he could assume, all the guidance and conduct of public affairs, which assumption, according to his presumption, must have been

most valuable. I know that the gentleman was held aloft by the gentleman himself as the one man not only in this country, but in this wide, wide world, who had read everything, studied everything that had been written upon the income tax, and who knew all about it; that he was the one man upon whom the progress of income-tax legislation must rest. [Laughter and applause.] I submit to the recollection and the observation and the judgment of those who served with him as to the facts.

He stated in his "lower animals" speech (he does not refer to it now) that he had been informed and believed that as many as eight Senators who voted for the passage of the substitute now before us had said that they believed free-silver legislation would bring bankruptcy and ruin upon the country. He did not identify them. He has not yet named one. He dare not do it; he never will do it.

The gentleman talks about me attacking him because he was out. Let him now name a Senator; they were not here when he spoke. Let him name one of them. Let him name the person who stated that a single Senator ever said anything like what he says came to him about these Senators. My belief is that not one man who has a seat in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol ever said any such a thing as that reported to the House by my colleague.

I simply referred to this matter before, and now refer to it again, because I saw in the papers of the State of Missouri that this gentleman in his speeches last summer told the people how he had seen the light and had risen above the common level upon which others are acting; but that, having been sent here as an advocate of free silver, having been elected upon a free-silver platform, having pledged himself to vote for and advocate free silver here, he would vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HARTMAN asked unanimous consent that Mr. DE ARMOND have five minutes more.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Referring to this incident of the Senators, I merely said that if eight Senators, or one Senator, had made any such remark as my colleague attributed to them, they had merely done what the gentleman himself does not, and will not, and dare not deny that he has done. So much I said in my little speech, which, it seems, the gentleman does not indorse—said it to let the Senators down easy after the gentleman had assailed them if they needed "letting down." So much to make lighter and easier the fall, if there was no way of escaping it, since the gentleman had heard certain things about them. [Laughter.] I repeat that I do not believe they ever said it. I do not believe the gentleman will ever open out the information upon which he rests his statement. I do not believe he will ever name the Senators, or one Senator; but I repeat once more that if they said what the gentleman says they did say, they merely did what it is reported over and over again that he has done, said what he does not now deny that he made a business of saying.

I said, in speaking of this matter, that the people whom the gentleman represents and those whom I represent are not a besotted and ignorant people; that they are not a people dependent for guidance upon the politicians who go around among them, especially politicians of the gentleman's stamp and kind. [Laughter.] I said that those people, honest, brave, truthful, steadfast, have admiration for those qualities when they find them in others; and I said that anyone who had used language which might be understood, by those who do not know these good people, as carrying the suggestion that they are an inferior people was certainly doing them a very grave injustice and was engaged in a most unsavory business himself. These people, Mr. Chairman, do not need defense unless they need to be defended on account of the misapprehension, the misunderstanding, the mistake, which led them to send the gentleman to the Halls of Congress. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman, in his remarks the moment before I rose, said something about Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold. I do not stand here to defend those historic characters. I let them go.

The gentleman talked about Gladstone. If I had chosen I might have commented upon the exquisite modesty that resides in my colleague when, in talking about his own conversion, his own elevation, his own progress, he thrust into such close connection with that great event the little incident about the change in the opinions of Mr. Gladstone. [Great laughter.] I might, if I chose to do so, speak of what he said about Bismarck, the great, imperial genius of the German Empire, one of the marked men of this century and of all the world. [Laughter.]

I might, if I chose, comment upon the modesty which prompted the gentleman to associate himself and his change of front with that great man, and some alleged change in his opinions. [Laughter.] But I merely said, in passing, what I say now, that any man has a right to change his opinions and it is no other man's business. But my impression was, and is now, and it has been greatly strengthened, that when a man changes his opinions and departs from his old associates upon some great question, he ought hardly to prate, at the first opportunity, about the "courage" which led him to reverse himself, or talk about the "cowardice" (without identification or specification) that, according to his impudent assumption, resides in those who do not do likewise; or talk about the "Chinese" and the "lower animals" as being typical of those who do not change when he does. [Laughter.] My impression is, my impression was, that such an exhibition is hardly in extra good taste, and I do not feel that I greatly transgressed the rules of this House or of propriety when I called attention to these things. [Laughter.]

I do not know whether any of the gentleman's chaste and tasty references will appear in his speech of last Saturday when he gets it into the RECORD, for the speech is still held back for revision, and is not yet in the RECORD. As to one of those references, that about people "feathering their nests," I do not know just what he meant; but I venture to say that if feathers are to be had for the asking, or for the plucking, the gentleman, if he is around, will get his full share if he is able to get it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HALL obtained the floor.

Mr. BRUMM. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. My inquiry is whether we must take the vote at 4 o'clock, notwithstanding the time taken up in these personal explanations?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BRUMM. Then I shall object to the time being thus occupied.

Several MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. HALL. Am I recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] has the floor.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reiterate that I do not wish at all to emulate this gentleman in billingsgate; I do not expect to equal him in it. In this slough he seems to be at home, and he must flounder alone. But I wish to reply in a brief manner to some matters to which he has referred.

He comes forward here and states that he is representing the people of my district and the people of his own district as well when he is declaring against the utterances that I made on this floor. I desire to call his attention to the fact that we have but five Democrats here from Missouri instead of fourteen in the Fifty-third Congress; that of those five Democrats, three of us are sound money men [applause], and that the leader of the 16 to 1 idea in the United States is now at home upon his rocky farm in Laclede County unless he is still lecturing to his one-man audiences in the South. [Laughter and applause.]

I desire to say further, in connection with the remark that the gentleman has drawn out with regard to the United States Senators, that the statement I made upon the floor of this House was made for the purpose of illustrating a broad proposition; it was made for the purpose of "pointing a moral" and enforcing this truth—and there are few intelligent men in the United States who have reached the age of 21 years who do not know it to be true—that public men, not in this body merely, or in the Senate, or in the State legislatures alone, but that all public men generally, are guilty of cowardice toward the people in the treatment of the great public. I gave that illustration for the purpose of pointing the moral and bringing out the truth more fully; and instead of retracting or modifying the statement I take this occasion to reassert the same proposition with greater emphasis and force than ever, so that it may be vividly brought before the people of the United States.

A MEMBER. Name the men.

Mr. HALL. I have this further to say: I did not make that statement with the intent and purpose of bringing into public view the communications or conversations, some public, some private, that led me to make the statement; nor do I recognize the right of any man on this floor to demand of me to bring into public notoriety the means by which this matter has been brought to my notice. If men choose to read the periodicals, there are periodicals extant in which you can find the expressions of some of the gentlemen to whom I referred. But I made my statement for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the people of the United States that crying evil; and I reiterate it for that very same purpose. [Applause.]

I wish to say to the gentleman that I am not called upon to answer to him or his constituents for my course in Congress. I propose to go back to my district and make the fight for sound money. [Applause.] He will go to his and make the fight for silver monometallism. Let the election next November show which is right, which represents the brain, the brawn, and the intelligence of the rural districts of Missouri, by showing whether the name "DE ARMOND" or "HALL" will be called when the roll of the Fifty-fifth Congress is made up. [Applause.] I have unlimited confidence in the honesty, the uprightness, the integrity, and the brains of my people. I believe they will sustain me; I believe that I shall receive their indorsement, and that the gentleman will come back (if he comes back at all) with less than the 91 majority that he received in the last election. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time for taking the vote on the question of concurrence, as agreed upon in the House, be extended until five minutes past 4 o'clock, and that of the time remaining the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] have the first five minutes, and that I be allowed the last.

Mr. KEM. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order has been called for; but the Chair was about to suggest to the gentleman from Maine that, as the order in reference to taking the vote was made in the House, it could not, in the opinion of the Chair, be changed in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly that point is well taken. Now, does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] wish to occupy a part of the remaining time?

Mr. TOWNE. I do not care to occupy any more time. Let the gentleman from Maine proceed, if he wishes, and then let us have a vote on this proposition on its merits.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are now six minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota might occupy three minutes.

Mr. TOWNE. I do not care to occupy any further time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then I desire to be recognized to close this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the first objection to this amendment is the same that has presented itself against all other amendments that have been offered, that if the House should concur with the amendment it would recede from and set aside all that it did six weeks ago. I take it for granted that it is the intention of the majority which passed the bill that went from this House to insist further upon it. Therefore, even if we were prepared to accept as an independent proposition the amendment which has been proposed, it could not be accepted without setting aside the House bill.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the provisions of this amendment, whose merits I think would not necessarily be considered in the vote which may be given. The proposition is that when the Governments of the United States, France, and Germany shall enter into an agreement for an international arrangement the mints of these countries, after such arrangement has been made, shall then be opened to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1.

My first suggestion is this practical one: If we go into a conference with the leading commercial nations of the world, or such as may in response to our invitation enter into the conference, in order to accomplish the end we have in view we must enter into it with no previous obligation as to the ratio of coinage. We must be prepared to say to the nations that we ask to join us in the conference, "We are ready to enter into an international agreement on any ratio that you will agree with us in adopting for the purpose of bringing on a world-wide bimetallism."

If we go in pledged to one particular ratio we enter at a disadvantage, and whatever proposition we have to make will be met by objections from various quarters. Nothing can be clearer than that whenever an international conference convenes, as I trust and believe one will convene in the next year, that it should be free to look over the whole question of the ratio which can be adopted and maintained, after having examined it, without any previous arrangement, and that it shall be prepared to concur at that time and go forward to the end desired.

It is therefore premature, in my judgment, to undertake to indicate to any conference what ought to be the ratio. More than that, I fear it is not possible, even with every nation in the world concurring, under the present conditions of silver production of the world, to maintain under unlimited coinage the relative value of silver and gold at the ratio of 15½ to 1, so as to secure the concurrent circulation of both metals. All the nations of the world, I fear, can not accomplish that at the ratio of 15½ to 1, unless the conditions of gold and silver production shall be materially changed. What the ratio may be that could be maintained by international agreement I am not prepared to say. It is somewhere between 16 to 1 and the present commercial ratio. No man is wise enough to-day to indicate it. It must be the result of conference and deliberation upon the facts existing all over the world and the result of a comparison of views.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRUMM. I demand the regular order. Let us have a vote on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOWNE), there were—ayes 53, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRUMM. I hereby give notice that I will ask for a yea-and-nay vote in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will not be pending in the House, having been rejected in committee.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], to agree to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—ayes 80, noes 190.

So the motion to concur was rejected.

[The announcement of the vote was received with applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The result of the vote is that the committee agree to recommend to the House that the amendment of the Senate be nonconcurred in.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the committee rise and report that recommendation to the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2904, had instructed him to recommend to the House nonconcurrence in the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to repeat the notice I gave at the commencement of the session to-day, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] desires to avail himself of the privilege of the rules of the House, before the previous question shall be moved, to speak in favor of the motion for concurrence in the House. That after one hour, or such time as he may see fit to occupy to-morrow, those members of the Committee on Ways and Means who are opposed to the Senate amendment will avail themselves of the same time in reply; immediately after which I shall move the previous question on the recommendation of the committee for nonconcurrence in the Senate amendment.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—VAN HORN VS. TARSNEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I ask the gentleman from Maine to withhold that motion for a moment until I can make a report from the Committee on Elections.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will withdraw the motion temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am instructed by the Committee on Elections No. 2 to present to the House the report in the contested-election case of Robert T. Van Horn against John C. Tarsney from the Fifth Congressional district of Missouri. The report is concurred in by all the members of the committee on the main question; but on the application of Mr. Tarsney to open up the case and take additional testimony, some few gentlemen dissent from the views of the committee and desire time in which to submit their views in writing, which I am assured will be at the earliest practicable moment. As soon as these views are filed I shall give notice of a day on which the House will be asked to consider the case.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat I desire to say to him that he is mistaken in saying that the whole committee have agreed upon that report, either as to the main question or as to the question of reopening the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if I have done any injustice to any member of the committee I certainly am sorry for it.

Mr. BAILEY. I know the gentleman did not mean to do so, and therefore I made my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I will say this in justification of myself, however, that if the gentleman did not concur in the main report, then I am certainly utterly unable to understand the force and effect of human language as used by him in the committee room.

Mr. BAILEY. I am perfectly satisfied that the gentleman did not intend to misrepresent me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly not. I certainly understood the gentleman as I have stated.

Mr. BAILEY. I simply desire my statement to go into the RECORD along with his. This much is true: The entire committee agreed that the case, as made up, could only be decided as the majority have decided it, but the committee——

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I drew the report, and I certainly do not intend to commit the gentleman to my reasoning.

Mr. BAILEY (continuing). But the minority insists that the case is not properly made up, and we could not agree to the conclusion of the committee on the main question, because we think the collateral question was not properly decided. In other words, the position of the minority is simply this: We think the committee's conclusion is correct from their premises, but we think their premises incorrect, and therefore their conclusion is wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman's distinctions are so subtle that I do not care to waste any time in discussing them.

Mr. BAILEY. I am content, however, to have those distinctions go into the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I will say again I certainly do not intend to commit the gentleman to my reasoning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 2, makes the report which has been presented to the House; which will be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I should like to ask gentlemen of the minority who desire to present their views how long a time they desire?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE]

has agreed to prepare the minority report. I see the gentleman from California is in his seat, and he will speak for himself.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I did not hear the first part of the discussion. I presume it relates to the matter of the report in the Van Horn-Tarsney case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes. I inquired how long the gentlemen of the minority desire in which to present their written views to the House.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I suppose you can give us until Tuesday?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks consent to file, by Tuesday next, the views of the minority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I see no objection. That seems to be a reasonable time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bill was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 1717) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the use of certain real estate in said city on which is situated the building known as The Exchange—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LINNEY, for seven days, from February 14, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUFF, for the remainder of this week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, February 14, 1896, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Attorney-General of the United States, transmitting a reply to the House resolution of January 7, 1896, in regard to the enforcement of the laws against trusts, combinations, and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce, and what further legislation is needed to protect the people against the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Public Printer, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant in relation to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant in regard to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a reply to the House resolution of the 4th instant relating to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Elizabeth McIntyre, administratrix of Robert McIntyre, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting estimate of appropriation for the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for improvements at Columbia Arsenal, Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an agreement made with the Indians of the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana, together with a report of the commission, the proceedings of the councils, and a draft of a bill to ratify the agreement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an agreement made with the Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana, together with the report of the commission, a geological report of minerals, and a draft of a bill to ratify the agreement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Elizabethtown Harbor, Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CHICKERING, from the Committee on Railways and Canals, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 565) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 351); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4122) granting an increase of pension to James H. Jones. (Report No. 334.)

By Mr. HOWE, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to Eugenia R. Sweeney, widow of Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Sweeney, deceased. (Report No. 335.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach. (Report No. 336.)

The bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catharine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine. (Report No. 337.)

The bill (H. R. 468) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. H. J. Kiernan. (Report No. 360.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4475) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine Gaffney. (Report No. 361.)

By Mr. DENNY, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa. (Report No. 338.)

The bill (H. R. 5229) for the relief of George H. Lott. (Report No. 339.)

The bill (H. R. 489) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891. (Report No. 344.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Sarah G. Ives. (Report No. 345.)

By Mr. WOODARD, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 154) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, heirs and children of Thomas U. Walter, deceased. (Report No. 342.)

The bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of certain parties, sufferers by the burning of the tug *Mystic* while in Government employ. (Report No. 343.)

By Mr. CROWTHER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (H. R. 3932) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Richardson. (Report No. 358.)

The bill (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to Charlotte Weirer. (Report No. 359.)

By Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs: The bill (H. R. 485) for the relief of Kate Eberle, an Indian woman. (Report No. 356.)

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax. (Report No. 357.)

The bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll. (Report No. 353.)

By Mr. ERDMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday. (Report No. 354.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

The bill (H. R. 5814) granting a pension to Cassie A. Davis, widow of James P. Davis and mother of Mary T. Davis, an invalid daughter. (Report No. 364.)

The bill (H. R. 3001) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Lapham, widow of William B. Lapham. (Report No. 365.)

By Mr. LAYTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2143) granting a pension to Mrs. Emily M. Van Derveer, widow of the late Brig. Gen. Ferdinand Van Derveer. (Report No. 362.)

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to Annie Thompson. (Report No. 363.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of the estate of William Moss, deceased. (Report No. 340.)

By Mr. BRUMM, from the Committee on Claims: The bill

(H. R. 2838) for the relief of Samuel H. Sentenne and Paul Boileau. (Report No. 341.)

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5345) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English. (Report No. 346.)

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2602) for the relief of Solomon Hyams. (Report No. 347.)

By Mr. HALTERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 483) for the relief of Mary Jane Lynn, the daughter of John R. Lynn, a Revolutionary soldier. (Report No. 348.)

By Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3007) granting an increase of pension to Michael Pettis. (Report No. 349.)

By Mr. LESTER, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 653) for relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. (Report No. 352.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5964) disposing of 2 condemned cannon and 12 cannon balls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5965) to exempt the wages and property of persons engaged in interstate commerce from execution, attachment, garnishment, distress, or other legal process in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5966) to abolish the fee system as to United States district attorneys and marshals and substitute salaries, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 5967) to provide for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes at St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5968) to increase the efficiency of the Marine Corps of the United States and to reestablish its organization—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5969) to make an equitable adjustment of the grants of land to the several States of the Union for State normal schools, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5970) to appropriate money to meet the deficiency in the appropriation for the expenses of the constitutional convention of the State of Utah—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COOKE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5971) to release and quitclaim to the commissioners of Lincoln Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, certain littoral or riparian rights belonging to the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 5972) to increase the efficiency of the infantry of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5973) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kittanning, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HALL (by request): A bill (H. R. 5974) to amend the patent laws of the United States—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5975) to amend an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company to organize a corporation and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN (by request): A bill (H. R. 6058) for the purchase of letters patent of the Dickinson self-righting and self-bailing lifeboat—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 6059) to provide relief for such employees in United States navy-yards as may be disabled by accident while in the performance of their duty, and, in the event of fatal casualties, for the relief of their suffering dependents—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 5976) to provide for the commissioner of copyrights and to revise the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5977) to provide submarine boats for the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) to grade substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 5979) for the right of the Rock Island, Muscatine and Southwestern Railway Company to build a bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. Res. 112) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings of the mint building at Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 113) for the protection of Provincetown Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. Res. 114) for a survey of Salt Pond, in Harwich, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HURLEY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 115) to provide for the purchase of the painting entitled "Eighteen hundred and sixty-four; or, Grant and his generals," by Hanson Balling—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A resolution (House Res. No. 165) to allow an annual clerk to the Committee on Banking and Currency—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HULICK: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, for protection to Armenian Christians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5980) for the benefit of James Blackburn, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 5981) granting a pension to Elihu Jones, of Potwin, Butler County, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5982) granting a pension to Elizabeth Roberts, of Fort Scott, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 5983) authorizing the town of Shawnee, Oklahoma Territory, to sell and give title to certain lots in said town of Shawnee—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Br. Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5984) to correct the military record of Oscar H. Gifford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5985) granting pension relief to John A. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) granting pension relief to Francis M. Ross—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) granting pension relief to Ross Wheatley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) granting pension relief to Mathew D. Cochran—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 5989) directing the Secretary of War to amend the record of John Dauberman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5990) granting a pension to Henry Felker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) granting a pension to Martin Feeney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) granting a pension to Flora A. Beeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) for the relief of Thomas Dilbert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON, a bill (H. R. 5995) granting a pension to Henrietta B. Lee, surviving child of Lieut. Daniel Bedinger, a soldier and officer in the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5996) for the relief of Sophronia S. Stowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) to correct the naval record of Francis G. French—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) to correct the naval record of William Perkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) to correct the military record of Elbridge McFadden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) to grant honorable discharge from Army, under true name, to Francis G. French—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 6001) for the relief of Oakley Randall, of Farnum, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) for the relief of Jehu Gum, of Churchville, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6003) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Jacob E. Noel a lieutenant-commander in the United States Navy, and that he be placed on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William D. O'Toole to the military service of the

United States and to place him on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6005) for the relief of Eli H. Bright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of Isaac A. Duncan, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 6007) for the relief of Bvt. Capt. James D. Vernay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 6008) for the relief of Amelia Johnson, widow of Alexander Johnson, who lost his life on the Capitol Grounds July 2, 1894, while in the service of the United States—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 6009) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John D. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 6010) granting an increase of pension to Edson D. Bemis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 6011) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth W. Coleman, widow of Samuel T. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of J. M. Flanary—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6013) for relief of the Spies Lumber Company, of Cairo, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 6014) to increase the pension of Herman Salem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6015) to increase the pension of William R. Deweese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6016) granting an arrearage of pension to Abram W. Blauch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 6017) removing the charge of desertion from the naval record of Patrick Naddy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6018) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Harvey and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6019) for the relief of Granville Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of Archibald Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6021) for relief of Lieut. Col. Henry G. Gardner, of Salyersville, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) for the relief of Meredith Risner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) for the relief of Andrew Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6024) placing the name of Reuben Patrick on the roll as a soldier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) for the relief of W. H. Nolcini, of Winchester, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) granting a pension to George T. Nickell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) for the relief of Tandy Mobley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) for the relief of Samuel May, of Floyd County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) for the relief of Thomas O. Marrs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) for the relief of Sarah Marrs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) increasing the pension of Sally Heath, a Revolutionary pensioner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEISENRING: A bill (H. R. 6032) for the relief of Spencer D. Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6033) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Sterling M. Turner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts (by request): A bill (H. R. 6034) for the relief of Joel M. Bryan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6035) for the relief of N. W. Jacobs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) for the benefit of Hiram Romey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6037) granting a pension to Mrs. Amanda Woodcock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6038) to increase the pension of Joseph M. Donohue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6039) for the relief of Levi Hoskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) for the relief of W. N. Stokes, administrator of Jefferson M. Potts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) for the benefit of Mrs. Elizabeth Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6042) for the relief of Mrs. Lavinia M. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 6043) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of William L. Vance, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER (by request): A bill (H. R. 6044) for the relief of Mrs. Carrie V. Millar, a volunteer nurse in the United States hospitals during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6045) for the relief of Isaac Newton, of Washington City, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 6046) granting a pension to Mary A. Stacey, dependent mother of Manley T. Stacey, late private Company D, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 6047) granting a pension to Lavina M. Howe, widow of George Howe, alias Thorpe, late Company F, Twenty-second Connecticut Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6048) granting a pension to Celia E. Dans, widow of William E. Dans, late Company D, Sixth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) granting a pension to Jerry Driscoll, late United States Railway Construction Corps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6050) for the relief of Mrs. Aurora M. Falconer, of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6051) for the relief of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, late of West Feliciana Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 6052) for the relief of Thomas McCullough—to the Committee on War Claims:

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) for the relief of Mary Ann Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6054) for the relief of Aaron M. Applegate—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 6055) for the relief of John A. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6056) for pension of Mary J. Calvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6057) granting a pension to Emily C. Merriman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to the President and Congress, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Oscar Netzner and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of House bill No. 5246, known as the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Amwell Grange, No. 1055, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty, in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Cumberland Post, No. 265, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, making application for two pieces of cannon, etc., for the use of said post—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AITKEN: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held at Leslie, Mich., protesting against the continuance of Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: Petitions signed by officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Richmond County, N. Y., against the sale of beer on Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to Congress, relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fishers Ferry, N. Y., relative to the sale of intoxicants at certain places—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Fairport, Honeoye Falls, Scottsville, Greece, Henrietta, Parma, Pittsford, Rush, and Monroe County, and the Eighteenth Ward of the city of Rochester, N. Y., asking that the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island be forbidden—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Honeoye Falls, Scottsville, Greece, Henrietta, Parma, Pittsford, Rush, and county of Monroe, and Twelfth and Eighteenth wards of the city of Rochester, N. Y., asking for the prohibition of the

sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Oscar H. Gifford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COUSINS: Papers to accompany House bill directing the Secretary of War to amend the record of John Dauberman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Pattern Makers' National League of North America for a bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of East Liberty Presbyterian Church of Pittsburg, Pa., for raising the age of consent and for Sunday rest and compulsory education in the national capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition from Teamsters and Yardsmens' Union of Pittsburg, Pa., relative to a bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes, introduced by the Hon. C. W. WOODMAN of Illinois—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of Frank W. Rutter and others, of Verona, and sundry citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DANFORD: Petitions of C. W. Minamire and others, of Belmont County; Riley E. Bowman and others, of Stark County; O. C. Downer and others, of Jefferson County; and S. M. Bowman and others, of Carroll County, all of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of J. F. Shroyer and others; also, N. B. Andrions and others, all of Marion County, W. Va., asking for the passage of bill for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Henrietta B. Lee—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of George W. Boling, for the correction of his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, asking an appropriation of $10,000 to encourage flax culture in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the city of Cosmopolis, Wash., favoring the passage of legislation in behalf of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, urging recognition of the rights of Cubans as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Vancouver Commercial Club, for the improvement of the Columbia River near Vancouver—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the town council of Sumner, Wash., favoring legislation in behalf of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, relative to the improvement of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of N. W. Robinson and 26 others, of Burton; also of W. H. Marple and 22 others, of McMechen, W. Va., in support of better immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of C. B. Bonnell and 21 others, of Conings, W. Va., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FARIS: Petition and proof to accompany House bill No. 2366, for the relief of John A. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, documents to accompany House bill No. 2372, for the relief of Hiram A. Benefeil—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition and proof to accompany House bill No. 2373, for the relief of Elvin Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2376, for the relief of Robert E. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2685, for the relief of Jere V. Pinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of Capt. James D. Vernay, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Testimony in behalf of Amelia Johnson, widow of Alexander Johnson, who lost his life on the Capitol Grounds July 2, 1894—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York, N. Y., in favor of the passage of a bankruptcy law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia in regard to the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Paper from Col. Ell Torrance, department commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, State of Minnesota, urging the passage of the Vicksburg National Military Park bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of J. C. Bowser, R. R. Wentz, A. C. Long, C. A. Deihl, and 59 other citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions unanimously adopted at a meeting held February 8, 1896, by the Winnebago County Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, introduced by Hon. E. J. HAINER, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the board of supervisors of Weaverville, Cal., asking for relief for the mining industry—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of David B. Mansfield and others, of Harwinton, Conn., favoring the granting of belligerent rights for the Cubans in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of William Davis and 55 citizens of Monmouth County, N. J., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of W. Ocar Hurst, M. D., and 287 others, of Northumberland County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of J. R. Motley and 24 other citizens of Oklahoma, asking for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of Charles Hipp and 25 other citizens of St. Mary, Ohio, for the favorable consideration of House bill No. 1429, to adjust the pensions of disabled soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petitions of Frank Abbott, Jacob Secor, and others, of Wappingers Falls, N. Y., and vicinity, in favor of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of La Grange, Rondout, and Rawlings, N. Y., asking for the passage of a bill which shall forbid the sale of beer and all spirituous and fermented liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEISENRING: Two petitions signed by a number of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., asking for the passage of the bill to inspect immigrants by the United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of E. D. Rumsey and 82 citizens of Tioga County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Calvin, Pa., praying for passage of the William A. Stone bill, to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of James R. Mansfield and 53 other citizens of Alexandria, Va., praying for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to the President and Congress on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Memorial of 103 citizens of the city of New York, requesting Congress to authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of Amanda Thompson, of Paragould, Ark., sister and only surviving heir of Zion R. Crayn, de-

ceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn., asking reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Memorial and petition of mayor, aldermen, Board of Trade, and 200 citizens, of Ellsworth, Me., asking the Government to improve the channel of Union River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition adopted by a largely attended mass meeting held in Salem, Mass., urging the Government to resort to vigorous measures in endeavoring to stop the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the rebellion from the State of New York, favoring the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of Labor Union No. 6517, in behalf of bill introduced by Hon. C. W. WOODMAN of Illinois, to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POOLE: Petitions of citizens of Pompey, Onondaga County, N. Y., relating to the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Petition of P. B. Stone and other residents of Waverly, Pa., for the passage of a bill for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of Joseph Wolf and 57 other citizens of Huron County, Mich., favoring the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of the Allen Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the Sixteenth Ward, Albany, N. Y., asking that the sale of beer at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth be forbidden—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Boonville, N. Y., relative to the sale of intoxicating liquors at certain places—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of 16 veterans of New Oxford, Pa., praying the passage of a bill granting a pension of $8 per month to any honorably discharged soldier and sailor who served at least ninety days in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 28 citizens of York County, Pa., in favor of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Memorial of George C. Foster and 38 other citizens of Hurley, Wis., asking for the further improvement of the Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society, in favor of the passage of the Cook bill, to license filled-cheese factories and tax all filled cheese, and also the passage of the Sauerhering bill, for a State trade-mark—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLER: Petitions of M. E. Singer and others, also of C. E. Bertolette and others, all of Stark County, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to Congress on its attitude relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of John M. Hamilton, H. N. Kelsey, and 20 other citizens of Batavia, Genesee County, N. Y., in favor of House bill No. 2920, in regard to reclassification of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Medina, Orleans County, N. Y.; of Kendall, Orleans County, N. Y., and of Alexander, Genesee County, N. Y., for the passage of a bill that shall prohibit the sale of beer and spirituous and fermented liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, New York—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Isaac C. Jones, Frank K. Saylor, L. Y. Sechner, and 53 others, of Sassamansville; also of Sue P. McBride, Hannah Russell, and 83 other citizens of Pottstown, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigrant-inspection bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to the President and Congress, relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Samuel Longstreet and 123 other citizens of Berkshire County, Mass., in favor of the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 14, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. DINGLEY. I call up House bill 2904, the unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. DINGLEY. The question before the House is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole for nonconcurrence. Before moving the previous question, the gentleman from Georgia will take the floor for an hour.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the important question now before the House, I shall endeaver to confine myself to a citation of such facts and such illustrations as I think bear upon the subject; and I shall carefully refrain from saying anything or intimating anything calculated to wound or hurt the feelings of any other member of the House. This is an economic question; and no matter what views gentlemen may have entertained in the past, I should assume, and do assume, that every member when he casts his vote to-day casts it conscientiously and honestly in accordance with the views that he now entertains.

I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to overrun the time which has been assigned me, and the chief difficulty I have is to select from the great mass of matter which might be presented that which is most pertinent and that which is least old, if such an expression may be tolerated.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject, and I ask unanimous consent that my colleague shall have as much time as he desires.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that his colleague shall have as much time as he desires. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRISP. I thank my colleague and I thank the House; but notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor, if possible, to confine myself to the hour prescribed by the rules of the House.

In 1873 the Congress of the United States passed an act demonetizing silver. Now, even that proposition seems to be disputed.

If it were possible that as we progress in the argument we could agree upon something, could agree upon some facts, then we might so narrow the issue as to make it more plain and comprehensible, but it seems impossible to do even this.

Now, I assert that in 1873 silver was demonetized. That is, we ceased to coin it, and the unlimited legal-tender quality was taken from it.

Again I assert, Mr. Speaker, that from the year 1792 down to the hour of the passage of the act of 1873 we were on a bimetallic basis or standard in the United States. Here again there seems to be some dispute. This dispute, Mr. Speaker, is of modern origin. Never was it contended until lately; but now we find the advocates of a single gold standard contending that notwithstanding since 1792 there had been a statute which authorized the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at a fixed ratio, and provided that each or either coin might be used in the payment of all debts, public and private, that, nevertheless, we never had bimetallism in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the confusion that arises, I respectfully submit, upon that question is in not drawing a distinction between a standard of value and a circulating medium. That there is a difference there can be no doubt. I quote from President Cleveland's last annual message:

There is a vast difference between a standard of value and a currency for monetary use.

In 1792 we established a mint. The act provided that—

Every 15 pounds weight of pure silver shall be of equal value in all payments with 1 pound weight of gold, and that all the gold and silver coin which has been struck at and issued from the mints shall be a legal tender in all payments whatsoever.

That, Mr. Speaker, I submit is bimetallism. That is the kind of bimetallism for which the Democratic party has always contended, a bimetallism which permits the free and equal coinage of the two metals at the mint upon a ratio fixed by law, and which authorizes the payment of debts, public and private, with the coin so struck at the mint. Some of our friends say that from 1792 to 1834 there was but little gold in circulation in the United States, and therefore we were on a silver basis. But no man can dispute, Mr. Speaker, that at that time we had in the United State a double

standard. What I mean by a double standard is that there were two kinds of coin which were freely and without limit struck at the mint, in either of which all debts, public and private, might be lawfully paid; and the fact that our metallic circulation may have been principally silver at that time in no way militates against the idea that we were on a bimetallic basis. What do gentlemen understand a bimetallic basis to be? A bimetallic basis is one which links together gold and silver coin, so that the aggregate amount of the two in the world regulates throughout the world the prices of things. Lest it may be said that this is a definition or a suggestion coming from one unskilled in financial matters, permit me to read from a statement from Baron Rothschild.

The simultaneous employment of the two precious metals is satisfactory, and gives rise to no complaint. Whether gold or silver dominates for the time being, it is always true that the two metals concur together in forming the monetary circulation of the world, and it is the general mass of the two metals combined which serves as the measure of the value of things.

Our friends tell us that from 1834 to 1860 the principal metal in circulation in this country was gold, and therefore we were then on a gold standard. Mr. Speaker, so long as the law provides for the free and equal coinage of the two metals you can not be upon a single standard. The principal part of your metallic circulation may be of either coin, but your entire circulation is based upon both coins, and values are regulated by the amount of both that exist as money in the world.

Our friends insist upon too much. When they say the circulation of a country is necessarily the standard of value therein, they overlook the fact that the general plane of prices is fixed by the amount of primary money existing in the world, and not by the amount in any one country of the world. There might be a circulation in the United States of paper, in Great Britain of gold, in France of silver, yet, so long as some great nation or several great nations by opening their mints to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at a fixed ratio maintained the commercial and coinage parity of both, the measure of values throughout the world would be the combined quantity of the two metals.

My good friend from Tennessee, Mr. PATTERSON, contends that from 1850 to 1860 this country was on the gold standard. It is necessary, or rather it is desirable, from the standpoint of the gentleman that he should establish that fact, because that was, perhaps, the most satisfactory era in the history of the country in respect to the increase of its wealth. But the gentleman bases his whole argument upon the circumstance that the principal metallic currency during that time was gold. My friend forgets, in the language of the President, that "there is a vast difference between a standard of value and a currency for monetary use."

Now let us look briefly at the effect of demonetization. All around me there are gentlemen on both sides of the House who insist that law can not create values, who insist that nothing that we may do here can have any effect upon the value of silver bullion or upon the value of gold bullion. To gentlemen who entertain that view, of course it is idle to talk, but to gentlemen who will take a plain, practical view of things, it seems to me it is "sticking in the bark" to say that law can not affect values.

I concede, Mr. Speaker, that if this Congress should say that the price of any given commodity should be a certain sum that act of Congress would be absolutely futile. But law may enhance the value of things by increasing the demand for them. Law may diminish the value of things by diminishing the demand for them. That proposition surely can not be disputed by any gentleman who will pause and think about it. Money is the one thing in this life for which all men contend. The demand for money is the sum of the demand for all things else on earth. A metal that is made money by law by one great nation becomes in demand by all the peoples in the wide world. Therefore, the law which makes that metal money at the same time puts it in a position where the demand for it becomes such that necessarily it is increased in value.

The same gentlemen who contend that law can not create value vehemently insist that they are in favor of an international agreement between the great nations of Europe and the United States respecting the coinage of silver. If law can not create value, I might ask how an international agreement between the nations of the earth could affect the value of the silver bullion. Any international agreement that might be entered into must be enforced at last by the law in the nations which might enter into it. How is it, then, that if law can not affect values that an international agreement can do so? How is it that the platform of one of the great parties of this country insists on the maintenance of the parity between the two metals by an international agreement or the safeguards of legislation? What did we mean, Mr. Speaker, when we said to the people that we favored the maintenance of the parity between gold and silver by an international agreement, if an international agreement could not put silver on a parity with gold?

All fair men must admit that it is possible to maintain the parity of the two metals by an agreement between the great commercial nations of the earth. So that the contention that law can not, in effect, establish the value of money seems to be without force and without weight.

I aver, sir, that the adoption of the single gold standard has been injurious to all the industries of the United States and to all the industries of every country adopting it. I shall cite extracts from remarks of distinguished men on this question. I shall do so because in stronger terms than I can employ they have described the disastrous effects of the striking down as a primary money of one of the great metals of the world so used for ages.

Senator SHERMAN, on July 11, 1876, in the Senate, referring to the law of Germany, said:

The enormous effect of the law in Germany, and as a consequence the partial demonetization of silver coins, I suppose, is felt by every man, woman, and child who buys or sells anything. A struggle for the possession of gold at once arose between the great nations, because anybody could see that if $3,200,000,000 of silver coin was demonetized and $3,500,000,000 of gold coin made the sole standard, it would enormously add to the value of gold, and the Bank of France, the Bank of England, and the Imperial Bank of Germany at once commenced grasping for gold in whatever form. Therefore, what we have observed recently is not so much a fall of silver as it is a rise of gold, the inevitable effect of a fear of the demonetization of silver.

That, Mr. Speaker, was Senator SHERMAN in 1876. You will observe that he says what has been so vehemently denied during this discussion that a great struggle of European nations for gold followed the demonetization of silver. That the striking down of one of the metals—one of the money metals of the world—is felt by every man, woman, or child who buys or sells anything; that the effect has been to appreciate the value of gold, which our friends on the other side so strongly deny, and that the disparity of the metals caused thereby is the result rather of a rise in gold than a fall in silver.

Senator GEORGE of Mississippi, in a speech delivered last summer, said:

In the first place, in the very year of its consummation in 1873, occurred one of the most disastrous panics that ever afflicted mankind. Cotton fell from the date of its passage in February to the end of the year, though the crop marketed was a short one, from 19¼ cents in New Orleans to 15¼, more than 4¼ cents per pound, or $22.50 per bale. This was pretty bad for a start, but it kept on falling, with only slight variations, till November 1, 1893, the date of the repeal of the Sherman law, when it reached 7⅛ cents, and then its further fall was accelerated till it reached 4¼ cents the last season. (These are New Orleans figures.) So the cotton farmer, at all events, can see how he has fared under the operation of the act of 1873. Compare 19¼ to 5¼ cents, a loss of 75 per cent nearly, and you can see the loss the farmer has sustained. He got last season a little over one-fourth the price that he got before this baleful act—this crime of all the ages, as Mr. Carlisle called it.

But it is denied that this fall was produced by demonetization. Let us see. Accurate tables of prices prepared by the best statisticians in the world, and which have been often published and never contradicted, show these convincing and unanswerable facts: That from 1850, when the money of the world was being increased by the large output of gold in California and Australia, general prices were constantly rising, so that in 1873 they were about 30 per cent higher than in 1850; and that from the very year of demonetization, 1873, they continually and persistently fell till they were lower in 1893 by between 35 and 41 per cent than in 1873. How could this happen except by and through the act committed in 1873—the demonetization of silver? Up to 1873 we had rising prices with increasing money supply, gold and silver being both used. From this very date, when money was contracting, one-half the world's money being disabled as a money metal, prices not only began to fall, but they continued to fall until a lower range of prices was reached this year than was ever known in our history.

Robert Giffen, recognized as one of the best authorities in England, said in 1888:

If events are the touchstones of prophecies, no prophecy was ever more certain than the increased dearness of gold. That the fall of prices to an extent so general as we are at present experiencing is to be referred to an increase in the purchasing power of gold is generally, and I might say almost universally, conceded.

I read again from Senator GEORGE:

In the decade 1851-1860 the cotton crop of the United States was more than doubled, yet the demand was so great that the price in 1860 was as high as it was in 1851. That was before the demonetization of silver. Now take a ten years under the influence of that baleful act, to wit, 1881-82 to 1891-92; in that decade the American crop increased only 65 per cent, though in it is included the largest crop ever grown up to that time, viz, 9,018,000 bales in 1891-92, and yet the price under the increase of only 65 per cent fell 60 per cent instead of keeping up even as it did in the first decade named, when production was increased over 100 per cent. Everybody can understand the significance of these figures.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is not so much a low price of which the world complains as it is the constant falling of prices. If prices were somewhat stationary, though low, business might continue. But where they are steadily falling, where the farmer plants his crop on the basis of the then existing price and must sell it at a lower, where the manufacturer makes his product on the basis of existing price and must sell it at a lower, where the merchant buying goods for sale to his customers must part with them at a lower price or without profit, there can be no prosperity.

Our friends say that low prices are due to modern methods, that we owe reduced prices to improved machinery, and the like. I grant that much of the cheapness of goods is due to art, invention, and science. But, Mr. Speaker, where low prices are due to improved methods, business in which such improvements are employed ought to be profitable. In other words, if the manufacturer, by reason of improved machinery, can produce goods more cheaply, his profits ought to increase. If the farmer, by reason of improved agricultural implements, can raise a crop more cheaply, the result of his operations ought to be increased profits to the farmer. I

ask you, is that the case in the United States? I ask you, is that the case in any of the gold-standard countries of the world?

Let me read, Mr. Speaker, what I chanced to see in a newspaper on yesterday in relation to gold-standard England. Replying to a deputation representing agricultural interests, a few days ago, the first lord of the treasury, Mr. Balfour, informed his visitors that the Government was preparing various measures for the relief of the agricultural classes.

Mr. Balfour stated that it was his personal conviction that agriculture suffered doubly owing to the present condition of the currency, and expressed his belief that the reduced prices were largely due to the artificial appreciation of gold which followed the demonetization of silver, and secondly, to the artificial advantage given the producer in silver-using countries over the gold-using countries.

And now to those of our friends who hope for an international agreement I especially commend the last clause of this interview:

Continuing, Mr. Balfour said that the obstacles to reform did not come from abroad. They were to be found at home. Therefore it was desirable to impress the powerful interests opposing it how much the national and individual prosperity were bound up in currency reform.

That, my friends, was on the 9th of the present month. On the 11th of the present month the Queen's speech was read in Parliament, and in that speech she said:

I regret to say that the condition of agriculture is disastrous beyond recent experience. Measures will be laid before you with the object of mitigating the distress of the classes engaged in that industry.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure, whatever may be the views of members here, that the farmers of the United States will indorse the utterance, that the condition of agriculture in our country too is most deplorable, and, to use the language of the Queen, "disastrous beyond recent experience." There is no industry in the United States that prospers under a single gold standard. There can be no industry prosperous so long as we have a steady reduction of primary money and a constant contraction of our circulating medium.

Alexander Hamilton, in his report (1791) on the mint, says:

To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation.

William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury, in a report (February 12, 1820) to Congress, says:

All intelligent writers on currency agree that when it is decreasing in amount, poverty and misery must prevail.

Mr. R. M. T. Hunter, in a report (1852) to the United States Senate, says:

Of all the great effects produced upon human society by the discovery of America, there were probably none so marked as those brought about by the great influx of the precious metals from the New World to the Old. European industry had been declining under the decreasing stock of the precious metals and an appreciating standard of values; human ingenuity grew dull under the paralyzing influences of declining profits, and capital absorbed nearly all that should have been divided between it and labor. But an increase in the precious metals, in such quantity as to check this tendency, operated as a new motive power to the machinery of commerce.

Production was stimulated by finding the advantages of a change in the standard on its side. Instead of being repressed by having to pay more than it had stipulated for the use of capital, it was stimulated by paying less. Capital, too, was benefited, for new demands were created for it by the new uses which a general movement in industrial pursuits had developed; so that if it lost a little by a change in the standard, it gained much more in the greater demand for its use, which added to its capacity for reproduction, and to its real value.

The mischief would be great, indeed, if all the world were to adopt but one of the precious metals as the standard of value. To adopt gold alone would diminish the specie currency more than one-half; and the reduction the other way, should silver be taken as the only standard, would be large enough to prove highly disastrous to the human race.

The American Review (1876) says:

Diminishing money and falling prices are not only oppressive upon debtors, of whom, in modern times, States are the greatest, but they cause stagnation in business, reduced production, and enforced idleness. Falling markets annihilate profits; and as it is only the expectation of gain which stimulates the investment of capital in operations, inadequate employment is found for labor, and those who are employed can only be so upon the condition of diminished wages. An increasing amount of money and consequently augmenting prices are attended by results precisely the contrary. Production is stimulated by the profits resulting from advancing prices; labor is consequently in demand and better paid, and the general activity and buoyancy insure to capital a wider demand and higher remuneration.

Leon Fauchet (1843), in Researches upon Gold and Silver, says:

If all the nations of Europe adopted the system of Great Britain, the price of gold would be raised beyond measure, and we should see produced in Europe a result lamentable enough.

Before a French monetary convention in 1869 testimony was given by the late M. Wolowski and by M. Rouland, governor of the Bank of France.

M. Wolowski said:

The sum total of the precious metals is reckoned at fifty milliards, one-half gold and one-half silver. If by a stroke of the pen they suppress one of these metals in the monetary service, they double the demand for the other metal to the ruin of all debtors.

M. Rouland, governor of the Bank of France, said:

We have not to do with ideal theories. The two moneys have actually coexisted since the origin of human society. They coexist because the two together are necessary, by their quantity, to meet the needs of circulation.

At the session (October 30, 1873) of the Belgian Monetary Commission, Professor Laveleye said:

Debtors, and among them the State, have the right to pay in gold or silver, and this right can not be taken away without disturbing the relation of debtors and creditors, to the prejudice of debtors to the extent of perhaps one-half, certainly of one-third. To increase all debts at a blow is a measure so violent, so revolutionary, that I can not believe that the Government will propose it, or that the Chambers will vote it.

I take it for granted that all men concede that our financial condition is unsatisfactory; that all men concede that something should be done; that all men concede that there have been errors committed in the past.

I aver, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a settled, a fixed, a determined purpose to depress silver in the markets of the world and to prevent its use as primary or standard money.

Now to the proof. In 1873, when the bullion was worth more than the coin, silver was demonetized. We ceased to coin it. What followed? There was agitation all over the country in behalf of the rehabilitation of silver. No question was so burning at that time as the restoration of silver.

In 1878 a free-coinage bill was passed. The representatives of the people desired to put the standard of value back where it had been in 1873. The bill went to the Senate. The matter was compromised. It was finally passed as the Bland-Allison law, vetoed by the Republican President (Hayes) and passed over his veto. The bill so passed was a substitute or a makeshift for the free coinage of silver.

That law provided that we should coin not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 a month. It provided that the coin issued under it should be a legal tender for all debts, public and private. How was it treated? In the first place, the minimum amount was coined. The Treasury Department, which might have coined $4,000,000, coined but $2,000,000, thereby expressing its judgments, so far as it could by its act, that coinage of silver was not desirable. The President expressed that view in his veto, and when overruled by a constitutional majority in both Houses his Secretary of the Treasury manifested his opposition by coining only the minimum amount required by the law.

The law said the silver coined under the Bland-Allison Act should be a legal tender for all debts, public and private. Our outstanding obligations, including the greenbacks, were payable in coin, and yet, according to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, from the very hour of resumption the Treasury Department transferred to the holder of the United States notes—greenbacks—the option to demand and receive gold in payment. I have heard that statement questioned, and have taken the trouble to get the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, so there can be no dispute about it. Mr. Sibley, a Representative from Pennsylvania, asked the Secretary of the Treasury a question when the Secretary appeared before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives during the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill for the year 1896, as follows:

I would like to ask you what objection there could be to having the option of redeeming either in silver or gold lie with the Treasury instead of with the note holder?

Mr. CARLISLE. If that policy had been adopted at the beginning of resumption—and I am not using this for the purpose of criticising the action of any of my predecessors, or anybody else—but if the policy of reserving to the Government at the beginning of resumption the option of redeeming in gold or silver all its paper presented, I believe it would have worked beneficially, and there would have been no trouble growing out of it; but the Secretaries of the Treasury from the beginning of resumption have pursued the policy of redeeming in gold or silver at the option of the note holders.

Now, I heard some gentleman yesterday—I do not recollect whom—say that the money under the Bland-Allison law, the silver issued under that law, stood without support and its parity was maintained because it was receivable for public dues.

Mr. Speaker, it might have been maintained in that way, but it was not. There has never been a moment from the demonetization of silver until this hour that the Treasury Department, no matter by whom administered, has manifested a friendly feeling for silver as primary money.

In 1890 the Bland-Allison law was repealed. The Sherman law was enacted, the law denounced by the national Democratic platform as a "cowardly makeshift."

Under that law we accumulated the fund of uncoined silver which is now in the Treasury. Under that law the Treasury coined some millions. Then coinage ceased. The Treasury might in the discretion of the Secretary have rapidly coined the silver bullion and redeemed the notes which were issued for its purchase; but no, only about eighteen or nineteen million dollars of the Sherman notes have been so redeemed, and the remainder, about one hundred and thirty millions, is still outstanding. But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Shortly before August, 1893, gold coin was presented to our Treasury officials and silver dollars asked in exchange and refused.

Mark you! Gold coin presented and silver dollars asked in exchange and refused by the Treasury Department, because, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Carlisle said that "all the silver dollars in the Treasury at the time were required under the provisions of the law relating to the currency to be held in the Treasury to cover the outstanding silver certificates and the Treasury notes issued

under the act of July, 1890." I read extracts from his letter to the Senate dated August 17, 1893:

4. Gold coin is issued in redemption of United States notes in sums not less than $50 by the assistant treasurers in New York and San Francisco, and in redemption of Treasury notes of 1890 in like sums by the Treasurer and all the assistant treasurers.

In further response to the resolution I have to say that recently gold coin has been presented at an office of this Department and silver dollars asked in exchange therefor, and that the exchange was not made for the reason that all the silver dollars in the Treasury at the time were required under the provisions of the laws relating to the currency to be held in the Treasury to cover outstanding silver certificates and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890. At present the Department would not and could not exchange silver dollars for gold coin if requested to do so by holders of gold for the same reason; but if the condition of the funds of the Treasury were such as to afford a margin of silver dollars in excess of silver certificates and Treasury notes outstanding, such exchanges would be made.

Respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

He refused to give silver for gold, because he must hold the silver to pay the silver certificates and Sherman notes issued under the act of 1890, and when a Sherman note issued under the act of 1890 is presented he redeems it in gold and not in silver. [Applause.] What mockery is this! What sort of friendly treatment is accorded silver by this law and the practice that obtains at the Treasury of the United States?

Again, we have a large quantity of subsidiary silver. In Great Britain, which is a gold-standard country, they have more than $200,000,000 of subsidiary silver, which is sustained alone by its being a limited legal tender. In the United States the subsidiary silver coin is not left to stand upon its own feet. So fearful are the single gold standard advocates of the United States that silver may have some footing that in 1879 they passed an act that even subsidiary silver coin should be redeemed in lawful money when presented to the Treasury in sums of $20 and multiples thereof. You can not take subsidiary silver in England to the Treasury and have it redeemed, for there is no law requiring its redemption. In the United States the worshipers of gold are not even willing to trust silver so far as our subsidiary coinage is concerned, but have provided that even that coinage should be redeemed in gold if the holders demand it.

Such has been the treatment, Mr. Speaker, of silver in this country. Our friends point to the Bland Act, they point to the Sherman Act, as evidence that a demand for silver will not increase the price. Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the free coinage of silver have never maintained that parity could be brought about by the purchase of silver, no matter how great the purchase might be. That which will bring parity, Mr. Speaker, is use as primary money in a country of sufficient wealth and population to create a demand for every ounce of silver that can be brought to the mint. It is not the fact that you coin, but it is the right of every ounce existing to be coined, that gives it value. [Loud applause.] No matter how much your purchase may be, if you leave a surplus that surplus will regulate the price.

Our single gold standard friends say that great efforts have been made here to maintain the parity between the two metals. I desire to call your attention a little to that. In the first place, every obligation of the United States bonds or notes is payable in coin. If you gentlemen on the other side believe these obligations are payable in gold, then, my friends, you ought to be brave enough to say so, because by so doing you could save to our tax-ridden people many millions of money.

Who is so bold on that side as to maintain that the obligations of the United States are payable in gold? Who on that side will vote for the payment of the obligations and bonds of the United States in gold? I hope you will not all rise at once. [Laughter.] Every obligation is payable in coin, so denominated in the contract, so voted by the Congress of the United States, and so understood by the creditors of the United States. Why, Mr. Speaker, only last February the President negotiated a bond sale. The bankers to whom he sold the bonds said to him substantially, "Sir, if within ten days from the date of this contract you can obtain the consent of the legislative department of the Government that these bonds shall be payable in gold, then we will take them at such a rate as to save to the people of the United States in interest more than $16,000,000." And the President sent down his message, and he said substantially to the House of Representatives, "I urge you to make these bonds payable in gold, because by doing so the people will save $16,000,000," and the representatives of the people refused to make the bonds payable in gold, and the syndicate took them on the contract they had entered into with the President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, has any gentleman here the hardihood to say that when we have paid or agreed to pay $16,000,000 for the privilege of paying these bonds in silver that we have no right to so pay them? [Loud applause.] Some gentlemen here say that in the past the obligations of the United States have always been paid in gold, and therefore coin means gold, and not silver; but the gentlemen who took those bonds are estopped from such a contention as that, because they themselves raised the doubt, and said, "If you will resolve that doubt in our favor we will pay you $16,000,000"; and yet we are told we can not pay them in silver, for if we do we violate the contract; if we do we trail in the dust the honor of our country. Mr. Speaker, what an absurdity! There is no man who buys a bond of the United States who does not read upon it that it is payable in standard money of 1870, gold and silver, at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, if we have no legal obligation to pay them, is there any moral obligation? Is there any reason why we should depart from the terms of the contract in the interest of the bondholders and the speculators of the world? Why, sir, a few days ago our condition was pitiable—absolutely pitiable. The greatest nation on earth, the greatest in commerce, in intelligence, in progress, applauded to the echo a message from the Chief Executive asserting the true American doctrine, asserting that no European power should acquire further lodgment on the American continent. [Applause.] But, Mr. Speaker, the sound of that rejoicing had hardly died away before the so-called "business interests" of the country, that class of whose patriotism we hear so much, were shaking at the knees for fear Great Britain would take our precious gold away! Can we maintain a system that leaves us in that condition and justify ourselves before a liberty-loving people? [Applause.]

Now, the question is, What is to be done? Our Republican friends say "nothing." That is the kind of Republican Congress we have got—"nothing—do nothing." [Laughter. Applause on the Democratic side.] You find your country embarrassed in the face of her enemies by laws that you yourselves have made, and, with full power to change them, you do nothing. Have we not a right to expect something from that side of the House? Is the country to be left at the mercy of the foreign money sharks because this Republican majority of 140 or 150 refuses to do anything? We on this side are helpless. This side of the House, however it may be divided on certain questions, would be glad to see something done to protect the Treasury, and at the same time protect the interests of the people.

We have paid, or obligated ourselves to pay, $262,000,000 to maintain the parity between gold and silver—obligated ourselves to pay that amount of principal, not to speak of the interest. The Secretary of the Treasury and the President tell us there is no need for that money except to procure gold, that there is no deficiency in the Treasury necessitating the issue of bonds. You gentlemen may say, and do say, that the Wilson-Gorman bill has produced a deficiency, but the President tells us, and so does the Secretary, that there is nothing in the condition of the Treasury to demand these sales of bonds except the necessity for gold. Two hundred and sixty-two millions of bonds have been sold for gold. The gold for which the earlier issues were sold has gone out into the country or abroad, and probably some of it is now coming back to pay for the later issues.

You have established by your laws—not Democratic laws, Republican laws, for I am afraid that sometimes you gentlemen forget that you are responsible for this condition of things—you have established by the laws you have passed what is called an "endless chain" which draws gold out of the Treasury. That has been done by your laws and by your method of administering the laws, which, I regret to say, has been followed by the Democratic Administration. You set the example, and the present Secretary of the Treasury says that but for the fact that you did set the example the other system might have been followed with great benefit to the country, but that, inasmuch as you did set the example of transferring the option from the Government to the holder, it was necessary that he should follow it. You are in the habit of saying, some of you gentlemen on the other side, "Why, we transferred the option because the obligation was upon us to maintain the parity between the two metals."

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the act of 1890 does declare in favor of the maintenance of the parity between the two metals; but did the Bland-Allison Act so declare? The exchange of gold or the transfer of the option was given by Republican Secretaries of the Treasury at a time when there was no legal obligation to maintain the parity between the two metals. It was a mere voluntary election on their part to surrender the rights of the people in favor of a class that was specially favored at that time and, I regret to say, since. Two hundred and sixty-two millions of dollars of bonds have been sold.

Now, what is the effect of that, apart from the cost? You recollect that our Republican friends, when they first reported their bond bill, had a provision in it which might be construed to retire the greenbacks. You recollect the fluttering that it created on that side. You recollect how anxious they all became to find out just what it meant, and you recollect the Ways and Means Committee was called together again and any ambiguity which existed in the bill was cured, so as to make it clear that the intention was not to retire the greenbacks. From that I would infer that the Republican majority in this House would not vote for a bill to retire the greenbacks; and yet, Mr. Speaker, the failure of the ma-

jority here to do something to change the existing laws does, in effect, retire the greenbacks from circulation.

Think of that a moment. We had before this last sale about $170,000,000, in round numbers, in the Treasury. About a hundred millions of it, I believe, was of that character on which gold is paid. Now, we have sold a hundred millions of bonds and we are going to get a hundred and ten millions in the Treasury for those bonds, so that when that money is received we shall have two hundred and seventy millions in the Treasury. If a hundred millions of that is gold, the remainder is greenbacks. When our friends in Europe or on Wall street want more gold they will take it from the Treasury of the United States with greenbacks, and when the gold just purchased is gone we will have $270,000,000 in greenbacks or Treasury notes in the Treasury. Two hundred and seventy millions of our greenbacks are thus locked up. Repeat that operation once or twice and every dollar of the greenback circulation of the country will be locked up in the Treasury and you will have done in a more costly way that which you would not vote to do at this hour.

Secretary Carlisle tells us in his last report that an attempt to impose taxation upon our people sufficient in amount to enable the Treasury to take up and hoard all of the legal tenders outstanding, now amounting to about $485,000,000, would be the most remarkable financial experiment of modern times. And you are permitting my friends—you are by your inaction now permitting just that thing to be done. You tax the people in a time of profound peace by bonds when there is no necessity for the money for the uses of the Government; and in that way you acquire and hoard the greenbacks in the Treasury. You contract the circulating medium to that extent. You say to the people that you do not favor the retirement of the greenbacks, and yet with power to repeal the Republican laws under which they are being retired, you carry out the policy of the leaders of this Congress and "do nothing."

Let us, Mr. Speaker, deal frankly with each other and with the people. If any man can show under existing law how it is possible to prevent the retirement of the greenbacks when the "business interests" of the country desire their retirement, let him now speak.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable. There is no escaping from it. It is manifest to any man who gives the matter a moment's consideration. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that during last year there was a contraction in the currency of the United States outside the Treasury amounting to more than $73,000,000. Since that time, sir, there has been a sale of $100,000,000 of bonds, which will result in the piling up in the Treasury of $110,000,000 more money, which is thereby taken out of circulation, which is hoarded, which is kept there by the "friends of silver," as they call themselves, for fear that this country might get upon a silver basis. And how long will it be before the contraction thus progressing will be the full amount of the greenback? Why not coin the silver and pay the Sherman notes? Why adopt a policy of refusing to give silver for gold, and at the same time refuse to redeem in silver the notes which were given for its purchase?

My friend from Maine says that if we do anything with the silver, except to hold a dollar for each note outstanding, we are perpetrating a fraud. Mr. Speaker, the law which requires us so to hold silver is a fraud. The theory has been that one hundred millions of gold kept in the Treasury of the United States was sufficient for the redemption of the three hundred and forty-six millions of greenbacks. But when you deal with silver, what you call legal-tender silver or standard silver, you require that each silver certificate shall have behind it a silver dollar. Why, if you are so friendly to silver and believe it to be a money of final redemption and standard money, may not one hundred millions of silver dollars sustain three hundred and forty-six millions of silver certificates as well as one hundred millions of gold will sustain three hundred and forty-six millions of greenbacks?

Why, sir, it is manifest that the whole effort at all times has been to avoid the free coinage of silver, and at the same time to hoodwink the people into the idea that those who do so are friendly to silver. Now, the final question is, Can we alone maintain the free coinage of silver? That, at last, is the practical question. I submit that there can be no contention in any fair mind that could an international agreement be had, say between the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, that silver and gold should be coined freely and without limit, at the ratio of 15½ to 1 or 16 to 1, that the bullion value of silver and gold coin and the coinage value of gold and silver coin would be exactly equal. I have heard it contended that the United States, from 1792 to 1834 and from 1834 to 1860 tried to keep the commercial value of gold and silver together by a ratio fixed by her laws and failed on both occasions, and hence the claim is that it is impossible, either by law or custom, to establish a parity between the coinage and the bullion ratio of the two metals.

We know, Mr. Speaker, historically, that France did maintain the ratio for seventy years, and we know that the apparent difference or real difference in this country on the two occasions mentioned arose from the fact that the ratios adopted in the United States, first 15 to 1 and then 16 to 1, in neither case fitted the ratio of France, 15½ to 1, and that the French ratio fixed the market price of both gold and silver bullion.

Now, if it be admitted that an international agreement between great commercial countries would restore the parity between gold bullion and silver bullion, then it simply becomes a question how much power must there be in the country which freely and without limit coins silver to bring it to a parity with gold. If you concede that an international agreement can do it, if you concede that four or five countries can do it, then you concede at once that law can affect values.

Secretary Manning defined the old condition of bimetallism, which some of our friends have recently discovered was not bimetallism, because the metals were not exactly of the same value. Mr. Manning says:

> The essential conditions of that old monetary order in their last analysis seem to be these:
> 1. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of gold.
> 2. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of silver.
> 3. Coined gold a full legal tender.
> 4. Coined silver a full legal tender.
> 5. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of silver and of gold.
> 6. Rated equivalence of both metals in such coinage, fixed by States powerful enough to make and keep it prevalent.

There was the old condition of things. In that day it had not been discovered that law had nothing to do with the value of a metal. In that day it had not been discovered that a double standard was, to use the language of the Secretary of the Treasury, "a physical and a metaphysical absurdity." [Applause.] No man had then found that out, but all the fathers believed that there might be such a thing as a double standard, and Mr. Jefferson himself, in writing to Hamilton, in February, 1792, says:

> I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.

Mr. Jefferson did not regard the double standard as a physical and metaphysical absurdity; Mr. Hamilton did not so regard it; but it is reserved for modern statesmanship to discover that the double standard, which we had for near a century and for the restoration of which we now contend, is a physical and metaphysical absurdity. When Mr. Sherman appeared before a Senate committee he said, speaking of the Bland-Allison law:

> In the first place, the silver bill satisfied a strong public demand for bimetallic money, and that demand is no doubt largely sectional. No doubt there is a difference of opinion between the West and the South and the East on the subject, but the desire for remonetization of silver was almost universal. In a Government like ours it is always good to obey the popular currents, and that has been done, I think, by the passage of the silver bill.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we have been told of late that it is evidence of a want of statesmanship to follow the popular current.

Mr. WHEELER. A want of courage.

Mr. CRISP. Yes, a want of courage to follow the popular current; but this great Senator, this great statesman, who has been so long in public life, says that in a Government like ours it is always good to obey the popular current. And why should it not be? Have we forgotten that the people constitute the Government of the United States? [Applause.]

Mr. Bayard, then a Senator from Delaware, asked this question of Secretary Sherman:

> How long do you suppose this short supply of silver and your control of it by your coinage will keep it equivalent to gold, when one is worth 10 cents less than the other?

At that very time the bullion in the silver dollar was worth 10 cents less than the bullion in the gold dollar. Here is the reply:

> Just so long as it can be used for anything that gold is used for it will be worth in this country the par of gold, until it becomes so abundant and bulky that the people will become tired of carrying it about—

He does not stop there—

> but in our country that can be avoided by depositing it for coin certificates.

Mr. SHERMAN does not think that there is any trouble about maintaining the parity just so long as it can be used for anything that gold is used for, and it will be worth the parity of gold in this country until it is so abundant there is trouble in carrying it about, and you can avoid that trouble by having silver certificates. That was his judgment on this question.

Mr. SHERMAN again—I quote him often because he is the father of most of this Republican legislation, and I quote admissions, as it were, against him and in our favor to show that our contention is founded in justice and right—Mr. SHERMAN in his letter to Mr. Groesbeck said that during the Paris conference he favored a single gold standard, but since that time other arguments—I quote him—"other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry of dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh in my mind all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system." And then he says:

> I am thoroughly convinced that if it were possible for the leading commercial nations to fix by agreement an arbitrary relation between silver and gold, even though the market value might vary somewhat from time to time, it would be a measure of the greatest good to all nations.

Mr. SHERMAN concedes that the commercial nations might by agreement fix the ratio between gold and silver. Mr. Carlisle agrees to the same proposition. In 1878 Mr. Carlisle said:

I shall not enter into an examination of the causes which have combined to depreciate the relative value of silver, and to appreciate the value of gold since 1873, but I am one of those who believe that they are transient and temporary in their nature and when they have passed away—

Now mark—

or have been removed by the separate or united actions of the nations most deeply interested in the subject, the old ratio of actual and relative value will be reestablished on a firmer foundation than ever.

"When these difficulties have been removed by the separate or united action of the nations most deeply interested in the subject." It never entered his mind that it could not be removed by united action; it never entered his mind in that day that legislation could not affect the value of money.

Now, the question is, Have we the power alone to bring to a parity the bullion value of silver and the bullion value of gold? Our gold-standard friends contend we have not, and present plausible theories in support of their contention.

We insist that we have the power. We say that what has been once done can be again done, and we cite the experience of France. In 1803 France opened her mints to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and kept them open at that ratio for seventy years, until the Franco-Prussian war. During all that time the French ratio dictated the world's market price of silver, and during all that time practically 15½ pounds of silver bullion would purchase in the markets of the world 1 pound of gold bullion. In the ten years ending with 1810 the world's production of silver averaged fifty and a quarter times the weight of gold produced each year. Nevertheless the market price of silver was 15.6 worth 1 of gold, the French mint price being 15.5 to 1. In the ten years ending with 1855 a complete reversal of the relative production of gold and silver appears, the silver produced during this period being only four and one-half times the weight of the gold each year. But the market price of silver averaged 15.4, as against the French mint price of 15.5. These figures I take from Mr. W. P. St. John, of New York.

The National Bimetallist of December 18, 1895, in dealing with this question truthfully says:

In 1792, Hamilton advised Congress to adopt the ratio of 15 to 1. He arrived at that conclusion almost entirely from a consideration of the different coinage ratios of Europe. Striking what he considered to be a fair average, he fixed upon the ratio of 15. Accordingly that ratio was adopted and coinage began, although upon a very small scale, for the country was a mere infant, and had been completely impoverished by the long struggle for independence.

From the opening of the mint in 1793 to the close of 1802, the total coinage had been $1,859,000 in gold, and $1,573,000 in silver, using round numbers. But in 1803 the French mint was thrown open freely to both metals at 15½ to 1. This made gold 3 per cent more valuable and silver 3 per cent less valuable at the French mint than at the American. The gold being more powerfully attracted by the coinage ratio of France, began to retire from circulation in this country and our currency consisted chiefly of silver.

In 1834 an attempt was made to apply a remedy, but instead of adopting the French ratio and putting ourselves in accord with the mint ratio of that country, we jumped over it to 16, or, more accurately, 15.988. By this ratio we gave gold a value of 3 per cent higher and silver a value of 3 per cent lower than they respectively had at the French mint. Accordingly the process was now reversed and the silver to a considerable extent retired from circulation. But in both cases it was the French mint, not "natural causes," that interfered with our circulation. The "market," that is, the demand for commodity use, had no more to do with it than the Gulf Stream had. First gold and then silver were drawn from America by the operation of the French law.

There is not a reputable economist in the world who does not recognize the fact that the French coinage law practically controlled what the gold people term the "market" both in Europe and America for a period of seventy years.

It is this precise circumstance that bimetallists rely upon in claiming that the United States can do the same thing now, this country being vastly greater in wealth, population, and power than France ever was.

But we are told that France has now closed her mints to silver. This is true, Mr. Speaker, but the reason she closed them was rather political than financial. Germany exacted a war indemnity of France amounting to a billion of dollars in gold. The acquisition of this extraordinary amount of gold enabled Germany to retire three hundred millions of her silver, and France closed her mints against that silver. Again, we are told there has been an overproduction of silver, so that it is impossible for us to do what France did for seventy years—maintain the parity. On this subject let me read an extract from a speech by a distinguished Senator of the United States, who is always careful and cautious in what he says. I refer to Senator COCKRELL, of Missouri.

If the total production of both gold and silver in the world during the four hundred years 1493 to 1893 were in existence to-day as a money, it would only be $14.47 per capita of the world, a wholly insufficient amount for the only money of final payment and redemption and the only measure of value. Search the world to-day and all the gold and silver money which can be found is only $6.34 per capita, a wholly inadequate amount for the transaction of the world's business. We have in the world to-day $2,570,900,000 of uncovered paper currency irredeemable for lack of gold and silver money. The nations having it are struggling to get gold and silver for its redemption, and will continue the struggle. In the five years 1889 to 1893 the world coined $165,976,893 of gold more than was produced, showing the fearful struggle for gold and its shifting from nation to nation and being recoined, and of the total silver product foreign nations alone coined over 66 per cent. They can not do without silver coins, can not part with what they have, and must continue to coin in the future as in the past, regardless of our action. Year by year the coined money disappears in numberless ways, known and unknown. The annual production does not keep pace with the increase of population, commerce, and industry, and the increasing demand for coined money.

Gold and silver are the most suitable metals for use as money and a measure of value, and have been used from time immemorial, and are more stable in their values than any other two metals. They have never been produced in unlimited quantities, like iron, lead, copper, zinc, and most other metals. Hence, no people have ever been flooded with gold and silver or either. Linked together as equals in money use for one hundred and eighty-five years prior to 1872, they maintained a most remarkably stable ratio during great changes in relative production, sometimes 75 per cent of silver to 25 per cent of gold, and then 75 per cent of gold to 25 per cent of silver.

There has been and is now no overproduction of silver. Mr. Speaker, after centuries of use of both metals the Secretary of the Treasury reports that in the world of metallic money there is to-day in round numbers $4,000,000,000 of gold and $4,000,000,000 of silver. Unfortunately this silver is not all standard money. There is no considerable quantity of silver bullion in the world outside our Treasury. India consumes as much as she ever did, and more is consumed in the arts.

As our distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] so well told us the other day, in his great speech made here, which in my judgment is unanswerable, the bulk ratio of gold and silver to-day, after centuries of effort to dig it from the earth, stands at just about the coinage ratio of 14 or 15 or 16 to 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sixteen and three-tenths, exactly.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Mississippi says 16$\frac{3}{10}$. It only remains, Mr. Speaker, to compare our resources with France and to say a word as to the greatness and power which we possess. With a population more than double and an area more than seventeen times as great as France, we have productive power more than Great Britain, France, and Germany all combined. Our country is new and comparatively undeveloped; our people are more industrious and productive than other people, and consume more. Mr. Mulhall, an English statistician, tells us that the merchandise transported on our railroads is double that carried on all the railways in all the countries in the world; we produce billions of dollars' worth of farm products, of manufactured goods, and of all the necessaries and luxuries of life. Our country is the richest in the world. It has been said:

It has in it every element of prosperity. * * * Nothing has ever been seen like the progress of this nation since the world began.

We need more money than any country under the sun. We are suffering now for want of it. With all these resources, who can doubt that the demand for money here and elsewhere will be and is so great that what our mint rate says is a dollar will be a dollar, with all the purchasing power of any other dollar at home and in all the markets of the world?

We ask that the law, that *the law*, shall look with favor upon silver coin, upon silver money. An act of Parliament confers upon the owner of a troy ounce of gold eleven-twelfths fine a title to £3 17s. 9d. in English money. The Government does not own the money. My friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] makes some point on that. He asks, "What good will it do to let bullion owners go to the mint and have their silver coined, when it does not belong to the Government?" What good, I ask the gentleman, does it do to permit owners of gold bullion to have it freely coined, when it does not belong to the Government? All free coinage is on private account.

In England the man who digs from the earth a troy ounce of gold, eleven-twelfths fine, is entitled by law—by act of Parliament—to receive in English money £3 17s. 9d. In the United States a man who digs from the earth 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, is entitled to receive a dollar of lawful money of the United States. What we propose is to put silver where it was before the act of 1873, so that the owner of 412½ grains of silver, nine-tenths fine, shall have a title at the mints of the United States to $1 in American money. When you give him a title to such a sum at the mints of the United States you will give him a title to a like sum in every country on earth, and, in my judgment, you will bring the bullion value of gold bullion and silver bullion together at your mint rate wherever commerce extends.

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the contention on the silver side of this question. Feebly, I know, I have expressed it, and yet I have spoken with earnestness. I have said nothing I hope unkind; I have meant nothing unkind; I have dealt with frankness, appealing not to theory but to experience; not inviting you to enter any field which has not been explored, but inviting you to return to the ancient system under which this country grew and prospered as no other country of which we have account ever did grow or ever did prosper. If we will but emulate the example of the fathers, if we will but assert and maintain the political and the financial independence of our beloved country, we may confidently hope not only that prosperity will return, but that it will continue the perpetual heritage of the people of the United States. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Georgia occupied?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has occupied an hour and a half, or very nearly that.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] proposes to occupy an hour of the equal time that will belong to the majority of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] is recognized.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for what time the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] is recognized?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia rose.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague begins, I ask unanimous consent that his time be so extended as to permit him to finish his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], that the time of his colleague [Mr. TURNER] be extended to enable him to conclude his remarks?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] wishes to occupy twenty-five minutes of the time belonging to the majority of the committee at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER]. With the understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be allowed twenty-five minutes, there is no objection on our part.

There being no objection, the request of Mr. CRISP was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that I enter upon a great controversy. I must also confess the embarrassment which arises from the consideration that I have to follow in this debate my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. Returning my thanks for the great courtesy which has just been shown me, I beg to say that I am actuated to-day by no aspiration to acquire credit for greater wisdom or courage than other men of my day and generation. [Applause.] I shall state opinions and conclusions which have been slowly, and I trust carefully, formed, but which I shall submit with the most respectful deference to the opinions of others. But, sir, I do not invoke any confidence merely by the expression of my opinions; on the contrary, I ask attention to the reasons which I give for the faith that I shall avow.

Let us look at the situation, and then see whether there are not some things about which we can agree and thus reduce the points of difference unfortunately existing on both sides of the House.

On the 27th of December last the House sent to the other branch of Congress a measure proposing to amend the law which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds. That body has returned the bill with a complete displacement of the bond measure and a substitution for it of a free-coinage bill. So far as germaneness is concerned, they might just as well have put a protective tariff in place of the measure we sent them. They might just as well have put in place of our bill, and as a substitute for it, the abandoned subtreasury bill of the Populists. So far as germaneness is concerned, they might just as well have substituted a scheme for the annexation of Mexico, silver and all. [Laughter and applause.]

There are some things, Mr. Speaker, to which, as I intimated just now, all men may agree. In 1792 our predecessors in Congress inaugurated the coinage by the Government of gold and silver at the ratio of 15 to 1. Gold being worth in the market more than fifteen times as much as silver, it did not go to the mint. Being undervalued by the law, it went where it was more appreciated. Such gold pieces as we had were melted down or crossed the ocean for the better market value. Even our silver coinage was greatly reduced by the competition of the worn and abraded silver coins of Spain and Mexico, the dollar pieces of which countries the United States had made a legal tender. Both of these phenomena are due to that universal instinct or calculation of men and nations which discriminates between the good and bad in money and keeps the bad going. Every man who has good money and inferior or doubtful money will, in his business transactions, use first the doubtful; and what he reserves from use will be the good. What is true of the individual is also true of the aggregation of individuals called the people or the nation. This inevitable tendency is what is called "Gresham's law." By causing the sound money to be kept out of trade it works a contraction of the volume of currency and limits the circulation to the amount of the unsound with all its risks and uncertainty.

In 1837 Congress endeavored to correct the mistake of 1792 and made the ratio between gold and silver about 16 to 1 at the mints. Then it was soon found that by the new ratio silver was undervalued and that gold was not worth sixteen times as much as silver. The result again demonstrated that the mint ratio, prescribed by legal enactment, can not supersede market value. This time gold, being the inferior metal at the established ratio, came into circulation, and silver, because of its greater value in manufactures and in other countries, went out of circulation. Here is another great precedent which shows that an act of Congress can not in the matter of value supersede the common sense of mankind.

In 1853, in order to keep our change money or subsidiary coins, Congress reduced the quantity of silver in our halves, quarters, dimes, and half dimes so greatly that it would not pay to melt them for use in manufactures or to export them to other countries; but their legal-tender quality was limited to sums of $5, and our silver dollar, not having been included in this change of ratio, remained out of circulation.

In 1857 an act was passed absolutely demonetizing the foreign silver dollars we had—the only "dollars of our fathers." On the 21st of February of that year Congress enacted "that all former acts authorizing the currency of foreign gold or silver coins and declaring the same a legal tender in payment for debts are hereby repealed."

Thus was accomplished actually, and practically, and completely what has been since called the "crime of 1873." The act of 1873 was only an epitaph which marked an old grave. Who was it laid impious and sacrilegious hands on the "dollars of our fathers"? Our fathers themselves did the deed! Let justice be done though the heavens fall. And in 1853 and in 1857 there was no uprising of the poor, no flourishing of pitchforks, no threat of dynamite and anarchy. Even the exigencies of politics and of parties could make no occasion for a tear, or even for a protest. The farmer was never happier and the laborer never went to his work with a merrier heart.

From 1857 to 1861 gold was the only standard money we had, and yet for the rich and the poor, the creditor and the debtor, the farmer and the laborer, we had the happiest, the most prosperous, and the most magnificent era in the world's history. [Applause.] It was emphatically the golden age of the Republic!

What I have already said no man can dispute. I now approach the great question, which is: Can this country alone restore the parity between gold and silver by free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 under present conditions? We have just been told that this can be done; but my colleague did not support the assumption with any clear statement of his reasons for that opinion. This is the mighty issue we are to decide. I have already proven by evidence clear almost as holy writ that we were never heretofore able by free and unlimited coinage at either 15 or 16 to 1 to maintain the parity between the two metals. And yet the experiments we made in these previous efforts were made when the difference between the value of the two metals at the given ratio amounted to only 2 or 3 cents in the dollar. Now, that difference amounts to about 50 cents in the dollar. In the early experiments we had the cooperation of nearly all the commercial nations; now we have the cooperation of none. In the face of this simple recital it almost staggers credulity that able men should favor the proposed experiment.

But let us try the question as you would a case in court, by witnesses. The gentleman can cite Mexico as a friend and supporter of his view, but Mexico has utterly failed by free coinage at her ratio, which is more liberal to gold than ours, to even approximate parity between the two metals, and is now on a silver basis.

Certain countries of South America can be summoned as witnesses for free coinage of silver, but their experience has been like that of Mexico, and three of them (Chile, Brazil, and Venezuela) have adopted the gold standard. Shall we cite the Chinese, the followers of Confucius, whose great barbaric wall has yielded recently to the pounding of modern progress and civilization? [Applause.] Shall we call up the Japanese, that intelligent and progressive people who are in the act of abandoning the exploded theories about silver, and whose business men are to-day agitating the question of the reform of their financial difficulties which arise under the single silver standard. In what other quarter of the world can you find a people to testify for the free and unlimited coinage of silver?

Let us now hear the other side. In the first place, these are the greatest people in the world, whose boundless resources were accumulated under the gold standard; our own countrymen, whose sentiments on this question are shown in our statutes at all stages of our great progress, and will be shown again this afternoon on the pending motion. There is Great Britain, the land of our ancestors, whose flag floats on every sea and on every continent, whose wealth and power were acquired under the gold standard. These two constitute the English-speaking race, the race that has governed more of mankind and governed them longer and better than any other race known to history. There is Germany, that nation of philosophers and scholars; Russsia, the young giant of the Eastern Hemisphere; Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Austria, France, and the British Government of India. In these countries are the sources of all our learning and civilization. Can there be any doubt how an impartial jury or court would decide this question, compassed about with such a cloud of witnesses? Let me here pause long enough to ask if the concurrent action of all these great nations depressed the value of silver, can we alone restore its value? It is a world-wide question, it would seem.

Let us now try this great question by the fireside, in the counting-house of the merchant, in the marts of trade, in the clubrooms,

and in the labor organizations, by a mode of proof which ought to be satisfactory to all classes of men. Let us try it by our own experience. Under the act of 1878, known as the Bland-Allison Act, we entered on a scheme by which we were to coin not less than $2,000,000 worth of silver, nor more than $4,000,000 worth per month.

A MEMBER. Ounces.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. No; dollars. I am correct in my statement. It makes a considerable difference, because the bullion was purchased at its market value. Under the operation of this act, the very first year we coined over $20,000,000. After that it ran up from $24,000,000 to nearly $30,000,000 per annum, until we had got somewhere in the neighborhood of $400,000,000. Prior to 1878 we had not coined exceeding $8,000,000 of silver. Now, if one government alone can impart value, why did not this immense augmentation of the coinage of silver tend to raise or at least maintain the value of silver? To that question I have never obtained an answer. In fact, silver went down every year of the Bland-Allison Act at a fearful rate.

Then we tried another experiment. In 1890 we passed the Sherman Act, so framed as to provide for the purchase and the use, in some form, of more than the entire American product, or 54,000,000 ounces of silver per annum. How did that experiment operate? Instead of the law increasing or even sustaining the value of silver by a use of silver larger than the full capacity of our mints under free coinage—under that experiment silver went down until it reached figures appallingly low in the spring of 1893.

Under this decline we stood on the verge of a convulsion when the British Government in India, that great reservoir of silver, closed its mints to its free coinage. Its market value then fell to the lowest point it had ever reached, or about half. I now repeat, if the Government use of silver can impart to it value at the mint ratio, for which my colleague contends, why was it that silver, under these two very liberal measures, instead of going up, actually went down so fearfully?

Let us now enlarge our view of the situation. It is nearly always claimed on the other side of this question that half the money of the world has been stricken down. It is a false assumption. Except perhaps in Germany, no standard silver has been demonetized, and, in fact, all the countries of the world since 1873, according to the last report of the Director of the Mint, have actually coined $2,700,000,000 of silver. [Applause.] All the coined silver in the world at this time is estimated by the same authority to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000. Of that immense sum, half, excluding recoinages, has been coined since 1873. Now, if this very liberal use of silver could not sustain its value, what becomes of the argument I am combating? As a matter of fact, more silver was coined during this period of limited coinage than during any like period of free and unlimited coinage. Why did silver go down instead of going up?

Mr. TERRY. Because they measure it in gold prices.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will endeavor, if my capacity is adequate to the occasion, to answer even that suggestion. [Laughter.] If it was fair to make the comparison between silver and gold at the beginning of the period, why is it not fair to make a comparison with gold now? Compared with gold at the beginning of this alleged outlawry of silver, silver was worth a premium of 2 to 3 cents on the dollar. Now, my friend ought not to insist on a change of standard when he comes to make a comparison in 1896. I ought to have the right to make the comparison according to the same standard in both cases. My friend ought to remember that we have now fifty times as much standard silver in this country as we had in 1873, and a great deal more gold; and it is therefore more liberal to silver to estimate its value now in gold than in 1873. We have an inflation now in standard money as compared with that year.

It may be assumed that the depression of silver is due rather to the fear that there would be too much of it than to any supposition that too little has been coined.

Finally, on this great issue, let me add that market value of an international commodity is at last the opinion of the business world. As that opinion is against the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 or 15 to 1, this would seem to be the conclusion of the whole matter. You can not raise the value of any article by forcing it upon an unwilling market.

Much has been said about falling prices of other commodities, and it has been assumed that this decline is due to the alleged demonetization of silver, I have shown that there has been no demonetization of silver, and that, in fact, the coinage of silver has been greatly increased since this fall of prices began, or rather since 1878. But let us for the sake of the argument suppose that reductions in cost of production, increase in the number of producers, the multiplication of labor-saving devices, the lowering of freight rates, the development of other countries, and the improvement in modes of culture and manufacture have had nothing to do with the fall of the prices of our great staples, whatever we do in the premises, would not our great staples still be sold in gold-standard countries? Can we fix the price of cotton, or wheat, or provisions in Europe? It is well known that the prices of these staples are fixed on the other side of the ocean without regard to our currency, and our own markets simply follow those prices. However strong we may be, our arms are too short to reach across the sea.

What a great opportunity awaits the statesmen of England, Germany, and France if European treatment of silver is as baleful as represented. If statesmen are extinct, why does not some philanthropist like Coin arise in London, Paris, or Berlin, and denounce the oppressors of silver? The sturdy yeomen, the plain people of those countries, when they settle even in this free country, seem invariably to deprecate free and unlimited coinage of silver. If free silver could restore prosperity to the farmers of England, Germany, and France, why have they not gone to the palace gates with their demands? Are they all fools?

Mr. TERRY. I will say to the gentleman, as he asked me, that the popular branch of the German Assembly voted in favor of bimetallism, and the common people in England are the same way; but the Rothschilds hold a mortgage on every throne in Europe, just like they held a receivership of the United States Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. And you would put the Treasury of the United States into bankruptcy in an hour. [Applause.]

Mr. TERRY. It has already been there under your system. It was put there by your system.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, my friend is content with mere assertion. I will endeavor as I go along, if my strength does not fail me, respectfully to demonstrate the peril to which I think he invites the country. I do not question his capacity, nor his greater learning, nor wisdom. I simply crave the right to offer my own reflections in the matter.

Mr. TERRY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Some reference has been made here to Mr. Balfour's opinion, and my friend from Arkansas has just referred to something that has transpired in the popular branch of the German Reichstag. He has not been fair in that citation. Mr. Balfour, in answer to a delegation which called upon him last year and urged a larger use of silver, distinctly said that the Government of England could not undertake it alone and unaided. When the gentleman referred to the action of the German Parliament, he ought to have been candid enough to say that the proposition there was to inaugurate the larger use of silver by the common consent of the commercial nations as ascertained in an international conference. [Applause.]

I am sure that there are many men who have been earnest and consistent friends of silver for years, who would feel the keenest anxiety if its unlimited coinage should be attempted under present conditions. They feel now that the great problem before us is how to preserve the parity of the great stock of silver dollars we already have. But there are others who manifest no such concern. What care they about convulsions? Have we not a right to pay our obligations in silver? Mr. Gladstone is represented as saying that England can not consent to free coinage of silver because England is a creditor nation, and it is contended that we should have free coinage because we are a debtor nation.

Mr. Speaker, I repudiate that doctrine. It is to the interest of a creditor nation to maintain a sound standard of money, but it is still more to the interest of a debtor nation to maintain its credit at the highest point. [Applause.] Would a bank bidding for the confidence of the community dare to force on its depositors or other creditors cheaper money than it demands?

Mr. LINNEY. If it will not disturb the gentleman, as I understand he is a North Carolinian by birth, I wish he would allow me to ask him a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad indeed to yield to my friend, but I am in the midst of an argument in which I would rather not be interrupted.

Mr. LINNEY. My question is a very short one.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman may ask his question at a later stage.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that according to the letter of the law we can pay our debts in silver. But should we do so against the consent of the holders of our bonds? In 1878 was passed the concurrent resolution to which my colleague [Mr. CRISP] alluded in December, and to which he has again alluded on this occasion, which, reciting the acts authorizing the bond issues, declared that it was competent and within the power of this Government to discharge its obligations in silver dollars of standard weight and fineness. But let us see the circumstances under which those bonds were issued, down through the series including those which were sold the other day.

In 1870 and 1875, when the large bond acts were passed, we had no silver dollars, and down to 1878 we had none. Our standard coin was gold, and gold only. Some correspondence took place

between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney-General, as stated by my colleague, and an opinion was given as to the kind of coin that would discharge these obligations. All that I concede, for I do not deny the narrow, technical, legal right. Neither do I deny that the Congress can lawfully change the ratio now so that we shall have only one-half as many grains of gold in our gold dollar as we have now, or that the Congress can change the silver dollar so that it shall contain only one-half the number of grains of silver of which it is now composed. We have that power. It was competent for us to do that then; it is competent for us to do it now. It is in our power to repudiate all our debts and to maintain the repudiation at the mouths of our cannon.

In the first place, the Stanley Matthews resolution of 1878 is not law. It never became a law under the Constitution of the United States. It undertook to prescribe a rule of action for the executive department, and yet it was never submitted to the executive department for approval, as required by the Constitution. That Constitution requires that every order or resolution which is intended to have the effect of law shall either be approved by the President or, being disapproved by him, shall be passed by a two-thirds vote over his veto. There was probably a reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Stanley Matthews resolution was never submitted to the Executive. Mr. Hayes, then President of the United States, had vetoed the Bland-Allison Act that session and might have disapproved the resolution. It was therefore simply a declaration of opinion on the part of certain gentlemen who had seats in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. Let us hear no more, then, of the Stanley Matthews resolution as law.

Now, let us look still further. By the resumption act of 1875 it was provided that the Treasury, from surplus revenues and from the sale of bonds, should accumulate coin for the redemption of the Treasury demand notes and obligations. That act did not, in fact, contemplate silver, because we had no silver dollars in the country. And it is well known that the Secretary of the Treasury actually accumulated $100,000,000 in gold only as the redemption fund, since well known as "the gold reserve." And since my colleague has been a member of the House an act was passed distinctly recognizing that reserve of $100,000,000 of gold for the purpose indicated; and whenever we have sold bonds since the resumption act, at home or abroad, we have required that they should be paid for in gold. Let it also be remembered that as a debtor nation, on the faith of this history, we invited the people at home and abroad to take our bonds—bonds of our municipalities, bonds of our States, bonds of our business enterprises of every kind—with the implied pledge that the Treasury would maintain the equality of our greenback circulation with gold. Since that time silver has gone down until the value of our silver dollars to our foreign creditors has gone down to half, or to 50 cents on the dollar. I ask is it consistent with national honor and integrity in the face of this recital to say that it is morally right for us to pay our debts in silver on this depreciated basis? But, sir, something has been said here about the interest of the debtors in this question.

I believe that there is hardly a debtor in this country who would be benefited by the election of a free-silver Congress and a free-silver President. If such event should ever happen, before the necessary act could be passed and put into effective operation what would happen? Every man in the world that holds a bond against the people or Government of the United States or a State or corporation of this country would, in order to anticipate silver payments, rush to his broker and order the sale of the obligation. Every holder of every sort of marketable security payable in the United States, whether he resides in London, in Berlin, in Paris, in New York, in Boston, or anywhere else, would rush to sell. They would no longer be buyers of our bonds, but raging madmen seeking to sell them. In such a panic, what would become of cotton, wheat, and prices of all property, and what would become of the debtor? If there is a man on this floor owning any sort of bonds who would not sell them under such conditions, let him stand up. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Perhaps they have not any. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, sir, what I have indicated as the necessary effect of a change of our fiscal policy, or, I may add, from a strong prospect of such a change, upon our marketable securities is equally true as to private obligations. Suppose my friend from Arkansas owed me a debt of $1,000 payable in the current money, now equal to gold, and that I should discover that it may be brought about that I might have to take depreciated silver, what would I do? I might sue, as I am human.

Mr. TERRY. You ought to receive the money of the contract.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Ah, the gentleman from Arkansas has not answered my suggestion.

Mr. TERRY. And you have not answered mine.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman from Arkansas forgets that I supposed that he owed me $1,000 in gold, or its equivalent, and that I should apprehend that silver might be forced on me when depreciated. My question was as to what I would be likely to do in advance of the depreciation.

Mr. TERRY. But suppose my contract provided for the payment of $1,000 to you in coin when silver was a part of the coin money of this country? Would you consider it honest afterwards to go to work and influence legislation so as to get two dollars for every one that I owed you? [Applause.] That is what you are doing, and the people understand it, and don't you forget it.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My friend's suggestion does not comport with the character of the occasion. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. It does not fit what you are proposing to say.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will put it again. My supposition was that the gentleman had made the debt in gold or its equivalent when silver was at a premium, or at par, and efforts likely to succeed pending which might degrade silver to 50 cents on the dollar; does he think that I would wait to be paid in that sort of depreciated money? [Applause.]

Mr. TERRY. I would stand within my right if I paid you according to contract. I have before me the act in regard to the bonds, to which he has been referring. They are payable in coin.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. TERRY. They were originally payable in lawful money. They went to work under an act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit" and made them payable in coin, and they were so sold.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My friend has made that very clear. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. And it is a full answer to your statement.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I insist upon in my supposition just now is not what is the narrow technical right of the debtor, but what would a creditor do who feared that if he waited on his debtor he might have to take bad money for good, or 50 cents on the dollar. He would probably not wait.

As to the public debt, I may say that I was endeavoring to show that any holder of our securities anticipating from political tendencies or the result of elections that he might be paid in money inferior to the standard prevailing at the time of his contract would at once unload his securities. We might with profit remember the lessons of experience. Why, sir, instead of paying the public creditor one dollar for two, I would rather pay two for one. [Applause.]

Mr. TERRY. That is what you are asking us to do.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. But I insist that there is no such alternative here. But we ought to pay our debts like honest people, dollar for dollar. We ought not, like a tricky insolvent, to pay our debts at 50 cents in the dollar.

Now, prior to these interruptions I was endeavoring to show, Mr. Speaker, what would be the effect of our return to silver payments in the face of the apprehensions which are entertained by all mankind. I have shown how it would endanger the character of our great people, the greatest in the world, as my colleague said. And if we are the greatest in the world, I utterly scorn and repudiate the idea that we will pay inferior nations in money inferior to that with which they pay their obligations to us. [Applause.]

I have endeavored also to show that this descent to silver payment would involve a merciless sacrifice of all the debtors in this country. No bank would grant renewals of debts except upon the gold basis. No private individual would extend a debt due to him in gold or its equivalent, by taking anything but a gold debt in renewal, and before the event which my friend from Arkansas desires could occur every poor delinquent debtor in the United States would either be in the poorhouse or his property would have been sold in a time of panic to pay his debts.

Now, I want to show, Mr. Speaker, that those who framed this bill in the Senate and those who defend it in the House are not fair and frank. They have not the courage of their convictions. They denounce the Secretary for redeeming our demand notes in gold, and insist that he shall redeem them in silver when more convenient. Now, why did not the friends of this measure take away from the Secretary any option in the matter? He found that his predecessors had all, under the laws, paid out gold, when demanded, in redemptions, and he declines to change this policy under the circumstances existing. If he is wrong, why do you not take the responsibility of the change? Why do you not provide expressly that he shall redeem our demand notes in silver or in gold and silver half and half or in other proportions? You make him still responsible for the credit of the Government and of our money and arraign him for doing what you not only permit but refuse to forbid. He has during his entire term been struggling with a most dangerous situation and with scant resources in the laws, with no cooperation on the part of Congress and maligned by members of his own party. He has on him all our burdens. The business interests of the whole country depend on the correctness of his judgment. An error in his exalted station on the fatal side would bring unspeakable calamities. If the friends of this measure know better than he does, why, I repeat, do they not take away his discretion and substitute explicit and mandatory directions? It is unfair. It is not magnanimous. It violates even the morals of politics, if there are any morals in politics.

In order to show that some effort has been made to degrade silver, we have been told to-day that the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to exchange silver for gold. I do not know where the authority for that statement comes from.

Mr. CRISP. I will show it to you. I will have the document here in a moment.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My colleague can tell me what it is.

Mr. CRISP. It is the testimony of Mr. Carlisle before the Committee on Appropriations. It was first, I think, in the shape of a communication in response to some Senate resolution. I will show the gentleman what the Secretary says in regard to it.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I shall be glad to have the whole communication.

Mr. CRISP. I will give the gentleman what I have. I can not furnish him what I have not. I will show him the Secretary's statement in a moment.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will not impeach the fairness of my colleague. Nevertheless, I do not believe the statement as it has been presented here, and I believe that a mistake is made about it. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Any excess over and above the amount of silver necessary to represent the silver certificates outstanding, and to meet the requirements of the Sherman Act, which requires that the Secretary should coin as much of the silver purchased as was necessary to redeem notes issued under the act when presented for redemption—and keeping in view the limitations of that act—I say, any excess of silver over and above those requirements Mr. Carlisle would have given out eagerly for greenbacks or gold at any time that the application was made to him, and would have paid the freight on it to California or Alaska. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Here is the statement. I hold in my hand a statement of Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, before the House Committee on Appropriations, in charge of the sundry civil appropriation bill for 1896. The testimony was given on the 21st day of January, 1895. I have read a part of it, about the exercise of the option. I will now read further:

Mr. SIBLEY. I understand you to say you have now $3,000,000 of free silver in the Treasury?

Secretary CARLISLE. Yes, sir; about that amount.

Mr. SIBLEY. In your reply to the Senate resolution asking why the Treasury had refused to give silver in exchange for gold, I think you replied to the Senate to the effect you had no free silver. Has this silver accumulated since that time?

Secretary CARLISLE. I do not remember the date of that reply.

Mr. SIBLEY. That was August 17, 1893.

Secretary CARLISLE. In the summer of 1893, by an oversight of the assistant treasurers throughout the United States, silver dollars were paid out to meet the extraordinary demand which then existed for small currency to such an extent that we had, in fact, more silver certificates outstanding than we had silver dollars in the Treasury. When I discovered the fact it was stopped, of course, at once. The ten subtreasuries are scattered throughout the country, and, not being in communication with each other, when the people demanded silver dollars on account of the great necessity for small currency, they paid them out freely, and it was discovered that they had done so to such an extent that outstanding silver certificates to the amount of between $600,000 and $700,000 had no silver left behind them.

That was when he stopped it, and so stated.

A MEMBER. Very properly.

Mr. CRISP. It was not a question of propriety, but as to whether the Secretary refused to pay silver.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. For gold.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. On uncovered silver.

Mr. CRISP. Silver for gold was my statement. The gentleman from Tennessee questions that, and the gentleman was present and asked a question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will allow me——

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. This is a controversy between me and my colleague.

Mr. WASHINGTON. But your colleague has brought me into it also.

Mr. CRISP. You brought yourself in by your remark.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I was present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I do.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And I was one of those who asked a question of the Secretary of the Treasury to establish the fact as to whether silver ever was redeemed in gold—that was an assertion that had been made by our free-silver friends—and the Secretary said silver was a money of ultimate redemption and was not redeemed in gold; that he did not refuse to exchange gold for silver and that its payment was not refused except when he found there was less silver in the Treasury than there were outstanding silver certificates.

Mr. CRISP. That is precisely what I said.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I never impeached the gentleman's statement except that while I was willing to admit that he believed his statement, I still believed that there was a mistake made somewhere; and my statement was, that in my opinion at no time when the Secretary had silver over and above the silver certificates, and above the requirements of the Sherman Act, has he failed to exchange it when asked for greenbacks or gold.

Mr. CRISP. Will my colleague allow me just here? Of course I know he does not wish to misrepresent me.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. My statement was distinctly that when gold was taken to the Treasury for silver the answer was, "I can not give you silver, because I have got no more silver than I have got outstanding certificates;" and when certificates were brought there under the Sherman Act they said, "We will not require you to take silver, but we will give you gold." That is the very point of the case. [Applause.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I put it to the fairness of the House and my colleague, was not he endeavoring to demonstrate that there was a settled, a fixed, a determined purpose to discredit silver, and did not he cite this instance as a demonstration of it? [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. He did, and does; does now.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. And when my colleague drew that conclusion the friends who agree with him on this side clapped louder than I have heard them during the entire delivery of his eloquent speech. And when it comes to be examined, so far from there having been any base, wicked effort in these transactions to discredit silver, the effort of the Secretary of the Treasury in the case cited was to maintain silver [applause], and to maintain the credit and honor of the Government in the same transaction. [Renewed applause.]

The Secretary could not give the silver for gold on the occasion mentioned because he had no silver that he could use for that purpose, and when he gave gold for Sherman notes it was to protect the Sherman notes under the established policy of the Treasury. Such is the whole matter.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. No, sir; I have had enough of my friend. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend a question in further elucidation of this point.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I have just declined to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I think my friend will consent to yield to me.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. If my friend from Arkansas will consent, I will yield.

Mr. TERRY. I do not see why the gentleman should ask me to consent when he refused me his consent.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I had yielded to the gentleman many times.

Mr. TERRY. You only yielded to me when you turned around in your place and asked a question of me.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I see that my friend from Arkansas believes that I have been guilty of some discourtesy to him.

Mr. TERRY. I do not, sir. But you would create the impression that I had not been called upon to answer any question by you.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I did not, and the gentleman knows——

Mr. TERRY. The RECORD will show.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I was about to decline to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi because I had declined to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. I will give my consent to let him ask all the questions he desires. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, if my friend has got a really hard question [laughter], if he has got something better than all the forty-eight reasons he gave the other night, or anything else that will knock out my argument, I will yield to him.

Mr. TERRY. I do not propose, sir, to knock out the argument of so able a man as the gentleman from Georgia, but the question I proposed to ask him was this——

Mr. HUTCHESON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I merely want to ask the gentleman this question, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will hear my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. I understand my friend to say that when gold was presented at the Treasury and silver was asked for——

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Stop! I did not mean to testify myself that any such affair as that ever occurred. [Laughter.] What I said was that if it did occur——

Mr. TERRY. Well, it certainly did occur according to the testimony of Mr. Carlisle. Now, when that gold was presented, the reply of the Secretary, as I understand the gentleman to state it,

was this: "I can not pay out these silver dollars in exchange for gold because by the law I am required to keep them here for the redemption of the Sherman notes."

Several MEMBERS. No, no!

Mr. TERRY (continuing). And yet, when the Sherman notes were presented, the silver that had been kept there for their redemption was not used for that purpose but gold was paid instead. That is the point.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can not think that it is necessary, after what has transpired to-day, for me to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas. He did not catch the point. It appears in the report made to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury that by voluntary exchanges with bankers and patriotic Americans he raised in 1893, on United States notes, $110,000,000 in gold to replenish the stock of gold in the Treasury. I therefore assumed that the Treasury, when occupied with that operation, would not have refused to give any spare silver for gold, and that proposition has also been sustained by the documents just cited. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for his question.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Never mind. Go on.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I did not mean to cut off my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I understand that, but I will not interrupt the gentleman now.

Mr. LINNEY. Now, will the gentleman allow me to ask that question which I desired to ask?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. On what branch of the subject is it?

Mr. LINNEY. Right on the line you are dealing with now.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a "Tarheel," and I can not refuse to hear his question [laughter], but I will ask him to make it brief, because I am very weary.

Mr. LINNEY. I see that you do not approve—at any rate I think I see that you do not approve—of any further issue and sale of bonds. Now, if that be so, please tell us how you are going to stop the further issue and sale of bonds unless you either raise more revenue by the tariff or coin more silver to redeem our obligations as they mature?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My friend has got his argument into his question, but he attributes to me an opinion which he has no right to assume that I hold.

Mr. LINNEY. Is it not true that you do not favor any further issue and sale of bonds?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I am about to answer him as such an inquiry ought to be answered, with all due respect to my friend from North Carolina. I assume that the gentleman himself is opposed to the further issuing of bonds.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I assume that the gentleman is also in favor of this bill for such use of silver as the bill contemplates.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes, sir; although I should prefer to limit the coinage to the American product.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Well, that does not make any difference as to the point at issue between me and my friend from Tar River. [Laughter.]

Now, let us see how that will work. Suppose you pass this bill for the free coinage of silver and then take away from the Secretary of the Treasury the power to sell bonds for gold, what then will the word "coin" mean in our laws?

I have before me here a statement from the Treasurer of the United States which shows that during the last two months the Treasury Department has not, at the custom-houses, received one dollar of gold or gold certificates. Now, take from the Treasury the power to sell bonds for gold and what will the Secretary do? By that simple device we will be on the silver basis in very short order. I infer that my friend from North Carolina is ready to take that fatal step.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me for a brief question?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I can not refuse my friend from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman said the Secretary, in 1893, by the exchange of currency obtained $110,000,000 in gold. Why, then, did it become necessary since that time, or why is it necessary now, to sell bonds to procure gold if that could be done in that dark and trying year?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will endeavor to answer my friend from Missouri, who is always a considerate man when he discards his prejudices and commitments. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department exhausted its power to obtain gold in that way. That is the answer I make to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, if the gentleman will pemit another question: How do we know, and how does the gentleman know, that he has exhausted the power to obtain gold? Has he tried it since then, and before resorting to the issuance of bonds?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. He continued to invite these exchanges by circulars, as I understand, and failed to obtain any material amount in addition.

Mr. Speaker, we are too near the silver basis now to take away from the Secretary the power to get gold in any way the law allows. Gresham's law is already operating. We can not repeal that great ordinance of commerce. Let gentlemen examine the cash which passes through their hands from day to day. They will find that they are receiving and paying out nothing but silver certificates. And silver certificates have superseded other money because the belief prevails that other money is better. We are dangerously near to actual disparity between our several kinds of money——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which shows that the gentleman from Georgia practically agrees with me that gold has gone out of circulation.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. This is a state of things which shows that the people and the banks are deaf now to patriotic considerations, out of fear, and are following the statute of Gresham or the law of self-preservation, so that if collapse comes they may fence against calamity. The great banks are sending out only silver currency, and it is the only money occupying the channels of trade. If a panic befalls, and this currency is depreciated one-half, on whom will the loss fall most heavily?

Will it be on the great banks? No; because they have gold in their vaults. Will it be the great capitalists, societies, and corporations—"Wall street," "the money power," so called? No; because they have gold, or gold obligations. But it will fall on those who handle a dollar or two, or $10, from day to day, and who will have to take it in their daily wages, and upon these farmers who will have to take it for what they are compelled to sell, and thus all this value made by law will evaporate and disappear from the scant hoards of the poor, whom it is our special duty to guard and protect. [Applause.]

It is very easy to put us down on a silver basis. It is very easy to talk about the debtor. It is very easy to talk about the poor man and the money of the poor. But I affirm, Mr. Speaker, that according to all experience and according to the judgment of those who have devoted their lives to this great inquiry in the interest of humanity—I affirm that there is no class of people in this country so deeply concerned in the maintenance of a sound and stable standard of value as the wage earner, the farmer, and the poor man, from one end of this country to the other. [Applause.] The others, these capitalists, these bankers, can take care of themselves and adjust themselves to the shifting, changing conditions of affairs. But the poor fellow who follows the furrow, or works at his bench, or carries his bucket to the shop in the morning—these men have no opportunity or means to prepare for a panic, no resources on which to bank, and no means with which to hedge or speculate; these men, who have been appealed to for their own ruin and degradation in this business, are those who are most concerned in maintaining a safe and stable currency. [Applause.]

Suppose that a man is receiving now $1 for his daily wage. How long after the collapse comes will he have to work and wait before he can raise his wages from $1 of nominal value to $2? How long will it take the farmer to catch up with the procession and double the nominal price of his products? How long will it take laborers by strikes and combinations and wars of every kind—how long will it take them to compel their employers to double their nominal pay under these conditions? But what they have to buy will go up at a bound.

Mr. Speaker, triumphant reference has been made here to the case of France. That has been thrown in our faces from every quarter. It comes to us from the Senate. It comes to us here to-day. It comes to us, I say, from every source.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS], who sits on my left, is quite familiar with French finances. I have had the pleasure of conferring with him on this subject, and have had the benefit of his valuable suggestions. I myself pursued the subject with some care. I have endeavored to seek information from the highest sources. France tried free coinage and abandoned it. It was a country friendly to silver, because silver is indispensable to the business of that country. A very large business there is done in silver coins of every denomination, and even in centimes. Transactions there are small and infinite. At the same time, the small dealers and farmers of France have no accounts with banks. They keep their own money. Under such a system a large volume of silver is indispensable. It is a country which could not have been induced to suspend free coinage except for the gravest reasons.

France tried the experiment of an international agreement and joined in what was called the Latin Union, a union with Italy, Switzerland, Greece, and Belgium, by which they fixed a ratio between the two metals and international coins of the same weight and fineness circulated freely in all the countries named. That union has been dissolved; and since France has refused the free coinage of silver the coins of like value in these other parts of the

Latin Union that happened to be in France have been rejected by the shopmen everywhere, and in addition to that, the Bank of France has recently returned to Italy, under a sort of Government auspices, two or three millions of dollars in Italian silver coin, because the French people would no longer take them, although they were a party to their coinage.

In France the Government has no demand notes outstanding, while we have $500,000,000. France has no such thing as agitation for free coinage at 15 to 1 by France alone, as a menace to its system of finance. In this country our stock of gold, with a population of over 70,000,000 of people, is $618,000,000. In France the stock of gold, in a country of about 35,000,000 inhabitants, is $850,000,000.

The per capita allowance of gold would be in this country $8.78. In France it would be $22.10.

How is it with silver? In the United States we have a total, including the coinage of limited tender, of $625,000,000 of silver—more of it than gold. In France the silver is $487,000,000. With uncovered paper estimated—for all this enters into the calculation—we have, on the basis assumed in the Treasury, which excludes the paper in the Treasury and the Sherman notes, but taking the basis of uncovered paper there after the gold reserve is deducted, we have a per capita of uncovered paper amounting to $5.92, while in France it is only 84 cents.

Now let us run that out. I here use the figures of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS]. France holds $231,000,000 more gold than we do, and she has only about one-half of the population. France holds $384,000,000 less of uncovered paper than we do. If we had the same per capita of gold as France we would have $1,567,279,700 of gold. Taking the per capita of silver in France, we would have of that metal $913,952,200. Our excess of gold over silver would at that per capita be $653,227,500. Now, we have more silver than gold. If we had only the same per capita of uncovered paper as France we would have $59,329,200 instead of $416,700,000. With such resources at his command, our Secretary of the Treasury, with such a limited strain for redemptions, would be happier than he has been for many a day.

The Bank of France has a monopoly of note issues, and keeps its paper almost entirely covered with gold and silver. It largely conducts the fiscal operations of the Government, which appoints its president and two of its vice-presidents. But the bank's assets are not those of France. It does not pay out as much silver as does our Treasury Department. All our collections from all sources of taxation are now in silver and uncovered paper; we get no gold, so that we do a great deal more with silver than the French Government and the Bank of France combined. We pay out many hundred millions of silver over the counter at the Treasury, and we receive nearly all our revenues in that currency. We honor silver a great deal more than France. As I have said, France has no demand notes to redeem. If we had none and had her resources in money, there would be no fear of silver such as is now apparent in this country.

It is sometimes said that the Government of France exercises the option to pay in silver or gold as it pleases. It has no demand obligations to meet, and as to Government disbursement we use daily a great deal more silver currency. The Bank of France will frequently pay silver to those who present bills at its counter; but whenever the person who presents the paper will state that he needs the gold for export or for any purpose for which silver is not as good as gold, they will give him the gold; and, as my friend indicates, that is largely a matter of accommodation.

My friend from Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAMS, has just asked me what I would do. If I could have my way, Mr. Speaker, I would stop all this agitation for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. [Applause.] I would allay all this menace offered the world against the credit and character of our obligations. I would make it as peaceable and quiet on this dangerous and perilous line as it is in France, in England, or in any other country where they have a stable currency and commercial repose and quiet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will my friend allow me just one interruption? Does my friend know of any practical way of preventing public agitation in a free country that is carried on by popular vote? I want to get the gentleman's idea as to a practical method.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no way to bring that about but to appeal to the good sense and conscience of intelligent gentlemen like my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. Speaker, my friend and I have made it so clear, together with others, since the foundation of this Government, that a protective tariff, for example, was perfectly absurd, that it can not be made any clearer; but the agitation continues, and I have asked the gentleman with reference to this silver question privately to give to the House some idea of how he proposes to continue to maintain a parity under the present system. Now, I admit that if there was no agitation there might be a great deal less trouble about a parity, but I have asked him for some practical method of doing the thing.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the correct thing, the ideal thing, the best thing, is very seldom practical in politics. People learn some things by experience, and I have been endeavoring to teach the lessons of experience. We may have to learn in the bitter school of adversity. We ought to avert calamity by the retirement of our demand obligations and the substitution of good bank issues, thereby releasing the Treasury from the entire system of redemption and furnishing gold for all the world.

If we could allay the fear of silver and paper money now pervading the land and restore confidence in our future, capital now hidden would seek active investment and our wonderful resources would again multiply as they have never done before. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have pursued this argument much longer than I had intended. I am greatly indebted to the House for its great forbearance. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, this debate has been protracted to such a length and the questions involved, some of them at least, have been so exhaustively discussed that I feel a decided disinclination to trespass for any length of time upon the attention of the House. I shall not attempt to cover in detail ground already covered by the gentleman who has preceded me [Mr. TURNER of Georgia], nor shall I waste time by stopping to indulge in words of preface or introduction.

The main proposition before this House has received almost no discussion. That proposition involves the question whether this House is willing to abandon its own legislation already adopted and accept legislation suggested by the Senate under the guise of an amendment, which differs wholly from the legislation of the House and is in no respect germane thereto. The House sent to the Senate a bill for the protection of our coin redemption fund and authorizing the issue of certificates of indebtedness and of bonds for the purposes of securing a national loan. That legislation was enacted to meet a supposed national exigency. The Senate has returned that bill with all after the enacting clause stricken out, and has substituted for the House legislation, among other things, a provision for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Even if this House should be in favor of such legislation as independent legislation, it is not consistent with its dignity that it should indorse the revolutionary methods of the Senate and abrogate its own constitutional function with respect to the raising of revenue; and I take the liberty of saying to the friends of free silver in this House, and especially to the friends of free silver on this side of the Chamber, that the cause they advocate will not gain a single friend nor will it make a single step toward success by any attempted humiliation of this House or subjection of it to the demands of the Senate. [Applause.]

The question as to the free and unlimited coinage of silver when presented to this House in a frank, open, manly way, in accordance with the rules of the House, is one thing; when that question is sought to be presented in the revolutionary way in which it is now sought to be presented by the Senate it is an entirely different thing. And, Mr. Speaker, I trust that gentlemen, when they come to vote to-day, will remember that the question upon which they vote is the simple question: Shall we abandon our own legislation, or shall we maintain the honor and the dignity of the House of Representatives of the American people? So much for that.

Now, I want to say a word or two with respect to that portion of the Senate substitute which relates to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. But before I say anything on that subject directly, let me say that there is no question of bimetallism here presented at this time. All the declamation that we have heard upon that subject is simply declamation, so much "thundering in the index," without any reference at all to the practical question that is presented for settlement.

What is the proposition that is presented? One ounce of gold will buy in the open market to-day 32 ounces of silver. The bald proposition presented by this substitute is, that the United States Government shall certify, contrary to the fact, that 16 ounces of silver are the equivalent of 1 ounce of gold, and shall, by legislation, decree that the Government itself will accept them as such and will compel each and every of its citizens to do the same. That is the proposition stated in plain and simple English. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the bare statement of the proposition in an assembly of honest men should carry with it its own refutation.

The advocates of silver, however, rest their case upon certain propositions which, if they can be sustained, appeal to our consideration. What are those propositions?

They are, first, that silver was demonetized by an act of Congress passed in 1873, in secret, pursuant to a conspiracy. Upon the faith of this proposition free-silver advocates grow eloquent over "the greatest legislative crime of all history." Then they say, in the second place, that after 1873, consequent upon the demonetization of silver, there was a fatal fall in prices, to the restraint of enterprise, to the destruction of trade, of the interests of agriculture, of business prosperity, and that that fall in prices and the

demonetization of silver bore to each other the relation of cause and effect. They say, in the third place, that the remedy for this existing evil is in the remonetization of silver, and that for the remonetization of silver all that is necessary is that the United States, single handed and alone, shall open its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Now, how much is there of truth in these several propositions? In the first place, Mr. Speaker, silver was not demonetized by the act passed in 1873. It was not demonetized secretly. It was not demonetized in pursuance of a conspiracy, and no legislative crime, in my judgment, was committed. The history of the demonetization of silver has to do with natural causes, with the law of supply and demand, and with the history of Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Latin Union. With respect to that history I do not undertake to make any argument. I undertake to make no argument, why? Because it is not of the slightest practical consequence whether silver was demonetized by the act of 1873 or not, nor is it now of any practical consequence, even the slightest, how it was demonetized or for what reason.

Suppose it was demonetized by that act; suppose it was demonetized when it should not have been demonetized. I ask you as plain, practical business men, charged with the interests of the people of this country, what bearing has that on the question as to the expediency or the justice of the United States now, in the year 1896, declaring by legislation that 50 cents shall be equal to 129 cents?

That question, Mr. Speaker, is a vital, fundamental question of business methods. It is not a question of morals or of history; it is not a question of what was right or what was wrong in the year 1873; it is a plain, practical, common-sense, business question as to what is right in this year of our Lord 1896. We are not legislating upon the conditions that prevailed in 1873, but we are called upon to legislate upon conditions that prevail now.

Now, just at this point let me emphasize the fact that there is no controversy between the advocates of the respective sides of this subject as to the present commercial value of silver. It is agreed that the relation of silver to gold is that of 32 to 1; and just here we encounter two different kinds of silver advocates; one will say, Restore silver to the mint and the legal and commercial value of silver and gold will at once approximate each other. The other will make no such claim, but will freely confess that to open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver will put us upon a silver basis at once. These latter justify themselves by saying that silver has not gone down, but that gold has gone up.

Now, the first of these classes, whether honestly or not, claim to be bimetallists; the second class are, whatsoever they may say to the contrary, silver monometallists. Unless the commercial price of silver can be advanced to its gold price by free coinage I assume that every honest free-silver advocate will admit that he has no case.

The success of his case rests upon the assumption that free and unlimited coinage by the United States will advance the commercial value of silver to the ancient ratio in its relation to gold of 16 to 1.

It will be admitted, I think, that the burden of proof is on the party making such assertion. How shall that proof be made? Not by mere assertion. Dogmatism is not proof. That gentlemen arise here and with feeling and eloquence, and I have no doubt honesty, declare that they believe that the opening of our mints to free coinage will advance the price of silver amounts to absolutely nothing. As many gentlemen and more gentlemen will arise on this floor and declare that in their belief it will not. So, Mr. Speaker, we must set off belief against belief. We are still lacking in proof. How, then, shall we find out whether or not the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver will appreciate the price of silver? There is, as it seems to me, evidence to be had upon the subject that is cogent and convincing as proof, and that evidence is against the sanguine belief of the friends of free silver.

The history of silver as money divides itself into two periods, one prior to 1873 and the other subsequent to that date. The conditions that existed prior to 1873 and the conditions that exist to-day differ widely from each other. Prior to 1873 gold and silver circulated concurrently as money at the ratio of about 16 to 1. Prior to 1873 every commercial nation in Europe (with the single exception of England) and the United States held their mints open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Prior to 1873, for almost a century, the annual production of silver was a substantially uniform, unvarying quantity. When its annual production largely increased and the commercial nations of Europe, the Latin Union included, closed their mints against free coinage, the price of silver at once declined and gold and silver ceased to be on a parity at the old ratio. Since that time the production of silver has increased 150 per cent and the cost of its production has decreased 50 per cent.

It is a fair inference, I submit, that the elements of production and those of international agreement and particular legislation were the causes that kept gold and silver on a parity, and that when international agreement ceased to exist the tie that bound gold and silver together was broken, and the latter became subject to the same laws as to value that relate to any other commodity.

Now, then, if you propose to restore the conditions of the period to which I refer, if you propose to reopen these closed mints, to reenter into these rescinded agreements, to reestablish the relative productions of gold and silver, then I will grant you that you may again have gold and silver as money upon a parity and upon the ancient terms.

But the annual production of silver being as it is, and the cost of its production being as it is, and both differing from what they were in the period under discussion, and no European nation coining silver, when you assert that the United States alone can restore the old conditions there is a fatal halt in your logic; you are asserting a non sequitur, and the facts of history, so far as this period goes, are against you. That all Europe and the United States, aided by the laws of supply and demand, accomplished a certain result is no proof that the United States alone, even aided by the same laws, could accomplish the result, much less is it proof that it could do so when the laws have been changed to the cheapening of silver.

I submit, therefore, if you take the facts of history and all human experience gained in the period preceding 1873, it is perfectly patent that the assertion you make, that the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver would advance the price of silver in the markets of the world is an open, plain, and palpable non sequitur.

Now, let us turn to the other period, since 1873. In 1878 the value of silver was $1.11 an ounce. The Congress of the United States passed the Bland-Allison Act, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver per month. The Secretary of the Treasury entered upon the performance of the office delegated to him. In 1879–80 the price of silver rose to $1.14, but notwithstanding the Treasury purchased silver from month to month and year to year in accordance with this law up until 1890, the next period to which I will call your attention, the price of silver uniformly and without a single break continued to go down. In 1890 it had fallen to 96 cents an ounce. In that year Congress passed an act authorizing and directing the purchase of four and a half million ounces of fine silver every month, and the Secretary of the Treasury proceeded, as in the other case, to the performance of his duty under the act. The price of silver, under the influence of this act, made a slight spurt and went to $1.04 an ounce. But it almost immediately fell again, and from that time down to the present it has never reached that figure, but has constantly and uniformly declined. The price of silver between 1878 and 1893 was as follows:

1878–79	$1.11616	1884–85	$1.09226	1890–91	$1.04780
1879–80	1.14397	1885–86	1.03295	1891–92	.93723
1880–81	1.13508	1886–87	.98148	1892–93	.84263
1881–82	1.13817	1887–88	.95617	July	.72037
1882–83	1.11912	1888–89	.93510		
1883–84	1.11529	1889–90	.96839		

Now, under the act of 1878 and the act of 1890, until 1893, this Government had purchased nearly 460,000,000 fine ounces of silver, almost the entire American product. I believe I am safe in saying that, leaving out of consideration the last year, it was the entire American product. And yet those purchases by the Government were absolutely futile, not only to raise, but to maintain the price of silver, which, as I said, uniformly went down. But that is not all. You must remember that from 1870 to 1890 England, France, Germany, and the United States coined altogether $746,406,852, and this does not take into consideration the coinage of Mexico and the coinage of India, the figures of which I have not, but which I am told would aggregate at least $50,000,000 per year in addition, and still silver kept on falling in price notwithstanding.

Now I submit to you, I submit to any candid man, willing fairly to consider this question, whether in the light of these facts, whether in the light of the coinage by the European nations that I have named and the United States, to the extent of nearly one thousand million dollars, in the face of which the price of silver still went down—I submit to any candid man whether he can stand up here and say with any hope of being believed that the mere opening of the mints of the United States alone to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will raise its price to an approximation with the price of gold. [Applause.]

Now, wholly aside from that, which is a matter of experience, a little calm deliberation and simple mathematical calculation will show the absurdity of the claim that legislation upon the part of the United States alone is sufficient to raise the gold price of silver. There is in the world to-day $3,500,000,000 worth of silver. The gentleman from Georgia who preceded me said there is $4,000,000,000 worth of silver. Every ounce of that silver is worth to-day 50 cents in the market and no more. The proposition of the free-silver advocate is that by an act of Congress we can add

to the value of silver over $4,000,000,000. I ask you, in cold blood, was a more preposterous proposition ever submitted to the consideration of sane men?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's twenty-five minutes have expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I understood that I was to take the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to state to the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] would occupy twenty-five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to an hour, if he claims it.

Mr. DALZELL. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the parties upon whom the burden of proof rests to establish their proposition that the opening of our mints will raise the price of silver to an approximation with that of gold must fail utterly in view of past experience and existing conditions.

I advance, then, to the second proposition. It is said that since 1873 there has been a fatal fall in the price of silver, concurrently with the price of all other commodities, and that the decline in the price of silver is the cause of the decline in the price of those other commodities. The method by which this proposition is sought to be sustained is to take a table of prominent articles of production and manufacture of various kinds, including silver, and, having fixed an index number at 100, to follow the prices through varying years and make a comparison; and it is contended that such a comparison establishes the fact that the fall in the price of silver, resulting from its demonetization, is the cause of the fall in the price of all these other commodities.

Now, I have here two tables which seem to me significant in their proof of several important facts. The first of these tables shows prices, wages, and purchasing power. It was compiled from the report of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, computed under the direction of Mr. Commissioner Carroll D. Wright. The prices shown in this table, as well as the prices in London, which are given in terms of gold, compiled by Mr. Augustus Sauerbeck, have been computed and compared, on the unit of 100 in 1860, by Professor Falconer, of Johns Hopkins University. Here is the first table:

Prices, wages, purchasing power.

	1845.	1850.	1855.	1860.	1865.	1870.	1875.	1880.	1885.	1890.
Meat	79.4	86.6	104.7	100	197	174.3	140.4	103.6	107.6	99.6
Other food	82.8	80.7	114.5	100	240.3	146.3	135	116.9	97.2	103.5
Cloths and clothing	97.1	91.3	94.7	100	299.2	139.4	120.1	104.5	84.8	82.4
Fuel and lighting	.....	102.6	121.1	100	237.8	196.5	156.5	100.2	89.6	92.5
Metals and implements	110.8	114.8	117.8	100	191.4	127.8	117.5	96.3	77.4	73.2
Lumber and building materials	106.7	102.2	103.4	100	182.1	148.3	143.7	130.9	126.6	123.7
Drugs and chemicals	121	123.6	129.2	100	271.6	149.6	144.2	113.1	86.9	87.9
House furnishing	102.3	125.6	121.1	100	181.1	121.6	95	85.2	70.1	69.5
Miscellaneous	114.8	107.7	115.2	100	202.8	148.7	122.9	109.8	97.5	89.7
Average of all prices	102.8	102.3	113.1	100	216.8	142.3	127.6	106.9	93	92.3
Average of all wages	86.8	92.7	98	100	143.1	162.2	158.4	141.5	150.7	158.9
Average wages by importance	85.7	90.9	97.5	100	148.6	167.1	158	143	155.9	68.2
Salaries of city teachers	74.8	83.8	91.4	100	134.7	186.3	188.1	182.8	186.3	86.3
Paper money	100	100	100	100	49.5	81.1	88.8	100	100	100
Gold price of silver bullion in London	95.3	97.3	100	100	99	98.2	92.2	84.7	78.7	77.4
Purchasing power of wages	84.4	90.6	86.6	100	66	114.1	124.1	132.3	162	172.1

The second table shows the fluctuation in the gold prices of forty-three articles of necessity which are in common use, comprising vegetable and animal food, tea, coffee, sugar, minerals, textile materials, and sundries, and this table was also compiled by Professor Falconer. It shows prices between 1846 and 1873, inclusive, in one table, and from 1873 to 1891, inclusive, in the other table, and is as follows:

1846 to 1873, inclusive.

1846	92.2	1856	102.8	1866	106.5
1847	97.9	1857	106.9	1867	103.9
1848	79.9	1858	93.3	1868	103.1
1849	76.4	1859	95.2	1869	101.9
1850	79	1860	100	1870	100.3
1851	77.1	1861	99.6	1871	102.6
1852	80.8	1862	105.6	1872	112.5
1853	96.9	1863	109.3	1873	116.6
1854	106.2	1864	112.3		
1855	103.1	1865	105.8		

1873 to 1891, inclusive.

1873	116.6	1880	91.8	1887	70.7
1874	107	1881	88.5	1888	73.9
1875	100.3	1882	88	1889	76.7
1876	97.5	1883	86	1890	76
1877	97.4	1884	79.3	1891	75.4
1878	91.2	1885	75.4		
1879	86.7	1886	72.4		

These tables show, as I have said, several significant facts.

They show first that there was a fall in prices in 1849 to a price as low within a fraction as the average of 1890 and 1891. Then a rise, then a fall, then the great speculative rise and financial debauch in 1873, when English credit and goods began to be spread over the world in a way which has but lately culminated in the disastrous losses in Australia and South America. I read from the Forum of April, 1895:

It will be observed that there were greater fluctuations and variations in the course of prices and almost as great a fall at one period between 1846 and 1872, when the Latin Union was in existence, and silver was coined in France freely at the ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold, as there have been since silver was deprived of its full function of legal tender.

When each separate type of the 43 articles is dealt with year by year, it is found that a few have risen since 1873, others have fallen but little, others greatly, others have varied from year to year, but there is no sign of any influence causing a steady tendency to depression, such as is asserted by the so-called bimetallists.

Since 1873 there have been less fluctuations than before, rather an orderly reduction in most prices, varying slightly with the difference in seasons in each year, but corresponding closely with reduction in cost. This beneficial fall has been accompanied by a corresponding or correlative rise in wages—greater in the United States than in any European States. Since 1873, under the influence of peace and the stability of the gold unit of value, this beneficent fall in prices has also been accompanied by a vast development of international commerce.

I apprehend, therefore, that so far as this branch of the subject is concerned the tables upon which the friends of free silver rely are utterly valueless to prove any concurrence of causes in the fall of silver and the fall of commodities. The truth is that no more patent humbug by way of alleged logic was ever attempted to be palmed upon a credulous people than this pretended parallellism between the decline of commodity prices and the price of silver. A list of commodities is prepared. It is shown that throughout a series of years they have declined in price. During the same years silver has declined in price. Therefore it is said the decline in price of these articles is due to the decline in price of silver. And, mark you, between the percentage of silver decline and the percentage of the commodity decline there is not the slightest correspondence. Was there ever a more absurd non sequitur? Why, by that method I can prove to you that the decline of all these articles was caused by the decline of any one of them. For instance, from 1873 till this date meat has fallen in price. But during the same period other food, cloths and clothing, fuel and lighting have also declined in price; therefore the decline in price of meat has been the cause of the decline in price of foods, cloths and clothing, fuel and lighting—a manifest absurdity.

It has been suggested that it is a poor rule that will not work both ways, and I borrow the suggestion: "Silver was demonetized; wages have risen, corn has risen, so have pork, and leather, and many other things; therefore the demonetization of silver is the cause of the rise in prices."

Now, to recur to our tables: They show, in the second place, what? They show that there has been a uniform decline in the cost of the necessaries of life and a uniform increase in the wages of labor. I know of no man outside of the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver who complains of the fall in the price of the necessaries of life and the increase in the wages of labor. I know of no man whose wail is heard because of the fall in prices of wheat, grains, food, cloth, clothing, and the implements of husbandry and of trade and all that go to minister to the comfort, the health, and the needs of every man, rich and poor, in his own home, except the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. [Applause.] To my mind the decrease in the cost of the necessaries of life and the increase in the wages of labor indicate not depression but prosperity. They indicate to my mind that condition of things which tends to increase savings-bank deposits, to build workingmen's houses, to bring American men and women up to the standard of American civilization. [Applause.] The fact is that there is not the remotest paralellism between the movement of circulation and prices. Commodities in general are less than 8 per cent below the level of 1860, while silver is 50 per cent below it.

Aside from that altogether, and I may not stop to go at any

length into a discussion of this proposition, for my time is passing rapidly—aside from that altogether there is not a single staple article that has fallen in price where the decline can not be traced to causes wholly apart from any money question, where it can not be traced to material changes in the cost of production and distribution.

The progress of invention, improved machinery and improved processes, reduced rates of transportation, enlarged competition, and other causes, with which the demonetization of silver has not the remotest connection, furnish easy explanation of reduced prices. Why, I was astounded to hear out of the mouth of a gentleman [Mr. TOWNE] who has evidently studied this subject with a great deal of care, the assertion that the period of invention antedated 1873, and that inventions had nothing substantial to do with the decline of prices for the last twenty years. I have in my hand a paper furnished me by the Commissioner of Patents.

That paper is as follows:

Number of patents issued by the United States and foreign countries in the periods 1850–1869 and 1870–1889, inclusive.

Countries.	1850-1869.	1870-1889.
United States	91,479	320,205
Austria	10,418	39,605
Belgium	26,698	49,581
Canada	3,254	34,026
Denmark	386	1,593
Finland	94	226
France	79,059	114,567
German Empire, including Baden, Bavaria, Prussia, Saxony, and Wurtemberg	7,166	58,355
Great Britain	38,416	104,149
Italy, including Sardinia	3,741	20,267
India	445	2,564
New Zealand	71	2,482
Queensland	55	2,413
Russia	974	2,962
South Australia	122	898
Victoria	751	3,732
Total	263,129	757,625

You will observe that during the first period there were issued 263,129 patents; during the second period there were issued 757,625 patents, or three times as many as during the earlier period. [Applause.] I have had furnished me by the Commissioner of Patents a mass of information which I have not had an opportunity to digest, but I find the following among the many subjects covered by patents since the year 1873: The entire system and device of electric lighting, heating, and furnishing motive power is a product of this period. Telephony also is a product of this period. Telegraphy has been improved within this period with the effect of largely reducing its cost. The harvesting of grain has been revolutionized. The manufacture of shoes has been revolutionized. Immense strides have been made in the improvement of railways and their equipment. Witness the automatic air brake. Milling, knitting, weaving, printing—in all these money-saving inventions have been multiplied. And so I might go on, if I had the time, and call your attention to various others of those inventions which have done so much to reduce the price of the necessaries of life. But outside altogether of the Patent Office, there is no gentleman here who, if he will give his mind to the subject for a moment, will not recall the ingenious processes by which the cost of production and distribution has been lessened. Why, in one year, as I am told, by the utilization of cotton seed, formerly a waste, $40,000,000 was saved to go to lessen the cost of the production of cotton.

Any gentleman who will think of it for a moment will recollect the fall in the price of the coal oil that is burned to-day, that is burned in every household at an insignificant cost, as compared with its cost fifteen years ago. Now the by-products of that oil constitute in themselves a wealth far beyond the estimated wealth of the oil as it was originally used. Why, by means of various labor-saving machines we have advanced the manufacture of steel in this country until now in the city which I have the honor to represent we claim the ability to compete with the world in its manufacture, and these machines are the product, in large part, of the last twenty-five years of invention. [Applause.]

Look at the reduction in transportation rates. Let me show you just for a second. In 1865 the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and its lines west of Pittsburg, the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, the Michigan Central, Boston and Albany, the New York, Lake Erie and Western carried 11,151,701 tons of freight, or, to express it in another way, moved of tons 1 mile 1,654,324,000. And how much did each ton cost for carriage? It cost 2.9 cents per mile. In 1885, twenty years afterwards, this same system of railroads moved of tons at the rate of 1 mile 11,331,306,000, at a cost of six-tenths of a cent a mile.

Now, these railway lines carried somewhat less than one-fourth of the tons moved 1 mile in 1885, yet they saved on the difference between cost of carriage in 1885 and the cost of carriage in 1865 $256,500,000. I might pursue this line of argument, to show the same results, with other roads, but it is not necessary.

In the face of facts like these, gentlemen will assert on this floor that the falling prices are due, not to these elements of modern civilization, but to the demonetization of silver, "the legislative crime of 1873." [Laughter and applause.]

Nor is the fall in prices due to any disuse of silver as money. In 1860 the world's coin consisted of $3,400,000,000. In 1894, thirty-four years after, the value of the world's coin had increased to $8,031,000,000.

Nor is the fall in prices due to the disuse of silver in the United States. The silver coinage prior to 1873, in the first eighty years of our history, amounted to only one hundred and forty million and odd dollars. In the eighteen years that succeeded the "legislative crime of 1873" silver was coined to the extent of $491,000,000 in round numbers. From 1792 up to 1873 there were only eight million and some odd silver dollars coined. In 1873 our per capita allowance of money was a little over $18; in 1896 it is over $23. So that it is perfectly apparent that neither the disuse of silver in the coinage of the world nor the limitation of the use of silver in the United States can by any possibility have had any connection with the decline in the prices of commodities.

Now, coupled with the assertion that there has been a fall in the price of silver is the qualification that that fall has been a fatal fall, that enterprise has been discouraged, that business interests have been destroyed, and that there has been a period of general and universal depression. I deny it utterly. I assert that the period from 1873 to the present, barring only the year 1893, when a panic was caused by the apprehension of a silver craze, is the most remarkably prosperous period in all our history. Let me call attention only to one or two facts. From 1850 to 1870 our national wealth increased from $7,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000, but in the succeeding twenty years, from 1870 to 1890, it made the astounding increase of $35,000,000,000. During that same period, up to the time when, under a Democratic Administration, we ceased to pay our debts and began to borrow again, we had paid of our interest-bearing debt $1,100,000,000. Think of it! In this period of business depression and a fatal fall of prices this American people paid off $1,100,000,000 of their interest-bearing debt. All the statistics of our industrial history show increased wealth, the lightening of the burden of debt upon the individual, and a greater consumption of the necessaries and luxuries of life. I unhesitatingly assert that that is true which Mr. Harrison said in his last message to Congress prior to his retirement from the Presidency. He said:

> A comparison of existing conditions with those of the most favored period in our history will show that a higher degree of prosperity and a more general diffusion of the comforts of wealth were never enjoyed by our people.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], the ex-Speaker of this House, who preceded me in this discussion, asserted in substance that the period from 1850 to 1860 was the high-water mark of the prosperity of this country. I will answer him by quoting from President Buchanan's message to Congress in 1857. He then used this significant language:

> The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly, and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices, and up till within a brief period our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture, and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, while the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount. Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people. With this the Government can not fail deeply to sympathize, though it may be without the power to extend relief.

I fear that my friend from Georgia will find himself without corroboration in the record of his country's history.

I do not stop to dwell upon the argument made in favor of free coinage in the interest of the debtor class. The gentleman who preceded me [Mr. TURNER of Georgia] has dealt with one aspect of that question, the aspect which has relation to the homely maxim that "honesty is the best policy." It is fashionable to denounce wealth and banks and capitalists, gold bugs and Wall street; but this is simply the language of the demagogue; it is not logic, it is not argument, it is not reason, and it is deserving of nothing but reprehension and contempt from honest men. The man who has borrowed a gold dollar and seeks to cancel his debt by the return of a silver one—two of which the gold dollar will buy—is not honest, and legislation in his interest, unless it be legislation to reform him or punish him, is vicious legislation.

But there is a world of misconception and misrepresentation included in the term debtor class.

I deny that in this country there is any debtor class as such.

The man who is creditor to-day is debtor to-morrow, and if there be any class that is particularly a creditor class at all times it is the class composed of those who, at the end of every week or every two weeks, march up in our great establishments to sign the pay rolls and receive the money for which the great capitalists of the country stand their debtors. I would be false to the interests of my constituents if I did not stand here for sound money for the wage earner. He is entitled to have a dollar of full debt-paying power.

I shall not stop now to discuss at length the question as to the effect upon this country of changing our monetary system from a system such as now prevails to that which would prevail if we minted 50-cent dollars. There is one startling fact, vouched for by all history, and that is, that wherever there is good money and bad money, or better money and worse money, the bad money and the worse money stay and the good money goes. This is pursuant to a law that is called Gresham's law, but it is the law of common sense, it is the law of human selfishness, for no man will pay a debt with a dollar in gold when he can pay it with a dollar in silver, two of which the gold dollar will buy. The first result, therefore, of free coinage would be the contraction of our currency by the withdrawal of all our gold, six hundred millions and more.

There are 20,000,000 wage earners in this country who would be affected by the introduction of a debased dollar. There are savings-banks deposits to the amount of nearly $2,000,000,000. There are members of building and loan associations whose investments in gold would be paid in depreciated silver. There are life-insurance policy holders to the extent of over $5,000,000,000, all of whose policies would be paid in debased currency. Then there are the pensioners of the United States. One hundred and sixty million dollars went to them in the past year, all of which they would have been obliged to receive in this debased currency if it had prevailed. Free silver coinage would mean a radical change of existing contractual relations, ruin to business, a wreck of values and of credit, and an introduction to an era of disaster the like of which we have never heretofore known. This country would become the dumping ground of the silver of the world. Not to prolong this discussion further, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the parties upon whom rests the burden of proof have furnished us no reason why we should embark upon this unknown and uncertain sea, with no port in sight and no chart or compass to direct our course. I submit that our salvation and prosperity call us to abide by the ancient landmarks, and that there alone our safe course lies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not fear or anticipate the success of the cause of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. For weeks and months an educated public intelligence directed to the subject has been making that cause more and more hopeless; but, if it ever did have any remaining hope, it died yesterday an unnatural death, slain by the hands of its own friends in the face of a delighted country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, what this country wants is not more free silver coinage. What it wants is more revenues through the custom houses [applause], more men in the mines, more blazing furnaces, more factories, more mills, the music of more spindles, more and cheaper transportation facilities, a wider field for labor, an enlarged home market, more consumption to stimulate production, to increase wages, and to decrease the hours of labor. These are the things we need and must have, and will have, in our onward march to the conquest of our manifest destiny as the leader of the world in agriculture, in manufactures, and in a commerce whose lifeblood shall be a monetary system good as gold the world over and as respected as the national flag. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, is it not in order now to ask a vote first on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment?

Mr. DINGLEY. After the Committee of the Whole recommends nonconcurrence? Should not the question be on the recommendation of the committee? I suppose it makes no practical difference, but it occurs to me that the question before the House now should be on the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman will see that if the vote be taken in the House on the motion to concur, the negative of that motion would be the affirmative of the motion to disagree.

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly. If it is more convenient I have no objection to that method. I ask unanimous consent that the question be taken on concurrence in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CRISP. That is practically the same thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine, that the question be taken on concurring in the Senate amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken on concurring in the Senate amendment; and there were—yeas 90, nays 215, not voting 50; as follows:

YEAS—90.

Abbott,	Dockery,	Maguire,	Shaw,
Aitken,	Doolittle,	Marsh,	Shuford,
Allen, Miss.	Downing,	McClure,	Skinner,
Allen, Utah	Ellis,	McCulloch,	Spencer,
Bailey,	Gamble,	McKenney,	Stokes,
Baker, Kans.	Hartman,	McLachlan,	Strait,
Bankhead,	Hermann,	McLaurin,	Strowd, N. C.
Barham,	Hilborn,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Bartlett, Ga.	Hutcheson,	McRae,	Talbert,
Bell, Colo.	Hyde,	Meredith,	Tate,
Bell, Tex.	Johnson, Cal.	Mondell,	Terry,
Black, Ga.	Jones,	Money,	Towne,
Bowers,	Kem,	Moses,	Tyler,
Broderick,	Kendall,	Neill,	Underwood,
Clardy,	Latimer,	Newlands,	Walker, Va.
Cockrell,	Layton,	Ogden,	Wheeler,
Cooper, Tex.	Lester,	Otey,	Williams,
Cox,	Linney,	Pearson,	Wilson, Idaho
Crisp,	Little,	Richardson,	Wilson, S. C.
Culberson,	Livingston,	Robbins,	Woodard,
Curtis, Kans.	Lockhart,	Robertson, La.	Yoakum.
De Armond,	Loud,	Sayers,	
Dinsmore,	Maddox,	Shafroth,	

NAYS—215.

Acheson,	Denny,	Johnson, Ind.	Sauerhering,
Aldrich,	De Witt,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scranton,
Andrews,	Dingley,	Joy,	Settle,
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Kerr,	Shannon,
Arnold, R. I.	Dovener,	Kiefer,	Sherman,
Atwood,	Draper,	Knox,	Simpkins,
Avery,	Elliott, S. C.	Kulp,	Smith, Ill.
Babcock,	Erdman,	Lacey,	Smith, Mich.
Baker, Md.	Evans,	Lawson,	Snover,
Baker, N. H.	Fairchild,	Lefever,	Sorg,
Barney,	Faris,	Leighty,	Southard,
Bartholdt,	Fenton,	Leisenring,	Southwick,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Fischer,	Lewis,	Spalding,
Beach,	Fletcher,	Long,	Sperry,
Bennett,	Fowler,	Loudenslager,	Stahle,
Berry,	Gardner,	Low,	Steele,
Bingham,	Gibson,	Mahany,	Stephenson,
Bishop,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Blue,	Gillett, Mass.	McCall, Mass.	Stewart, Wis.
Boatner,	Graff,	McCall, Tenn.	Stone, C. W.
Boutelle,	Griffin,	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, W. A.
Brewster,	Grosvenor,	McClellan,	Strode, Nebr.
Bromwell,	Grout,	McCormick,	Strong,
Brosius,	Grow,	McCreary, Ky.	Sulloway,
Brown,	Hadley,	Mercer,	Sulzer,
Brumm,	Hager,	Meyer,	Taft,
Bull,	Hall,	Miles,	Tarsney,
Burrell,	Halterman,	Miller, W. Va.	Tawney,
Burton, Mo.	Hardy,	Minor, Wis.	Tayler,
Burton, Ohio	Harmer,	Moody,	Thomas,
Calderhead,	Harris,	Murphy,	Tracewell,
Cannon,	Harrison,	Noonan,	Tracey,
Catchings,	Hart,	Northway,	Treloar,
Chickering,	Hatch,	Odell,	Tucker,
Clark, Iowa	Heatwole,	Otjen,	Turner, Ga.
Clark, Mo.	Heiner, Pa.	Overstreet,	Turner, Va.
Cobb, Mo.	Hemenway,	Owens,	Updegraff,
Codding,	Henderson,	Parker,	Van Voorhis,
Coffin,	Hendrick,	Patterson,	Wadsworth,
Colson,	Henry, Conn.	Payne,	Walker, Mass.
Connolly,	Hepburn,	Perkins,	Walsh,
Cook, Wis.	Hicks,	Phillips,	Wanger,
Cooke, Ill.	Hill,	Pitney,	Warner,
Cooper, Fla.	Hitt,	Poole,	Washington,
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker,	Price,	Watson, Ind.
Corliss,	Hopkins,	Prince,	Watson, Ohio
Cousins,	Howe,	Pugh,	Wellington,
Crowther,	Howell,	Quigg,	White,
Crump,	Hubbard,	Ray,	Wilber,
Curtis, Iowa	Hulick,	Reeves,	Willis,
Curtis, N. Y.	Huling,	Reyburn,	Wilson, Ohio
Dalzell,	Hull,	Royse,	Wood,
Danford,	Hurley,	Rusk,	Wright.
Daniels,	Jenkins,	Russell, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—50.

Adams,	Eddy,	Kyle,	Pendleton,
Anderson,	Ellett, Va.	Leonard,	Pickler,
Arnold, Pa.	Fitzgerald,	Linton,	Powers,
Barrett,	Foote,	Lorimer,	Raney,
Belknap,	Foss,	McDearmon,	Robinson, Pa.
Black, N. Y.	Griswold,	McEwan,	Russell, Conn.
Buck,	Hainer, Nebr.	Meiklejohn,	Sparkman,
Clarke, Ala.	Hanly,	Miller, Kans.	Stallings,
Cobb, Ala.	Henry, Ind.	Milliken,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cowen,	Howard,	Milnes,	Woodman,
Crowley,	Huff,	Miner, N. Y.	Woomer.
Cummings,	Hunter,	Morse,	
Dayton,	Kirkpatrick,	Mozley,	

So the motion to concur was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. WOODMAN with Mr. MCDEARMON.

Mr. LEONARD with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut with Mr. KYLE.

Mr. HANLY with Mr. PENDLETON.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. COBB of Alabama.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. PICKLER.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HOWARD is absent on account of serious sickness. I am requested to state that if he were present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. SULZER. My colleague, Mr. MINER of New York, is absent. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. WILSON of New York is confined to his room by sickness. If presen, the would vote "no."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. My colleague Mr. ARNOLD is seriously ill at his house. If present he, would vote "no." I wish also to state that my colleague Mr. HUFF, and my colleague Mr. WOOMER, who is detained by an accident, are both absent. If present, they would vote "no."

Mr. ALDRICH. My colleagues, Mr. FOSS, Mr. LORIMER, and Mr. BELKNAP, are detained from the House by unavoidable reasons. I am authorized to state, inasmuch as they were unable to secure a pair, that if present, they would vote "no."

Mr. MERCER. My colleagues, Mr. HAINER and Mr. MEIKLEJOHN, are absent. Mr. MEIKLEJOHN has a pair, but I was unable to secure a pair for Mr. HAINER. If they were present, I am requested to state, both of them would vote in the negative.

Mr. AITKEN. My colleague, Mr. LINTON, was called away on account of sickness, and I wish to have him excused on this vote.

Mr. BENNETT. My colleague, Mr. FOOTE, is unavoidably detained from the House. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. DALZELL. My colleague, Mr. ARNOLD, is detained by illness. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. CHICKERING. My colleague, Mr. BLACK, is absent. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. My colleague, Mr. MORSE, is absent from the House on account of sickness. If present, he would vote in the negative.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. My colleague, Mr. EDDY, is absent by appointment of the Speaker to attend the funeral of the late Mr. Crain of Texas. He is paired with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOWARD], and if present would vote in the negative.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, left here, I am informed, with the understanding that he was paired with myself on this question. If present, he would vote "no." I voted "aye," as I had no arrangement with him for a pair, and did not consent to it. He did not speak personally to me on the subject, of course.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HENRY, is absent by leave of the House. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. STEELE. I desire to make the same announcement with reference to Mr. HANLY.

Mr. McMILLIN. My colleague, Mr. McDEARMON, is absent by direction of the House. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. MEYER. My colleague, Mr. BUCK, has been called home on important business. He endeavored to secure a pair, but failed to do so. Were he present, he would vote "no."

Mr. TUCKER. My colleague, Mr. ELLETT, is detained by illness. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CLARKE, is now at his home in Alabama fighting for sound money. If present, he would maintain the same position on this floor and vote "no" on the present proposition.

Mr. PICKLER. I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]. If present, he would vote "no," and I should vote "aye."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My colleagues from Missouri, Mr. MOZLEY and Mr. RANEY, are absent from the House. I desire to say that if present, they would vote "no" on the pending question.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. [Applause.]

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of 1896."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, at the earliest day practicable, from electrotype plates to be furnished to the Public Printer by the within-named association wholly without cost to the Government, 3,000 copies, in separate form, of the Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the International Deep Waterways Association, for circulation, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

A concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and hereby is, directed to eliminate from 10,000 copies of the Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States, Census of 1890, the monograph entitled "Report on agriculture by irrigation in the western part of the United States"; that he be authorized to print an appendix, the data for which shall be furnished by the Interior Department, bringing the water-supply information up to date, and an index; and that he bind the monograph thus enlarged in one volume in style uniform with the other final Census reports; that of this report on irrigation 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 5,500 copies shall be for the use of the House, and 1,500 copies for distribution by the Department of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins; and

A bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota";

A bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895; and

A bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House Senate bill 879 for the correction of a verbal error.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona;

A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; and

A bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War;

Joint resolution (S. R. 65) to print the annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service;

A bill (S. 824) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842;

A bill (S. 1320) to confirm the title to certain lands in William Morgan and Harrison Moore, and to require the issue of patents therefor;

A bill (S. 1693) for the rebuilding or repair of the public wharf at Sitka, Alaska; and

A bill (S. 1804) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask that the urgent deficiency bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, if necessary, that an order be made that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the urgent deficiency bill, which has just been received from the Senate, will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years;

Joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory;

Joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida; and

A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, providing a chaplain for the Military Academy.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following bills and resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and hereby is, directed to eliminate from 10,000 copies of the Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States, Census of 1890, the monograph entitled "Report on agriculture by irrigation in the Western part of the United States;" that he be authorized to print an appendix, the data for which shall be furnished by the Interior Department, bringing the water-supply information up to date, and an index; and that he bind the monograph thus enlarged in one volume in style uniform with the other final Census reports; that of this report on irrigation 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 5,500 copies shall be for the use of the House, and 1,500 copies for distribution by the Department of the Interior—

To the Committee on Printing.

A concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office at the earliest day practicable, from electrotype plates to be furnished to the Public Printer by the within-named association wholly without cost to the Government, 3,000 copies, in separate form, of the Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the International Deep Waterways Association, for circulation, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives—

To the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, a communication from the Secretary of State, covering the report of the Director of the Bureau of American Republics for the year 1895.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SPENCER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WALSH, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BRUMM, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. JENKINS, for one day, on account of sickness.

And then (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Speaker announced the House in recess, under the rule, until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session, with Mr. PAYNE in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report clause 3 of Rule XXVI.

The Clerk read as follows:

3. The House shall, on each Friday, at 5 o'clock p. m., take a recess until 8 o'clock, which evening session shall be devoted to the consideration of private bills reported from the Committee on Pensions, and the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock and 30 minutes.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar, under the special order.

The question being taken, the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TALBERT demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 57, noes none.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, with Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

KATE A. PITMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Kate A. Pitman, widow of George Pitman, late a private in Company C, One hundred and second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her $12 per month, the same to be subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force on and after its passage.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we commence with the first case on the Private Calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. This bill was pending at the last session of the committee.

A MEMBER. Let the report be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The report has been read.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I made a few suggestions on this bill two weeks ago to-night. I think I am correct in my belief that this is the case.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, this is the case.

Mr. LOUD. On that evening I took occasion to state that the soldier in this case had reenlisted after the war in the Regular Army, and the assumption was that he was then in sound bodily health. I asked any gentleman on this floor to produce evidence to the contrary. Some gentleman did rise and state that there was an abundance of proof that this man had died as the result of disability incurred in the service. I could not see how it could be, so I took occasion to go to the Pension Office, and I find that the facts in this case are that this widow never claimed that her husband died as the result of service, but she made application simply under the law of 1890, under which, if she could prove that she was married to this soldier, she would be entitled to $8 a month. Now, simply because there seems to be some defect in the proof of this woman's marriage, the Committee on Invalid Pensions come into the House and recommend that she receive $12 a month.

Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. Chairman. The House can of course accept my statement in such manner as it sees fit; but I assume the position that no pension of this character shall pass this House while I am present, giving the woman more than $8 a month, unless you produce a quorum to pass it. This is one of those cases. If you will reduce the amount to $8 a month I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I introduced this bill and reported it as the subcommittee of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. So far as I am concerned, I do not desire the House to pass the bill upon my judgment as to what the evidence on file in the Pension Office shows. What the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] states is true, that the widow made an application under the law of 1890, a thing that had not been brought to my attention until I investigated it a little more, as the gentleman himself has done. But I put it upon a broader ground than that. I understand, and every gentleman here understands, that the general pension laws and rates were fixed upon averages and to apply to general classes, and everybody understands that in making up these general classes some soldiers get less than they ought to have, and some perhaps get more. My proposition is that every bill that comes in this House ought to stand upon its inherent merits.

This is a peculiar case. This widow is now afflicted with a fatal malady. While the report perhaps does not show that fact, yet I know from current rumor that her life can not be prolonged beyond a few months. She lives in the same town in which I live, and in that way I know the facts.

The record shows that this soldier served his country six years, three years in the war of the rebellion and three years in the Regular Army, defending the pioneers of Western civilization against the ravages of the Indians.

Now, if the gentleman from California thinks it is his patriotic duty to raise the question of no quorum here, why, as a matter of policy, I will consent to have the bill amended so as to reduce the amount to $8 a month, but it certainly is not that justice to which this widow is entitled. With the concurrence of the committee, I would rather have this bill amended so as to give her $8 a month now than to take the chance of having it passed at a higher rate at a later date in the session.

Mr. ERDMAN. Will the gentleman who made this report state whether the paragraph in the report which I am about to read refers to the woman who is now claiming this pension? It says:

A comrade who testifies that he was with the soldier on his way home makes affidavit that there was no marriage of Pitman to this woman. It seems that the soldier picked up this woman and lived with her a short time. After Pitman and this woman lived together a short time, the evidence shows a man came from the South, claimed her as his wife, and she went away with him and has never been heard of since.

Do those remarks apply to the woman who is now claiming this pension, or do they apply to the woman whom this man took out a license to marry?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ERDMAN] was present during the discussion in the committee, and he must be aware of the facts—that is, I suppose the gentleman was present during the discussion. I stated the other night that there was no question in the Pension Department about the soldier having died from disability incurred in the service. What I ought to have stated, perhaps, is that there was no question raised upon that subject in the Pension Department, but the claim was rejected upon the ground, as stated, that there was not satisfactory evidence that this woman had been legally married to the soldier. Now, the facts in relation to that are substantially as follows: When this soldier came out of the Regular Army, in 1870, he came

back to his home, at Mansfield, Ohio, with a woman who lived there with him a brief time. At the end of that time a man came from the South claiming her as his wife, and she went away with him. In two or three years after that he was married to this claimant, the last woman.

There is no question as to the validity of that marriage if the soldier was not married to the woman I have mentioned as having gone away. Now, the only evidence tending to show that he may have been married to that woman was found upon the records of the probate court of Montgomery County, Ohio, showing that a license had been issued to Josiah G. Pitman and Helen Joiner, but there was no evidence that there had been a consummation of the marriage, and the name of the soldier was George Pitman. It is shown by the records of the Pension Department that there was a very thorough examination made of the case by special examinations, and that the special examiners had been directed to try to find this woman and to find out from her whether she had been married to the soldier.

The evidence shows that after two or three years of special examination they found the woman, or some woman who bore the same name that this woman bore, in a house of ill fame somewhere in Georgia. The investigation was prosecuted through the police force and the postmasters in Georgia very largely, and upon finding the location of this woman, instead of investigating the matter and interviewing her to find out what the facts were, and whether she had been married to the soldier, they dropped the examination, and the special examiner reported the case with the recommendation that it be rejected. I claim that there is no evidence that any court of justice would consider sufficient to annul the marriage between the soldier and this woman who claims to be his widow. There was no evidence in the report that this other marriage to which reference has been made was consummated, and the marriage laws of Ohio require every officer or minister to make a return, and that return has to be recorded. There was simply the issuing of a license that only allowed or permitted them to get married; but there is no evidence that they did get married, nor did it appear that this was the same party.

Mr. ERDMAN. Does the gentleman say that when the license was taken out for the marriage there was an actual consummation of the marriage?

Mr. KERR. No, sir. It was found that this license that I speak of had been issued, but there was no return.

Mr. ERDMAN. Was the marriage ever solemnized?

Mr. KERR. The evidence of a comrade shows beyond any doubt that he accompanied him from the time of his discharge from the Regular Army until he reached his home. He testifies that in several affidavits and before the special examiner that he was with the soldier during the time until he reached home, and there was never any marriage between him and this woman.

Mr. ERDMAN. For a space of between two and three weeks there appears to have been a consummation of the marriage, according to the testimony of this comrade:

After Pittman and this woman lived together a short time the evidence shows that a man from the South claimed her as his wife and she went away with him and has never been heard of since.

Mr. KERR. There is no question about that.

Mr. ERDMAN. Well, now, am I to understand there was a license issued and a consummation of the marriage?

Mr. KERR. No. I say that under the laws of Ohio that would not be a consummation of the marriage to the extent of annulling a subsequent legally solemnized marriage. It would as to property rights have the same purpose as to annul.

Mr. MILES. The gentleman hardly means to annul, but to avoid.

Mr. PICKLER. As the gentleman has indicated that he will accept it, I move to amend in line 7 by striking out the word "twelve" and inserting the word "eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out section 2.

Mr. ERDMAN. Let that be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force on and after its passage.

Mr. PICKLER. Under the general law these special acts take effect after passage, and that is surplusage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

HENRY H. SCHRAWDER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of Henry H. Schrawder, late a member of Company E, Second Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge; and the proceedings of court-martial finding him guilty of absence without leave and desertion are hereby vacated and set aside.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the report and accompanying letter of General Ruggles, Adjutant-General, be read.

The report (by Mr. MCCLELLAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder, having had the same under consideration, respectfully report as follows:

It appears that the charge of desertion and conviction thereof and conviction of absence without leave were all founded in error.

The Adjutant-General of the Army, as will be seen from the accompanying letter, recommends that the soldier's record be cleared by legislation, as the War Department has no jurisdiction in the case.

Your committee therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, June 20, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith bill H. R. 6305, Fifty-third Congress, second session, for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder, also letter from the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, United States, and to report as follows:

The records of this office show that Private Henry H. Schrawder enlisted November 1, 1862, in Company E, Second Battalion, Fifteenth Infantry; was admitted to hospital July 11, 1864; furloughed September 17, 1864, for thirty days; furlough extended to October 27, 1864; that on October 17, 1864, he was arrested at Harrisburg, Pa., brought before a general court-martial, and charged with having deserted on October 6, 1864; that he pleaded guilty; that his plea was confirmed by the court; that he was found guilty and sentenced to forfeit all pay, bounty, etc., due or to become due, etc., and fifteen days after promulgation of sentence to be confined at hard labor at Clinton Prison, Dannemora, N. Y., for two years and six months (General Court-Martial Order, No. 48, Department of the East, June 8, 1868); that he was released from prison and dishonorably discharged September 13, 1865, by Special Order 473, Adjutant-General's Office, series 1865, and that so much of the order as required that discharge be dishonorable was subsequently revoked.

Upon investigation of this case in 1891, on a call from the Commissioner of Pensions, the following notation was placed on the records by direction of the Adjutant-General of the Army:

"The findings of guilty of absence without leave and desertion were reached by the court without a full knowledge of the facts in the case, as the records of this office show Private Schrawder received a contusion of the head from shell in the battle of Kenesaw Mountain, June 28, 1864, and was sent to general hospital on that day; entered Brown General Hospital, Louisville, Ky., June 11, 1864, with anæmia hemiralopia; was furloughed September 7, 1864, for thirty days and furlough extended to October 27, 1864; that he entered post hospital Fort Adams, Newport, R. I., November 6, 1864, with eruption of skin, and was returned to duty November 26, 1864. He was then held in confinement at Fort Adams, R. I., awaiting trial for desertion, which took place April 4, 1865.

"The above shows that, although found guilty of absence without leave from June 24, 1864, to August 27, 1864, he was wounded in battle at Kenesaw Mountain June 28, 1864, and from that date to date of trial was under military control, either in hospital or on furlough, or in confinement awaiting trial; that although found guilty of desertion from October 6, 1864, on furlough which was extended to October 27, 1864, and therefore improperly charged with desertion. As the man has, however, been convicted of absence without leave and desertion by a general court-martial, the Department has no power to set aside the findings, etc., of the court-martial, which have been executed."

From this notation on the rolls it appears that the charge of desertion and conviction thereof and conviction of absence without leave were all founded in error. It is therefore recommended that, to do justice to the soldier, his record be cleared by legislation of these wrongful charges and convictions.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE D. RUGGLES,
Adjutant-General.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I scarcely think that it is necessary to add anything. The letter of General Ruggles shows that the soldier was suffering from contusion of his head and was virtually out of his mind when under the charge of desertion, and pleaded guilty under a misapprehension. In view of the recommendation of General Ruggles, I have been unanimously instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report the bill to the House favorably.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

RUFUS BETZ.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2048) for the relief of Rufus Betz.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of this bill be not had at this time, but that it be laid aside for consideration later.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

THOMAS HOLADAY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas Holaday.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place upon the invalid pension roll the name of Thomas Holaday, late a private in Company C, Kimball's regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $24 per month.

The report (by Mr. CROWTHER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2326) to pension Thomas Holaday, having considered the same, respectfully submit the following report:

The evidence before the committee upon investigation shows that Thomas Holaday was pensioned June 2, 1885, by certificate No. 298904, at $2 per month from April 4, 1862, for rheumatism; increased to $8 per month from December 16, 1885; increased to $16 per month from June 26, 1889. The pensioner's name was dropped from the rolls February 28, 1890, on the ground that "he was erroneously pensioned. The company and regiment to which he belonged was a State organization, not in the service of the General Government, and the

disabilities incurred therein are not and were not then pensionable under existing laws."

It is not denied that the disabilities from which Mr. Holaday suffers (his limbs being drawn out of shape, and confined to his bed, and helpless a portion of the time) are not of service origin; neither is it denied that these disabilities were incurred while performing service in defense of his country; but because of a mere technical difference of opinion as to whether his service was performed in State or national forces, he is dropped from the pension roll in his old age, when he is helpless and dependent, at a time when the strong arm of a generous Government should be his shield and protector.

Your committee are of the unanimous opinion that while there may be differences as to the kind of service, there are none that the services were not faithfully performed and the disabilities incurred therein; hence, if there be error, your committee prefer to err upon the side of humanity and duty and give the pensioner the benefit of the doubt. We therefore recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendment:

After the last word in the printed bill insert:

"*Provided*, That the pension herein granted shall be paid to Thomas Holaday, and that no part of it shall be retained by any authority to reimburse the Government for any pension heretofore paid."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on concurring in the amendments recommended by the committee.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should be glad if the gentleman in charge of this bill would make a statement.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered by a subcommittee of which I was the chairman. There is no doubt whatever that this man's disabilities are pensionable. There is no doubt but that he performed the service, and there is no question but that he was upon the pension roll, placed there by General Black when he was Pension Commissioner. But a subsequent Pension Commissioner in investigating pension cases discovered that there might be a probability that this unfortunate citizen was on the pension roll by mistake, and he was dropped from the roll, as the report states, not because he had not rendered the service, but because there was some technical reason found why he should not be there. The citizens of Missouri have always contended that the pension laws of the United States provided for the Missouri State Militia. On March 3, 1879, there was passed a bill which contains this provision:

The provisions of existing pension laws are hereby extended to the officers and privates of the Missouri State Militia.

A joint resolution was passed by the Fifty-third Congress extending the provisions of the law of 1890 to the Missouri State Militia. There is no necessity, Mr. Chairman, to go back and explain why it was necessary for the Missouri State Militia to be employed in the service of the General Government. Every citizen of this country who knows the history of the unfortunate period between 1861 and 1865 knows the services that were performed by that militia. It is not necessary for me to state here that there was an agreement between President Lincoln on the one hand and Governor Gamble of the State of Missouri on the other. That agreement, a copy of which I hold in my possession, was signed and sealed by the parties thereto. Under that agreement these various militia organizations were placed in the service of the General Government under the command of United States officers, and in most cases they were paid by the General Government.

Now, for this nation, at this time, when the few of these men who are left are old and decrepit, some of them in the last stage of disease, many of them unfortunately so disabled as to be unable to earn their livelihood—for this nation, I say, at this time, to take advantage of any technicality whereby the small stipend that has been given to them every month in order that the wolf might be kept from the door is taken away from them, is an act that ought to be condemned by every citizen on the soil of the United States. I, sir, am in favor of granting a pension to every man, I care not who he is, that bore an arm in the defense of his country and its flag. I do not care whether he served in the militia or in the Regular Army or in the volunteer forces of this nation; it is sufficient for me to know that he was a follower of the flag and a defender of the nation's principles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the Pension Bureau, we find that this citizen was pensioned first at $2 per month, but that in about eight months the pension was increased——

Mr. TAWNEY. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him whether there is a minority report in this case?

Mr. CROWTHER. No, sir, there is not.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then I feel ready to vote upon it. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, in this case I had an investigation made by the pension authorities, and I am advised as follows:

In the matter of the bill No. 2326, to restore to the pension rolls the name of Thomas Holaday, late of Company C, Kimball's Regiment, Sixth Missouri State Militia, Volunteer Cavalry.

It appears from the records of the War Department, on file in the Pension Office, that Kimball's regiment of six months' militia was purely a State organization, never mustered into the United States service, and never classified as a part of the volunteer forces of the United States, and hence its members possess no title to pensions and never did have any except under the provisions of the paragraph of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes, and that restricts the right to pensions for disability incurred while in the State militia and not in the United States service to such persons as establish their claims prior to July 14, 1874.

Mr. CROWTHER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ERDMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CROWTHER. If this was a purely State Militia organization, how does it happen that all of the rolls of the organization are on file in the War Department?

Mr. ERDMAN. I do not understand that that establishes any point whatever in the case, and certainly not that which the gentleman claims it establishes.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Did this organization perform service for the Government under command of officers of the General Government?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERDMAN. Suppose it did——

Mr. NORTHWAY. I am asking the question for information. Did it in fact perform service for the General Government under the command of officers of the Government?

Mr. ERDMAN. I am not advised on that point.

Mr. PICKLER. It did. That is the fact.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Now, if that is so, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania object to a man's being granted a pension who had served in that militia if he was disabled?

Mr. ERDMAN. Unless all of that command were treated in the same manner, I would.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If they were injured in the service you would grant them a pension, would you not?

Mr. ERDMAN. Provided all of them were injured; but I do not want any one or two or three picked out for special favors.

Mr. NORTHWAY. You would deny a pension to one man who applied for it because all of the same command did not apply!

Mr. ERDMAN. No, sir; but I say let them all wait until they all get it together.

A MEMBER. They will be dead. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. ERDMAN. This man was erroneously placed on the rolls, and General Raum, who will hardly be claimed as unfriendly to the United States soldier, took his name off the roll.

Mr. FARIS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ERDMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FARIS. Is it not true that the error that is alleged to exist in the case of this soldier is that he was a member of the Missouri Militia instead of a member of the United States forces?

Mr. ERDMAN. No, sir; it did not assume that shape.

Mr. FARIS. Then what is it?

Mr. ERDMAN. That he never was mustered into the service of the United States.

Mr. FARIS. That is because he was a member of the Missouri State Militia, and the law read by the gentleman from Missouri shows the militia to be pensionable.

Mr. ERDMAN. And they were not pensionable.

Now, if you are going to pension all of this regiment I will vote, I think, with you; but I do not wish to pick out special cases.

Mr. NORTHWAY. For my own part every man in the service will receive my vote for a pension if he is entitled to it, no matter what his service was.

Mr. ERDMAN. Well, he will receive mine as a class, but I do not wish to pick up special individuals and grant them particular favors.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will remember that promise hereafter.

Mr. ERDMAN. I will.

But there is another serious objection to me with reference to this bill. It proposes to grant arrears of pension.

Mr. PICKLER. Not at all.

Mr. CROWTHER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, it does not.

Mr. ERDMAN. Then what does this proviso mean:

Provided, That the pension herein granted shall be paid to Thomas Holaday, and that no part of it shall be retained by any authority to reimburse the Government for any pension heretofore paid.

Mr. TRACEY. That does not give arrearages.

Mr. ERDMAN. He was indebted to the Government before the passage of the bill, and if you deduct the pension you propose to grant him it certainly is the granting of arrears.

Mr. PICKLER. On our theory, and the theory of the committee, he did not owe the Government anything. We contend that he was disabled in the service, that he was entitled to the pension, and if he was erroneously dropped from the rolls he ought to have the pension allowed to him, or, in other words, restored to the rolls without deducting anything on any such claim as that. He was disabled in the service and is entitled to the pension.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the bill be laid aside with favorable recommendation?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERDMAN) there were—ayes 83, noes 0.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN (having counted the committee). There are 116 members present, a quorum. The motion is agreed to, and the bill is laid aside with favorable recommendation.

The Chair desires to state, however, that there is a committee amendment that was overlooked. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the last word in the printed bill insert: "*Provided*, The pension herein granted shall be paid to Thomas Holaday, and that no part of it shall be retained by any authority to reimburse the Government for any pension heretofore paid."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the committee amendment will be considered as adopted.

Mr. ERDMAN. I object.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Would it be in order to reconsider the vote by which the bill was laid aside?

Mr. PAYNE. That can not be done in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HILL. I make the point that the vote has not been announced.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote was announced.

Mr. PAYNE. The correction, Mr. Chairman, can be made in the House. It is not necessary to make it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from New York is correct; and the bill will be laid aside to be reported to the House with favorable recommendation.

RACHEL PATTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rachel Patton, of Paris, Edgar County, Ill., formerly the widow of John H. Patton, late captain of Company C, Seventy-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. WOOD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton, report as follows:

The committee has fully considered the evidence submitted, and find that the claimant was the widow of Capt. John H. Patton, late Company C, Seventy-ninth Illinois, who was killed in battle at Liberty Gap, Tennessee, June 25, 1863.

Claimant was pensioned as his widow on December 15, 1863, under the general law, at $20 per month. She drew this pension until September 30, 1875, when she was dropped from the rolls by reason of her remarriage to one William G. Culbertson.

On March 29, 1889, by decree of circuit court of Edgar County, Ill., claimant was divorced from said Culbertson on account of his willful abandonment and desertion of her, and by decree of said court she was permitted to resume her former name of Rachel Patton.

Claimant is 63 years of age; feeble in health, unable to work; is in receipt of an income of $175 per year, which is insufficient for her support.

She has applied for restoration to the rolls, which was rejected October 6, 1891, on the ground that under the law she has no title to the pension on account of her remarriage.

The committee therefore recommend that the bill do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out the words, in fourth and fifth lines, "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws" and insert in lieu thereof "at the rate of $20 per month."

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, this is another of the bills to pension widows who have remarried. Many of the committee will remember the case of Susan D. Wright, which was under consideration a few evenings ago, and which I then opposed for the reason that she was not the widow of a soldier.

A MEMBER. But she was.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The same applies now to this case, and I oppose it for the same reason that I opposed that. Upon that evening I was met by the reading of an ancient law concerning the pensioning of Revolutionary widows, and the gentleman who read it, after he had completed the reading, announced, with something of a flourish of trumpets, that an apology was due from the gentleman from New Hampshire. I now ask the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS]. I felt somewhat chagrined that such a state of affairs should have existed and that I should have been totally ignorant of the matter. So I have taken occasion between that time and now to look up the status of the law in that regard, and I will read to the committee just exactly how it stands and what basis there was for the remark of the gentleman from New York. By an act of 1838 this became the statute:

If any person who served in the war of the Revolution in the manner specified in the preceding section has died, leaving a widow whose marriage took place before the expiration of the last period of his service—

There is a very important limitation. The marriage must have taken place before the end of his service, while he was in the Army—

such widow shall be entitled to receive, during the time she may remain unmarried, the annuity or pension which might have been allowed to her husband by virtue of the preceding section if living on June 7, 1832, and pension under this section shall not be withheld from any widow in consequence of her having married after the decease of the husband for whose services she may claim to be allowed a pension under this section: *Provided*, That she was a widow on July 4, 1838.

Now, let us note right here that that was passed fifty-four years after the close of the war. If like legislation shall take place fifty-four years after the close of the last war, it certainly will not be so objectionable as it would be now. But to go on a little further. By a joint resolution passed in 1846 we find the following:

If any person who served in the war of the Revolution in the manner specified in section 74 of this act has died, or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow whose marriage took place before the 1st day of January, 1794—

Only eleven years after—

such widow shall be entitled to receive for and during her natural life, from and after the 4th day of March, 1848, the annuity or pension which might have been allowed to her husband in virtue of section 74 of this act, if living on the 7th day of June, 1832: *Provided*—

And I ask the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] and of the committee to the proviso—

That in the event of the marriage of such widow such annuity or pension shall be discontinued.

So I will admit that for the period of eleven years that was the statute of the United States. But after an experience of eleven years upon this subject Congress deliberately repealed the only statute under which such widows were pensioned after their remarriage. But the gentleman, I presume, will call my attention to a section now standing in the Revised Statutes of the United States, and to save him the trouble I will read it for him. This, I will say, is a resolution, No. 13, of July 1, 1848, transferred into the Revised Statutes as section 4743:

In all cases where a pension has been granted to any officer or soldier of the Revolution in his lifetime, the evidence upon which such pension was granted shall be conclusive of the service of such officer or soldier in the application of any widow, or woman who may have been the widow, of such officer or soldier, for a pension; and upon proof by her that she was married to any such officer or soldier, and that she is a widow, she shall thereupon be placed upon the pension rolls at the same rate that such officer or soldier received during his lifetime.

And that is the only existing statute now which in any way refers to the pensioning of remarried widows, and that does not authorize it at all, but simply says in connection with such cases as then had been filed and not adjudicated that the proof of the service of the soldier shall be conclusive as to their claims pending during the eleven years under which she was entitled.

Now, in all these cases, let it be noted that the widow was limited in the time of her marriage, and that only for eleven years was there a period under which such a pension could have been granted. That, too, was sixty-one years after any possible service in the war of the Revolution, and bringing that date down to service in the war of the rebellion, no such enactment would naturally take place until 1926; and I pledge the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] that I should be most happy to meet him here in 1926 to further consider this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to occupy the time of the committee when it is seriously disposed to consider the questions before it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois who made the report is recognized.

Mr. WOOD. I yield a moment to the gentleman from New York, but desire to be recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. My friend from New Hampshire, who has been looking over the ancient statutes which he is now reading to the House, might have occupied himself in matters which I think would be really of more value. We are engaged in the transaction of business which relates to the present. I quoted the statutes as they now exist in the Revised Statutes and in the volume of laws as published by the Pension Office. I desire to congratulate the gentleman from New Hampshire, who has by a long and slow process of reasoning, continuing two weeks, discovered the facts I stated to the House two weeks ago.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I desire to ask the gentleman a question. Does he claim now that the law which he cited two weeks ago was one under which he thinks this woman could receive a pension after she had remarried.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I certainly do. I do not controvert the statutes of the United States.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It only refers to the matter of evidence.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, this discussion between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from New Hampshire is very interesting as an abstract question of law; but it arose on a pension claim that was reported by the committee at the last meeting, two weeks ago. That poor woman is dead, and her case will not trouble this House any more. Now let us get down to the case in hand, before she dies. I want to say this widow comes here just the same as the widow of any major-general or brigadier-general that is pensioned by special act of Congress. The law does not give Rachel Patton any pension, nor did it give a pension to the widow of General Cogswell.

Mr. MILES. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MILES. The point I would like to inquire of the gentleman is just this: I understood him to say that she comes here just like any other widow; and if so, I would ask him for what reason he strikes out the words "subject to the provisions and

limitations of the pension laws" and inserts in lieu thereof "at the rate of $20 per month"?

Mr. WOOD. I do that simply because it means precisely the same thing without so many words. "Subject to the limitations of the pension laws," will pension this woman at the rate of $20 per month; and it is best to have it understood, and plainly understood, so that this committee will know what it is having done, and know precisely how much pension they are voting to this woman.

Mr. MILES. I would like to ask the gentleman, because I think I was in the committee when this matter was up, if he does not know that under the general pension laws this woman would not stand like other widows?

Mr. WOOD. I understand under the general pension laws that this widow has no claim to a pension. I have said that already; nor have the widows of major or brigadier generals, and bills that have been introduced by my friend from Maryland and reported to this House also are in the same condition, that they have no standing under the pension laws.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman please explain under what provision of existing pension law, if this woman were pensioned as a widow, she would receive $20 a month?

Mr. WOOD. If she were pensionable under any existing law this bill would not be before this committee, and because she is not pensionable under any existing law this bill is here.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. But the gentleman does not understand my question, which was: If she were pensionable under existing law what law would give her $20 a month rather than $12 or $8 a month?

Mr. WOOD. She was the widow of a captain of volunteers of infantry.

Mr. PICKLER. That is the amount of pension to a captain.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is all right.

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman would wait a moment, I think I would come to that. I will not detain the committee but for a few moments. This woman was not married to the soldier since the war. She did not marry him to get his pension and help to spend it. She was his wife when the war broke out; she was his wife all through the war; she stayed at home and looked after his family.

I would be willing to pension her. She relieved the Government, by her remarriage, of paying $3,360 which otherwise it would have paid her. She remarried, but that marriage was unfortunate, and she has obtained a divorce on the ground of willful desertion and abandonment. A court of equity, which is a court of conscience, has restored to her her name, the honored name of her former husband, and I ask if the American Congress can not be as fair and just and generous as that court of law and give her back the pension which she lost by that unfortunate marriage. Her soldier husband was killed in battle, and I say this bill ought to pass. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the case we had under consideration when we last met in Friday evening session was that of a remarried widow whose husband had died. This is the case of a remarried widow who was divorced after living fourteen years with her second husband. I do not think it will be amiss for the House to hear the reasons that used to be submitted at these pension sessions in the last Congress when such bills were up for consideration, and therefore I send to the Clerk's desk to be read a report bearing upon this subject.

The report was read, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to restore her to the pension roll the same as if she were still the widow of the soldier whose name she voluntarily surrendered years ago.

To pass this bill is to nullify for the benefit of this one individual the substantial limitation of the general laws that the pension of soldiers' widows who have remarried shall cease.

The objections to be urged against such bills as this are numerous. In the first place, it makes an exception of a case which is in nowise exceptional. There may be varying degrees of destitution in different cases, but it may be fairly stated that all cases of widows who have remarried and again become husbandless, by reason of death or divorce, present the same substantial conditions.

If any widow so situated should be restored to pension, all widows so situated should be restored, and this by general enactment and not by individual private bills, whereby those who may happen to have a friend to espouse their cause secure a benefit which the modest and the unknown never think of seeking. Special pension acts are justifiable only in cases which are essentially exceptional and should not be used to grant to one that which is denied to the many whose situation is precisely the same. But aside from this consideration, however, the soldier's widow who remarries voluntarily relinquishes her pension because she prefers to do so.

The Government can not become an insurer against an unfortunate termination of this second matrimonial venture either by divorce or death. To restore pension in case of divorce is to encourage remarried widows to seek divorces, and, in any event, it is to give them an ostensible claim upon the soldier's death and memory which they have long since renounced by preference.

Furthermore, it is not to be assumed that legislation of this character is in the line of justice or of honor to the soldiers themselves, or that it is necessarily desired or favored by the soldier classes. A contribution from the public Treasury to the support of the widow of the soldier, so long as she remains his widow, every soldier, perhaps, desires, and the common consent of the nation for thirty years has sanctioned this; but that each soldier looks forward to and desires that his services and his memory shall be the basis of a pension to his wife at some remote day, beyond an intervening period of matrimonial alliance with some other husband, is by no means self-evident or fairly to be presumed.

Mr. THOMAS. What is that document?

The CHAIRMAN. It is an extract from the RECORD, read in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ERDMAN. It is a minority report made in a case similar to this.

A MEMBER. Who is the author?

Mr. ERDMAN. My name is prefixed to it.

The question being taken on the amendment proposed by the committee, the Chairman declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 91, noes 8.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum, Mr. Chairman; and upon that I demand tellers.

The question being taken on ordering tellers, 13 gentlemen voted in the affirmative, not a sufficient number, and tellers were refused.

The amendment was then agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the bill as amended be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass?

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to make any factious objection to the pensioning of this widow, but just to call the attention of the gentlemen of this committee to-night, as I did a few nights ago, to the principle that is involved in the passage of this bill. On the last Friday night that we met here there was presented a bill, similar to this, for the benefit of Mrs. Susan Wright. It was presented by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] and on an appeal made to him by several members of this committee he was prevailed upon, from a sense of justice, from a sense of right, from a sense of principle, to agree to withdraw the bill, being satisfied that it was against principle and against law in theory and in practice.

Now, here is another bill proposing to pension another lady under almost identical circumstances, a case surrounded by almost the same conditions, the only difference being that, as stated by the gentleman who has charge of this bill, the courts have granted this lady a legal divorce from her second husband. That difference, however, does not alter the case in the least, because to grant this lady a pension would still be in direct violation of the pension laws of the United States, which laws are as liberal as laws can well be, so that if she is not entitled to a pension under the laws as they exist, it must be quite clear that she ought not to have a pension at all. I want to appeal to gentlemen on the other side of this House——

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a legal question. Does not the granting of the divorce place the woman in the same position that she was in before the marriage, and is not the presumption raised that no marriage existed at all?

Mr. TALBERT. No, sir; not by any means.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Does it not place her in the position she was in before the second marriage was contracted?

Mr. TALBERT. By no means. While I am not a lawyer nor the son of a lawyer, I am an honest man, and I can answer that question as a man of common sense. No. [Laughter.]

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that though I come from South Carolina I am not the man to stand up here to oppose the granting of a pension to any honest soldier or to the widow of an honest soldier who is justly entitled to it. I am willing to rise in my place here and advocate and vote for any such pension, and I have done so on former occasions. But at the same time I believe it to be my duty as a member of the American Congress to raise my voice against the violation of the laws of the nation in which I live. I believe it to be my duty to protest against what I regard as wrong in principle, wrong in practice, wrong in theory, and that is why I oppose the granting of this pension.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Does my friend oppose this bill because the lady is a divorced widow, and on the ground that South Carolina does not allow divorces, or is it because he thinks a woman who has been twice married needs no pension? [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. The laws of South Carolina do not enter into this question at all, sir. I am glad to say that we have no divorce law in South Carolina, and we expect never to have any such law. But that has nothing to do with the bill under consideration at this time.

And I want to appeal to the common sense of the Republicans, I want to appeal to your sense of justice, I want to appeal to your sense of right; I ask you to halt and consider before you take this step. I have been authoritatively informed that if you grant this

pension, and grant pensions to others similarly situated, that it will not fall short of 100,000 in number, and in the preparation of the pension bill no arrangement has been made for that increase.

I do this, therefore, Mr. Chairman, from a sense of common justice and in defense of the right. I appeal to you and ask you gentlemen not to urge bills of this character; and I ask you if you are not willing to let it go over with an unfavorable report and not hold it over here as an obstacle to obstruct the way of other and meritorious claims that ought to be passed, and that ought to have, at all times, the right of way.

I hope you will do that. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Oh, be quiet, and let your hair grow.

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TALBERT. I yield to my friend with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to ask my friend from South Carolina if he considers it a violation of the pension laws for the same Congress that makes the pension law to make another law to put this specific case upon the roll?

Mr. TALBERT. It is not doing it. As a matter of course the makers of the law can violate the law, and they do it, and they are sometimes hung for it. [Laughter.] But that has nothing to do with the case, I will say to my distinguished, congenial friend, whom I like——

Mr. WILLIS. I want to know if in the judgment of the gentleman from South Carolina the granting of this pension would be in his opinion a violation of the pension law?

Mr. TALBERT. I do say that it would.

Mr. WILLIS. Can not the same power that made the law set it aside and make another?

Mr. TALBERT. Well, the Supreme Court is in that business. [Laughter.] They have enough of that kind of work to do now without our nullifying our own laws and despoiling our own nest. [Laughter.] As, for instance, the income-tax law. [Laughter and applause.]

I am not making any factious opposition. I am not making any technical objection to the bill. I am only suggesting to you that in the granting of pensions we should take, first, those cases which are really meritorious, and where the law should be applied. I do not wish to say anything that would injure any person's claim or do any harm to any honest applicant. I am willing to vote for all cases of that character that come along. But I do say to you that we should draw the line at such cases as this.

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to say to my friend from South Carolina that when the Democratic party gets into power again of course the Supreme Court will have its hands full setting aside acts which they have passed. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. Of course the Democratic party fills the hands of everybody, poor and all, alike. [Laughter.] That is the object of the Democratic party. But the Republican party, as soon as they get into power, take all out of the hands of the people that the Democratic party put into them. [Laughter and applause.] But that has got nothing to do with the case.

I only want to appeal to the common sense, to the justice of which gentlemen so much talk on this floor. Now, I know my friend has a great store of justice as well as regard for the old soldiers and their widows who are drawing pensions and those who do not draw pensions, and that he is as much opposed as anybody else to any invasion or innovation of their rights. But here is a direct violation of the rights of everybody. You are granting a pension to some one who is not entitled to it at all. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TALBERT. If our friends on the other side would only be patient a little while, they can get to a vote in time. I yield to my friend with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman yields to me?

Mr. TALBERT. Yes. [Renewed cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. TALBERT. Oh, my friends, let us reason about this. [Laughter.] Let us reason about it like brothers. Let us talk over it a while, and let us reason like Christian gentlemen and brothers. How pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. [Laughter.] Let us talk about it now quietly a little while, as I told you a while ago, and let your hair grow, although some of you have very little.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman from South Carolina yields to me and has indicated to me that he believes I am the possessor of a large sense of right and justice——

Mr. TALBERT. I know it; I do not believe it. [Laughter.] I know it.

Mr. WILLIS. I believe the gentleman yielded me the floor.

Mr. TALBERT. I did. Now go on. I was only going to say——

Mr. WILLIS. Now, if the gentleman is going to occupy the floor at the same time that he has yielded to me, why I think I will give it back to him. If he is like the Dutchman who had his treadmill wound up to go so long and would not stop until it was run down, then I will sit down. [Laughter.] But if he will yield to me I would like just to say a word more.

Mr. TALBERT. Well, I will withdraw the suggestion, if it is offensive to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I do not believe that is justice or righteousness—— [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. TALBERT. I hope the gentleman will proceed; he is getting along very nicely. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. My friends around me suggest that our colloquy is injuring this case.

Mr. TALBERT. Oh, I hope not. If I thought so I would stop. I have no motive of that kind.

Mr. WILLIS. Then I think we had both better stop.

Mr. TALBERT. All I want to do is simply to get the attention of the committee to what I believe to be the rights of the case, and I want to know if we can not get together and reason on it. What are you in such a hurry to vote for? Are you afraid of your case? Or are you not willing to hear me for my cause?

Gentlemen, I mean to do right, and now I want to ask you, in justice to the old veterans, many of whom are not getting pensions who ought to have them, to let these claims that are unmeritorious and undeserving go by the board, and let us go along here and take up those whose claims are meritorious and who ought to be pensioned, and not take up the valuable time of this committee here in doing this kind of thing.

I do not feel disposed to take up any more of your time, and I believe you will do right.

I move now that this bill be laid aside with an unfavorable report, and I hope the motion will be carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation?

Mr. TALBERT. I made the motion that it be laid aside with an unfavorable report, and that takes precedence.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] has moved that this bill be laid aside with an unfavorable recommendation. We have heard from the gentleman from South Carolina before in this session of Congress. We have heard from the State of South Carolina every year, in every session of Congress, excepting the few years that South Carolina was not entitled to and did not have a Representative upon this floor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

South Carolina has produced more trouble to this country than any State in this Union, from the days of John C. Calhoun, when President Jackson threatened to hang him for treasonable acts and utterances, until to-day, when the gentleman from South Carolina on this floor one day preaches and justifies treason and the next day opposes the payment of pensions to disabled Union soldiers and their widows. A South Carolina Congressman talking treason and opposing the pensions to Union soldiers in the House and a South Carolina Senator talking anarchy and communism in the Senate of the United States is a spectacle that in these latter days stands without a parallel.

I have no disposition, Mr. Chairman, to discuss sectional questions at the Friday night sessions, which should be exclusively devoted to the consideration of private pension bills. I am willing and ready to vote for every private pension bill that shall be by the Committee on Pensions favorably reported to this House, but I do not propose to be dictated to as to how I shall vote by Representatives from South Carolina, a State, sir, which has never since the war had an honestly elected Democratic Representative in either the House of Representatives or Senate of the United States. If South Carolina had sunk into the sea in 1860 this country would have been saved thousands of lives and billions of dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. TALBERT. I do not desire to reply to the gentleman, because he has not touched the subject at all. To his claptrap about South Carolina and her Representatives since 1872, I return the salutation of silent, scornful contempt. I always come directly to the subject, but now I want to say again that South Carolina can take care of herself and has always done it. But, as we have now heard from the gentleman from Canada, let us have a vote. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, what do I understand the question to be?

The CHAIRMAN. That this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. PICKLER. I understood the gentleman from South Carolina to move that it be laid aside with an unfavorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. This motion takes precedence of the other motion. The question is on laying aside the bill with a favorable recommendation.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. Division.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 92 and the noes are none, and accordingly the bill is laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. MILES. No quorum.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point comes too late. The decision had been announced before the gentleman rose.

Mr. MILES. My friend made the point, and I made it, too. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The decision had been announced before the gentleman rose.

Mr. MILES. I move that the committee rise. Now, I just want to say this——

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. PICKLER. I rise to a point of order. The Chair had ordered the Clerk to read the next bill, and the Clerk was taken off his feet by the gentleman's motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES] is in order. The point of order of the gentleman from South Dakota is not well taken. The question is, Shall the committee now rise?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERDMAN) there were—ayes 1, noes 94.

Accordingly the motion of Mr. MILES was rejected.

PETER B. PALMENTEER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Peter B. Palmenteer.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Peter B. Palmenteer, late a private in Company D, Seventh Michigan Cavalry, and to grant him a pension at the rate of $12 per month from and after the passage of this act, the same to be in lieu of any other claim for pension under existing law.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions reported an amendment striking out the words, "from and after the passage of this act, the same to be in lieu of any other claim for pension under existing law."

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I ask that the report be read, Mr. Chairman.

The report (by Mr. THOMAS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Peter B. Palmenteer, having carefully examined the same, together with the evidence, respectfully submit the following report:

On September 10, 1862, the claimant enlisted in Company D, Seventh Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and served from that date until December 15, 1865, when mustered out and honorably discharged. On September 24, 1879, a claim was filed by him under the general law, and on June 2, 1885, a pension was granted at the rate of $2 per month for injury to spine, from December 16, 1865, to February 20, 1884, when the disability ceased. On August 26, 1891, a claim for restoration was rejected on the ground of no pensionable degree of disability.

On November 27, 1891, the claimant filed under the act of June 27, 1890, and the medical examination, which was made in 1892, shows applicant's condition as follows: "Four-eighteenths for injury to right arm; nothing for injury to spine, chest, and abdomen, and old age; two-eighteenths for rheumatism; and is disabled from pensionable and other causes." On July 21, 1893, however, this claim was rejected on the ground of no ratable degree of disability under said act.

It seems that in 1892, when the medical examination was made, the claimant was clearly entitled to at least $6 per month, and since that time his rheumatism and other infirmities have increased to such an extent as to warrant the amount fixed by the bill.

In view of all the facts, your committee respectfully recommend that the bill be amended by striking out, in line 8, all after the word "month," and that as so amended the bill do pass.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill asks the House to overrule a decision of the Pension Office, and it seems to me that the gentleman in charge of the bill should, in justice to the claimant, make a full statement of the facts of the case. The report does not show that the bill has been considered with the judicial fairness which the Committee on Invalid Pensions should always show in considering any bill, especially in the paragraph before the last, which says:

It seems that in 1892, when the medical examination was made, the claimant was clearly entitled to at least $6 per month, and since that time his rheumatism and other infirmities have increased to such an extent as to warrant the amount fixed by the bill.

Why does it seem so? I trust the gentleman will make an explanation.

Mr. MAHON. Before debate is had on this bill I would like paragraph 6, Rule XIV, read. I do not want to make any objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

6. No member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the House, unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending, in which case he shall be permitted to speak in reply, but not until every member choosing to speak shall have spoken.

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. ERDMAN. May I inquire for whose benefit my colleague had that rule read?

Mr. LACEY. I want to make an inquiry of the committee, because this brings up a question that very many members have before them. I have written perhaps forty letters during the last month to soldiers who have asked me to introduce bills to increase their pensions, and to allow them pensions, where the question of ratable disability was involved; in other words, an appeal from the Pension Office to the House of Representatives. If this bill is that kind of a bill, and the report is somewhat vague, we ought to know it, so we can furnish the committee with abundance of work, as there are thousands of these cases. It may be that there is more than is indicated in this report that makes this an exception. If not, and it is merely a case where the Pension Office does not give a man as much as he thinks he ought to have, I would like to have the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that this bill was reported before the general bill which covers this class of cases, was reported. The Committee on Invalid Pensions have reported a committee bill which covers such cases as this and gives the rating as first exercised by Commissioner Raum.

Mr. LACEY. Then this is practically a repeal of the Bennett case?

Mr. PICKLER. This practically disposes of cases such as the Bennett case.

Mr. LACEY. Then every case under the special act of 1890 would be on the same footing?

Mr. PICKLER. I do not know about that. There is an eighteen-dollar rating for total disability; that is, a dollar for every eighteenth. Now, the report in this case shows that they found four-eighteenths of disability in one cause and two-eighteenths in another, which would make six-eighteenths. According to the present holdings of the Pension Office, unless it shall be shown that the claimant has six-eighteenths in one disability he can not get any pension at all. A case was given to me yesterday in which the Pension Office found forty three-eighteenths, and because the soldier did not have six-eighteenths of any one disability they rejected his claim. Now, it seems to the committee that is out of all reason, and this man was clearly entitled to $6 per month, as he was found to have four-eighteenths and two-eighteenths. From the circumstances surrounding the case the committee were of the opinion that he was equitably entitled to $12 a month.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced by myself and I should be pleased to give the committee any information they desire in regard to the condition of this man. It will appear from the report that he enlisted in 1862 and served upward of three years, making a very honorable record; that after leaving the Army he applied for a pension and was given a rating of $2 a month for disability incurred in the service. That was increased from time to time until 1878, when it was claimed on an examination that the disability of injury to the spine had ceased to exist.

Now, it appears that many times an injury of that kind does not appear upon the surface, and it is so considered in this case. Information came to me from conversation with the man himself, and also from his comrades and neighbors, which shows that he has been unable to do a day's work during the last three years. They sent a petition to me requesting me to introduce a bill and make the statement that this man is upward of 60 years of age; that he had been totally dependent upon the little pension he had; that to-day he was helpless and would have to be assisted by the public unless the pension were given to him.

The rating that was given in 1892 would entitle him to $6 a month, as shown by the medical examination; but since that date the man has grown worse. He is getting older, is totally disabled, and appeals to this Congress to take into consideration his honorable record and his condition and grant him the mere pittance of $12 a month for his services.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say if the gentleman from Canada will stop his fog horn and his idle vaporing long enongh, and if he will get back into his seat and quit talking about hanging people, for some people I know of are not worth hanging, I want to say I think this pension ought to be granted. [Laughter and applause.] Here is a brave old Union soldier [laughter], against whom nothing can be brought, and while his claims were denied at the Pension Office originally, it has been shown to the committee and by this report that at the time he would have been entitled to $6 a month, and since that time his rheumatism and other ailments have increased to such an extent as to make him under the law entitled to a still higher rate of pension.

It appeals to my sense of justice, and, as I said in opposing the other pension, I do not think it is right to give it; but here is one before us in which I think it is, and I am honest enough to say that this old soldier, against whom nothing can be brought, ought to have this pension, and I am willing to give it to him. [Applause.]

I am sorry that the gentleman from Canada has left so early, for I wanted to say to him that I hope he will quit talking about hanging a man that has been dead for seventy-five years. If he must hang people, let him try to hang living folks, and then he will show a little more bravery; and I want to say right here, gentlemen, that you do not find the old soldiers who met each other in the red blaze of battle fighting the war over again now. That is generally done by those who in time of peace are invincible, but

in time of war were invisible. [Laughter.] I hope this bill will pass. I give it my hearty indorsement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside, to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LEWIS C. SCHILLING.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Schilling.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that bill be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CHARLES A. FOSTER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to Charles A. Foster, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll of the United States the name of Charles A. Foster, late acting assistant surgeon United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to oppose this bill, but I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to a general bill upon this subject (No. 3131) which I had the honor to introduce in the House, and I hope that before other private bills of this character are reported favorably that general bill will receive the consideration of the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. In reply to the gentleman from New Hampshire, I will say that in the general bill already reported we have provided for these cases.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that bill, to come in at the end.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Provided, That the pension herein granted shall be paid to Charles A. Foster, and that no part of it shall be retained by any authority to reimburse the Government for any pension heretofore paid.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is an attempt to pension by a special bill one of a large class, and it is therefore open to the objections which lie against all of that kind of special legislation. I understand also that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] has reported a general bill in which this class of claimants, and probably teamsters, and I do not know but camp followers also, are all provided for. However, when it is proposed to pension any of these as a class, we can consider that question; but I deem it unfair and unjust to a large number of people similarly situated to allow a special bill of this character to go through, especially in view of the fact that it is proposed to give this man arrearages of pension indirectly, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, under the old law there was no question but what contract surgeons came under the law, and they are receiving pensions now. Under the act of 1890, as first construed, pensions were granted to this class of army surgeons and assistant surgeons, and this man enjoyed a pension from 1890 to 1895, when he and some others were stricken from the rolls, it being held—and I think, perhaps, according to the strict letter, although I do not believe it was the intent of the law—that this class of surgeons did not come under the provisions of the act of 1890. This man is 80 years of age, and I do not believe that he can wait long enough on this earth for us to pass a general law on this subject, so I think we ought to pass this bill now.

The amendment of Mr. PAYNE was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHN E. EVANS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3432) for the relief of John E. Evans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of John E. Evans, late sergeant, United States Marine Corps, on board United States sloop of war *Jamestown*, on the pension roll at $30 per month.

The report (by Mr. MILES) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3432) granting increase of pension to John E. Evans, having carefully considered the same, respectfully submit the following report:

The claimant enlisted in the United States Marine Corps July 14, 1862, and was honorably discharged therefrom. He again enlisted January 17, 1871, and was discharged May 20, 1872. He is now pensioned under the general laws at $12 for rheumatism, resulting disease of heart, chronic diarrhea, and resulting disease of rectum.

While in the first service he has a record of treatment for "diarrhea," vertigo, "epileptic attack," bilious colic, and bronchitis. While in the second service he has a record for treatment for "abscess," "phthisis pulmonalis, with cough and night sweats;" "severe spasm," "attack of epileptiform kind, also hæmoptysis."

Claimant has been examined four times within the last five years. The examination of June 7, 1895, shows that "this man can do no effective manual labor," and another, had on August 20, 1895, shows incapacity "in a degree equivalent to loss of a hand or foot for purposes of manual labor."

The evidence on file in the Pension Bureau discloses the fact that the claimant is afflicted with nervous affection to a degree which totally incapacitates him, and the further fact that it originated in the service. It appears, however, that he is unable to obtain a pension commensurate with his disability, because he does not understand the nature of his disease, and is misled by the belief that he is affected with heart trouble.

Your committee, therefore, in view of all the facts, respectfully report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon in this case to oppose with all the power I have the granting of a pension of $30 a month. I want clearly to define my position. This man is entitled to a pension under the law of 1890 of $12 a month, which he is now receiving, and there is no law in existence, nor any conceivable stretching of any law, that could give him any greater pension than that. Now, I want to say to my Republican friends——

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman understand that this man is getting $12 a month under the old law?

Mr. LOUD. No; under the new law.

Mr. PICKLER. No; he is getting it under the old law.

Mr. LOUD. Well, your report does not so state.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. LOUD. I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the House, that I do not think the Commitee on Invalid Pensions are treating the House with proper courtesy in the reports which they present here——

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will allow me, I refer him to the sixth line of the report, where this statement is made:

He is now pensioned under the general laws at $12 for rheumatism, resulting disease of heart, chronic diarrhea, and resulting disease of rectum.

Mr. LOUD. That is all right.

Mr. PICKLER. That is what I said.

Mr. LOUD. I admit that he is being pensioned under the "general law," but I claim it is under the law of 1890.

Mr. PICKLER. No; it is under the old law.

Mr. LOUD. Well, I assume that it is under the law of 1890.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will not undertake to controvert the report.

Mr. LOUD. I want to say to the gentleman that it appears by the very report in this case that this man did not contract these diseases during his service in the Army or in the Navy. The principal diseases which are recited in the report were treated during this man's first service, yet notwithstanding that fact he was well enough in 1872 to enlist in the Marine Corps, in which the examination is the most searching that is required in any branch of the service.

Mr. Chairman, these are facts, and they can not be denied. This case stands substantially on the same plane as the case of Kate Pittman. I know nothing of the papers on file in the Pension Office, but it appears to me exactly in the same light as that case, as far as the report of the committee shows anything about it.

Now, I wish to say to my Republican friends, that if you are going to pension every man who is disabled to-day in this country it ought to be done by a general law. But on behalf of the old soldiers of the country I appeal to you to make no exceptions in individual cases of this kind. If it is right to pension a man at $30 or $50 per month, then it is right to pension every man who is disabled at the present time, under similar circumstances, at the same rate, although it may not be the result of his service during the war. I have, you have, and no doubt every member present has, twenty-five or more men in his district, of his personal acquaintance perhaps, who stand on precisely the same footing as this one, men who are blind or paralyzed who have been trying day by day and year by year ever since the close of the war to connect their present disability with the service, and it is impossible for them to do so. And I say to you whenever a man becomes disabled or blind twenty-five or thirty years after the close of the war that it is a very large stretch of the imagination to connect that disability with the service.

I repeat, I feel about this case as I did in the case of Kate Pittman. I do not propose to raise the point of order of no quorum in the Committee of the Whole on the consideration of this case; but in reference to this, and all cases of a similar character, I will require you to furnish a quorum in the House, because I do not think such bills ought to pass under any other circumstances.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, very well, we will do that.

Mr. LOUD. All right. I reserve to myself the right to demand a quorum; and I am perfectly willing to stand on that record before the soldiers of this country. I am satisfied that they want, and all that they want, is justice and equity for all, and not justice and equity, as you consider it in the committee, for the few.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the House, and to the gentleman from California who has just taken his seat, that I have seen this old soldier myself, and I am very sorry that I could not file him as an exhibit with my report in this case.

Mr. LOUD. I do not care anything about his present condition.

Mr. MILES. I will come to the other points directly.

If you will read the report carefully, I think you will see that it sets out the fact that in the opinion of the man who made the report—and I can consult no other man's judgment than my own, and no other man's conscience than my own in the preparation of

these reports—after reading the whole record in the case, and examining the evidence in the Pension Department, I came to the conclusion that this old soldier has to-day the same epilepsy which he had in the war; and I want to say to the gentleman from California that if he knows anything of the disease called epilepsy, he knows that it is a peculiar and an insidious disease, and how hard it is for expert physicians even to discover it. It is entirely possible, therefore, that when this man reenlisted in the service of the Marine Corps the epilepsy was not discernible even by an expert.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MILES. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask the gentleman if the testimony of the physician or the medical expert brought to bear in pension cases is not just as good an opinion as his or mine?

Mr. MILES. That is very true, but the gentleman knows well that the medical expert, if a man mistakes his disease in his application, never comes to his rescue to tell him what it is, and the Department will not do it. He must file his application, alleging his disease, or they will not aid him and tell him what disease he is suffering from. The gentleman knows very well how difficult it is for a man to understand exactly what his own disease is.

The War Department records, however, allege that this man had epilepsy during the service, and was treated for that, and if my friend should see him I have no doubt that he would conclude that he had it to-day. But the man does not know it himself; and the gentleman knows full well that people afflicted with this disease are always averse to acknowledging it.

Mr. LOUD. And even the committee could not convince him that he had it?

Mr. MILES. Well, I never mentioned it to him myself. It is twice mentioned in the war records, and it is also mentioned in the report. The record of the case shows that he was suffering with this disease. I have reported to the House that I believed the disease from which he is suffering had its origin in the service. So believing, I reported that I thought it a meritorious case. I believe it to be a worthy case, and one that the House should act upon and pass.

I wish to say that I never introduced the bill myself. I know nothing of the man, and knew nothing of him until I saw him in the room of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. The bill was introduced by Mr. PICKLER, the gentleman from South Dakota, and he may know something more of it than I do. As far as I know of the case, however, I am satisfied of its merits, and this I gather from my own examination of the record in the office.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, all I know about this is that I have known this old soldier for about a year here in the District of Columbia. I do not know what employment he has, or whether he has any; but, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES] has well said, this man is to-day a physical wreck. He appeared before the Committee on Invalid Pensions. He was treated for this epilepsy in both services. He was treated for it during the first service, and in the second service he was treated for the same disease. He is totally incapacitated from performing manual labor. Thirty dollars is what the law allows for that form of disability, and we are standing exactly upon the pension laws.

The only trouble about this case is that this old man says all the time that he has heart disease, and he has alleged heart disease in his application. The Pension Office finds that that is not what is the matter with him, but it is epilepsy, and that is all the trouble there is about getting his claim through. Had he alleged epilepsy there is no question but what he would have had his $30 a month. I believe if there is a just bill on the Calendar this is one of them. This is exactly the amount that is allowed by law to every soldier who proves he is totally incapacitated from performing manual labor. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to allow this case to go over for one week.

Mr. MILES. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] understands the law that if this soldier is totally disabled he is entitled to what this bill gives him.

Mr. LOUD. If he is totally disabled as to the result of his service, yes. I understand the law. It makes a great deal of difference whose ox is gored, I find in cases here.

Mr. MILES. This is no ox of mine.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman advocates this case because he reported it. The gentleman advocated the pensioning of a woman at $72 a month, which bill, I am free to confess, would not have been passed without a quorum if I had been on the floor of the House. I think the chairman would do better to let this case go over. In view of the fact that you can not convince this applicant himself that he is suffering from this disease, how can you expect to convince the Pension Department?

Mr. PICKLER. As I understand, the gentleman from California has got his knife out, and is going——

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no; I have not got any knife out. I am here in the interest of justice and equity.

Mr. PICKLER. You declared publicly that you were going to raise the question of no quorum in cases of which you did not approve.

Mr. MILES. I had about taken the floor for the purpose of extending the courtesy to the gentleman from California which he asked, but he has been so discourteous in his language that I can not get the consent of my mind to do so. I thought his request was reasonable. I have no interest whatever in this case. I did not introduce the bill. I have applied to the consideration of this case my conscience and my best judgment. The gentleman insinuates the contrary, and to no man making such an insinuation will I, without an apology, ever extend a courtesy.

Mr. TALBERT. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I understood him to state that this applicant was first said to be suffering from heart disease, but that it turned out upon examination by the authorities not to be heart disease, but epilepsy. I am not a doctor, but I want to ask the gentleman, who may be a doctor, if epilepsy is not an indirect effect of some heart trouble?

Mr. PICKLER. I give it up. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JULIA A. HILL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Julia A. Hill, widow of Charles W. Hill, late colonel of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SULLOWAY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill, having carefully examined the same, together with the evidence submitted, adopt the accompanying Senate report (No. 5) as their own, and respectfully report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill passed the Senate in its present form December 21, 1895.

[Senate Report No. 5, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill, having examined the same, beg leave to report as follows:

This bill passed the Senate in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, but was not considered by the House. The reports already made cover all the facts in the case.

Claimant is the widow of Col. Charles W. Hill, late of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry. Soldier was mustered into service December 25, 1863, and remained in service until July 13, 1865, the close of the war. He died in Toledo, Ohio, November 24, 1881, of brain disease, alleged to have been the result of sunstroke received while in the military service. Prior to his service in the United States Army he was commissioned by the governor of Ohio as brigadier-general and was placed in command of the State troops in West Virginia, where he rendered important service. The widow applied for pension, which was finally rejected, chiefly on the ground of unsoundness prior to enlistment.

To arrive at a clear understanding of this case it will be necessary to review the testimony at length, which, it is proper to say, is somewhat conflicting.

When the widow's claim was filed the Pension Bureau called upon the Adjutant-General's Office for information as to the military service of the soldier, and received this reply:

"Charles W. Hill was mustered into the service of the United States as colonel of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers, to date December 25, 1863, to serve three years or during the war. On the muster roll of F. and S. of that regiment for the months of January and February, 1864, he is reported present, and so borne to August 31, 1864. September and October, 1864, absent commanding United States forces at Johnsons Island and Sandusky, Ohio. Subsequent rolls to June 30, 1865, present. He was mustered out with regiment July 13, 1865.

"Regimental returns: October, 1864, on leave of absence. March, 1865, absent with leave. All other returns (February, 1865, alone missing), present. Organization books are incomplete and furnish no information in this claim. He was granted leave of absence for fifteen days October 25, 1864, on surgeon's certificate, which is not on file, and nature of disability not of record. Again for fourteen days November 12, 1864, on private business. Again for one day January 15, 1865, private business. For ten days March 31, 1865, on surgeon's certificate, of which the following is a copy:

"'Col. Charles W. Hill, of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers, having applied for a certificate on which to ground an application for leave of absence, I do hereby certify that I have carefully examined this officer and find that he is suffering with chronic ulcerations of the mouth and general nervous prostration, caused by impaired digestion and anæmia, and in consequence thereof he is in my opinion unfit for duty. I further declare my belief that he will not be able to resume his duties in a less period than fifteen days.

"'Dated at Johnsons Island, Ohio, this 22d day of March, 1865.

"'H. EVERMAN,

"'*Surgeon, U. S. Volunteers, Chief Medical Officer.*'

"And finally for five days, June 19, 1865, on private business.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"M. BARBER,

"*Assistant Adjutant-General.*

"By WM. ARMSTRONG."

It will be interesting to briefly review the facts as presented in the above statement. In the first place, it appears that soldier served continuously from December, 1863, until October, 1864, before he applied for sick leave, and it further appears that the records were so carelessly kept as not to show the cause of disability. Again, in March, 1865, sixteen months after enlistment, he secured sick leave, the certificate showing that he had ulcers of the mouth and general nervous prostration, caused by impaired digestion, the surgeon giving it as his opinion that the soldier would not be able for duty in a less time than fifteen days—from which it would seem that the disability could not have been of long standing.

The widow's application for pension was based on the ground that soldier suffered sunstroke in the Army, and all the medical evidence goes to show that he died from softening of the brain; but the Department rejected the claim on the ground that the brain disease was not due to ulceration of the

mouth and general nervous prostration, and that it was not otherwise shown to be due to military service; and it was also claimed that he had trouble with his head prior to enlistment.

So far as the record shows no one ever claimed that the ulceration of mouth and nervous prostration had anything to do with the death cause. The claim set up was that the soldier sustained sunstroke while in the service, which ended in fatal brain disease. On this point the widow was not able to produce conclusive proof, yet a mass of circumstantial evidence is on file which ought to be given great weight, and it is possible that if the army records had been carefully kept it would appear that soldier's first sick leave was in consequence of sunstroke, to which he frequently alluded after discharge as the cause of his ill health.

Six different special examiners had charge of the case, four of whom expressed an opinion that the case was meritorious, and the other two reported against it. The adverse reports were made on the ground that the soldier was not sound at the time of enlistment. It is evident that prejudiced testimony was given on this point by children of soldier by a former wife, between whom and claimant unfriendliness existed. Claimant furnished a large number of certificates, medical and otherwise, showing that soldier was in excellent health at the time he entered the service, which is strongly corroborated by the fact that, after serving three months, in 1861 he entered the service of the State as adjutant-general, where he remained until December, 1863, when he took charge of a regiment, in which capacity he served for almost one year before asking for sick leave. Had he been an invalid when he enlisted, it is hardly to be supposed that he could have undergone the fatigues and exposure of that length of time without medical aid.

The following affidavits have an important bearing on the cause of death:

STATE OF OHIO, *Lucas County, ss:*

On the 15th day of November, A. D. 1883, personally appeared before me the undersigned, Dr. James L. Chase, who, being by me duly sworn, says that he now is, and has been for over forty years, a practicing physician, and was well and intimately acquainted with Charles W. Hill, late colonel of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry. That affiant was the attending physician at the death of Charles W. Hill. That said Hill died at Toledo, Ohio, on the 24th day of November, 1881, of paralysis, superinduced and brought about by softening of the brain, and that said softening of the brain was caused by a sunstroke which said Hill received in the military service. Affiant well knew said Hill before he entered the Army, and he was then a sound and healthy man, free from any brain difficulty. * * * Affiant was intimate with said Hill from the time he returned from the service till the day of his death, and affiant knows that said Hill never recovered from said sunstroke, and always suffered therefrom, as he verily believes.

JAMES L. CHASE, *M. D.*

Above affidavit was given at Toledo, Ohio, and sworn to before Andrew Farquharson, notary public.

The following medical certificate is likewise of interest:

NASHUA, N. H., *November 16, 1886.*

This certifies that in July, 1878, I was called to see Gen. Charles W. Hill, late colonel of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteers. From appearances disclosed on examination great distress in head and lack of power both of body and mind. I regarded the disease as progressive breaking down of the substance of the brain, and as a very probable consequence of sunstroke; and from the history of the case, the long duration of the symptoms, and the unsuccessful result obtained from treatment, I should consider there was no doubt but that he contracted the disease while in the service.

S. G. DEARBORN, M. D.,
Late Surgeon New Hampshire Volunteers.

(Sworn to.)

Dr. Woodbridge, of Youngstown, Ohio, an army surgeon, gives a similar opinion, and testified that he frequently heard Colonel Hill while in the service, complain of trouble with his head.

The only adverse medical testimony in the case is found in an affidavit by Dr. D. B. Sturges, of Pittsburg, Pa., who swears that he first knew Colonel Hill in December, 1864, when he was suffering from indigestion and ulceration of the mucous membrane of the mouth. Dr. Sturges gave it as his opinion that the ulcers were due to a scrofulous diathesis, which condition probably existed before enlistment, and it is evident that in deciding the case the Pension Bureau attached great weight to this affidavit, notwithstanding Dr. Sturges did not know the soldier before enlistment, while Dr. Chase knew him before enlistment, attended him in his final illness, and came to an entirely different conclusion.

On the question of soundness at date of enlistment there are scores of affidavits on file from persons who knew Colonel Hill intimately, and who testify that he was entirely sound when he entered the military service. These affidavits are given by bank officials, by merchants, by lawyers, judges, and other reputable citizens. On that point the testimony is absolutely overwhelming; but notwithstanding that, the question of prior unsoundness seems to have cut quite a figure in the final determination of the case.

The claimant in this case is at present a resident of Milford, N. H., engaged in teaching, from which she must soon retire, as she is in poor health. She has nothing except what she earns. The equities in the case seem to be wholly on her side, and although there is conflicting testimony, and very likely the evidence was not sufficiently conclusive to warrant the Pension Bureau in favorably considering the claim, your committee are of the opinion that the case is a meritorious one, and therefore report the bill back favorably and recommend its passage.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much does this bill carry?

Mr. PICKLER. This is a Senate bill. This lady is the widow of a colonel. By the passage of this bill she will get $30 a month.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

MICHAEL M'KENNA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3596) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McKenna.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing upon the records of the War Department against the name of Michael McKenna, alias David Dunton, late of Company F, First United States Dragoons, and to grant him an honorable discharge.

The Committee on Military Affairs recommended an amendment, to add to the bill the following:

To date July 31, 1848: *Provided*, That this shall not entitle such soldier to any pay or emoluments, except pension, which he would not otherwise be allowed.

The report (by Mr. BISHOP) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3596) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McKenna, alias David Dunton, would respectfully report the same back to the House, and recommend that the bill be amended by adding:

"To date July 31, 1848: *Provided*, This act shall not entitle such soldier to any pay or emoluments, except pension, which he would not otherwise be allowed."

And that the bill when so amended do pass.

This soldier ran away from home at the age of 11 years, enlisted under an assumed name as a bugler, and served through the Mexican war. When peace was declared and his regiment returned to the States, his parents found out where he was and took him home without the formality of a discharge. He enlisted again in the same troop in 1853, served five years, and was honorably discharged.

Owing to his enlistment at such a tender age, his faithful service through the Mexican war, his subsequent enlistment and honorable discharge, your committee are of the opinion this act of clemency should be extended.

The Adjutant-General's report is as follows:

"WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.
"*Washington, D. C., February 16, 1895.*

"Respectfully returned to Hon. Jos. H. Outhwaite, chairman Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

"It appears from the records of this office that David Dunton was enlisted on the 9th day of December, 1846, at Saltillo, Mexico and was assigned to Troop F, First Regiment of United States Dragoons. Muster roll of troop for July and August, 1848, reports him 'Deserted July 31, 1848, at camp at Carrollton race course, near New Orleans, La.,' a private. Records show him to be a deserter at large from this enlistment.

"He enlisted again June 18, 1853, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in band, First United States Dragoons, under name of Michael McKenna, in violation of the twenty-second (now fiftieth) article of war, being a deserter at large. Discharged June 18, 1858, at Fort Tejon, Cal., by expiration of service, a private.

"H. C. CORBIN,
"*Assistant Adjutant-General.*"

Application for removal of charge of desertion.

TERRITORY OF ARIZONA, *County of Pima, ss:*

On this 2d day of December, A. D. 1890, personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the county of Pima, in the Territory of Arizona, David Dunton, alias Michael McKenna, now a resident of Tucson, county of Pima, Ariz., who, being duly sworn, declares that he is the identical David Dunton, alias Michael McKenna, who was a bugler in Company F, in the First Regiment of the United States Dragoons; that he was enlisted in said company and regiment during the latter part of 1846 at Camargo, Mexico, by Capt. Philip Kearney, mustered into service during the bombardment in 1847 at Vera Cruz, Mexico; that he served faithfully until on or about the 31st day of July, 1848, when, without any intention of deserting, he left the regiment under the following circumstances: His father obtained permission from the commanding officer to take him home to see the family, with the understanding that he was to be returned to camp the next morning. Upon reporting next morning, found the regiment had embarked on a steamer up the Mississippi River, and, not knowing where to report, he returned home.

Subsequently, in June, 1853, he again enlisted in the First United States Dragoons and was assigned to the band.

(The applicant is unable to give the exact date of his enlistment and mustering into service, but knows that he joined the company in camp below Camargo, soon after they arrived from the East, and was sworn in just before the bombardment of Vera Cruz.)

This declaration is made for the purpose of securing a removal of the charge of desertion, and he hereby appoints, with full power of substitution and revocation, M. V. Tierney, of Washington, D. C., his attorney to present this application, and to receive and receipt for the discharge that may be issued thereon, and to do any and all acts necessary to effect the purpose of his said appointment.

His post-office address is Tucson, Ariz.

MICHAEL MCKENNA.

ADAMS SANDERS.
T. G. RUSK.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that here is another case which is not meritorious. It is the case of a deserter asking to have the charge of desertion removed, and it does seem to me that there are other cases much more meritorious, and that this case ought to be laid aside at least, and let other cases be considered.

Mr. BOWERS. Will my friend allow me to make a statement?

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. BOWERS. This boy was 11 years of age when he enlisted, and he served through the war—he was a bugler—so that when he went home after the war he would have been only about 14 years old. Then he reenlisted in the same troop, served five years, and was honorably discharged.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. TALBERT. I will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PARKER. This was a boy 11 years of age. His father lived near New Orleans. The boy ran away and enlisted under the name of David Dunton, so as not to be caught and taken home. When they got down into Mexico an officer in charge of one of the troops of dragoons took him from the company in which he was and had him taught to be bugler of his troop. He served through the war, came up near New Orleans, and was there with the regiment on a boat. His father found him, and asked if he could not go home with him for a while. The lieutenant said, "I do not know; we may have to leave at any time." The father took this little tot, about 13 years of age, with him, and when they came back the boat was gone. He shortly afterwards enlisted in the same regiment and battalion as an older boy, got into the band, and stayed there five years. Having gotten older, and I am sorry to say a little poorer, he comes here and says, "I served all through the war, and when I asked for a pension they say it could not be granted because they say I deserted. I did not."

Mr. TALBERT. This case is all right. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bills to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PAYNE having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole House had had under consideration sundry bills on the Private Calendar, and had directed him to report them to the House with various recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first bill reported from the Committee of the Whole two weeks ago.

MARTHA BROOKS.

The first bill reported from the Committee of the Whole was the bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 strike out the word "twenty" and insert the word "twelve."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ERDMAN. I would like the gentleman who has charge of that bill to state what it was. I do not recollect it now.

Mr. BRODERICK. That bill was recommended for passage two weeks ago, at the last evening session we had for the consideration of bills of this character. It was fully explained then, and recommended for passage without division. It is the case of an old lady, the gentleman will remember, 83 years of age, who is a dependent mother. There is no question about the evidence, and there was no question in the committee. The report was unanimous, and there was no question here when the bill was recommended for passage.

Mr. ERDMAN. How much does the bill carry?

Mr. BRODERICK. Twelve dollars. I introduced it for $20 and the committee amended it, making the rate $12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN D. WRIGHT.

The next bill reported from the Committee of the Whole was the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw that bill from further consideration of the House. The morning after it passed the Committee of the Whole I received notice that Mrs. Wright was dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw the bill from the consideration of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection, the bill will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

KATE A. PITMAN.

The next business reported from the Committee of the Whole was the bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there be no objection, the amendments will be voted on in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

RACHEL PATTON.

The next business reported from the Committee of the Whole was the bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton.

The amendment recommended by the Committee of the Whole was reported.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what that bill is. I do not recall it.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. It passed to-night.

Mr. ERDMAN. If that is the remarried-widow bill, I shall require a quorum to vote upon it.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, so far as this amendment is concerned there is no reason why it should be adopted, except that it was put in there that there should not be any misunderstanding in regard to it.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment, and that the bill lie over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. MILES. I object, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to have to object, but I am opposed on principle to granting pensions to these remarried widows, and I must interpose all objections known to parliamentary practice when it is attempted to pass bills of this character.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Maryland object to the bill being laid aside?

Mr. MILES. I have no objection to its being laid aside, but I do object to its retaining its place. I want it to go to the foot of the Calendar.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question being taken on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill the Speaker pro tempore declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ERDMAN. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 6.

Mr. ERDMAN. No quorum.

Mr. PICKLER. Will not the gentleman consent to let this bill go over, retaining its place on the Calendar, so that we may proceed with the other bills? Will he not withdraw his point of no quorum and let us dispose of bills to which there is no objection?

Mr. ERDMAN. I will say to the gentleman that his appeal comes too late.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How many members constitute a quorum in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hundred and seventy-nine.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, who raised the point of no quorum?

Mr. ERDMAN. I made the point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned until 12 o'clock Saturday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Civil Service Commissioners, replying to the House resolution of February 4, in relation to the efficiency of employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriations for defraying the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which were referred bills of the following titles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by reports; and said bills and reports were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union:

The bill (H. R. 1414) to establish the Mahon River light station, Delaware River, on a new site. (Report No. 369.)

The bill (H. R. 5363) making an appropriation for a fog signal on the north pier of the entrance to Menominee Harbor, Wisconsin. (Report No. 370.)

The bill (H. R. 3552) providing for sundry lights, etc., in Lakes Huron and Superior. (Report No. 371.)

The bill (H. R. 55) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near Big Oyster Bed Shoal, New Jersey. (Report No. 372.)

The bill (H. R. 4989) establishing gas buoys in the St. Lawrence River. (Report No. 373.)

Mr. TRACEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 175) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain uses of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park, and other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 374); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROSIUS, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3822) to abolish the office of Solicitor of Internal Revenue, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 375); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FISCHER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5382) to authorize the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company to extend its line of railroad into the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 376); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5293) for a light vessel off Fire Island, New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 378); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS of New York, from the Committee on Military

Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 85) relative to the medal of honor authorized by acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 379); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred a bill of the House (H. R. 3621) reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 6120) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, accompanied by a report (No. 381); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3278) to amend section 1 of an act approved December 21, 1893, entitled "An act to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 382); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. WASHINGTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 1601) to amend the military record of John S. Evans. (Report No. 366.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 5610) for the relief of George T. Stevens, assistant surgeon Seventy-seventh New York Volunteers. (Report No. 367.)

By Mr. TRACEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 1609) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Fleming, of Battery E, Third United States Artillery. (Report No. 368.)

By Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands: The bill (S. 818) for the relief of Halvor K. Omlie, of Homen, N. Dak. (Report No. 377.)

By Mr. CURTIS of New York, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2263) to place Lieut. Col. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army. (Report No. 380.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6060) appropriating $960.96 to pay for paving in front of post-office in the city of Ottumwa, Iowa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6061) to authorize the purchase of the portrait of William Henry Harrison, late President of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 6062) to amend section 3621 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the deposit of revenues—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6063) to amend section 12 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved July 31, 1894, relating to delinquent officials—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. PITNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the provisions of section 4631, Title LXV, "Prize," of the Revised Statutes, and of the act of June 8, 1874, in relation to prize money to fleet officers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 6065) for the coinage of silver dollars, restricted only by the law of supply and demand, and to maintain the parity of gold and silver without loss to the Government—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6066) to amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 6067) to restore the coinage of silver dollars, and to redeem greenbacks and Treasury notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 6116) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effect of convict competition by confining the sale of goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State or Territory in which they are produced—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 6117) to rectify existing subdivision and prepare a permanent plan of highways over all lands not subdivided in the District of Columbia lying outside of the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6118) granting a pension to honorably discharged officers, soldiers, and sailors of the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 6119) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A resolution (House Res. No. 167) to allow a clerk to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COFFIN: A resolution (House Res. No. 168) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish estimate of cost of deepening channel in Baltimore Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 5947) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to L. L. Eggleston Post, No. 184, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Deposit, N. Y., a condemned cannon—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bills (H. R. 3674 and H. R. 4262) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 5779) granting a pension to Edna McLauren, with papers to accompany said bill—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Petitions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, and of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, for appropriations for protection of seacoast towns—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorial of the National Board of Trade urging the fortification of the east end of Long Island Sound—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 6068) to correct the military record of William Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ATWOOD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6069) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Christine C. Barnard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) for pension for Annie R. Weeden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6071) granting a pension to George A. Baldwin, of Berkeley, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 6072) for the relief of James Boland—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6073) for the relief of W. H. Harrison—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6074) for the relief of Charles H. Buttner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) amending the military record of John S. Chapman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) granting a pension to Mrs. Wealtha Post Leggett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 6077) to increase the pension of Patrick Culhan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 6078) for the relief of William H. Lankford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) to correct the military record of Jeremiah Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6080) increasing the pension of Gilbert Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) granting a pension to Woodson O. Angel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 6082) to grant a pension to Emeline C. Sewell, widow of Chief Engineer George Sewell, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6083) to restore the pension of Robert W. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) for the relief of George Tucker, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6085) to restore the pension of David M. Sartain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6086) to grant a pension to George Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 6087) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Anna M. Dare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 6088) granting an increase of

pension to Henry H. Jeter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 6089) for the relief of the legal representatives of William W. Hildreth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6090) increasing the pension of Fletcher S. Kidd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6091) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Dixon, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6092) granting a pension to Delia Fry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6093) granting a pension to Richard A. Saint Clair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) to reimburse Jesse C. Hartsock for moneys stolen from post-office of Brandon, Ohio, while he was postmaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 6095) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Philip Schrout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6096) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Christen Heinze—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6097) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Eugene Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6098) granting a pension to John B. Gouldsberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6099) granting a pension to Margaret Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6100) for relief of George W. Pettigrew—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) to pension Mrs. Sarah G. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) to grant honorable discharge to W. H. Wood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 6103) for the relief of the estate of John Caruth, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6104) for the relief of Anton Gloetzner—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 6105) for the relief of D. J. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6106) for relief of James Coleman and Theodore H. N. McPherson—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 6107) for the relief of James C. Brickley, late of Company E, Second Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) granting pension to Tilburn E. Taber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 6109) granting a pension to Anabella Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) granting a pension to Virginia E. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6111) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Sargent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 6112) to correct the military record of William Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 6113) granting Gould P. Austin, of Phœbus, Va., permission to erect a building upon the Government reservation at Fortress Monroe, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 6114) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary F. Hinkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hartley—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6121) to grant a pension to George A. Tillett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) to correct the military record of George A. Tillett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 6123) granting an honorable discharge to Dudley Doherty, late private Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 6124) granting a pension to Susie Margarite Landrum, of Warsaw, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Dr. J. H. Burket and 25 other citizens, of Remington, Pa.; John C. Jones and 17 others, of Washington County; John B. Abrahan and 141 others, F. B. Williamson and 125 others of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. AITKEN: Petition for the removal of the charge of desertion against William Cooper, of Company F, Fifteenth New York Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Albert A. Elmore and 66 others, of Davison, Mich., urging the enactment of a law giving all soldiers and sailors who served not less than ninety days or more not less than $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Petition of G. W. Burling, J. Cauffman, and others, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring a bill for the inspection of immigrants, known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of the Lincoln Association of the Union League of Philadelphia, to make February 12 a national holiday—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Memorial concerning the claim of the Odd Fellows' Hall Association of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of J. H. McLean and others, of Chattanooga, Tenn., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUMM: Petitions of Daniel R. Hey and others, H. H. Bensinger and others, J. A. Shellhamer and others, John Shoener and others, G. W. Berg and others, M. D. Warmkessel and others, S. C. Geist and others, John Kisawelter and others, and Wallace E. Zerbe and others, all of Schuylkill County, Pa., in support of bill to secure a better class of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Memorial of the R. B. Hayes Club, in favor of amending the military record of John S. Chapman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petitions of L. F. Babcock and 114 others, of Midland City; J. B. Wiggins and 51 others, of Midland County; Alex. Nelson and 52 others, of Arenac County, all of the State of Michigan, favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Samuel Morris and 97 others, of McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 5246—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Thomas P. Jacobs and 51 others, of New Martinsville, W. Va., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Petition of citizens of White Plains, N. Y., favoring the enactment of a new immigration law—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FISCHER: Papers to accompany House bill for a pension to Emeline C. Sewell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of citizens of West Creek, Ocean County, N. J., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Pennsylvania in favor of the passage of an act for the inspection of immigrants coming to the United States who are unfit socially, morally, and physically to become citizens of the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial from the Board of Trade of San Jose, Cal., protesting against the refunding of the debt of the Pacific Railroad—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Board of Trade, concerning a harbor of refuge at Block Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of Warr Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Mitchellville, Iowa, favoring a service-pension bill of $8 per month to all honorably discharged Union soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter of T. H. Stanton, Paymaster-General United States Army, relating to the claim of Col. T. C. English, to be filed with House bill No. 4942—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Indiana, for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of McLaughlin Post, No. 131, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, for a pension of $12 per month to widows of Union soldiers or sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting pension to honorably discharged officers, soldiers, and sailors of the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of C. M. Bickle and others, of Shamokin, Pa., in support of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Frank Schminky and others, of Shamokin, Pa., against appropriating public moneys for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition and evidence for a pension to Margaret Kirkpatrick, army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William Fisher and 25 other citizens of Oklahoma, for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of McCray Post, No. 27, Grand Army of the Republic, of Prairie City, Iowa, favoring the Vicksburg National Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of John L. Springston, as guardian of Nancy Runningcatcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, for an appropriation of $5,000 to enable the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to make a series of exhaustive observations upon the currents of the Bay of San Francisco, the entrance and bar to the bay, and the Gulf of the Farallones, forming the approaches thereto—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, for an appropriation of $1,500 to establish fairway marks upon the south shore of the Golden Gate—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, to retain the telegraph line between San Francisco and the Point Reyes light-house station, and for an appropriation of $2,000 for the construction of a house for the use of the telegraph operator—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, for an appropriation of $200,000 for the minute survey and removal of the dangers to navigation in the harbor of San Francisco and the approaches thereto—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, to have marked upon the entrance sheet of the Bay of San Francisco the line of telegraph, telephone, and military cables that cross the bay, and also to depict upon the same chart the area wherein vessels can not anchor in the bay and harbor of San Francisco—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Committee on Commerce, for properly marked fairway signals to be placed on the south shore of the Golden Gate—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Camden, N. J., for the enactment of the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHON (by request): Petition of James Coleman and Theodore H. N. McPherson—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of J. R. Scott and 250 others, of Putnam County, W. Va., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the Reformed Presbyterian, the United Presbyterian, and the Methodist Episcopal churches, Londonderry, Ohio, praying for the recognition of God in the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Francis G. Hodges and 49 other citizens of Attleboro, Mass., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PITNEY: Petition of 136 citizens of Sussex County, N. J., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Morristown, N. J. (90 members), in favor of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of fleet staff officers of the United States Navy, for the passage of a law granting to them the same share of prize money that has been granted to fleet captains—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of 250 citizens of Warren County, N. J., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of the Oneida (Ill.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PUGH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5901, for the relief of William F. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. S. Patton and 17 others, of Martin County, Ky., for the passage of bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5452, for the relief of Martin Lunsford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5899, for the relief of Mary McGlone and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of restricting immigration and in behalf of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petitions of the Board of Trade of Cairo, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 2779—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of citizens of New Haven County, Conn., concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of numerous citizens of McKean County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARNER: Memorial of soldiers of the late war residing in Towanda, McLean County, Ill., favoring the passage of a law granting a pension of $8 per month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war of the rebellion and was honorably discharged, and a pension of not less than $12 per month to each widow of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Anthony Higgins and 19 others for the enactment of a law to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of citizens of Crawford County, Ill., for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 15, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. ALEXANDER WEBB.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs as to the bill to place Gen. Alexander Webb on the retired list of the Regular Army.

There was no objection.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

The bill and the amendments were read.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask that that bill be now considered and that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

On motion of Mr. QUIGG, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were concurred in was laid on the table.

YANKTON RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

The bill and amendments were read.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. McMILLIN. I desire to know what is the status of this bill.

The SPEAKER. It is a House bill which has been amended by the Senate and been sent back to the House, and, as the Chair understands, it is a bill which would not go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McMILLIN. That being so, is it a proper subject for consideration in this hour?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what amount of land is affected by it.

Mr. LACEY. I can not give the gentleman the exact number of acres, but the Senate amendments include some additional reservations in the State of South Dakota, where the situation is substantially the same as in the one covered by the House bill. The original proposition was this: These settlers entered upon the land too late to plant a crop that year. Under existing laws they could have an extension of a year if they had planted a crop and it had failed; but in this case the crop did not fail; it simply failed to get planted. This bill gives them a year's leave of absence, the same as if the crop had been planted and had failed, but requires them to live an additional year upon the land in order to acquire their homesteads. In other words, they get no

credit for this leave of absence. The Senate has made some amendments to the bill, and I have asked that those amendments be concurred in.

The amendments were concurred in.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were concurred in was laid on the table.

LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ARIZONA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona, with an amendment of the Senate.

The amendment of the Senate was read at length.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to the lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the mineral-land laws of the United States be, and are hereby, extended so as to apply to all lands embraced within the Colville Indian Reservation, namely: Beginning at a point on the eastern boundary line of the Colville Indian Reservation where the township line between townships 34 and 35 north, of range 37 east, of the Willamette meridian if extended west would intersect the same, said point being in the middle of the channel of the Columbia River, and running thence west parallel with the forty-ninth parallel of latitude to the western boundary line of said Colville Indian Reservation in the Okanogan River, thence north following the said western boundary line to the said forty-ninth parallel of latitude, thence east along the said forty-ninth parallel of latitude to the northeast corner of the said Colville Indian Reservation, thence south following the eastern boundary of said reservation to the place of beginning: *Provided*, That the land used and occupied for school purposes at what is known as Tonasket School, on Bonapart Creek, and the site of the sawmill, gristmill, and other mill property on said reservation, is hereby reserved from the operation of this act, unless other lands are selected in lieu thereof as provided in section 6 of the act which became a law, without the approval of the President, July 1, 1892, entitled "An act to provide for the opening of a part of the Colville Reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, passed the Senate, and was reported favorably by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House. There is no objection to it from any quarter, and it is recommended by the Interior Department.

Mr. McMILLIN. Reserving the right to object—unanimous consent, I believe, not having been given yet for the consideration of the bill—I would like to ask for the reading of the report, one of them, either the House or Senate report.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I have adopted the Senate report and incorporated it in the House report from the Committee on Indian Affairs. It shows the recommendation of the Department of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who also recommend an amendment, which was adopted by the Senate and is a part of the bill. This bill has been recommended by all of the Government officials.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman states on whose recommendation it was made, but gives no information concerning the bill. That is what I am trying to get at. I am willing to take the statement of the gentleman in place of the report, but it seems to me, in a matter so comprehensive as this, we ought at least to have some understanding as to what we are doing.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the reservation to which this bill relates is in the State of Washington. There is legislation pending now having for its purpose the opening of the reservation. That has been going on for some time. There are well-known mineral lands in the reservation, and this provides that the mineral lands may be segregated from the great body of the lands——

Mr. SAYERS. What reservation does this refer to?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The Colville Reservation.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will ask the gentleman if the purpose of segregating the lands—the mineral lands—is for the purpose of ascertaining their value?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Oh, no; it is only that these mineral lands, which are recognized as quite valuable, shall be placed under the well-known mineral-land laws of the United States. These lands are in the north half of the reservation.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is this land that has been bought from the Indians by the United States?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. No; the reservation is being opened and the lands are to be allotted. It was an Executive-order reservation, and not a result of legislation.

It seems to me that it ought to be satisfactory to the House when all the officials of the Department, the Secretary of the Interior and all, have agreed to it and recommend it.

Mr. BOATNER. I think we will do little harm when we accept the recommendation of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendment recommended by the committee was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. DOOLITTLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

POWER OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to inquire as to the condition of the law on the subject of the right of the executive officers of the Government, in the several Departments thereof, to refuse to enforce, execute, or comply with the provisions of any act of the Congress of the United States on the ground of its alleged unconstitutionality or for other reasons, and to report to the House by bill or otherwise.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McMILLIN. I believe the right to object has not yet been waived in this case. I am willing that the gentleman from New York shall state the purpose of this resolution and the effect of it.

Mr. RAY. Perhaps I should say a word by way of explanation of the resolution.

It grows out of the recent refusal of the Comptroller of the United States Treasury to execute a law passed by Congress appropriating money for the payment of the sugar bounty. The Comptroller raised the question, when the matter came to him, that the appropriation was unconstitutional, and he therefore refused to certify and pay the money. It resulted in the question being sent to the Court of Claims under an act of Congress claimed to be applicable.

The question was very thoroughly argued before the Comptroller as to whether or not he had jurisdiction or a right to raise the constitutional question, and whether, under an act of Congress, he had power to take the action that he did take. Very able arguments were made on both sides of the question by gentlemen learned in the law; and it must be conceded, on all hands, that the question is one not entirely free from doubt.

January 3, 1896, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] introduced into this House a resolution (H. Res. 84). That resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and after careful consideration that committee agreed upon and reported back a substitute, House resolution No. 125, accompanied by Report No. 105.

The original resolution recited certain matters or transactions connected with the Treasury Department of the United States growing out of and connected with the nonpayment of certain sugar bounties earned under the tariff act of October 1, 1890, and the payment of which was provided for by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," and which act made an appropriation of $5,238,289 for the payment of such bounties.

Certain claims for such bounties having been presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and by him allowed, same were certified to the Auditor of the Treasury Department.

The first claim so allowed was that of the Oxnard Beet Sugar Company, and amounted to $11,782.50. The Auditor proposed to allow such claim and certify the amount thereof for payment from the appropriation of March 2, 1895. Acting under the provisions of section 8 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. L., 208), the Auditor certified this decision to the Comptroller as an original construction of the statute making the appropriation.

It will be noted that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives had, by appropriating the money for the payment of these claims, asserted the constitutionality of the tariff act of October 1, 1890; that the President of the United States had assumed and asserted its constitutionality by approving the act of March 2, 1895; that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had assumed and asserted the constitutionality of both acts by allowing and certifying the claim, and that the Auditor of the Treasury Department had reiterated and acquiesced in these holdings by passing and proposing to pass this claim. But when the matter came to the Comptroller of the Treasury Department for final certification and payment he refused, or at least suspended, payment, and called upon the Oxnard Beet Sugar Company and other claimants under the same to show why the Comptroller should not hold that the tariff act of October 1, 1890, was unconstitutional, and consequently the act of March 2, 1895, appropriating money to pay the bounties earned under that law, unconstitutional also.

After several hearings the Comptroller adhered to the opinion that the appropriation was unconstitutional, and acting under the provisions of section 1063, Revised Statutes of the United States, he returned the papers in the case to the Auditor, who transmitted

same to the Secretary of the Treasury, and he transmitted same to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

Section 1063, Revised Statutes, provides as follows:

Whenever any claim is made against any Executive Department involving disputed facts or controverted questions of law, where the amount in controversy exceeds $3,000, or where the decision will affect a class of cases or furnish a precedent for the future action of any Executive Department in the adjustment of a class of cases, without regard to the amount involved in the particular case, or where any authority, right, privilege, or exemption is claimed or denied under the Constitution of the United States, the head of such Department may cause such claim, with all the vouchers, papers, proofs, and documents pertaining thereto, to be transmitted to the Court of Claims, and the same shall be there proceeded in as if originally commenced by the voluntary action of the claimant; and the Secretary of the Treasury may, upon the certificate of any Auditor or Comptroller of the Treasury, direct any account, matter, or claim of the character, amount, or class described in this section to be transmitted, with all the vouchers, papers, documents, and proofs pertaining thereto, to the said court for trial and adjudication.

On the one hand, it is most earnestly and vehemently asserted that section 1063 confers no such power as has been claimed and exercised by the Comptroller, and that he has usurped power, defied the authority of the Congress of the United States, and violated his plain duty as an executive officer of the Government.

On the other hand, it is claimed that the law referred to plainly covers the case and confers the power exercised: that it is a wise provision, and that the power ought to rest in the Treasury Department to refuse to pay out money appropriated by Congress when the act is unconstitutional or void for any reason. It is asserted that an unconstitutional act is not a law; that it binds no one and protects no one who executes it, and that when grave doubts exist those charged with the execution of a law prima facie valid necessarily have the power to suspend its execution and ought to be protected by law in the exercise of such power, whether it turns out that the law is constitutional or otherwise.

It is plain that the laws of the United States ought to be faithfully executed. The Constitution so provides. It is also plain that the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land and must be obeyed; also that every law duly passed is prima facie valid and constitutional.

It is common knowledge, however, that the legislatures of the several States and the Congress of the United States occasionally pass unconstitutional acts. The Supreme Court of the United States, upon which rests the constitutional duty of determining such questions when properly before it, has so held. It follows that the right to challenge the constitutionality of every law ought to rest somewhere, and where can that right rest except with those charged with the execution of the law or those whose duty it is to obey it?

But if this right exists, if it ought to exist, it should not be lightly or frivolously exercised.

In some of the States, notably the State of New York, provision has been made by law whereby such a question can be raised by any taxpayer.

It may be wise that the laws of the United States be so amended that any citizen may bring suit to determine such a question; that the heads of Departments only shall be permitted to raise the question; that no head of Department or any officer thereof shall raise such a question unless the Attorney-General of the United States shall have first pronounced against the legality of the law in question.

It may be safely asserted that the condition of the law on this subject is unsatisfactory; that the law is uncertain; that the questions involved are of great importance, and that some action ought to be taken that will fix the powers and duties of all executive officers.

The original resolution introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana was quite severe upon the Comptroller of the Treasury. It seemed to express the views of that gentleman, who recited that the refusal of the Comptroller to certify the claims for payment was a refusal to perform a ministerial duty simply, and one imposed upon him by law, and that it constituted a nullification of a law of Congress and deprived citizens of their rights; that the assertion by the Comptroller of the right or power to act as he did in the premises was inconsistent with the dignity of Congress and in direct contempt of its authority, and the resolution proposed an inquiry, first, as to whether the power existed and, second, in case it should be determined that no such power existed, to report action that should vindicate the authority of the Congress of the United States.

The substitute reported by the committee contains no recitations whatever, but refers generally to the action of the Comptroller, and authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into the condition of the law on this subject and report to the House by bill or otherwise.

The general rule is that if an executive officer executes an unconstitutional law and litigation follows in which it is determined that the law is unconstitutional the officer is not protected in what he has done. It has been claimed that if the Comptroller should obey the act of March 2, 1895, and the appropriation made by that act should be declared unconstitutional he would be personally liable to the United States for the money paid out under it. It is asserted that there is no difference in principle between this case and one where a sheriff or marshal takes the property of a private citizen under an unconstitutional law against the will of the owner. It is asserted that an unconstitutional act is not a law in any sense and affords no protection whatever to any officer, high or low, who executes it.

I for one do not assent to the proposition that any officer connected with the Treasury Department would incur personal liability should he execute an act of Congress duly approved or passed over the President's veto by paying out money appropriated and directed to be paid thereby.

I do not assent to the proposition that section 1063 of the Revised Statutes of the United States authorizes the Comptroller of the Treasury to refuse to execute a law upon the ground that it is unconstitutional. I do not think that section applies to or was intended to cover such a case.

But inasmuch as the question has been raised, the Committee on the Judiciary has thought it proper that the law on this subject be examined into, and that a report be made to the House either by way of suggesting legislation or otherwise. Those who will take the trouble to study the opinion of the Comptroller of the Treasury, written by him when he took action in the sugar-bounty cases, will see that he contends for a doctrine that if established would enable him to suspend the payment of every account and claim upon which he has power to pass upon the ground that the law of Congress was unconstitutional and send the matter to the Court of Claims for adjudication in the court. If such a power exists an overzealous Comptroller or one exceedingly sensitive on constitutional questions may at any time seriously embarrass the transaction of the business of this Government.

It would seem highly proper that the Comptroller of the Treasury shall construe all acts of Congress when construction is necessary, in order that he may disburse the moneys of the Government in strict accordance with the law, but it seems at first glance exceedingly improper that he should be empowered to suspend the operation of laws prima facie valid upon the ground that he is a better expounder of the Constitution than the Congress itself, and in some cases than the Congress and President of the United States acting in harmony.

On the other hand, no person, whether occupying an official position or not, desires that the Constitution be violated or that an unconstitutional law be enforced. It would seem more proper that the question be raised by some person other than the one charged with the execution of the law.

It would be a strange situation should a judge refuse to pass sentence upon a convicted criminal on the ground that the law authorizing sentence was, in his opinion, unconstitutional. Still, judges have the right to interpret as well as enforce the law. Judges have the power to adjudicate upon the constitutionality of all laws, and still this power presupposes that the question is brought before the court in some of the methods known to the law.

If the Congress of the United States, having created the office of Comptroller and charged that officer with the duty of enforcing its laws, has at the same time clothed him with the power to question their validity and refuse to enforce them, we have a situation that is novel, to say the least. If such is the condition, then Congress has created a censor of all its acts appropriating money, and has empowered the President of the United States to appoint that censor, by and with the advice of the Senate alone.

I feel justified in asserting that Congress never intended to confer such authority upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or any other executive officer. If it has done it, it is high time that the law be amended, and that if such power is to rest anywhere it be conferred upon the head of a Department alone, and that the power of such head of Department shall be restricted in such a manner that the business of the Government may not be interfered with.

If an executive officer in one of the Departments may refuse to execute a law of Congress upon the ground of its unconstitutionality, it is difficult to see why the heads of Departments may not refuse to execute laws upon the same ground, and why the President of the United States may not refuse to enforce any law upon the same ground.

It will not do to say that Congress is supreme; that its acts can not or should not be questioned. The humblest citizen when called upon to act under or obey a law prima facie valid may deny its constitutionality and test its validity; but this is a personal right, and rests on the ground that he has a right to protection in his person and property and that the Constitution is his shield. When Congress passes a bill and the President approves it, and when Congress provides executive officers to enforce such law, it is hardly presumable that it intends to clothe such officers with power to question the validity of the act.

Still, if these officers may not raise the question, who shall? If money is appropriated for a purpose not warranted by the Constitution, and the disbursing officers discover the fact, shall they

execute the law and consummate an illegal and an unauthorized act of Congress?

These questions, with many others, suggest themselves and demonstrate the wisdom of a careful investigation of this subject. The committee has taken no position on the question. The resolution asserts nothing, denies nothing, but simply directs investigation, and authorizes a report that may be useful to the House. The question, so far as it relates to the President of the United States, is not a new one.

In 1868 Andrew Johnson, then President of the United States, issued an order under date of February 21 removing Edwin M. Stanton from the office of Secretary of War and appointing Gen. Lorenzo Thomas Secretary of War ad interim, in plain violation and disregard of the act of Congress entitled "An act regulating the tenure of certain civil officers," passed March 2, 1867.

This action was made the basis of one of the articles of impeachment preferred against the President. The President undertook to justify his action on the ground that the said act was unconstitutional; at least that he believed it to be unconstitutional; acted in good faith and in obedience to his oath of office to support the Constitution and execute the laws; that an unconstitutional act of Congress is not a law in any sense, and that all executive officers, from the highest to the lowest, had the right to refuse obedience to an unconstitutional act of Congress.

The managers on the part of the House of Representatives, on the trial of the President, contended that this plea constituted no answer; that it is the duty of every executive officer to obey and faithfully execute the laws as he finds them written upon the statute books, and can not raise constitutional questions in this way.

The question was very fully and ably argued on both sides.

The argument of Hon. William M. Evarts, later a Senator of the United States, and at one time Secretary of State of the United States, will be found at pages 717 and 719 of the report of that trial, and he cites many cases showing that the right to raise the constitutional question has been exercised by executive officers whose duties are ministerial many, many times. This power or asserted right has been exercised by executive officers in the State and city of New York many times, and I am not aware that the right has been questioned. Still I have not found a case arising in New York where the officer has been brought to account. His right to raise the question by refusing to execute the law seems to have been acquiesced in.

In the case of the President impeachment failed. The doctrine contended for was condemned, however, by a vote of 35 to 19.

I have offered these suggestions for the mere purpose of demonstrating the propriety of adopting this resolution. A careful examination of the condition of the law on this subject will suggest necessary changes and lead to a discussion of the subject that will probably result in great good.

The Committee on the Judiciary is not seeking this labor. We have enough on hand to occupy our time and sharpen our wits, but the question being one of general interest and one forced upon our attention, we are willing to undertake an investigation on the lines suggested by the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGLEY. The language at the end of the resolution, "with authority to report by bill or otherwise," would not make the matter privileged when it came in, would it? My impression is that there would have to be inserted the words "to report at any time, by bill or otherwise," in order to make it privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Maine is right, and that this would not be a question of privilege. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state, sir—not rising for the purpose of interposing any factious objection to what may have been done by the committee—that I am not in accord with the ulterior purpose sought to be attained by this resolution. I believe that an executive officer executes any unconstitutional law at his peril. Therefore, there must be somewhere resting upon him the duty of inquiring as to whether or not a particular act is unconstitutional, when that matter has been brought directly to his attention. But if the House desires merely to instruct the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the law upon this subject, I will interpose no objection so far as that is concerned; but I desire to state, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, that I am not in accord, as I have said, with the ulterior purpose of this resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FORT SMITH AND WESTERN COAL RAILROAD COMPANY, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. LITTLE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The bill was read. It provides that the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Arkansas, be, and the same is hereby, vested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, equipping, operating, using, and maintaining a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, beginning at a point to be selected by said company on the western boundary line of the State of Arkansas, at or near the city of Fort Smith, Sebastian County, and running thence by the most practicable route through that part of the Indian Territory occupied by and known as the Choctaw Nation, in a southwesterly direction through the counties of Scullyville, Sans Bois, Gaines, and Tobucksy, to a point on the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway, in said Choctaw Nation, between McAlester and South Canadian, with a switch from a point on said line to form a connection with the St. Louis and San Francisco Railway at a point on that railroad, to be located between Cedars Station and the Backbone Tunnel.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommended the following amendments:

In section 2, line 11, strike out "two" and insert "one"; also in said line strike out "three" and insert "two." And in line 18 of said section strike out the words "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

In section 3, line 20, strike out "thirty" and insert "ninety." After the word "States," in line 21, insert the word "district."

In line 22 of said section strike out the following words: "At Muscogee, Indian Territory," and insert the following: "For the central district of the Indian Territory, sitting at the place nearest and most convenient to the property sought to be condemned."

Strike out all of section 8.

In section 9, in line 13, strike out the word "five" and insert "three."

Add, at the end of section 10, the following amendment:

"*Provided further*, That the entire line of said road shall be surveyed and located, and said location approved by the Secretary of the Interior before the work of construction shall commence."

Mr. LITTLE. I wish to offer an amendment which was omitted in the report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add, at the end of section 1, the following words:

"And with the right to build in the line of said railroad a bridge across the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall be first approved by the Secretary of War."

The SPEAKER. Is this amendment approved of by the committee?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITNEY. I rise for the purpose of asking a question for information. I should like to know if there is enough land remaining in the Indian Territory to furnish a right of way for this road? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. There is an abundance of land in the Territory, and all the land taken will be paid for.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LITTLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

TUG MYSTIC.

Mr. STEPHENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of certain parties, sufferers by the burning of the tug *Mystic* while in Government employ.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $523.45, to reimburse certain parties hereinafter named for certain property lost by them by the burning of the tug *Mystic* while employed by the United States in connection with the resurvey of St. Marys River, Michigan, said parties being at the time of said burning in the employ of the United States, and said loss having occurred through no fault or negligence on their part. The persons to whom said money shall be paid and the amount to be paid them, respectively, are as follows, namely: Glen E. Balch, assistant engineer, $261.90; John C. Turner, carpenter, $55.60; Rebecca Day, cook, $94; P. C. Bye, laborer, $56.75; Thomas J. Bye, carpenter, $6.15; Robert R. Cook, laborer, $19.90; Edward McMorris, laborer, $29.15; total, $523.45.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYERS. Let us have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. STEPHENSON. It is in accordance with the recommendation of General Poe, and it only carries $500.

Mr. SAYERS. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. WOODARD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of certain parties, sufferers by the burning of the tug *Mystic* while in Government employ, having had the same under consideration, beg leave to report the same, with the recommendation that it pass.

The letter from the Secretary of War, Executive Document No. 129, Fifty-third Congress, second session, fully sets forth the facts, and your committee adopt the same and make it a part of this report.

Mr. SAYERS. I think it is customary where losses are sustained as the result of injuries inflicted by Government vessels.

Mr. McMILLIN. But this is not a Government vessel.

Mr. SAYERS. It was employed by the Government.

Mr. STEPHENSON. This is all right; it is only $500.

Mr. McMILLIN. The Government is not an insurance agent for those vessels that it employs. I would like it to go over, so as to have an opportunity to read it. I see the report is very long.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

EXAMINATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would like to ask whether this bill has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Lands; it received the approval of the committee, as it has received the approval of the officers of the Government.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Is there any communication to that effect?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know. I am asking for the consideration of the bill on the report of the Committee on Public Lands. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this is merely an extension to the State of California of the provisions of the Idaho and Montana act, as it is called, which was passed at the last session of Congress, for the purpose of allowing the segregation and classification of mineral lands in the State of California. It is a bill that was unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands; all the people in our State are in favor of it; the delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, are unanimously in favor of it, and it is not opposed by anybody, but will work great good, and I hope no one will object.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and would like to hear an explanation of the bill. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to this point: Here you are passing a bill, or proposing to pass one, which recites old acts of Congress making grants of large areas of the public domain to various railroad corporations named in the bill. Now you provide that the mineral lands embraced in the grants shall be subject to certain things. Now, might it not be held that this bill ratifies these grants as to all the lands that are mineral?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, Mr. Speaker, it does not provide anything of that kind.

Mr. BOWERS. This is the same as the Idaho and Montana bill.

Mr. TERRY. I do not know anything about the Idaho and Montana bill, but this is a very serious question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will state to the gentleman that this is simply a provision for the classification of the lands by a commission to be appointed by the President of the United States for the purpose of deciding which is mineral lands and which is not. Lands that are mineral do not go to the railroad company, but those that are mineral do go to the settlers. It does not affect the title of the land in any degree. It does not affect anything, except to allow the people a quick and expeditious manner of settling the question as to whether the land is mineral land or not.

Mr. TERRY. I understand that, but that is not my point.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It does not confirm the title to the railroad grant. It does not affect the title.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman will permit me, I would state that the bill states distinctly—

That nothing in this act shall be taken or construed as recognizing or confirming any grant of land or the right to any grant of land in—

And then it goes on and mentions the railroads.

Mr. TERRY. Is that stated in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir.

Mr. TERRY. There was so much confusion I could not hear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask that the report be read, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TALBERT. I rise to a point of order. We can not hear what is being said.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to ask the House to come to order.

The report was read at length.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman who wants to pass this bill will produce a letter from the Secretary of the Interior saying that the bill is all right, I shall not object; but it seems to me that it is a rather dangerous thing to legislate in this way respecting this land, which belongs either to these railroad companies or to the United States.

Mr. HARTMAN. Let me just speak to the gentleman a moment. I want to say that this bill is an exact duplicate of the bill which the Fifty-third Congress passed for the examination and classification of the mineral lands in the States of Montana and Idaho. That bill is operating to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office. And as a Representative from one of those States I want to say that in conversation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office both of those gentlemen expressed themselves as entirely satisfied with the operation of that bill in those respective States.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. Has this bill ever been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LACEY. It has not been so submitted.

Mr. McMILLIN. Nor to the Commissioner of the General Land Office? Has the opinion of either one of them been obtained upon it?

Mr. HARTMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee that this is an exact duplicate of a bill which did meet the approval originally of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office in so far as it applied to Montana and Idaho. The same principle is involved in this bill, and it has operated very advantageously in the States to which it is applied.

I have in my hand the report from two of the districts in Montana, wherein it is shown that in one of the districts the total cost per acre of the examination and classification has been only 2.3 cents.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman wholly mistakes my interrogatory. What I asked was whether or not this bill had been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HARTMAN. I am informed by the gentleman from California that it has not.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why has it not been submitted to the Secretary?

Mr. HARTMAN. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question. I am informed by members of the Public Lands Committee that inasmuch as the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office had favored a similar bill applicable to Montana and Idaho, and inasmuch as this bill was simply for the purpose of extending the benefits of the provisions of that bill to the State of California, it was taken for granted that this also would meet the approval of the Secretary and of the Commissioner. Furthermore, the bill had worked so advantageously in Montana and Idaho that it was supposed it would be expected to work advantageously in California. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] was chairman of the Public Lands Committee in the last Congress, and he recommended the bill for Idaho and Montana. He is a member of the Public Lands Committee in this Congress, and he favors the passage of this bill, and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] will not object, but will let a bill of this meritorious character, which everybody interested is satisfied with, be considered and passed. The miners want it; the railroad company is satisfied with it; the people of California, irrespective of party, want it. It will do a great deal of good in California, and it will not do anybody any harm. The only objection I have heard to the bill is simply that it has not been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior; but I am informed by my colleague from California [Mr. BOWERS], who is a member of the Public Lands Committee, that the reason it was not submitted was that it was supposed that the Secretary and the Commissioner would approve it because they had approved a similar bill for Montana and Idaho. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is present and understands this matter and can explain it, and I trust he will do so.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, a bill like this was introduced by Mr. Caminetti, of California, at the last session of Congress. I had to leave before the end of the session and can not state why it did not become a law; but this bill, I understand, is, with one exception, identical in terms with the one reported from the committee in the last Congress as to Idaho and Montana.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is identical.

Mr. McRAE. I have stated that it is literally a copy of the Montana-Idaho bill. I do not think the Department has been asked by the committee to consider it.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from California whether there are not different conditions involved in this bill from those that were involved in the other bill; whether there are not rights of the Government and of the railroad companies involved here that were not involved in the bill applicable to Montana and Idaho.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, sir. This bill especially guards all the rights of the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. The fact is that the mineral lands that belong

to the United States are now being taken by the railroads, and we want to save them for the United States and for the people. That is the whole matter.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. If that be true, why did you not get the indorsement of the Secretary of the Interior for the bill?

Mr. BOWERS. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office had approved the bill for Idaho and Montana, and this is a similar bill extending the provisions to California, and I hope no one will object.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, in making the grants to these railroads originally the mineral lands were reserved to the Government. There was for a long time a contention on the part of the railroads that they were entitled to all of the lands not known to be mineral at the time of the definite route of location, and it was not until last year or the year before last that the Supreme Court passed upon the question. It has been held that the railroads take no lands known to be mineral at the time of the patent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the gentleman in charge of this measure: I knew so little about the bill that I hardly felt at liberty to interpose an objection, but this is the first time I have ever known a bill of this magnitude to go through the House without the opinion of the Department within whose jurisdiction the matter comes being called for. It seems to me peculiar that that was not done in this case, and we have had no sufficient explanation as to why it was not done. Thus much I wanted to say; thus much I think it is right to say; and I believe now that it would be much better to let this bill go over until Monday morning. In the meantime the Secretary could be consulted. It is not difficult to get to him. If this is a good bill, as is claimed, there will be no difficulty in getting the approval of the Secretary. If it is not a good bill the House ought to know it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee and other gentlemen for not objecting, and I want to say simply that whenever the California delegation and people can agree upon anything, that ought to be the best evidence on earth and in heaven that it is a good measure, for we are the most factional fighters in the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. I will ask the gentleman whether he knows what the Secretary of the Interior thinks about this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am informed that he is in favor of it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Who said that?

A MEMBER. Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman [Mr. BOWERS] does not claim that he submitted this bill to the Secretary at all.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that by saying that in view of the fact that an exact duplicate of this bill applying to Montana and Idaho had been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and in view of the fact that they had approved that bill and were satisfied with the working of it, I suppose the gentleman in charge of this bill did not see fit to further burden the Secretary and the Commissioner with the subject.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman's statement bears out what I have said, that they never asked the Department anything about it.

Mr. HARTMAN. Exactly. That is perfectly true.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill is in such condition that its consideration can not be obstructed by a single objection, and in view of that fact I will ask the gentleman whether he is not willing to let it go over until Monday morning, in order that in the meantime the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior can be obtained? Let the bill go over with the understanding that it will come up at Monday's session.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not know enough about the rules to know whether if this bill now goes over until Monday it will lose its place.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill go over until Monday, to come up for consideration immediately after the reading of the Journal.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PORT OF DELIVERY, SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Syracuse, in the State of New York, be, and is hereby, constituted a port of delivery and that the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise conferred by the seventh section of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to said port; and there shall be appointed a surveyor of customs to reside at said port, who shall receive a salary, to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, not exceeding $1,000 per annum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOUD. I think we ought to have the report read. I see this creates a new office.

The report (by Mr. SHERMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6) providing that Syracuse, N. Y., be constituted a port of delivery, beg leave to report back to the House with an amendment and with a favorable recommendation.

Insert after the word "by," at the end of line 5, the words "the seventh section of."

This amendment is suggested by the Treasury Department, and as thus amended the Department approves the bill.

The part of said section 7 to which this amendment is intended to apply reads:

"That the privileges of transportation herein conferred shall not extend to any place at which there are not the necessary officers for the appraisement of merchandise and the collection of duties."

Syracuse is a city of over 100,000 inhabitants. The passage of this bill is asked by her municipal government and all her large importing houses, of which there are many. The imports of the city last year, so far as reported to the manufacturers' exchange, were $1,662,866, and estimating those not reported, the amount would exceed $2,000,000. The custodian of the United States public building writes that "ample room can be provided on the second floor of the building" to accommodate the proper officials if this bill is enacted.

The bill merely meets the needs of largely increasing commerce at Syracuse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was considered, the amendment recommended by the committee was adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. POOLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

JOHN C. CUTTER.

Mr. DRAPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 83) for the relief of John C. Cutter, first lieutenant, Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to revoke the order accepting the resignation of First Lieut. John C. Cutter, Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, on January 2, 1864, "for the good of the service," and to issue to him an honorable discharge as of said date: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to allow the said Cutter any pay, bounty, or other allowances to which he would not have been entitled under the terms of his original discharge.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would like to hear the report in that case.

The report (by Mr. PARKER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 83) entitled "A bill for the relief of John C. Cutter, late first lieutenant Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry," beg leave to report:

This is a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to revoke the order accepting Lieutenant Cutter's resignation on January 2, 1864 "for the good of the service," and to issue to him an honorable discharge from that date, with the usual proviso against pay, bounty, or other allowance.

Lieutenant Cutter was regimental quartermaster under Colonel DRAPER, who now introduces this bill. In retreat, November, 1863, from Lenoir, east Tennessee, he burned the officers' baggage and some other effects. His affidavit states that this was for want of wagons and by order of General Ferrero, to prevent its falling into the enemy's hands. The Colonel reported that it was from neglect to give personal attention to the transportation, preferred charges of neglect of duty, and withdrew them on receiving his resignation. Colonel DRAPER continues:

"I found it would not go through by a mere ordinary indorsement, and I indorsed it 'for the good of the service,' and he was then discharged.

"As there was nothing in Lieutenant Cutter's record of a dishonorable character, he having been a good soldier, and having failed only in this matter of carelessness, I think it no more than fair that this stigma should be removed from his name."

The committee concur in this view, even if Lieutenant Cutter was careless, which he denies. He could not, and did not, anticipate that his resignation would have been accepted dishonorably.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts object to an amendment at the end of the bill, in addition to the relinquishment of any pay, bounty, or allowances named there, to include also the words "or pension"? This party would be pensionable under this bill.

Mr. DRAPER. I have no objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I offer that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendment proposed by Mr. McMILLIN was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed,

On motion of Mr. DRAPER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills and joint

resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Joint resolution (S. R. 65) to print the annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 824) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1320) to confirm the title to certain lands in William Morgan and Harrison Moore, and to require the issue of patents therefor—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1693) for the rebuilding or repair of the public wharf at Sitka, Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1804) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HARBOR OF MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to submit a favorable report on a resolution of inquiry and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read at length.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask that the report of the committee be read.

The report was read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The amendment recommended by the committee simply makes the House resolution a joint resolution.

I think there is no opposition to the resolution. The War Department has the information ready; it will involve no expense, and can be returned to the House in a very short time.

Mr. LOUD. Let me ask the gentleman if the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would not have that power—to call for any information in the hands of the Secretary of War—without this resolution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. We would not have presented this resolution if we had the power.

Mr. LOUD. The question in my mind is whether this resolution does not warrant the Secretary of War in going beyond the power that you give him in the direction of surveys. If not, it seems to me that the committee could get all the information without coming into the House. The language is a little indefinite.

Of course, I understand that they could not appropriate the money until they had the survey; but this is calling substantially for a survey not warranted by the law adopted in the last river and harbor bill. I can not help thinking that the committee would have abundant power to get the information sought here without coming to Congress at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is mistaken, I think. The committee discussed the matter very fully. This calls simply for the return to the House by the Secretary of War of such information as he has now in his possession. This is needed for the use of the House and the committee in the consideration of this matter. Of course the committee do not want him to make a new survey, but simply to furnish the information, such as the resolution calls for; and I would say to the House and to the gentleman from California that the hearing on the matter is to come up before the committee on Monday next. A delegation from that city is present, the information is already in the possession of the War Department, and this information can be prepared and returned by the Department by Monday next, in time for the hearing.

Mr. LOUD. I am satisfied that the power is already in the hands of the committee to get all the information of this kind that is available. The only objection is that it seems we are making a special case before Congress to authorize the Secretary of War to make an additional survey. I simply call attention to it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors conferred with the Secretary of War, or rather with the Chief of Engineers, concerning this matter; and it is at the suggestion of the chairman that the committee this morning passed the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to make the change in this resolution from a simple House resolution to a joint resolution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is the purpose of the amendment that has been offered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which makes the resolution a joint resolution.

The amendment was adopted.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The question recurred on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the title of this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that no title has been appended to it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask leave to withdraw the resolution, and I will prepare the title.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is withdrawn.

VESSELS IN ST. MARYS RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movement of vessels in St. Marys River.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to adopt and prescribe suitable rules and regulations governing the movements and anchorage of vessels and rafts in St. Marys River, from Point Iroquois, on Lake Superior, to Point Detour, on Lake Huron, and for the purpose of enforcing the observance of such regulations the said Secretary is hereby authorized to detail one or more revenue cutters for duty on said river.

SEC. 2. That all officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who are directed to enforce the regulations prescribed by the above rules are hereby empowered and directed, in case of necessity, or when a proper notice has been disregarded, to use the force at their command to remove from channels or stop any vessel found violating the prescribed rules.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the violation of any such regulations or rules of the Secretary of the Treasury by the owners, master, or person in charge of such vessel, such owners, master, or person in charge shall be liable to a penalty of $200, and the vessel, its tackle, apparel, furniture, and cargo, at any time used or employed in violation of such regulations, shall be forfeited to the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may remit said fine or release said vessel on such terms as he may prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOUD. I should like to hear the report read, or some explanation.

Mr. BENNETT. The purpose of the bill is simply to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make regulations to provide against accidents in the St. Marys River, through which all commerce to and from Lake Superior must pass, comprising thousands of vessels, steam and sail.

Mr. LOUD. Why do not the present regulations cover it?

Mr. BENNETT. Because of the peculiar circumstances existing there. There is at present no law governing the movement of vessels on and through the St. Marys River beyond the steering and sailing rules for the navigation of inland waters. The channel is only 300 feet wide, and in some places there is barely space for large ships to pass. Its enactment has become necessary, as rules may properly be made under the provisions of the bill which involve no expense in enforcing them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BENNETT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE ST. FRANCIS, ARKANSAS.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas.

The bill was read. It provides that the St. Francis Bridge and Turnpike Company is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a drawbridge across Lake St. Francis, at or near Lake City, in the State of Arkansas, in accordance with such plans as the Secretary of War may decide to be necessary in the interest of navigation; and the draw shall be constructed in accordance with such plans as may be approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I now ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. PATTERSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having considered House bill 3962, recommend that the bill be amended as follows:

In line 15, section 1, insert the words "the said company" before the word "may."

In line 21, section 2, insert the words "from sunset to sunrise" after the word "bridge," and in line 23 of same section strike out the words "when any vessel shall signal to pass."

As amended, the committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAHANY objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this lake wholly within the State of Arkansas?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there a navigable river which connects it with other States?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; it is in the sunk lands of the St. Francis River, which passes through Arkansas and into the State of Missouri. This bill has been submitted to the Secretary of War, and he has approved it. The committee also approve it. There is no objection from any source whatever.

Mr. DINGLEY. Observing from the language that it was wholly within the State of Arkansas, I wished to know whether there were navigable waters which connected this lake with other States.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; there are navigable waters, but at this place scarcely any boats pass, and the provisions of the bill provide that the bridge shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the War Department.

The amendments recommended by the committee, set forth in the report, were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCULLOCH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DELIVERY OF LETTERS IN TOWNS AND VILLAGES.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Regular order.

Mr. SPERRY. I ask the gentleman to withhold that for the purpose of allowing me to present a bill which will not take more than five minutes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5473) concerning the delivery of letters in towns, villages, and other places where no free delivery exists. The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. SPERRY. I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall have to insist on the regular order. The consideration of that bill will take three or four hours. It will lead to a long debate.

Mr. SPERRY. No, it will not; it simply gives people a chance to do a certain thing and pay for it themselves, and there ought to be no objection to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There may not be, but I know it will lead to a long debate, and I shall have to insist on the regular order.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no desire to object to that bill, but I desire that it lie over.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred sundry resolutions, to wit:

"1. *Resolved*, That the Clerk be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to appoint an additional reading clerk, whose term of office and salary, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, shall be the same as that now provided by law for a reading clerk of the House of Representatives.

"2. *Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to employ J. Y. Jamieson as special employee, his duties to exchange public documents for members of the House, at a salary of $900 per annum, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

"3. *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint Fred S. Bishop as assistant clerk in the office which directs the special binding of public documents for the personal use of members of Congress, at a salary of $1,600 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until other provision is made therefor.

"4. *Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer and typewriter, so long as may be necessary, for a period not to exceed three months from the adoption of this resolution, the same to be appointed by the chairman of the committee, subject to the approval of the committee, and to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $6 per day.

"5. *Resolved*, That the employees of the House of Representatives be paid their salaries semimonthly instead of monthly, the same as the other Departments.

"6. *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ E. J. Totten as a clerk at a salary of $1,200 per annum, beginning on the 1st day of January, 1896, and also one skilled laborer at a salary of $800 per annum, such salaries to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives. The said employees to be assigned to duty in the Clerk's document room of the House and to attend to the folding, packing, and shipping of the books and documents of the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, and perform such other duties as may be required.

"7. *Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer and typewriter so long as may be necessary, for a period not to exceed three months from the adoption of this resolution, the same to be appointed by the chairman of the committee, subject to the approval of the committee, and to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $6 per day.

"8. *Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to employ 15 folders during the session and one month thereafter, at $75 per month each, and that the Clerk of the House be directed to pay the above employees out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

"9. *Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a superintendent of the ladies' reception room at a compensation of $1,200 per annum"—

Beg leave to report as follows:

The resolution providing for an additional reading clerk is disapproved.

The resolution providing for the appointment of J. Y. Jamieson as special employee for the exchange of public documents for members of the House is disapproved.

The resolution providing for the appointment of Fred S. Bishop as assistant clerk in the office which directs the special binding of public documents for the personal use of members of Congress is disapproved.

The resolution providing for the payment of salaries to employees of the House semimonthly instead of monthly is disapproved.

The resolution providing for the appointment of E. J. Totten as a clerk, and also one skilled laborer, both to be assigned to duty in the Clerk's document room, is disapproved.

The resolution providing for the employment of 15 folders during the session, and one month thereafter, is herewith returned, with the recommendation that the same be adopted.

Resolutions Nos. 4 and 7 authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on the District of Columbia to each employ a stenographer and typewriter for a period not to exceed three months, at the rate of $6 per day each.

Your committee are of the opinion that the exigencies of the situation justify it in recommending that a reasonable amount be allowed these two committees for the employment of stenographers for a limited period, and to that end submit the accompanying resolution as a substitute for those presented to it, and recommend the adoption of same.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted the following resolution:

That the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency and the District of Columbia be authorized to expend not to exceed $150 each as compensation for the employment of stenographers and typewriters during the current session of Congress, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move the adoption of the substitute for the resolution just read.

The substitute was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask for the passage of the next resolution now, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ 15 folders during the session, and one month thereafter, at $75 per month each; and that the Clerk of the House be directed to pay the above employees out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXPERTS FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to employ a suitable expert or experts, and to have done such printing as may be necessary, the expense of such services and printing not to exceed the sum of $1,500, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, beg to report and recommend the adoption of the same.

We attach herewith a report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is desirable to foster and extend the export of the surplus agricultural and manufactured products of the United States to foreign countries; and

Whereas in certain countries the importation of these products is prohibited or restricted and subjected to burdensome inspection, intentional overvaluation, or discriminating duties: Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be, and is hereby, directed to prepare and submit to this House a report which shall show in what countries such restrictions, regulations, or discriminations are in force, of what they consist, the causes alleged therefor, their effect upon our foreign commerce, and the effect upon the commercial treaties or agreements with foreign countries entered into after October 31, 1890, upon our trade with those countries, and also the effect of the subsequent abandonment of such treaties upon that trade.

Resolved, That for the purposes of making such investigation and report the committee be, and hereby is, authorized to employ a suitable expert or experts, and to have done such printing as may be necessary, the expense of such services and printing not to exceed the sum of $1,500, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CRISP. How did that resolution get before the House, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. On a report from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CRISP. The Committee on Accounts reporting a resolution directing the Committee on Ways and Means to do something?

The SPEAKER. It was originally reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, and referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Accounts has no jurisdiction to so present that resolution as to make it privileged. The rules provide that reports from the Committee on Accounts touching expenditure out of the contingent fund of the House are privileged, and no other report from that committee.

The SPEAKER. This provides for payment out of the contingent fund.

Mr. CRISP. But, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to direct another committee to perform another service, and incidentally provides that in the performance of that they may use a sum of money from the contingent fund. Now, surely, Mr.

Speaker, it could never be contended that a resolution of that sort would be privileged under the rule which permits the Committee on Accounts to report a resolution disposing of the contingent fund. That is a mere incident. The purpose of this resolution is to direct another committee of the House to perform certain acts; and I submit, in the first place, that the Committee on Accounts has no such jurisdiction; and, in the second place, if the committee has jurisdiction, that they can not report it as a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question as to the privilege might be subject to discussion, the House having referred it to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CRISP. How did the House refer it to the Committee on Accounts?

The SPEAKER. It was presented in a report from the Committee on Ways and Means, and as the Chair recollects, in open House it was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. TAWNEY. It was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRISP. You state that this was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means?

The SPEAKER. It was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means and the question was raised in regard to the expense.

Mr. CRISP. I did not so understand. Let me ask the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], or some gentleman on the Committee on Ways and Means, was this resolution favorably reported from the committee?

Mr. DINGLEY. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and being reported, the point of order having been made that it provided for an expenditure from the contingent fund, then, by the House, it was referred to the Committee on Accounts, which gives the Committee on Accounts jurisdiction, the only point being in reference to expenditure from the contingent fund.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the committee which has really——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor, unless he yields.

Mr. McMILLIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CRISP. Will the Speaker be kind enough to direct that the resolution be again read, so that some of my colleagues who were present may be able to remember something about it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will again be reported.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point is this: The House has never adopted this resolution. It was introduced, went to the Committee on Ways and Means, I am informed, was reported back favorably by that committee, and referred by the House, if you please, to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state exactly the status of the resolution.

Mr. CRISP. I would be very glad for the gentleman to do so.

Mr. TAWNEY. It was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House by myself. The report was made in the open House, whereupon I asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. Objection was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], and thereupon I asked unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Accounts, because it carried with it an appropriation from the contingent fund, and could not be considered in the House against an objection unless that committee had first considered it, and by unanimous consent it was referred by the House to the Committee on Accounts, and is now reported from that committee back to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the rule provides, among the committees that shall have leave to report at any time:

> The Committee on Accounts, of all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

Now, the resolution which has just been read is for what? It is a resolution to authorize and require a certain investigation. Incidental to that investigation is an expenditure which may or may not be made out of the contingent fund of the House. That resolution has been referred to the Committee on Accounts by unanimous consent. I concede, as suggested by the Speaker, that perhaps would give the committee jurisdiction of the whole resolution; but it does not follow that that would make the whole resolution privileged when reported from the Committee on Accounts.

The regular method would have been to introduce a resolution providing for the payment of the expenditures of the Committee on Ways and Means to a given amount respecting this work. That would be proper after the House had authorized the Committee on Ways and Means to perform the work. But the peculiar situation presented here is that a resolution which is referred to the Committee on Accounts, no matter whether by the House or by an individual, and which instructs another committee of the House to enter upon a certain investigation, is reported back here as a matter of privilege, and it is contended that because it incidentally provides for the payment of certain expenses out of the contingent fund of the House the resolution thereby becomes privileged. I submit to the judgment of the Speaker, if he will reflect on it a moment, as to whether that is a proper contention.

Mr. HOPKINS. Let me ask the gentleman from Georgia how a report from the Committee on Accounts, recommending an appropriation of $1,500 from the contingent fund to pay an expert for the Committee on Ways and Means, differs in principle from a report by the Committee on Accounts providing for the payment of a stenographer or any other assistant required by a committee?

The SPEAKER. The point the gentleman from Georgia makes, as the Chair understands it, is not in regard to the expenditure, but in regard to the resolution going beyond that and directing the Committee on Ways and Means to make a certain investigation.

Mr. HOPKINS. But that is a matter that has been already determined by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The resolution directing the expenditure of $1,500 from the contingent fund of the House, taken alone, might not be obnoxious to the objection; but the question is whether, joined to the other proposition, which has not received the sanction of the House, it can be the subject of a privileged report under the rule. That is a point on which the Chair would be glad to have some authority cited.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, no recommendation of an appropriation from the contingent fund can come before the House without being joined with some other proposition for the use of that appropriation. The House has to vote upon that question as well as upon the question of expenditure, and the matters are so intermingled that it seems to me they can hardly be separated. When an expenditure is recommended for a certain purpose, as, for instance, for an additional clerk, or whatever the purpose may be, the resolution always embraces both questions.

The SPEAKER. But while the Committee on Printing have the privilege of reporting upon all matters relating to the House printing, yet if they propose to print for an Executive Department the resolution ceases to be privileged, even though it may include something for the House. The Chair thinks that has been the general course of the decisions.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand it, the Committee on Printing has jurisdiction of all matters relating to printing and the appropriations for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. But it has not privilege as to all matters relating to printing.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to two points. This resolution contains two distinct propositions. The first is, to expend a portion of the contingent fund, over which that committee has absolute jurisdiction. The other is, to make an investigation over which that committee would have no jurisdiction in the world unless by jurisdiction having been conferred through the reference of the resolution.

Now, the rules provide that, as to one class of its duties, the reports of the Committee on Accounts are privileged; but that means, at least by implication, that as to all other matters it is not privileged. Therefore, when a report comes in embracing two subjects-matter, one of which is privileged and the other not privileged, the nonprivileged matter carries the whole to the ground so far as the question of consideration is concerned. In addition to that, to show to what extent we would go in absurdity if we should adopt the contrary rule, if the contention of the gentlemen who hold that this matter can be considered as privileged under the rules is true, then all that will be necessary to confer jurisdiction on the Committee on Accounts to direct every other committee of this House as to what it shall consider and how it shall consider it will be to attach a little item of expenditure to the resolution providing for the investigation, and that will give the Committee on Accounts jurisdiction to report at any time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a decision bearing upon this question by Mr. Speaker Carlisle, in the second session of the Fiftieth Congress, reported in volume 90 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 47, in which was considered the question as to what effect nonprivileged matter in a report would have upon the privileged character of the report. That, as I understand it, is the point which the gentleman from Tennessee now makes, that this report just presented by the Committee on Accounts contains nonprivileged matter which in effect destroys the privileged character of the report. Now, if that were true, I have no hesitancy in saying that the point of order is well taken; but the Speaker will recognize the fact that the privileged part of this report is the appropriation of $1,500 from the contingent fund of the House, and that connected with that proposition is the purpose for which the appropriation is to be made. How can the Committee on Accounts present a report appropriating money from the contingent fund of the House without expressing the purpose for which the money is to be expended?

Now, that is all that that part of the resolution does which the gentleman from Tennessee claims is nonprivileged. It is merely

an expression of the purpose for which the appropriation is to be made, and in the case which I have here Speaker Carlisle held that if the nonprivileged matter in a report was essential to the accomplishment of that which was privileged, then the nonprivileged matter did not destroy the privileged character of the report. The question arose in that case on a bill reported from the Committee on Public Lands for the protection of the public lands and forfeiture of certain land grants, but the bill contained other provisions which were claimed to be nonprivileged, and in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, upon the same bill, Mr. Cox, of New York, who was temporarily occupying the chair, ruled that the nonprivileged matter did destroy the privileged character of the report. The same bill came up at the beginning of the second session of the Fiftieth Congress when Mr. Carlisle was in the chair, and he was called upon to pass on the correctness of the decision made by Mr. Cox, and he overruled that decision, and in doing so used this language:

The second section, which directs the Attorney-General to institute suits, provides simply a means for the accomplishment of the object which the bill contemplates; and the Chair thinks that the point raised by the gentleman from New York, that nonprivileged matter can not be connected with privileged matter in a bill, does not arise in this instance. The Chair has held, and will continue to hold, that nonprivileged matter can not be connected with privileged matter, unless it be something which is essential to the accomplishment of that part of the bill which is privileged; and the Chair thinks that is the case here. With great respect for the opinion of the gentleman from New York who presided when this question was presented before, the Chair feels constrained to hold that this is a matter of privilege, and so decides.

Now, in the present instance, I take it that the purpose for which the money is to be expended, being expressed in the same resolution, does not destroy, in accordance with the ruling I have just cited, the privileged character of the report. It is essential to the accomplishment of the purpose of the resolution, which itself is privileged; and being so, and necessarily so, is carried with that part of the report which is privileged; otherwise it is impossible, as suggested to me by the gentleman from Iowa, to divide the matter and make an intelligent report.

Certainly the Speaker would not hesitate to hold that a report simply to appropriate money out of the contingent fund, without expressing any purpose for which it is to be appropriated, could not be entertained or considered by the House. Now, the committee in this case, having had jurisdiction of the matter, and properly, too, by unanimous consent of the House, have considered the advisability of making the appropriation for the purpose contemplated and expressed in the resolution. Under such circumstances it seems impossible for the Speaker to hold otherwise than that that part of the resolution which does not relate directly to the expenditure of money from the contingent fund should be considered as privileged when connected with admittedly privileged matter, because it is an essential part of the resolution, which would otherwise authorize the appropriation of money from the contingent fund without providing any purpose whatever to which it is to be applied.

In the Manual, on page 528, this reference is made to the question under consideration:

As a general rule the insertion of matter not privileged in a proposition otherwise privileged destroys the privileged character of the report. The rule is, however, liberally construed, and if the proposed addition is substantially in aid of the privileged object the whole matter is held to be privileged.

And I think this resolution comes clearly within the rule here stated in the Manual, and is also supported by the ruling I have already cited made by Mr. Carlisle and the Fiftieth Congress. If the purpose for which the expenditure is authorized is not essential to the accomplishment of that part of the resolution which authorizes the expenditure, then it would be such nonprivileged matter as would destroy the privileged character of the report. But such is not the case. Take away the purpose of the resolution or the object of the expenditure and nothing remains; hence it must be essential, and if essential, it does not have that effect.

Mr. CRISP. If the Chair has any doubts whatever on the proposition I will ask to say a word or two.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it must be so plain that there can be no doubt whatever about it. A resolution is introduced for the purpose of requiring the Committee on Ways and Means to perform a certain duty. That is the object of the resolution. No man in looking at that resolution ever could have denominated it as a resolution to pay money out of the contingent fund of the House. It was simply a resolution directing the Committee on Ways and Means to perform a certain duty. That resolution would be referred by the Speaker, as it was referred by him, to the Committee on Ways and Means. That is conclusive of the idea that the Speaker thought that committee had jurisdiction of the proposition. The committee considered it and reported it back.

But the committee, mark you, did not ask the judgment of the House upon it. If the Committee on Ways and Means had reported that resolution back, striking out the appropriation, and the House had adopted the resolution instructing the committee to perform the duty that the resolution contemplated, then a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Maine, or some other member of the committee, providing for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of a sufficient sum to enable the committee to perform the duty, would have been privileged. But to hold that this is privileged because it incidentally provides for a payment from the contingent fund would be to hold that if I should introduce a resolution to-morrow directing the Committee on Agriculture to make an investigation and providing at the same time for an expenditure of $100 from the contingent fund, that no matter what the character of the resolution may be, the Committee on Accounts could take it because of that addition and make it privileged. If I introduce a resolution to investigate the Navy Department, or the construction of ships, and attach a provision that the incidental expense necessary to the investigation is to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, that, under the contention of my friend from Minnesota, would make it privileged.

Now, this resolution reported from the Committee on Ways and Means is not privileged. The Committee on Ways and Means have the privilege of reporting at any time on certain measures. This is not a measure of that character. All bills or resolutions which the committee may report on are not privileged. But, by this mere act of referring it to the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman contends that committee has jurisdiction to report it at any time, and makes privileged a matter that would otherwise not be privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman what effect the fact that the House had received by unanimous consent the report of the Committee on Ways and Means and acted upon it by referring it to the Committee on Accounts would have on the question of privilege?

Mr. CRISP. How was it referred?

The SPEAKER. It was referred to the Committee on Accounts by the House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. By unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. That is action by the House, perhaps, in the highest form.

Mr. CRISP. How would that change the character of the measure?

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker Carlisle on a similar occasion held that such a reference was simply like a unanimous vote of the House referring the matter, carrying no other authority; and it will not be insisted upon that the House acted on the fundamental proposition involved in this resolution at all.

The SPEAKER. The point which the Chair is suggesting is the reception by the House and then committing it.

Mr. McMILLIN. But then, Mr. Speaker, the House was bound to receive it. We then presume that the House was not satisfied with the action of the Ways and Means Committee and determined to try another committee, and it places it on no higher ground than if it had been introduced originally and sent to that committee. It is a recommittal of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. CRISP. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is this: Concede that the House referred it. Concede that the House referred it by a vote, or by unanimous consent. Unless there went with it the right to report at any time, the Committee on Accounts acquire jurisdiction of it by the reference of the House simply as they would have acquired jurisdiction by a private reference; and when it reaches the Committee on Accounts its privileged character is to be determined by the resolution. Now, what is the resolution? What would you denominate it if you were speaking of that resolution? Would you denominate it a resolution to appropriate money from the contingent fund of the House? Would you not denominate it a resolution authorizing the Ways and Means Committee to make investigation? If you would, Mr. Speaker, then the Committee on Accounts has no right to report at any time a resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to make an investigation.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question is too plain for argument. The rule invoked by the gentleman would absolutely overturn the rules of the House, and overturn the decisions heretofore made on these questions, that the insertion of matter not privileged in a proposition otherwise privileged destroys the privileged character of the report. That is the general rule, the sensible rule, and if it be not now maintained, then, Mr. Speaker, around this Committee on Accounts, which was designed and intended merely to disburse the contingent fund of the House, can be gathered and reported all the important business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Suppose this resolution, having been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, had gone onto the Calendar and come up for consideration, being called up by that committee. Does the gentleman say that it could have been considered in this House against the objection of any member—providing as it does for the appropriation of money from the con-

tingent fund of the House—without first having been considered by the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. CRISP. That portion of it, perhaps, could not.

Mr. TAWNEY. How can you separate the parts of the resolution? It would take away from it its purpose, and you would have no resolution at all.

Mr. CRISP. Since I have been here it has been the uniform rule, so far as I know, that where a committee reports back a resolution for an investigation they either report it appropriating the money or they make no provision for it, and when the committee is directed to do a thing, the chairman of that committee introduces a resolution reciting that, whereas the committee has been directed to make an investigation, resolved, that a certain sum be appropriated out of the contingent fund for that purpose. That resolution goes to the Committee on Accounts; but they do not consider the propriety of making the investigation. That is no part of the business of the Committee on Accounts; but they merely consider the propriety of appropriating money to enable the expenses of that investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I understand the gentleman from Georgia, his objection is not to the fact that the Committee on Accounts have now jurisdiction of the resolution?

Mr. CRISP. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But his objection is to the question of its privileged character?

Mr. CRISP. That is it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. When the House, by unanimous consent committed this resolution, it had embodied in it not only the appropriation of the money, but the direction for its expenditure. Now, did not that clothe this committee with authority to report the resolution?

Mr. CRISP. Suppose you grant that. The question is, is it privileged?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The committee reporting a resolution which it has jurisdiction of, which provides for the expenditure of money and states the purpose of expenditure, it seems to me carries with it the right to report it as a privileged question.

Mr. CRISP. To me it seems so plain that I do not care to argue it further, merely suggesting that if you adopt that practice, it embarrasses every stage of the proceedings of this House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The fault may perhaps be with the House in consenting to clothe this committee with the jurisdiction of the whole matter.

Mr. CRISP. But that can not give authority to the committee to report at any time unless the House consents that they may report at any time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But the House committed the resolution to the committee and the committee have that privilege.

Mr. TAWNEY. Just one word in reply to the gentleman from Georgia. I fail to see, after reading paragraph 57 of Rule XI, how he can possibly attach to this report the limitations that he now seeks to attach to it:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated.

Then it goes on to name the committees—and to the Committee on Accounts touching all matters of expenditures of the contingent fund of the House. Now, the only question is whether or not that part of the resolution which does not expressly relate to the expenditure of money from the contingent fund is nonprivileged, or, in other words, is not essential to that part of the resolution which is clearly privileged, and which the gentleman from Georgia himself admits is privileged in this resolution, and if it is essential to the accomplishment of that which is made a privilege by the rules of the House, then it certainly retains its privileged character, notwithstanding the fact that it directs a committee of this House to make a certain investigation which the gentleman says is nonprivileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks——

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment. I think that a great deal depends in this matter upon the force that is given to the resolution, which apparently directs the Committee on Ways and Means to do a thing which they are already authorized to do. It was entirely unnecessary that it should have been put in that form, because the Committee on Ways and Means have entire authority now to investigate this whole question of reciprocity and the effect of reciprocal legislation. They do not need any authority. The only thing they come to the House for is authority to appoint an expert in order to carry on their business, just the same as committees come in here and ask for a stenographer to carry on their business. If this resolution had been couched in this form:

Resolved, That for the purpose of making an inquiry into the effects of reciprocal duties the Committee on Ways and Means is hereby authorized to appoint an expert at a salary of $1,500, or at an expense of $1,500, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House—

there could be no question of its being privileged when reported from the Committee on Accounts. It is simply the form in which it is presented that gives an appearance of giving authority—that we are giving some authority to the Committee on Ways and Means that they do not now have. We do give particular authority that the committee has not now. All that the Committee on Ways and Means asks is that they shall have authority in conducting the investigation which they have determined to make to expend not to exceed $1,500 from the contingent fund of the House in the employment of experts or otherwise.

Mr. GROUT. Then, if the gentleman will allow me a suggestion, it is simply a question of expense.

Mr. DINGLEY. There is no authority given in this resolution.

Mr. CRISP. Then the gentleman did not hear the resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. I confess the resolution is couched in a form that appears to give authority to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRISP. It directs them.

Mr. DINGLEY. I confess it does in that particular form; but as the gentleman from Georgia is well aware, while it appears in the form as presented to give them authority, it is simply that the Committee on Ways and Means shall have authority to employ an expert. That is all they ask for, and a mere change in the phraseology of the resolution would at once remove every objection that can be urged against it.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to make a suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that the form is very distinct. It has within it the conferring of authority upon a committee that is certainly not a privileged matter upon which the Committee on Accounts can report, and the fact that they have the privilege of reporting on expenditures out of the contingent fund does not give them the privilege of reporting upon nonprivileged matters. That is the general principle that runs through the rules of the House. And the Chair is very glad, in deciding that the resolution is not in order, that it does not prevent the Committee on Ways and Means from presenting it, as the chairman suggests, in proper form to obtain the report from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. DINGLEY. The committee will simply change the phraseology to make it conform to the rules.

Mr. LOUD. The suggestion that I desired to make was to withdraw the resolution so as to avoid this contention.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I withdraw the report.

The SPEAKER. The report is withdrawn.

REPORT OF MAJ. ANSON MILLS.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there be printed at the earliest day practicable 500 copies, in separate form, with paper covers, of the report of Maj. Anson Mills, United States Army, dated October 10, 1889, to the Director of the Geological Survey on the subject of his investigations and surveys for an international dam and reservoir on the Rio Grande del Norte for the purpose of controlling the flood waters of said river and preserving the boundary between the United States and Mexico, with the five appendixes, A, B, C, D, and E, attached thereto, using the same plates for diagrams and maps that were used in the printing of the Annuals of the Geological Survey, eleventh, part second, pages 54 and 56, and thirteenth, part third, page 410.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois who offered the resolution.

Mr. HITT. The number of copies provided to be printed is 500. The document is one really having little or no interest to most of the members of the House. The resolution was introduced at the request of the Secretary of State, the minister from Mexico, and the commissioners who are now engaged upon the boundary dispute. The documents in question are technical in character. I know that they would be of very little concern to members, and therefore I move to amend by inserting after the word "printed" "for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs." I can assure the House that the committee will have a proper number of the documents sent to the Secretary of State and the Mexican minister, and to those gentlemen of the House who have districts that are concerned in the Southwestern portion of the country.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH SUITS MAY BE BROUGHT TO VACATE AND ANNUL PATENTS UPON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill to provide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul patents upon public lands, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent to lands heretofore erroneously issued under a special grant shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act, and suits to vacate and annul patents hereafter issued shall only be brought within ten years after the date of the issuance of such patents. But no

patent to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser shall be vacated or annulled, but the right and title of such purchaser is hereby confirmed.

SEC. 2. That if any person claiming to be a bona fide purchaser of any lands erroneously patented or certified shall present his claim to the Secretary of the Interior prior to the institution of a suit to cancel a patent or certification, and if it shall appear that he is a bona fide purchaser, the Secretary of the Interior shall request that suit be brought in such case against the patentee, or the corporation, company, person, or association of persons for whose benefit the certification was made, for the value of said land, which in no case shall be less than minimum Government price thereof nor more than the amount paid by the purchaser to the original grantee of the United States, and the title of such claimant shall stand confirmed. An adverse decision by the Secretary of the Interior on the bona fides of such claimant shall not be conclusive of his rights, and if such claimant or one claiming to be a bona fide purchaser, but who has not submitted his claim to the Secretary of the Interior, is made a party to such suit, and if found by the court to be a bona fide purchaser, the court shall decree a confirmation of the title and shall render a decree in behalf of the United States for the value of the land as hereinbefore provided. Any bona fide purchaser of lands patented or certified to a railroad company, and who is not made a party of such suit, and who has not submitted his claim to the Secretary of the Interior, may establish his right as such bona fide purchaser in any United States court having jurisdiction of the subject-matter, or at his option, as prescribed in sections 3 and 4 of chapter 376 of the acts of the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress.

SEC. 3. That if at any time prior to the institution of suit by the Attorney-General to cancel any patent or certification of lands erroneously patented or certified, a claim or statement is presented to the Secretary of the Interior by or on behalf of any person or persons, corporation or corporations, claiming that such person or persons, corporation or corporations, is a bona fide purchaser or are bona fide purchasers of any patented or certified land by deed or contract, or otherwise, from or through the original patentee or corporation to which patent or certification was issued, no suit or action shall be brought to cancel or annul the patent or certification for said land until such claim is investigated in said Department of the Interior; and if it shall appear that such person or corporation is a bona fide purchaser as aforesaid, or that such persons or corporations are such bona fide purchasers, then no such suit shall be instituted and the title of such claimant or claimants shall stand confirmed; but the Secretary of the Interior shall request that suit be brought in such case against the patentee, or the corporation, company, person, or association of persons for whose benefit the patent was issued or certification was made for the value of the land, as hereinbefore specified.

Amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Line 4 of section 1, after the words "under a," insert the words "railroad, Mexican, Spanish, or other."

Also, after the word "patents," in lines 8 and 9, insert "and the limitation of section 8 of chapter 561 of the acts of the second session of the Fifty-first Congress and amendments thereto is extended accordingly as to the patents herein referred to."

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of this bill.

The report (by Mr. LACEY) was read, as follows:

On the 17th day of January, 1896, the President sent to Congress a message in relation to the expiration of the limitation provided in the act of March 3, 1891. Under the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat L., 256), the Interior Department was directed to adjust all the various railway and other land grants as speedily as practicable, and whenever it was ascertained that lands had been erroneously patented the law provided that actions should be brought to cancel the same.

Provisions are embraced in the act of 1887 to protect settlers and purchasers by giving them preferential rights in case of the cancellation of their patents.

These proceedings of necessity caused much disturbance among land titles, and although the purpose involved was the laudable one of protecting the Government by correcting mistakes and overturning fraudulent patents, a sense of insecurity and loss of confidence in the integrity of patent titles became a serious drawback to the settlement and improvement of some parts of the country.

In order that all these questions might be speedily adjusted, and that any proposed litigation for the purpose of annulling patent titles should be promptly brought, the limitation act of 1891 was passed, requiring that all such suits as to patents already issued should be commenced within five years, or prior to March 3, 1896, and that as to patents subsequently issued suits to cancel the same should be brought within six years after the date of the patent.

The Commissioner of the Land Office on the 18th of December, 1895, addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Interior, suggesting an extension of time by amendment to the act of 1891. The Secretary of the Interior communicated with the President upon the subject, recommending the repeal of the limitation altogether. Thereupon the President sent a message on the subject to Congress, asking for a repeal of section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891.

We will set out in an appendix to this report the message and other communications above referred to.

The Committee on the Public Lands have patiently examined the whole subject and invited before them all persons interested in the question, as also the Assistant Attorney-General for the Department of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

There has been a large variety of land grants which will be affected by the proposed extension of the limitation. The Commissioner of the General Land Office was of the opinion that it would require ten years more to adjust the grant under the act of 1887, and therefore thought the limitation should be extended ten years.

In the adjustment of these grants it is not practicable for more than from two to four clerks in the General Land Office to work at one time without having duplicates made of certain lists or records. With this small force the adjustment has slowly proceeded for the last nine years, and over 60,000,000 acres still remain unadjusted. It appears, however, that by active diligence about 12,000,000 acres have been adjusted in the last year. At this rate the work could be completed in five years more.

But even if it could not be done with the present force, the committee are of the opinion that duplicate copies of lists and documents or records ought to be made to expedite this work, and that the time ought not to be extended more than five years.

While it is important that the rights of the Government should be cared for, and that a reasonable time for adjustment of these patented grants should be given, it is also of the highest importance that the validity of the Government patents should be examined as speedily as practicable so that former settlers and those who wish to become settlers or purchasers of these lands may know that the Government patent issued by the highest authority of the nation shall be evidence of a final and complete character that the Government's title has been lawfully transferred.

Under existing law, and in the absence of any limitation, a settler may buy a home upon one of these grants, and after occupying it for years, under the faith of a patent regularly issued and recorded, find himself made a party to a long, vexatious, and expensive litigation, and in the end be permitted to buy the land again from the Government or to enter it under the homestead laws.

That such a thing may occur for a reasonable time is perhaps the necessary consequence of fraud and mistake in patents, but that such a condition should be kept open without limit is an intolerable blemish upon the titles purporting to come from the Government. If a private individual sells and conveys lands, and they pass into innocent hands, the purchaser is protected as against his grantor, and time will protect him against all comers. But as against the United States, in the absence of a limitation law, he is never secure and may be subjected to annoyance and expense and possible loss of his land at any time.

A private individual may have obtained a patent for a homestead, tree claim, or preemption claim, and after selling the same the purchaser, who has bought upon the faith of the Government patent, may be harassed by proceedings in the courts hundreds of miles away, with a possible appeal to the expensive forms of the court of appeals, and the still more expensive and clogged tribunal of the United States Supreme Court.

To remedy these defects the act of 1891 was enacted. On account of the large land grants involved, and the fact that it has not been found practicable to adjust them within so short a time, we think that a bill giving five years' longer limitation ought to pass, but we do not believe that this extension of time ought to affect bona fide purchasers; that as to them the limitation of the act of 1891 ought to operate as a final bar when the time first limited shall expire.

But as to the original patentees, no great injustice will be done to them by extending the time five years longer, and within that time we think that the grants can be all adjusted. The shortness of this time, it is true, may put the Interior Department to some inconvenience, and it may involve some extra expense for clerical work, but the importance of bringing to an end all disputes upon the part of the Government as against its own patent titles is so evident as to need but little argument in its support.

Your committee have prepared and presented a bill which will carry out the purposes outlined in this report, and we recommend its passage.

We can not agree with the President that public policy requires that there should be no limitation as against the Government in these cases.

We have had unpleasant object lessons in many of the Spanish grants, whose limits are as elastic and uncertain as the Venezuelan boundary. The presence of these disputed titles has cast a blight over some of our most beautiful lands for more than a generation. There should be some time fixed when such a condition shall cease to exist.

The limitation may perfect titles in some instances founded in more or less of fraud or mistake. So it happens with all such statutes, but universal experience has demonstrated the necessity of such statutes.

Most of the States of the Union have adopted statutes which will bind the States themselves. Such statutes have been found to work well. To require the sovereign power to proceed in a reasonable time if it wishes to avoid or nullify its own acts is a just provision in behalf of its individual citizens. The absence of limitation excuses delays on the part of officials, and that which may be done at any time, however distant in the future, is much less likely to be attended to in the present.

We are informed that as to some of these land grants the greater part that has been patented has been sold to third persons. That was the very purpose of the land grants. It was not intended that these grants in aid of public improvements should be tied up indefinitely and withheld from settlement.

It was the theory of the projectors of such enterprises that these lands would be brought into markets by the building of railways and that the railway companies would be interested in selling them on long time at low prices and at low rates of interest to actual settlers who would furnish a carrying business for the new lines. It ought not to be the policy of the Government to harass or annoy one of these settlers by any litigation whatever.

The policy of making railway grants has been long since abandoned. The adjustment of those made should proceed with all reasonable speed, so that the transactions may be closed.

The railway companies themselves have encouraged delay by failing to procure their patents, in order to avoid local taxation. One of the purposes of the act of 1891 was to encourage the patenting of such lands, so that they might become subject to such taxation, and that their sale and settlement might be encouraged.

The bill which the committee presents with this report is as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent to lands heretofore erroneously issued under a special grant shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act, and suits to vacate and annul patents hereafter issued shall only be brought within ten years after the date of the issuance of such patents. But no patent to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser shall be vacated or annulled, but the right and title of such purchaser is hereby confirmed.

"SEC. 2. That if any person claiming to be a bona fide purchaser of any lands erroneously patented or certified shall present his claim to the Secretary of the Interior prior to the institution of a suit to cancel a patent or certification, and if it shall appear that he is a bona fide purchaser, the Secretary of the Interior shall request that suit be brought in such case against the patentee, or the corporation, company, person, or association of persons, for whose benefit the certification was made, for the value of said land, which in no case shall be less than minimum Government price thereof, nor more than the amount paid by the purchaser to the original grantee of the United States, and the title of such claimant shall stand confirmed. An adverse decision by the Secretary of the Interior on the bona fides of such claimant shall not be conclusive of his rights, and if such claimant, or one claiming to be a bona fide purchaser, but who has not submitted his claim to the Secretary of the Interior, is made a party to such suit, and if found by the court to be a bona fide purchaser, the court shall decree a confirmation of the title, and shall render a decree in behalf of the United States for the value of the land as hereinbefore provided. Any bona fide purchaser of lands patented or certified to a railroad company, and who is not made a party of such suit (and who has not submitted his claim to the Secretary of the Interior), may establish his right as such bona fide purchaser in any United States court having jurisdiction of the subject-matter, or at his option as prescribed in sections 3 and 4 of chapter 376 of the acts of the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress.

"SEC. 3. If at any time prior to the institution of suit by the Attorney-General to cancel any patent or certification of lands erroneously patented or certified, a claim or statement is presented to the Secretary of the Interior by or on behalf of any person or persons, corporation or corporations, claiming that such person or persons, corporation or corporations, is a bona fide purchaser, or are bona fide purchasers of any patented or certified land, by deed, or contract, or otherwise from or through the original patentee or corporation to which patent or certification was issued, no suit or action shall be brought to cancel or annul the patent or certification for said land until

such claim is investigated in said Department of the Interior; and if it shall appear that such person or corporation is a bona fide purchaser as aforesaid, or that such persons or corporations are such bona fide purchasers, then no such suit shall be instituted, and the title of such claimant or claimants shall stand confirmed; but the Secretary of the Interior shall request that suit be brought in such case against the patentee, or the corporation, company, person, or association of persons, for whose benefit the patent was issued or certification was made, for the value of the land as hereinbefore specified."

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

The undersigned, members of the Committee on the Public Lands, think that the Government should not be prevented from initiating proceedings to correct the fraud or errors of its agents or grantees, by which much of the public domain may be passed to corporations and syndicates. We propose the following substitute for the bill reported by the committee.

THOS. C. McRAE.
O. W. UNDERWOOD.

A bill to repeal section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891," and the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891, concerning prosecutions for cutting timber on public lands, to Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona," approved February 13, 1893, be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

APPENDIX.

We here set out the President's message and the departmental correspondence upon which it was based:

[House Document No. 151, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.]

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

To the Congress:

I desire to invite attention to the necessity for prompt legislation in order to remove the limitation of the time within which suits may be brought by the Government to annul unlawful or unauthorized grants of public lands.

By the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stats., 556), the Secretary of the Interior is directed to adjust each of the railroad land grants which may be unadjusted, and it is provided, if it shall appear, upon the completion of such adjustment or sooner, that the lands have been from any cause erroneously certified or patented by the United States to or for the use of a company claiming under any of said grants, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to demand a reconveyance of the title to all lands so erroneously certified or patented, and on failure of the company to make such reconveyance within ninety days the Attorney-General is required to institute and prosecute in the proper courts necessary proceedings to restore title to said lands to the United States. The demands made under this act have been numerous, and in some cases have resulted in the reinvestment of title to the lands in the United States upon demand, but in most cases the demand has been refused and suits have been necessary.

The work of adjustment has been unavoidably slow. The said act makes provision for the reinstatement of entries erroneously canceled on account of railroad withdrawals, and, upon certain conditions, provides for the confirmation of titles derived by purchase from the companies of lands shown to be excepted from the grants. It contemplates a disposition of every tract described by the granting act, situated within the primary or granted limits; an inspection of each tract certified or patented to the company within such limit, to determine whether such certification or patenting was proper; the listing of those tracts shown to be erroneously certified, and the determination for what tracts lost to the grant indemnity is to be allowed.

It is necessary, in making such an adjustment, that all questions of conflicting claims, either between settlers and the road or between two roads, the grants for which conflict or overlap, be finally disposed of, so that a proper disposition of the land can be shown in the adjustment. While adjustments have proceeded with the utmost rapidity consistent with a due regard for the rights of the settlers, of the United States, and the railroad companies, and while to this end the force of adjusters has been largely augmented in the General Land Office, many of the grants yet remain unadjusted.

In some of the grants, notably the corporation grants, the lack of surveys up to the present time made the completion of the work impossible.

Decisions rendered by the Interior Department in numerous conflicts have been carried into the courts. The construction of the Interior Department has generally been sustained when final determination has been reached, but many of the cases are still pending in the courts, not yet having been decided. Some of these cases, while involving immediately the title to only one particular tract, will, when decided, furnish a rule of construction to control the disposition of the title to thousands of acres of other lands in the same situation. Until the courts pass upon these questions final adjustments can not be made.

By section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., 1099), it is expressly enacted that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent theretofore issued "shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act." This period of five years will expire on the 3d of March, 1896. Of course no suit by the United States to secure the cancellation of a patent in this class of cases after that date would be effective. Indeed, it is now too late to initiate proceedings looking to any such suit, inasmuch as demand has to be first made on the company, and thereafter ninety days must be allowed for compliance or refusal, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887. Before the expiration of this period the statute would bar the right of recovery by the Government, and the benefits of anticipated favorable decisions of the courts would be lost so far as they might determine the character and disposition of grants similar to those directly involved in pending cases.

It will be readily seen that if this act of limitations is to remain on the statute books the portion of the adjustment act referred to would be rendered nugatory. Indeed, there would be but little use in continuing the adjustment of many of the land grants, inasmuch as ascertained rights of the United States or of settlers could not be enforced by law.

Legislation establishing limitations against the right of the Government to sue is an innovation not entirely consistent with the general history of the rights of the Government, for it has uniformly been held that time did not bar the sovereign power from the assertion of a right.

The early adjudications of the Land Department construed the grants with a degree of liberality toward the grantees which later decisions of the courts and of the Department have not sustained. It seems clear that the further progress of adjustments will develop facts and transactions in connection with these land grants which ought to be the subjects of legal examination and scrutiny before they are allowed to become final and conclusive. The Government should not be prevented from going into the courts to right wrongs perpetrated by its agents or any other parties, and by which much of the public domain may be diverted from the people at large to corporate uses.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that the act of 1891 should be so amended as not to apply to suits brought to recover title to lands certified or patented on account of railroad or other grants. And I respectfully urge upon Congress speedy action to the end suggested, so that the adjustment of these grants may proceed without the interposition of a bar, through lapse of time, against the right of recovery by the Government in proper cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 17, 1896.*

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 27, 1895.

SIR: I beg leave to invite your attention to the provisions of section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 1099), where it is enacted that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patents theretofore issued "shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act," which, in my opinion and that of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, ought to be repealed. In order that you may fully understand the situation, I beg to submit the following observations:

By the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. L., 556), the Secretary of the Interior is directed to adjust each of the railroad land grants which may be unadjusted; and it is provided if it shall appear, upon the completion of such adjustment, or sooner, that lands have been from any cause erroneously certified or patented by the United States to or for the use of a company claiming under any of said grants, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to demand a reconveyance of the title to all lands so erroneously certified or patented; and on failure of the company to make such reconveyance within ninety days the Attorney-General is required to institute and prosecute, in the proper courts, necessary proceedings to restore title to said lands to the United States.

The said act also makes provision for the reinstatement of entries erroneously canceled on account of railroad withdrawals, and, upon certain conditions, for the confirmation of titles derived by purchase of the companies of lands shown to be excepted from the grants.

The demands made under this act have been numerous, and in some cases have resulted in the reinvestment of title to the land in the United States; but in most cases the demand has been refused or no response made thereto, and suits have been necessary.

The work of adjustment contemplates a disposition of every tract described by the granting act situated within the primary or granted limits; an inspection of each tract certified or patented to the company within such limit, to determine whether such certification or patenting was proper; the listing of those tracts shown to be erroneously certified, and the determination for what tracts lost to the grant indemnity is allowable.

It is necessary, in making such an adjustment, that all questions of conflicting claims, either between settlers and the road or between two roads the grants for which conflict or overlap, be finally disposed of so that a proper disposition of the land can be shown in the adjustment.

In some of the grants, notably the corporation grants, the lack of surveys renders an immediate adjustment impossible.

Decisions have been made by this Department in the matter of numerous conflicts and the cases have been carried into the courts.

So far as the same have reached final determination they have generally been favorable to the construction of this Department, but many are still pending in the courts.

Under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887 (supra), the adjustment of the railroad land grants has proceeded with the utmost rapidity consistent with a due regard for the rights of the settlers, of the United States, and the railroad companies. To this end the force of adjusters has been largely augmented in the General Land Office; and when deemed advantageous, the hours of work have been prolonged even until late at night. And when any such adjustment has been submitted to the Secretary for consideration and approval, as is required in every instance, prompt action has always been taken, such work being treated as "special."

Notwithstanding these extraordinary efforts, many of the grants yet remain unadjusted, though much and very rapid progress has been made. But from the nature of the many difficulties and complications connected with the work, the recital of which would occupy too much space herein, it has been, and is, both a moral and physical impossibility to close the adjustment of these grants as speedily as desired. Some of the cases now pending in the courts involve actually the title to only one particular tract, while a decision upon the questions therein would control the disposition of the title to thousands of acres of other lands in the same category.

When these important matters will be decided it is almost impossible to say, but certainly not before March 3, 1896. Should these questions be decided favorable to the Government, the favorable decision could not necessarily be made to inure to its benefit as to the other lands the title to which was not by actual description embraced in said decision, because, by section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 1099), it is expressly enacted that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent theretofore issued "shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act." This period of five years will expire on the 3d of March, 1896.

Of course, no suit by the United States to secure the cancellation of a patent in this class of cases after that date would amount to anything. Indeed, it is now too late to initiate proceedings looking to any such suit, inasmuch as demand has to be first made on the company, and thereafter ninety days must be allowed for compliance or refusal in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887 (supra), before the expiration of which time the statute would bar the right of recovery by the Government.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have greatly affected the previous dispositions made under railroad grants, but will facilitate the progress of the adjustment of grants, notably, Northern Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Bardon (154 U. S., 288); Northern Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Bardon (145 U. S., 535); Whitney *vs.* Taylor (158 U. S., 85), and United States *vs.* St. Paul and Sioux City Railroad (159 U. S., 349).

It will be readily seen that if this act of limitations is to remain on the statute books the portion of the adjustment act of 1887, before cited, would be rendered nugatory. Indeed, there would be but little use in continuing the adjustment of many of the land grants, inasmuch as ascertained rights of the United States or of settlers could not be enforced by power of law. By this denial to the Government of the right to go into court and ascertain its rights the railroad companies would profit very largely, as it is a well-known fact, capable of abundant substantiation by the records of the Land Office, that the early adjudications of the Land Department construed the grants with a degree of liberality toward the grantees which, by later decisions, is declared not to have been warranted by law.

Should, therefore, the statute of limitations make them secure in the enjoyment of the lands thus obtained, it is entirely inconsistent with experience to suppose for a moment they would, on an impotent demand, voluntarily surrender anything that the law secures them the enjoyment of.

It is submitted, with due respect, that the legislation of Congress establishing this limitation against the Government is an innovation utterly inconsistent

in my opinion, with the theory of our institutions, and seems likely to result almost entirely in benefiting the interests of the corporations and adversely to those of the Government. From time immemorial it has been held that limitations did not bar the sovereign power from the assertion of a right. And in this country the highest judicial tribunals have uniformly held that laches was not to be imputed to the Government, which could only act through its agents. But in this matter the Government is barred from righting the wrongs, whether intentional or inadvertent, perpetrated by those agents against the people at large, by which much of the public property has been perverted to corporate uses.

Statutes of limitations are regarded favorably because of the repose they give against stale claims, the presumption being that after the lapse of a reasonable time they have been asserted and adjusted or waived.

But this presumption does not arise where, from circumstances, no proper opportunity has been afforded for the assertion of the claims, as, for instance, during the existence of the disabilities of minority, coverture, or the like. And certainly such presumption can not arise in the matter of these land grants, where, as is abundantly shown, from the very nature of the case, the rights of the Government are ascertainable with so much difficulty.

Under these circumstances it seems to me that the act of 1891 should be so amended as not to apply to suits brought to recover title to lands certified or patented on account of railroad or other grants. And I respectfully request that you urge upon Congress to take speedy action, as suggested, that there may be no delay in the adjustment of these grants and no bar, by lapse of time, against the right of recovery by the Government in a proper case.

Herewith is transmitted copy of the letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to me on this subject. Your attention is invited to the fact that in recommending the repeal of the existing law he suggests the reenactment of limitations of ten years within which suits are to be brought to secure cancellation of patents. I do not entirely concur in this suggestion of the Commissioner, but think, for reasons herein stated, it would be best to repeal the limitations absolutely, and leave the law as it existed prior to the passage of said act of March 3, 1891.

Very respectfully, HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1895.

SIR: On March 3, 1891, an act of Congress entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," was approved by the President. (26 Stat., 1095.) Section 8 of said act provided, among other things, "that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent heretofore issued shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act, and suits to vacate and annul patents hereafter issued shall only be brought within six years after the date of the issue of such patents." And by another act, approved the same day (26 Stat. L., 1093), entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,'" the same proviso was enacted. It will be observed that this section makes no exception, but applies to all patents.

By act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. L., 256), directions were given for the adjustment of all grants by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the recovery by the United States of title to lands which from any cause have been erroneously certified or patented under such grants, and said act requires that the adjustments be made in accordance with the rulings of the United States Supreme Court. Therefore, as conveyances under these grants date as far back as 1850 and were made under various court and departmental rulings, it is not surprising that many of said conveyances have been and will be found, under the construction now given such grants by the Supreme Court, to have been erroneous.

A number of these grants have been examined with a view to their adjustment, and rules have been laid to show cause why suits should not be instituted for recovery of title in some cases, and demands for reconveyance have been made in others, but very few have been finally adjusted and closed, not more than a dozen; and most of these examinations, nearly all in fact, were made prior to the rulings of the United States Supreme Court in the cases of Mary Bardon *vs.* Northern Pacific Railroad (145 U. S., 535) and Whitney *vs.* Taylor (158 U. S., 85), which so change the previous rulings of the court, as construed by this Department, as to make necessary a reexamination of all railroad land grants, excepting the few finally closed and some half dozen examined since the decision in the case of Whitney *vs.* Taylor, above referred to. The Department so held in its letters of July 18, 1895, in the case of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company, and September 5, 1895, in the case of the Burlington and Missouri River Railroad Company of Iowa.

There are 79 land-grant railroads and 7 land-grant wagon roads.

Under the provisions of section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891, as originally passed and amended as aforesaid, the time within which the United States can legally bring suit for the recovery of lands erroneously patented prior to March 3, 1891, will expire March 3, 1896, unless an extension be made by Congress.

The work of adjusting these grants is one of great magnitude, and the division of the office charged with its execution is also charged with the consideration and determination of all questions relating to or arising out of conflicts between grants by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, wagon roads, canals, and river improvements and rights of way over the public lands for railroads, canals, ditches, and reservoirs, and its current work must be kept up. It is also charged with the administration of the grant of desert lands to certain States.

It is clear, therefore, that the time within which the United States may bring suit for the recovery of land erroneously certified or patented under these grants must be extended or that the interests of the Government, and in many instances those of private citizens, must suffer. I have accordingly the honor to suggest that Congress be asked to extend such time ten years, or until March 3, 1906, for lands patented prior to March 3, 1891, and ten years from date of patent for lands patented subsequent thereto.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments recommended by the committee.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not a privileged matter. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Iowa on that point.

Mr. LACEY. It is undoubtedly a privileged report from the Committee on Public Lands under paragraph 57 of Rule XI, which provides that the Committee on Public Lands shall have the privilege of reporting at any time "bills for the forfeiture of land grants in the public lands, and bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill for the reservation of the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, lands that have been erroneously patented to somebody else. It provides means by which that erroneous patenting may be recalled and the lands may be reserved for the benefit of bona fide settlers, and it comes clearly within the paragraph of the rule I have cited.

Mr. LOUD. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill merely extends the time in which suits may be begun, and there is a question in my mind as to whether it does come within the provision of the rule. This is a bill which I am rather inclined to think will provoke a good deal of discussion on this floor, and the question I now raise is whether it comes within the rule as privileged. It is a bill which merely extends the time within which suits may be begun.

Mr. LACEY. I will say to the gentleman that it is a matter of great importance to his State.

Mr. LOUD. It is of great importance to my State. It opens up one of the greatest questions in California; it opens up all the old Mexican titles which we have heretofore regarded as settled. I doubt very much whether it is a privileged matter.

Mr. LACEY. It does not open up that question, Mr. Speaker; the question is now open. This bill merely amends a limitation law which is now in force, the act of 1890, and is in response to the message of the President sent here on the 17th of last month. The limitation expires on the 3d day of next month, and if there is any question about the bill being privileged there certainly should be no question about its consideration at the earliest practicable time.

Mr. LOUD. I will not object to its consideration. The question I raise is as to whether it is privileged.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, well; let it go.

The SPEAKER. If the point of order is insisted upon, the Chair would like to understand how the bill does come within the provisions of the rule.

Mr. LACEY. In this way. The land grants have to be adjusted under the act of 1887. That act required that the Secretary of the Interior should, as speedily as possible, adjust all of these land grants and determine the lands, if any, which had been patented erroneously, such as lands lying beyond the limits of the grants. Then the act of 1891 was passed, limiting actions to cancel such patents to five years, and this bill now proposes to extend that time five years more as to everybody except bona fide settlers, so that the lands which will be affected will be lands that will be reclaimed by the United States to be reserved for the benefit of the public.

This bill, therefore, reserves for public settlement erroneously patented lands, and that brings it within the privilege of the rule. If it does not, of course the bill is not privileged. It opens the lands also to settlement, which brings it within the privilege.

Mr. LOUD. I admit that that may be contingent; but the object is simply to extend the time within which certain suits may be begun, which makes the mass of titles, which are now substantially perfected, for the next five years or more still under supervision by the Government and subject to question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that that provision has always had a liberal construction, and will decide that it is a privileged matter.

Mr. LOUD. Then I raise the further point of order that this must have its further consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LACEY. It does not involve the expenditure of any public money.

Mr. LOUD. It relates to the public lands generally, however.

Mr. LACEY. It does not involve the giving away of the public lands, but the reclaiming of public lands wrongfully patented, and I do not think it is subject to that point.

The SPEAKER. On what ground does the gentleman from California claim that this must go to the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. LOUD. Because it provides ultimately for the disposition of the public lands.

The SPEAKER. In what way?

Mr. LOUD. Well, it takes land now in the possession of certain parties back to the Government, which is an ultimate disposition of the lands.

The SPEAKER. But that seems to be not an appropriation of money, but an acquisition of money.

Mr. LOUD. I am not speaking of the money portion, but that it is ultimately a disposition of the public lands, which I assume involves a question that must be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOWERS. If I may be allowed a minute, as one of the committee——

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman proceeds the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Then I have nothing further to say on the subject at this time.

Mr. McRAE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the bill.

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas to offer a substitute for the bill, so that both may be considered together.

Mr. McRAE. I offer the following as a substitute:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to repeal section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891," and the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891, concerning prosecutions for cutting timber on public lands, to Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona," approved February 13, 1893, be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the proposed substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas sounds very complex to hear it read, but is in fact a very simple matter. The act of 1891, March 3, providing a limitation against the Government in bringing suit to cancel the patents to public lands previously granted to anybody, required that all such suits should be begun within five years. This proposed substitute repeals that section without any limitation whatever, but continues the power on the part of the Government hereafter at any time to bring actions to cancel patents either to railroad companies or others for any lands that have been granted heretofore.

The committee bill, however, has been prepared with great care in response to the message of the President read to this House on the 17th day of last January. The President calls the attention of Congress to the fact that that limitation in the act of 1891 will expire on the 3d day of March, 1896, and that there are 60,000,000 acres of land grants yet to be adjusted in order to determine what patents, if any, had been erroneously issued, and asks that the law may be repealed that fixed this limitation.

The Committee on the Public Lands of the House, in response to the request of the President, prepared the bill now before the House extending the time as to these Mexican, Spanish, and railroad land grants for a period of five years. We fixed upon that time for this reason: Last year the entire force of the division of the Interior Department engaged in this work succeeded in adjusting land grants to the extent of 12,000,000 acres. There are about 60,000,000 acres of land grants yet unadjusted. The committee believe that in five years, with the same diligence shown by the Department during the last year, they could adjust all of the remaining grants. If we gave them ten years to do the work in, instead of five, the committee believe it is likely that nothing will be immediately done; but if the time was limited to five years, active work will be done, and I think that the work will all be complete within that time.

The previous adjustments of these grants have only been carried through the Department at the rate of about 3,000,000 acres a year until during the last year, when by active, diligent work, the Department succeeded in adjusting 12,000,000 acres. This bill, therefore, in the judgment of the committee, gives ample time for the conclusion of the work.

As to the settlers now on the lands, we report that the individual settlers or purchasers who have bought land from the railroad companies and other parties, and who are innocent holders of land, should not be disturbed, and that the limitation of the act of 1891 shall be absolute after the 3d day of March next.

There are in California, in Kansas, in Nebraska, and in other States very considerable quantities of these lands which have passed into the hands of innocent holders, and they are protected by the bill in its present form. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

Mr. HARTMAN. Before the gentleman does that, I want to ask him a question. I am interested in this bill, as he is, and I favor the bill. There is only one thing about it that I want to ask his judgment upon. Commencing in line 12 of page 1, and ending on line 15, page 2, the following language occurs in the bill:

But no patent to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser shall be vacated or annulled, but the right and title of such purchaser is hereby confirmed.

Now, in many instances purchasers of these lands have bought them prior to the issuance of the patent by the Government to the railroad company. I want to know whether their rights will in any way be affected by the provisions of this bill? To illustrate my point, I will say that there are now in the neighborhood of 2,000 men in the State that I represent here who are bona fide purchasers of Northern Pacific Railroad lands. They have taken them in good faith, made a partial payment, bought them on the five and ten year contract plan. They have made partial payments on those lands, and have gone into possession and made improvements. Now, what I want to know is, will their rights be entirely preserved by this bill? If not, I desire to have it amended so they will.

Mr. LACEY. It seems to me there is no question about that, as to settlers who buy the land from railroad companies having lands granted to them by acts of Congress. After the settler buys a patent is issued to the railroad company. That patent at once inures to the benefit of the purchaser, and he having bought the land and subsequently held it in good faith would be protected by the provisions of this bill. That was the intention of the bill. I think it is fully broad enough to cover it. In addition to that, sections 3 and 4 have been added, giving opportunities for the settler to have his title confirmed in the Department of the Interior. But we have in the closing words of this first section provided expressly that the title of bona fide settlers is not only protected by the limitation, but it is affirmatively confirmed by the act itself.

Mr. HARTMAN. You will observe, though, that the language says that "no patent" to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser, and so forth, shall be affected. That contemplates the previous issuance of a patent.

Mr. LACEY. Not at all.

Mr. HARTMAN. If there has been no issuance of a patent, but the railroad company have simply taken the land under the grant, and then have sold it to purchasers, and those purchasers have paid all or a portion of the purchase price, how are they protected?

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman from Montana must remember that this bill only deals with patented lands. As to the class of settlers he refers to, their rights will be determined under the forfeiture act of 1890 or any other act that may be applicable.

Mr. LACEY. The act of 1887.

Mr. McRAE. This only deals with erroneously patented lands.

Mr. LACEY. The class of settlers referred to by the gentleman from Montana is not affected one way or the other by this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to ask my colleague one question about this. There are, in the State which he and I represent in part, over 3,000,000 acres of land that might be affected by this statute. There is a provision here that the lands held by the bona fide purchaser shall not be harmfully affected, that is, so far as the annulment of the patent is concerned, but there may be a suit against every one of the holders of that land unless they do something to establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that they are bona fide owners. Will not this impose upon every one of these men the necessity of establishing that fact before the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LACEY. No, it will not.

Mr. HEPBURN. No man will be certain until the five years have elapsed that he may not be the defendant in a suit, for he can not tell what particular patents it is the purpose of the Secretary to attempt to invalidate, and his only safety in avoiding that litigation is by himself taking the initiative to satisfy the Commissioner that he holds by a bona fide title. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it throws the cloud that may result from the fear of litigation upon every one of these acres of land and continues it for five years.

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. The cloud is simply in the mind of my friend. We have carefully considered that question. That limitation will expire absolutely on the 3d of March. It only runs about two weeks now, and the present bill does not extend it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Their title would then be perfected?

Mr. LACEY. The title would then be perfected. It has been amply cared for, and if they desire to avail themselves directly of section 2 they may do so, or other persons can do it for them; and it is only, as I have said, to run two weeks longer.

Mr. HEPBURN. But if this law runs what would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from bringing his action for the annulment of patents of every one of these acres during any part of the limitation fixed?

Mr. LACEY. The act of 1887 and 1891 require that there shall be ninety days within which the settlers or any person against whom an action can be brought shall be notified and demand for reconveyance made, and the limitation expires in two weeks, so that it is impossible for the Government to make the demand, as the ninety days expire within two weeks. The whole matter has been carefully guarded in this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does not this simply extend the provisions of an act amended relating to where another party has gone on the land afterwards?

Mr. LACEY. It does as to the original patentees, while the land remains in their possession, but where the land has been sold to an outsider or a bona fide settler the rights of the bona fide settler are protected.

Mr. HEPBURN. But how about that? Is this changed in order to prevent litigation? Is it to put a limit upon the power of the Secretary to prevent these suits, which must be done by the holder of the present title by showing to the Secretary that he is a bona fide settler?

Mr. BOWERS. His ninety-days' notification will expire before that time.

Mr. LACEY. The limitation provided in the act of 1891 expires on the 3d day of next March, and these men are protected, therefore; and the second section was drawn after consultation with gentlemen from my friend's district, where the most of these lands

in Iowa are situated, and this section was put in to protect them if anything should happen between now and the 3d of March; and I am able and glad to say that the rights of the men now living in the Eighth district of Iowa have been carefully guarded by the bill.

Mr. HARTMAN. In view of the fact that there seems some question as to whether the rights of the bona fide purchasers in lands which have been patented from the railroad companies are to be protected fully here, would the gentleman have any objection to accepting an amendment to section 1 on this line, so that the last clause should read, "But the right and title of any purchaser of lands granted to any railroad company shall be, and they are hereby, confirmed to such purchasers subject to the full payment of the contract price therefor?" Would the gentleman have any objection to such an amendment as that, which eliminates all doubt?

Mr. LACEY. That raises another question that was not considered by the committee. It was not involved in our examination, and not necessarily involved in this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill only deals with patented lands. When a patent is issued for a quarter section of land held by some person whom my friend has in his mind now, under the act of 1891, and an action may hereafter be brought at any time within six years from the time at which that patent may issue, and this bill changes the time to ten years instead of six, so that this bill does not affect them in any way injuriously as to the patents hereafter to issue, but only deals with patents heretofore issued.

Mr. HARTMAN. Do you mean to say that within five years from the date it changes the time in which patents will issue in the future? How is that?

Mr. LACEY. It was proposed both ways in the committee.

Mr. HARTMAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say this: If any purchaser of land for which patent has not already issued to a railroad company has made a part of his payments upon those lands, and we will say the next year patent issues, that within ten years from the date of the issuance of that patent an action can be brought against that bona fide settler?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. HARTMAN. Then I submit that you are not doing anything to protect the rights of the bona fide settlers.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman does not understand the situation.

Mr. HARTMAN. I have about 2,000 constituents who are interested in just such matter.

Mr. LACEY. Let me explain, and I think you will agree with me. The bill contemplates that in a case where a railroad company should have sold lands outside of its grant, and by mistake that land should subsequently be patented to the railroad, an action to cancel that patent will be limited to ten years; and the act of 1887 fully protects the men who are situated like those you speak of. They are entitled to a prior right in their land, and their rights are fully protected by the act of 1887. But this bill had no such purpose in view. It does not intend to confirm the title of the lands in the railroad company that may have been heretofore sold beyond the limits of its grant.

Mr. HARTMAN. Admitting that to be true, surely the gentleman does not pretend to say that the rights of a party who has bought land in good faith of a railroad company and paid his money for it, and gone on and made his improvements and expended large sums of money in that way, are protected by a bill which simply gives him a preference right to locate upon the land and buy it again from the Government?

Mr. LACEY. How could a man buy in good faith from a railroad company lands that were 40 miles, or even 3 or 4 miles, outside the limits of the grant?

Mr. HARTMAN. Oh, that is an exceptional case. That does not apply to one case in a thousand.

Mr. LACEY. Well, that is the only class of cases that will be affected by this bill. It is in the main a question of divisional lines, as to whether the grant covers the quarter section or falls short of it, and if a man bought lands before the grants were adjusted and patented, from somebody who did not own those lands, he can, under the act of 1887, procure the patents to be issued to himself, and thus be fully protected. On the other hand, in Montana a number of patents have been issued for lands that did not belong to the railroad company and which has sold them, and those purchasers are fully protected by this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Government patented lands to the railroad company that the company was not entitled to.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

Mr. McRAE rose.

Mr. PICKLER. Before the gentleman from Arkansas enters into the discussion of this bill I want to ask him a question. I observe that his amendment contemplates an amendment of the timber-culture law. I want to ask him whether this bill or the substitute affe cts the timber-culture entrymen?

Mr. McRAE. It proposes to repeal section 8 of that law, not the whole law. If the gentleman will read the substitute he will see that it applies only to section 8.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, does that in any way affect timber-culture entrymen?

Mr. McRAE. Not at all. I shall not attempt, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this bill in detail. I think that in some respects it is very imperfect, even along the lines that the majority of the committee have agreed upon, but if the committee amendments are adopted it will be improved. The point to which I ask consideration of the House is this, that the statute of limitation should be repealed outright. I do not believe that there should be a statute which would prevent the Government from bringing suit to correct mistakes and frauds committed by its agents or otherwise. In 1806 there was a statute of limitation passed prohibiting suits brought on the bonds of United States marshals, and that is the only statute of limitation passed during the history of this Government until the act of March 3, 1891, which is involved in this bill, and it produced such a condition of affairs in the Department of the Interior as made it necessary to call the attention of Congress to it by a special message from the President. Now, sir, the very presence of this bill is the strongest argument than I could make for the position I assume.

It demonstrates the danger of all such legislation. It shows how easy it is to defeat justice and promote fraud when there is a statute of limitation that validates the latter. The experiment made by the Fifty-first Congress in passing the act of limitation ought to convince us that there should be none, because here we are with a large part of the railroad grants yet to be adjusted and the time fixed by that law practically out. We are urged by the Executive to act promptly, and yet on account of bonds and appropriations and other reasons it is a month before we get consideration in one branch of Congress. Millions of acres of land belonging of right to the homeless people will by reason of mistakes and frauds be lost unless we can get the concurrence of both branches and the Executive to repeal or extend the limitation against suits. The railroads want the bar to attach, and it will be hard to prevent it now.

I introduced and the last House passed a bill to repeal section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891, but no action was taken in the Senate. It may not act now. I believe that the Government, which must act through its agents, will necessarily at times have some who are incompetent, careless, or dishonest, and that it should not be bound by the doctrine of estoppel or laches like individuals who have their free volition to act at once.

Mr. TAWNEY. How much time has the Government had to adjust these patents?

Mr. McRAE. Since when does the gentleman mean?

Mr. TAWNEY. Since the mistakes of the Interior Department were made. The gentleman was speaking about not holding the Government responsible.

Mr. McRAE. I do not know how many mistakes have been made. We can not tell until the adjustments are made.

Mr. TAWNEY. But mistake is the basis on which the adjustments are asked for.

Mr. McRAE. The investigation and adjustment may show that a great many mistakes have been made.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, there ought to be some limitation.

Mr. McRAE. That is the very point where the gentleman and I do not agree. I am trying in my feeble way to show that there should be no limitation.

I insist that a sovereign government which is compelled to act through its agents ought to be at liberty at any time to expose frauds perpetrated or mistakes committed by those agents. When the certification and listing of railroad lands was first inaugurated the lists were made, not because they were regarded as patents, but simply as notice to all the world that the lands were claimed by the railroad companies. These lists were oftener than otherwise prepared by the railroad companies and signed by the Department officials without much examination, under the supposition that it bound no one and that all errors could be corrected when patents were applied for.

In the course of time, however, the Land Department, which has grown and increased in importance with the years, eventually decided that these certificates made after this imperfect examination possessed the same binding force in law as patents. By the second section of this bill the certificates are treated as patents, and yet we are told that there should be a limitation against exposing and correcting the frauds that have been carried or may be carried into certificates obtained in this way. It is a dangerous policy, and will cost us much in the end. No harm can come to any honest settler who holds by purchase in good faith under the act of March 3, 1887, for by it he is secured in all of his rights. I do not object to any reasonable protection to settlers and honest purchasers, but I do not want corporations and syndicates to hide their frauds behind imaginary settlers.

My proposition is to give the President what he asks for, to give the Department what it ought to have and what it has always had until the act of 1891, and then hold them responsible for errors and frauds. If you will do this you will hold over the heads of

all corrupt agents who might be induced to perpetrate a fraud the fear of exposure and punishment, but if you fix a limitation you offer a premium to corruption. Many of the sharp, shrewd representatives of railroads will be able to cover up for a limited period frauds of the greatest magnitude, and thus dishonestly take from the settlers millions of acres of land which they ought to have and could get but for the validation of such frauds by laws like the one proposed.

I think the proper thing to do is to repeal the whole limitation clause; but if you can not see your way clearly to do that, the next best thing is to pass the first section of the bill the committee recommend.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LACEY. I had an understanding with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and also with the Chair, that this bill would have been called up earlier in the day, in time to be disposed of without delaying the Agricultural appropriation bill. I only ask now that the further consideration of this bill be postponed, retaining its present status, until the Agricultural appropriation bill is disposed of.

Mr. LOUD. I have no objection to letting this bill go over until we dispose of the agricultural bill; but I have no disposition, in view of the fact that the Chair has already held it to be privileged, to agree that it shall retain its present status. I would not feel inclined to grant it any extraordinary privilege over and above what the bill now carries.

If it is amended to suit me, and as I have suggested to the gentleman from Iowa, by striking out these allusions to the Mexican-Spanish grants, that will be another matter.

Mr. LACEY. Well, that is a matter on which we can confer personally hereafter. I have no objection to it myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROUT). The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the further consideration of this bill be postponed till the conclusion of the agricultural bill, and then to be taken up, following it immediately, retaining its present status. Is there objection?

Mr. LOUD. To the latter part of the proposition, Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. LACEY. Then, objection is made, and we will have to go on with the bill.

Mr. McRAE. Would it be in order to postpone the further consideration of the bill until Monday or Tuesday or any other day the gentleman from Iowa may suggest? It will not lose its privilege, as I understand.

Mr. LACEY. I will make the suggestion, in view of the arrangement with the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, that the bill go over. I move to postpone the further consideration of the bill until the Agricultural appropriation bill is disposed of.

Mr. LOUD. If the request of the gentleman from Iowa had been put in that language I should not have objected to it.

Mr. LACEY. I understand the gentleman from California objects.

Mr. LOUD. No; I said that I should not object to the language of the suggestion now made by the gentleman from Iowa that this bill simply go over until after the Agricultural appropriation bill is disposed of. What I do object to is the attempt that the gentleman has made to make it privileged.

Mr. LACEY. I ask also that it retain its privileged character.

Mr. LOUD. But the Chair has already decided that the bill is entitled to a privilege which would not be interfered with, I suppose, by letting it go over. The bill would be entitled to the same privilege at any other time that it is entitled to now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not understand the request. Will the Chair please state it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked for the postponement of the further consideration of the bill until the conclusion of the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and then to be immediately resumed.

Mr. LOUD. Ah, Mr. Speaker, but that was not the request, as I understand it, which the gentleman made. The motion was to postpone the bill until after the Agricultural bill was disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is conscious that he added the latter clause. The request is that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until the conclusion of the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do I understand the Chair to hold that the bill does not lose its privileged character?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that it loses no privilege which it now possesses. Is there objection to the request that the bill go over?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Before that motion is put, with the consent of the gentleman from New York, I desire to present a large bundle of petitions. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the petition of 8,652 Grand Army men of the State of Ohio, petitioning for a graded service-pension law, a measure which I most earnestly indorse. I simply call attention to the vast number of signers who ask this legislation, and ask that the petition take the usual course. They come to me with a favorable recommendation from the distinguished department commander of Ohio, Maj. Charles Townsend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to offer a petition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have the right to introduce the petition and only asked unanimous consent to make the brief statement that I have already made.

The petitions were sent to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was impossible to hear the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I presented a vast body of names of petitioners upon the subject of a service pension, and I simply asked permission to state that there were 8,652 of those names.

LEAVE TO PRINT ON THE BOND BILL.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the extension of the time for the printing in the RECORD of speeches upon the bill which has been under consideration (H. R. 2904) until the 22d instant, inclusive. It extends the time for one week longer. Under the agreement which was made the ten days' time would expire to-day. I desire to extend the time for one week longer, so that speeches upon that bill, within the limitations of the original agreement, may be printed in the RECORD any time during the coming week, including the RECORD of the 22d of February.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the House sufficiently understand the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Several MEMBERS. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and pending my motion, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate upon that bill close at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and pending that motion, he asks unanimous consent that the general debate upon that bill be closed at 5 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I object.

Mr. WADSWORTH. How much time does the gentleman from Georgia desire? I am willing that the debate shall go on as long as it is desired, but I simply wish to have an agreement as to the time for the general debate before we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will not object, and I hope that nobody will interpose any objection. I think the proposition to close the general debate upon the Agricultural bill at 5 o'clock is a fair enough one. There will be plenty of time to discuss it, of course, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall be very generous in extending time.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent to close general debate on the Agricultural appropriation bill at 5 o'clock?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEELE. I thought that consent had already been given.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills, with Mr. HULL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the time will

be equally divided between the two sides. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. I have no disposition to talk on this bill. I do not know that I shall take five minutes. This is a plain, straightforward bill, the legitimate child of a company of honest farmers. [Laughter.] They have caught the spirit of the times and have sailed close to the shore. The bill carries $145,000 less than the bill of last year, and I believe that the celebrated Mr. Holman, of Indiana, was in this House at that time. His fame has gone throughout all the land, if not throughout all the world, on the matter of retrenchment.

The bill carries $234,000, practically, less than the estimates, and really $104,000 less. Now, sir, I do not know that I want to say anything more upon that. I am satisfied that you will be pleased with the bill until you come to the matter of the distribution of seeds, bulbs, and so on. It will be left in your hands, and I have no doubt you will be able to manage it to the satisfaction of men and angels.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I desire to ask him if there is anything in this bill which provides anything in regard to the appropriation for seeds during last year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to say to the gentleman it does not. A resolution has already passed the Senate and is now before the Committee on Agriculture on that subject, and will be reported next week. There is nothing in this bill touching the appropriation for seeds of last year. The provisions in this bill are for the fiscal year ending 1897, and that is provided for.

Mr. PICKLER. I understand the gentleman to say that the resolution passed by the Senate which instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed with the distribution is now before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is before the committee now.

Mr. PICKLER. When did I understand the gentleman to say that it will be reported?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will be reported next week.

Mr. PICKLER. I simply desire to suggest that a great many of us would be glad to see that resolution reported. Now, there is another question.

Mr. STEELE. I hope this will not come out of my time.

Mr. PICKLER. I will yield you mine. As I understand, the provision on this question in this bill is the same as the law that now exists?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. PICKLER. What assurance has the gentleman or the Committee on Agriculture that the Secretary of Agriculture, who has defied the law of the past year, that is in the same language, will not defy it the coming year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have no assurance on the subject.

Mr. PICKLER. Would it not be well to establish a parity between the law and the Secretary?

Mr. WADSWORTH. At the proper time an amendment will be offered to the section which I think will be satisfactory to the gentleman and to the House.

Mr. PICKLER. Has the gentleman the amendment already prepared?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My colleague [Mr. WILBER] has the amendment in charge.

Mr. QUIGG. Will the gentleman from New York inform me whether there is anything in this bill appropriating any money for the publication of books?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course there is the same item as of last year, on page 17, "Publications of Department of Agriculture."

Mr. QUIGG. I notice that in the past that Department has been competing with the general publishers of the country in the publication of books. I happened to notice a few days ago a publication on the "Honeybee," and I am informed by publishers that there is absolutely nothing new in it; that is simply a book that is got out by the Agricultural Department, in competition with books that are published on that subject, as other books have been got out by the Agricultural Department in competition with the regular publishers of the country; and it occurred to me that in this era of retrenchment, upon which we are all on both sides of the House agreed, it might be a good idea for the gentleman and his committee, who have already economized so admirably, if they would extend their economy to the publication department of the Agricultural Department and enable the publishers of the country to sell their books without the cheap-labor competition of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The gentleman from Montana is authority for the statement that efforts are now being made to cross the honeybee with the lightning bug, in order that the product may labor at night. I want to know if there is an appropriation here for that purpose or if the committee has taken that into consideration? [Laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. That would not require an appropriation, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York to control one-half of the time and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to control the other half.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in any general debate on this bill. The bill is a very good one, a very economical one in every respect, and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the House. When we come to the proper point in the debate under the five-minute rule I shall want to propose perhaps an amendment or two.

I will now yield fifteen minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I propose at the proper time to introduce an amendment to this bill which has reference to the sale and introduction of tobacco and other farm products in foreign countries. I will say now what I have to say upon that amendment, and also upon some other matters connected with the general bill.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because in my judgment it has reference to a matter which has received little or no consideration. Not because it is of little importance, but because it is not generally understood. My amendment may apply to other farm products, but it is my purpose to confine myself for the few moments I have to speak to the one product, tobacco. No other product of the greatest and most important of all industries is so trammeled in its efforts to reach and supply the foreign demands.

England and Germany are free markets and offer to the American farmer an opportunity to sell this great staple without let or hindrance, and afford by far the best outlet for the surplus, especially for certain grades of tobacco. Nearly all the strips (that is, leaves with the stems taken out) made in this country are sold in England, and a considerable quantity of rich, dark tobacco is sent to Germany. This still leaves a very large proportion of the crop not needed in this country to seek other markets, or, I might rather say, to be sought by Government contractors to supply the demands of other foreign countries. The Governments of France, Italy, and Spain, and probably some others, buy entirely through what is termed "Regie" contracts. These contracts are let to individuals and firms, they agreeing to furnish so many hogsheads of the particular types wanted at a stipulated price. The entire trade is a government monopoly. Austria and Hungary buy through their consuls, but the monopoly is the same.

Now, my object in offering these amendments is to try to open these foreign markets to the individual producers of tobacco in this country. In France and these other countries no individual is permitted to sell a hogshead of tobacco at all. Tobacco is treated differently in that respect from any other product, and this great industry is a very important one to a large part of the people of this country. These contracts are made with a few individuals. These individuals set the price of the product in this country, and it must go into their hands, because there is no outlet for it except through these contractors.

The contractors are few in number—generally three or four men control the contracts for these Governments—and of course with an abundant supply they get together and fix the price on all export grades, from which there is no appeal, as all this tobacco must go into this trade or it can not be sold at all.

Now, the object of this amendment is to start an investigation of this matter and by friendly intercourse with these Governments seek in time to get them, for advantages offered them in the sale of their products to this country, to at least modify this method of supplying their wants, so as to allow our dealers in tobacco, or our farmers, if they think proper to do so, to ship and sell tobacco in these countries as freely as other products are sold, under such customs duties or restrictions as they may see proper to impose. England puts a very high tariff on tobacco; still it is our best market for certain grades.

That this may not appear to be a trivial matter, I desire to present a few figures to show the importance of this crop, at least to Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, and especially to Kentucky, as that State produces about one-half of the tobacco grown in the United States.

For the year 1895:

Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Louisville	174,885
Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Cincinnati*	30,000
Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Hopkinsville*	15,000
Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Clarksville*	15,000
Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Paducah*	12,000
Number of hogsheads of Kentucky tobacco sold at Mayfield*	5,000
Estimated bought loose and not resold in any of these markets	20,000
Total	271,885

*Estimated.

At 1,400 pounds to the hogshead equals 380,639,000 pounds.

I am unable to state accurately the amount of "Regie" tobacco taken from Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia, but state approximately

as the amount taken of Western tobacco, mostly from Kentucky and Tennessee.

	Hogsheads.
France (annually)	10,000
Italy (annually)	18,000
Spain (annually)	16,000
Hungary and Austria (annually, through their consuls)	6,000

Making as a total 70,000,000 pounds, or 50,000 hogsheads.

Under Government monopoly this tobacco is sold at enormous profits, ranging from 200 to 800 per cent, France, for instance, realizing upon this article alone a revenue of many times its cost in this country, amounting annually from sixty to seventy millions of dollars. England does the same thing by a different method; not shutting off private shipments and sales, but by an enormous tariff of 76 cents per pound. This is at least ten times the cost of the tobacco in this country. It may be retorted that our tariff on tobacco is very high. On fine cigar wrappers it is $1.50 to $2.25 per pound, and lower grades 35 to 50 cents per pound; but when we come to compare the real market value of these tobaccos it will be seen that our seemingly high tariff sinks into insignificance when compared with the enormous duty imposed by England, our rate being from 73 to 198 per cent of the value, England's ten times the cost, or 1,000 per cent. Of course open markets on the one hand and a lower duty on the other would greatly increase the demand by lowering the price to consumers, and correspondingly increasing the price to producers in this country.

The provisions of this amendment kindly, gradually, but persistently carried to a successful issue would, in my judgment, bring greater benefits to the producers of this important farm product than all the legislation ever enacted in its interest.

The importance of the improvement of agriculture in methods of sale, of culture, and of prices for products can not be exaggerated. It is the basis of all industries. It furnishes three-fourths of all our exports. Upon its broad and stalwart shoulders rest the most vital interests of every class, of every calling, and, indeed, of every individual citizen of this great country. Without agriculture we could have no commerce, and of course would have no use for railroads or banks or other great institutions, which, under the benign influence and fostering care of a prosperous agriculture, are capable of bringing such great benefits and blessings to the human race. These things being true, it can not be said that any legislation which fosters and benefits agriculture is in any sense class legislation. Washington said: "No greater good could come to any country than the improvement of its agriculture."

Other causes, at least in the judgment of the farmers themselves, have a most pernicious effect upon the price of farm products—one is the unsatisfactory financial system which prevails in this country at this time. No one seems to be satisfied with the present system, and no one seems capable of suggesting a better which would be acceptable to all sections or, in fact, to either party. One party imposing additional burdens upon the people by a continuous bond system, the end of which no human foresight can determine; the other party doing the same thing by additional tariff taxation under the guise of providing an increase of revenue, which the disbursing agents of the Government declare we do not need.

What is the result of the exhaustive discussion of this great question which has occupied the House for the past several days? Any conclusion reached? Any practical plan for a new or different financial system proposed? Certainly none which at all promised the possibility of being enacted into law or satisfying even in an approximate degree the great mass of the people.

The two great political parties of the country stand disaffected and divided with folded arms, unable or unwilling to manifest that degree of patriotism or love of humanity which should induce every wellwisher for the real prosperity of the country to sacrifice at least something of personal opinion and agree to some plan which would bring relief to that great industry which, prosperous itself, can alone bring prosperity to the country at large.

We can speak with pride of our manufactories, our railroads, our commerce, our exports, three-fourths of which, as I have said, are furnished by agriculture; but all these great industries must languish and become unproductive unless the basal industry upon which they all rest is by some means rehabilitated and made more remunerative to the tillers of the soil.

This depression is not only felt in this country, but in others as well. The Queen of England, in her recent address to the Parliament, said:

> I regret to say that the condition of husbandry is disastrous beyond any recent experience. Measures will be laid before you with the object to mitigate the distress in that industry.

It is easy to find fault, and it is said that farmers are proficient in this particular recreation. Whether these complaints are real (as we believe many of them are) or imaginary, the same effect of unrest and dissatisfaction is produced, and this great conservative class, amounting to about 30,000,000 of our population, have their eyes of hope turned to this Congress, with its overwhelming Republican majority, in mute appeal for relief. They have "asked bread, will you continue to give them a stone?"

Another prolific source of complaint is the gambling in farm products, by which it is made to appear that there is for sale, and is sold, one thousand times as much of any stipulated product as has been raised. However, it is not my purpose to discuss this subject now, as a bill will probably soon be before this Congress seeking to remedy this evil.

In conclusion, I desire to say, as a real representative of the American farmer, and without the slightest prejudice to other callings and professions, all of which are needed and have an important place to fill in this busy world of ours. Real farmers, men of worth and integrity, and a proper understanding of the situation, should not and will not ask any character of legislation which might be supposed to benefit them at the expense or detriment of other classes of citizens. This amendment offered to this bill suggests the route through which good to this great interest may come. It is impossible, under any system of protection, that the staple agricultural products of this country, which are produced largely in excess of our own needs, can be benefited or in any way protected against competition of other countries or the low prices of other markets of the world. The system of bounties proposed by some to be laid upon exports of agricultural products would, in my judgment, be fraught with far more evil than good. It is wrong in principle, and would be impracticable in execution, only bringing, it may be, benefits to the few to the detriment of the many. We ask no legislation of this kind, but come modestly and say, only give us a fair chance. Take away the obstructions as far as it can be done by friendly conference and agreement with other countries; open to us, as wide as may be, the avenues of commerce; give us open and unobstructed markets at home and abroad, and, aided by other reforms already indicated, we can and will successfully compete with the world.

With the best country on the globe, the best farm machinery, and the best and most effective workers in the world, why should we fear competition with any other country or people on earth? [Applause.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, before my colleague takes his seat, I would like to ask him to have the amendment which he proposes to offer read.

Mr. CLARDY. I will read it. It is this:

> Page 9, after line 6, insert the following:
> "And to secure as far as may be a change in the methods of supplying tobacco and other farm products to foreign countries."

It will be seen that this does not add anything to the amount of the appropriation made by the bill, but simply enlarges the scope of the action to be taken by the Secretary in introducing our products into foreign countries.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. You referred in your speech to the quantity of tobacco produced in Kentucky; was your reference to the product of last year?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; 1895.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to indulge in any strictures upon the present Secretary of Agriculture, but rather to give a brief and succinct statement of the seed question. For something more than thirty years it has been the policy of this Government to distribute seeds among the farmers of the United States, to make, as the present Secretary puts it, a "free, promiscuous distribution of seeds." In the appropriation act for the year 1866, under the head "Department of Agriculture" we find this language:

> For purchase of cereal, vegetable, and flower seeds, and for labor in putting up seeds, seed bags, and miscellaneous items, $60,000: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Agriculture shall only purchase and distribute, with the fund herein appropriated for that purpose, such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another.

Prior to that time there had been distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture, but this, I believe, was the first limitation put upon the Commissioner of Agriculture in regard to the expenditure of the money appropriated for that purpose. That provision, somewhat elaborated, became section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which is in the following language:

> The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another; and the purchase, or propagation and distribution, of seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings, shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interest of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the provisions of law upon that subject found outside of the necessary provisions of the appropriation bills. I heartily agree that it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture in the purchase and distribution of seeds to conform to section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which I have just read, and

I believe there is no condition of affairs existing in the United States which makes it impossible, or even difficult, for him to execute and expend the appropriation under that section of the Revised Statutes. To show something of the purpose of Congress and to show the view which members of Congress took of this subject in times that have passed, I send to the desk, to be read by the Clerk, an extract from the speech of Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, delivered in the House of Representatives on the 8th day of April, 1876.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is, perhaps, not universally known that the country suffers more from worn-out seeds than worn-out land. When a field is partly seeded with oats received from the Department weighing 50 pounds to the bushel and partly with the best common oats that could be procured weighing 37 pounds to the bushel, and when the heavier oats produced 65 bushels an acre weighing 48 pounds to the bushel and the lighter oats produced 48 bushels an acre weighing 31 pounds to the bushel, it is time every farmer should know what is meant by worn-out seed, the percentage of annual deterioration, and the necessity of periodical renewal, where the best seed can be had, and what sections of our country are best adapted to this and other crops.

Individual effort can not supply this want. No journal in the land furnishes a tithe of the information respecting the monthly condition of crops in all the States and foreign countries.

About one-half of our people are engaged in agricultural pursuits. This is the only Department of the Government that interests one-half of our people directly. The States can not supply the information for themselves, for while each State could very readily arrive at a knowledge of the condition of all its industries, such knowledge is comparatively valueless without like information respecting all the others.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. After Mr. Wilson had spoken those words he went on to give individual instances where the Department of Agriculture had distributed seed which had proved immensely valuable to farmers. And right here, let me say proudly, Mr. Chairman, that I was myself a farmer's boy, brought up on a farm, and doing farm work with my own hands, and I know that in those boyhood days we always looked forward with interest to the time when our Congressman should send us seeds, and I know that we found in actual practice that we could use those he did send with great profit. I may add that in my own neighborhood very many of the finest kinds of vegetables that were produced were raised from the seeds thus distributed, and such is the fact down to this day in that locality. Even during the last summer I received very many thanks for seed which I had myself distributed.

I now ask your attention while I read an extract from the report of Mr. King, who was in charge of the seed division of the Agricultural Department in 1888. He says:

It is the aim of the Department to distribute enough seed to thoroughly test each valuable variety of wheat, corn, barley, oats, or other cereal, in every Congressional district in which it is probable that they can be successfully grown. The increased production per acre, and the greater weight per bushel of a superior quality that has resulted from the distribution by the Department would, if the facts could be aggregated, convince the most skeptical of its value to the country at large. The value of the seed distribution is best evidenced by the records in the annual reports of the Department. For instance, in that of 1868 it is shown that the wheat crop reached 224,036,600 bushels; acreage, 18,460,132; average yield per acre, 12.1 bushels; value of crop, $319,195,290; average price per bushel, $1.42.

The reports of experiments with Tappahannock wheat distributed by the Department show an average yield per acre of 25 bushels; the total yield at that rate, on the acreage of 1868, would be 461,503,300 bushels, an increase of 237,466,700 bushels, which at $1.42 per bushel would be a money-value increase of $337,202,714. If this wheat were to take the place of other varieties, however, and should be sown as the general crop is now sown, without the special care usual in experimenting, the average yield would, of course, fall below 25 bushels; but if the average increase per acre could be raised to 15 bushels (a low estimate for the Tappahannock) the increase in bushels would be 55,380,396; in money value, $78,640,162.

Immediately after the introduction of the Fultz wheat in 1871 into nearly every county of Virginia, from 40 experiments in nearly as many counties, the lowest yield reported was 15 bushels to the acre, while the average yield was 30 bushels. The average yield of the wheat crop in Virginia in 1871 was 8 bushels per acre, and the price was $1.39 per bushel, making a total valuation of $8,852,910. If the Fultz wheat had been exclusively sown and the average yield had been but 15 bushels per acre, a gain of only 7 bushels, the resulting increase of the value of the wheat crop would have been $7,746,896, or about one-quarter enough to pay the existing State debt. As the direct result of the very general distribution of improved varieties the increase in the average yield of wheat during the years 1878, 1879, and 1880 was 2 bushels per acre. This in 40,000,000 acreage yearly would be 80,000,000 bushels increase, or a gain to the country of about $75,000,000 annually.

All that started from a distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture. Again he says:

The increase in yield of oats by the introduction of improved varieties imported or grown in localities especially adapted to their growth has been from 10 to 30 bushels per acre, sufficient to pay the entire cost of growing the crop, thus leaving the usual average crop one of clear gain to the producer.

Again I quote from this report:

The direct benefits resulting from the distribution of Department seeds would, if aggregated, represent more millions than the seed has ever cost in thousands in any year of its existence. Wherever a marked increase of crops has occurred the result has generally been attributed to the new and improved varieties of seed distributed. The statement is frequently made by correspondents that the seed received by them had increased the yield of crops from 10 to 50 per cent. The records of the Department teem with evidences of the money value of the increased production due to the introduction of new seeds.

Many indirect factors of great general value can also be secured by a study of results of seed distribution. The benefits obtained from a mere change of seed from one climate to another, or from one kind of soil to another, are sometimes very marked. The records of the Department show that on farms where the wheat crop, from an average of 24 bushels per acre, has been gradually diminished to 20 bushels or less per acre, a change of seed again ran up the crop to its former average maximum yield, thus indicating that a diminishing production is not always attributable to soil deterioration alone, and that a systematic rotation of seed exchange is a potent factor in maintaining the productive capacity of the soil.

Not the least of the benefits resulting from the introduction of new varieties of seed is the mixed and varied husbandry made possible thereby. In no Department of the General Government has the expenditure of so small a sum been productive of as much good as that expended in the introduction and dissemination of valuable seeds and plants.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to read that last paragraph again?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

In no Department of the General Government has the expenditure of so small a sum been productive of as much good as that expended in the introduction and dissemination of valuable seeds and plants.

Mr. STEELE. What report is that?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It is in the report for 1888, the report of Mr. King, who was then in charge of the seed distribution and had held that position under several Commissioners and the first Secretary of the Department.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is the unvarying testimony of all who have had to do with this question until we come down to the year 1894. In the message and documents relating to the Department for that year we find a report of the special agent for the purchase of seed. We shall have occasion to refer to him more than once before we get done with this bill.

Mr. Enos S. Harnden, the special agent for the purchase of seed, says:

In the light of my experience as a former seed man, however, I consider the free distribution of seeds by this Department as an infringement upon and an interference with a legitimate business, and I believe it should be abolished.

This gentleman claims that he was a seedsman himself and that it interfered with his former business. His impression was that the distribution should be abolished, and that no further distribution of seed should take place to the citizens of the United States. That view either he transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture transferred it to him, for it seems to have become a settled policy of the Department. Which it was I do not know, but I think I am not transcending my duty as a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the last Congress when I say that there was a determined effort made before that committee to get it not to recommend the usual seed appropriation.

The Department of Agriculture was heard before that committee as much as it desired to be heard, and when we decided to report the bill appropriating money for the purchase of seeds I believe there was not a dissenting vote in the committee. It came into the House, and probably not more than half a dozen Representatives opposed the appropriation. I have been told upon good authority that a like condition of unanimity existed in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and that there was no opposition in the Senate to the passage of the usual appropriation bill. Therefore, up to last summer, there had been no adverse action taken, either in a legal or an illegal way, in connection with the purchase of seeds.

But we find from the Secretary's own report that he was determined, if possible, not to execute the appropriation which Congress had made. And so, first of all, hoping to secure some kind of sanction for his intended action, he asked the Attorney-General to construe for him the law, especially the section of the Revised Statutes which I have read. In reply, the Attorney-General, the present Secretary of State, Mr. Olney, repeating the interrogatories submitted, says:

You make two inquiries, as follows:

"Can the Secretary of Agriculture legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to wit, seeds 'rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent change from one part of our own country to another,' under authority of the act of March 2, 1895?

"Would it be proper and lawful for the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of the verbiage of the act of March 2, 1895, and the wording of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to advertise for proposals to furnish the Department of Agriculture seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants, 'rare and uncommon to the country, and for such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another,' reserving the right to reject any and all bids?"

The answer is:

1. The seeds purchasable under the act of March 2, 1895, are limited to those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, there being no reasonable ground for claiming that the act of March 2, 1895, operates, or was intended to operate, as a repeal of the earlier statute.

2. If not obligatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, trees, etc., conformably to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, it is certainly competent for him to make the purchases comformably to said statute, the right to reject any and all bids being reserved. But the form of the question is such that I think it proper to call attention to the fact that, while seeds purchased must be such as are "rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," the trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings to be purchased are such "as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States."

Respectfully, yours,

RICHARD OLNEY, *Attorney-General.*

I do not suppose there is a lawyer in the United States of America who would have given a different answer. I do not suppose there

is a Representative in the sound of my voice who would have wished the Secretary of Agriculture to have made his purchases in any other way than as was required by section 527 of the Revised Statutes.

Can anyone find in that answer of the Attorney-General any liberty or license to the Secretary of Agriculture not to carry out the appropriation? There is not a solitary word in it which indicates any such suggestion, but its whole tenor and statement is that it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out that appropriation and to do it conformably to law. Now, let us see how the Secretary of Agriculture proposed to do it. The Attorney-General replied to him April 20. On April 27 he issued proposals in the following language:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1895.

In accordance with section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which authorizes the purchase of "seeds rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," also "such trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings as are adapted to general cultivation, and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States," and in accordance with the terms of the appropriation (act approved March 2, 1895) for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, "as required by law," sealed proposals, in duplicate, subject to the usual conditions, will be received by the Secretary of Agriculture until 2 p. m., July 1, 1895, for supplying to the United States Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and to be delivered before November 1, 1895, such valuable seeds, trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings, as are covered by section 527 of the Revised Statutes quoted above. Persons submitting bids should specify the kind and varieties, with full description of each variety, of seeds and plants upon which they desire to submit bids and the quantities they are prepared to contract for, and must guarantee delivery of the same in Washington. The right is reserved to reject any or all bids.

J. STERLING MORTON, *Secretary.*

It is to be observed from this proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture—although it is presumed he had given great attention to this subject—was not willing to specify in the proposals what he wanted, either in kind, variety, or quantity, and the subsequent correspondence, which is contained in Senate Document No. 40 of this Congress, shows that he received very many letters asking for information, and in no case did he send a letter in reply, but according to this very document, sent simply the advertisement again.

Again, it is shown by the correspondence that the Secretary was informed that it would be impossible, if he was to have seeds of that year's production, to cure them sufficiently to be delivered in bulk at the Department by the 1st of November, and he was asked if, in regard to those particular varieties, he would not be willing to give additional time. In no instance did he make a direct and satisfactory reply to that inquiry. The general reply was another copy of the advertisement. How, then, could the seedsmen throughout this country know what the Secretary of Agriculture wanted or what he was willing to do? More than that, it has been told to me—I do not know accurately of the truth of it—that certain seedsmen were confidentially informed by employees of the Department of Agriculture that it would be useless for them to bid, because no seeds were to be bought.

I ask that you give this document your full and careful consideration, because you will find in it from beginning to end a thorough, determined purpose not to execute the statute of the United States, not to buy the seeds, not to conform to the custom and practice of his predecessors or to his own. More than that, this document shows that if a bid was a little irregular in form it was rejected for that reason only. If it was received a minute too late it was rejected. And in every instance after the time for the opening of the bids each person asking information was informed that there would be no seed distribution that year.

Mr. BOATNER. I want to ask the gentleman how he expects, if the verdict of the Secretary is the same as last year, that the Secretary of Agriculture will execute the law? He has refused to expend the former appropriation or obey the provision directing the expenditure of this money, and he claims to be supported in that position by the decision of the Attorney-General.

Now, if the committee merely reenacts the law of last year, what reason is there to expect that the Secretary of Agriculture will make the expenditure and distribution to which the gentleman is addressing himself?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. In the first place, in reply to the gentleman from Louisiana, I wish to repeat what I have already said, that there is nothing in the opinion of the Attorney-General to justify the nonaction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he, as a lawyer, if he will examine it, will agree with me in that statement; secondly——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask the gentleman from Louisiana a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. In a moment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to ask him one question right now. It will be too late afterwards.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, again, it is impossible to tell what may transpire between now and the time for the execution of the next appropriation bill. There may be such object lessons as will lead him to abandon his office or to execute the law.

I find, also, that he appointed to open these bids and to pass upon them this same Enos S. Harnden, who had announced that he was the "late seedsman," and that he was opposed to the purchase of any seed whatever. That he appointed, as second, the disbursing officer, and the third of that committee a clerk in his immediate office. That committee opened the bids at the time designated, and in a very few days after that they reported that they had rejected them all; and appended to the bids, as printed in this document, there appears simply a memorandum of the ground upon which they rejected them, viz, "that they were not rare or uncommon." And yet the Secretary, in his statement before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, claimed that some of them were "so rare and uncommon" in relation to their prices that it would not be expedient to buy them. Then, upon that report, we find that on the 25th day of July he abolished the seed division and closed the door, so far as it was possible for him to do so, to any further purchase of seeds.

Mr. PICKLER. What was the date that he closed the seed division?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The 25th day of July.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield the gentleman twenty minutes more.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then he directed the seed division of his Department to be closed, a division which had been regularly appropriated for by Congress, and he discharged the people who had been appropriated for and occupied the space which that division had previously occupied by other divisions of his office which were more in favor with him.

Mr. PICKLER. What was the date, now, that the bids were opened and the seed division closed?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The bids were opened on the 6th day of July and the seed division was closed on the 25th of that month.

Mr. PICKLER. And they did not need any of those seeds until November to give to us?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Really not until January of the next year.

And now comes the next question which immediately arises in all your minds. If the bids which were opened on the 1st day of July were not satisfactory, if they did not conform to the statutes, if they were not sufficient in number, if they were too high in price, or if there was anything else the matter with them, why did not he issue proposals again? There was time for half a dozen proposals to be made, for the bids to be put in, and the seeds to be delivered before the time of the ordinary delivery, on the 10th of January of the next year, to Congressmen and Senators for their distribution. It was simply and solely that he did not desire to do it; and that, acting as Secretary of Agriculture, he preferred to nullify an act of Congress rather than to perform his sworn duty. There is no escape from that conclusion.

Now, there are a few matters to which I wish to ask your attention, which seem to come so directly from the Secretary himself that they show his animus in this matter. It was my privilege to offer a resolution in this House on the 6th of December last, upon this very seed question, calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture for his reasons for nonaction. The resolution was objected to by the gentleman from Tennessee, and consequently under our rules went to the Committee on Agriculture without action by the House. But a like resolution was a day or two afterwards passed in the Senate, and in reply to this resolution the document to which I have already referred was sent. But very soon after I offered that resolution the Secretary had a long interview with a reporter of the Evening Star, which can be found in the issue of Saturday, December 21, 1895, in which he is asked in regard to this matter; and some of the language he is reported to have used on that occasion is so peculiar for a Secretary of a Department that I beg the indulgence of the House while I read it.

Turning to matters more personal to the Secretary's Department, I asked him about the resolution of Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire to investigate the seed question. The Secretary settled back in his chair, with a smile.

"I am quite ready for them on that question," he said. "But there may be a good Republican or two on the anxious seat."

And now please observe this language:

When I began to investigate the sale of seeds by members of Congress I sent the purchasing agent of the seed bureau to the Capitol, with instructions to buy the seed quota of some member of the House and give his check for it.

Admitting that it would be culpable on the part of any member of Congress to sell his seed quota, what shall we say of a Secretary who sent his own trusted official, probably with the Government's money, to the Capitol to degrade and debauch a member or members of Congress?

Mr. MEREDITH. Is that member's name given in any way? It ought to be given.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It is not.

Mr. MEREDITH. I would vote for a resolution to compel his name to be given.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire (reading):

He had no difficulty in finding a seller of seeds among Congressmen, and in my possession now is the check bearing the indorsement of a millionaire ex-member of the House—a check for $75. I have kept the man's name out of my annual report, and he is not mad about that. I have no wish to do him any injury. I was not after him personally, but after the system of which he has become an "awful example."

If the House investigates the seed question of course the ex-member's name may have to be made public. There also will be shown about a hundred transfers of seeds from one member to another recorded on the books of the Department. They do not prove, of course, that money was paid for the transfers. I suppose the members will say they exchanged public documents for seed, and vice versa. One of the friends of this seed-selling millionaire said the $75 had been used to buy copies of the horse book for gratuitous circulation. Again, I am told that he bought $75 worth of pocket knives for presentation to the pages of the House. They had better harmonize their stories for the defense, else the matter, becoming public, would embarrass the defendant by adverse or antagonistic pleadings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there, according to his own contention, in that interview is a condition of affairs which I presume never did exist before in this country.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. If it would be proper, I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows who this man is he purchased this seed from?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I do not.

Mr. MEREDITH. I hope my friend will call for his name.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. He is an ex-member, and would be beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me that it would relieve a good many members of this House from suspicion, because there are a number of us who were members of the last House.

Mr. MOSES. Would they take you for a millionaire? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that I am not a millionaire; but there are a great many people in this country who may suspect that I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Now, let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, that here is a peculiar condition of affairs, one which probably never before existed in the United States, certainly one which was never before brought to the attention of an American Congress, that a Secretary of one of the Executive Departments of the Government has, by his own admission, attempted to seduce and reduce to degradation a member of the Legislature of the nation. If Mr. Morton can explain that satisfactorily, I hope he will; for, as I said before, I am not here to vituperate against him. I am here simply to defend the purchase of seeds and to explain the circumstances which surround and justify it. But the Secretary has gone a little bit further than that. He seems to be ready, not only to purchase the seeds of members of Congress and pay for them and then turn State's evidence and claim glory for it, but he stands ready also to defy Congress, according to his own statement.

I find in the Washington Post of February 9, 1896, another interview—and, by the way, this Secretary is great upon being interviewed—from which I read this language:

Under the law, continued the Secretary, every head of an Executive Department, when he is in doubt as to the meaning of a statute, is required to apply to the Attorney-General for advice, and it was upon the opinion of Mr. Olney that I based my action. There is one way for them [referring to Congress] to satisfy their minds as to whether I have violated the law, and that is to bring articles of impeachment against me. If I have deliberately violated the law, I should be impeached—

I agree with him—

and the sooner they go at it the better. If they can not impeach me, then they can not substantiate their statements. If I am wrong, I am ready to take the consequences.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with this condition of affairs. The Congress of the United States has made an appropriation and has expressed its will time and time again as to the expenditure of that appropriation; one branch of Congress has passed a resolution demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture carry out that appropriation according to the law and the uniform practice, which resolution is now before a committee of this House and, I am told, will soon be reported to this body for its action. If, in the opinion of the members of this House, the Secretary of Agriculture is right, of course they will not pass the resolution. If, on the contrary, they believe, as I most certainly do, that he is absolutely and unconditionally wrong, and that the seed question is of very small consequence in comparison with the right settlement of the question which the Secretary raises when he lays down the proposition that, he being the head of an Executive Department, it rests in his own sweet will either to execute or not execute an appropriation made by Congress, and that, too, when he does not even claim that the appropriation is unconstitutional or that it is contrary to the practice of the Government. If Representatives believe as I do about that I trust they will take appropriate action.

Mr. SWANSON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. Did not the Secretary recommend to Congress not to make the appropriation for seeds? Did not the House of Representatives refuse to follow his recommendation and make the appropriation, and then, in complete violation of the recommendation he had previously made, did he not fail to use that appropriation after the will of this body and of the other branch of Congress on the subject had been ascertained?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. All that is true. His recommendations went to and were considered by the Committee on Agriculture of this House in the last Congress and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate in the same Congress, and I presume he has made a like recommendation in this Congress; but as to that I do not know.

Now, as I have said, the question of seeds is of comparatively small importance, although I believe it to be important and one that the people of this country require action upon at our hands; but the great and overpowering question of all in this case is: Shall we, as the representatives of the people, permit the head of any Executive Department to disregard and, so far as is within his power, to nullify acts of Congress which we pass, and shall he go unscathed? That is the question before the House which we must meet in behalf of the people, that we may preserve our Government. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are thirty-five minutes still remaining to this side of the committee. Of that time, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MOSES], ten minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], and fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Chairman, I shall use but little of the time which has been accorded me as a member of the committee, as there are other gentlemen who wish to be heard. I have been a member of the Agricultural Committee since 1891, and I believe that the present is the smallest Agricultural appropriation we have had during that time. This is called an appropriation for the Agricultural Department, but the money which it carries is largely used for other purposes not strictly agricultural.

For instance, nearly one-third of the entire amount, or more than $800,000, goes to the Weather Bureau. Not one of the Republican members of the committee has deemed it necessary to say anything about this bill or to give any indication that they believed the farmers of the country expect them to say anything in behalf of their interests. They are ready at all times to advocate bonds and tariff and protection for the classes, but for the interests of the plain people of the country they display no concern.

The bill before us appropriates $130.000 for the purchase of valuable seeds, plants, and the like, to be distributed among the people of the entire country. This has been the law for twenty years, and this amount was carried in the last bill.

I remember that in the Fifty-third Congress the Secretary of the Agricultural Department urged our committee to strike out this appropriation. We refused to concur with him. The matter was brought before this House and fully discussed. After hearing all that could be said by his friends both Houses almost unanimously directed that no change be made. Mr. Chairman, in this country it is the duty of the Congress to make the laws, and it is the duty of the Executive Departments to see that they are carried into effect, and not to nullify or abrogate them. If the Secretary of Agriculture was in doubt before as to the legislative will and intention, he certainly was not after the discussion had here.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion just there?

Mr. MOSES. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask if the gentleman remembers the fact that the House increased the appropriation $30,000 for this very purpose?

Mr. MOSES. That is true. I offered the amendment myself in the committee. It was at first proposed to give only $100,000, and it was afterwards increased to $130,000, and $30,000 additional for the distribution of bulletins. We kept the same amount for seed distribution and did not cut it down one iota.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of this House to the growing tendency upon the part of the executive branch of this Government to ignore the laws of the land. Thwarted in his efforts to take this poor pittance from the farmers, he assumes the veto power and says the law shall not be enforced. No throne in constitutional Europe has such power. After a bill is passed in this and the other end of the Capitol and signed, these despots who sit in official positions in Washington, who, by the way, are never elected by the popular vote of the people, must sit in judgment upon our acts and say what shall and what shall not be the law of the land. [Applause.] And this is especially true when it is anything affecting the agricultural classes.

I charge here that the laws of the country are often nullified, and more frequently misconstrued against the people's interest. I warn you that here lies the greatest danger to our country. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARDY] was yesterday denouncing the old nullifiers of South Carolina. Why, sir, Calhoun

and his followers pale into insignificance compared with these. [Laughter.] The law says that sufficient silver shall be coined to redeem the Sherman notes. The Executive says gold shall be the only redemption money. In the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses we directed that a small sum be expended in testing the feasibility of extending better mail facilities to the rural districts. They refuse to do so.

Mr. Chairman, these few packages of seeds are about all the farmers of the country really get from the Government; everybody else gets protection. We appropriate $450,000,000 a year of the people's money, and though one-half of the people of the country are farmers, we can not give them this pitiful sum. As Senator VEST said, we can give thousands to raise rare flowers for the powers that be, but we must take from the poor man this small pittance that helped to feed his family.

Mr. Chairman, the danger to democratic institutions of the United States is not so much that the people's representatives will not do their duty as that those usurping powers, having no consideration for the welfare of the people, will nullify their will and will not carry out the laws which have been passed.

The Secretary of Agriculture said with reference to the seed distribution that the system was objectionable because some member has seen fit to sell his portion of the seed. I do not believe that any member of Congress would do such a thing as that. I believe his name, if signed to any such transaction as that, was forged.

Understand that I do not charge the Secretary with willful misrepresentation of the members of this House. I believe he has been deceived or imposed upon. I do not challenge the word of the Secretary of Agriculture; but I do say, Mr. Chairman, that there has certainly been a mistake somewhere. I know city members who, having no use for their pro rata, have generously donated them to the other members. A member from Baltimore, in the Fifty-second Congress, came to me and voluntarily, as I was a country member, gave me a part of his apportionment of seeds. I noticed, too, that many of the seed went to gentlemen residing in the Secretary's own State, and I do not believe that they bought one package of the seeds that were transferred to them.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] asks why we have not changed the law. He asks why we did not make it mandatory. We have not done so because we know if we put anything of that nature into the bill that would change existing law, some "cuckoo," ever ready, would sound his note and raise the point of order against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER. There is no rule of the House now that prohibits a change of existing law in appropriation bills, is there?

Mr. MOSES. We can not change existing law in appropriation bills.

Mr. BOATNER. It was not so in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. HOPKINS. Your claim is that under the existing law the seeds should be distributed, is it not?

Mr. TUCKER. Under the present law.

Mr. MOSES. Under the present law. He says there are no valuable seeds, and I say this——

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be no innovation to add a paragraph giving an explanation to that law, so that even the Secretary of Agriculture could understand it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary openly defies Congress and tells us to impeach him. Something like this should have been done long ago. The old Democratic ship will never ride the political seas safely until these Jonahs are cast overboard.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, the feature of this question which has aroused my indignation is the fact that the refusal of the Secretary of Agriculture to expend the appropriation made by the last Congress for the purchase and distribution of seeds is based upon a sort of false pretense.

Antecedent to his decision that under the terms of the law he was not authorized to expend the appropriation, there emanated from the Agricultural Department reports derogatory and discrediting to the Congress of the United States.

The individual who has found his way into the Agricultural Department under this Administration (laughter) considered it not inconsistent with the dignity of his position to allow reports to go out through the press, scattered broadcast through the Union, that he had discovered great frauds and abuses in the distribution by members of the seeds allotted to them under existing laws, and whose names he did not give to the public.

I do not know whether those statements were true or false, but I do know that it was an outrage to herd honorable men, incapable of such conduct, with the few who might have been guilty of it, and I assert that the publication of any such scandalous charges against a body of gentlemen without the designation of the names of the individuals who had been found so small and so corrupt and so unfit for the positions that they occupied as to embezzle the property intrusted to them for distribution was not only an insult to the Congress of the United States, but an unmanly attack inconsistent with the dignity of a Cabinet officer. [Applause.]

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, however small and obscure the individual who, by chance or under Executive favor, should happen to be raised to the high position of a Cabinet officer, the mere fact of his elevation ought to raise him above any such contemptible littleness. [Applause.] For one, as a member of the Fifty-third Congress, I resent and denounce as a slander the imputation that that body, or any considerable number of its members, were guilty of the crime of selling the seeds which were allotted to them for distribution among their constituents. [Applause.]

This, Mr. Chairman, may be very strong language as applied to a Cabinet officer. I do not know whether the Cabinet officer was responsible for these reports or not. I know that the reports were spread broadcast in the press. They were never contradicted by the Agricultural Department. They purported to emanate from the Agricultural Department, and I say, sir, the fact that this slander was sent out against Congress indicated a feeling on the part of the head of that Department toward it that was absolutely unaccountable.

So far as I am concerned, I care nothing whatever about the seeds. I believe that to abolish the system of the distribution of seeds through members of Congress would be advantageous to the members. It is a burden and expense; it is no advantage to any member of Congress. The member of Congress receives a few thousand packages of seeds. He has not one package for every ten constituents. For every constituent who receives a package of seeds and who is gratified at the compliment ten are dissatisfied because they have not been likewise favored, so that the pretense that this is an electioneering scheme of Congressmen is a false one. No Congressman benefits anything by it, unless under the old system he might use a considerable part of his salary in buying seed and having them sent out through the Agricultural Department, a system which I believe at one time prevailed.

Mr. RAY. With the gentleman's permission, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. BOATNER. With pleasure.

Mr. RAY. Does not the gentleman know the fact that the hard heart of the Secretary of Agriculture has relented, and that out of the abundance of his generosity—and of the appropriation—he is about to make most generous distribution? I received a letter this week from the Secretary of Agriculture announcing that he had complied with the law; that he had made an apportionment, under the appropriation act, of seeds, plants, and bulbs, and that the pro rata coming to me for my district of 216,000 people would be 15 grape seeds and 25 strawberry plants. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, justice to the Secretary of Agriculture requires that that admission should be made. I received a similar letter, advising me that there were 40 grape cuttings and 100 strawberry plants at my disposal for distribution in my district. I suppose the Secretary had found some rare kind of grapes——

Mr. RAY. I think the difference in the number distributed shows the partiality of this Democratic Administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the only thing Democratic that the Secretary ever did. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER. I infer from receiving this letter that he had found grape cuttings which were heretofore unknown, probably discovered in Armenia or some foreign parts, and probably some Chinese strawberries. I could not account for it in any other way. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, coming down to the question at issue, the main question, shall the House of Representatives continue to permit an executive officer to discredit its authority? There is no principle better established in law than that after a statute has received executive or judicial construction its reenactment in the same language is a legislative indorsement and confirmation of that construction. This appropriation was made by reason of a section of the Revised Statutes that has stood for many years, one that was executed by the Commissioner of Agriculture before that Department was erected to the dignity of a Department, executed by the predecessors of the present Secretary of Agriculture, and executed by him for three successive years. The appropriation to be expended under that statute was an indorsement, a confirmation by Congress, of the construction which has been put on it by the Secretaries of Agriculture.

Then, sir, the refusal by the present Secretary of Agriculture to execute the law, to expend the appropriation, was in deliberate contempt of the authority of the Congress of the United States. I so construe it, and for one, as a member of Congress, I am tired—I am disgusted with having this body brought into discredit and its authority despised by mere executive officers. Why, sir, it has got to the point that a mere subordinate, a man who is known as Comptroller of the Treasury [laughter], declares an act

of Congress unconstitutional and refuses his "royal assent" to its execution. [Laughter and applause.] It has come to the point that a second veto power has been discovered. While Congress may pass a law which if the President should veto, might be passed, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding, a clerk in the Treasury Department may turn it down, so that the parties who are interested have to go to the courts and obtain a judicial indorsement of our action. A two-thirds majority can not reach him, because the Congress which enacted the law has passed out of existence, or may not be in session when the veto of the clerk is pronounced.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I ask how long it is since that happened?

Mr. BOATNER. This has occurred just recently.

Mr. SKINNER. I desire to make an inquiry of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield two minutes of my time to the gentleman.

Mr. SKINNER. As I understand the gentleman's purpose is to secure action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, I want to ask the gentleman if an amendment of this kind would not accomplish that purpose and be in order? And if so, I will give notice to amend on page 20, after the word "dollars," in line 25, by adding the following words:

And it is hereby made mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to make such purchase and distribution of seed as was done prior to 1895.

Mr. BOATNER. I think that would cover the case if such an amendment should be adopted.

I want to say that I suspected the Secretary of Agriculture would refuse to execute this law on the ground of the unconstitutionality of an act appropriating public moneys for this purpose. I believed he would have done so under the narrow construction placed upon the Constitution by some but for the fact that if he had instituted one investigation for this purpose he would have found there was no authority in that instrument for his Department. In other words, that while the expenditure of Congressional appropriations for the purchase of seeds might be unconstitutional, the office which he held was still more unconstitutional, and that may be the reason why he did not make the point that the proposed expenditure of money was unconstitutional.

It has become fashionable in some quarters of late to discredit this body and its membership. Those who do so forget that the members of this House directly represent the people of the United States, and reflections upon them are reflections upon their constituents. No doubt the Secretary of Agriculture entertained a profound contempt for the Congress whose enactment he refused to execute, but it would be wise for him to remember that the people of the United States have not invested him with any authority to exercise his judgment about the wisdom of the laws which he is called upon to execute, and that until he is vested with legislative powers he can better utilize his time in the execution of his official duties than in criticising the acts of the legislative department of the Government.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries $2,500,000, in round numbers, for the support of this Department of the Government that is supposed to be in the interest of the agricultural people of this great country. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it was intended——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman allow me? Inadvertently he stated the amount inaccurately. The amount carried by the bill is $3,158,192.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I accept the correction, Mr. Chairman. I had the figures from a member of the committee. I regret that I am not posted as to this bill, not being a member of that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that three million and odd thousand in money is appropriated and has been appropriated for a specific purpose; and we all remember when the strife was on hand throughout this country to create the office of Secretary of Agriculture and make the Secretary a Cabinet officer, there was serious doubt as to the constitutional right and power to do so. But the farmers of this country, from one end to the other, petitioned Congress, and continued to do so until that Bureau was exalted, and instead of the chief of that Bureau being the Commissioner of Agriculture he was promoted to Secretary of Agriculture and a member of the Cabinet.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this country will hold and should hold the Committee on Agriculture of this House responsible for the administration of that office and that Department of the Government. Those of us who belong to other committees of the House can not understand this matter in detail, nor have we time under the regulation adopted by this House to understand and discuss these bills in detail.

Mr. KEM. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. I understand you to say that the country ought to hold the committee responsible. Does not the gentleman think that this Congress ought to hold the Secretary responsible?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I said this committee ought to be held responsible, and the House ought to hold the committee responsible, for the proper administration of this Department. I do not propose to stir up the members of that committee and to answer all their questions. I have not the time.

Mr. MOSES. I would like to ask my colleague, does he hold this committee responsible for the appointment of Secretary Morton?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would he put upon this committee the great burden of being either the conscience keeper or lip care of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, sir; I would not.

A MEMBER. Do you hold this committee responsible?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do hold this committee responsible for bringing back a bill into this House with this provision:

Division of seeds:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution as required by law.

That is the very verbiage under which he took shelter before and dodged and refused to execute the will of this House and administer his Department as we directed him to do it. And yet you come back into this House with the same verbiage in your bill, as ambiguous as Mr. Morton or anybody else would like to have it. I have no excuse to offer for Mr. Morton, and I want it distinctly understood that I think he has gone a long way and certainly has stretched his conscience and stretched the Constitution and the law a great deal more when he has refused to expend that money as the House directed him to expend it.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. If the committee had changed that provision of the bill, would not the point of order have been raised against it that it changed existing law?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, sir. I presume that every man on the floor of this House is ready to stand up here, when the occasion arises, as a friend of the farmer. [Laughter.] I have never yet seen it fail. The man does not come to Congress who dare make a point of order upon an amendment or a provision in a bill which directly affects the interests of the people who sustain this great Government of ours, who furnish three-fourths of our exports in time of peace, who furnish nine-tenths of our soldiers in time of war, and who, in their taxpaying capacity in its last analysis, which is the sweat of the face, pay nearly all the taxes. [Applause.]

Mr. RAY. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Georgia, if he will permit me, that after March 4, 1897, we propose to have a Republican Secretary of Agriculture who will carry out the law as now written on the statute book.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. We have not time to wait for that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, let the gentleman take heed that his party does have such a Secretary. We shall hold them to that promise; and I want to make a suggestion in that connection to my friend from New York who was so kind as to make that suggestion to me. I say to him: Put a man there who knows how to clean the mud off his own boots, how to manage a farm, how to work a farm, and not a politician, not a man who goes over the country singing either goldbugism or silverism. [Applause.] Give us a man who is not only a scientific man, but a practical man; above all, a man who is in touch with the people who draw a line over a mule and plow from Monday morning until Saturday noon, and then ride 10 miles to get their mail, receiving, perhaps, a weekly paper and a letter once a month. When such a man receives a few papers of seeds through the mail he goes home rejoicing in the fact, saying to himself, "I am a citizen of a great country, and I am not forgotten, though ever so humble." [Applause.]

Let them give us a Secretary who is in touch with that kind of people, for they are the great bulk of our people. What difference does it make to a man who lives in New York or in Atlanta, who has his mail dumped into his lap, by his own fireside, three or five times a day, whether he gets any seeds or not, when his property is all in stocks and bonds? But the poor farmer who does not know anything about the market, who can not know anything about the market, who has neither time nor money to buy agricultural books or periodicals to post himself about rare and valuable seeds—it is for his benefit that the Secretary is placed in that Department to act as a trustee or medium through whom the seeds that we provide to be distributed shall go to a people who do not know and can not know about them, or procure them in any other way. I say to my Republican friends, therefore: If you do change the Secretary of Agriculture be sure and get a man who is in touch with the great mass of the people. Do that, whatever else you do.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this Committee on Agriculture why it is that they have recommended only the small sum of $130,-

000 for the purchase of seeds, bulbs, flowers, and rare plants, when, in the preceding section of the bill, they recommend $25,000 contingent fund for lamps, and twine, and brushes, and brooms, and maps, and oils, and paints, and such like? If Mr. Morton can afford to spend $25,000 for the articles enumerated in the preceding section without any compunctions of conscience, in the name of heaven why can not he spend $130,000 for the benefit of more than 9,000,000 of men, women, and children who never saw the city of Washington, who never will see it, who, many of them, do not get upon a railroad car once in their lifetime, who are isolated and separated from the great centers of this country, centers of intelligence as well as centers of commerce—why, I ask, could not the Secretary afford to spend $130,000 for those people? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I want to see every member of this committee take hold of this bill and change and amend it as it should be changed and amended, so that, in the first place, it shall answer the purpose for which the Department was created and not for the benefit of the politicians or a nest place for officeholders, but for all the people who farm the land and till the soil. In the second place, I want to see them take the bill and amend it so that the servant—and Morton is nothing but a servant, and I want him to understand that [laughter and applause]—to see that our servant, the Secretary of Agriculture, obeys the will of the House. [Applause.]

Now, this country has just about reached this point: There are three branches of the Government, and I am perfectly willing to let the legislative department attend to its own business, and, so far as I can, I am determined that the other departments of the Government shall attend to their own business and let ours alone. [Applause.] And we will draw the line and have it distinctly understood that this is our branch of Government and is not under the control of any Comptroller of the Treasury or the Secretary of Agriculture, and that he can not undertake to nullify laws made by the House of Representatives. [Applause.] If the appropriation for seeds and plants, as carried by the last bill, was unconstitutional we have a Department (judicial) authorized so to declare. For the first time in the history of this Department we have an officer charged with the duty of executing the laws, nullifying the law; not only so, but abolishing the seed division, thus defying Congress again to attempt its restoration except at great expense. The Department has done great good in times past, not by lecturing or writing in favor of gold monometallism, silver monometallism, or bimetallism, but by a careful study as to how best to develop and build up our agricultural and kindred interests. Let us have liberal appropriations to this end and a Secretary that does not know so much more than Congress, and then we can again move on to success.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MEREDITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on that side has been exhausted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are five minutes of the general debate left, and I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield back any time I did not use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia occupied his entire time. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] did not occupy all of his, and there are a few minutes yet remaining on that side.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield part of that time to the gentleman from Virginia and the rest to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MEREDITH. Mr. Chairman, I have no controversy with the Secretary of Agriculture; I have no criticism upon the Committee of Agriculture and no criticism of the bill which has been introduced here by the committee. But what I desire to emphasize is this: That when it was insinuated that members of the last Congress had sold their proportion of seeds that they had received for distribution among the people it was an insinuation against every member of the House unless the names of the parties who were guilty of that offense were made known.

I think it due to the House and every member of it, and especially due to the last House and to the ex-members who were here then as members, that the names of those who have done this act shall be made known; and I will support a resolution, if any gentleman will introduce it, or will be glad at the proper time myself to introduce a resolution, calling on the Secretary of Agriculture to give the names of parties who have sold their proportion of seeds that were intended for distribution among the people.

My reason is this: Like all members of this House, I am getting dozens and dozens of letters from constituents asking me to send them seed. I presume that is the case with every member present. It may be said that nobody would suppose that a member here would sell his seeds; but we all know very well that designing people can go through the country and tell people that the reason they do not get seed in response to their application is because that "darned scoundrel" down there in Washington has been selling them. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SORG, for three days, on account of important business.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. DANIELS, for ten days, for rest and on account of exacting business.

To Mr. SMITH of Illinois, for two weeks.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The bill (H. R. 4462) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation will be laid upon the table, in the absence of objection, the Senate bill having passed the House to-day.

There was no objection.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH (at 5 o'clock p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Chippewa River, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate for surveying lands in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture relating to an appropriation for a director in chief of scientific bureaus and investigations—to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation under ordnance and ordnance stores—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered be to printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6062) to amend section 3621 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the deposit of revenues, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 385); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6063) to amend section 12 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved July 31, 1894, relating to delinquent officials, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 386); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PHILLIPS, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6119) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 387); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5915) to provide for the revision and consolidation of the statute laws of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 392); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Industrial School for Girls, of Alabama, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 393); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4706) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 394); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 2578) to refer the claim of the owners of the brig *Tally-Ho* to the Court of Claims. (Report No. 388.)

The bill (H. R. 3576) appropriating $6,332.30 in payment of the claim of C. M. Kirkpatrick for paving the street adjacent to the United States arsenal at Indianapolis, Ind. (Report No. 389.)

By Mr. DENNY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1821) to reopen and adjust the account for service of Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers. (Report No. 390.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1045) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others. (Report No. 391.)

By Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 1499) to correct the muster of Lieut. Gilman L. Johnson. (Report No. 396.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 6125) making appropriation for improvement of the Tennessee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6126) for the purchase of letters patent of the Dickenson self-righting and self-bailing lifeboat—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 6127) to establish a life-saving station at or near Salisbury Beach, Salisbury, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 6128) to authorize certain persons who have intermarried Cherokees to sue for their interest in certain moneys of the tribe from which they were excluded—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 6129) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Jewell Post, No. 3, Grand Army of the Republic, Pleasanton, Kans.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6130) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in State of Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 6131) to take the United States Government out of the banking business, refund the national debt, reform the currency, and to improve our banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 6178) for the erection of a penitentiary on the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 6179) for the incorporation of associations for the improvement of the breed of horses, and to regulate the same, and to establish a racing commission—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 6180) to authorize the city council of the city of San Antonio, in the State of Texas, to extend the street known as Dwyer avenue through the property of the United States, known as the arsenal grounds, in said city—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6181) to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls for the monument to the Union Soldiers of Tennessee—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 116) directing the Secretary of War to submit a new survey, project, and estimate for the improvement of Coos Bay Harbor, in the State of Oregon, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his annual report, September 28, 1895—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DRAPER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 117) authorizing Lieut. William McCarty Little to accept a decoration from the King of Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAW: A joint resolution (H. Res. 118) to pay heirs of David Heaton the remainder of salary of his unexpired term in Forty-first Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the navigation of the Connecticut River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENDALL: A memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, for the passage of a law putting State guards on the same footing as regular United States soldiers as to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORD: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, concerning the election of United States Senators—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, concerning the election of United States Senators—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A memorial of the general assembly of Ohio, concerning the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT: A memorial of the general assembly of Ohio, for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the qualified electors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, concerning the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of Ohio, asking Government protection for Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE: A memorial of the legislature of Massachusetts, asking the United States Government to reopen the Connecticut River for navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6132) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Remly and to issue to him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6134) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Purdum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 6135) to increase the pension of Stephen Bronson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 6136) for the relief of Alfred W. Kent, for the value of horses and services in the transportation department of the United States Army in the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6137) for the relief of Joshua Bishop—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 6138) to amend the military record of James P. Kirby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 6139) for the relief of Elizabeth Fulwiler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 6140) to increase the pension of Mary C. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 6141) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John S. Stotts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6142) granting a pension of $12 per month to David M. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 6143) for the relief of Peter Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6144) for relief of Thierman & Frost—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 6145) for the relief of William Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6146) increasing pension of Jeremiah Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) to pension George W. Wiggle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6149) to correct military record of William Burke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEM: A bill (H. R. 6150) granting a pension to Sarah G. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6151) for relief of Jesse Turner, of Crockettsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) for relief of John F. Kirtley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 6153) for the relief of the Import-

ing and Exporting Company of the State of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to James Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) removing charge of desertion from military record of John P. Fox, of Roanoke, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6157) for the relief of Paul Leary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 6158) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 6159) to increase the pension of Mrs. Helen A. De Russy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 6160) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to John Woods, late a private in the United States Marine Corps, certain prize money due him—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 6161) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Dennis Gunn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to Allen P. Haws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 6163) for the relief of John B. Hawkins and W. H. Hawkins, of Onslow County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6164) for relief of John Carver, sr., of Cumberland County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6165) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Turneyfold Mercer, of North Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 6166) granting a pension to Minnie Parker, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Ely S. Parker, late of the United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6167) to confer jurisdiction upon Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of the heirs of William Robinson, and to remove the bar of the statute of limitations therefrom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) providing for the hearing and adjudication by the Court of Claims of the claim of the heirs of John Clemson and John C. Cookson, for property seized or destroyed during the war of the rebellion, and removing the bar of the statute of limitations therefrom—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 6169) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Dennis Cain, Company I, Forty-fourth Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 6170) for relief of James Coleman and Theodore H. N. McPherson—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 6171) granting a pension to John Y. Winings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 6172) authorizing the sale of the title of the United States in lot 5, square 1113, in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6173) to pension William F. Davisson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of Margaret J. Parks, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6175) for the relief of Rufus M. Hodgkins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 6176) granting a pension to Martha E. Koller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6177) granting a pension to Andrew L. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 6182) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Mander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: A bill (H. R. 6183) to amend the military record of Henry Hartt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Dr. J. H. Burket and others, of Remington, Pa., praying for an amendment of the postal laws so as to allow a salary to fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Petition of the heirs of Alvin R. Baker, deceased, late of Walker County, Ala., praying reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: Papers to accompany House bill to amend the military record of Henry Hartt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of the Teamsters and Helpers' Union of Newport, R. I., in favor of the passage of the bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Rhode Island Historical Association, asking for an appropriation to publish the records and papers of the Continental Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of M. E. Benton and others, residents of Newton County, Mo., concerning bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Joshua Bishop—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Papers relating to the claim of Pleasant H. Cook, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Black River, Clayton, Sandy Creek, New Bremen, Theresa, Lowville, Houseville, Pulaski, Philadelphia, Mexico, and the county of Jefferson, all of the State of New York, against the sale of intoxicants at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of ex-soldiers of the Union Army residing in Oswego County, N. Y., relative to pensions of soldiers and their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of the Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., in regard to restrictions of the exportation of American live stock—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Resolution passed at a mass meeting of citizens of Davenport, Iowa, favoring the recognition of Cubans as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of L. N. Walter and others, of Elm Grove, W. Va., for a better class of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Charles L. White and others, of Clarksburg, W. Va., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of L. G. Brock and 209 others, of Marshall County, W. Va., favoring a change of rate of first-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of Marion Palmer and 17 others, of Woodlawn, Oreg., asking for the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of W. H. Royse and 46 others, of Hardman, Oreg., protesting against appropriations for sectarian purposes and asking for a constitutional amendment to that effect—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ERDMAN: Petition of 395 citizens of Berks County, Pa., and 247 citizens of Lehigh County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARIS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2379, for the relief of John Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of 2,000 settlers in Oklahoma, asking for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Four petitions, containing a total of 8,652 names, surviving officers and soldiers of the war for the Union, urging the passage of a pension law strictly graded on the amount of service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Resolution of Ben Kersey Post, No. 486, Grand Army of the Republic, New Providence, Iowa, favoring the passage of a service-pension bill giving $8 per month to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served ninety days in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper from the Dubuque branch of the National Association of Post-Office Clerks, urging favorable action on the postal-clerk classification bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULING: Four petitions of a number of citizens of Kanawha County, W. Va., asking for the passage of a bill to inspect immigrants by the United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nebraska, asking for the passage of a Sunday law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Sarah G. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KULP: Petitions of A. D. Levann and 98 others, of Columbia County, Pa., and J. S. Numan and 33 others, of Sullivan County, Pa., in support of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petitions and papers of citizens, of various church denominations, of Springfield, Elizabethtown, and Lebanon, all of the State of Kentucky, in behalf of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of W. H. Hays Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Washington County, Ky., and also Union soldiers of the war of the rebellion, asking for the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John H. Badge, in behalf of James Renfrew and others, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to James Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to accompany House bill granting a pension to William M. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ellenville, N. Y., against the sale of beer to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Papers relating to the claim of N. M. Aldridge, of Rienzi, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of John W. Holmes and 88 others, of Camden, N. J., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MADDOX: Papers relating to the claim of John Lewis, of Paulding County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Samuel Hunt, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of William A. Bray, of Gordon County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolutions of the John A. Myers Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jackson, Minn., in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENNEY: Petition of merchants of Petersburg, Va., asking legislation in reference to traffic in adulterated cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of Bushrod L. Fox, of Loudoun County, Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5878, relating to the claim of the heirs of Silas Burke, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of E. C. Neal and others, of Tremont, Me., and vicinity, for the erection of a monument on Weavers Ledge, Bass Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOODY: Petition of Edward S. Moseley and other citizens of Newburyport, Mass., asking the establishment of a life-saving station at Salisbury Beach, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of ex soldiers and sailors of the Union Army residing in the State of New York, favoring the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY: Petition of Vincent B. Clark and 20 other veterans of the late war, asking for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: Petition of citizens of Madison County, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Madison County, N. Y., against the sale of intoxicating liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Onondaga County, N. Y., asking for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of Mrs. M. E. Russell and other officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Windsor, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waverly, N. Y., against the sale of beer to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Windsor, N. Y., in behalf of the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions of Babcock Post, No. 59, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, of Owego, N. Y., in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Resolutions of the trustees of the public reservations of Massachusetts regarding the preservation of the Palisades of the Hudson—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

My Mr. SNOVER: Petition of George M. Deady and 106 other citizens of Bad Axe, Mich., for a law equalizing pensions for those who have lost limbs, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of W. H. Gordon and other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of S. S. Sullivan and others, of Toledo, Ohio, for the improvement of Manitowoc Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: Petition of ex-prisoners of war residing at Falls City, Nebr., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., urging the passage of the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of D. W. Hill and others, of Humboldt, Nebr., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolutions of the Dartmouth College Association, of New York, urging all lawful efforts on behalf of the Government for the suppression of Turkish barbarity in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: Papers relating to the claim of William Hinkle, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Emanuel Suter, of Harrisburg, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Thomas H. Rollins, of Rappahannock County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Abraham Funkhouser, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILBER: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Jefferson, East Worcester, Glenville, Sharon Springs, Amsterdam, and county of Schoharie, State of New York, against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Glenville, Jefferson, East Worcester, Amsterdam, Sharon Springs, and county of Schoharie, State of New York, against the sale of spirituous liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOAKUM: Papers relating to the claim of Ganet S. Chandler, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 17, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, calling for information as to the probable cost of providing a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, on the coast of North Carolina, capable of sheltering the largest vessels, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the subject, dated February 13, 1896; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, certain information relating to the mail bag repair department of the division of mail equipment, Post-Office Department; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented sundry petitions of citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1886, or some similar measure, requiring the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company to dispense with horses and adopt rapid transit on its lines, and remonstrating against the extension of the tracks of this company until its existing lines are modernly equipped and operated; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GORMAN presented a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Methodist Protestant Teachers' Meeting, praying for the passage of the so-called Phillips bill, providing for the appointment of an impartial commission to investigate the labor problem; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Methodist Protestant Teachers' Meeting, and a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation providing stricter divorce laws for the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Methodist Protestant Teachers' Meeting, praying for the enforcement of a compulsory educational law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Methodist Protestant Teachers' Meeting, and a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent in the District of Columbia and the Territories from 16 to 18 years; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Thomas M. Beadenkoff, secretary of the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Baltimore, Md., and a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Methodist Protestant Teachers' Meeting, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Thomas G. Addison and sundry other citizens of Washington, D. C., and the petition of Rev. John H. Elliott and sundry other citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1825, to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR presented resolutions of the legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the navigation of the Connecticut River; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

[Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the year 1896.]

Resolutions relative to the navigation of the Connecticut River.

Whereas it is desirable that the attention of Congress should be called to the urgent need of reopening the Connecticut River, running through the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut, to navigation, as far up said river as the cities of Springfield and Holyoke in said Commonwealth, for the following reasons:

First. Because the reestablishing of navigation on the Connecticut River will restore to said river the shipping industry that formerly made up a large part of the business of Springfield.

Second. Because the Connecticut River is the largest and most important river in New England.

Third. Because navigation on the Connecticut River would enable the General Government to reach by water its arsenal and armory at Springfield.

Fourth. Because, by the opening of navigation on said river, the General Government would save thousands of dollars annually in freight charges.

Fifth. Because, by making said river navigable, millions of dollars would be saved in freight charges to the people living along its banks.

Sixth. Because it would benefit a territory populated by more than 500,000 inhabitants.

Seventh. Because it would advance the prosperity of a section of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that is increasing in population with marked rapidity.

Eighth. Because, by removing the present obstructions that impede navigation as well as the natural flow of the river, the health of the people living along its borders would be less liable to the dangers of malaria, resulting from the overflow of the said river in the spring of the year, caused by said obstructions.

Ninth. Because, by making said river navigable, it would again furnish an inexhaustible supply of shad and other migratory fish, which formerly contributed to the yield of food for the inhabitants, and which are now totally unknown in its waters on account of said impediments to navigation; and

Tenth. Because said Connecticut River being a natural water highway, the people's rights to its use as such should not only be protected, but such improvements should be made as would make more valuable their inherent rights to such a highway.

Resolved, That our Commonwealth can not be true to herself if she remains silent or inactive when her rights are encroached upon by acts within or without her borders.

Resolved, That the people of this Commonwealth have just cause of complaint on account of the existing impediments to navigation on the Connecticut River, inasmuch as said river is a navigable body of water, in law as it would be in fact, were it not for the artificial obstructions placed in the way of such navigation.

Resolved, That the inactivity of our Commonwealth in protecting the inherent rights of her citizens in the great water highway which she has recently taken under her protection is a manifest injustice to those citizens who would save millions of dollars by the opening of said river to navigation.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their best endeavors to urge upon Congress the importance and justice of reopening the Connecticut River to navigation as far up as the cities of Springfield and Holyoke.

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions, properly attested, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In senate, adopted February 3, 1896.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 6, 1896.

A true copy. Attest:

WM. M. OLIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. It is the petition of Marie A. Shipley, of New York City, now residing in Lugano, Switzerland, who is a very learned investigator and historical student, praying that the 24th of June, the anniversary of the discovery of the North American coast by the Cabots in 1497, be made a national holiday.

My question is as to what committee the petition should properly go. There is one measure at least before the Judiciary Committee proposing to establish a national holiday, a bill which the Senator from New York himself introduced. Another one has come from the Committee on the Library. It seems to me that all these measures should go to one place. I will have the petition referred to the Committee on the Judiciary unless some other course be suggested.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Committee on the Library used to have all such measures.

Mr. HILL. I think this petition should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and at the same time I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] that his bill relating to the establishment of Lincoln's birthday as a holiday should also be committed to the Judiciary Committee, where the whole subject can be examined, if the Senator from North Dakota has no objection to that course.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The bill referred to by the Senator from New York is already on the Calendar, having been reported by the Committee on the Library. I have no objection, however, to its going to the Committee on the Judiciary if it is the desire that the legal aspect of the measure shall be considered.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will make that motion, we might dispose of it now, if there is no objection.

Mr. HALE. I do not know that there is any objection, and yet these bills have heretofore been before the Committee on the Library. The Lincoln holiday bill was sent to that committee, and that committee considered it and it was reported to the Senate and went to the Calendar, where I propose to ask the Senate very soon to take it up. It would have been passed on the 12th but for the single objection of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], who has views upon increasing the number of holidays. Under these circumstances, I see no reason why the bill should run the gauntlet of any other committee, it having already passed through the committee that ordinarily has charge of such measures. I propose to ask the Senate, perhaps to-day, to take up the Lincoln holiday bill as reported from the Committee on the Library, and therefore at present I do not feel like assenting that it be sent anywhere else.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maine will permit me to suggest that I think it will facilitate action upon the bill to which he refers to have it sent to the Judiciary Committee. I do not say what action would be taken, but it would facilitate some disposition of it. As to the form of the bill, it strikes me that it is not in correct shape. There is considerable question as to the propriety if not the power of the United States to create a public holiday except so far as concerns the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States.

All bills relating to the subject of national holidays passed prior to 1894 relate simply to the District of Columbia and constitute part of the Revised Statutes applicable to that District. In 1894 Congress passed a law relating to Labor Day which does not seem to be limited to the District of Columbia. That is the only exception. I do not know what committee reported it, but no very great attention was paid to the passage of that bill. I introduced a bill the other day relating to Jackson's birthday, which has gone to the Judiciary Committee. I should assume that the Committee on the Library would be disposed to regard a bill relating to the establishment of a legal holiday as properly belonging to the Judiciary Committee.

The petition which the Senator from Massachusetts has just presented in reference to another holiday goes to the Judiciary Committee. The Jackson birthday bill is before that committee. My suggestion was not made in hostility at all to the bill when I suggested to the Senator from North Dakota that his bill might with propriety be committed to that committee for such consideration as the Judiciary Committee propose to give it. That is all I have to suggest at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the request of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HALE. I have stated that I object for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands. The petition presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waukesha, Wis., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the establish-

ment of a department of manufactures; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the speedy completion of the harbor of refuge at that port; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, concerning the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of each State; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution. Concerning the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of each State.

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America be memorialized as follows: The general assembly of the State of Ohio respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to submit a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the qualified electors of each State of the Union.

The general assembly believes that such an amendment to the national Constitution will result in each State having at all times a full representation in the national Senate, will prevent protracted and disturbing contests for membership therein, and will prevent all attempts to influence improperly or corruptly the selection of members to the national Senate.

The general assembly believes that as all political power in the United States comes from the people, that the sole right to select all legislative officers should by the Constitution be vested directly in the people.

Resolved, That the governor is hereby respectfully requested to forward a duly authenticated copy of this memorial, under the great seal of this State, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, in order that the same may be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

CHARLES H. BOSLER,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted February 3, 1896.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 3d day of February, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 4th day of February, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF OHIO, *Executive Department:*
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR.

To the Senators and Representatives of Ohio in the Fifty-fourth Congress of the United States of America:

In compliance with the terms of the foregoing resolution I herewith transmit duly authenticated copy of the same, that it may be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

Witness my signature and the great seal of the State of Ohio, at Columbus, this 4th day of February, A. D. 1896.

ASA S. BUSHNELL, *Governor.*

Mr. SHERMAN presented a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, praying for the restoration of duty on wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution on the singling of wool for the free list.

Whereas the singling out of wool for the free list in the present tariff law has proven a calamity of appalling proportions to the sheep husbandry of the United States, which should be rectified by the present Congress by the reimposition of a duty on that staple: Therefore

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators and Representatives from Ohio in the National Congress, now assembled, are hereby requested to use all honorable means by influence and vote to secure the passage of the House bill which restores 60 per cent on the schedule in the McKinley bill on wools and woolen goods.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our delegation in Congress.

DAVID L. SLEEPER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ASAHEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Ohio:*
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Samuel M. Taylor, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 6th day of February, A. D. 1896.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 6th day of February, A. D. 1896.

SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warren County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide military instruction in the public schools; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the petition of Elizabeth Hines, of Newbern, N. C., praying that she be restored to the pension roll; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Board of Trade of the city of Port Townsend, Wash., praying for the passage of Senate bills No. 1172 and No. 1242, the one to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and the other to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve. The petition states that "Port Townsend being the port of entry of Puget Sound collection district, there are registered there a large fleet of vessels doing the carrying trade of the Pacific, and its citizens are all more or less interested in the making and the enforcement of good and protective laws." I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRICE presented a memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, requesting the Congress of the United States to submit a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of each State; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation designed to introduce and establish military tactics in the public school curriculum; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of military education and for promoting the adoption of a uniform military drill in the public schools of the several States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia equal to the most efficient State Sunday law; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4447, to create an Executive Department to be known as the department of commerce; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Lewis Vaughan and sundry other citizens of Livingston County, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent unwholesome and unreasonable immigration to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PALMER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented sundry petitions of citizens of Oregon, praying for the early completion of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg., praying for the improvement of the Clear Water River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions numerously signed by citizens of Glass Valley, Oregon, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that "neither Congress nor any State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use the property or credit of the United States, or of any State, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used, for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control"; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition numerously signed by citizens of St. François County, Mo., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1640, granting a pension to Catherine L. Nixon; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS presented sundry petitions of the Christian Endeavor Union of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to substitute volunteer arbitration for railway strikes and for the appointment of an impartial commission to investigate the labor problem; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented sundry petitions of the Christian Endeavor

Union of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent and for the adoption of improved divorce laws for the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented sundry petitions of the Christian Endeavor Union of Milwaukee, Wis., and the petition of Mrs. L. A. Hodge, president, and Mrs. M. M. Wilber, secretary, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenbush, Wis., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia, and for the enforcement of the national compulsory educational law; which were referred to the Committee of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TELLER. I present resolutions adopted by the Farmers' Institute of Camden County, N. J., favoring the free coinage of silver, which the memorialists have requested me to present to the Senate. I do not care to have the resolutions read, but I ask that they be printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the memorial will be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of J. B. Culver Post, No. 128, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the enactment of the Monroe doctrine into a fundamental law of this Republic; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Frank Nelson and sundry other citizens of Blue Earth County, Minn., praying for the nationalization of the telegraph business and the interstate commerce of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging Congress to reopen the navigation of the Connecticut River as far as the cities of Springfield and Holyoke; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the board of trustees of public reservations in Massachusetts, expressing the hope that the efforts being made for the preservation of the Palisades of the Hudson, opposite New York City, may be successful; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the memorial of William T. Brown and sundry other citizens of St. Clair, Mich., remonstrating against the placing of bridge piers in the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. I present a petition and accompanying resolution of certain owners of cotton shipped from Natchez, Miss., in August, 1863, on the steamer *Gladiator*, praying that Senate bill No. 2222, a bill for their relief, be referred to the Court of Claims for examination and report under the provisions of section 14 of the act approved March 3, 1887. I move that the petition and accompanying resolution be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL presented the petition of S. K. Winn, John A. Barker, A. J. Fristoe, and sundry other citizens of Petersburg, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing relief for the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of the common council of Roanoke, Va., praying that the United States district court for the western district of Virginia be authorized to hold one or more of its terms in that city; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Board of Trade of Bridgeport, Conn., praying that an appropriation be made for the purpose of converting Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I., into a harbor of refuge; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for the passage of House joint resolution No. 11, to amend the Constitution prohibiting further appropriations to institutions under ecclesiastical control; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAULKNER presented a petition of Swan Pond Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of West Virginia, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON presented resolutions adopted by Post No. 2, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill No. 306, to pension soldiers and sailors who were confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the American Academy of Medicine of Easton, Pa., and a petition of the Alumni Association of the College of Pharmacy of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the rank and pay of the Medical Corps of the Navy; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Erie, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to the suffering citizens in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Shinar Commandery, No. 143, Associated and Independent Order Knights of Malta, of Delta, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation relieving the suffering in Armenia, for the speedy recognition of Cuba, and for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry memorials of citizens of Adamstown, Pa., remonstrating against the appropriation of moneys for sectarian institutions; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present resolutions signed by W. D. Charde, secretary of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., stating that it is believed that the extension of foreign markets for American breadstuffs and the products of American agriculture generally would be greatly facilitated by the enactment of House bill No. 3212, introduced by Mr. KERR of Ohio, and now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. The bill is approved by that body, and they pray that our Senators and Representatives be urged to work for its enactment into law. The bill is not before the Senate, and I ask that these resolutions may be received and referred to the Committee on Finance, to which such a bill, I suppose, would properly go.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Finance, in the absence of objection.

ESTATE OF HAMPTON L. LEE.

Mr. TELLER. I present a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain papers in connection with the bill (S. 1033) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hampton L. Lee, deceased. I move that the communication and accompanying papers be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Claims, to accompany that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 492) for the erection of a public building at Meriden, Conn., reported it without amendment.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1491) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1872) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange in behalf of the United States the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., now belonging to the United States and held for light-house purposes, with the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company for any other tract or parcel of land in said county equally well or better adapted to use for light-house purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2001) authorizing the sale of title of the United States to certain tracts of land in the District of Columbia to Margaret Shugrue, Caroline Lochboehler, and John R. Scott, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I am also directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1707) defining the qualifications of chief inspector and deputy inspectors of plumbing in the District of Columbia, to submit an adverse report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN] to the bill just reported by him in reference to plumbing and the qualifications necessary for a man to be appointed a plumber in this District. What I ask is that that bill be placed upon the Calendar instead of being postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I have no objection to its going upon the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to state that there are hundreds of thousands of men engaged in that calling in this country who are intensely interested in the bill, and I think they ought to have a chance to be heard in some way, if necessary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1786) for the relief of the legal representatives of John H. Crane, deceased, submitted an

adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BACON. In behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], who is providentially detained from the Senate, and by instruction from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. 5490) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MANTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1935) providing for a commission to negotiate with the Crow and Flathead Indians for the cession of portions of their respective reservations in the State of Montana, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 477) to repeal section 553 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, requiring the district judge for the southern district of Florida to reside at Key West, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I am also instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 501) to require the judge of the southern district of Florida to reside in Jacksonville, Fla., to report it adversely. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] to this report.

Mr. CALL. I could not hear the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PLATT. It is an adverse report. The Committee reports favorably upon the bill repealing the law which requires the district judge to live at Key West, and adversely upon the bill introduced by the Senator from Florida, requiring the judge of the southern district to reside in Jacksonville.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator if he will please state the ground upon which the adverse report was made? Jacksonville is the principal point, and I introduced the bill at the request of the——

Mr. PLATT. We can scarcely discuss the bill now. The bill may go to the Calendar if the Senator desires.

Mr. CALL. Let it be placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 268) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the petition of Henry A. Du Pont, of the State of Delaware, claiming a seat in the Senate from that State, have had the same under consideration, and instruct me to report the resolution which I send to the desk, and recommend its passage. I accompany the resolution with a report, and ask that the report, without reading, may be printed in the RECORD for the convenience of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. And also as a document.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. And also as a document, as a matter of course.

I give notice that I shall call the resolution up for consideration at as early a date as may seem to suit the convenience of the Senate, other matters being considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution appended to the report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Henry A. Du Pont is entitled to a seat in the Senate from the State of Delaware for the full term commencing March 4, 1895.

Mr. PALMER. In connection with the report submitted by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to state that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], who is not present this morning, will ask consent to present a report expressing the views of the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and after conference with the Senator from Oregon, I believe it is understood that the Senator from Indiana may file that report, and that the reports be printed together.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I have delayed presenting the report for some two or three days for the accommodation of the Senator from Indiana, but I presume, for some unavoidable reason, he is detained from the Senate to-day. I shall not therefore ask to have my report printed until the Senator from Indiana is ready to submit the views of the minority.

Mr. COCKRELL. And then let them be printed together in the RECORD and in document form.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes; in both forms.

Mr. HARRIS. Had the Senator not better withhold his report until the views of the minority can go into the RECORD? Otherwise, his report will have to lie upon the table until the views of the minority are filed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I will state that if the Senator from Indiana does not come in during the day I shall withdraw the report.

Mr. GRAY. That is all right, then.

Mr. PALMER. I may be allowed to state that I think the Senator from Indiana has his report ready, and I suppose some accident prevents his being here this morning.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he withhold the request to have the report printed in the RECORD at present, and renew it when the views of the minority are ready, so that both may appear together.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I have just stated, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that unless the Senator from Indiana comes in during the day I shall withhold the request for the printing of the report in the RECORD.

Mr. TURPIE entered the Chamber.

Mr. HOAR. I see the Senator from Indiana is now here.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that I just now submitted the report in the Du Pont case, stating that I desired to have the report and the views of the minority printed together in the RECORD and also as a document.

Mr. TURPIE. I will state to the honorable Senator that the report of the minority is not quite finished. I expect to finish it to-day, however, and shall submit it at least to-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Then I ask that the whole matter be laid over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be withdrawn as requested.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2114) establishing gas buoys in the St. Lawrence River; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 2115) to regulate the practice in the circuit courts of the United States and to provide for winding up corporations subject to their jurisdiction; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2116) for the relief of Wilber H. Graef & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2117) for the relief of Mrs. George Pauls; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2118) to protect public forest reservations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2119) for the relief of John Breitling; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2120) to release and quitclaim to the commissioners of Lincoln Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, certain littoral or riparian rights belonging to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2121) to provide for the better manning and equipment of vessels on the Northwestern Lakes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2122) to provide for the completion of the Washington Aqueduct tunnel; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2123) to test the improved methods for the disposal of sewage and water filtration of villages and cities; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2124) to authorize extension of the lines of the Potomac Light and Power Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2125) granting a pension to Mrs. Frances C. De Russy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2126) granting a pension to Mrs. Laura A. Nelson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2127) providing that all official advertising in the District of Columbia shall be placed in only one daily newspaper, and awarded to the lowest bidder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2128) to make an equitable adjustment of the grants of land to the several States of the Union for State normal schools, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Nolan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2130) to provide for a military peace establishment; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAWLEY. While I state that I present the bill by request, I ask leave to say that it is without prejudice whatever to the bill. We have many projects of this kind, and out of them I hope we shall get something satisfactory. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2131) to correct the military record of Charles A. Wahl; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 2132) for the relief of settlers upon lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the New Orleans Pacific Railway Company; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will state that this bill was drawn by the Commissioner of the General Land Office upon a recommendation to that effect by the Secretary of the Interior, and its purpose is to give relief to certain deserving citizens in Louisiana who had settled upon imdemnity limits within the grant claimed by the New Orleans Pacific Railway under an order issued by the Interior Department when Mr. Lamar was Secretary of the Interior opening those lands to settlement.

Subsequently it was found that those very lands so settled had been selected by the railroad company under its grant, and in a contest between the settlers and the railroad company the settlers were defeated. A great injustice would be perpetrated upon them if this bill or a similar measure is not enacted into law. I move that the bill be referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2133) granting a pension to Mary E. Ely; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2134) to protect the insignia of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 2135) to pay estate of Anna Irons for beef cattle furnished the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2136) for the relief of Joel M. Bryan and Rebecca Bryan, deceased, by Joel M. Bryan, her administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2137) for the relief of Francis S. Davidson, late first lieutenant Ninth United States Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 2138) granting a pension to all honorably discharged officers and enlisted men who served in the military and naval service of the United States ninety days or more; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2139) providing that the circuit court of appeals of the eighth judicial circuit of the United States shall hold at least one term of said court annually in the city of Denver, in the State of Colorado, or in the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, on the first Monday in September in each year; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2140) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Grim; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 2141) to amend an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company to organize a corporation and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 2142) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2143) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2144) restoring a pension to Mills T. Redman; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I desire to present the petition of Mills T. Redman, a first-class pilot, praying for the restoration to him of his pension and of his name to the pension roll. I move that the bill and accompanying petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 2145) fixing the time for holding the circuit and district courts in the district of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2146) to amend section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1895, being an act amendatory of an act with reference to the postal service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 76) authorizing Lieut. William McCarty Little to accept a decoration from the King of Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SAC AND FOX INDIAN SCHOOL IN IOWA.

Mr. GEAR. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the Indian appropriation bill when it shall be presented. I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs with the request to that committee to refer the amendment to the Indian Bureau for report.

It is, in brief, a proposition that Congress shall appropriate $35,000 in the Indian appropriation bill for the purpose of establishing an Indian school at an Indian reservation in the State in which I live and represent in part. There is in that State, and has been for over fifty years, a small branch of the Sac and Fox Indians who were not in harmony with the Indians who, under Black Hawk, made war against the American people in 1832. They strayed off, leaving the main body, and went west of the Missouri River and purchased with their own money, received from the Government for their share of their land, a couple of sections or such a matter in Tama County, in my State. The Government has always had an agency at this small reservation, if I may so use the word, but the Indians have never had the advantage of any school. Those Indians now number 400, and they are gradually increasing in number. They had, in 1892, 80 children of school age; they had last year 117 children.

To my mind it is most desirable that the Government should take some action and establish a school at that place. The good people of my State who are interested in the education of Indians, the people called the Indian Rights Association, have kindly taken this matter up and they present it to Congress through me. They have had a talk with the officers of the Indian Bureau, who are highly favorable to it. This is my only reason for detaining the Senate. I merely want to say further about the moral condition of those people that it is most deplorable, and the only way we can make them better in future, it seems to me, is by taking the rising generation and teaching them as we teach other Indians in Indians schools, in order that eventually they may become self-supporting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and printed.

THE COTTON-BOLL WEEVIL.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the Agricultural appropriation bill. I ask that the amendment be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

For investigating the spread and devastation of the cotton-boll weevil (Anthonomus grandis) and for experiments looking to its destruction and eradication, $100,000.

Mr. BLANCHARD. This matter has been called to my attention by the president of the Cotton Exchange of the city of New Orleans. I hold in my hand certain letters received by him and referred by him to me, which I ask, together with the amendment, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This Mexican weevil, it seems from these letters, is a new enemy of the cotton plant that has appeared during the past season in southern and western Texas, and its depredations have been such that the cotton attacked by it has not been worth the picking. The farmers have discovered that the poison which exterminates other insect pests has had no effect upon this new enemy and that the weevil has extended rapidly.

It is further stated in these letters that those who are in a position to observe closely the ravages of the Mexican weevil fear that another season will witness a considerable advance in the pest in the direction of the other cotton States. If unarrested the weevil will rapidly increase and extend its ravages in new directions, so that in time the entire cotton belt will be pretty certain to be affected.

It is further stated that how to arrest the ravages of this new enemy of cotton is now the problem which is worrying the cotton interests. The Mexican weevil, while as yet confined to a portion of Texas, is actually a menace to the entire cotton belt. Hence it is considered that the matter is a fit subject for national legislation.

This new enemy of the cotton plant originated in Mexico, beyond the Rio Grande, and so great were its ravages in that section that cotton planting there was abandoned. It has now transferred its operations across the Rio Grande into the counties of southwestern Texas, and its ravages are rapidly extending, so that it would seem that this proposed legislation is timely.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and printed.

CONDITION OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the amount of money in the Treasury on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1889, including the gold reserve of $100,000,000, and the amount of money in the Treasury on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1893, including the gold reserve of $100,000,000, and if there was a decrease of the revenue between said dates, and the amount and cause thereof.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I have no objection to the facts which the Senator from Nebraska inquires for, but it seems to me it is a little unusual to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to state his opinion on the disputed political question what is the cause of the diminution of the revenues of the United States. I hope the Senator will strike out the words "and cause."

Mr. ALLEN. That is satisfactory. Let the words "and cause" be stricken out, so that it will read "and the amount thereof."

Mr. HOAR. I have no objection to the resolution in that form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

LAND PATENTS TO BOND-AIDED RAILROADS.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to suspend the further issuance of patents for lands granted by acts of Congress in aid of the construction of what are commonly known as "the bond-aided railroads of the United States" to such roads, their grantees, or assignees, as are in arrears to the Government until the accounts thereof with the Government shall have been settled and their condition fully determined by act of Congress or other competent authority.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let it go over, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. PLATT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the hearing before the Committee on Patents of parties interested in the bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Daniel Drawbaugh be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

FUR SEALS IN BERING SEA.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to send to the Senate copies of the reports made by the agents, officers, or persons acting under the authority of the Secretary or the Department of the Treasury in the years 1894 and 1895, which reports relate to the condition of the fur seals on the Pribilof Islands, or to the hunting of such animals in Bering Sea, or in the North Pacific Ocean, and the effect of such hunting upon the fur seals that resort to Bering Sea.

PRINTING OF TREATIES.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the treaty of 1850, known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and Articles XX to XXVIII, both inclusive, of the treaty of February 11, 1860, between Great Britain and Nicaragua, and the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Nicaragua, be printed together as a document for the use of the Senate.

COLUMBIA RIVER SALMON FISHERIES.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a resolution, which I ask may be read and lie on the table. I give notice that I shall call it up at an early day for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the salmon-fishing industry of the Columbia River is one of vast magnitude, the pack of last year amounting to 655,410 cases of the aggregate value of $3,342,928, giving employment to 1,574 operatives and 3,775 fishermen, and giving investment to more than $3,000,000 capital; and

Whereas it is evident from past experience elsewhere that the fish in said river will become extinct unless properly protected and artificially hatched; and

Whereas from the fact that said Columbia River is partly within the jurisdiction of the State of Oregon and partly within the jurisdiction of the State of Washington, and therefore not subject wholly to the legislative control of either State, it becomes of the utmost importance that whatever legislation is necessary looking to the protection and promotion of this great industry should be enacted by the Congress of the United States, provided jurisdiction over the subject exists in Congress: Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, instructed to investigate and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date whether or not the Congress of the United States has jurisdiction to legislate concerning the protection and promotion of the salmon fisheries of the Columbia River.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 12th instant approved and signed the act (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 13th instant approved and signed the act (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENTS IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER February 12, 1896:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire and report whether, during the year 1895 or any portion thereof, any of the employees of the Post-Office Department, while receiving pay from appropriations for that Department, did, with the knowledge, connivance, or direction of any clerk or clerks, or chief or chiefs of division, levy and collect assessments of money on and from other employees of the Department to be used, and which was used, for political purposes in States where election campaigns were in progress at that time; whether any person or persons were employed and borne on the Department rolls as employees and regularly paid as such who, while pretending to be discharging the duties of inspectors in the free-delivery service, were in fact actively engaged in aiding and assisting one of the political parties in said election campaign; whether, during such time, in room 3 of the Interior Department building, or in any other room or rooms in said building or in any other building, any employee of the Department was directing or managing the employment of persons for the purposes aforesaid and receiving and disbursing the moneys so assessed and collected, and whether such manager or director kept an account of such moneys in his own name in any bank of the city of Washington or elsewhere.

The committee will inquire and report, further, whether during the period covered by this resolution any person or persons were employed by any clerk or chief of division in the Post-Office Department and kept on the Department pay rolls and paid out of the Department funds, which payment was not authorized by law or by any lawful rule or regulation of the Department, and for which services no appropriation had been made by Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that that resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BOND SALES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER February 12, 1896:

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators, not more than two of whom shall belong to one political party, shall be appointed by the Vice-President, whose duty it shall be—

First. To investigate and report generally all material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

Second. To investigate and report specially what amount of available funds, classified, was in the United States Treasury and on deposit in other places, subject to the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the bonds were sold or offered for sale; whether there was or was not coin enough on hand to meet all coin obligations of the Government due at the time said bonds were sold or when they were offered for sale; what obligations were due at that time and the amount of each, stated separately; what was the reason for any unusual withdrawal of coin from the Treasury shortly before bonds were sold or offered for sale, if such unusual withdrawals were in fact made, and by what persons or classes of persons and for what purpose or on what account such withdrawals were made; who purchased the bonds, in what amounts, and where, whether in the United States or in foreign countries, and in what proportions, and from what persons or classes of persons the gold was procured with which to pay for the bonds, what the bonds sold for, and what was the market price of our Government bonds at the time, and what effect the bond sales had on the credit and business of the people of the United States.

Third. To investigate and report as to the manner of disposing of said bonds, by what authority, and what contracts, advertisements, or proposals were made by the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto; what agreements or contracts, and whether oral or in writing, and whether publicly or privately and secretly, were entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury and any other person or persons with respect to the sale and purchase of the bonds; whether any officer of the Government, or any person or persons for such officer and on his behalf and in his personal interest, and with his knowledge or consent, entered into any contract, agreement, or arrangement, directly or indirectly, with any person or persons, partnership, corporation, company, or syndicate, for the purpose of affecting the price offered or to be offered for said bonds or any of them, with the intent and expectation to receive commission or personal reward by reason of such contract, agreement, or arrangement; whether such contract or agreement had any and what effect on the prices offered for the bonds, what the effect was, and who, if any person, profited by it and to what extent.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that resolution will be passed over, so that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] may have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. PEFFER. What is the objection?

Mr. CULLOM. I simply ask that the resolution may be passed over, as the Senator from Minnesota desires to address the Senate.

Mr. PEFFER. Without prejudice?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

CATTLE QUARANTINE IN SOUTHWESTERN STATES.

Mr. VEST. On the last day's session of the Senate a communication was received from the Secretary of Agriculture, in response to a resolution of the Senate, adopted at my instance on the 12th instant, in regard to the quarantine line recently established by the Secretary of Agriculture on the northern border of Texas and of other States. I ask the Senate to take it up for the purpose of reference. It is Senate Executive Document No. 121.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to resolution of the Senate, dated February 12, 1896, copies of the regulations establishing the quarantine line in the Southwestern States for the years 1895 and 1896.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate, and especially of Senators from the cattle-raising and cattle-feeding States, to the vast importance of this action of the Secretary of Agriculture. I will say in a very few words that the effect of this order of the Secretary of Agriculture is to increase the price of beef to the people of the United States, and its specific effect upon States like Missouri, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Kansas is to deprive the cattle feeders of those States of their supply of beef from the southwestern portion of the Union for the coming year. We have now in those States the largest corn crop we have ever raised. Corn is worth from 10 to 12½ cents a bushel at cattle depots in Missouri and Kansas, and in other States it is worth even less. Our cattle supply is very deficient, because some years ago there was a panic in regard to the price of cattle, and cattle raisers sacrificed their entire herds, including cows and calves. They were rushed upon the market; the price went down abnormally, and the supply was exhausted. We in Missouri are now, and I take it to be the case in the other States I have mentioned, absolutely dependent upon the supply of cattle for feeding purposes from the great State of Texas. The supply from the other States, Colorado, Arkansas, the Indian Territory, and Arizona, is comparatively unimportant. If the Texas supply is shut off from the cattle feeders of the great corn States of the Northwest, it will result in a vast increase in the price of beef throughout the United States and in an absolute and specific loss to the cattle raisers of those States.

In 1884 Congress passed an act in regard to the prevention of contagion among cattle. It was the act which established what is known as a Bureau of Animal Industry in the Agricultural Department. Senators who were here in service at that time will remember the discussion which occurred here for days in regard to State rights and the power of the Federal authorities to go into a State for the purpose of destroying cattle supposed or charged to be infected with pleuro-pneumonia and other contagious cattle diseases. The result of that controversy and argument was that we passed the act of 1884, which gave to the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Agricultural Department, or rather to the Commissioner of Agriculture, as the Secretary was then termed, the power to prevent the carrying of diseased cattle from one State or Territory to another or to the District of Columbia.

That was the compromise effected between divers opinions in regard to the power of the Federal authorities. It was assumed then, in order to settle the question, that power should not be given to the Federal authorities to go inside of a State and take possession of infected cattle or cattle charged to be such for the purpose of quarantining or destroying them. The law remained in that condition until 1891, when, at the instance of General Rusk, then Secretary of Agriculture, the Special Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, of which I was at that time chairman, introduced an amendment to the general appropriation bill of 1891 which was intended to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to quarantine counties and districts inside of States, the Secretary reporting that it was absolutely impossible for him to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia under the original act of 1884, which we had enacted. That change in the law has been continued from 1891 up to the last appropriation bill, and I ask the Secretary to read that law as it stands now, with a few immaterial amendments, so that this matter can be fully understood.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, and in such manner as he may think best, in the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products, and to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, sheep scab, and other diseases of animals, and for this purpose to employ as many persons as he may deem necessary, including $1,000 additional temporary compensation to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State into another, etc.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the object of that legislation, as every member of the Committee on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products and of the Committee on Appropriations will testify, was to extend this power so that the Commissioner of Agriculture, now the Secretary of Agriculture, should have the right to quarantine counties inside of States in order to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia outside.

I ask the Secretary to read the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture to the resolution I offered, which shows that he denies that he has any power to establish quarantine inside of a State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

In response to this resolution I send herewith copies of the regulations establishing the quarantine line in the Southwestern States for the years 1895 and 1896. From these regulations it is seen that the quarantine line for the year 1895 crossed the territory of the States of Texas and Arkansas and the Territory of Oklahoma, while the line as established for 1896 is made to conform with the boundary line of these States and this Territory.

The reason for the change is found in the act of May 29, 1884, which prohibits the shipment of live stock affected with any contagious, infectious, or communicable disease from one State or Territory to another, or from any State into the District of Columbia, or from the District into any State, and provides a penalty for the shipment of such live stock in violation of the law.

I do not find anything in the statute mentioned or any other statute which directs or authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent the shipment or driving of infected live stock from one section of a State to any other section of that State, or to establish a quarantine line across the territory of a State with the purpose of preventing such movement of affected or exposed live stock, except by cooperation with the authorities of that State and in conformity with the laws thereof.

In past years quarantine lines have been made across the territory of several States which were not authorized by existing law, but which were made as a concession to the cattle industry, and in the expectation that the interests of the communities involved would be sufficient to secure respect for such lines. Unfortunately, these expectations have not been realized. Infected cattle have been driven with impunity across such lines, endangering the cattle industry of the United States, and particularly the export trade in live cattle.

Violations of the regulations of this Department were brought to the attention of the governor of Texas last summer, and it appears from his communications in reply that under the Texas statutes the quarantine line can not be enforced until after May 15 of each year. Such regulations should go into effect not later than February 15 in order to guard against the dissemination of Texas fever. If cattle can be shipped or driven from the infected section of Texas to the healthy section without restriction until May 15, the contagion is likely to be disseminated over the whole State, and this contagion will remain active until the following winter. It is therefore unsafe to allow any cattle from the State to be shipped into other States or Territories, except for immediate slaughter, and in accordance with the regulations provided by this Department.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I dislike exceedingly to be again put in the attitude of criticising the action of the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not question his motives. I sympathize entirely with his object in preventing the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, a deadly disease, and one which would destroy, if unrestrained, the entire cattle industry of the country. But it is most

unfortunate that, after establishing this quarantine line across States, across Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee, and after three years' operation of that order, the Secretary all at once discovers that he has not the legal power and the constitutional right to retain that line, and is now engaged in an acrimonious discussion with the governor of Texas with regard to the line as established inside of that State. I care nothing about the details of this discussion between the governor of Texas and the Secretary of Agriculture; but the result upon the cattle raisers of Missouri and upon the other cattle-raising and cattle-feeding States is most disastrous. In a year when, as I have said, we have the largest possible supply of corn we are shut off from the cattle supply of Texas, and the result is that the price of beef meat goes up throughout the entire country, and in this era of depression there is additional financial depression caused by reason of this order.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to make a statement in regard to this matter, as it is rather important to my State?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to state, Mr. President, that this quarantine question in the northern part of my State is one that has excited a great deal of interest for the last four or five years. When Secretary Rusk was in charge of the Agricultural Department I went to him and urged him to extend the quarantine line south so as to include north of the line two tiers of counties in my own State. He promised to do so, but the election came on and he failed to do it. I then, in connection with my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. DINSMORE, and Mr. NEILL, urged upon the present Secretary of Agriculture the necessity of changing the lines so as to relieve from the operations of the quarantine regulations these two tiers of counties in Arkansas, because they operated as a great hardship upon the people in that section who own and raise cattle. In fact, the quarantine regulations resulted in taking from $2 to $3 off the price of every head of cattle that was shipped from northern Arkansas into St. Louis, although the character of country and the character of cattle were precisely the same as those in Missouri, the country being equally healthy and free from all cattle diseases.

Finally the Secretary consented to make, and did make, an order dated, I think, February, 1893, extending the line south so as to relieve the two tiers of counties in Arkansas from the regulations of the quarantine. It was a proper order to make. It gave universal satisfaction in twelve or fourteen counties in northern Arkansas. No possible hurt has ever come or could come from it. I was, therefore, greatly surprised on the 28th of January when I received a copy of a new order from the Secretary of Agriculture reestablishing the old line between Arkansas and Missouri, thereby placing those counties again under the quarantine regulations which entailed such a great hardship upon the people of northern Arkansas. In company with General NEILL and Mr. DINSMORE, of the House of Representatives, I went to the Department about ten days ago and we urged upon the Secretary again to be relieved from this hardship, when he made the same answer as he had made to the Senator from Missouri, that he had no power to establish quarantine regulations inside a State unless he could have the consent and cooperation of the State authorities. We were persistent, however, and told him that we had passed a statute in the State of Arkansas to prohibit the crossing of that line where the quarantine line was made in the State, which would be enforced. He finally agreed with us, as I understood him, that he would correspond with the governor of our State, and if he could be assured that the State law would be enforced he would modify this late regulation and reestablish the quarantine line so as to leave these two tiers of counties in northern Arkansas north of the line instead of south of it, as does the late order.

I wished to make this statement in order that the people of northern Arkansas might know the precise condition of affairs. I hope and believe that when the Secretary of Agriculture hears from the governor of our State he will reestablish the line, leaving those two tiers of counties in northern Arkansas north of the quarantine line and the cattle not subject to quarantine regulations, which operates with such great hardship upon the cattle raisers in the northern part of our State. I hope he will reestablish that line. If he fails to do so, it will undoubtedly work great injustice and great hardship upon those people living in the counties I have mentioned. The cattle there are as free from disease as the cattle in any section of the Union, and there is no reason why they should be subject to quarantine regulation, and I am confident the governor of the State will give the Secretary the assurance that he requires as to the enforcement of the State law.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it will be noted in the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture to the resolution of the Senate that he distinctly affirms that he can find no law which authorizes him to establish a quarantine line inside of a State. I assume that the Secretary of Agriculture has seen the provisions in the appropriation bills from 1891 to 1895. He must have seen them, because his attention is called specifically to the appropriation act of 1894 in a letter from the district attorney, R. U. Culberson, I believe, of the western district of Texas. If the Secretary of Agriculture means to say that Congress had no right to make those provisions in those appropriation bills, I am very sorry he did not say so in so many words. He says in a letter to Mr. Hughes, the president of a cattle association in Texas, who wrote to him earnestly remonstrating against this last order, that he is powerless to go into a State and establish a quarantine line without the cooperation and consent of the authorities of that State; in other words, that if pleuro-pneumonia exists in a county or a district, unless the State authorities cooperate with the Federal authorities the Secretary of Agriculture is powerless to confine pleuro-pneumonia to that district or to that county. In these appropriation bills, as shown by what the Secretary has read, Congress intended to give, and did give, if the English language amounts to anything, the power to the Secretary of Agriculture to go into any State, buy up the diseased cattle, and destroy them or quarantine them in that State, as he might see proper; and in every one of these appropriation bills so much as is necessary out of the aggregate appropriation to the Bureau of Animal Industry is devoted to that purpose.

Now, under this ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture, I say, in conclusion, that from the 1st of February—because he says first that the 15th of February ought to be the beginning of the quarantine in each year, and he afterwards says that the safest date would be the 1st of February—from the 1st of February to the 15th of November in each year no cattle can be brought out of the State of Texas, or out of Arkansas, or any of the Southwestern States, for the purpose of being fed in the great corn States of the Northwest.

I move now that the communication of the Secretary of Agriculture be referred to the Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. PALMER. I ask that the communication of the Secretary of Agriculture, instead of being referred, be laid upon the table for the present. I hope to be able to-morrow or the next day to address the Senate upon the general principle involved.

Mr. VEST. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the communication will lie upon the table.

DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURTS IN TENNESSEE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution reported by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which the Senator from Minnesota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Minnesota kindly yields to me in order that I may ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to consider at this time House bill 1676, which changes the times of holding the terms of the Federal courts at Knoxville, in Tennessee. The first term of the court is to be held on the first Monday of next month. I therefore ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall not object if the bill does not lead to debate; but I do know that the Senator from Minnesota has been patiently waiting here for more than a half hour in the hope that he might be allowed to go on.

Mr. HARRIS. If the bill leads to the slightest debate, I shall not ask the Senate to consider it. I would not impose upon the Senator from Minnesota who is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall not interpose now, but I give notice that I will object to any other business, even if the Senator from Minnesota yields.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. That this act take effect from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it; and that all laws and parts of laws conflicting with this act be, and are hereby, repealed.

Mr. HARRIS. That provision is wholly unnecessary, but it is absolutely harmless; and, in view of the shortness of the time between now and the time at which the first term of the court is to be held, I appeal to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] to let the Senate disagree to the amendment, so that the bill may be passed at once.

Mr. PLATT. This is a House bill, I believe?

Mr. HARRIS. It is a House bill.

Mr. PLATT. The committee reported an amendment striking out section 3, because the section was unnecessary, and, indeed, ridiculous; but if there is necessity for the immediate passage of the bill, we will withdraw the amendment and allow the bill to pass.

Mr. HARRIS. I should be glad to have that done. I quite agree with the Senator as to the unnecessary character of the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona; and

A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery;

A bill (H. R. 83) for the relief of John C. Cutter, late first lieutenant Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry;

A bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman;

A bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks;

A bill (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas;

A bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movement of vessels in St. Marys River.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, providing a chaplain for the Military Academy;

A joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida;

A joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American Territory; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the concurrent resolution submitted by me some time ago.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution indicated by the Senator from Minnesota, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution reported by Mr. DAVIS from the Committee on Foreign Relations January 20, 1896, as follows:

Concurrent resolution relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Whereas President Monroe, in his message to Congress of December 2, A. D. 1823, deemed it proper to assert as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, were thenceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power; and

Whereas President Monroe further declared in that message that the United States would consider any attempt by the Allied Powers of Europe to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; that with the existing colonies and dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and should not interfere, but that with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and further reiterated in that message that it is impossible that the Allied Powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; and

Whereas the doctrine and policy so proclaimed by President Monroe have since been repeatedly asserted by the United States by Executive declaration and action upon occasions and exigencies similar to the particular occasion and exigency which caused them to be first announced, and have been ever since their promulgation, and now are, the rightful policy of the United States: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurrring), That the United States of America reaffirms and confirms the doctrine and principles promulgated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, A. D. 1823, and declares that it will assert and maintain that doctrine and those principles, and will regard any infringement thereof, and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continents, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right of sovereignty or dominion in the same in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety by or through force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate, or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American Isthmus, whether under unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes or under any other unfounded pretensions, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and as an interposition which it would be impossible in any form for the United States to regard with indifference.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it is a matter of common observation that each successive year our foreign relations increase in difficulty, complexity, and importance. This results, of course, from the development of the power of this nation, from the growing and overpowering tendencies of modern times to bring all nations closer together in social and commercial intercourse, and from all the reasons which prompt humanity, however divided by geographical lines and governmental differences, to affiliate. The closer the relations of one government to another, the more natural it is that their international relations should become of increasing frequency of recurrence and more difficult of solution. That fact explains why there are probably more questions unsolved between us and Great Britain than exist between us and all other nations of the world combined.

The present question is important and far reaching. It not only involves the adjustment of the controversy under consideration, but also the application and even the existence of the Monroe doctrine itself. Of course it must be most gratifying to everybody that the conditions of the controversy apparently have been considerably ameliorated within the last month. If that amelioration, when we are permitted to know its conditions, rests upon bases which do not concede anything from the Monroe doctrine, but recognizes and confirms it in its entirety, it will receive the warmest approval of the American people. But if, on the contrary, it is the result of any material abandonment of the principles enunciated by President Monroe, and to which the American people are most warmly attached, that people will rise up in condemnation of it.

I wish to speak, Mr. President, with the utmost temperateness of expression, for in all controversies of this character it is best to do so. It is in the interest of harmony and ultimate peace that nations, through all their exponents, representative or legislative, speak with honest frankness in defining their policies and what they expect to assert. In a way which will necessarily be discursive I shall consider briefly the origin of the Monroe doctrine, its character and nature, the various phases of our national existence in which it has been applied, and to some extent the present controversy.

I understand the Monroe doctrine as promulgated by President Monroe in 1823 to be fairly summarized as follows: That the American continents are not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power; that we should consider any attempt on the part of such powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; that any interposition by European powers for the purpose of oppressing the independent nations of the American continents, or of controlling in any other manner their destiny, would be considered by the United States as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward us; that there shall be noninterference by the United States with European possessions on this hemisphere as they existed in 1823.

This doctrine, which has become indelibly inscribed upon our policy, was submitted by President Monroe, three months before he proclaimed it, to Madison and Jefferson, then in their declining years and in the retirement of private life. Mr. Madison approved it in characteristic terms of philosophic moderation, while Mr. Jefferson, the most prescient of American statesmen, the far-seeing man who acquired by the Louisiana purchase more territory to the United States than he had assisted to wrest from Great Britain by conquest, most warmly approved it and pronounced it to be the most important matter that had been submitted to his consideration since the Declaration of Independence.

It may not be improper for me to state briefly, for it has been done more fully and more ably here than I can possibly pretend to do, the origin of this doctrine and the connection of Great Britain with it. It is well known that immediately after Great Britain and the Allied Powers of Europe had compassed the overthrow of the First Napoleon a treaty, autographically signed by the sovereigns of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, and which was not signed by George, then regent of England, for the reason that the constitutional limitations of his authority required him to act through his ministers, committed the great powers of Europe to the forcible repression of any attempt by insurrection or revolt to change

the existing Governments, which not only were asserted by the signatories to have been the legitimate result of their military triumphs, but which they also asserted were vested in them by Divine authority.

In various congresses held after the convention by which this alliance was formed these provisions were put forward with unmistakable distinctness. In the congress at Laybach it was promulgated that all reforms effected by insurrection should be held null and void. In that of Troppau it was asserted that Divine law gave the European nations the imprescriptible right to place themselves in open hostility to those States which, by change of their institutions and Governments, should afford a dangerous example to other peoples.

Under these sanctions Austria repressed with a cruel and bloody hand the popular uprisings in Naples and Piedmont. The Holy Alliance had restored the house of Bourbon, in the person of Ferdinand VII, to the throne of Spain. He found when he acceded to that Kingdom the constitution of the First Napoleon striking down abuses and opening a career for talents—the constitution of that man who, whatever he was, left every country better governed than it was when he seized it.

This constitution Ferdinand VII nullified and abrogated. A revolt took place in Spain about 1820 which had for its object the restoration of Napoleon's constitution. It was an uprising of popular right and conviction against the despotic acts of the monarchical authority so recently instituted in the peninsula by the Allied Powers. And accordingly, as the result or by the instigation of another congress held at Verona, France was commissioned to put in operation against the people of Spain the principles which had been declared by the Holy Alliance. She did so. Her armies traversed the peninsula and stood arrayed in triumph at its extremity at Cadiz. It was very natural under such circumstances that, flushed with such an achievement, the Allied Powers and France, in vindication of the principles which they had announced, should purpose to take upon themselves the attempt to restore to the Crown of Spain the South American colonies which, in the years immediately succeeding the accession of Joseph Bonaparte to the throne of that Kingdom, had shaken off the Spanish yoke and had become free and independent states.

The memoirs of Prince Metternich disclose that a congress, which was never held, was called to meet at Paris for that purpose. It was asserted that negotiations had been entered into between France and Spain for the purpose of enabling and justifying France in assisting Spain in the reconquest of her transatlantic dependencies. England was alarmed at this. The balance of power, to maintain which she had committed herself after the fall of Napoleon, had become overbalanced, or had threatened to become so, as to her. Accordingly Mr. Canning protested to the Court of France against the attempt which he supposed, and had reason to suppose, was to be made against the independence of the new nations in the Western Hemisphere. Aggrandizement by France on those continents at the expense and with the consent of Spain was feared. Accordingly England sent a formidable fleet into the West Indian waters. This inspired the fear or apprehension on the part of Mr. Rush, then our minister at the Court of St. James, that England had designs upon Cuba, while England had been inspired in her action by the fear that France had designs upon the same island. This was the beginning of the relation, or the understanding, between Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. Canning suggested that the United States notice this, and proposed that England and the United States should enter into a joint declaration of their status and intentions as to the new states on the Western Hemisphere. This was declined. This was the end of any joint action or understanding between Great Britain and the United States upon this subject. They proceeded separately thereafter upon their own lines. Great Britain notified the French Government that it would not permit the seizure or acquisition by France of any territory belonging to Spain upon the Western Continent, and Mr. Monroe, proceeding independently upon American lines, made the declaration the substance of which I have attempted to give.

These declarations were immediately self-efficient. The Holy Alliance and France abandoned their attempt and their intention. I have never thought that the action of Mr. Canning in that celebrated incident was inspired by any love on the part of that statesman for free institutions or for our Government. The thing involved and feared by him and by Great Britain was the danger to British trade. During the great continental wars Great Britain had become supreme upon the sea. No State of the continent had a mercantile fleet able to enter in the least degree into competition with her. She had engrossed the South American trade completely, and although failing and refusing to recognize the independence of those States, she had with a view to trade established consular relations wherever the performance of consular duty would aid her trade.

I say that I have never believed that any love for the spread or perpetuity of free institutions at all inspired the British Government in what it did in this matter, and although Mr. Canning grandiloquently boasted that "I sought the materials of compensation in another hemisphere, * * * I called the New World into existence to redeem the balance of the Old," he also stated while he was attempting to identify English and American action, in a letter to the British minister at Madrid, respecting the ephemeral monarchy of Iturbide in Mexico, and the recently established Empire of Brazil, that "monarchy in Mexico and monarchy in Brazil would cure the evils of universal democracy which I most dread—America versus Europe."

Mr. President, it is unfortunate, and yet not to be wondered at, that among a people of so many and various convictions as our own attempts should be made to qualify or to entirely deny the Monroe doctrine. The doctrine itself stands challenged. The letter of the Secretary of State and the message of the President have been assailed. The concurrent resolution now pending has been attacked upon the ground that it commits the Government of the United States to too much in this or in any future controversy of like character. The resolution, embodying, as it does, the text of the Monroe doctrine, particularizes that doctrine as to cases existing or imminent.

It does not commit the Government of the United States to any protectorate over the governments of Spanish or Portuguese America. We are not bound by that doctrine or by that resolution to any guardianship over them. We have under that doctrine and that resolution no responsibility whatever for their conduct as to foreign nations. Not one of the South American States can derive any exemption under that doctrine or that resolution from the chastisement of war by any foreign power, the only limitation being under the policy of this Republic that acquisition of territory by such war, as the result of superiority in arms or conquest, shall not follow as a result.

The principle requires the United States to intervene when, and only when, it considers that the act threatened or proposed by a foreign power is dangerous to our peace or safety. This peace or safety may be threatened by the hostile action of a foreign power alone, or it may be menaced by the amicable, collusive, and cooperative action of a European power with a South American State having for its object the results which are opposed to the peace and safety of the United States. In either case, as against either party or both combined, the United States should intervene and assert the policy now under consideration in any instance as to which it shall deem such attempts to be dangerous to its peace or safety.

The principle of this doctrine is neither novel nor unprecedented. The history of Europe ever since the peace of Westphalia is filled with its examples. Turkey is to-day a standing object lesson of its application, and has been for more than a century. Ever since the Crescent began to wane over Europe it has been the doctrine of the civilized powers of that continent that none of them by any means, whether by conquest or by arrangement with Turkey, shall acquire any portion of the territory of the Ottoman Empire. While it is true that the illustration afforded by Turkey and the powers of Europe in relation to her fails to be justified by any such principle as that upon which the Monroe doctrine is based, the illustration is one of particular cogency and perfect force.

When the Marquis of Salisbury stated in his reply to Mr. Olney that the assertion of the American policy is not based upon any canon of international law he did not state the entire fact. If from that statement it is to be inferred that the assertion of that policy is against the rules of international law, it is manifestly incorrect. While the right of intervention has not gone into the universal canon of international law as a right between nations, it is nevertheless a right existing in any nation, under the principles of that high system of jurisprudence by which it can authoritatively intervene upon the territory or in the affairs of any other State, whenever it deems that the situation is such as to endanger its peace and safety. And this application is nowhere so frequent and nowhere so frequently justified as in cases where the acquisition of territory by one power is deemed by another power to be dangerous to its peace and safety. No publicist states this more positively than Sir Robert Phillimore. In his chapter on intervention he says:

> The reason of the thing and the practice of nations appear to have sanctioned this intervention in the following cases. * * *
> More frequently and upon far surer grounds with respect to the territorial acquisitions or foreign relations, when such relations or acquisitions threaten the peace or safety of other States.

From the day when the Monroe doctrine was first promulgated it has been the Executive policy of this Government, and no leading American statesman that I am aware of, except Mr. Calhoun, ever denied the permanency of its application. Mr. Webster said immediately after the announcement:

> I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it nor tear it up; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame.

He also said, and I read this as bearing upon the true interpretation of the doctrine, that it is to be invoked when, and only when, the United States may consider its peace and safety to be involved:

It is doubtless true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that the declaration must be considered on our rights and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation.

It did not commit us at all events to take up arms at any indications of hostile feeling by the powers of Europe toward South America. * * * If an armament had been furnished by the allies to act against the provinces the most remote from us, as Chile or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action diminishing also our means of effectual interposition, might still have left us—

To do what? Not to acquiesce, but he says—

to content ourselves with remonstrances.

But a very different case would have arisen if an army equipped and maintained by these powers had been landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico and commenced the war in our immediate neighborhood. Such an event might justly be regarded as dangerous to ourselves, and on that ground call for decided and immediate interference by us.

When these words were spoken our population was small; steam and electricity had not then begun the oceanic transference of thought and matter. The Nicaragua Canal was the chimera of a few enthusiastic visionaries; our possessions on the Pacific Coast were small and inconsiderable, and were protected by their isolation and remoteness. We had not thought of acquiring California.

Under existing conditions what would Mr. Webster now say? These conditions would have made applicable to those States mentioned by him his explicit declaration as to our duty in case hostilities should be commenced by a European power upon the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. But under conditions as they then were and now are Venezuela by her location, her relative situation to the United States, would have been a case in point for Mr. Webster to declare for the effective interposition of this Government even at that time.

The course of the executive department of the United States in the assertion of this doctrine has been consistent from the date of its promulgation. Nowhere does this appear more clearly than by the declarations of the various Administrations respecting the Island of Cuba. As I have stated in giving a sketch of the history of this matter, so far as Great Britain and the United States were concerned, apprehensions concerning the acquisition of Cuba by France or England were the very origin of this declaration by notifications made by Mr. Rush and Mr. Gallatin, as I shall show. Mr. Clay, Secretary of State, as directed by President Adams, wrote to Mr. King in 1825 directing our ministers to the various European courts to announce "that the United States for themselves desire no change in the political condition of Cuba; that they were satisfied that it should remain open, as it now is, to their commerce; and that they could not with indifference see it passing from Spain to any European power."

The Marquis of Salisbury observes in his letter that so far as he is aware the letter of Mr. Olney is the first written communication that this Government has ever addressed to any foreign state asserting the Monroe doctrine. In a certain exact and literal sense that may possibly be correct, although I do not think it is. The United States had asserted that doctrine for more than seventy years by the messages of Presidents and by instructions to our foreign ministers, and has inscribed its adhesion to it upon the pages of history so conspicuously and indelibly that it seems something like a subterfuge at this time to make the point that the United States has never in a written communication submitted its pretensions to any foreign power.

I think that this letter of Mr. Clay, by direction of President John Quincy Adams, in 1825, enjoining upon our ministers to notify the foreign powers what our views were respecting Cuba and its acquisition by any of them was a distinct assertion of the Monroe doctrine in its entirety.

Mr. Gallatin, in 1826, states in his memoirs that he "tried to impress strongly upon his (Mr. Canning's) mind that it was impossible that the United States could acquiesce in the conquest by or transference of that island (Cuba) to any great maritime power."

Mr. Webster wrote to Mr. Campbell, the minister at Madrid, in 1843:

The Spanish Government has long been in possession of the policy and wishes of this Government in regard to Cuba, and has repeatedly been told that the United States never would permit the acquisition of that island by British agents or forces upon any pretext whatever; and that in the event of any attempt to wrest it from her, she might securely rely upon the whole naval and military resources of this country to aid her in preserving or recovering it.

Mr. President, the case of Cuba was one where the above declarations were made upon the mere supposition that Spain might at some time wish to sell that island to a European power. No one then entertained the conception that if any European power possessing a colonial dependency or any South American State deemed it advantageous to cede it to another European power, such cession would not be a violation of the principles promulgated by President Monroe. Upon the mere apprehension that such a sale or cession was intended, Mr. Webster expressed the opinions which I have cited.

The Yucatan incident presents a very conspicuous definition and assertion of the principles enunciated by President Monroe. This was a case where a Central American State was engaged in a war with her Indian tribes. She was unable, it seems, to make head against them. She requested the interposition and solicited the interference and dominion of England and Spain for her protection. On that and other occasions President Polk announced and defined the Monroe doctrine as I understand it to be. This definition by Mr. Polk produced, if I recollect correctly, the remarkable and unaccountable statement by Mr. Calhoun that the Monroe doctrine was a merely ephemeral enunciation, dying with the occasion which produced it, and that it did not prevent any South American or Central American power from annihilating its sovereignty by cession. In this statement Mr. Calhoun stands alone among American statesmen.

Mr. President, take as an illustration an event comparatively recent. It is but a short time since we were debating in the Senate with great earnestness and some acrimony the conduct of the present Administration toward the then recently instituted Republic of Hawaii. There is an instance in which in regard to an island remote from our shores, in the heart of the Pacific Ocean, it has been proclaimed since 1840, repeatedly by various Secretaries of State, and I do not know but in the messages of various Presidents, that ultimate destiny has committed the Hawaiian Islands to coalescence with the United States, and that no foreign intervention or cession of that territory to any foreign power would be tolerated by us. As sustaining the propriety, the expediency, the necessity, of making a Congressional declaration of what are conceived by Congress to be the principles enunciated by President Monroe as applicable to existing conditions, I desire to read the resolution passed by this body, introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], respecting Hawaii:

Resolved, That of right it belongs wholly to the people of the Hawaiian Islands to establish and maintain their own form of government and domestic policy; that the United States ought in no wise to interfere therewith, and that any intervention in the political affairs of these islands by any other government will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States.

When this resolution was passed, Hawaii was at peace with all the world. The newborn Republic had been recognized by all the nations of the earth. There was no government upon the planet making any attack upon her sovereignty except the United States itself, who was engaged in the attempt to reseat upon an overturned throne a sanguinary and barbarous queen. If it was proper for this body to pass a resolution of that character under such circumstances in regard to Hawaii, what objection can there be at the present time, under existing conditions, to Congress firmly, temperately, clearly, explicitly proclaiming by resolution its adherence to the Monroe doctrine and its application to such existing conditions?

Everyone is familiar with the present controversy. It has existed for fifty years. It arises from the undetermined interior boundaries between British Guiana and Venezuela—boundaries necessarily, perhaps, left somewhat obscure and indeterminate by the terms of the treaty which concluded the peace of Westphalia, and by the treaty of 1814, whereby Holland ceded to Great Britain a portion of her possessions in Guiana.

It is to be remarked that throughout this controversy Venezuela has always made one consistent claim. During all the time that this dispute has been carried on the claim of Venezuela has been consistent and unyielding that the River Essequibo is the boundary which separates her possessions from those of Great Britain.

As time has gone on in the course of this long-protracted altercation, the claims of Great Britain have increased immeasurably. A map showing the various boundaries prescribed by Great Britain is perfectly bewildering in its intricacies and inequities. She has never laid a single definite boundary line and said, "This, and no other, is the line upon which I stand." She has never anywhere along the whole course of this dispute set up the image of the god Terminus and said, "Here are my unalterable bounds." She has progressed beyond the Essequibo to the Schomburgk line. She has gone beyond that in steady advance almost to the Orinoco River on its western and southern course, until by a growth of pretensions with which history has made us familiar by its examples, she claims 70,000 and more square miles of territory, and says as to arbitration, "I will arbitrate as to my claim west of the Schomburgk line; I will not arbitrate any question as to territory east of that line."

The extreme claim of Great Britain in Venezuela is the entire river basin of the Essequibo, as indicated by the streams that run into that river from the west. It is an enormous expanse of territory. Yet the extension of the Schomburgk line to Point Barima is not vindicated even by that geographical pretension.

It is very interesting to consider how and where this claim originated. In all text-books of geography taught in schools, in all political manuals, in all encyclopedias and sources of information

up to within a time comparatively recent, the boundaries between Venezuela and Great Britain were as plainly set down and known as any geographical fact which is not liable to be overturned by the aggressions of a strong power upon a weak one. I have here the book of Robert Schomburgk, sent to me by an esteemed constituent. It was published in London in 1840. It contains the original map to which such frequent reference has been made. Whether Robert Schomburgk at that time was in Venezuela as an agent of Great Britain for the purpose of setting up a boundary of any kind is not certain from the book.

It is to be presumed that he was. But it does very clearly appear from what he states on pages 2 and 3 of this volume how indeterminate the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana was at that time, and upon what theory Great Britain maintains her present contention, whatever it is, as to the line west of the Essequibo River. He says:

> The boundary which separates the British settlements from Venezuela and Brazil has never been determined.
> * * * If we follow the limits which nature prescribes by its rivers and mountains and include all the regions which are drained by the streams which fall into the Essequibo within the British territory, and, adopting the River Corentyn as its eastern boundary, the counties Demerara, Essequibo and Berbice, which constitute British Guiana, consist of 76,000 square miles

It was there that the conception first appears that, by a contested rule sometimes, but not invariably, applied for the determination of boundaries, where a State has taken possession of a river or of the mouth of a river, Great Britain could claim the entire basin of the Essequibo, which subtracts 70,000 square miles from Venezuelan territory and increases British territory to three or four times more than what fifty years ago it was almost universally conceded to be.

But there is something more to this than the mere acquisition of territory. The seizure of Point Barima or its acquisition by Great Britain involves the control by that power of the navigable channel of the Orinoco River at its mouth. A consideration upon the map of the relative situation of that geographical point toward ourselves and our own interests will demonstrate in a moment the importance of that occupation to us.

The Orinoco is one of the most remarkable river systems in the world. It is navigable for the largest vessels of war for 400 miles from its mouth. From its source it runs to the north and thence turning runs to the east until it empties into the Atlantic. Its upper waters connect with the navigable waters of the Amazon, and everyone knows how vast are the relations of that stream and its tributaries to the interior of South America.

The mouth of the Orinoco River is the key to a great internal commerce, destined in the future to become more vast than the imagination even can attempt to foresee. The hand of Great Britain is upon that key. She has flanked and taken in reverse, in a military sense, the commercial advantages of one-third of the South American Continent. The mouth of the Orinoco is about six days' sail by a fast steamship from the city of New York. It is about three days' sail from the entrance to the Nicaragua Canal. Its possession by Great Britain, in connection with her West India Islands, makes the Caribbean Sea an English lake and the possessor dominates all those waters. With a naval station at its mouth it has a commanding position as to all contingencies of peace or war, which can be apprehended by this Government. This is not pleasant to contemplate. It concerns our peace and safety, and demands an assertion of the principles of the Monroe doctrine.

Considering the evidence as it is, it is impossible not to feel that this contention for territory, based upon the assertion that it is a mere dispute as to boundary, is not in good faith. We see the familiar processes of history repeated here. The thing that hath been it is that which shall be, and there is no new thing under the sun. A claim of right to an extended boundary, an overrunning of frontiers, and occupation by the subjects of a foreign power, suffered and encouraged to continue until the conditions have become inveterate, become a pretext that this is a just and valid acquisition of territory under the guise of a boundary dispute.

The occasion for this controversy was not sought and has not been brought on by the United States. She has pleaded vainly for arbitration and for a peaceful composition of this matter; but Great Britain, asserting that in no event will she arbitrate anything east of the Schomburgk line, insisting that she must protect and defend her colonies even beyond that line, has by actual seizure—for the extension of government and jurisdiction is seizure—laid hold of territory which Venezuela steadily, and with more than plausibility, asserts never was the property of the Dutch, and never was, consequently, the property of England, but was always the property of Spain, from whom Venezuela derives her title.

Of course it is very pleasant to hear from the other side of the water in Parliamentary debate (and I wish to treat those pleasing words with the utmost possible respect and consideration) that this controversy is not what it was a month ago, and that great concessions have been made and will be made to the United States. I trust that may be so. I should like to see the basis upon which these alleged concessions have been made, because if they are made upon the basis of a passage in the President's message, to which I shall call the attention of the Senate, I assert that the people of the United States will never vindicate the policy foreshadowed by that portion of that document.

I desire to consider for a moment the diplomatic correspondence as it stands before this body and before the people. The Marquis of Salisbury in his letter to Mr. Olney denied not only the application of the Monroe doctrine to the question of boundary, but denied that it had any efficient existence in any controversy that can arise between any foreign power and the South American State. I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary will read the printed portion of that memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

> The contentions set forth by Mr. Olney in this part of his dispatch are represented by him as being an application of the political maxims which are well known in American discussion under the name of the Monroe doctrine. As far as I am aware, this doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the Government of another nation; but it has been generally adopted and assumed as true by many eminent writers and politicians in the United States. It is said to have largely influenced the Government of that country in the conduct of its foreign affairs, though Mr. Clayton, who was Secretary of State under President Taylor, expressly stated that that Administration had in no way adopted it. But during the period that has elapsed since the message of President Monroe was delivered in 1823 the doctrine has undergone a very notable development, and the aspect which it now presents in the hands of Mr. Olney differs widely from its character when it first issued from the pen of its author.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day. There is no danger of any Holy Alliance imposing its system upon any portion of the American continent, and there is no danger of any European State treating any part of the American continent as a fit object for European colonization. It is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke, in defense of the views on which he is now insisting an authority which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow-countrymen. But the circumstances with which President Monroe was dealing, and those to which the present American Government is addressing itself, have very few features in common.
>
> Great Britain is imposing no "system" upon Venezuela, and is not concerning herself in any way with the nature of the political institutions under which the Venezuelans may prefer to live. But the British Empire and the Republic of Venezuela are neighbors, and they have differed for some time past, and continue to differ, as to the line by which their dominions are separated. It is a controversy with which the United States have no apparent practical concern. It is difficult, indeed, to see how it can materially affect any State or community outside those primarily interested, except, perhaps, other parts of Her Majesty's dominions, such as Trinidad.
>
> The disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any of the questions dealt with by President Monroe. It is not a question of the colonization by a European power of any portion of America. It is not a question of the imposition upon the communities of South America of any system of government devised in Europe. It is simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the throne of England long before the Republic of Venezuela came into existence.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The Government of the United States is not entitled to affirm as a universal proposition, with reference to a number of independent States for whose conduct it assumes no responsibility, that its interests are necessarily concerned in whatever may befall those States simply because they are situated in the Western Hemisphere. It may well be that the interests of the United States are affected by something that happens to Chile or to Peru, and that that circumstance may give them the right of interference; but such a contingency may equally happen in the case of China or Japan, and the right of interference is not more extensive or more assured in the one case than in the other.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> They fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European State would be a highly inexpedient change. But they are not prepared to admit that the recognition of that expediency is clothed with the sanction which belongs to a doctrine of international law. They are not prepared to admit that the interests of the United States are necessarily concerned in every frontier dispute which may arise between any two of the States who possess dominion in the Western Hemisphere; and still less can they accept the doctrine that the United States are entitled to claim that the process of arbitration shall be applied to any demand for the surrender of territory which one of those States may make against another.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, while those statements repeat frequently the denial that this Government has no right to interfere in a boundary dispute, yet the opening portion of the statement which has been read, the concluding portion, and much of the remainder of this paper, which I regret that I have not time to analyze, but to which I call the careful scrutiny of the Senate, is a total denial of the existing efficacy or efficiency of the Monroe doctrine as applicable to any dispute which may arise between a foreign power and a South American State.

Recurring to Lord Salisbury's denial that this is the first written intimation by this Government of an intention to assert the Monroe doctrine, I find on the 26th of September, 1863, Mr. Seward addressed the Government of France as follows:

> Nor do the United States deny that in their opinion their own safety and the cheerful destiny to which they aspire are intimately dependent on the continuance of free republican institutions throughout America. They have submitted these opinions to the Emperor of France on proper occasions as worthy of his serious consideration in determining how he would conduct and close what might prove a successful war in Mexico. Nor is it necessary to practice reserve upon the point that if France should upon due consideration determine to adopt a policy in Mexico adverse to the American opinion and sentiments which I have described, that policy would probably scatter seeds which would be fruitful of jealousies which might ultimately ripen into collision between France and the United States and other American Republics.

Mr. President, in any review of the present situation, or of the

discussions which have accompanied it, it becomes necessary to consider the message of the President of the United States upon this question. In doing this I wish to proceed with the utmost possible respect for any document emanating from that high authority which primarily affects our foreign relations. It is of the utmost possible concern to us, so far as our relations with foreign powers are concerned, that, irrespective of party, we shall, so far as possible, all stand together.

To a large portion of the President's message in assertion of the Monroe doctrine no possible exception can be taken. It has not been frequent in recent times that the people have so unanimously approved what they supposed to be an unqualified assertion of national dignity and honor. But a noncritical scrutiny of the message discloses that it contains an exception and reservation which diminish and limit the force and application of the Monroe doctrine to an important extent which has never before been attempted by any American statesman excepting Mr. Calhoun. The President of the United States says:

> Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not of course be objected to by the United States.

I undertake to say that the American people will never vindicate that statement. It is no part of the Monroe doctrine, and it never was, that any adjustment which a South American State might make of its own free will as to a cession of territory, under any pretext whatever, could "not of course be objected to by the United States." Mr. Calhoun is the only statesman in our history who ever asserted that the doctrine could not prevent a voluntary cession of her sovereignty by a South American State.

Mr. President, if the nullification of the Monroe doctrine contained in these four lines is suffered to stand as part of the policy of the United States, it is impossible to see, upon any fair construction of this message, why, under any circumstances, any cession of territory or sovereignty by a Central or South American State can not be made without any right of question by this Government. In the case under present consideration, considering the relations of Venezuela to Great Britain, how significant this concession and these words are, that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country (Venezuela) may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not, of course, be objected to by the United States."

Wherein is the free will of Venezuela operative, looking at the matter sensibly and squarely as it is, when she is at this moment under the duress of an ultimatum by England for acts committed by Venezuela on this very territory, and is under a limitation of time for reparation by her, or for reprisals by Great Britain in case of refusal?

If all this consoling talk from across the water, this temperate language from our adversaries, is based upon negotiations now pending upon the assumption that Venezuela can, of her own free will, by any act which she considers to her advantage, cede territory, and that to such a cession the United States, of course, can make no objection, if the pretext that those negotiations are a boundary dispute, is a mere pretext under which the acquisition of territory is sought, and the real fact is that there is to be an acquisition of territory beyond the limits of the true boundary by means of a treaty between Great Britain and Venezuela, the people of the United States never will acquiesce in it. It is practically a conquest.

Great Britain has extended her jurisdiction, has applied force to a large portion of territory claimed by Venezuela. She has said, "I will arbitrate west of a certain line; I will not arbitrate east of it; as to that I will admit no question." If Venezuela can make a cession under such circumstances, such duress, such surroundings, why not, under the principles of the few lines I have just read, can she not cede as the result of conquest and of foreign war, and wherein could we object?

Mr. President, we have enormous interests in the stability of the South American Republics. We form with them a vast unity of interests, the like of which has never existed between any independent systems of government since the world began. It is the unity of free Governments; it is the natural unity of trade and commerce. We called a great congress of these nations in Washington a few years ago to effect more intimate relations—political, social, and commercial. Those purposes, that unity, have been attacked by the pretensions of Great Britain in the present instance.

Unqualified disparagement of the Spanish-American people or their Governments is not justified by their character or their history. To condemn them because they have not entirely surmounted their inherited difficulties is unjust in the extreme. The weaker they are the greater is the danger to our peace and safety by foreign aggression.

The struggle to throw off the yoke of Spain began in 1810. Brazil dissevered herself from Portugal in 1823. There was thenceforth not a vestige left of foreign monarchy from Canada to Cape Horn. Those colonies became free and independent States, and thus they have ever since remained, except during that brief period of our own disability to enforce our foreign policy against European intervention, when an Austrian archduke was seated by the armies of France upon the throne of Mexico as the consequence of a treaty between Great Britain, France, and Spain, which was concluded upon the hope, expectation, and desire that the United States was about to vanish among the ghosts of dead empires and republics.

When the United States rose from its struggle, as strong in recreated might and unity as it had seemed weak in its agony, an assertion of the Monroe doctrine drove the French from their conquest and destroyed the Empire which they had instituted.

The establishment of independent States in Spanish and Portuguese America is one of the most momentous events of history.

The achievements of our fathers were unprecedented. They have never been surpassed. But they did not emancipate a continent. When their work was done the United States was bounded on its landward side by the possessions of Great Britain and Spain. But our ancestors taught all the people of the south how to achieve their independence. They did achieve it over a continental area so vast that from—

> Where Andes, giant of the western star,
> His meteor standard to the winds unfurl'd,
> Looks from his throne of clouds o'er half the world—

we saw the crown in the dust, the scepter broken, the miter humbled, and millions of men, triumphant over the wreck of despotism, rejoicing in the temple of free institutions which they had built upon its ruins.

They began their career of self-government. But they were impeded by enormous obstables. The founders of the United States had lived under a constitutional monarchy. They had enjoyed liberty of speech, printing, and conscience. They had largely governed themselves, and were familiar with the blessings of that stability which has always been the result of self-government when administered by men whose inheritance has been constitutional liberty. Our progress was immediate, unbroken, and marvelous.

But the Spanish colonies had been crushed under the most repressive and tyrannical autocracy that the world has ever seen. They had been governed from Europe by the comprehensive absolutism of Charles and by the minute and inquisitorial absolutism of Philip, whose successors had adopted their methods. There was no self-government. Corrupt and cruel viceroys had oppressed the estates, liberties, bodies, and souls of that people for three centuries. It is not surprising that when they emerged from that darkness of generations they did not and could not see and act with the efficiency of men who had lived in the light of an ancestral freedom. But though their advances have been slow, they have taken no step backward. For seventy years their progress has been from good to better. We can clearly see that during the last twenty years especially their governments have become more solid, their people more stable. Mexico now stands so firmly upon her great foundations that her stability is not thought of as a question.

Chile has become a powerful, prosperous, and enduring State through and in spite of her revolutions. She has possessed herself of the instrumentalities of the highest civilization. She has mastered the arts of peace, and she has also a fighting capacity equal to that of any people of the same numbers. The Argentine Republic is powerful, enlightened, and progressive. Brazil is perfectly composed, after having presented to the world the unexampled spectacle of the transformation of a monarchy into a republic by the people taking an emperor from the very citadel of his power, putting him on shipboard, and sending the imperial passenger away, an exile from a bloodless revolution.

To the science of international law South America has given Bello, Alcorte, Pando, and Calvo. Lessons in naval warfare have been taught by the conflicts of her armored vessels. In her own wars the valor of her people has been illustrious on a hundred battlefields. Everywhere the church has been divorced from the state. Conscience acts with freedom. Speech and the press are free. Education has been secularized and made universal.

Does anyone suppose—can anyone suppose, considering the universal rapine of territory in every other quarter of the globe during the last fifty years—that all this could have been brought to pass and that these struggling yet progressive nationalities would have been left unmolested had it not been an assured fact that the United States was always ready to maintain and assert the principles to which the message of James Monroe committed it in 1823? By all this the cause of free governments has been strengthened everywhere.

That cause is our cause. It is the cause of constitutional self-government all over the world. It is the cause of that hierarchy of free states upon this hemisphere destined, in the long processes of time and in the competition of nations and their policies, to bring to the aid of human progress and personal liberty all those

omnipotent forces with which that Providence who presides over nations arms free men.

It will become the cause of England herself—the most powerful of self-governing States. For that time is inevitable in the struggle for human rights when antiquam exquirite matrem will be a mandate to us more imperious than that of the oracle, and when the mighty mother will stand arrayed with her mightier son until of both it will be said:

Hic domus Æneæ cunctis dominabitur oris,
Et nati natorum, et qui nascentur ab illis.

It is one of the most striking features of this controversy, Mr. President, that the arbitration of this entire question by Great Britain has been steadily denied and refused. Arbitration was requested by this Government through the enactment of joint resolutions by Congress. It was requested by Spain. It has been requested by several of the Spanish-American States in a manner equally formal; and the latest advice we have upon this subject is that there may be arbitration with negotiation. But as to what shall be settled by arbitration and what by negotiation there is no disclosure.

If there can be arbitration of the entire question, of course humanity will rejoice; but if it is to be that illusory and partial arbitration which the English Government has hitherto expressed its willingness to allow, namely, the giving up without question of everything east of the Schomburgk line, and arbitrating those shadowy advancing and receding claims west of that line, it does not touch at all the substance of this controversy, and may most seriously imperil our rights, our peace, and our safety.

Why should not such a controversy be arbitrated? Does anyone suppose that Great Britain would not arbitrate such a case between her and a power anywhere nearly her equal? Disputed boundary cases are the natural and proper subjects for arbitration. Costa Rica and Nicaragua arbitrated their case before President Cleveland during his first term. Great Britain arbitrated the last northwestern boundary dispute with us before the Emperor of Germany. The universal tendency of the most enlightened thought and the most advanced jurists, of the most experienced administrators of governments, is to refer these questions to some tribunal that can pass upon the law, the right, and the facts, and make the decision final. It is to be sincerely hoped that the intimations we have seen in the newspapers that this result may be brought about will not be without foundation.

Mr. President, the Monroe doctrine has never been looked upon with favor by any European power. The treaty of London in 1861 and the invasion of Mexico by England, France, and Spain were intentional contraventions of it, although a different pretext was expressed upon the face of the treaty. You may search the annals of our diplomatic intercourse from the time that doctrine was promulgated, and you will not find it assented to by any foreign power outside of the Western Hemisphere. One of the arguments most frequently advanced against its validity is that this declaration of principles enunciated by President Monroe was for a special occasion in 1823, and that it was a temporary and ephemeral measure which died with the occasion which produced it; that it never has had since the cessation of the causes which generated it any living efficacy or force whatever. This argument is especially reenforced by the statement that although Executives have, from time to time, enunciated and asserted the doctrine, yet so little has it been thought of by the American people, and so clearly has it not entered, as they say, into their policy, that there has been no legislative declaration of its validity and force since it was promulgated by President Monroe.

That statement, Mr. President, is true. There has been no legislative declaration by both Houses of Congress that the Monroe doctrine is or is not a cardinal policy of the United States. Foreign jurists have expatiated upon this; foreign newspapers have repeated it whenever any controversy concerning it has arisen. They have been echoed to some extent in this country. It has been taught from professors' chairs, too frequently, I am sorry to say, that because Congress had never put into the shape of resolution or legislative enactment the Monroe doctrine it was a mere declaration of the policy of the Administration which went into history seventy years ago.

I could cite the foreign jurists, reviewers, and pamphleteers to that effect to an extent which would weary the Senate. But I will give extracts from two. Calvo, a contribution of South America to international law, the Grotius of the nineteenth century, speaking of the Monroe doctrine, says:

The principles thus promulgated by President Monroe have never received any express sanction. If the United States have often been inspired by them in this or that act of their foreign policy, they have never made them legally obligatory by a formal legislative vote. This fact has always forbidden the attribution of the character of a law to the maxims of Monroe, and has caused them to preserve the simple title of a "doctrine."

That is the opinion of the most authoritative teacher of international law in continental Europe to-day. Sir Robert Phillimore, in his work upon International Law, in discussing the Monroe doctrine, says:

I may observe in passing that the doctrine contained in it, whatever that be—

A truly British touch—

has not been corroborated by an act of the Legislature of the United States.

Throughout the discussion of the foreign text writers upon international law the denial is persistent of its binding efficacy as a matter of continuous policy of the United States upon the ground that it was the mere declaration of an Administration for a special and transitory purpose, a declaration which served that purpose and became nonefficient from that moment.

The pending resolutions do not add a single principle to the Monroe doctrine, nor do they take a single principle from it. They make it applicable by particularization to existing or imminent exigencies. They subtract nothing from its revered principles, as I think has been subtracted by the message of the President. The preamble is expressed in the words of President Monroe himself, with the exception of the recital that the doctrine and policy promulgated by him have been repeatedly enunciated by subsequent executive action of this Government. I will take the time of the Senate for a few moments to explain why the phraseology of the resolution as it is was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has been said, as I have stated, by foreign authors, foreign statesmen, foreign publicists, that the Monroe doctrine died with the occasion of its birth, and therefore the resolution reaffirms and confirms it as an everexisting and continuing principle from the day of its origin. It is stated that this Government—

Will regard any infringement thereof, and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American Continent or any island adjacent thereto—

The phrase in regard to islands was put in to make more certain what we deemed a fair construction of the expression of President Monroe, who in his message spoke only of the continents of the Western Hemisphere. And yet, in the light of the diplomatic papers of Mr. Webster and Mr. Clay, which I have read, who will deny that it is a proper construction of the message of President Monroe to include the West India Islands, and Cuba especially, as falling within its provisions?

There is a class of enthusiastic patriots in this country whose conceptions of the Monroe doctrine have been such that they deem it the duty of this Government to interfere in case any foreign power shall wage war upon any of the Central or Southern American Republics. To those who consider more carefully such an idea is extremely crude, dangerous, and far-fetched, but it is one which has been exceedingly prevalent and has done more harm to the efficient assertion of the doctrine itself than all other causes combined.

Accordingly the committee deemed it best to express in the resolution nearly in the language of Mr. Webster himself, and certainly in the spirit of that language, that such a construction of the Monroe doctrine ought no longer to be entertained, but that reserving to itself the right to judge, the United States would act "in any case or instance as to which United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety."

There is nothing radical, there is nothing aggressive, there is nothing warlike in the resolution. It is pacific in its intentions and its expressions, and it takes away the opprobrium which hostile writers have attempted to put upon the doctrine by their unfounded and reiterated assertions that we were establishing a protectorate over the entire South American Continent; that we were their guardians, and yet nevertheless we were not responsible for them; that our position was an absurdity and unwarranted by any proper relations that should exist between nations.

The resolution proceeds:

In any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety, by or through force—

Nobody can object to that—

purchase, cession, occupation.

Those words were designed to cover just precisely the contingencies I have described in my remarks, namely: That no South American State can of her own free will by treaty with a foreign powes cede away her territory or sovereignty under the pretext of force, purchase, or cession in any case where such a transaction shall be deemed by the United States dangerously to involve its peace and safety.

The word "pledge" is used in the resolution, and with reason. "Pledge" in international law means the hypothecation of territory to secure the payment of a debt or the performance of some act. It was stated some six weeks ago, apparently upon authority, that a treaty had been or was about to be negotiated between Great Britain and Spain, involving a loan to Spain by subjects of Great Britain, whereby certain ports of Cuba were to be pledged as security for the payment of the loan. Such a step would be

the first act of acquisition. Such a step would be setting up the government of a foreign power to a certain extent in the Island of Cuba. Such an act would be the controlling of the destinies of that island by a foreign power. All history teaches us with monitions that we can not disregard that to put the ports of Cuba in pledge to any foreign power such as England would be the beginning, and perhaps the designed beginning, of the utter extinction of the sovereignty of Spain and its transfer to another power.

The word "colonization" is used, and why? Everybody supposed until recently that the prohibition by President Monroe as to colonization had done its work long since, and that by the passing of the American continents under the uncontradicted dominion of civilized powers the question of colonization was no longer open. But upon looking into the correspondence between Venezuela and Great Britain on this subject it is seen that in addition to the rights which Great Britain claims under her treaty with the Dutch, she claims, and made the claim to Venezuela, of certain treaties and cession by Indian tribes. The whole and original basis of colonization upon these continents was then, in the light of the nineteenth century, asserted by Great Britain in a diplomatic correspondence as the foundation of a teritorial claim. More than that, Mr. President, notwithstanding this vast area of territory, 70,000 square miles, is in controversy, Great Britain, begging the entire question, begging the merits of the entire contention, says "some 40,000 British subjects have gone into this disputed territory, and therefore I must protect them." If 40,000 or any number, less or more, of British subjects have gone into this territory, that gives Great Britain no right to protect them there as her subjects by virtue of her asserted sovereignty over that territory. They took their chances whether they went under the sovereignty of Venezuela or under the sovereignty of Great Britain. The declaration of the resolution respecting the control of the Nicaragua Canal no one can object to.

What I have already said will construe the language of the resolution in regard to alleged boundary disputes and the cession of territory thereunder being a violation of the Monroe doctrine. My proposition is, and I believe it is the true American policy, that under no pretext, and by no means, whether of boundary dispute, or by war, or cession, or pledge, or colonization, or occupation, or any other unfounded pretext, shall any European power acquire any territory upon either of these continents, or impose upon the governments thereof its system, or control its destinies, in any case where the United States shall deem such an attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety. That policy, so defined, applies just as much and just as thoroughly to a boundary dispute, or the pretext of a boundary dispute, as it does to any other device by which territory is sought to be acquired in violation of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, wherever we look over the civilized and uncivilized world we see territorial aggrandizement going on everywhere except on the Western Continent. The islands south of the equator in the Pacific have been taken up by France, Germany, and England—Russia seeking to get an outlet to the south from her icebound railway terminus at Vladivostock—and heaven grant she may get it; Japan, seizing the island of Formosa, is barred from her conquests on the Chinese mainland. France has overrun Cochin China and Cambodia. Siam, without a particle of warrant, except in the law of conquest, is subjugating the Kingdom of Madagascar.

The territorial acquisitions of England throughout the world we all know. She dominates Egypt, and an English administrator presides over the administration of Egyptian finances. Italy is making her way into Abyssinia, and all of Africa, all of the desert heart of slaveland south of the equator, has been partitioned between the great European powers. The little Republic which has changed its place of existence repeatedly under pressure of English aggression has been attacked by processes which, though disavowed, are perfectly intelligible when the history of the last fifty years is read.

As to the South American States, this, I believe, is the first instance in seventy years that any foreign government has attempted, under any pretense whatever, to acquire any territory or set up any dominion in that continent. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] suggests to me the case of the State of Honduras. I was limiting my remarks to South America, but I have always thought the case of Honduras a most striking violation of the Monroe doctrine—not only of that doctrine, but of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Developing as a territorial claim from the merely permissive right, which we call in the Northwest a logging permit, granted for the benefit of a few mahogany wood choppers, and which in terms recognized the sovereignty of Spain, it has extended into a claim of 7,500 square miles, dominating the Nicaragua Canal and our possessions on the Mexican coast. It is particularly to be observed that the latest official publications state that its western boundaries, like those of Venezuela, are as yet undetermined.

It is said that conditions have changed; that the Monroe doctrine is no longer applicable. I understand the Marquis of Salisbury to say that in his dispatch, and those who echo him in this country say the same thing—that it is better all around to permit the universal ascendancy of England to be established over the South American Republics whenever and wherever that power desires. When did the conditions change? When did the change begin?

Do not these conditions operate on Cuba to-day? What American would see, and could see, with a proper regard for the peace, the dignity, and the safety of his own country, the transfer of that island from Spain to Great Britain upon any terms or under any circumstances? Were not these conditions justly operative as to Mexico in 1861, or Yucatan in 1848, or Hawaii in 1894? No, Mr. President, the conditions and circumstances and dangers which produced the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine in 1823 are emphasized and made stronger as every year goes by.

Mr. President, there has been talk of war. To merely declare and define American policies and American rights has been deprecated as tending to bring on war. There never has been the least danger of war throughout this controversy. Neither Government has ever threatened it or purposed it. The interests of Great Britain and the United States in the great and common cause of civilization are too enormous and too vital to each of them to bring about such a consummation.

No American soldier will stand upon the soil of Canada; no American militia force will burn a Canadian village, and under the pretext of retaliation no British army will again apply the torch to the Capitol, to the Executive Mansion, or to the archives of the United States. New York will not be laid under contribution, nor will Melbourne, Hongkong, Auckland, or Bombay. The Canadian Pacific Railway will continue to transport its passengers and freights; the Welland Canal will not be seized, nor will the lock at Sault Ste. Marie. The English merchant marine will sail the monopolized seas in peace, and the people of the United States will continue to pay annually $150,000,000 in gold to English shipowners and underwriters for freights and premiums. These nations will adjust their differences amicably and with justice to each. I shall extremely regret if I have said any word to inflame the feelings on either side.

But the question now is whether Congress, to whom in the very vestibule of the Constitution all legislative power is given, which has the power to declare war and the authority to preserve peace by its power to provide for the raising of armies and navies, representing directly the will and sentiments of the people, will or ought, in the exercise of these powers thus confided to and duties imposed upon it, declare that the Monroe doctrine is a vital, indispensable, and continuous policy of the United States?

Why should we not do it? I am not aware that any principle which these resolutions assert has been seriously controverted on this side of the Atlantic, except by those who deny that the Monroe doctrine has now any efficient existence. Executives have declared this policy; party platforms have declared it, and yet, from the time that it was first promulgated, Congress never has done so. There never was a time more propitious, more exacting than the present time for such a declaration. In time of danger it is necessary, and it is the surest path to peace and good feeling to state firmly our position. Under the ameliorated conditions which this controversy seems to bear, it becomes more and more expedient and necessary for us to declare exactly our convictions and the policy of the American people upon this subject.

And, Mr. President, such a declaration is worthy of the dignity of this people. Abject to the degradation of subjection is any nation that takes counsel of its fears and dares not declare its principles. Such cowardice makes the cause of constitutional liberty a tolerated alien in its own heritage. [Applause.]

HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSION OF THE AMAZON.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit, with the accompanying papers, a report from the Secretary of State, answering the resolution of the Senate of January 16, 1896, addressed to him, calling for information concerning the claims against Peru of Thomas W. Sparrow, N. B. Noland, and others, members of the commission known as the Hydrographic Commission of the Amazon, employed by the Government of Peru, for compensation for their services on said commission.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 14, 1896.

REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read,

and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, a communication from the Secretary of State covering the report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics for the year 1895.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 14, 1896.

CLAIMS OF B. H. HENRY AND OTHERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of January 7, 1896, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying report of the special agent of the United States sent to the Fiji Islands to investigate the claims of B. H. Henry and other American citizens for compensation for certain lands alleged to have been owned by them and claimed to have been appropriated by the British Government.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 14, 1896.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman; and

A bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery;

A bill (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas; and

A bill (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movement of vessels in St. Marys River.

FORT SMITH AND WESTERN COAL RAILROAD.

The bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the bill may lie upon the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

JOHN C. CUTTER.

The bill (H. R. 83) for the relief of John C. Cutter, late first lieutenant Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, was read twice by its title.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be taken up and considered at this time.

Mr. TELLER rose.

Mr. LODGE. It will not delay the Senate a moment. If necessary I can explain it in a few words.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear some explanation of the bill. It properly belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator will observe that the bill gives the soldier nothing except what he gets under the original discharge.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; it revokes an order dismissing him from service and sets a precedent for thousands of other cases.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I will explain the bill. Lieutenant Cutter was in the Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. He was regimental quartermaster under Colonel DRAPER, who introduced this bill in the other House. In retreat, November, 1863, from Lenoir, east Tennessee, he burned the officers' baggage and some other effects. His affidavit states that this was for want of wagons and by order of General Ferrero, to prevent its falling into the enemy's hands. The colonel reported that it was from neglect to give personal attention to the transportation, preferred charges of neglect of duty, and withdrew them on receiving his resignation. Colonel DRAPER, who was the colonel in command and made the charge, says:

I found it would not go through by a mere ordinary indorsement and I indorsed it "for the good of the service," and he was then discharged.

As there was nothing in Lieutenant Cutter's record of a dishonorable character, he having been a good soldier and having failed only in this matter of carelessness, I think it no more than fair that this stigma should be removed from his name.

The committee of the House concurred in this view, and say that even if Lieutenant Cutter was careless, which he denies, they concur in the view. He could not, and did not, anticipate that his resignation would have been accepted dishonorably. The bill was introduced by his colonel, who made the indorsement which led to his being discharged dishonorably, when the colonel meant nothing of the sort and was ready to accept the resignation. The House committee unanimously reported the bill. The House permitted the bill to go through without any objection. It carries with it no appropriation of any character.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the last part of the bill be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to allow the said Cutter any pay, bounty, or other allowances to which he would not have been entitled under the terms of his original discharge.

Mr. COCKRELL. That does not change the status. That places the beneficiary in just the same position as if he had been honorably discharged, does it not?

Mr. LODGE. It does not allow him to take anything that he can not take now under the existing discharge. It simply wipes from his record a stigma which he desires to have removed, which he thinks is unjust, which his colonel thinks is unjust, and which everybody is willing to have removed. It carries nothing with it.

Mr. VILAS. It is very obvious that the bill ought to go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the present consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that the Military Academy appropriation bill be now taken up and proceeded with.

Mr. PEFFER. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me a moment to call up a little matter which I am confident will pass without objection?

Mr. TELLER. I gave way Thursday, and I believe I shall have to decline to yield to anything that can possibly bring up any controversy.

Mr. PEFFER. It will elicit no controversy, I am very confident.

Mr. TELLER. If I yield now I must yield to others. I know half a dozen Senators who want to call up little bills that they think will take no time. Let us go on with the appropriation bill for the time being.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that it was agreed to dispense with the informal reading when the bill was called up on Thursday last.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order was then made. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 3, before the word "cadets," to strike out "three hundred and seventy-one"; and on page 2, line 1, before the words "one hundred," to strike out "at $540 each per annum"; so as to make the clause read:

For pay of cadets, $170,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

For additional pay of librarian, $120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the word "thousand," to insert "one hundred and twenty"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for extra pay of officers of the Army on detached service at the Military Academy, $22,120.51.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the word "musicians," to insert "general army service, cavalry detachment"; so as to make the clause read:

For pay of the Military Academy band, field musicians, general army service, cavalry detachment, and enlisted men on detached service, and extra pay for enlisted men on special duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 24, after the words "one wagoner, $168," to strike out "two musicians, $312."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, after the word "at," to strike out "30 cents per day, when employed, $840," and insert "$20 each, $560"; so as to make the clause read:

For extra pay of 28 enlisted men of cavalry detachment employed on additional duty with the instruction battery of field artillery, United States Military Academy, at $20 each, $560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 14, after the word

"musicians," to insert "general army service, cavalry detachment," and in line 16, after the words "Military Academy," to strike out "fifty-eight thousand one hundred and fifty-four dollars and ten cents," and insert "fifty-seven thousand five hundred and sixty-two dollars and ten cents"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for the pay of the Military Academy band, field musicians, general army service, cavalry detachment, and enlisted men on detached service, and extra pay of enlisted men on special duty at the Military Academy, $57,562.10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 9, to strike out:

For compensation of librarian, $120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nine hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for civilians employed at the Military Academy, $25,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert:

And any unexpended balance of the appropriation of $400 for two 36-inch terrestrial globes for section rooms, made by the Military Academy appropriation act approved January 16, 1895, is hereby made available and may be used for the purchase of furniture for section rooms and of text-books, books of reference, maps, map cases, and for stationery for use of instructors.

So as to make the clause read:

For department of history, geography, and ethics: For text-books, books of reference, maps, map fixtures, stationery, and repairs, $150; and any unexpended balance of the appropriation of $400, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 10, after the word "branches," to insert "and"; so as to make the clause read:

For rough specimens, fossils, and for apparatus and material to be used in the practical determinations of mineralogical and geological specimens, pencils and paper for the practical instructions in the same branches, and for gradual increase and improvement of the cabinet, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 20, after the word "dollars," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That so much of the act approved May 20, 1886, chapter 362, Statutes at Large, as requires special text-books at the Military Academy be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the word "stone," to strike out "wall" and insert "walk"; so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the construction and repairs of the roads between the south guardhouse and southern boundary line of reservation, and for continuing the laying of a stone walk along same, and extending the same northward to a junction with the present concrete walks, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

For completion of repairs and improvements to barracks of the detachment of army-service men, Quartermaster's Department, and for steam heating of same, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 4, to insert:

For cases, materials, fittings, fixtures, and other appliances for ordnance museum in new Academy building, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-nine" and insert "sixty-one"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for public buildings and grounds, $61,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to strike out:

Total appropriations for Military Academy in this bill, $449,117.61.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. TELLER. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HAWLEY] desires to offer an amendment on the first page of the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, a bill passed both Houses, and has, I think, been signed by the President by this time, which provides for a chaplain at West Point, to be appointed for that special service, and not detailed from the general body of chaplains. In the bill which passed he was given the allowance of a captain, mounted. That renders it necessary to make an amendment on page 1, in line 9, to strike out the word "eight," before "professors," and insert "seven"; then, after the word "professors," to insert "and a chaplain, with the pay and allowances of a captain, mounted." The total, then, must be changed from "$27,000" to "$26,000." It is all practically one amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 9, before the word "professors," it is proposed to strike out "eight" and insert "seven"; after the word "professors," to insert "and a chaplain, with the pay and allowances of a captain, mounted," and in the same line, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-seven."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. On page 2, line 4, I move to strike out "ninety-nine" and insert "ninety-eight."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 4, before the word "dollars," it is proposed to strike out "ninety-nine" and insert "ninety-eight"; so as to read:

In all, for permanent establishment, $198,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VILAS. I desire to submit an amendment to the bill which has been reported favorably with an amendment by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That the Corps of Cadets shall consist of 2 from each State at large, 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, and 10 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and those appointed at large may be residents of any State in the Union. The two appointed at large from each State shall be actual residents of the State from which they are appointed, and the others shall be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts or the District of Columbia, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

Mr. VILAS. The amendment as I originally proposed it provided for the appointment of 20 cadets from the United States at large, but was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment reducing the number to 10, and I have offered it in that form.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to hear some reason why we should increase the number of cadets. I understand that we have some cadets now whom we are not able to assign to duty.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed repeats the present language of the section of the Revised Statutes upon this subject, with simply the addition of the words "two from each State at large." So the only change proposed in the existing law is to add the appointment of 90 cadets at large, to be appointed by the President, as the law now provides with reference to all cadets, but probably, according to the usage which has always prevailed with reference to the appointments from Congressional districts, the nominations of these cadets would be made by Senators.

A word or two only in reference to this. It has been recommended by the successive Boards of Visitors year after year. It happened to be my fortune to participate in the examination last year at the Military Academy, as one of the members of the Board of Visitors, and the necessity for the increase of the efficiency in the Military Academy was very strongly impressed upon my mind, as well as upon the minds of those who were upon that board, and they have recommended this amendment to the law. Indeed, they recommended that the 10 from the United States at large, which are peculiarly the appointments of the President, should be increased to 20. The Military Committee, however, thought it wise to leave that as it has been, and therefore the amendment now is limited simply to the additional 90 cadets.

Mr. President, in the first place it will be observed that in the law as it stands, practically the greater number, almost all the cadets, are appointed, one from each Congressional district. That has been the law for a great number of years. During that time, however, the population of the United States has so greatly increased that the population of a Congressional district is now more than twice what it was when that provision was adopted. Thus the Military Academy does not now instruct probably more than one-half the proportionate number which it instructed at the time when the method of the appointment of the cadets and the limitation upon their number was provided.

The Military Academy has grown to be one of the most useful institutions in the country, and it ought to extend military instruction so as to provide among the body of the people a large number of persons who, in times of necessity, would be available for the military uses of the United States. It is a matter of common knowledge to all that among the very best officers who served their country during the war with the Southern States, those who had been instructed in the Military Academy and afterwards took their places in civil life were among the most efficient. The general who commanded our armies and who led them to eventual success was himself taken from the ranks of civil life. The general who next succeeded him as General of the Army came from the ranks of civil life. Among some of the most illustrious charac-

ters of the war were persons who had not served in the Army of the United States except for a brief period after their graduation from the Military Academy, but who had gone out in the world and who had taken their part in the ordinary duties of the citizen; but when occasion demanded they were found to be equipped and ready for the most useful service that could be rendered.

The Military Academy is maintained at a considerable expense by the people of the United States. The last Board of Visitors made some inquiry into that expense, and I should like to read a few words from one of the reports, which will show something of the way in which the large expenditures for the Academy have grown up:

> The act for the support of the Military Academy, which has for many years been one of the regular appropriations by the Congress, makes no provision for the pay of officers employed in the government of the Academy, instruction and discipline of cadets, and command of the Army detachments there, except for nine professors, and the additions granted certain officers because of the service required of them, nor for the pay of enlisted men, except the extra-duty pay and the pay of the band and field musicians employed at the post. That part of its appropriation which is for such extra pay of officers and enlisted men of the Army, together with that for the payment of professors and cadets, is disbursed by the Paymaster-General; while the moneys set apart by it for the more direct expenses of the Academy, and for the improvement of the public property at West Point, are disbursed by the quartermaster of the post.

The appropriation for the support of the Military Academy for the year ended with June, 1895, carried for the payment of the instructional force $53,226.70, yet the actual disbursements to officers engaged in instruction and discipline of cadets was $151,034.94, while to other officers and men there was paid $95,374.91, and the expenses of the instructional departments were $13,752.63, besides ordinary expenses and repairs, $51,719.05. Miscellaneous and incidental expenses, band and musicians, brought the total of the cost of what may be said to be the instruction and discipline at the Military Academy up to the sum, if I have added the amounts correctly, of $348,675.43, and that is exclusive of the pay of the cadets. So the regular appropriation for the support of the Military Academy does not by any means indicate the cost to the United States of the maintenance of the instruction and discipline at the Academy.

Sir, if you take the total actual cost to the United States of the maintenance simply of the instruction and discipline, you will find that it exceeds $1,000 apiece for each cadet actually receiving instruction. The total number of appointments which may be made is, I believe, 371, under the present law; but such is the result of examinations—and they are by no means excessively rigorous, according to the best observation I could give the subject—that only about from two-thirds to three-quarters of the total number appointed are admitted to the Academy. Thus the graduating class, which was, I believe, rather larger than usual this year, was, if I remember correctly, in the neighborhood of 60—58 is my remembrance. We are turning out annually then, from that Academy, which is maintained at a great charge, but a very small number of instructed young men. Take any college of this country, and I think it will be found that the average cost to the foundation, or the appropriation for the annual maintenance of the college, does not exceed $125 per pupil, while the cost at the Military Academy runs to over $1,000 per pupil, not counting the pay of the cadets. The instructional force at West Point is ample now to furnish tuition and proper instruction to a very much larger number of young men than are admitted to that institution.

It is said, as was remarked by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in charge of this bill, that we do not now have places in the Army to supply all the graduates of the Academy. I rather think that that is an error. I think they are substantially appointed to the Army; but I do not care for that in the purpose of this amendment. I am not seeking that the pupils of the Military Academy shall all be admitted to the Army. If there are some now who can not be admitted to the Army upon graduation, for the reason that there are not sufficient vacancies occurring regularly to admit so many, those who are not admitted must go into civil life. What is the reason why this Academy, which can furnish an education ample for any young man to begin civil life with, should not furnish that instruction to a greater number, even up to the full measure of its capacity? We can not do better in the way of preparation against the contingencies of war than to scatter through the United States a number of well-educated young men, instructed in the military art as well as in other branches, fitting them for the ordinary duties of civil life, who shall be, as it were, a reserve corps of efficient, well-educated, intelligent men for the conduct of such business as the necessities of the country may intrust to them in the way of military service? Therefore, without elaborating at great length upon this matter, I hope the amendment will at once meet the approbation of the Senate.

The amendment, as I said, has been recommended and recommended again. The recommendation has been reiterated by successive Boards of Visitors, by Secretaries of War, and by almost everybody who is acquainted with the circumstances of the military establishment. It will add little or nothing to the cost of the maintenance of the Academy, the only addition of any consequence being simply the addition of the pay of such cadets as shall be admitted. I do not think that the number I propose is nearly so great as ought to be added to the Corps of Cadets in the Academy. I think it would be well if we at least doubled it, for it will prove that out of 90, which this amendment, if adopted, provides for the admission of, probably not more than two-thirds or three-fourths can be admitted. That is the history with all appointments. Thus, we should distribute through the course of four years only some 60 or 70 more students. The whole number of cadets actually receiving instruction in the Academy would then not be equal to the number of appointments the law now provides.

Mr. FAULKNER. Are the quarters sufficient for such a number?

Mr. VILAS. Yes; the quarters are substantially sufficient, as I was informed, for the accommodation of the additional number which would be appointed. There would be no difficulty, as I believe, in that respect.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this amendment, from its very nature, so commends itself to the judgment of every person concerned who has inquired into the usefulness of the Military Academy that elaborate argument and discussion would rather tend to impair its strength than to increase it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator state the number of cadets now in the Academy?

Mr. VILAS. If I remember correctly, the number of cadets at the time when the Board of Visitors were at West Point was 266. I am not sure that I have the number exactly correct. Of those, the graduating class, of course, retired at the last commencement, and another addition from among the appointments made for the present collegiate year was made, but how large that addition was, how many were saved out of the examinations, I am unable to answer the Senator at this moment.

Mr. HAWLEY. The total of all the appointments is 366, and that gives——

Mr. VILAS. The number is 371, I believe.

Mr. HAWLEY. That gives, we will call it, 90 to each class. The Senator says there were graduated at the Academy this last year about 58 or 60.

Mr. VILAS. Something in that neighborhood.

Mr. HAWLEY. That, from my recollection, is about the way it runs ordinarily. Owing to casualties, death, resignation, dismissal, or from failure to pass the examinations, the number is cut down, so that with this proposed addition to the number I think there would be graduating at the Academy scarcely more than perhaps about as many as the law now contemplates.

Mr. VILAS. Probably not so many.

Mr. HAWLEY. Only the usual complement, probably not so many as under existing law. Then we have a magnificent and costly plant there, to use a manufacturing term; fine grounds of immense value, fine buildings, and an unsurpassed corps of instructors, numbering how many?

Mr. VILAS. I have not right at this moment the number, but as to the cost I have the figures.

Mr. HAWLEY. Officers are detailed in addition to those named here.

Mr. VILAS. There are but 9 professors for whom regular appropriation is made in the Military Academy bill, but there are, all told, some 60 officers of the Army detailed and paid from the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course receiving their ordinary compensation, with a little addition to it in some cases.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me right there, I will call attention to the fact that although the Military Academy appropriation bill purports upon its face to provide for the Academy there was expended $387,000 out of the last appropriation bill, and up to the time when these figures were given me the Paymaster-General had paid, in addition to that sum, $198,754.91 to officers and men who were really assisting in the instruction at the Academy.

Mr. HAWLEY. It seems to me that we are not availing ourselves of the great advantages there, and not getting the full benefit from the large sums of money that we have expended and annually expend in carrying on the institution. I have had within twenty-five or twenty years the honor to twice serve on the Board of Visitors, and that was one of the obvious remarks, one of the things the members of the boards were always saying might be improved, and that we might just as well educate a larger number of men there, and if places could not be found for them in the existing Army they could be honorably mustered out after a certain time.

Mr. WALTHALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if he agrees with the Senator from Wisconsin that this increase in the number of cadets will involve no additional expense for lodging?

Mr. HAWLEY. I understand they can lodge them. You see, we have now vacant beds to the number of eighty or ninety. I

think they can lodge them without any trouble and feed them. I do not see that any additional sum will be needed, except for board and the annual allowance of $500 to each cadet.

Mr. WALTHALL. There will be no necessity for additional instructors?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know, but I should think not by any manner of means, nor, perhaps, for barracks. I think there is no necessity for any additional barracks.

Mr. ELKINS. I favor the amendment, but it seems to me it should state explicitly how the President shall nominate the two cadets from each State at large. Now, the law under which the present number of cadets is appointed is found in section 1315 of the Revised Statutes, and it says:

> They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 10 cadets appointed at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia.

It says nothing about their being nominated upon the recommendation of the Congressmen from the respective districts. That is taken for granted. But it seems to me we might as well settle that question right here. I do not think the President of the United States wants to be troubled with these appointments. I do not think he cares to be troubled about the 10 cadets at large.

We can settle the question by an amendment to the effect that these appointments shall be made upon the recommendation of the Senators. I suggest such an amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit an interruption, I will state that I have prepared just such an amendment.

Mr. ELKINS. If it in terms meets the point I make I will accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. With the consent of the Senator, I will send the amendment to the amendment to the desk and have it read.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator will give me leave I will make one remark in regard to the matter.

The amendment which I propose is a repetition of the language of the Revised Statutes, and the only addition consists in the insertion of the words "two from each State at large."

Mr. ELKINS. I am aware of that.

Mr. VILAS. The custom has become as fixed as law that the appointments from the Congressional districts and the Territories are made upon the recommendation of the Representatives from the several districts, respectively, and the Delegates from the several Territories, respectively, and it did not seem to me that it would be quite becoming to insist upon the specific declaration here that the appointments of the two from each State at large should be made upon the recommendation of Senators.

Mr. ELKINS. If that is our meaning, it would not hurt to put it in the law.

Mr. VILAS. Not at all. It is merely a question as to whether we should take the course of being so specific in the matter where there can hardly be any occasion for that exactness and where, as it seems to me, we might be open to criticism.

Mr. ELKINS. As to the custom, I know it has the force of law in respect to the appointment of cadets from Congressional districts, but we are now making a new law or amending the present law, and we can be explicit, I think, without giving any offense or inviting any criticism whatever from any quarter.

If it is the intention and the purpose of the Senate to have these cadets nominated upon the recommendation of Senators, it will do no harm to say so in terms; and that would set the question at rest.

Mr. VILAS. I presume it would be necessary to add a similar provision in reference to Representatives and Delegates.

Mr. ELKINS. Let that take care of itself. I hardly think there is necessity for such a provision, however. There the custom has the force of law. But I have no objection to it there, either. I do not think the President wants this right.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment the following proviso:

> *Provided*, That the two cadets at large shall be appointed only on the written recommendation of the Senators from the State to which they are accredited, and all cadets, except those reserved to the President by general law, shall be made only on the written recommendation of the Representative of the Congressional district or Territory to which they are respectively accredited.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be again read, in order that we may see what effect it will have, and whether the recommendation is to be by one Senator or by both Senators from a State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will again be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the amendment to the amendment does not require the joint action and recommendation of both Senators as to each of the appointees.

Mr. ALLEN. The proposed amendment to the amendment does require the joint action of both Senators from a State, and, as I believe, wisely. I do not believe that because a State may be represented by two Senators entertaining different political views they could not come together in a joint recommendation in the interest of the public service. I think there could be no objection to the amendment to the amendment from that source.

I wish to say, while talking upon this subject, that we in the Western States especially feel a little bit jealous of the appointments that have been made to the Military Academy and to the Naval Academy. The law as it exists has been construed by some person, I do not know by whom, to authorize the President, if there is a failure to recommend within the time specified, to select a cadet from any part of the United States and accredit him to any Congressional district whose quota is not full. I know, for instance, that during the last Congress, possibly the preceding Congress, there was appointed to represent my Congressional district, the northeastern or Third district of the State of Nebraska, a boy from the District of Columbia, who perhaps was never 10 miles west of this city, and the thousands of boys in that district who are competent and are perfectly willing to represent the district in the Military Academy were deprived of their right to do so in consequence of that appointment.

Now, it may be said as an excuse for this condition that Representatives sometimes fail to make their recommendations within the time prescribed and when they are called on. But I am well persuaded that even such a failure ought not to authorize the President to select a boy from the State of New Hampshire, for instance, to represent a district in the State of Nebraska, or vice versa; that he ought to be required to make his appointment from the State to which the appointee is accredited, or the district to which he is accredited, if competent material can be found there to select from.

I was informed that in the case to which I referred no notice was received by the Representative to make the selection. I do not mean to say that the Secretary of War, or whoever had the appointing power, did not send a notice; I would not imply anything of the kind; but the mails are sometimes uncertain in this country, and in that case I am informed that no notice was ever received by the Representative to make a selection.

I think the amendment to the amendment is in the interest of keeping the representation of every State and Congressional district on a parity, if I may be permitted to use that expression, with every other State and district in the Union, and that the President, or whoever it may be, should be deprived of the power to take a boy from the District of Columbia and accredit him to a Congressional district 1,500 or 3,000 miles west of this city. It is only to cover cases of that kind that I offer the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I am very sorry to differ with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who has been a later and better Secretary of War than I, and also with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who was a good soldier; but I can not agree with them as to the amendment to the amendment.

It seems to me very much wiser and better to hold this appointment in the hands of the Commander in Chief of the Army. Every subsequent appointment is made by the President, and it seems to me a fitting thing that this initial step should be under his control. It is his duty to guard the Army and to protect it from any improper appointment, and I think the abuse of which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] speaks, if it proves to be an abuse, for I think the case he refers to must be an exceptional one, can be reached in some other way.

The law now is explicit that the cadets shall be taken from actual residents in each Congressional district. If any executive officer disobeys or evades the law there is a better way to reach it, it seems to me, than to change the law and inaugurate a system which, I think, would be much less military and decidedly objectionable.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. A question may arise in making the appointments as to whether the boy is an actual resident of a State or district. Our courts in this country have differed very materially as to what constitutes residence, and between an actual resident and a legal resident there is a very broad distinction. A boy might go into the State of Nebraska, for instance, or the State of Vermont, and live there for four or five years and not be a citizen of the State.

Mr. PROCTOR. Very well. Then strengthen that clause in any way so as to make it clear that the appointees must be taken from the State. Make it "a legal resident," if necessary. I do not care how strong that provision is made, but I do insist that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, should be

charged with this responsibility, as he is in every other step in the career of an officer. Every commission must come from the President. I believe the present is a wise system and that we ought not to depart from it.

Mr. ELKINS. The President can not appoint without the advice and consent of the Senate. He is not supreme in the appointment of officers.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Why should there be any difference between cadets at West Point and cadets at the Naval Academy? The law explicitly provides that those appointments shall be made on the nomination of the Representatives and Delegates in Congress. The appointments are made by the President. Now, is the military arm of the service of a higher character than the naval arm? Is it important that the President should have this power unlimited by any statute, so that he may properly discipline and control the Army, while he is not to have the same power over the appointment of naval cadets?

Mr. PROCTOR. If the system in the Navy is wrong, it is no reason why that of the Army should also be made wrong. Let the Navy system conform to the one that has been so successful in the Army.

Mr. CHANDLER. A fair answer to that, I think, is that the same system prevails in both cases. In the one case it is by statute and in the other it is by custom. If the system is to prevail, should not a statute so provide?

Mr. PROCTOR. The statute guards against any possible abuses. That is why I am in favor of the statute remaining as it is. I think the responsibility should be with the President.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator whether it is possible for Senators or Representatives to commit abuses in that connection in this enlightened age. Is it necessary to give the President the power to refuse to make appointments according to the nomination of a Senator or a Representative because they may do wrong and commit abuses?

Mr. PROCTOR. I think there have been cases where, with very good reason, appointments were refused. For that reason I think the law ought to remain as it is.

I am heartily in favor of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. Fortunately, we are not warlike people; that is, we do not maintain a great standing army and a great navy, and have no occasion to do so. But there is all the more reason why we should be a military people; why we should diffuse as generally as possible military education and be prepared, if the time ever comes when the military strength of the nation must be called out, to manage it and handle it.

There is no way to do this so well as to have a large number of men distributed throughout the country who are competent to take charge of the reserve force. As the Senator said, the leading men in our war of the rebellion, the general who commanded the great armies of the West and led them to victory and also the general who commanded the armies of the East, were both graduates of West Point who had gone into the civil walks of life.

The education there acquired fits men admirably for other high positions. The scientific education obtained there makes them able engineers for great works of public importance. Very many prominent men in the country who have taken leading positions in other walks of life owe their qualifications and their positions to their education received at West Point. It is my recollection that every board—I know every one that has given this careful attention—has earnestly recommended an increase of the number of cadets at West Point.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy much time in discussing the amendment. Of course it will be borne in mind that the amendment is not in order, but I assume no one will make the point of order against it, as I think it is fair to discuss it thoroughly.

The proposition, I understand, is to add 90 cadets to the number of cadets now authorized by law, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] argues that there will be no additional expense to the Government except for the pay of the cadets. That is true, perhaps, in one sense, and yet I can hardly think it possible that we can add about one-third, according to the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, to the number of cadets without increasing somewhat the expenses incident to their education.

The Senator from Wisconsin shows that there are a large number of people assigned to duty at West Point in educating these youths for service in the Army. That is true; and the cadets receive there a very careful and minute education as respects the number in each class. So my apprehension is that if we shall enlarge the number of cadets there will also be a necessary enlargement of the number of those who are to instruct them.

But the amendment seems to have in it the idea that this is a good time for us to educate young men for the Army, and when they are educated at Government expense they shall either be idle in the Army or shall be permitted to resign from it. As I understand, the cadets are in the Army from the time they enter West Point. They are soldiers and officers of the Army from that time. In calculating the increased pay, what is called the longevity pay, their service or time at West Point is credited to them.

Now, in addition to that, if there are not places for the cadets after their graduation, they are appointed as second lieutenants, receiving the pay and allowances of second lieutenants until such time as there are vacancies in the Army. It so happens that at the graduation last year there were 20 cadets who were unassigned because of the fact that there were no vacancies in the Army, and they were made second lieutenants and received the pay of the arm of the service to which their graduation entitled them, as will be seen by the statute of 1886. Allow me to read the law. Here is the act passed in 1886, which is a modification of a former statute:

> That when any cadet of the United States Military Academy has gone through all its classes and received a regular diploma from the academic staff, he may be promoted and commissioned as a second lieutenant in any arm or corps of the Army in which there may be a vacancy and the duties of which he may have been judged competent to perform.

That is to say, if a young man graduates and is entitled to enter the Engineer Corps of the Army because of his standing in the class, and at the time of his graduation there is no vacancy in the Engineer Corps, then he is made a second lieutenant with all the pay and all the allowance of a second lieutenant, and receives that pay and those allowances until he is assigned to duty when a vacancy occurs.

I have a telegram here from the Secretary of War in response to a question directed to him. It is stated that there were 20 members of the last graduating class commissioned additional second lieutenants; that all these have since been assigned to vacancies except 3, 2 in the Engineer and 1 in the artillery corps; that there are besides 3 additional lieutenants of engineers, graduates of a former class; and that there are now in all 6 additional lieutenants, 1 of whom will be assigned to a vacancy now existing.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are 6 now?

Mr. ALLISON. There are 6 now. When a graduate at West Point is entitled to enter the Engineer Corps or the artillery corps of the Army he is, under existing law, made an additional lieutenant, and receives the pay and allowances authorized by law until such time as there is a vacancy. The experience of the last few years discloses that the number of graduates at the West Point Academy is practically on an equality with the number of vacancies from year to year.

Mr. SEWELL. Not quite. There are some appointments made from noncommissioned officers in the Army.

Mr. ALLISON. There is occasionally a sergeant in the Army promoted or one from civilian life gets an opportunity to enter the Army. But here it is proposed to add 90 lieutenants to the Army who are to graduate at West Point and become officers without an opportunity of serving in the Army. I submit that that is not a wise provision in our existing condition as to finances.

Mr. VILAS. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to say that it is not proposed to add 90 lieutenants to the Army. It is proposed to add 90 appointments to the number of cadets, who will be so distributed that probably only one-fourth of the number who are accepted after examination, and who finally sustain themselves in the course, will become graduates. It will hardly add more than 15, or at the most 18, annually.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator from Wisconsin say that only 20 per cent of those who enter West Point graduate from West Point?

Mr. VILAS. Annually?

Mr. ALLISON. Twenty per cent annually.

Mr. VILAS. Yes; that is 80 per cent in four years, and that is more than the proportion who graduate.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the point the Senator makes, but I call his attention to the fact that it only postpones the time when this additional number appear. For the first four years, probably, none will be added, because none can graduate before that time, but at the end of four years 100, or whatever the number is, will graduate, and then there will be 100 more graduates within a year. At the end of four years there will be 100 graduates, as I stated. For the present, of course, that will not be the case.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he thinks that will probably distress our finances, commencing four years from now?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not arguing against the amendment on the ground that it will distress our finances. I am only showing that at this time, with a sufficient number of cadets at West Point to fill the vacancies in our Army, or practically so, it is proposed to add 90 cadets at an increased expenditure of certainly from $50,000 to $70,000 per annum, without including the additional cost of education; and I say this is proposed in view of the pressing fact that the same Visiting Board at West Point recommended

for the convenience of the cadets who are already there $130,000 more than the committee of the House or the committee of the Senate saw fit to provide for in the pending bill, because we supposed that could be postponed for another year.

I call attention to this matter with great deference, because I see the Committee on Military Affairs believe it to be a wise provision. It may be that they propose to increase the Army, or think the increased number of officers will be needed when the four years shall have expired, but I very much wish that this matter could have been more carefully matured, and could have been introduced here as a separate bill and have full discussion as a separate measure, without placing it on this appropriation bill. And I think there is some reason to believe that the other House would hesitate to put this provision on without an opportunity of further debate in that body than can be had on an appropriation bill.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I regret that the amendment has been offered.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin by adding at the close of his amendment:

Any graduates unassigned to existing vacancies within one year after their graduation shall be honorably discharged from the service.

This would obviate the continuous expense.

Mr. VILAS. I shall be entirely willing to accept that amendment, especially if it would meet the objection which the Senator from Iowa urged in that particular. I would like, by the kindness of the Senator from Connecticut, General HAWLEY, to have read at the desk the recommendation of the Adjutant-General of the Army upon this proposed amendment. It has just been transmitted by the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 8, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith an amendment intended to be proposed as a new section to the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, which has been referred to the Department by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The measure proposed by this amendment is to increase the maximum strength of the corps of cadets from 371 to 471 by adding to the present number 2 cadets from each State at large and 10 from the United States at large.

The amendment is recommended to favorable consideration. The plant at the United States Military Academy is already sufficient for the purpose proposed and the measure is in the interest of the service.

Very respectfully,

GEO. D. RUGGLES,
Adjutant-General.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

Mr. VILAS. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Vermont can be accepted, if there is no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Wisconsin to accept the amendment. It is now accepted.

Mr. VILAS. If the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is to be insisted upon, in view of what was so well said by the Senator from Vermont, I should like to suggest this to him as a better form of expressing the amendment, perhaps, to meet the idea he has in view:

Provided, That of the two cadets from each State at large one shall be appointed on the recommendation of each Senator from such State, and that the one from each Congressional district and Territory shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Member of Congress from such district or the Delegate from such Territory.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not propose to detain the Senate for more than a few minutes. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] has given to this subject such laborious and intelligent research and presented the results of that research so clearly as to carry conviction to the Senate and the country. I think that the fate of this amendment might be safely trusted to the Senate without another word. But it has been suggested by some of the friends of the measure that a few words from me might not be out of place.

I am not a West Pointer, Mr. President, and on this account perhaps any suggestions from me may be regarded of less technical value; but they ought for the same reason, perhaps, to be received as also less partial than if made by a graduate of that Academy. Whatever of military education it has been my fortune to receive was obtained in another school. It came only from the stern and somewhat checkered experience of a soldier's life in the field. Recalling that experience and weighing impartially the considerations which favor this amendment, I am not permitted to doubt that it ought to be adopted. It seems to me that in the present condition of the country—I mean as to its means of defense—some such provision for increasing the educated soldiery of the country is imperative.

Of course, Mr. President, we all regret—every lover of peace and friend of arbitration—every thoughtful man regrets the necessity for military preparation in this age of enlightened progress; but we must recognize the fact that the necessity exists for increased coast defenses, increased naval power, as well as increased number of educated soldiers.

Even with our isolation from the great military powers of the world by reason of our surrounding oceans, we can not afford to stand still while all the civilized nations of the globe are increasing their armies and navies and the character and destructiveness of their armaments.

This necessity for preparation, Mr. President, is emphasized by the marvelous changes which have occurred and are still occurring in the arms and implements of war. It is said by high authority that these changes in the character of guns and engines of war are far greater in the last twenty-five years than in the whole of our past history—since the fathers fought with crude arms at Lexington and won with them at Yorktown—greater, perhaps, than in the preceding half dozen centuries.

Mr. President, I offer that fact as argument for this amendment. The necessity for action on the line indicated by this amendment and upon other lines of defense is further emphasized, Mr. President, by our recent experience. The country has just been aroused from its repose—startled from its fancied security as to its relations to other nations by the possibility of war—war with the most powerful nation in some respects on the globe. It is true that this experience has brought forth the renewed and gratifying assurance of absolute unity among the American people in support of that American doctrine enunciated by President Monroe. It has demonstrated that every section, State, and township is ready to uphold and enforce the rightful construction of that law at any cost. But I apprehend, Mr. President, that it would greatly promote the confidence and comfort of our people to know we were prepared in all respects for whatever issue might be involved.

This experience has also demonstrated that our people desire peace, are hoping and believing that some settlement will be reached on a basis just and honorable to both Great Britain and this Republic; but who doubts that these hopes of peace would be strengthened and our prayers for peaceful adjustment be more effective if backed by competent power? What surer guaranty of peace—may I not ask what nobler contribution to honorable, enduring peace—than thorough preparation for war? There is truth as well as grim humor in the homely aphorism, that war guns are peace preservers. But, Mr. President, our very deficiencies in these respects, the great cost of suitable defenses, and the long time required for their introduction, constitute another argument for this amendment.

Mr. President, I trust that I shall not be misunderstood by the Senate, by the country, or by others who might read these suggestions. I neither entertain nor mean to express or imply any doubt of our ability to successfully defend this country even in our present condition in case of war. We defended it as separate colonies by united action. We defended it in its infancy and weakness. It has survived fifty years of sectional alienation and bitterness which culminated in the bloodiest of civil wars. Of course, therefore, in any emergency we should be able to take care of it now. Now that this alienation and bitterness is gone, now with sections and States all concordant and all hearts beating as the heart of one man we could bid defiance to the world in arms.

But, Mr. President, it is not simply a question of ability to protect our country from a foreign foe, but a question of defending it with the least tax in money, and especially in men. In the chances of such inexpensive defense an educated soldiery for commanders is a mighty factor. It is true that great emergencies call to the front great leaders in all fields—and that will be the experience of the future; but, sir, you had as well tell me that special training was valueless to the painter or sculptor as to the soldier.

The advantages of trained leaders is demonstrated by all past experience. Even our war with Mexico, fought as it was so largely by volunteers, a war in which the South poured out its blood so freely, and in which we extended the borders of the Republic to the Pacific Ocean—even in that war the value of educated soldiers, although many of them were not in the Regular Army, was abundantly demonstrated. I offer that as an argument.

But, Mr. President, the policy of this Government, which I most cordially approve, of maintaining a small standing army further strengthens the reasons for the adoption of this amendment. Who can tell when some unexpected and trying complications may arise calling for the rapid mobilization of great armies? It is in such a contingency, which may occur at any time in our future, that we shall need these educated soldiers scattered among our people to drill and discipline the reserved military power in our patriotic youth. We need men who are themselves trained in the use of the new and destructive implements of war, trained to obe-

dience and self-restraint, inspired by the lessons they learn at West Point and by a lofty spirit, to bring our untrained youth quickly to a high order of efficiency. In the words of Calhoun, when Secretary of War, the nation will need in such emergency educated skill to lead "its valor to victory."

Sir, we are not left without encouragement from highest sources. The early Presidents, Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, and Monroe, all were impressed with the wisdom of the general policy now in view.

I therefore, Mr. President, as a means of future safety, whether in foreign war or domestic disturbance, give my approval and vote to this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] has offered an amendment which he suggests as a substitute for my amendment, and he suggests in that connection that his substitute expresses my idea better than my own production. I am very thankful to the Senator from Wisconsin to supplement my poor education with his superior education in this respect, and to express my idea of the proposed amendment better and in more apt language than I am capable of expressing it myself; and I am inclined to accept in lieu of my proposed amendment the language which he uses.

However, there was a remark or two submitted by the honorable Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] which I believe in fairness I ought to reply to. I do not think we disagree as to the facts that the President of the United States, by virtue of being Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, should have the armed power of the nation well in hand. But I submit to the honorable Senator from Vermont that running along with that thought is the thought that every State in this Union shall be appropriately represented and adequately represented in both the Naval and the Military Academy, and that the practice has been, to some extent at least, so much so as to call public attention to the fact that in the case of vacancies which may exist in many of the States by reason of the failure of the Representative to make a representation, young men taken from other sections of the Union, and especially from the District of Columbia, have been appointed to those positions and accredited to States and Territories in which they never sojourned and in which their parents never lived, and that it is wrong.

I am perfectly willing to give the President of the United States, or the Secretary of War, as representing him, power to fill every vacancy in the Military Academy that may take place from any cause, but in doing that I want to have the Senators and Representatives consulted from the State to which the appointment is accredited. I do not think it is the part of wisdom or good policy to permit the President of the United States to make an appointment to either the Naval or Military Academy without a recommendation of the Senators or the Representatives in Congress from the State to which the appointment is accredited.

I am not going to detain the Senate very long, but let me ask what would be the consequence if we were to pursue the course pointed out by the honorable Senator from Vermont, whose vast experience in public life, and especially in the War Department, preeminently fits him to speak intelligently on this subject? The result would be that in a short time, if we should have a war with Great Britain, as seems to be imminent this evening, or a war with any other power, all the officers of the Army, or the great majority of them, would come from the District of Columbia. All the officers, or a great majority of them, in consequence of this system of irregularity in appointment, and this discrimination against the States and Territories of the Union, would come from the District of Columbia or some locality in the eastern part of this nation, and the private soldier, the man who carries his musket and fights the battles, would come from the States and districts which have been ignored in the disposition of the appointments in the Military Academy and in the Naval Academy. I am perfectly willing that we should have an Army big enough and a Navy big enough to protect the United States, although I am decidedly at this time against any proposed increase of either.

Mr. President, I want the officers and private soldiers and noncommissioned officers to come from States and Territories according to their population and according to the districts represented in the Halls of Congress. If a vacancy occurs in the State of Nebraska or in the State of Vermont, why can not the President go to the State of Vermont or the State of Nebraska and get his appointee and fill the vacancy? Why should he confine himself to a little District here, 10 miles square, and say that a boy who was born here under the shadow of the Capitol——

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLEN. In a moment.

That a boy who was born here under the shadow of the Capitol, and who never has been as far west as the west line of this District, should represent a district in the State of California, or a district in the State of Colorado, or a district in some other State?

Now I will hear the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SEWELL. The case stated by the Senator from Nebraska is an exceptional one. The universal practice is to appoint from the district. It is only when some member of the House of Representatives, after repeated notice, has neglected his duty to appoint that an appointment is made outside of the particular district.

Mr. ALLEN. That is no answer at all to the argument. I say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am perfectly willing the President should exercise this power; but when he exercises it, let me ask the honorable Senator why he should not go to the State of New Jersey, where the vacancy exists? Why should he take a boy from the District of Columbia and say, "I will appoint him from the First district of the State of New Jersey and accredit him to that district"? Does it not, in the long run, give the District of Columbia or some other district or State undue representation in the Military and Naval academies of the United States?

What I insist upon is, not that the President shall be deprived of this power if a member of Congress fails to exercise it, but that in exercising the power he shall be confined to the district or the State that is not represented in consequence of the failure of its Representative or Senator to make the proper recommendation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question, if I may. I am profoundly ignorant of most of the rules as to the appointment and promotion of officers, but I am under the impression that there has heretofore by law been an opportunity year after year, with perhaps the intermission of a year at times, of promoting men from the ranks to officership in the Army. I understand it is the blue ribbon that is given to meritorious privates, which impels them to their duty and leads them to hope that there is something for them beyond a corporalship or a sergeantship, and there is the one chance before them that, if they faithfully perform their duty for years, they may themselves wear the epaulets and rise to officership and command. I am told this is so. Now, I desire to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, if this be so, whether the amendment which he proposes will not forever cut off and debar, unless our Army is increased, any further chance of promotion from the ranks?

Mr. VILAS. I will answer the Senator from Colorado by saying that I think it will not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator please explain why it will not? If there are now, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] said a few moments ago, in answer to some remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], but occasional vacancies, and some of those vacancies are filled from the ranks, if you double your appointments to West Point, and the vacancies are to be filled from West Point, what opportunities will there be for filling vacancies by promotion from the ranks?

Mr. VILAS. Precisely the same there are now. Whenever the President thinks that the circumstances are such that he ought to promote meritorious soldiers from the ranks, the power remains with him as it is with him now.

Mr. SEWELL. By law the President has to take the appointee first from the Academy, second from those that are surplus, and after everything else is exhausted he goes to the ranks.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Colorado desires——

Mr. BATE. If the Senator from Wisconsin will pardon me, it is likewise the law now that a noncommissioned officer may prepare himself to undergo a competitive examination and on successfully passing it he is entitled to a commission. It is confined to noncommissioned officers.

Mr. VILAS. That, perhaps, is a better answer than the one I was about to make to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SEWELL. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] has made a mistake as to the law. While the noncommissioned officer has the right to be examined for promotion, there are only about six or eight appointments a year, and the President has first to exhaust the Academy before he can appoint from the ranks.

Mr. BATE. I did not say that the noncommissioned officers had an absolute right to be appointed over the West Pointers, but they have the right to seek such promotion.

Mr. SEWELL. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] said, there are to-day some of the brightest young men who were graduated last year simply serving with doubtful commissions, and are not assigned to duty. I am in favor of the increase proposed on general principles, but I want the Senate to take into consideration this idea, that if the increase is made to the number stated you will take away all hope from the young men who are trying to perfect themselves in the Army in order to become commissioned officers.

Mr. GORDON. May I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that possibly the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, retiring these officers from commission one year afterwards, might relieve the Army of the embarrassment he suggests?

Mr. SEWELL. That raises another question entirely. That would be simply making a general educational institution of West Point for other than military purposes at the expense of the Government. I do not believe that a young man ought to be discharged after having devoted himself to this special profession.

He ought to look forward to promotion in that profession, and he ought not to look forward to being discharged by reason of there being no vacancies. We had a case of that kind in the Navy a few years ago, where a whole class of young men were put out, nine-tenths of whom have not succeeded in life by reason of the fact that the whole current of their ideas and thoughts of labor were changed by an act just like this.

Mr. VILAS. One object of the amendment, in my opinion, is to provide that a good number of young men every year, who have been educated at the Military Academy, shall leave the Army and go into civil life. It is to provide the means which are so abundant for military instruction at the West Point Academy for the use of the young men of the country, and I do not see that there is the least difficulty in retaining at the same time the authority and power of the President to promote from the ranks in meritorious cases, with whatever incentive may now exist, and if there be need for any change in the law to effect that, I should cheerfully agree to it.

Mr. CHANDLER obtained the floor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me make a suggestion, as the Senator from Wisconsin was replying to me. If, under the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, the force would be doubled, then there would be absolutely no chance for an appointment from the ranks, for there would be no vacancies. The retiring of men to private life is only after vacancies are filled at the expiration of a year. If the Senator from Wisconsin desires that there should be any further promotions from the ranks he must certainly include in his amendment a provision that there shall be annually appointed a certain number from the ranks.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator from Colorado hardly deals with anything less than hyperbole. An amendment which would add from fifteen to eighteen to an annual class can hardly be said to double the number of cadets at West Point. So far as the other amendment is concerned, it is enough, it seems to me, that we should deal with one thing at a time. We ought not to attempt in this section to endeavor to reform all provisions of law.

Mr. TELLER. It is quite evident that if we should attempt to get a vote to-night it would not be very satisfactory. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 18, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *February 17, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 15, was read and approved.

CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has a matter which, by consent of the House, comes up immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker I ask that the bill which was under consideration on Saturday (H. R. 5819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California, be put to a vote. I understand that Mr. Geary, an ex-member of this House, had a conversation with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], and he had no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Were there any amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of California, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation; and

An act (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I make the report which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows:

They recommend concurrence in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 34.

They recommend nonconcurrence in the amendments numbered 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62.

They recommend concurrence in the amendment numbered 4, with an amendment as follows:

After the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For printing 500,000 copies of part 2 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the year 1895, as required by section 73 of the act entitled 'An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents,' approved January 12, 1895, $300,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I should be glad to have this bill considered in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, has this bill been printed with these amendments?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks if this bill is printed with the amendments.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; the gentleman can get it by sending to the document room. It is House bill 4321, with Senate amendments, and is printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st day of January the House passed what is known as the urgent deficiency bill. It carried $4,421,000.

The practice has grown up in late years to pass two deficiency bills, one early in the session, to cover items required by the public service, the other near the close of the session, which takes up all items of deficiency. This practice grew up out of the necessities of the Government service.

The Committee on Appropriations took somewhat of a new departure when they reported this bill. Wherever we recommended appropriations at all we exhausted the subject, and aimed to cover, and substantially did cover, every item that was before the committee by estimate. We included all items which we considered to be necessary for the public service before the close of the fiscal year. Hence the bill was over $4,000,000, the largest urgent deficiency bill that ever passed this House. It went to the other end of the Capitol. The Senate considered the bill and amended it and passed it so as to make it carry $1,623,000 additional, making the bill over $6,044,000.

There has been a controversy for many years between the House and Senate as to what is the duty of the House touching appropriation bills. We have always claimed—and that claim has been substantially concurred in between the two bodies, that the House of Representatives should originate the general appropriation bills. The Senate have always claimed that they could originate them, and under their power as a coordinate branch of Congress they have practically added to the House bills whatever seemed to them to be proper. This matter was discussed in the Senate upon this bill. Much was said that perhaps I ought not to consume time in repeating, and in fact perhaps it would not be in order for me to state what this Senator and that Senator and the other Senator said. Suffice it to say, that when it was all said, with one exception the Senators seemed to be quite vigorous in protesting that the Senate had just as much power touching appropriation bills as had the House.

There seemed to be a consensus of opinion that when they added $1,623,000 to this urgent deficiency bill they were performing a duty that the House had failed to perform. Possibly something was said of a little capital that somebody desired to make. Well, now, I think it is due to the House that I should call attention to this and see what are the facts with respect to this claim. I will just analyze this bill for a moment. The amount as the bill passed the House was $4,400,000; as it passed the Senate, $6,044,000. The items added in the Senate are as follows:

Preparing report of World's Columbian Exposition	$18,006.10
Reimbursement of T. W. Palmer, president World's Columbian Exposition	1,998.35
To open Jupiter Inlet, Florida	500.00
Navy-yard, Brooklyn	50,000.00
Naval station, Key West, Fla	4,000.00
Naval War College, Rhode Island	2,000.00
Equipment, Navy	50,000.00
Claims for surveying public lands	7,297.28
Library of Congress building	480,000.00
Library of Congress, assistants	1,125.00
United States Senate	27,473.21
Total	642,399.94

Now, then, these items never were before the House committee by estimate or otherwise. Gentlemen understand that under the rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations gets jurisdiction through estimates submitted through the Secretary of the Treasury, referred through the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. If it is in this line.

Mr. SAYERS. We can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I understand that one of the Senate amendments is an appropriation to the president of the World's Fair Commission for preparing a report.

Mr. CANNON. I will come to that presently——

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I would ask if that is correct?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; not to the president, but to the director-general——

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Yes, the director-general.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). Who deposits his report, and about which the House committee had no hearing and no estimate. That is put on and we recommend nonconcurrence. Now, then, let me call your attention to the items added of which the House or Committee on Appropriations were advised after the bill was under consideration or had passed the House.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him one moment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SAYERS. Will you also state in reference to the item for the payment of letter carriers that that was not before our committee?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; I am going to come to that. I will give the other items:

To reimburse railroads for transporting certain negroes from Mexico	$5,087.09
Expert counters in Treasury	7,500.00
Battlefield, Antietam, Md	7,000.00
Horses for cavalry and artillery	30,000.00
Back pay and bounty	75,000.00
Eleventh Census	15,000.00
United States court expenses	309,739.19
Court of Private Land Claims	10,000.00
Judgments, United States courts	22,866.25
Judgments, Court of Claims	441,891.80
Total	924,084.33

So it will be seen that, of these matters that never were submitted to the House until after our bill was completed, the Senate, on its own motion and on estimates sent to it, put on this bill some $600,000; so that there were left only $56,000 that the Senate have put on by way of amendment that the House have had any jurisdiction of. Of that $56,000 a part of it was $20,000 for lighting the insane asylum. The House committee did not recommend that for the reason that at the time, nor yet, while we are satisfied it ought to be lighted, we were not satisfied that it was being properly administered. The history of it, in a word, is this: In 1893 they asked $20,000 for this purpose. That was the full estimate; we gave it. In 1894 they came back and said, "It cost a little more than we expected and we want $10,000 more." We gave it. Now they come by their estimates and say, "We want $20,000 more," making $50,000 for a little electric-light plant for the insane asylum. On inquiry we did not think that the Government was getting its money's worth and we were tired of being paltered with; and to ascertain if the proposed expenditure of this sum was to be made with due diligence to protect the Government, we did not feel that we ought to recommend it; but the Senate put it on.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me just a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the gentleman to enumerate certain items there and to allege that the House committee have never had jurisdiction of those items. Does he mean to say that they would not have been in order under the rules of the House in the Committee on Appropriations to be considered, or is it the fact that they were not submitted to the committee?

Mr. CANNON. Just as I meant to say, under the rules of this House the Committee on Appropriations gets jurisdiction upon estimates transmitted from the Secretary, through the Speaker, and referred to the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, I understand the gentleman to say that these items were never transmitted to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Exactly; at least not transmitted in time for consideration by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Never before the committee prior to the consideration of this bill in the House and its passage.

You may say, "Well, what is the matter?" Not much of anything, except the lecture which this House has received in another body. I am inclined to believe that most of these items are correct, though we have no official information about them. We have recommended nonconcurrence for the purpose of hearing from the Senate conferees as to the information or the estimates they may have to justify these items. We wrote into the bill as it passed the House every item of deficiency for this year and former years in the Department of Justice submitted up to the time we prepared the bill. I understand that after we had passed the bill here the Department of Justice certified to the Senate over $300,000 more. We shall find out about that. If that be so, it is, of course, perfectly proper for that amount to go in. As to a printing amendment put on by the Senate, we recommend that the House concur in that amendment with an amendment by the House carrying $300,000 for the publication of the Agricultural Report of 1895. This is made necessary by the Richardson printing bill, which provides for the printing of these reports, and as there is no money appropriated for the purpose we recommend this appropriation. Heretofore the appropriation has been made by a joint resolution reported from the Committee on Printing authorizing the printing and prescribing the number.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A self-appropriating resolution.

Mr. CANNON. The printing law authorizes the printing of 500,000 copies of the report and provides how they shall be distributed. After this bill passed the House the Public Printer sent in his estimate of $300,000. That estimate went to the Senate, but for some reason that coordinate branch of the Government, which claims to have just as much authority as we have to originate appropriation bills, did not put in the item. We sent for the Public Printer and found that $300,000 appropriated now would give us the report for distribution in June, whereas if we did not appropriate the money available until the next fiscal year we should have to wait for it until October. For this reason we recommend this appropriation by way of a House amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman has answered my question. I wanted to know when the reports were to be ready.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word in conclusion. I want to keep strictly within the rules of this House, but when I read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, speaking for the committee over which I have the honor to preside and for the House, I must say that when we are criticised in another body for alleged nonperformance of our duty, I do not look upon such criticism with delight, especially when every word of it is based on false premises. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to seek to take away from any parliamentary body in this or any other country the privilege of trying to justify the wisdom of its own action and its own existence, and possibly that had better be done even upon a false foundation than not done at all. I have many times noticed that some people having great ability make their best speeches when they are not embarrassed by the facts surrounding the matter considered. Having said this much, I shall ask that the report of the committee be adopted, that the House concur as the committee recommend and nonconcur in the items I have mentioned, in order that we may hear from the Senate conferees the reasons of that body for putting on these amendments.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I should like a minute or two when the gentleman gets through.

Mr. PICKLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will take the floor again and yield for my friend's question, but I wish to yield now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] as much time as he desires.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to criticise the action of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations. In fact, sir, this is a unanimous report. I concur fully in what has been said by the chairman of the committee in reference to the bill and amendments. But I wish to make this further remark, that while this bill is much larger than any urgent deficiency bill that has heretofore passed, it contains, and will contain when it becomes a law, more than a million dollars of appropriations which are not, in the technical sense of the term, deficiencies. In other words, there will be more than a million dollars carried upon this bill and also upon the general deficiency bill which can not be properly charged to any dereliction on the part of the last Congress. My judgment is, and I believe the distinguished gentleman at the head of the Committee on Appropriations will agree with me, that the deficiency appropriations for this session of Congress will be far less than the deficiency appropriations of any preceding Congress for many years past.

Another word in regard to the amendment which is proposed to the Senate amendment covering the appropriation of $300,000 for the publication of the Agricultural Report for the fiscal year 1895. The necessity for this appropriation does not arise from any default of the last Congress, because at the last session of the last Congress the sum of $300,000 was appropriated for the publication of the report for 1894, and that was the only estimate we had. The Public Printer now submits that if, instead of delaying this appropriation until the passage of the sundry civil bill, we give the $300,000 for the publication of the report of 1895, he will have it ready for distribution, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, in the month of June next, instead of having it delayed until October or November, as has been usual.

I will say further, in addition to what the gentleman from Illinois has said, that whatever reflection has been made upon the Committee on Appropriations of the House or upon the House itself, in any quarter whatever, is unjust and has no foundation in fact. Of the more than a million and a half dollars added to this bill by the Senate, only a very small sum was before the Committee on Appropriations of the House for consideration. As to the asylum appropriation of $20,000, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] who sits before me, who was a member of the Committee on Appropriations in the last Congress and in the Fifty-second Congress as well, will remember that the superintendent of the asylum came before us and said that $20,000 would be amply sufficient for the asylum, and it was given to him freely. In the next Congress he returned and said that he would need $10,000 more, and that also was given to him freely; but when he came before the committee at the present session and asked, in addition to these sums, $20,000 more, the chairman of the committee very properly required that he should furnish some facts which would show the necessity for such an increase.

Mr. DINGLEY. In either of these Senate amendments is there an appropriation for an object in the nature of a claim which, under the rules of the House, ought to be referred to the Committee on Claims for consideration there?

Mr. SAYERS. There may be one or two; but I hardly think more.

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect any.

Mr. SAYERS. Nor do I. As stated by the gentleman from Illinois, these amendments, or a large number of them, will be accepted by the House conferees; and the only object in consuming the time of the House with this explanation was to answer some very improper and unjustifiable reflections made upon the House and one of its committees in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. I yield now to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to Senate amendment No. 26, on page 17, which provides for an appropriation of $10,000 to be used in defraying the expenses of the so-called Puyallup commission. This commission was appointed three years ago to obtain the consent, so far as possible, of the Puyallup allottees and the Puyallup Indians to the sale of the reservation lands proper of the Puyallups. There are about 600 acres of school lands—reservation lands proper. The balance of that reservation has been allotted to the Indians, who are holding in severalty and who are citizens of the United States.

I had a conversation with the Secretary of the Interior about the time this bill was being considered in the Senate, and he stated to me that $7,500 would be sufficient for this purpose. He further said that he was inclined to believe that the restrictions upon the sale of these lands should be entirely removed by as early a date as the 1st of next December. There will be found in the Indian appropriation bill, when it is taken up here for consideration, a provision that the act of the legislature of Washington in relation to the removal of these restrictions shall be in force after December next.

There have been three commissioners at work out there for three years. They have been paid nearly $14 a day each for such services as they have rendered to the Puyallup Indians. The amount paid for these services is to be taken out of the proceeds of the sale of the Indian lands—a provision which I believe to be most inequitable and wrong in principle. I do not think these commissioners should be continued in office at their present very high compensation. If an appropriation is to be made here, I desire that it shall be made in the Indian appropriation bill and shall run parallel with the other provision to which I have referred.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman refers to the Senate amendment?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Allow me to ask how much of this land of the Puyallups is there remaining?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. A very large proportion of it—in fact, nearly all—remains unsold. There was, for a time, a good deal of objection on the part of the allottees to the sale of any of these lands under the efforts and through the ministrations of these commissioners. I understand that recently the commissioners have obtained the consent to some extent—I do not know to what extent—of the Puyallup allottees. There never was any serious objection so far as the school lands, or, as we term them, the reservation lands proper, were concerned. The Indians desired, of course, as any other citizens would, to receive the fair purchase value of their lands. They are an intelligent body of Indians. They never have caused the Government any trouble or any expense.

I wish to state that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], when the Indian appropriation bill comes up, will offer an amendment providing for an appropriation of $7,500, in accordance with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of continuing the labors of these commissioners until the 1st of next December, but reducing their number to two and their salaries to $10 a day, which would certainly be a very ample compensation.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Then your idea is to cut out this amendment of the Senate?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, sir; I want it struck out altogether, unless it conforms to the honorable Secretary's recommendation for $7,500.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Washington says he desires this amendment to go out unless the Secretary's suggestions are met?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes; unless the sum appropriated can be cut down to $7,500, which I presume can not be done; and there ought also to be a provision that the limitations provided by the statute of the State of Washington shall be accepted.

Mr. CANNON. Have allotments been made to all these Indians substantially?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Oh, yes; long since. And when these restrictions have been removed the period of time remaining under the provisions of the law now existing will be only about six years.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then, as I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Washington, this amendment of the Senate is, in fact, new legislation extending an old law.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The object is to continue these commissioners.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the time has expired under the law as it now stands.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Oh, no; this was to be a continuing commission, I suppose, under the provisions of the law.

Mr. DINGLEY. Without any limit whatever?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. No, sir; but there must be a limit to this sort of thing, because the heart of these allotted lands is being eaten out, and the Indians are being deprived of their just rights. I do not propose, if any effort I may make can prevent it, that this thing shall go on indefinitely and forever until the value of the lands is destroyed.

Mr. DINGLEY. According to the gentleman's statement, this provision does not belong to a deficiency bill, but should be inserted, if anywhere, in the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. I understand from the gentleman's explanation that substantially all these Indians have received their allotments.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CANNON. That is, their homes?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The amendment of the Senate reads:

To select and appraise such portions of the allotted lands within the Puyallup Indian Reservation, Wash., as are not required for homes for the Indian allottees.

Now, they have been about three years at this, as I understand it?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, sir; and the Secretary says that the result of their labors has been altogether disproportionate to the amount of money expended heretofore.

Mr. CANNON. And as I understand the gentleman, he is inclined to the opinion that this commission should not be extended further?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Not unlimitedly, of course. I am willing that they shall continue for a few months longer. But there certainly ought to be a limit to the work.

Mr. SAYERS. I understand the gentleman to say that the Committee on Indian Affairs has this matter under consideration?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, sir; and will make a report upon it.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Let me suggest also to the gentleman from Illinois that we have determined that the whole matter shall be wound up not later than next December.

Mr. CANNON. I am very glad to have the benefit of the gentleman's suggestion to take with us into the conference.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me a moment? I do not understand whether the Committee on Appropriations recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment No. 11 or not.

Mr. CANNON. No; we recommend nonconcurrence.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I would like to ask if it has been called to the attention of the committee that the report made by the director-general of the World's Columbian Exposition has not been signed by anybody, has not been referred to any committee of the commission to pass upon, and that it is not, in the true sense of the word, authoritative. I have been informed that such are the facts in regard to the report—that it has never been brought before the commission, and has not been signed by the one who prepared it. Does the Committee on Appropriations think that it would be proper to make the appropriation under such circumstances?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that this is a Senate amendment put in on information given to the Senate committee. The House has had no estimate for its infor-

mation in the matter. I will state, however, that we apprehend it may turn out that the director-general, at his own expense, has made this report, as the law made it his duty to do. I apprehend that it will turn out not to have been submitted to the national commission for the reason that the national commission has not for a very long time had a meeting and can not have a meeting unless an amount is appropriated covering some twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars to pay its expenses.

But we recommend nonconcurrence, and will give the matter consideration in the conference committee. When we consider the amendment, if we are to consent to it, or if we disagree, as we may disagree, we will be in a position to inform the House fully of all the facts.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him as to the amendment No. 27? I understand that this is a motion to nonconcur.

Mr. CANNON. As to most of the Senate amendments it is. We recommend nonconcurrence in the amendment No. 27.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not desire to combat the views of the committee, but wish to call attention to the fact that these surveys have been performed, and this is the amount of some small balances due to the surveyors. I will be very glad if the committee would give the matter very careful consideration.

Mr. SAYERS. We had no information respecting the claim when we made up the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota, and in passing answer the question of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], asked a little while ago, that possibly here is one of the items that is in the nature of a claim; possibly not an audited account; but I am unable to say. It has that appearance.

Mr. DINGLEY. Which is that?

Mr. CANNON. That is the item to which the gentleman from South Dakota calls attention. Whether it is an audited account or not I can not say, or whether it is a mere claim. But I am inclined to the opinion that it is a claim.

Mr. PICKLER. It is for work performed, and the accounts have been approved by the Commissioner of the Land Office.

Mr. CANNON. We will ascertain, of course, all the facts in the conference committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me for a moment, the gentleman is well aware that it has been the custom of the other body, in considering the appropriation bills, frequently to place in them, and send into conference, appropriations for objects that are distinctly in the nature of claims, and it seems to me when it is found that distinct claims are thus inserted which, under the rules of the House, would be referred to the Committee on Claims—the Appropriations Committee having jurisdiction of the matter in the House—that there ought not to be, on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, any concessions to the Senate giving advantage to one claim over others or the great body of claims.

Mr. CANNON. I heartily concur with the remarks and suggestions of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. SAYERS. But the gentleman from Illinois knows that this is the very character of amendment that is the most difficult to dispose of or defeat in conference.

Mr. CANNON. Gentlemen all understand how difficult it is for somebody who, as a servant of the House, tries to carry out its rules, or for a committee that does the best it can to conform to the rules in its service of the House—how exceedingly difficult it is to observe the rules and perform its duties and stand against the urgent personal request of individuals from time to time.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to call the attention of the conferees of the House to these small sums for surveyors and deputy surveyors. Of course there can be no question about the justice of these claims when properly presented. These claims are not visionary, but they are for money that has been well earned by very laborious work in the surveying of these public lands. These are poor men, who are dependent upon this money for their living, and they ought to be paid as soon as the items can be properly gotten at. I merely desire to call attention to the justice of the claim. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman in regard to amendment No. 47, whether that amendment covers any of these judgments for Indian depredation claims?

Mr. CANNON. It does not cover any Indian depredation claims or judgments.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the character of these judgments?

Mr. CANNON. Judgments in the Federal courts under the Tucker-Edmunds Act, and also certain judgments of the Court of Claims.

Mr. PICKLER. I am not interested in those judgments under the Tucker-Edmunds Act.

Mr. CANNON. All of which judgments were certified since the bill passed the House, if certified at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote upon concurrence in the amendments recommended by the committee and nonconcurrence in the other amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] moves that the following amendments be concurred in:

The Clerk read as follows:

They recommend concurrence in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 34.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask that the vote be taken in gross.

Mr. CANNON. The report of the committee identifies the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires that they be read to the House.

The amendments in which concurrence was recommended were read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring.

The amendments were concurred in.

The remainder of the report of the Committee on Appropriations was then agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. I move a conference.

The motion of Mr. CANNON was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CANNON, Mr. NORTHWAY, and Mr. SAYERS.

SALE OF BONDS, ETC.

Mr. DALZELL. I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to submit the report which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the resolution of inquiry hereinafter set out, having considered the same, report a substitute therefor, and recommend the adoption of said substitute.

SUBSTITUTE.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to inform the House—

First. What was the aggregate amount of bonds issued and sold under the resumption act of 1875, and also what was the aggregate sum realized therefrom, specifying the character of coin received, between the passage of said act and March 1, 1893; and also the aggregate amount of bonds offered and sold under such act, and the aggregate sum realized therefrom, between March 1, 1893, and January 1, 1896, giving amount, rate, character of bond, and sum realized for each issue; and also what was the amount of gold in the Treasury reserve for redemption of United States legal-tender notes January 11, 1879, and what was the amount of gold reserved for such purpose March 1, 1893, and also the amount reserved on January 1, 1896.

Second. What was the aggregate amount of United States legal-tender notes redeemed by the Treasury between January 1, 1879, when the resumption of specie payments took effect, and March 1, 1893, and what was the aggregate amount redeemed between March 1, 1893, and January 1, 1896, specifying separately the amount of greenbacks, so-called, and the amount of Treasury notes thus redeemed, and not including the Treasury notes thus redeemed, and not including the Treasury notes redeemed and canceled as provided by the act of July 14, 1890, and also specifying the kind of coin, whether gold or silver, used in such redemption.

Third. What was the amount of greenbacks, so called, less currency certificates held by national banking associations, and what was the amount of Treasury notes in the Treasury March 1, 1893, and also January 1, 1896; also, what was the amount of United States legal-tender notes and currency certificates held in this reserve by national banking associations at each of such dates, or at the time nearest to such date for which the Treasury has official returns.

Fourth. What was the amount of United States legal-tender notes on deposit in the Treasury March 1, 1893, and also January 1, 1896, as the 5 per cent fund for the redemption of the notes of national banking associations.

Fifth. What disposition was made of such of the United States legal-tender notes as were redeemed from January 1, 1879, to March 1, 1893, and did not remain as cash in the Treasury at the latter date; and also what disposition was made of such of the United States legal-tender notes as were redeemed between March 1, 1893, and January 1, 1896, and did not remain as cash in the Treasury at the latter date.

Sixth. What was the surplus or the deficiency of revenue, as the case may have been, each fiscal year, or part of year, from July 1, 1879, to March 1, 1893, and from March 1, 1893, to July 1, 1895, and for the first half of the fiscal year ended January 1, 1896; what disposition was made of the surplus in each fiscal year; and also from what source or sources the requisite means were obtained to pay so much of the current expense of carrying on the Government, pensions, and interest on the public debt as was in excess of the revenue in any such fiscal year or part of fiscal year.

Seventh. What was the amount paid on account of the reduction of the principal of the interest-bearing public debt, including premium on bonds redeemed each fiscal year and part of fiscal year from July 1, 1879, to March 1, 1893; how much of such amount was derived from surplus revenue, and how much from the fund for redemption of notes of national banking associations in liquidation or reducing circulation, etc., which was covered into the Treasury by the act of July 14, 1890; and also how much the interest-bearing debt was increased between March 1, 1893, and January 1, 1896.

Eighth. What was the amount of legal-tender notes held in the Treasury as the deposit of national banking associations in liquidation or reducing or retiring their circulation for the redemption of their outstanding circulating notes, January 1, 1879, March 1, 1885, March 1, 1889, and also July 14, 1890, when this fund was covered into the Treasury; what was the amount of such notes of national banking associations redeemed from the fund between January 1, 1879, and March 1, 1885, and between March 1, 1885, and March 1, 1889, and also between March 1, 1889, and July 14, 1890; also what was the amount of legal-tender notes paid into the Treasury by national banking associations in liquidation or reducing or retiring their circulation between July 14, 1890, and March 1, 1893, and between March 1, 1893, and January 1, 1896; and also what was the amount of notes of such banks redeemed by the Treasury during each of these periods?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the resolution is admissible of amendment. I would like to offer an amendment, which is perfectly harmless, and I think perhaps the gentleman would accept it. Is the resolution open to amendment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I have not a copy of the resolution, and

can not, therefore, indicate exactly to what line I would like to offer the amendment. I would like to amend the resolution so as to have the Secretary of the Treasury inform the House how bonds were sold between 1873 and 1879; whether they were sold to individuals or to syndicates, or to banks, and to give the names of the purchasers and the manner in which the bonds were sold, as well as the amounts realized.

Mr. DALZELL. That is not germane to the resolution at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do not see why it is not germane.

Mr. DALZELL. That is a matter not necessary to go to the Secretary of the Treasury for at all. I demand the previous question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do not think the gentleman can take me off the floor to demand the previous question. The Chair had recognized me to offer an amendment. I believe I was recognized, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like a copy of the resolution, so as to let the House see whether my amendment is germane.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must reduce his amendment to writing.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If the Chair will indulge me for a moment I will do so. [After a pause.] With the permission of the Chair, I will read the amendment, as the Clerk might have some difficulty in locating where it is to go in, and then I will hand it to the Clerk. The amendment proposes to add after line 9 the following:

Provided also, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to inform the House to whom and in what manner bonds were disposed of which were sold between 1873 and 1879, giving the names of the purchasers and corporations to whom or through whom said bonds were sold.

Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, the information that is asked for by him from 1873 to 1879 is no part of the information sought by this resolution. The resolution does not contemplate obtaining any information as to the manner in which bonds were sold. It simply asks what amount has been sold, what amount has been realized from them, and what disposition has been made of the funds. That is entirely a different subject. If we were to inquire at all as to the bonds sold before 1879 we certainly ought to inquire for all, but there is no proposition to inquire as to the others.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I beg leave to differ from my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in regard to my amendment. As I gathered from the reading of this resolution, which has not been printed, which is not on our desks, and the scope of which it was impossible to get, except as we could catch from the reading in the midst of the confusion that has been prevailing this morning, this resolution seeks to obtain full information from the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to the sale of bonds, the amounts realized, and what has been done with the funds gathered from the sale of those bonds from 1873 up to the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be perfectly candid with the House. It has been charged repeatedly, and from different sources, that this Administration pursued a new and unusual method, and a method perhaps in violation of law, in selling bonds of a recent issue to a syndicate. Now, I desire that this House shall be officially informed as to the manner in which the bonds sold between 1873 and 1879, which made the resumption of specie payment a possibility, were marketed, whether they were sold upon advertisement to individuals alone, and to the people of the country at large in the form of a popular loan, or whether the bonds were sold to a syndicate in a manner similar to that pursued in the sale of bonds which this Administration found it necessary to adopt on a recent occasion when the credit of this country was trembling in the balance.

Now, I can not see why my friends upon the other side upon the Ways and Means Committee can have the least objection to have the request for this information included in this resolution, as it is altogether on the same matter as that contained in the resolution. It is begging the question to say that it is not germane, when that lengthy resolution covers the whole ground of bond issues. This simply asks for another branch of the same information, very valuable to the House and to the country, and I hope that my amendment will have the support of not only our friends on this side, but all of those on the other side of this House who wish to see the light turned on all the financial transactions of the Government from 1873 to this hour.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad now to support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee if the House or if Congress would authorize the reprint of the document, the general publication of which was once suppressed by a Democratic chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, giving the entire history of the sale of bonds to support the resumption of specie payments from the 1st day of January, 1879.

I presume the gentleman does not want the information, or else he is not well advised as to the history of that historic event. That was an event in the history of American financiering when the Democratic party proclaimed that the resumption of specie payments was impossible, and we were told that it would require the presence of the Regular Army around the subtreasury in New York to protect the little amount of money that would be on hand on the day fixed for resumption. But while we listened with intense anxiety for the reports that should come on that memorable day, the result was that there was more gold and silver in the Treasury at sundown on that day than there was at sunrise on that day. I know nothing about any sale of bonds between 1873 and 1879 except to protect the gold reserve, as we might say, in favor of the resumption of specie payments.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is it not a fact that at the time when, as the gentleman says, there was more gold in the Treasury at sundown than there was at sunrise, the Government was in receipt of ample revenues to meet all demands upon it?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly. There was a protective tariff in operation, and money was pouring into the Treasury. But as to that bond sale about which the gentleman from Tennessee inquires, that sale was an open book, and if the gentleman will only procure the publication of that document—it was a Senate document, quite a large one; I have it, and it is one of the most interesting in the financial history of the United States during our time—if the gentleman will procure the republication of that document, he will discover that the bonds were sold under a written contract with the same syndicate that bought the bonds of the United States a year ago at 104, and that that written contract had two or three provisions in it which do not appear in the contract in 1895.

One provision was that the Secretary of the Treasury might put an end to the contract at any time when he thought he could do better, and in fact he did put an end to it before the time expired. Another provision was that for sixty days after the publication of that contract all the people of the United States should have an opportunity to bid for those bonds at the same price at which the syndicate was to get them. Not only that, but they were to have time to pay for them in four several installments. Not only that, but the expense of advertising in all the leading papers, the advertisements to be drawn by the Secretary of the Treasury, was to be borne by the syndicate, and the gentleman will learn that those advertisements were drawn by the Secretary of the Treasury and were published throughout the United States at great expense to the syndicate, and that the syndicate was allowed to have only such bonds as the popular subscription did not take. And he will learn another fact of importance, and one that I am sure he does not want to know just now, viz, that the total profit to the syndicate was not $10,000,000, as it was in 1895, but was one-fourth of 1 per cent and no more, being so limited by the terms of the contract itself. That was the financiering of 1879, and that was the proudest act of the Republican party in all the history of resumption, and I do not think the gentleman from Tennessee really wants at this time to put that act on exhibition, in comparison, side by side, with the blundering, terrible downfall of the present Administration in its efforts to protect the finances of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. What was the premium paid under that contract of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The bonds were sold at par.

Mr. MCMILLIN. At par? Then less was obtained for them than was obtained for the bonds sold in the manner of which you are complaining.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Less was obtained. We lived then at a time when gold had been at a premium of almost 50 per cent and we were struggling on against the opposition of the Democratic party, the same party that to-day is attacking its own Administration in the interest of the prostration of the credit of the Government. We were then trying to get a gold equivalent for the greenback currency of the country, and we were being contended with and fought at every step by the solid vote of the Democratic party on this floor, and therefore it was that the achievement was all the greater and all the more glorious, because we had to overcome not only the actual financial condition, but the opposition of a party just emerging from defeat in other matters and seeking vengeance here.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, so far as the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] is concerned, I would see no objection at all to it if it were in the form of a separate resolution of inquiry addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury. My objection to it is that it is not germane to the subject-matter of the pending resolution, but relates to an entirely different subject. If the gentleman will introduce an independ-

ent resolution asking for the information he desires, so far as I am concerned, I shall help him to pass it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my colleague on the committee state why, if we are to have this information at all, pertaining to the same general subject, it should not be embodied in this same resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. The point is that it does not relate to the same subject. It is entirely outside of the subject of this resolution as considered in the committee, and as I was instructed to report it. For that reason I am opposed to the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee as an amendment, and I hope that it will be voted down. I renew the demand for the previous question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have had some conference with other members of the committee besides the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My amendment is pending, and I am utterly at a loss to see why the gentleman should so strongly object to an amendment like this, which reaches all the sales of bonds of the Government from 1873 up to this time, being made a part of the pending resolution. It is certainly, in my judgment, germane. It is very pleasant, of course——

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] inform the Chair whether his amendment, his original amendment, was presented to the House?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir; I presented it to the House and read it myself. I now ask the Clerk to read it so that the House may understand it.

The SPEAKER. Is this a second amendment?

Mr. WASHINGTON. No, sir; it is the same; I have simply written it out so that it may be more intelligible and have also, at the suggestion of my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], made a change of one or two words, which I ask may be incorporated; or, if there is any objection to that, I will ask that the amendment stand as I offered it.

The SPEAKER. The trouble is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has asked for the previous question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. But my amendment, Mr. Speaker, was pending before he asked for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. It must have been the previous amendment.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, then, let it be the previous amendment just as I offered it, though the one I have offered does not differ materially.

The SPEAKER. The question, of course, is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Does that cut off my amendment?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I should be glad to have the amendment read. I have been endeavoring to ascertain what it is, but have been unable to find out.

The SPEAKER. That matter can come up after the House has decided whether it desires the previous question to be ordered. The question now before the House is on ordering the previous question.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon the amendment presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON]. The Clerk will read the original amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 12, page 1, after "1896," the following:
"That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to notify the House how and in what manner the bonds were disposed of which were sold between 1873 and the present time, and all necessary facts as to the purchasers, whether persons or corporations, through which the bonds were placed."

Mr. WASHINGTON. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the matter is not open to debate.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If the House will indulge me a moment——

The SPEAKER. The matter is not open to debate, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. WASHINGTON. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he insists upon a vote on this amendment, or will he accept it as a modification of his resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not accept it. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, it was rejected: there being—ayes 30, noes 94.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon agreeing to the original resolution.

Mr. PATTERSON. I hope the resolution will be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. That can be done by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the reading of the resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. The reading will consume a great deal of time—probably ten minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. I was not on the floor when the resolution was read before.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I object.

The question being taken, the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NEWLANDS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] claim the floor?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to resume the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. HULL in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on this bill was exhausted on Saturday last. The Committee of the Whole will now proceed to consider the bill under the five-minute rule. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of Secretary of Agriculture, $8,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $4,500; Chief Clerk, who shall be superintendent of the Department buildings, $2,500; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, $2,000; stenographer to the Secretary of Agriculture, $1,400; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $1,600; one librarian, $1,800; one assistant librarian, $1,400; one appointment clerk, $2,200; one chief of Supply Division, $2,000; one telegraph and telephone operator, $1,200; one clerk class 4, $1,800; three clerks class 3, $4,800; four clerks class 2, $5,600; ten clerks class 1, $12,000; ten clerks at $1,000 each, $10,000; six clerks at $840 each, $5,040; one engineer, who shall be captain of the watch, $1,600; one fireman, who shall be steam fitter, $900; one assistant fireman, $720; one assistant fireman, $600; four night watchmen at $720 each, $2,880; messengers, laborers, mechanics, day watchmen, and charwomen, $20,000; in all, $94,540.

Division of Accounts and Disbursements: Chief of division and disbursing clerk, $2,500; one assistant chief of division, $2,000; one cashier, $1,800; two clerks class 3, $3,200; four clerks class 2, $5,600; one clerk class 1, $1,200; in all, $16,300.

Mr. BLUE. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. WADSWORTH] some questions in regard to the reductions made by this bill. The report shows, I believe, that there has been something like $145,000 of reduction. First, I will ask, has there been any reduction of salaries?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the first clause, the law clerk was struck out, for whom the amount estimated was $2,200. We also struck out one clerk of class 4, $1,800. This was done at the suggestion of the Department. I understand the gentleman is inquiring now in regard to the first clause of the bill.

Mr. BLUE. Are those the only reductions?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir; the only reductions in that clause.

Mr. BLUE. Have there been any increases in the salaries of officers in that clause?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir.

A MEMBER. Or in the number of officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir.

Mr. BLUE. At this point I should like to be informed by the chairman of the committee where the reductions occur.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You mean throughout the bill?

Mr. BLUE. Yes, sir; if the gentleman has the information conveniently at hand.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We can not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. BLUE. I have asked the chairman of the committee where the reductions occur in this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you mean in this item?

Mr. BLUE. Not only in this item, but through the entire bill, if the gentleman has a statement showing in detail where the reductions have been made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would suggest to the chairman that there has been an increase in the Animal Bureau; a chief clerk dropped and an assistant chief of division added at an increased salary; a man who does not know hollow horn from botts. [Laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the Weather Bureau there has been a reduction of some $13,000 in salaries. That is the most important change in the matter of salaries in the bill. There are a number of minor changes, but these I can explain as we reach them in the different paragraphs of the bill. It will be more convenient to adopt that course than to make a general statement now.

Mr. BLUE. I would like to have a detailed statement of the reductions, if the chairman will be kind enough to furnish it, because this is a bill on which there should be no reductions except for evident reason. It carries a small amount and is for the benefit of a very large proportion of the population of the United States. The reductions, as far as I have been able to ascertain, would be wholly unnecessary; and I would be very glad to have the chair-

man have the statement prepared of the exact condition of the bill as it is now reported as soon as possible.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should have to go all through the bill and take up each item for that purpose.

Mr. BLUE. I would be glad if the gentleman would state the principal items, then.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the first section of the bill there is one law clerk stricken out——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the general debate has been closed, and the pending section, which has just been read, is all that is before the committee. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I ask, for information, if it is not the rule to read the entire paragraph through and then submit amendments to it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was just saying that if there is no objection, the chairman of the committee can make a statement covering the reductions in the bill, although the general debate has been closed. Otherwise it would have to be proceeded with by paragraphs.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would prefer to explain the paragraphs as we reach them.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask whether the reductions in the Weather Service of which he speaks are recommended by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are recommended by the chief of the Bureau, and also by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PICKLER. Are all of the reductions made in the bill recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WADSWORTH. With the exception of a few small ones. In the main they were all recommended by him, but a few were made by the committee on our own responsibility. I ask for the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Publications: Chief of Bureau, $2,500; assistant chief of Bureau, $1,800; one editorial clerk, $1,600; one proof reader and indexer, $1,400; one clerk, $1,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment I wish to offer here to change the word "Bureau," in line 9, where it occurs the second time, to "Division," and also where it occurs in line 10. It is simply a typographical mistake in framing the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add in line 14, page 3, after the word "dollars," the words "in all, $8,300."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I accept that amendment. It was simply an error in not footing up the total of the paragraph.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Document section: One chief of section, $2,000; one foreman, $1,800; one chief folder, $1,200; one clerk class 1, $1,200; five copyists at $840 each, $4,200; seven folders at $600 each, $4,200; in all, $22,700.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move as an amendment, in line 21, to strike out "22,700," and insert "22,900." It was an error in footing up the total.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of division, $2,500; one assistant chemist, $1,800; one assistant chemist, $1,600; one clerk class 1, $1,200; employment of additional assistants in Division of Chemistry when necessary, $5,000; in all, $12,100.

Mr. LONG. I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of this bill if there is a reduction in the Division of Chemistry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the title "employment of additional assistants in the Division of Chemistry when necessary" there is a reduction of $5,000. That was done for the reason that a great deal of the work done heretofore by the Chemistry Division is done now through the different scientific divisions. They all need laboratories, microscopes, and so on, and the reduction was made because we thought the work could be done just as satisfactorily through the other divisions with the materials they have at hand.

Mr. LONG. There is a reduction, then, of $5,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. But this morning, after a conversation with the Secretary of Agriculture and with Mr. Dabney, the Assistant Secretary, I have agreed that I would consent to an increase of this item to $10,000, if the Senate would agree to it.

Mr. LONG. Why do you not make that motion now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not wish to make it now because we have not the information. What I suggested was that if the Department can furnish satisfactory assurances to the Senate that would induce them to make this amount ten thousand, I would not object. If, on further presentation to the Senate, they shall agree to insert that amount I will concur.

Mr. LONG. That is, if the Senate increases it to ten thousand you will not object?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Why not put it in now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. For the reason that I wish them to present their further facts to the Senate, on which they may induce the Senate to base the proposed action.

Mr. LONG. And you are willing for the increase?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; under the circumstances I have stated. When these facts were stated to me this morning by the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, I was alone, and though satisfactory to me, I alone had no right to authorize the insertion in the bill of such a proposition.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the gentleman to explain why there is any necessity for this increase? Why does the gentleman suspect that the Senate is going to ask to have it increased to $10,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Assistant Secretary Dabney wanted to present certain facts to the Senate and to ask for the increase. These facts he stated to me, and as I listened to him I was satisfied that the increase ought to be made; but there was no other member of the committee present, and I did not feel authorized to accept the amendment on my own responsibility.

Mr. LONG. Do you object now to an amendment increasing it to $10,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Personally, I have no objection, but I am the only member of the committee, so far as I know, who has considered the matter, and I do not feel authorized to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Considering the extraordinary increases that have been made in this Bureau—this Department that used to be a bureau—from time to time, in the last three or four years——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you mean the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and the extraordinary statement from year to year of how much is being saved—that is, not expended—by the Secretary of Agriculture, how much better he is than Congress, and how economical he is, does my friend from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] view with approval a proposition to further increase this appropriation, even above the amount which the committee have recommended to the House?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have said that individually I was convinced that it ought to be done. But I was not willing to say that I would favor it on the floor of the House, because none of the other members of the committee had been consulted.

Mr. CANNON. If this increase of $5,000 is made, has my friend any assurance that it will not be just $5,000 more "saved," that this economical Secretary may proclaim to the country as a saving between this and the ides of November?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No amendment has been offered, and all this talk is out of order. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] only purposed to give the Democratic party a little slap in the face about the administration of that Department.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I was reenforcing the vigorous language of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] touching the Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And you were doing right.

Mr. CANNON. I could not give gentlemen on that side a monopoly of all that business. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. This matter was fully discussed with the Secretary of Agriculture, and it was with his consent and approval that this reduction was made.

Mr. LONG. Does the gentleman state that it was made at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The explanation was that this work that had formerly been done in this division was now being done in other divisions, and that this amount was all that was needed.

Mr. PICKLER. Is not the Secretary of Agriculture willing to wipe out the whole Department?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We are not trying the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PICKLER. I think he ought to be tried.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. He is running that Department on business principles, and when he says that he thinks a particular item can be reduced, and that the work is being done elsewhere, I fail to understand why we should increase that item here.

Mr. PICKLER. Simply because on his recommendations the whole Agricultural Department will go out of existence pretty soon.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I think the matter was well understood. The members of the subcommittee understood it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. If no amendment is offered, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Division of Agrostology: One agrostologist, who shall be chief of division, $2,500; one assistant chief, $1,800; one assistant, $1,500; one assistant, $1,400; one histologist, $900; in all, $8,100.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out the Division of Agrostology. I consider that a very important division, much more so than garden seeds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] moves to strike out the paragraph just read.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, during the years that have passed over our heads, which involved the discussion of the Morrison tariff bill, the Mills bill, the bill of 1890, the law of 1894, and the attempted legislation of the present Congress to relieve the Treasury from bankruptcy, a great deal has been said about the effect of our legislation upon the agricultural interests of the country, and we were told, in language more eloquent than I can hope to use, that the great aim and purpose of the Democratic party on this floor and in the country was to enlarge the scope of our markets in foreign lands for the productions of our agricultural interests. We were told that we were, by the law of 1890, building around the agriculturists of this country a Chinese wall. I remember listening with intense interest to a splendid argument by a distinguished member of this House, now a distinguished member of the United States Senate, in which he argued from premises as follows:

If you buy abroad, you may sell abroad; but if you do not buy the commodities manufactured in foreign lands, you can not have a market for the agricultural products of your own land.

That is an argument as old as the discussion of this question, which is a hundred years and upward in this country; and yet it has always had to me a very interesting sound, and if we were driven to the discussion of theories, it seems to me this side of the Chamber, having the views that I do, would have difficulty in maintaining our position.

The time has come at last in this country when we have something besides theories to go on. We are no longer driven to the consideration of theoretical propositions, of discussions that emanate from distinguished doctrinaires of the colleges. They have become utterly valueless to the ear of the American voter, because the American voter has a lesson now based upon actual facts, based upon actual knowledge, based upon actual conditions, that answers conclusively all the theories and relegates into the obscurity which they deserve to occupy upon this question the men in the colleges, scientific men, who undertake to preach the doctrine of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," as applied to the question of the sale of the agricultural products of one's country.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a brief statement showing the effect upon the agricultural interests of this country in detail of the law of 1890, and the changes involved in the repeal of the law, the striking down of the section providing for reciprocity contained in the law known as the statute of 1890, the McKinley law, and I will add this statement to the remarks which I have here made:

HOSTILE TO THE FARMERS—ASTONISHING RESULTS OF THE WILSON TARIFF LAW—A DEFINITE COMPARISON OF ITS WORKINGS WITH THOSE OF THE M'KINLEY LAW IN A GIVEN PERIOD NOW POSSIBLE FOR THE FIRST TIME—A FALLING OFF OF $83,000,000 IN THE VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS EXPORTED, WHILE THE IMPORTS HAVE INCREASED LARGELY.

[By telegraph to the New York Tribune.]

WASHINGTON, *February 14.*

The great mass of citizens of the United States who are dependent on agriculture for a livelihood will perhaps be astonished to find to how great an extent the new tariff law is discriminating against them, both in the matter of the importation of their own products and the importation of foreign products which compete with their own labor. They have had intimations of this in the fragmentary statements which it has been possible to present from time to time of the workings of the new law, but it is now possible for the first time to compare definitely from official publications the workings of the new law in a given period with those of the McKinley law. And the statement thus obtained shows that in practically every department of agriculture the new law has placed the great population of this country who are dependent on agriculture at a great disadvantage.

The Treasury Department arranges its statements of the operations of the customs law in two different forms. At the close of the fiscal year, June 30, it presents a statement showing the amount and value of imports and exports during the twelve months ending at that date. At the close of the calendar year it presents a statement showing the imports and exports during the twelve months ending December 31. The operations of the McKinley law ended August 28, 1894; therefore, the last full year of its workings shown by any official statement in detail would be the year ending June 30, 1894, which is usually termed the "fiscal year 1894." The Wilson law went into effect August 28, 1894; therefore, the first full year's statement in detail which can be had of its operations is the calendar year 1895. Naturally, neither the old nor the new law worked normally during the few weeks preceding or following the date at which the change was made—August 28, 1894—and a comparison of the fiscal year ending a few weeks prior to that date with the calendar year beginning a few weeks after that date is essentially a fair one to both laws. Besides, it is the only method of comparing official statements of the workings of the two laws during periods of equal length nearest to the date at which the old law ceased to be operative and the new one went into effect. A comparison, therefore, of the imports and exports during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, with those of the calendar year beginning January 1, 1895, places side by side the two yearly official statements obtainable which most nearly touch on either side the date at which the change was made from the old to the new law.

MISLEADING DEMOCRATIC PROMISES.

A good many of the 30,000,000 of people who are dependent on agriculture in this country, and who recall the fervor with which the Democratic statesmen denounced the McKinley law as hostile to the farmer, and characterized the Wilson law as one which would be greatly to his advantage, will be surprised to learn that under the Wilson law the imports of farm products in competition with their own labor have been much greater than they were under the McKinley law, while the exports of farm products have fallen off since the repeal of the McKinley law. The orators who denounced the McKinley law and favored the Wilson law insisted that they were legislating in a way that would protect the farmer and yet increase his sales abroad. That their promises were misleading, inaccurate, and untrue is apparent from a comparison of the actual workings of the new law with those of the McKinley law.

In all the great articles of farm production, such as wheat, barley, wool, hides, tobacco, meats, flax, breadstuffs, hops, hay, hemp, cotton, and others, the importations have largely increased under the new law, while in the same class of articles the exportations under the new law have decreased. These statements, it should be remembered, are based on official figures furnished by the Treasury Department, covering the years most nearly touching the date at which the change was made from the McKinley law to the Wilson law. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894, the last fiscal year under the McKinley law, the exports of products of domestic agriculture amounted to $828,714,773. In the year 1895, the first calendar year under the Wilson law, the exports of products of domestic agriculture amounted to only $545,714,375. This was a falling off of $83,000,000 in the amount exported. That the new law actually discriminates against the farmer is shown by the fact that but 67 per cent of the total exports of 1895 under the new law were agricultural products, while over 72 per cent of the exports in the last year of the McKinley law were agricultural products.

THE OFFICIAL FIGURES.

The following tables show, from official reports of the Treasury Department, the imports and exports of farm products in the last fiscal year under the McKinley law compared with the first calendar year under the Wilson law. It may be worth while repeating the statement already made, that these two periods—the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894, and the calendar year beginning January 1, 1895—most nearly touch the date at which the change was made from the old to the new law of any annual periods covered by the official statements of the Treasury Department. The fiscal year 1894 closed two months before the end of the operations of the McKinley law, and the calendar year 1895 began four months after the Wilson law had begun its work. Each year's figures may, therefore, be assumed to present a fairly normal picture of the workings of the two laws, and thus to give for the first time since the enactment of the Wilson law an absolutely accurate official comparison of their operations as affecting the great class of citizens of the United States dependent on agriculture:

Imports of farm products.

	McKinley law, fiscal year 1894.	Wilson law, calendar year 1895.
Hides	$17,270,637	$36,432,989
Tobacco	11,001,798	15,225,726
Wines	6,739,425	7,222,102
Wool	6,107,438	33,770,159
Leather	4,508,330	7,745,092
Cotton (unmanufactured)	3,010,205	5,171,099
Rice	2,464,226	2,955,329
Animals	2,411,066	3,365,123
Seeds	2,395,695	4,650,430
Breadstuffs (all)	1,981,317	2,886,736
Provisions (all)	1,797,847	2,106,130
Flax (unmanufactured)	1,336,845	2,239,920
Cheese	1,247,198	1,471,091
Hay	761,937	2,191,635
Wheat	761,177	1,121,789
Feathers	726,692	3,063,636
Hops	484,415	547,045
Barley	358,744	501,137
Hemp	239,918	1,212,243
Eggs	199,536	219,459

Exports of farm products.

Cotton	$210,869,298	$189,890,645
Breadstuffs (all)	166,774,558	125,604,486
Provisions (all)	145,262,273	132,456,843
Flour	69,271,760	50,292,886
Wheat	59,470,041	40,898,547
Lard	40,089,721	37,348,753
Bacon	38,338,357	37,411,944
Animals (all)	35,698,180	33,791,014
Cattle	33,455,092	26,997,701
Corn	30,211,154	27,907,766
Beef	16,696,583	16,522,018
Oil cake and meal	8,807,807	7,851,246
Seeds (all)	7,941,935	1,983,894
Cheese	7,180,232	3,401,117
Distilled spirits	5,676,936	1,685,460
Pork	5,067,773	4,430,155
Clover seed	4,540,822	1,126,618
Hides	3,972,487	2,835,947
Hops	3,844,194	1,745,945
Tallow	2,706,164	1,207,350
Flaxseed	2,426,284	31,076
Barley	2,379,714	1,485,038
Sugar and molasses	2,209,265	1,886,672
Oats	2,027,994	599,835
Vegetables	1,740,604	1,557,467
Hay	890,503	698,934
Broom corn	210,742	179,856
Rye	126,532	724

This statement shows conclusively that low tariff, tariff reduction, tariff for revenue without revenue, such as we have now,

has barred the access of American agriculturists to the markets of other countries of the world; that instead of the contention of the doctrinaires being worked out by actual observations and by actual conditions, we find ourselves being gradually driven out of the market and narrowed down in the sale of our agricultural productions to the markets of our own country, and those markets circumscribed and cut down to the aggregate demands for agricultural products under the depreciation in value of the manufactured products of the country which are driven out of foreign markets, and hence the reduction and decrease in the expenditures of the American laboring man and consumer. This is all I desire to say. The demonstrations which I will embody in my remarks are official, coming from Democratic sources alone, and they will more than prove the truth of my proposition.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then do I understand that low tariff benefits the home market?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I say that it destroys the home market. I think you will find it plain when you read it.

The Clerk read down to and including line 24, page 6.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I reserve all points of order on the following paragraph—Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One Chief of Bureau, $4,000; one assistant chief of Bureau, $2,500; one chief of inspection division, $2,500; one assistant chief of inspection division, $1,800; one chief of dairy division, $2,500; one assistant chief of dairy division, $1,800; one chief of pathological division, $2,500; one assistant in pathological division, $1,400; one assistant in pathological division, $840; one chief of bio-chemic division, $2,500; two assistants in bio-chemic division, at $1,400 each, $2,800; one assistant in bio-chemic laboratory, $720; one chief of miscellaneous division, $2,250; one zoologist, $2,250; two veterinary inspectors, at $1,800 each, $3,600; two veterinary inspectors, at $1,400 each, $2,800; one assistant at veterinary experiment station, $1,000; one clerk, class 4, $1,800; one clerk, class 3, $1,600; one clerk, class 2, $1,400; five clerks, class 1, $6,000; seven clerks, at $1,000 each, $7,000; one clerk, at $840; two firemen, at $720 each, $1,440; four messengers, at $720 each, $2,880; two skilled laborers, at $660 each, $1,320; for employment of artists, laborers, and charwomen, $5,000; in all, $67,040.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I offer an amendment to that paragraph; but, first, Mr. Chairman, before my amendment is read, I desire to submit a point of order to the Chair. The act of Congress authorizing the establishment of this division distinctly states that the salary of the Chief of said Bureau shall be $3,000 per annum, and the Commissioner shall appoint a clerk for said Bureau with a salary of $1,500 per annum. The act of March 2, 1891, increased the salary of that clerk to $2,000. In this bill that clerk is dropped, and you have one assistant chief of Bureau, at an increased salary over that of the clerk of $500. Therefore this bill changes existing law, drops the chief clerk at $2,000, and puts in one assistant chief of the division at $2,500. There is no law, Mr. Chairman, for an assistant chief of the division; no law authorizing his appointment; no law authorizing his salary; and I must say, with all due deference to the chairman of the committee and the committee, there is no work for the assistant to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the chairman of the committee on the point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I refer the gentleman to the act of Congress establishing the Bureau.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I find that these salaries have heretofore all been paid out of a lump sum by the Secretary. He had absolute power to fix these salaries as he pleased. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The salary of chief clerk of the Bureau was fixed as provided in the law, and the officer that they propose to install here in his stead is not provided for. There has not been any provision for it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I repeat, for the information of the House, that in the last appropriation bill all these salaries were paid from the lump sum appropriated for the support of the Bureau, and a lump appropriation of $800,000 was provided, and the salaries of all the employees were regulated entirely by the Secretary and by the Chief of the Bureau.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the committee will permit me, I suggest that all the laborers outside of those specified in the act were employed. They are not under specified salaries. He was given $800,000 for expenditures, and the law says that he shall not have more than 20 employees. He had 700 outside of the city last year and 50 inside, making 750 employed, when the law restricts him to 20. I will send the law up and have it read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. The Commissioner of Agriculture shall organize in his Department a Bureau of Animal Industry and shall appoint a chief thereof, who shall be a competent veterinary surgeon, whose duty it shall be to investigate and report upon the condition of the domestic animals of the United States, their protection and use, and also inquire into and report the causes of contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases among them, and the means for the prevention and cure of the same, and to collect such information on those subjects as shall be useful to the agricultural and commercial interests of the country, and the Commissioner of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ a force sufficient for this purpose, not to exceed 20 persons at any one time. The salary of the Chief of said Bureau shall be $3,000 per annum and the Commissioner shall appoint a clerk for said Bureau with a salary of $1,500 per annum.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are but two salaried officers provided for in that act, the chief and the clerk, both whose salaries are fixed, but by an act dated March 2, 1895, Congress increased the salary of the clerk to $2,000. There has been no assistant chief since 1893, but in January last, this year, the Secretary appointed a certain doctor in this town—an M.D., not a veterinary surgeon—as assistant chief of that division, a man who knows nothing in the world about veterinary surgery, although the act requires that this officer shall be a veterinary surgeon. There are several reasons why this provision is out of order. First, it changes existing law; second, it increases the appropriation, and third, it puts an officer in that division who is not competent in the face of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he has investigated this subject and if he is entirely certain that the act of 1884 has not been amended as to the number of employees that may be employed in this Bureau?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It has not. The same act of May 29, 1884, gave the Secretary of Agriculture a bulk sum of $800,000 without specifying a single officer that was to be employed or a single salary that was to be paid, the money being used to pay laborers and experts at the different stock yards and stock pens throughout the country. That $800,000 has been disbursed in that way, but the law recognizes only two officers of this Bureau and fixes their salaries.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it can hardly be that that statute of 1884 has not been amended at some time with respect to the number of employees; for certainly 20, nor three times 20, nor five times 20 could not accomplish the work that this Bureau is set to do; but if the gentleman is correct as to that provision of the statute remaining unchanged, of course the point of order would be a good one against the Bureau having more than 20 employees.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am not making a point against the Bureau having more than 20 employees.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I want to suggest that I am glad that the Committee on Agriculture has undertaken to appropriately determine in each appropriation bill the number of officials that there shall be in each of these bureaus of the Agricultural Department, just as is done with respect to every other Department of the Government, and to provide definitely for their salaries. There can be no more vicious method of making appropriations than appropriating a lump sum and giving full authority to the heads of Departments to determine not only the number of officials and others that shall be employed, but their salaries. I commend very heartily the wisdom of the Committee on Agriculture in endeavoring, so far as this Bureau is concerned, to put an end to that practice and to provide specifically what each official who is to be paid out of these appropriations shall receive.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Unfortunately the committee does not do that. They give him the $800,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir; we do not. We reduce the appropriation by more than the amount paid for salaries.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will refer the gentleman to the act approved March, 1891, page 44, where the Secretary is given authority to employ as many persons as he may deem necessary, including $1,000 temporary compensation to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry. There is one amendment, and it is the only amendment that we have had to the act since its passage.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman does not hold that the law of 1884 is still applicable, confining this Bureau to 20 employees?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have not made a point of order on that. I have merely suggested that the law authorized the employment of 20 persons, and that the Commissioner now has 750. I mention that fact to bring it to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, the gentleman must know that the Bureau of Animal Industry is probably the most important Bureau of the Department, and I think the law of 1884 must have been amended, because the Bureau has been going on for several years with a large number of employees.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will look at the act of 1895, he will find all the change that has ever been made. That act gives the Commissioner $800,000, to be spent as he pleases.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the question is on the point of order, and it is entirely to that that I wish to direct attention. The point of order is not that the Committee on Agriculture has classified the bulk appropriations hitherto made, and put it at the disposal of the Secretary of Agriculture, as the gentleman from Maine seems to think. The point of order is that this changes existing law, inasmuch as it abolishes a statutory office that, in the act of 1884, was created. In that act two statutory offices, and two only, were fixed—that is the act establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry. One officer of that Bureau was a clerk, whose salary was fixed at $1,500 per annum.

Now, there has never been any change of that statute establish-

ing these statutory officers—and I ask the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Maine, because I do not believe that after he hears the grounds upon which the point of order is made, he will contend that it is not well taken—there has never been any change in the law to establish these statutory offices. There has been a change in a subsequent appropriation bill of the salary which these statutory officers were to receive.

Now, the point made is that here is an amendment which changes an existing law by abolishing a statutory office. It seems to me so clear that the abolition of a statutory office is a change of existing law that it is not worth while to argue it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But it does reduce expenditures.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; it increases the expenditure $500 a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are two answers to the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York. The first is, as I understand the rules of the present House, the limitation upon the point of order which may be made and which was made by the Democratic Houses—namely, that a point of order did not lie if the proposition reduced expenditures—is not a limitation under the present rules of the House. The second answer is one of fact, that it does not reduce the expenditures, because it provides, instead of the officer abolished, another officer with an increase of salary of two hundred and twenty or two hundred and fifty dollars per annum.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the gentleman's charge is entirely wrong in one respect. He says that while we have been classifying the appropriations for this Bureau we have repealed the old appropriation for bulk sums and put them in the hands of the Secretary without any reduction. He is entirely mistaken in this. We have made a considerable saving in the total appropriations when we take everything into consideration. We have reduced the bulk appropriation from $800,000 to $650,000, I think.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is a reduction of $83,000 in that Bureau.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that respect the gentleman from Maine is right. The work which the Agricultural Committee has done is a work worthy of all praise. There is nothing in the Government operations that I know of that seems to me to be more wrong in principle than the idea of leaving vast sums of money under the control and to be expended exclusively at the discretion of the executive officers of the Government.

But the point of order is not directed to that. The point of order is that there is a change of existing law, and the point of order is sustained by the assertion that the existing law embodies the establishment of a statutory office and that this changes that statutory office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the point of order to be first to the whole of this paragraph with reference to the salary of the Chief of this Bureau?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; only to that part of it dropping the chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That you are abolishing an office here by creating another one, namely, one assistant chief of division. My point of order is that you have no right to abolish the chief clerk, who is provided for by statutory law, and substitute an assistant chief of division in his stead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, I offer the amendment I send up, so as to provide for the deficiency thus created.

Mr. BRODERICK. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. BRODERICK. Does the gentleman maintain that the point of order will lie to the simple omission to make an appropriation to pay a salary? This is not a proposition to abolish an office, it is not a proposition to change the law, but simply an omission to make an appropriation for a salary.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands this to be the abolition of an office entirely and the creation of another with an increase of salary of $500.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, I ask that the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 1 of page 7, after the word "dollars," strike out "one assistant chief," and insert in lieu thereof "one chief clerk"; and in line 2 strike out "five hundred"; so that the clause will read "one chief clerk of Bureau, $2,000."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That amendment puts back the officer as authorized by law and at the salary authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Georgia that as the words "two thousand five hundred" have been struck out on the point of order, it will be necessary to make the language of the amendment somewhat broader. The reason the Chair did not decide the point of order before was that he understood it was reserved, with the understanding that if the amendment were voted down the point should be insisted on.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then I offer the whole proposition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand that the words "one assistant chief of Bureau at $2,500," in line 1, page 7, have been eliminated on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And now I move an independent amendment, to insert, after the word "dollars," the words "one chief clerk of Bureau at $2,000."

The Clerk read the amendment of Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. The Department does not need that officer, and so informed the subcommittee. Certainly this House does not want to force upon the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other Secretary, an officer that he does not need to transact the business of the Department.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In answer to that remark, I wish to say that the present chief clerk has been serving since 1893 under the law. Prior to that, for eight years, a gentleman by the name of Cowing held the place of chief clerk. This officer is provided for by law; and the other officer whom the gentleman so generously inserted in the bill was not provided for by law. I will ask the gentleman whether there is any necessity for an assistant chief?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why, the gentleman from Georgia knows himself that one chief of that division can not properly transact its business. As I have said, this is probably the most important Bureau of the whole Agricultural Department. It deals with millions and millions of dollars' worth of meat exports. This Bureau is, in my view, of more practical value to the agriculturists of the country than all the other bureaus of the Agricultural Department put together.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman know the present assistant?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have met him; that is all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman know that he is nothing but an M. D.—a medical doctor?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman know that he supervises the work of eight or ten scientific men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No doubt he performs the duties devolving upon him as assistant.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture claim on this floor that it is suitable for such a man to supervise the work of those eight or ten scientific men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman makes a statement in regard to the character of this officer. I know nothing——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not a statement about his character.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I presume he is competent for the position, or he would not occupy it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He is not a veterinary surgeon or a scientific man.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I doubt whether the gentleman is correctly informed on that point. I doubt whether the Secretary of Agriculture or Dr. Salmon, the Chief of the Bureau, would deliberately violate the law and employ a man not a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I understood you thought differently the other day about the possibility of the Secretary violating the law when we were discussing his refusal to use the appropriation that the House had made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is another matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is a gray horse of another color?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Entirely.

Mr. KEM. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will answer it if I can.

Mr. KEM. This is a matter of some importance, and I should like to ask the gentleman this question while it is in my mind: I understood him to say a moment ago that the Secretary of Agriculture had in his employ over 700 men of a certain class, while the law provided for the employment of but 20. Now, the chairman of the committee has just asked the gentleman from Georgia whether he supposed the Secretary of Agriculture would violate the law. I want to ask the gentleman whether, if that statement be true, the Secretary has not violated the law in that respect?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, the act of 1895, as I stated, gave the Secretary of Agriculture $800,000 in bulk, to be expended, I am sorry to say, just as he pleased, without any responsibility to anybody.

Mr. KEM. Does not the law specify that there shall not be more than 20 men employed at one time in that branch of his Department?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does.

Mr. KEM. And if he has employed over 700 has he not violated the law?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is an inference which the gentleman can draw just as well as I can.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me it does not require any drawing of inferences. The fact stands out for itself.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman will bear in mind that we are dealing with an officer who is very strict in his construction of constitutional law and all that—so much so that he sometimes sets aside a statute of Congress.

Mr. KEM. But my point is that the chairman of the committee rose and asked whether it was to be supposed that the Secretary of Agriculture would violate the law——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to suggest to the chairman of the committee, in all good faith, that if we do not insert this provision for one chief clerk there will be no salary appropriated for this, an officer provided for by law—the chief clerk. As the provision for the assistant chief clerk has been ruled out on the point of order, the Department will be left in a dilemma unless the amendment I propose be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will guarantee that they will get along without it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. As they did under the eight-hundred-thousand-dollar appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A clerk will be detailed for this service, if necessary.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I again call the gentleman's attention to the fact that G. M. Brumbaugh, an M. D. of the city of Washington, a practicing physician, was taken from the ranks of the medical profession in this District, and without any knowledge of veterinary surgery, without any preparation for that line of work at all, was put in there in place of this law clerk provided for by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. My objection is simply this——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to submit any observations by way of criticism of the committee, inasmuch as I am not familiar with the duties of the office sought to be abolished or the duties of the proposed office. I do not know whether either office is essential. I do insist, however, that it is fair to presume that the office of chief clerk is necessary, because there is an express provision of the statute, as I understand it, creating the office. Mr. Chairman, it may be necessary, in the reorganization of this Bureau, to create the office just stricken out on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Georgia, but I submit that, under the rules of the House, the rule having been invoked, and this proposed office having been eliminated from the bill, that we should now execute the law authorizing a chief clerk for this Bureau. If that officer is not necessary, if there are no duties for him to perform, then, as an individual member on this floor, I shall not interpose a point of order if the chairman of the committee will now submit an amendment repealing the law creating the office. It seems to me clear, however, that Congress, when the original act was passed, thought this office a necessity. It has now an independent statutory position that perhaps gives it an importance that does not attach to some other positions in this same paragraph.

I submit, therefore, in equity and in fairness, that this officer's salary be provided for, or else the chairman of the committee should at this time submit a proposition to repeal the law creating the office. It seems to me that this is the analysis of the situation: If the office is not necessary—and I do not assume to speak on this question, because I have no information—then the statute should be repealed; but do not repeal it by indirection, because the rules absolutely forbid such action. I shall vote to repeal the law if the chairman submits the proper motion.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The Chair has ruled very properly, doubtless, that this provision should be stricken out, upon the point of order raised by the gentleman from Georgia, who assured me only as recently as Saturday evening that no points of order would be raised on this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not against a farmer; that is what I said.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I trust this matter will be allowed to remain just as it is. This action was taken by the committee after full consultation with Dr. Salmon and with the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, and if there is any politics in the matter it has been injected by the Secretary of Agriculture. Both the chiefs of division and the Secretary say that they do not care for this official, and I know of no reason why we should insist.

Mr. DOCKERY. Then why not repeal the law?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I know of no reason why we should insist on retaining an official that neither the head of the Department nor the chief of division cares to retain. I hope the matter will be allowed to rest just as the Chair has left it, with this section stricken out, and I certainly hope that gentlemen on this side of the House will fully understand that if there is any politics in the matter it is injected by the other side of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I should like to ask my friend one question before he takes his seat. Does he believe that the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Assistant Secretary, and the committee combined, have the right to repeal a law?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I am not discussing that issue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is just what you propose.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I am not here to defend the honorable Secretary of Agriculture. I believe he is capable of taking care of himself. He has possibly been somewhat ungracious and hasty, but I want to say this: After a careful examination of the several divisions of the Department of Agriculture, I believe good and efficient work is being done in all of those departments, and it has been the effort of this committee in making appropriations to give them all the money they could efficiently use, not to mar the efficiency of any department, and we think in presenting this bill we have done so. The action taken here by the committee was taken entirely at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] rules it out upon a point of order, and I hope this side of the House will stand by the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. PICKLER. I want to ask a question for information, as to whether this clerk who is legislated out is named Mr. Lyle?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know his name.

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman from Georgia know as to that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe the clerk's name is Lyle. I think he is a free-silver man. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. The question I want to ask is, whether the clerk who is legislated out was not put into the Agricultural Department upon the recommendation of the Senators from Missouri, and whether this arrangement to legislate him out has been gotten up by the Secretary of Agriculture since the debate on the resolution in the Senate a few days ago in regard to seeds? Has the gentleman any information in regard to that?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We have no information except that the recommendation for this legislation was made long before the debate in the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the question of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. PICKLER. As to whether the clerk legislated out by this bill was not a clerk put into the Agricultural Department upon the recommendation of the Senators from Missouri?

Mr. WADSWORTH. On that point the committee have no information.

Mr. PICKLER. Wait until I finish my question. I ask further if this proposed legislation is not upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, and if it has not been made by him since the debate in the Senate a few days ago on the seed resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To the second part of the gentleman's question I will say that this bill was framed at least ten days before the Senator from Missouri submitted his celebrated speech in which he attacked the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PICKLER. Is it not further true that in the first estimate submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture this clerk was estimated for by name, and that he has changed that since the debate took place in the Senate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That estimate was not made by name, but there was in the estimates an appropriation for a chief clerk, just as there were many other estimates that are not contained in the bill now.

Mr. PICKLER. Why did the Secretary make the change?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not the custodian of the Secretary's mind.

Mr. PICKLER. Is that not since the debate in the Senate took place?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would suggest if the gentleman from South Dakota should address his inquiry to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] he would be more apt to get information on the subject than by addressing his inquiry to the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, so far as concerns the interrogatory submitted by the gentleman from South Dakota, I will say it is true that when the estimates came from the Secretary of Agriculture they came there with an estimate for this office, and that subsequently, upon advice of the chief of the Bureau, that estimate was changed, in which advice the Secretary of Agriculture coincided. It is also true, as was said by the chairman of the committee, who never goes beyond the limits of the strictest truth in making any assertion, that the committee has no official

knowledge of the state of facts mentioned by the gentleman from South Dakota; but it is a fact that this man whose office is being attempted to be abolished by this resubmission in an estimate from the Department of Agriculture is a free-silver Missouri Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is the trouble with him, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the House to a few facts bearing upon the question as to whether this office is necessary in the absence of another office, namely, that of assistant chief of Bureau, to take its place, which attempt fell before the point of order. No matter what may be said of the officer, the office is necessary to the administration of the business of the Department of Agriculture. If the Secretary of Agriculture wants to get rid of the man who is holding the office, let him, in God's name, discharge him. He has the full right to do it.

Mr. PICKLER. He is under the civil service, and he can not discharge him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, he can. The civil service does not keep a man from being discharged [laughter]; it keeps a man from being appointed. Let him discharge him, and let him meet the full responsibility of that position. As I understand, this gentleman is not making any sort of point about this. But my point is that if this office is abolished that it tends to cripple the administration of the Department, as the duties of the office are absolutely necessary for the proper administration of the affairs of that Department. The Secretary of Agriculture advises the abolition of the office, but he proposes another officer in the place of that one, and if he is appointed he will attend to precisely the same duties among others. Now, under a point of order the new officer can not take his place, but the duties remain and they must be attended to.

Now, if there is to be a lick struck at this man because of his indorsers, or because of his views, or because of what not, let this gentleman, the Secretary of Agriculture, who has never been cowardly and never hid himself behind anything, strike his blow from the open. I do not assert that such is his purpose. But if the objection lie to the officer, let him abolish the officer; if the objection lie to the office, will the business of the Bureau suffer? Now, let us see. This position of chief clerk of the Bureau of Animal Industry has existed for eight or ten years, held by Judge W. J. Cowing, now deceased, during the administrations of Secretary Rusk and Secretary Colman. Its duties are practical, statutory, and executive. Distribution of mail; that duty has not ceased. Distribution of publications of Bureau; that duty has not ceased. Keeping time and supervising work of clerks; that duty must be attended to. Examining requisitions and purchase of supplies; that is absolutely indispensable. This Bureau is comparatively similar to the Weather Bureau, which has a chief clerk, at a salary of $2,250. The Weather Bureau has no assistant chief of Bureau.

Now, with respect to the office attempted to be legislated into this bill. The duties of the assistant chief are not required except in the temporary absence of the chief, as his work is scientific, and the law requires him to be a veterinarian. Now, I am informed, and I do not stand sponsor for the information upon my own knowledge, because I have no personal knowledge in that respect, but I am informed that the man sought to be legislated into this place instead of the other man, and who would be required to have knowledge of veterinary science, is a man who has no veterinary knowledge whatever. I am informed that he is not a veterinary surgeon. I therefore beg gentlemen on both sides of the House, irrespective of party politics, to remember that the duties of this office are necessary; that the office is necessary, whether it be under that particular officer or not. There should be a provision in the bill for such an office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have further time.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One other word, somewhat personally to myself. I was upon the subcommittee; I was upon the main committee; I followed in the lead of the gentleman from New York; and if anybody upon the committee is to be blamed for this part of the bill just as it appears here, I do not want to shirk my part of the blame, because at the time, with insufficient information of what I now believe to have been behind it, I stood where the gentleman from New York now stands, and therefore can have no possible criticism to make upon him.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi who, perhaps, rather leads the House to suppose that this was the only item estimated for that we threw out, I call his attention to the fact that we threw out a law clerk recommended by the Secretary, we threw out an electrician recommended by the Secretary, and we also threw out a clerk of class 4 estimated for.

Now, a word in answer to the gentleman from Missouri. When this Bureau was first organized there may have been need for a chief clerk, but that need has ceased, so the Secretary tells us and so the Chief of the Bureau tells us. Is it for this House to put a man in that Bureau against the judgment of the Secretary and the chief? I do not care who the man is or what his politics are, because that has nothing to do with the subject, in my judgment.

Mr. BRODERICK. Do I understand the gentleman from New York to say that this official has not any duties to perform there now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. His duties are so light that the Secretary and the Chief of the Bureau say that he can be dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia we shall be in this attitude: We shall have this clerk provided for by law, and as we do not abolish the office in this bill——

Mr. WADSWORTH. The best way to abolish an office is to take away the salary, is it not?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is exactly the point I am coming to. The clerk goes along and discharges the duties of the office, although you do not provide his salary, and, as I understand it, the Government will still owe a salary and he can sue for it in the Court of Claims and recover.

The fact that you do not provide his salary does not abolish the office. The Government will owe him the salary at the end of the year, and it strikes me that we either ought to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia and continue this officer, with the salary, or else we ought to repeal the law. As suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, if the office is not needed in the Bureau I trust that no man here will make a point of order against an amendment to abolish it, for certainly no gentleman would desire to continue an officer in the employ of the Government who is not needed. On the other hand, if the object is indirectly to get rid of this chief clerk by providing an officer to be called an assistant chief of the Bureau, and, by a kind of juggle, to devolve upon him the duties of the chief clerk, it seems to me that that is an indirectness which Congress ought not to be guilty of. I think we ought to go ahead and legislate directly for the attainment of the end we have in view.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I understand that while that attempt is being made, as the gentleman says, yet the law as proposed here does not even devolve the duties of the former clerk upon this assistant chief.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is correct in that. The language of the law does not, but I suppose it is intended that the Secretary of Agriculture may assign this assistant chief of the Bureau to discharge the duties of the chief clerk. Otherwise you will have the Bureau of Animal Industry without a clerk.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the situation is simply this: The Secretary of Agriculture does not want the man, and we have provided him no salary. Now, do you not think the thing will last until next Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the point of order must be sustained, but I hope the amendment will be adopted. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the duties of this Bureau of Animal Industry have grown to be among the most important in the Government, in the work that is done by it and the amount of money that is expended, and I hope that this House will not, by refusing to appropriate a salary for an officer that the law provides for, do anything that will cripple this very important Bureau. We know, Mr. Chairman, upon what small pretext the Governments of the Old World keep our meat products out of their markets, and we have to provide very carefully and guardedly for showing them that our meats have been properly inspected, or else they will make some pretext to exclude them. I know that for several years the Bureau of Animal Industry has been gradually growing, and while 20 employees, as suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska, were originally provided for, yet we all know that the great work of this Bureau can not be done now by 20 men. I suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska, also, that if the work of this Bureau had been confined to 20 men his constituents would now be howling as loudly as any people in this country.

Mr. KEM. I do not want the gentleman from Georgia to misapprehend my meaning in what I said a few moments ago. The point I wanted to bring out was, not that 20 men were sufficient to do this work, but that the Secretary of Agriculture was violating law in employing a greater number; that if more than 20 men were required, the law should be amended so as to permit him to have more; but the fact that he may need more than 20 men does not justify him in violating the law. There has been too much of that done in all branches of our Government, from the President down.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Chairman, we have put this work upon the Secretary of Agriculture. The law failed to make provision for increasing the number of officers; and where he is not to blame we should not hold him responsible. This work must be done, and, Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee of the Whole will not cut off one item of this bill. If we make any change, we should rather increase these appropriations from year to year, instead of striking anything out. I say this not because my section of the country is interested in the exportation of meats or other products, but because I think this measure is but justice to the Western farmers, who pay their pro rata part of the taxes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. MOSES. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. LIVINGSTON, there were—ayes 31, noes 35.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, 44 voting in favor thereof; and Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. WADSWORTH were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 50.

So the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Collecting agricultural statistics, Division of Statistics: Collecting domestic and foreign agricultural statistics, compiling, writing, and illustrating statistical matter for monthly, annual, and special reports; special investigations and compilations; subscriptions to and purchase of statistical publications containing data for permanent comparative records, maps and charts, stationery supplies, blanks, blankbooks, circulars, paper, envelopes, postal cards, postage stamps, freight and express charges, and necessary traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the monthly crop report issued on the 10th day of each month shall embrace a statement of the condition of the crops, by States, in the United States, with such explanations and comparisons with other months and years as may be useful for illustrating the above matter, and that it shall be submitted to and officially approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before being issued or published: *Provided also*, That $10,000 of the amount hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, may be expended in continuing the investigations concerning the feasibility of extending the demands of foreign markets for the agricultural products of the United States, $110,000.

Mr. PICKLER. I move to amend by adding the following:

For the publication of the work known as the Special Report on Diseases of the Horse, to be distributed as such publications have heretofore been distributed, $30,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will reserve his point of order for a moment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will, if the point is understood to be pending.

Mr. PICKLER. Let it be regarded as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will be reserved.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up time in discussing the gentleman's point of order. I sincerely hope, however, he will not press it, but will allow us to vote on this amendment. It provides for the publication of the book known as the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse. As is well known, this is the most popular publication ever issued by the Agricultural Department. There is not a member of this House who is not interested in it; there is not a member whose constituency are not anxious to secure these books. This question has been discussed time and again, and on no occasion when a vote has been had here on this proposition has it been voted down. This is a book for which there is a constant demand from the farmer, from the carriage man, from the drayman, from the man interested in fine horses, and from the man interested in "scrub" horses. These books are in demand everywhere; we can not have too many of them. I assure gentlemen who have not yet had a great many publications for distribution that this proposition will give them the most valuable work that they will procure while they are in Congress. It is a book that will suit their constituencies. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his point of order so that this amendment may be inserted in the bill. The amendment provides that these books shall be distributed as heretofore.

Mr. SWANSON. For how many copies of this book does your amendment provide?

Mr. PICKLER. The sum proposed to be appropriated is $30,000. I do not know exactly how many copies that sum ought to provide for. The chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. PERKINS] has information on this subject, which I am sure will be appreciated by the House, if he will be kind enough to state it.

Mr. PERKINS. I have information from the Public Printer that 75,000 copies will cost about $43,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Fifty-eight cents a copy was the estimate furnished us, I think.

Mr. PERKINS. About that sum.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman will remember that the Public Printer reported that the plates from which the old volumes had been printed were worn out, and that it would be necessary to make new electrotype plates.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The plates were worn out?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; the old stereotype plates were entirely worn out.

Mr. PICKLER. That may be. But certainly with all these divisions of the Agricultural Bureau and the great expense of the investigations that all these Bureaus are making in all of the Departments, with the inquiries they are conducting, it certainly is a very mistaken notion, it seems to me, after having gone to that expense that we now stop short and not furnish the results of that information to the people. I have already said that this was a work of great importance to the people.

Suppose it does take new plates to reprint it? That only proves that the publication was so popular among the people that the present plates were used to such an extent as to wear them out.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Let me suggest to the gentleman from South Dakota that if the point of order is well taken against the amendment, he can provide for the publication of the work in the Agricultural Report. That will have the effect of increasing the number of copies, too, very largely.

Mr. PICKLER. That might be possible, and yet I presume the same point would lie there.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will state to the gentleman from South Dakota that if he desires to offer an amendment instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to insert this matter in the annual report for the next year, although it may change existing law, I will not object, and in that way he gets an edition of 500 copies, and will make the Agricultural Report at the same time of some value to the people. But to insert it in every bill that comes along I do not think right or proper.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Put it in the Agricultural Report.

Mr. PICKLER. I would be glad to hear from the chairman of the committee on that point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will state to the gentleman that I will make no objection, and will be glad to accept an amendment of that kind.

But let me suggest to the gentleman that he propose the amendment, not at this point, but under the head of "Publications," on page 17, where it properly belongs.

Mr. PICKLER. That seems to be the desire of the committee, and I will try to conform to it. But at the same time I would like to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to proceed for a little while longer, and move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hardly thinks that would be in order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from South Dakota is now occupying the floor on a point of order, and would not be limited to five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PICKLER. I am discussing the point of order. [Laughter.]

I want to say that I do not understand that the gentleman from Tennessee is to forget, or at all events I hope he will not forget, my resolution before his committee for a publication of a separate edition of this book. A great many people do not care to have it in with the Agricultural Report, while at the same time that will suit a great many.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the amendment at this point?

Mr. PICKLER. No; I will not withdraw it. Let it go out on the point of order if it is insisted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, after line 6, insert:

"And to secure, as far as may be, a change in the methods of supplying tobacco and other farm products to foreign countries"

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. It only seeks to place tobacco on the same footing and in the same category with all other products of the soil in foreign countries. It is now trammeled by exactions laid on it in a number of countries, and is excluded from some, and the only object of the amendment is that it shall be placed in the same category with other farm products as far as that may be possible and restored to similar conditions now existing with regard to them.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CLARDY, it was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Biological survey, Division of Biological Survey: For biological investigations, including the geographic distribution and migrations of animals, birds, and plants, and for the promotion of economic ornithology and mammalogy, an investigation of the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for prepara-

tion and publication of reports thereon, and for illustrations, fieldwork, and traveling, and other expenses in the practical work of the Division, $17,500.

Mr. DOCKERY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in at the end of line 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "city of New York" where they occur and inserting in lieu thereof the words "city of St. Louis."

[Laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not do that. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Laboratory, Department of Agriculture, Division of Chemistry: Chemical apparatus, chemicals, laboratory fixtures and supplies, repairs to engine and apparatus; gas and electric current, purchase of samples and necessary expenses in conducting special investigations, including necessary expenses, labor and expert work in such investigations, $4,000; for rent of laboratory building, $900; in all, $4,900.

To investigate the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors, when deemed by the Secretary of Agriculture advisable; employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary for the purpose named; preparing, illustrating, and publishing reports and exhibiting the results of such investigations, and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue an investigation relative to the various typical soils of the United States to determine their chemical characteristics, and especially the nature of the nitrifying organisms contained therein; the preparation of reports thereon; apparatus and materials required in conducting such investigations; employment of the necessary investigators; freight and express charges, and necessary traveling expenses, $5,000; in all, for Division of Chemistry, $9,900.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there is any reduction in this item from the appropriation of last year; and if so, the reason for it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The total amount submitted last year was $14,900, and the amount submitted this year was the same. We have reduced it $5,000, in view of the fact that investigations into adulterated food have, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, been abused in this, that a great many people having yeast and other articles of commerce for the market would come to the Agricultural Department and have them analyzed, and put them on the market as perfectly pure on the authority of the analysis of the Agricultural Department, and would use that as an advertising medium.

Mr. LONG. Then this reduction is at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LONG. What is the total reduction in the Division of Chemistry in this section and in the former section?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The total reduction in this section is $5,000.

Mr. LONG. And in the preceding section, covering salaries, the reduction is also $5,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not statutory salaries, but for extra employees, to be employed when necessary.

Mr. LONG. The total reduction is $10,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I believe the gentleman is willing that $5,000 shall be added to the other section?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LONG. That is, if the Senate will place that amendment on the bill the gentleman will not oppose it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct; but I could not consent to that amendment now, because I have not consulted any other members of the committee.

Mr. LONG. You are not in favor of the appropriation of an additional $5,000 on this section, I believe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. And it is not the intention to ask for that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; not on this section; but on the other.

Mr. LONG. What other divisions have you reduced from the appropriations of last year besides the Division of Chemistry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have reduced the Division of Botany and the Division of Roads. We have reduced the forestry investigation $5,000, for the reason that the sum of eight or ten thousand dollars has been spent each year in testing the strength of timber. These tests are practically finished, and there is no need of the larger sum. We have reduced the appropriation for experimental gardens and grounds $4,500, because experience in the last three or four years shows that this can be done. The appropriation for public road inquiries has been reduced by $2,000, for the reason that we have taken the printing formerly done under this appropriation and added it to the Division of Publication and Printing. We have reduced the Division of Agrostology, or rather they estimated $15,000, and we gave $10,000, for the reason that the $15,000 heretofore paid the salaries and the general expenses of the division. There were no statutory salaries in that division under the last bill, but the salaries are now made statutory and appropriation is made for their payment. A lump sum of $10,000 is appropriated for the general expenses of the division.

Mr. LONG. And these reductions have all been made with the consent or at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WADSWORTH. All but one.

Mr. LONG. Which one?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think in the Division of Botany he did not quite consent to that reduction. He thought it was a little too great.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. In regard to the investigation of the strength of timber, what reduction has been made and under what subdivisions of the bill does that come?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the Division of Forestry. They have had an appropriation for general expenses of that division of $25,000. This bill carries $20,000.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And it is cut down now to that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The sum of eight or ten thousand dollars has been spent every year for several years in testing the strength of timber. Those tests are practically finished.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I do not think the investigations are finished so far as Western timbers are concerned, and there is a great desire expressed here that these experiments be continued until the Pacific Coast timber is thoroughly inspected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Department informs the committee that practically these tests have been finished, and that, if not actually finished, there is enough money left in the appropriation of 1895 to complete them.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Fiber investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the investigations relating to textile fibers indigenous in or adapted to the United States, including their economic growth, cleansing, and decorticating, preparatory to manufacture; the testing machines and processes for said cleansing and decorticating; for the purchase of material for said tests; for the purchase of fiber plants and seeds for distribution, propagation, and experiment, and for the labor and expenses incident thereto; and for traveling expenses in connection with said duties, $5,000.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 19, page 14, insert the following:
"And the Secretary of Agriculture shall use, in his discretion, such portion of said sum as he may deem advisable for the purchase of fiber flaxseed, to be distributed for use in the State of Washington."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural experiment stations, Office of Experiment Stations: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," and to enforce the execution thereof, $750,000, $30,000 of which sum shall be payable upon the order of the Secretary of Agriculture, to enable him to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the said act of March 2, 1887, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required by section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887, shall ascertain whether the expenditures under the appropriation hereby made are in accordance with the provisions of the said act, and shall make report thereon to Congress; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons as he may deem necessary, and to incur such other expenses for office fixtures and supplies, stationery, traveling, freight, and express charges, illustration and publication of the Experiment Station Record, bulletins, and reports as he may find essential in carrying out the objects of the above acts, and the sums apportioned to the several States shall be paid quarterly in advance. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may care to buy it copies of the card index of agricultural literature prepared by the Office of Experiment Stations and charge for the same a price covering the additional expense involved in the preparation of these copies, and he is hereby authorized to apply the moneys received toward the expense of the preparation of the index, $750,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound an inquiry to the gentleman in charge of this bill. I find by examination of the bill at this point passed by the last Congress there was an appropriation of $15,000 for irrigation investigation. I desire to know whether anywhere in this bill, as reported by the committee, there is an appropriation for the continuation of that investigation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the item for the investigation of irrigation was stricken out from the bill for this reason: For a certain number of years the question of irrigation was an experiment in this country. The Department of Agriculture has gone as far as it possibly can in instructing the people living on the streams throughout the arid regions how to irrigate. From now on it is more the duty of the Geological Survey to take the matter up and ascertain the sources of water and the quantities of water from the watersheds, and we can depend upon that service to attend to the matter. The Secretary of Agriculture believes that his Department can render no further service to the people living along the streams of the far West in practical irriga-

tion. I know it, as I am interested in irrigation to a limited extent myself.

Mr. LONG. I would like to inquire whether this provision was struck out at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think he said that he could do without the appropriation.

Mr. LONG. I desire to offer an amendment at this point.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. I desire to make an inquiry as to what was done with the former appropriation, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, of $15,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is being used. There is $6,000 or $8,000 of it used in salaries at the Bureau in Washington.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. How was the rest of it used?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In certain investigations. I can not tell you in detail.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Can not you give this committee some light on it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. On the 1st day of July, 1895, there was a balance unexpended of $2,160.42. On the 1st day of February, 1896—that is, up to date—there was an unexpended balance of $1,069.23.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. That, still, does not enlighten this committee as to what was done and what the appropriation was used for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not tell the gentleman. There are $6,000 or $7,000 paid in salaries of clerks of the Department. I think there was one chief clerk, and a chief of division at $2,500.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Then I simply say that the condemnation of the administration and not the principle is involved.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That may be the gentleman's judgment.

Mr. KEM. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LONG. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the amendment be reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 3, page 16, the following:
"Irrigation investigation: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the collection of information as to the best modes of agriculture by irrigation, $15,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with the provision of the appropriation act for the present fiscal year. I am not here to indorse the methods employed by which this appropriation was expended by the present Secretary of Agriculture. It has done some good. I do not believe that the investigation of the proper course to pursue and what can be done by irrigation is completed. I believe it is possible to do something else in that direction. There is one gratifying thing about this, and that is that the appropriation now being made will be expended not entirely by the present Secretary of Agriculture. [Applause.] His successor will expend part of it, and I am in favor of inserting this provision for the continuation of the investigations. The report of the committee shows that there has been a decrease in the appropriations over the present fiscal year of $145,358, but their report also shows that this decrease is not in salaries, but that the salaries have been increased, as shown by their report, $61,180.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman does not want to mislead the committee I am sure.

Mr. LONG. I am taking your report.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is caused entirely by the classification of the salaries in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and making certain ones statutory.

Mr. LONG. That is a reclassification which requires a larger amount than was paid before.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We take this out of the lump sum for the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the actual saving in the Bureau of Animal Industry is $87,000.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; this decrease of $145,318 is brought about in what way?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have named a number of the items to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG. It is brought about by the decrease of items just like this $15,000, throwing out entirely this provision of the bill, which was in the bill for this fiscal year. I am in favor of the continuation of this investigation. It has been of some benefit to the people that I represent, and I believe that if the Secretary of Agriculture will administer this provision in a proper way it will benefit largely the people of the Western portion of the United States. I am opposed to its being stricken from the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, and it is not fair to criticise the purposes of this amendment by saying that the Secretary of Agriculture has heretofore used these appropriations merely for the purpose of paying clerk hire in the city of Washington.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say that. I said that a portion of it, $6,000 or $8,000, had been so used. I did not mean to cast any slur upon the use of the appropriation in that way.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Well, I do not mean to cast any slur upon the committee; neither do I mean to cast any slur upon the administration, for it does not need it. [Laughter.] But I do venture to say that if $6,000 out of a total of $15,000 was used here in Washington for the payment of clerk hire, manifestly there was maladministration so far as that appropriation was concerned, though perhaps not any more than can be found in the Department generally.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to this House that three-fifths of the United States is arid in character. The future granary of the world is to-day arid and desert in character. Irrigation is yet in its infancy. This appropriation has been made in the past, and it ought to be made now, and there ought to be and will be future appropriations to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the investigations as to the best modes of promoting agriculture by irrigation. That is the object of making this appropriation, and it is no reason against it to say that the Geological Survey does this work. The Geological Survey is charged with the ascertainment of the supply and volume and flow of our rivers, but that work does not cover this point, because the Geological Survey does not investigate the question of irrigation as applied to the development of the agricultural resources of the arid regions. I insist, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of three-fifths of the area of the United States, which is yet to be the garden of the world, that we ought to have this small appropriation, and I insist that it is not proper to criticise our claim for it upon the ground that in the past the money appropriated for this purpose has not been properly applied. I trust that in the future it will be applied properly in the direction for which it was intended, and not for the purpose of paying some clerks here in the city of Washington for doing nothing.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I coincide with what has been said here by the two gentlemen who have just spoken, and I only wish this committee could realize the importance of even a small amount of work in this direction. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture intimates that this irrigation work is about finished. I can not agree to that statement. In my section of the country, where we have the greatest artesian-well belt in the world, we want this appropriation continued. We say it ought to be larger, so that the Agricultural Department might send out practical irrigators, men who understand the distribution of the water over the fields, to instruct our people, because, even after the wells are put down, our farmers do not understand the proper distribution of the water.

It is a scientific matter. It is a kind of work which the Government ought to do, a kind of work which the Government does do in every other direction. The Government investigates as to minerals and mineral lands and informs the people as to where it will be profitable to mine; in commerce it assists by coast surveys, by warnings as to rocks and points of danger, and in many ways as to weather; adaptability of different sections for different purposes it investigates and reports in the interest of the people, and certainly it ought to do the same in this matter of irrigation.

I have no criticism to make upon the Secretary of Agriculture so far as this Bureau is concerned. I believe it has done a good work so far, and the only reason why it can be said that so large a proportion of the appropriation has been expended in paying clerks in Washington is that Congress has always refused to make an adequate appropriation for this work. It is only by agitating the question and keeping it before Congress that we have been able to get any appropriation for irrigation, and I want to say that it is going to be before Congress until something is done.

In the last appropriation bill we had the pitiful sum of $15,000—it ought to have been $150,000—and that seems to have been stricken out now at the suggestion of the Secretary. It ought to have been kept in the bill. I do not want to have it understood that I am finding fault with the committee or with the chairman of the committee that have had this bill in charge. I know very well the pressure that comes upon those who are responsible for the amount carried in these appropriation bills, and I know how necessary it is for them to refuse many things that are asked of them, but at the same time I believe some discernment ought to be used in making these appropriations. This bill certainly contains appropriations of much less importance than this one for irrigation. We make provision for agrostology and for botanical and entomological investigations, for investigations for the Division of Vegetable Physiology and Pathology, and matters of that kind.

Now, I say that while you are making appropriations in this direction, gentlemen, the interests of agriculture proper are overlooked, and in fact they are always the ones that suffer. You can always get money here to build a gunboat, you can get money here for the improvement of rivers and harbors, or for fortifications along the coast, or for building ships, but it seems that as

soon as the farmers call for the publication of the horse book, or something with reference to cattle or sheep, or an appropriation like that which I am now advocating for scientific investigations along the lines that the people are demanding, the question of "economy" comes to the front and we are cut out of those appropriations. It is not right. The agricultural classes of this country pay more taxes and receive less return from the Federal Government than any other class in this country.

Here are matters for which there is an emphatic demand on the part of the people. All over the country they are asking why these appropriations are not made. Men write to us, "Why do you not send us these books?" One man writes to me, "I had a valuable horse that died the other day. If I had had this book I believe I could have saved him." Our constituents understand how these matters interest them. They understand how they are to be benefited by them.

In reference to this matter of irrigation, we want this appropriation to stand. The Secretary of Agriculture has sent out in this service scientific men who understand the distribution of these waters. After our people have gone to the expense of putting down wells—a work in which the Government ought to have helped them, and in which it must help them—they are entitled to have these investigations made. As the population of the country increases, as your cities become larger and larger, and concentrations of large populations therein, there will come a demand for more tillable land, for homes for these people who must leave the cities and find homes in the West. In these arid and semiarid regions of the country fine soils exist, none better anywhere; and the Government will have to take up these investigations so that those fine soils may be utilized. It ought not to take the back track on such a question. In my own State we have artesian wells that throw up water as high as 60 to 70 feet, and as high as 4,000 gallons per minute, and it must make our rich country a garden spot, and we want the Government to do its duty by our people.

These investigations, the expense of which is comparatively small, should be continued. This is only what the Government has done in other directions. It should instruct our people upon the distribution of these waters, so that they may realize beneficial results from the money they have expended. I hope the amendment will be sustained.

The chairman of the committee says that this is legitimately the work of the geological department. Sir, that is no answer. That department has been moving out on these lines; but I desire that this matter shall receive the attention of both branches of the Government. It is an agricultural matter, and appropriations for this purpose should be contained in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether a report has been made by the Department with reference to the expenditure of this money appropriated for the present fiscal year; and whether any specific statement has been made as to the results of these investigations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not such a report; nor has it been furnished to the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee does not know anything about what has been done with the money?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not in detail.

Mr. ANDREWS. I understand the chairman of the committee to say that something like six or eight thousand dollars of this sum of $15,000 has been expended for clerk hire. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. ANDREWS. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment, in justice, as I believe, to the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to inform the gentleman that I am not seeking to cast any reflection upon the Secretary of Agriculture or anybody else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wanted to correct——

Mr. ANDREWS. I am trying to ascertain the practical results which have been realized from the expenditure of this money, and I claim the right to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS] declines to be interrupted.

Mr. ANDREWS. I simply wish to say that for a large portion of the country lying to the west no more valuable appropriations can be made than those which seek to promote an extensive development of feasible modes of irrigation. While I shall support this amendment, I believe that the amount specified should be much larger than $15,000. I believe active measures should be pursued for the development of this question in its relations to the millions of acres of territory to the west that could be brought under profitable cultivation by irrigation.

Those who have led the westward march of civilization in this country have waged a brilliant warfare against the adversities and hardships incident to frontier life. Their successes have enriched the nation with untold millions that would have remained undeveloped had it not been for their deeds of patient toil and sacrifice. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to ask the Federal Government to assist in the discovery of ways and means whereby large portions of arid and semiarid districts of the West may be transformed into gardens and fields of plenty.

A certain gentleman sitting at my left shakes his head and says, "No, no; we already know all there is to be known on this subject of irrigation." Well, perhaps he does, but I assume that he will not be seriously offended when I call his attention to the fact, that the crowned heads and literati of the Old World talked likewise when Columbus declared that the earth is round and that by sailing westward land could be found. In spite of the self-assumed wisdom of that age, a new continent flashed into view, and time has established within its limits the greatest republic known to human history.

Numerous instances can be cited to show that neither the past nor the present holds a monopoly of knowledge. You ask Western members to vote for appropriations for coast defenses, rivers, and harbors, and we expect to do so within reasonable limits.

But, speaking for myself, I believe that the Federal Government should assist in the discovery and promotion of feasible modes of irrigation in the arid and semiarid portions of the West.

Give as liberal aid to the West in this direction as the West has always accorded to the East for the purposes mentioned, and western Kansas, and Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and their neighboring States will return to the wealth of the nation more than a hundredfold for every dollar so invested by the Federal Government.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I entirely agree with all that has been said in favor of this amendment. We have in this bill a total appropriation approximating $3,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture, and we have an appropriation suggested of only $15,000 to cover the investigation of irrigating methods. Now, gentlemen, all know the extent of the arid region. It comprises one-third of the entire area of this country. It is the field of effort and of enterprise in the future. The great agricultural depression which has prevailed for some time past, bringing about the low prices of agricultural products has temporarily blocked the progress of irrigation in this country. But we are in hopes that the proper economical laws will be passed that will restore in part, at least, the values of agricultural products which have been lost in the past few years.

We all know that the increasing population of this country will demand that larger areas be put under cultivation. It is comparatively easy to cultivate land that is watered from the heavens; it is difficult to cultivate arid land, which must be watered by scientific methods, involving large expenditures of money, expensive surveys of lands and of sources of water supply, requiring, too, the storage of water, the construction of dams, and the diverting of ditches and canals. Even if this work of practical irrigation does not proceed now with the vigor that it should, it is important that we lay up a storehouse of information upon this subject while this great work is temporarily delayed. It is important that the Department of the Government having control of the agricultural investigations of the country and expending in a given year $3,000,000 should expend a part, at least, of that sum in attention to the needs of this vast area, which is hereafter to be a thickly populated portion of the country.

For my own part, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this appropriation ought to be increased. But at all events the present organization that has investigated this subject should be permitted to continue in the same direction. I am very well aware of the necessity which exists for economy in expenditures for the coming fiscal year, we all know that the revenues of the Government will not permit of any extravagent expenditures, and we all know the difficulties that beset the different Appropriation Committees of the House in securing necessary revenues that they may appropriate properly for the expenses of the Government. But at the same time, when we are making an appropriation covering a general subject, of about $3,000,000, an organization costing only $15,000 per annum, and whose objects are so far-reaching and important, should certainly be maintained as the nucleus of a larger and more efficient organization in the future. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said on this question of the importance of the subject of irrigation in the Western country, but it seems to me that Congress has never undertaken to do quite the practical thing in reference to it. Irrigation is not an experiment. It has been practiced for centuries in some countries. It is not experiments that we want. We have had small appropriations several years, but have had no practical results from expenditures. We want an appropriation; and it seems to me that Congress will certainly authorize it and appoint some official whose duty it shall be to secure sites for reservoirs and rights of way for distributing ditches in the semiarid region and the arid regions of the country.

Everyone who has given any thought to the question understands that there can be irrigation where water can be obtained if there is a sufficient expenditure of money; and the thing to do is to authorize some official of the Government to secure the sites for reservoirs where the water may be stored, and secure the rights of way for distributing ditches, and get to work in a practical way. I repeat that that is what ought to be done.

I am not opposed in any sense of the word to this proposition, because there is a very large district of country west of us which must depend upon irrigation. Irrigation has done much for the State that I have the honor in part to represent here. The western part of Kansas needs irrigation; and the State herself has made appropriations and is taking steps to irrigate there, and is doing much to reclaim that semiarid country. While I favor this proposition, I fear that the appropriation will probably result, just as all the other appropriations heretofore made by Congress have resulted, in being paid out largely as salaries without any practical advantage to the people. If there is any report of what has been done under provisions similar to the one proposed no one has produced it. In view of what has been done, I think the thing to do is to authorize an expert to investigate and report and give us something that will result in good to the country and to the advancement of the important work that is proposed to be done. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word concerning the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that we know all about irrigation. I must deny the gentleman's proposition. I say that we know nothing, practically, of irrigation yet in this country. When the gentleman says that he, with ten years' experience in practical irrigation, has learned all of it, he shows to this House that he knows nothing whatever about the subject.

The people of Utah have been studying the practical question of irrigation for fifty years, and they do not know it all. There are many things which the Government can investigate and which the Government should investigate; how much water should be used on land of a given kind, how much water should be applied to a given crop, how much water should be used at different periods of the year. These things are not known and have not been investigated, and would be worth much to the agriculture of the arid and subarid regions to understand; and this appropriation, if properly used—the appropriation proposed by the pending amendment—should be used, in part at least, to obtain some knowledge on this very question.

I hope, therefore, the amendment will prevail. We have not reached the depth of knowledge here that the gentleman from New York seems to think we have on this subject.

Mr. BLUE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes an insignificant appropriation. It seeks to put into the bill what has been the law heretofore, for the purpose contemplated. It has been dropped from this bill upon the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have been informed that he believes that the western portions of Kansas and his own State ought to be abandoned to the herdsmen and the cattle men. But the people who inhabit these regions have put into them their industry, capital, and energy. Such persons as they are can not be found in any other portion of this great Republic. Year after year in these semiarid regions they have remained by their farms and homesteads striving even against the laws of nature to test to the utmost of their ability the possibility of raising crops successfully there.

So far as irrigation is concerned in these regions, it is an unsolved problem. In the valleys of the great streams like the Arkansas there is no longer any question of the sufficiency of the underflow; but when you reach the higher altitudes in the western half of the State of Kansas, in that region not supplied by any great streams, the question there as to whether those people can successfully irrigate by sinking wells and raising the water to the surface is a very important one. It has been tested to a certain extent and has been in a degree successful, but it has been by the people themselves putting in their knowledge, their energy, and capital in sinking wells and building reservoirs to control the water and apply it to the soil. The Agricultural Department should join hands with the Geological Survey in assisting the people in solving this problem. The State of Kansas has contributed liberally to aid her citizens in experimenting with and testing the underflow.

All that is asked for in this small appropriation is that the Government shall experiment and give the people the necessary information. It is of the utmost consequence to all those people of that region that the Government shall determine for them where they can sink wells with a certainty of finding the underflow and save them the disastrous expense of testing for themselves.

The sites of the earliest civilization were in the irrigated regions of the world, and there are no more courageous, industrious, or patriotic people under the sun than those who cultivate the soil near the ditches of the great arid and semiarid regions of the West. Successful irrigation is one of the great problems of the future, and it is here for solution.

This bill, it has been stated, carries about $3,000,000. This limited appropriation of $15,000 is for the benefit not only of the agricultural classes of this nation, but for all the people, and it is to be used to reclaim these arid lands, not by absorbing a great appropriation from the Government, but asking that the Government experiment and point out where these wells may be successfully sunk and how this irrigation may be profitably practiced. When that is done the people will put into it their energy and their capital, a thousandfold in proportion to every dollar that is asked from the National Treasury. These men who have gone into the western third of Kansas and Nebraska, and have located homesteads there, are entitled to this recognition from the Government. The same is true of the heroic people who have gone into every arid region in the Republic.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that this is a matter about which appropriations have been made heretofore. These experiments have been pushed under the auspices of appropriations to the Agricultural Department. Now, here are the Representatives of a great section of the Union, representing, as they must, truthfully and properly, the particular interests of their section. They are not particularly interested in very many of the matters carried in this bill, in which other sections of the country are especially interested. Now, these gentlemen come here representing a great body, in acres, of the Union, a section of the Union to which we must look in the future for the great necessities of food products. These gentlemen seem to understand what they want. They seem to understand the necessity. Now, why should they be deprived? Why should this matter be cut out of this bill when they are protesting that it is indispensable to the development of their country? That is all I have to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to unnecessarily prolong the discussion, but representing a district which has been somewhat benefited by these experiments, I hardly think I should remain entirely silent until the discussion is closed. If we refuse to insert this amendment we should do it understandingly and deliberately, not with the idea that we have finished the work, but with the deliberate admission that we are not willing to commence it. We are just commencing. Gentlemen, are you aware that more than one-half of the people of the world live on account of irrigation? In Asia the great bulk of the crops are raised as the result of irrigation. Shall we remain behind the partly civilized or less civilized nations who inhabit China, India, and Arabia? Not only that, but a little investigation has developed the fact that we shall find in the reports published at the expense of the Government that there lived in America a race of men before the Indians came here, known as the mound builders, who practiced irrigation on an enormous scale, beyond anything that has been dreamed of here in Congress.

Now, the surveyors have great irrigation ditches on the western coast that were evidently dug by the mound builders, which could not have been built by the Indians. They have traced them for thousands of miles. Shall we, as proud progressive American citizens, be behind Asia? Shall we be behind the mound builders in having the sense to make proper use of these blessings which God has given us in the land which we have been given to occupy? The Indians were swept away because they did not make a proper use of the blessings which God placed within their reach. Must we be swept away on account of some little thing of that kind because we do not apply scientific methods to the means of obtaining a living for the people?

Why, my friends, in this Democratic House I have seen this appropriation made for four years without a question, without making a fight for it. Shall you signalize the return of the Republican party to power in this House by wiping out this little picayune item of $15,000, intended for the advancement of agriculture and civilization in America?

Mr. SHAW. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. COLSON. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order now. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHAW] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of $15,000 be also appropriated to make investigations in regard to the best methods of ditching and draining lowlands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make the point of order against that amendment that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York raises the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. Does the gentleman desire to say anything on the point of order?

Mr. SHAW. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must hold that the point of order is well taken. It is new legislation entirely.

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, it is pleasurable to me to see education in this country extending along Populistic lines, because for myself I can not conceive of a more paternal measure than the one we are now considering, and because——

Mr. ANDREWS. May I ask the gentleman a question? If the appropriation, as contemplated in this amendment is paternalism, what would you call the appropriation of millions of money to keep water off certain lands of the country, referring more particularly to river and harbor appropriations?

Mr. SKINNER. I will anticipate the gentleman's question and say this: That I propose to vote for these irrigation appropriations, and if I had the power I would make it ten times as large [applause], but at the same time I am inclined to draw no distinction between irrigation and ditching swamps and making canals for the purpose of clearing and cultivating our lowlands. You will excuse me for that, when I tell you that I am the representative upon this floor of the very cradle of this Government, and yet at the same time it is lowland country. It is the country of the Dismal Swamp, where the "fox fire" is seen strong as a lamp; and if we had some governmental aid extended to us we would have as prosperous a country as you possibly could have in the Northwest. At the same time, I shall favor your measure; and after you have had experience and profited by governmental aid in this way, I know that your hearts will be big enough to extend the same ratio of benefit to the lowlands of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, speaking from memory a few minutes ago with respect to the salaries in the division I said they amounted to between $6,000 and $8,000. I find that they were $4,100, and I desire to correct my former statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe very thoroughly that irrigation has gone beyond the line of experiment. I reassert that I believe that the people out in the irrigated regions know more about the subject of irrigation than any gentleman who has spoken on the floor of the House. I believe it can be left with them, and that this appropriation would be absolutely useless and serve no good purpose.

Mr. PICKLER. Why does the gentleman say that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the people there know more about this question than we do.

Mr. HARTMAN. I want to ask the Chairman first whether the amendment now pending is an amendment providing for the payment of $15,000 for the purpose of advancing the cause of irrigation?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HARTMAN. Is that amendment subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HARTMAN. Then I move to amend that amendment so that it will read: "Thirty thousand dollars, payable in silver dollars of 412½ grains of standard silver." [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I raise the point of order on that.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, by a large vote this House announced the other day——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Maine reserves the point of order on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HARTMAN. Certainly. By a large vote the other day the House announced its opposition to standard silver dollars; and we were informed by a large number of the speakers that those dollars were worth only 50 cents on the dollar in gold. I am perfectly willing that instead of the $15,000 we should appropriate $30,000 in these 50-cent dollars. I hope the House will have no objection to inserting $30,000 in silver; and I trust they will be worth just as much in the opinion of the gentlemen who voted here against silver as $15,000 in gold. [Laughter.] I prefer it that way, and I am satisfied that gentlemen will accept that amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. PERKINS. But the House decided that it was opposed to 50-cent dollars.

Mr. HARTMAN. I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public-road inquiries: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States; to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making; for labor, traveling, and other necessary expenses, and for preparing and publishing bulletins and reports on this subject for distribution, and to enable him to assist the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, $8,000.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I would like to have the gentleman in charge of this bill explain why, when the matter of good roads is in its infancy in this country, the appropriation is cut down $2,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from New Hampshire, I will say that heretofore the printing for that division has been paid from the sum appropriated under this head, but that the printing has now been transferred to the Publication Division. The money appropriated for the cause of good roads is, therefore, practically the same.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is all right, then.

The Clerk read as follows:

Publications, Department of Agriculture, Division of Publications: For the printing, illustration, publication, and distribution of bulletins and reports, $85,000, as follows: Farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of different sections of the country, an equal proportion of two-thirds of which shall be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, $10,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify Senators and Representatives of the character and number of each bulletin and each other publication of the Department of Agriculture (not sent to the folding rooms of the Senate and House) to which each Senator and Representative may be entitled for distribution on the basis herein provided; for the distribution of bulletins, illustrations, and engravings; for the pay of artists, draftsman, engravers, and additional proof readers when necessary; the purchase of tools, instruments, paper, ink, pencils, paints, and other necessary materials; for labor, printing, printing proofs, necessary traveling expenses, and for drawings, engravings, lithographs, paintings, other illustrations, and electrotypes, $30,000; for distribution of documents; for the purchase of paper, envelopes, gum, twine, and other necessary materials, $5,000; in all, $85,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a correction in line 9, page 17. Insert the word "preparation" after the words "for the." That is to correct an omission in the printing. In line 23 of the same page, at the end of the line, the word "draftsman" should read "draftsmen."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLSON. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 11, page 17, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "Architectural Bureau, for the distribution of information as to the best methods and plans for the construction of farmhouses, the sum of $20,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make the point of order that that is new legislation and increases expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLSON. I do.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants to speak to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman can discuss his amendment.

Mr. COLSON. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that has more firmly impressed itself upon my mind than all others it is the fact that the people living in the agricultural districts throughout the country need information as to the best plans and methods of constructing dwellings in which to live.

In passing through the rural districts in my travels throughout the United States, I have often observed large houses on which had been expended ample labor and material to construct comfortable dwellings when in fact, notwithstanding that large expenditure of labor and material, there was no comfort in those houses. If there is one thing more than all others that is enjoyable; if there is one thing more than all others that contributes to domestic comfort and happiness, it is a dwelling house constructed with all the modern conveniences. It is about as easy to have such a dwelling house in the country as it is in the city. This fact is not realized, however, by the people living in the rural districts.

The result of this lack of information is that the people are leaving the farm and going to the cities. This is unfortunate. The country population is the strength of the nation. It is in the country that you find patriotism that is not measured in dollars and cents. About one-half our people are engaged in agriculture, and this part of our population is the rockbed of our political and social fabric. We can not do too much for this class of our population. The point of order made by the gentleman may be well taken, and I understand that the Chairman of this committee may so hold, but I desire to put myself on record as favoring the distribution of the information contemplated by my amendment.

We appropriate money for the distribution of publications on various subjects and for the distribution of seeds, all of which is right and proper, and I think the Congress could do no better thing than make provision for the distribution throughout the country of information as to the best methods and plans for the construction of farmhouses. This Government ought to contribute in every possible way to improve the condition of the farmer. If it can give him any suggestion as to improved methods of building, heating, and providing water supply for his country house it ought to do so.

The pending bill carries $145,358 less than the Agricultural Department appropriation bill for last year. It carries only $3,158,192.

This is too little consideration for the farmers of the country. It is nothing, sir, compared to the contribution made by the farmers of the country to the support of the Government. We appropriate each year more than $25,000,000 for the support of the Army; about the same amount for the support of the Navy; and for the support of the whole Government the great sum of $433,000,000. Of this great sum we give only a little more than $3,000,000 for the Agricultural Department. How very liberal we are to the farmers of the country! Mr. Chairman, before this bill is reported I hope I will have an opportunity to speak further upon this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair must rule out the amendment as new legislation.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 18, line 8, after the word "dollars," add:
"*Provided*, That the work known as the Special Report on Diseases of the Horse shall be included in the publication of the Agricultural Report: *Provided further*, That said Agricultural Report shall not exceed the size of the same for the last fiscal year."

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I have put that amendment in the form in which it is at the suggestion of some gentlemen near me. I believe we each get about 900 copies of the Agricultural Report. This amendment would put the horse book into the Agricultural Report, but as some question has been made as to the size of the volume, at the suggestion of some gentlemen here I have provided in the amendment that the Agricultural Report with the horse book included, shall not exceed in size the Agricultural Report for the last fiscal year. I believe that amendment is feasible and I believe it is proper. I would a great deal prefer to have the horse book in a separate volume, but some gentlemen whom I have consulted seem to think that is not practicable at the present time. I believe that a good deal of the matter usually contained in the Agricultural Report can be omitted, and that it will be better for our constituents to have those matters omitted and this horse book inserted in lieu of them. I would be glad to hear from the chairman of the Committee on Printing and from other members of that committee on this subject.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have on my desk and I exhibit to the House a copy of the Year Book, and also a copy of the Report on the Diseases of the Horse. The committee will observe that the two volumes are very nearly equal in size. The proposition of the gentleman from South Dakota is to insert this volume (the horse book) in this one (the Year Book), and yet to have the latter volume no larger than it is now; which is obviously impracticable.

Mr. PICKLER. Is that the Agricultural Report which the gentleman has there?

Mr. PERKINS, I have here the Agricultural Report.

Mr. PICKLER. For what year?

Mr. PERKINS. It is the Agricultural Report for the year 1894, the last one issued, and the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse which I have here was issued in 1890. If you vote to insert this Special Report on Diseases of the Horse in this Agricultural Report, and at the same time provide that the latter shall be no larger than heretofore, then you simply provide for the printing of 500,000 copies of the horse book to the exclusion of the Year Book, and at an expense of $300,000. Now, the Year Book is intended to cover the whole agricultural field. It is supposed that all farmers and all who are interested in agriculture are interested in that volume, while for the horse book only those care who are interested in the horse; so that this amendment provides for a great extravagance. All that is required, at the most, is 75,000 copies of the Report on the Diseases of the Horse, which can be produced in a separate volume at 56 cents per copy, whereas provision is made for 500,000 copies of the Agricultural Report at an expense of $300,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Agricultural Report is not required, then we have done a foolish thing here to-day in providing in the deficiency bill for an expenditure of $300,000 for the production of that report for 1895. On the other hand, if it is desirable, if it is a volume the publication and circulation of which ought to be continued, it ought not to be supplanted by this horse book merely to accommodate the desire of some gentlemen who want copies of the latter. We ought to proceed understandingly in this matter, and we can not carry out the provisions of this amendment without excluding the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the year to which the law shall apply. Again, if both volumes are to be printed, if this horse book is to be included with the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, making two volumes in place of one, then we must make an appropriation of $600,000 in place of the $300,000 we have already appropriated.

Now, sir, in my judgment, it would be very much more economical, if this House desires an additional number of copies of the horse book, to make an appropriation of $43,000 for 75,000 copies of that book, and have them printed separately, instead of supplanting the Agricultural Report with the horse book, in which, as I have said, comparatively few persons are interested.

Mr. MOSES. I will ask the gentleman whether in his opinion if the horse book were included as a part of the Agricultural Report it would not be practically lost anyway? The recipients, if they do not read the Agricultural Report, would never know the horse book was included therein.

Mr. PERKINS. As to that, members desiring the horse book would find it in the Agricultural Report, and members would send the volume to their constituents as the Agricultural Report, whereas in fact it would be the horse book.

Mr. MOSES. But he would have to write a personal letter to every constituent.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, no; the title could be amended so as to avoid that trouble.

Mr. PICKLER. I like very well what the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. PERKINS] has said. I would much prefer to have this information in a separate volume, as undoubtedly every other member would. The Agricultural Report displayed here is a much smaller volume than those reports ordinarily are. They generally are about twice that size.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, I think the gentleman is mistaken. If he will send out and get the Agricultural Reports for a series of years he will find that the size of the volumes is pretty nearly uniform.

Mr. PICKLER. All I have to say is that I get a much fuller and larger Agricultural Report than the gentleman from Iowa does, because I am persuaded that my report is usually twice the size of the volume he has exhibited. But I do not care to discuss that matter further.

It was upon the suggestion of a gentleman who has a good deal of technical knowledge as to the printing of these reports that the provision was inserted that the size of the volume should not be greater than heretofore. I shall be very glad to substitute for my amendment the proposition suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Printing. Of course we do not wish to interfere with the Agricultural Report, but this is a matter which has come up again and again, which has been fought off in one direction or another until the expiration of one term of Congress after another, so that we have not obtained the books. If the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, will again state his proposition I shall be very glad to offer it in lieu of my original amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. The Public Printer estimates that the cost of 75,000 volumes will be $42,350.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall be in favor of the amendment as stated by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PICKLER. I modify my amendment so as to read as follows:

For publication of the work known as Special Report on Diseases of the Horse, to be distributed as heretofore under resolutions of Congress, $42,350.

The amendment of Mr. PICKLER as modified was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement, which I am aware is not in order, in reference to the amendment just disposed of. That amendment ought to provide in so many words the method of distributing the publication. It provides for distribution in the manner heretofore made, when in fact the distribution has not always been uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] has been recognized and has sent an amendment to the desk.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment just adopted be modified so as to provide that 50,000 copies of these reports be for the use of the House and 25,000 for the Senate.

Mr. PICKLER and Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the amendment sent to the desk by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER].

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 10 and 11, page 17, strike out "eighty-five" and insert "sixty-five"; in line 16, same page, strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty"; so that the clause will read:
"For the printing, illustration, publication, and distribution of bulletins and reports, $65,000, as follows: Farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of different sections of the country, an equal proportion of two-thirds of which shall be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, $30,000."

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire, Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is to call attention to the manner in which the money has heretofore been expended for farmers' bulletins and to show that the amount here proposed to be appropri-

ated is unnecessarily large, in view of the practice of the Department heretofore. In Document No. 25 of this session, showing the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, we find on page 37 that the entire amount expended for farmers' bulletins during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, was only $25,639.65. The appropriation for that year was $30,000; and under that appropriation about 22 or 23 farmers' bulletins were issued.

In the last appropriation bill, the bill for the year ending on the 30th of June next, $50,000 was appropriated as proposed here; but under that appropriation, up to the present date, there have been only seven or eight new bulletins issued. In the document which the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the Senate, known as Document No. 40, he states what he had done up to that date, December 18, 1895, with that appropriation. It appears by that report that he had expended in nearly half of the fiscal year—in nearly all of the six months ending on the 31st of December last, only $7,820.62. It is therefore evident that there is no necessity for so large an appropriation as is here proposed. The making of such an appropriation simply gives the Secretary of Agriculture an opportunity to claim, as he so volubly does, how much he has saved from year to year. The amount named in the bill will not be needed, and consequently I do not think we should appropriate so large a sum. We have already added some $40,000 to this clause, and it seems to me proper, as it is of no use, that we should take off the $20,000 I propose in the amendment, and I think that no one will object to the adoption of the amendment when these facts are taken into consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Had you not better cut it a little further?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Well, this is something, and it is something in the right direction.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is no increase in this item. The appropriation of last year was $67,000. In this bill we have done away with an item of $15,000 for illustrations, and added it to the $67,000, which would make $82,000; and we have taken $2,000 from the road inquiry, and added it to this, making $84,000. We have also taken some other small items from different divisions, making in all $85,000; so that it is an apparent increase only, but not an actual increase.

With that explanation, if the committee desires to cut it down $20,000, certainly the Committee on Agriculture will not make any objection.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The Chairman will readily assent when I show that the deduction comes entirely from the appropriation for farmers' bulletins, and does not touch the items to which he has referred, leaving $30,000 for that purpose; and as only $20,000 has been expended heretofore in any one year it would seem to be ample.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not object to the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Seeds, purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, $130,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this provision, with reference to the distribution of seeds, be postponed until after we have concluded the remainder of the bill.

Mr. COUSINS. I object.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 20, on page 20, the words "as required by law."

I think that this is necessary in order to make the appropriation available. If these words are not omitted from the bill the Secretary of Agriculture will probably do as he has done heretofore on a similar occasion, where complaint has been made that he has not executed the law. He has taken, I understand, the opinion of the Attorney-General, who has said that under the provisions of the law now existing the Secretary may elect to say that he can not find any seed of the character proper to be distributed.

Now, if we strike out the words I have mentioned, here is an independent statute, an appropriation, and the purpose of the appropriation is specifically set out in the statute itself.

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I send to the desk as a substitute for that offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 20, after the word "dollars," in line 25, by adding the words: "And it is hereby made mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to make such purchase and distribution as was done in the years prior to 1895."

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the language of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, as well as the former appropriation bill and this one, should be clear enough to be mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture, but at the same time we find that the Secretary of Agriculture is so opposed to distributing this relief, or making available this appropriation, that he has even obtained from the law Department of the Government an opinion that the law is directory simply, and not mandatory, and he chooses to avail himself of that decision.

Now, I think the former action of the Secretary of Agriculture is sufficient to demonstrate that we should speak to him hereafter in a language that he can not misunderstand, in language commanding him to execute the will of the people. We should leave no room whatever for him to hinge a doubt upon about our will in connection with the matter.

The distribution of the seed by the Congressmen to their respective constituents in this country is a question of prescriptive right, both of the people and of the Congressmen themselves; and while it may entail additional labor on the Representatives to send out seed, yet it is a recognition, to the remotest district and hamlet of the country, of their constituents who receive the seed at their hands.

And, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that outside of that matter, while I have no assault whatever to make on the Secretary of Agriculture, while I have no assault to make upon the bill, yet at the same time it does seem to me that the only assistance that the Secretary of Agriculture has been to the farming classes of the country is to conspire with Grover Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle for the purpose of bringing about such legislation, or by the execution of such financial projects, as to practically halve the price of all their products, and takes up his time in planting trees throughout the country or lecturing upon the rostrum upon what we commonly call the "gold-bug" side. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural Department of this country was intended to administer practical relief to the people, and I can not conceive any more available manner of making the distribution of this intelligence or of improving farming than by the proper distribution and improvement of seeds.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the passage of either of these amendments, especially the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], would concede the position taken by the Secretary of Agriculture. If would, it strikes me, be an admission that what has heretofore been done was not required by law. If we strike out the words "required by law" that will concede the correctness of the position now taken by the Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore it would be taking a position which we upon this side—and I also think gentlemen upon the other side—do not wish to assume.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the amendment be again read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 20, page 20, after the word "distribution," the words "as required by law."

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending which was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER].

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask to have it reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 20, after the word "dollars," in line 25, by adding the words: "And it is hereby made mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to make said purchase and distribution as was done in the years prior to 1895."

Mr. TRACEY. I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The substitute of Mr. TRACEY was read, as follows:

And the Secretary shall purchase the seeds, bulbs, vines, cuttings, trees, shrubs, and plants, and distribute the same as herein directed, and not otherwise.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment simply because I think it makes the law more explicit. If that is adopted, there will be nothing to construe, and there will be no question about it. It will be a plain direction to the Secretary to execute the appropriation made by Congress for that purpose, an appropriation which, in my opinion, is as useful as any that is made for the entire Department of Agriculture.

The substitute of Mr. TRACEY was rejected.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The substitute of Mr. SHAW was read, as follows:

In line 25, page 20, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "Which said sum shall be expended as provided for in this section, and the Secretary shall have no discretionary power not to purchase seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants, but shall purchase and distribute the same when it is possible to obtain them."

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the agricultural districts of North Carolina. The question of the distribution of seed is exceedingly important to my people. I am daily receiving letters from my constituents asking me to send them seeds. I have not time to answer the numerous letters which I have re-

ceived. They come from people who pay their full pro rata of the taxes of this Government. They want these seeds, and most respectfully, representing the people of North Carolina, we ask that the Secretary of Agriculture be compelled to send the seeds out as required by law.

Mr. TALBERT. I desire to say a word or two right here as a farmer, and in the interest of the farmers of this great nation of ours. And I am not ashamed of the fact that I am a farmer, although there are very few in this House. I do not, however, claim to be such a great farmer as it is said my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] told his people he was on one occasion when he was stumping his district for Congress. He said he was born between the plow handles. [Laughter.] I was not exactly born between the plow handles, Mr. Chairman, but I got there mighty soon afterwards, and stayed there a long time, too, after I did get there. [Laughter.]

I desire to say right here that I shall favor the amendment offered by my friend from North Carolina because of the simple fact that unless an amendment of that sort shall be passed by this House the Secretary of Agriculture will proceed to do as he has done this season, and will repudiate and nullify the law, instead of acting as he ought to act and obey it; and I for one am disposed to place him where he will be obliged to dance to the music. [Applause.]

Why, sir, to show you his audacity, after he abolished this department under the advice of the Attorney-General, he immediately took possession of the hall where the work had been done and made use of it for other purposes showing that it was his evident intention never again to have the seed department opened.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the farmers of our country deserve some consideration at the hands of this Congress and protection from such base usurpation and tyranny of Cabinet officers. And why do I say this? It is because they make that which feeds and clothes the world, and as a general thing a great many of them go nearly naked and half starved themselves from being discriminated against.

Mr. Chairman, the only way that a great many of them know they have a Government is by sometimes receiving a package of seeds or going to the post-office occasionally and getting a few documents. I think, sir, it is an outrage to allow a Cabinet officer to have the law so construed as to deprive this class of people of that small privilege, and right here and now this House should say to Mr. Morton, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther."

In 1888 the very last act of President Cleveland was to sign the bill giving to the farmers of the United States a Cabinet office. I must say that that was one good thing which he did, and I am glad to be able to say he did one good thing; but the worst thing he ever did for the people, especially for the farmers, was to put this fellow in there who has destroyed the usefulness of the Department to the people of the country. [Applause.]

It reminds me of the fable of the dovecote where they asked for a king, having a hawk as ruler, and he destroyed so many doves that they asked to have a new king, and a kite was given them; but he ate in one day more doves than the hawk did in many days. The Secretary has acted even worse than the kite. He has destroyed the usefulness of the whole Department to a certain extent. I say that some restrictions ought to be put upon him, so that he will follow the wishes of the people of the country. Now, why should the farmers have this consideration? Let me read from his own report. He says of the farmers:

> The same farmers have with part of their surplus products also fed all the urban population of the United States, poor and rich alike. Cereals, meats, vegetables, fruits, eggs, milk, butter, cheese, and poultry have been supplied the village and city markets of the United States in abundance. It is probably safe to say that more than 40,000,000 of American citizens not living on farms have been so furnished with all the necessities and luxuries known as products of the varied soil and climate of the States and Territories of the Union.

Now listen further to this:

> During the fiscal year 1895 the United States exported to foreign countries domestic commodities, merchandise, and products aggregating in value $793,000,000. The aggregate value of the agricultural products included in that sum was $553,215,317.
>
> Of the total exports, Europe received a valuation of $628,000,000, or 79 per cent of the whole.
>
> Thus American agriculture, after feeding itself and all the towns, villages, and cities of the United States, has also sold in the outside world's market more than $500,000,000 worth of products. So the farmers of the United States have furnished 69.68 per cent of value of all the exports from their country during the year 1895.

And now, after that very magnificent showing, he refuses this little pitiful sum of $130,000 to give them a few garden seeds, by his arbitrary ruling.

In the presence of these facts, in front of these figures, demonstrating that agriculture in this Republic has, during the year, fed itself, supplied all citizens of the Union engaged in other vocations, and then shipped abroad a surplus of over $500,000,000 worth of products, then are these not reasons for some consideration?

How is it that the 42 per cent of the population of the United States which feeds the other 58 per cent and then furnishes more than 69 per cent of all the exports of the whole people must in addition to that burden be deprived of even this small luxury of a few seeds for gardening purposes?

If 42 per cent of the citizens of the United States have fed and clothed these other 58 per cent, and then furnished the products for exporting $500,000,000 of money, how can you refuse to put in a mandatory clause here that will force that gentleman to do his duty whether he wishes to do it or not? You have got to put the harness on him and make him work. [Applause.]

Now, one word further. The farmer's wants seem to me to be ignored in this Hall and himself belittled. Every other industry has received protection at the hands of the Government, while the agriculturists have been left out to battle with climate, soil, and adverse circumstances. We should take care of that class in its adverse circumstances and let it come in and have a little consideration here.

Why, sir, the farmer has been alluded to here with a view of belittling him in various ways. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. OWENS]—I wish he was in his seat—said the other day, and I do not hardly know what he meant, speaking of a little bug as the farmers' little lieutenant, thereby throwing, apparently, discredit on them. He was comparing a gentleman at the other end of the Capitol, as I suppose, to a little bug which bore its burdens backward. He must have meant (and God forgive him for injecting such a remark) that species of bug which, when you strike up with him, you are not able to tell whether you have overtaken him or met him. [Laughter.] Be that as it may, I want to say to the gentleman that if he ever meets the gentleman referred to at the other end of the Capitol, whether it be in public or in private, on the stump or in the forum, he will know very well whether has met him or has overtaken him. He will find, if he meets him or overtakes him, that he will have his hands full. [Laughter.] And don't you forget it! [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I desire that this amendment shall be passed as an act of justice to the great producing element of this great country, and I shall give it my vote and hope it will be passed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TALBERT. I just want to say a word, if the House will give me one or two minutes more.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to continue his remarks.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBERT. I thank the gentleman and the committee for their indulgence, and will not detain them long by what I have to say.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session (Mr. HULL in the chair).

Mr. MCEWAN. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments already pending.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask if there is no one here who will undertake to defend the Secretary of Agriculture. Among all these Republicans, Democrats, Populists, and Tillmanites, is there none so low as to speak for him? [Laughter and cries of "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute for the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the question is now upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina for an amendment offered by his colleague. That is correct, I believe. The amendment and the substitute are intended to reach the same result; that is, to put the distribution of this seed as it was in former years by the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, it occurs to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER] is the proper amendment to adopt. The substitute of the other gentleman from North Carolina simply says that it shall not be discretionary in the Secretary of Agriculture, as I caught his amendment as read from

the desk, to distribute this seed. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand it, does not claim to make this distribution in the exercise of any discretion. He does not claim to put it upon his option or his discretion to distribute the seed, but he said that the law did not require him to distribute such seeds as were offered to him in the market, and that they were not such as would require him to make the distribution by law.

The section of the Revised Statutes providing for this distribution of seeds provides for the distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, plants, etc. Now, when the Secretary advertised for that class of seeds, as I understand the matter, he submitted the question of the advertisement and the kind of seeds that were offered in response to the advertisement to the Department of Justice, and the Attorney-General decided that the seeds offered were not rare, not uncommon, not improved, and therefore the Secretary rejected all bids.

Mr. COX. When the Attorney-General decided that they were not rare seeds, was it a question of law or a question of fact that he was deciding? [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, the gentleman is a good lawyer, and he can answer that question for himself.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney-General did not pass upon the quality of the seeds at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That may be true. I am only stating what the Secretary claimed, which was that the seeds did not come up to the requirements of the law, or did not meet the conditions set forth in the advertisements that he had published. That being true, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina covers the question, because it provides that it shall be made mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture hereafter to purchase similar seeds to those which have been purchased in prior years. That removes all doubt in the matter, and there can be no question but that the Secretary will be compelled to make the purchase.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary raised exactly the same objections before he sought the opinion of the Attorney-General that he did afterwards.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, I suppose he wanted to have his action backed up by a decision of the chief legal officer of the Government, and he got it, or thought he got it, and was satisfied with it. I think the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina ought to be adopted.

A MEMBER. Let the amendment be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as above.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the proposed substitute for that amendment.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee as to the discretionary power of the Secretary, I will, with the consent of the committee, withdraw my substitute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCEWAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Insert in line 25, page 20, after the word "dollars," the following: "The distribution to be made in the same manner as was done by the previous Secretaries of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is covered by the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a minute upon the proposition now before the House, the amendment just read. The trouble that we find with the law as now written upon the statute book is that the Secretary of Agriculture so construes it that he refuses to carry out the true spirit and intent of that law as we all understand it. Now, for this body to insert into this bill a worse provision than is already found there would be, to my mind, mere nonsense. Every lawyer knows that when you write in the statute book something that is so indefinite that it can not be executed it amounts to nothing and the executive officers are at perfect liberty to disregard it. When you propose to say in this bill that the usual purchase of seeds shall be made, that the Secretary shall purchase seeds under the law and distribute them as former Secretaries of Agriculture have done in years gone by, it is an indefinite provision which will amount to nothing.

Such a provision would impose no obligation upon the Secretary of Agriculture. He would not be under any obligation to hunt through the acts performed by previous Secretaries to ascertain in what particular mode or manner they had executed the law, and he would not do it, but would shield himself under the rule which all lawyers understand, that such a provision pointing out no particular thing that the officer is to do, but only generally directing him, to imitate the conduct of someone who has gone before him is so indefinite that it can not be executed, and may be disregarded by the executive officer.

Now, I am as anxious as any member of this House can be to have a provision inserted in this bill which will compel the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds as has been done heretofore and to distribute them to the farmers of this country, because there is a general demand from the farmers all over the land for this distribution of seed. But I want our action on this subject to be wise. I want a provision inserted in this bill that there shall be no mistake or question about, and I want it prepared with more care than has been devoted to the one now before this committee. I want it to be explicit. I want it to tell the Secretary of Agriculture just what he shall do, and not send him on a wild-goose chase, to ascertain what has been done by someone in the Department in prior years, because if we put it in that form I repeat that he probably will refuse to execute the law because of its indefiniteness.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York is in error in the construction which he puts upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. Ordinarily such an amendment as that now offered would be subject to the criticism which the gentleman from New York has passed upon it. But I submit to him that the Secretary of Agriculture can not claim that he misunderstands the intention of the House of Representatives in the enactment of this law, or that he has any doubt about the construction of the law, when he is commanded to execute it as he did execute it for two successive years and as it was executed by his predecessors. He knows that for two years after his induction into the office he now occupies he expended this appropriation in the purchase of all sorts of garden and field seeds, distributing them in various sections of the country, allotting them to members of Congress according to the climatic conditions of their districts. He knows how he executed the law. He refused to expend the last appropriation upon the ground that the manner in which such an appropriation had before been expended was inconsistent with the statute under which the appropriation was made.

Now, then, since his refusal to expend the appropriation in accordance with the custom which had prevailed because of his contention that it was not in accordance with the statute, this House legislatively declares that it was in accord with the terms and the spirit of the statute and commands him to continue the execution of that statute as he had executed it during the two preceding years. If he should fail to expend the appropriation under the terms stated, in accordance with the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, he would be acting in deliberate and willful contempt and disregard of the legislative mandate; he would be refusing to execute a law of Congress about the meaning of which there could be no misconception.

Now, we can not in an act of this kind direct him as to the particular classes of seeds which he shall purchase. We can not say he shall buy so much of this kind of seed and so much of the other; so many trees of this sort and so many of another. We can not go into such particulars; but we can command him to exercise under the law the discretion which he did exercise during two years of this Administration, and which was exercised by his predecessors in office. I think, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina sufficiently covers the case, and that if the Secretary of Agriculture should refuse to execute such a provision he would refuse to execute any law which we might pass on the subject.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the various amendments now pending may either be voted down or held in abeyance for the present until the reading of the paragraph pertaining to this subject has been completed. I have an amendment at the desk which I think will satisfy the gentlemen who have spoken on the subject and those who have moved the amendments now pending.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES IN GERMANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, in compliance with the resolution of the House of Representatives of February 1, 1896, a report from the Secretary of State, with copies of the correspondence of record in the Department of State in relation to the exclusion of life insurance companies of the United States from transacting business in Germany.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 17, 1896.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. LEISENRING, indefinitely, on account of sickness.
To Mr. MONEY, for one week, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota";

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona;

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892;

A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution;

A bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895; and

A bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Alfred Duplantier against The United States, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KULP, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 400); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3719) to provide for appointment by brevet of active or retired officers of the United States Army, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 401); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 3673) for the relief of Calvin Gunn. (Report No. 397.)

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894. (Report No. 398.)

By Mr. COX, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (S. 227) to authorize the Auditor for the War Department to audit certain quartermasters' vouchers alleged to belong to John Finn, of St. Louis, Mo. (Report No. 399.)

By Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs: The bill (H. R. 5259) for the relief of George T. Simpson and Louis Shaw. (Report No. 402.)

By Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 4082) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry. (Report No. 403.)

The bill (H. R. 2744) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased. (Report No. 404.)

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

By Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (H. R. 1289) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Dougherty. (Report No. 405.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa (by request): A bill (H. R. 6184) providing that all official advertising in the District of Columbia shall be placed in only one daily newspaper, and awarded to the lowest bidder—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6185) authorizing the purchase of a building and lot for the use of the Post-Office Department at Asbury Park, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6186) to provide for the condemnation of allotted lands in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6187) to authorize the location of a Branch Home for Volunteer Disabled Soldiers in Jefferson County, Ky., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6188) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895," approved July 16, 1894, amending the third proviso thereof—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6189) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6190) to increase subtreasury facilities of the Northwest, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6191) to place on the retired list certain officers and enlisted men in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 6192) to provide for additional fog bells at Iona Island and Fort Washington, upon the Hudson River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 6193) to authorize and encourage the holding of a transmississippi and international exposition at the city of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, in the year 1898, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 6194) to prohibit fraudulent conveyances, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 6195) amending the statutes relating to the sale of printed copies of patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 6196) to create a department of commerce, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 6197) to provide for the erection of a custom-house in the city of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6246) to provide topographic surveys and mark elevations on the arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LACEY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 119) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish one condemned cannon for the use of Wisner Post, of Montezuma, Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, for the Department of Iowa—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGG: A joint resolution (H. Res. 120) to provide for the presentation of medals of honor to the militia and volunteer troops of the several States who volunteered their services for the defense of the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania in the year 1863, prior to and after the battle of Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: A resolution allowing stenographer and typewriter to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, at a salary of $100 per month during the sessions of the Fifty-fourth Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, favoring restoration of duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAFT: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, favoring the restoration of the wool schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAYTON: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, requesting Congress to submit a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the qualified electors of the several States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island concerning the construc-

tion of a channel into Great Pond Harbor, Block Island, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, in favor of improving the navigation of the Connecticut River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, asking Congress to submit a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, requesting Congress to restore the duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A memorial of the Ohio general assembly, in favor of the choice of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Ohio general assembly, favoring the wool schedule in the Dingley bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A memorial of the Ohio legislature on the singling out of wool for free trade—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 5985) granting pension relief to John A. Taylor—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5986) granting pension relief to Francis M. Ross—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5987) granting pension relief to Ross Wheatley—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5988) granting pension relief to Matthew D. Cochran—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5609) granting an honorable discharge to Albert Locke, alias Shipley—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3862) for the relief of John Green—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5470) for the relief of James W. Holt—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Heniff—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 6198) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a duplicate bond to Benjamin H. March, guardian of Ruth March—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) for the relief of Francis S. Davidson, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 6200) granting a pension to Nimrod H. Harman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 6201) for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, John B. Dillon, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, of Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6202) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Alexander Nugent, Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) for the relief of Mary L. Piatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 6204) granting a pension to Ellen Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 6205) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Dudley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) for the relief of J. H. Stovall and William Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 6207) granting a pension to Caroline M. Tryon, widow of Charles Tryon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 6208) for the relief of James C. Slaght—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) for the relief of John Groom, late a private in Company F, One hundred and sixty-fourth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6210) for the relief of the heirs of Asa Chilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 6211) for the relief of William Sharrock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 6212) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alfred George Towers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6213) granting a pension to Loudavick Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) granting a pension to Robert L. Akridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) to increase the pension of Ambrose D. Manion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6216) to restore Jesse P. Cox to the pension roll of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) granting a pension to William L. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 6218) for the relief of the estate of John H. Nelson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6219) for the relief of Otis A. Eubank—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) for the relief of Granville J. Kelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 6221) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 6222) granting an increase of pension to Czar Dunning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 6223) for the relief of William F. Gibson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 6224) to correct the military record of Ephraim E. Dean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6225) granting increase of pension to Edmund Woog—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARSON: A bill (H. R. 6226) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph U. Orr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 6227) to pension Malissa La Flesh, widow of Capt. Isaac La Flesh, Ninth Indiana Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) to correct the military record of James Mally—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6229) granting a pension to John McLaren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 6230) granting a pension to Tim Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) to restore Jonathan Hess to the pension roll and pay him $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Bowling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting increase of pension to John J. Boatwright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) to restore the name of J. R. Pack to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 6235) to grant increase pension to Ira Bacon, Company A, Fifty-second Indiana Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) to grant a pension to Mrs. Helen Funkhouser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK; A bill (H. R. 6237) for the relief of John W. Peek—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 6238) for the relief of the estate of Parkes & Ward, of Yell County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 6239) to increase the pension of Elwin A. Scutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) to correct the military record of William H. Barrett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6241) to amend the military record of Capt. A. M. Dobbelaere—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 6242) for the relief of Mary Smith, late a nurse in the Medical Department, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 6243) for the relief of Henry Snider, of Moundsville, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 6244) for the relief of Patrick Delaney and Albert U. Chambers, composing the firm of P. Delaney & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 6245) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Isaac Conley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. A. 6247) to grant a pension to Miss Jennie E. Moore—to the Committee Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: Papers to accompany House bill to correct

the military record of William H. Barrett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Capt. A. M. Dobbelaere—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Edwin A. Schutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi: Petitions of the various churches of Corinth and Columbus, Miss., in behalf of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: Petition of citizens of Washington County, R. I., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of the Wisconsin Christian Endeavor Union, representing over 500 societies, urging the enactment of the Erdman bill for the arbitration of railway strikes; also, asking the passage of the Phillips bill for a commission to investigate the labor problem—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Christian Endeavor Union, favoring the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; also, the national compulsory education law, and the suppression of child labor in the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Christian Endeavor Union, to raise the age of consent in the District of Columbia, and extend the same to the Territories; also, to repeal the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma and Arizona, and to substitute the stricter divorce law of the District of Columbia by extending it to all the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARHAM: Petition of citizens of Humboldt County, Cal., praying for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Santa Rosa, Cal., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Petition of the board of aldermen of Aspen, Colo., also of the town trustees of Silverton, Colo., on the Nicaragua Canal construction—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ghent, N. Y., against the sale of liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ghent, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Memorial of C. W. Palmer, of Riga, Monroe County, N. Y., regarding the sale of public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of ex soldiers and sailors of the Union Army during the rebellion, now residing in Mississippi, for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of 32 citizens of Livermore, Ky., and vicinity, asking the passage of the Stone bill on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: Petition of T. Y. Abernathy and others, of Macon County, Ala., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petition of William L. Bond and 52 others, of Fairview, Mich., praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11, to amend the Constitution of the United States, and prohibiting further appropriations to institutions under ecclesiastical control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. W. Cowley and 11 clerks in the post-office at Lansing, Mich., for the passage of the Sperry classification bill (H. R. 3273)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Two petitions of sundry persons of Allegheny, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of several hundred citizens of various States, for an appropriation for aid in the building and establishment of a home for superannuated and disabled soldiers of the late civil war in the United States, of both the Union and Confederate armies, at Eureka Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: Petition of A. J. Culbertson and others, of Stewartsville, Mo., urging the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Union soldiers of the late war residing in Newton County, Mo., in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of 1,000 settlers in Wood County, Okla., asking for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of church members of Knoxville, Tenn., in favor of the claim of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: Resolutions adopted by the Vermont Merino Sheep Breeders' Association, in favor of the tariff bill now under consideration in the Senate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Boston (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the bill to remove discriminations against American vessels used in the coastwise trade—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HART: Petition of Albert Broadhead, Abram Greene, and 92 other citizens of Bethlehem, Pa.; also, petition of William H. Brink, William Hay, and 37 other citizens of Tobyhanna Mills, Pa., in favor of the passage of the bill providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HATCH: Petition of Union soldiers and sailors of the late war residing at Brookston, Ind., favoring the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Protest from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against military instruction in the public schools of the country—to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution of a mass meeting held at Davenport, Iowa, urging Congress to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cubans—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the California Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for the enactment of a Sunday law for the national capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of C. D. Mosher, of Chicago, Ill., for the establishment of United States national coupon savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, dated Chicago, February 7, 1896, protesting against the passage of any measure to provide for military instruction in the public schools of the country—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Almond, N. Y., relating to the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Edward D. Owen, John Isherwood, and 31 other citizens of Pennsylvania, in favor of the passage of the bill introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE, providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, letter, numerously signed by representative citizens of Pennsylvania, and indorsed by Governor Hastings, urging the passage of a bill granting a pension to Mrs. Catherine Searle McCartney, of Wilkesbarre, widow of the late Gen. W. H. McCartney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HURLEY: Petition of Alice Ward, mother of James Ward, Company G, One hundred and fifty-eighth New York Volunteers, asking for a special act to grant her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Mary Syers, widow of John Syers, of the Twentieth Independent Battery, New York Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of citizens of Davenport, Iowa, favoring the recognition of Cuban belligerency—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: Protest of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against any measure which aims to provide military instruction in the public schools of the country—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of Mrs. Helen A. Palmer and other officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Plattekill, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. A. Palmer and others against the sale of spirituous liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of John McDermott, of Vaughan, Tex., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolutions of the St. Paul (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the location of a United States subtreasury at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Petition of various churches of Marion, S. C., in behalf of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., against military instruction in public schools—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Letters to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Otis A. Eubank—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of citizens of Yellville, Ark., for the

relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: Papers to accompany House bill providing additional fog bells at Iona Island and Fort Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Patrick Delaney and Albert A. Chambers, comprising the firm of P. Delaney & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: Resolution of the city council of Roanoke, asking for a term of the United States court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., asking that the harbor of refuge at said city be completed—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., asking the establishment of a department of manufactures—to the Committee on Manufactures.

By Mr. PAYNE: Remonstrance of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn Central, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, remonstrance of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn Central, N. Y., against the sale of beer and spirituous liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. POOLE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Onondaga Valley, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Onondaga Valley, N. Y., against the sale of beer and liquors to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PUGH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6161, for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Dennis Gunn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Wilmina Gunn for widow's pension, to accompany House bill No. 6161—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5946, granting an increase of pension to Abraham H. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of J. F. Hatten and 30 other citizens, and R. F. Burns and others, all of Lawrence County, Ky.; also William D. Welburn and others, of Bath County, Ky., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6108, granting a pension to Tilburn E. Taber, of Carter County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Carter County, Ky., praying for the passage of House bill No. 6162, for an increase of pension to Allen P. Haws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Memorial of the Peace Association of Friends, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Resolution adopted in annual town meeting of the citizens of Provincetown, Mass., urging Congress to make an appropriation for the survey and protection of the harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHAW: Papers to accompany House bill No. 164, for the relief of John Carver, sr., of Fayetteville, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of F. A. Pitman and other citizens of North Carolina, for life-saving station at Bogue Inlet, North Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Nelson Kane and 55 citizens of Newport, N. Y., asking for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Ilion, N. Y., and Trenton, N. Y., against the sale of liquor to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Ilion, N. Y., and Trenton, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Ilion Council, No. 56, Order United American Mechanics, of Ilion, N. Y., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of Robert Lewis and others, of Stonefort, Ill., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of James Coleman and Theodore H. N. McPherson, for the payment of a claim for legal services—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of Charles E. Underwood, J. L. Lord, and 60 other citizens of Grant County, Ind., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 2764, looking to the prevention of violations of the State temperance laws—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of H. B. Scott, of Disko, Ind., asking that pension checks be cashed by postmasters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Pat. F. Fitz and 40 other citizens of Howard County, Ind., in behalf of Warren Parker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Paul L. Bahr, of Marion, Ind., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of Edward Tucker and 73 other citizens of Marquette County, Mich., praying for the passage of the Stone bill for the inspection of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., for the completion of the harbor of refuge at Milwaukee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, letter of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3212 to secure a better foreign market for grain and other agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., to provide for the enrollment and organization of naval reserve forces—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, protest of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against military instruction in the public schools—to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of a bankruptcy law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., to establish a department of manufactures—to the Committee on Manufactures.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of a Sunday law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, remonstrance of Frances E. Willard, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and others, against the passage of any measure which aims to provide military instruction in public schools of the country—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TRACEY (by request): Petition of churches in Columbia, Mo., in support of the bill for relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 6194, relating to the Spanish land-grant swindle—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, affidavit of P. L. Hurt in support of House bill No. 3303, to grant a pension to Thomas S. Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of Frank D. Orme in support of House bill No. 6172—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 18, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

THE JOURNAL—COIN REDEMPTION BILL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the minutes are approved I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

I observe on page 1786 of the RECORD, in yesterday's proceedings, that a message from the House of Representatives announced to the Senate "that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue." The RECORD is silent as to whether the House requested the appointment of a conference committee or not, and I take it that this is a proper time to call the attention of the Senate Finance Committee to this matter and ask them if there is any intention upon the part of that committee to request a conference with the House of Representatives upon the disagreement arising between the two Houses with respect to this bill.

From the votes which have been taken in the Senate from time to time during the present session of Congress, and from the fact that, I think with the single exception of the chairman of the Finance Committee, every member of that committee has announced that he is a bimetallist and in favor of the use of both gold and silver in our money, I infer that some effort will be made upon the part of the Senate Finance Committee to bring about an adjustment of the differences between the Senate and House upon the bill. That has been the course which has been pursued since I have been a member of the Senate in regard to

every bill where there is a disagreement between the two Houses. I think this is the only instance I have ever known where there was a failure to request a conference, and I infer that it was an oversight, possibly of the chairman of the Finance Committee or of some member of the committee, when the announcement of the action of the House was made to the Senate. Before the minutes are approved I should like to know if that be true.

Mr. MORRILL. I can say to the Senator from Nebraska that we are waiting for some action on the part of the other House. If they desire a conference I suppose they will ask for it, and their request will be responded to here.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to express the hope that there is no premeditated intention on the part of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Finance Committee to let the matter drop at this time for political purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will have the Secretary read an extract from the Journal by way of explanation.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *February 14, 1896.*

Resolved, That the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate to House bill 2904, entitled "An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue."

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I ask whether on that report being made to the Senate it would be in order for the Senator from Nebraska to move to recede from the Senate amendments, or whether he would be obliged to wait until after the bill itself should come back from the other House?

Mr. CULLOM. I think the first thing in order is to approve the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, if there is no objection to the manner in which it is made up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will determine the parliamentary question when it arises. Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cummunication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, certain information as to whether any person or persons in the employ of the Post-Office Department has applied for or has received any patent for an invention, or improvement of existing invention, made or received since his entry into the employ of the Post-Office Department, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter of the 14th instant from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the use of unexpended balances of appropriations for subsistence and civilization of the Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes for the fiscal years 1895 and 1896 not needed for that purpose in the purchase of stock cattle for the benefit of that portion of these tribes located on the Tongue River Reservation, in Montana, and requesting that the matter receive the favorable action of Congress; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to some and disagreed to other amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CANNON, Mr. NORTHWAY, and Mr. SAYERS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota";

A bill (H. R. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation;

A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892;

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona;

A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; and

A bill (H. R. 4810) extending the time within which the Maryland and Washington Railway Company shall be required to complete the building of the road of said company, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved August 1, 1892, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 2, 1895.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SEWELL. I present a memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia to the President and Congress of the United States, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine. Coming from a very distinguished association, I move that the memorial lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

By unanimous consent, the memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President of the United States
and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia respectfully represent:

That they have been deeply moved by the menace of war between our beloved country and the parent nation, and earnestly entreat you to take no step which may increase the danger of such a calamity.

We also respectfully protest against the passage of the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, giving the sanction of Congress to a development of the sentiment originally enunciated by President Monroe, but hitherto advocated without color of law. By implication, if not directly, there appears to be thus claimed for the United States a self-constituted protectorate over all the other Republics in this hemisphere.

We urge that the attitude assumed by the resolution above referred to is without sanction in international usage, without historic authority, and unwarranted by the other nations concerned. Furthermore, we believe it is not rendered necessary, as alleged, because of any threatened danger to this country, while it is in its spirit belligerent and unchristian. We therefore feel that the deliberate assertion of what must be regarded as a virtual protectorate, established by the lawmaking power of the United States, would be a grave mistake, and that it were far wiser to leave the subject, as heretofore, an unformulated popular sentiment.

We submit that the position taken by President Monroe, but since repudiated by eminent statesmen, is fraught with too momentous consequences to be safely adopted by Congress under the stimulus of the present exciting controversy as to the boundary of Venezuela, while its importance demands long, careful, and cool discussion. We are persuaded that the maintenance of peaceful relations with all nations is far more in harmony with the spirit of our institutions and more worthy of a truly enlightened people than any question of boundary or ownership among the Republics of South America.

Let us therefore entreat you to listen to the teachings of the "Prince of Peace," as plainly set forth in the gospel, and not commit our hitherto favored country to a sentiment and line of foreign policy inimical to its highest interests.

Signed on behalf of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia.

SAMUEL MORRIS, *President.*
PHILIP C. GARRETT, *Vice-President.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *Secondmonth 3d, 1896.*

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Mrs. V. F. Cox, superintendent of the department of Sabbath observance of the New Jersey Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the petition of Mrs. H. H. Logan, president, and Mrs. C. H. Green, secretary, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Morristown, N. J., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the memorial of Joshua Matlack, jr., of Mount Holly, N. J., relative to the war in Cuba and the assertion of the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of C. D. Mosher, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the establishment of United States national postal coupon savings banks in every post-office in America; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of L. P. Plummer Post, No. 50, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting a pension to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., indorsing House bill No. 3212, providing for the extension of foreign markets for American breadstuffs; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by Sedgwick Post, No. 16, Grand Army of the Republic, of Evart, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation donating to them one condemned cannon for use on Memorial Day and

other patriotic occasions; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Michigan Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting a pension to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEFFER. I present the petition of Mrs. Alfaretta Mitchell, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Varck, Kans., representing a large number of people, praying Congress to pass what they call a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia, and also praying Congress not to pass any legislation to establish a bureau of military education and promote the adoption of uniform military drill in the public schools of the several States and Territories. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I present a letter addressed to me, in the nature of a petition to the Senate of the United States, with the request that I should ask that it be printed as a miscellaneous document for the information of the Senate and of the committee that may have charge of this subject.

The letter states that an American citizen, Mr. Clune, the treasurer of the American Railway Union in Los Angeles, Cal., is imprisoned by Judge Ross in the Los Angeles County jail under a sentence of eighteen months for an alleged conspiracy, the only evidence of which was the fact of his being an officer of the American Railway Union and engaged in a strike or withdrawal of services from the Southern Pacific Railroad corporation, without any violence or any detention of the United States mails, and without any trial by jury or being confronted with witnesses. I am requested to have it printed for the purpose of informing the Senate and of aiding in obtaining such legislation as will prevent the arbitrary imprisonment of American citizens under judicial process, and also to create a public opinion favorable to his release from confinement through a pardon by the President.

This proceeding, if the statements of the letter of Mr. Clune, written from Los Angeles jail, be true, demand the immediate consideration of the Senate.

The authority to deprive a citizen of the United States of his personal liberty, take him forcibly from his family and incarcerate him in jail for eighteen months, without a jury trial and without witnesses, on the order of a single judge, and the denial of appeal to any other tribunal, is a violation of all constitutional provisions for the security of personal liberty, and is nothing less than the lettres de cachet of the French kings.

The statements of this letter should receive from the Senate, charged with the duty of protecting all the guaranties of the Constitution by proper legislative provisions, the most serious consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. PLATT. To what?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To printing the letter as a document. The Chair hears no objection. The petition will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented resolutions adopted by the Maryland Division, Sons of Veterans, United States Army, of Baltimore, Md., praying Congress to pass the bill making the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln a national holiday; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GORDON presented the memorial of Mast, Crowell & Kirkpatrick, publishers, of Springfield, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed increase of postage on serials, books issued in serial form, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Rev. C. C. Cary, of Forsyth, Ga., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, to prohibit the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Immigration, to whom was referred the bill (S. 301) to amend the immigration laws of the United States, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 210) establishing additional regulations concerning immigration to the United States, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 2147) establishing additional regulations concerning immigration to the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1716) for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of the estate of Thomas H. Millsaps, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1726) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge across the Red River, between the States of Arkansas and Texas, at a point above the town of Fulton, in Arkansas, on said river, built by the Texarkana Northern Railway Company, but now owned and operated by the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company, and to authorize the latter company to maintain said bridge over said waterway, subject to certain stipulations and conditions, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2053) to provide better facilities for the Federal courts in New York City, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 768) for the relief of James A. Moore, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 34) for the relief of Clara A. Graves, Lewis Smith Lee, Florence P. Lee, Mary S. Sheldon, and Elizabeth Smith, heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WHITE. The bill (S. 1079) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Finance, but the Committee on Foreign Relations now being engaged in the consideration of the same subject-matter, I am instructed by the Committee on Finance to ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the matter, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 281) for the relief of F. M. Vandling, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1891) for the relief of James Petty, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to John B. Meigs, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BRICE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1414) granting a pension to Emma Brough Gerard, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1288) for the relief of John Stull, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1790) granting a pension to Mrs. Hypolite Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1342) granting a pension to Lena D. Smith, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 568) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann M. Madden, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. MANTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1985) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, in Montana, under the homestead and mining laws of the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 460) for the relief of the executor of C. M. Shaffer, deceased, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. On behalf of the Committee on Privileges and Elections I present the resolution and report I submitted yesterday and then temporarily withdrew in the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont, of the State of Delaware, to a seat in the Senate from that State. I ask that the resolution and re-

port, without reading the report, be printed in the RECORD in full, and I give notice that at an early date I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution appended to the report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Henry A. Du Pont is entitled to a seat in the Senate from the State of Delaware for the full term commencing March 4, 1895.

Mr. TURPIE. I am authorized by the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to submit the views of the Senators composing the minority in the case of Henry A. Du Pont upon his petition for a seat in this body, and to ask that the views be printed as a part of the RECORD.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. And that the report and the views of the minority be printed together as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the petition of Henry A. Du Pont, of the State of Delaware, claiming a seat in the Senate from that State in virtue of an election by the legislature thereof on May 9, 1895, having had the same under consideration, beg leave to submit the following report:

STATEMENT OF FACTS.

There is in this case no material contention as to the facts. It is conceded the petitioner, Henry A. Du Pont, was, at the date of his alleged election, a citizen of the United States and an inhabitant of the State of Delaware, over 30 years of age, and in all respects qualified to become a Senator.

The legislature of the State of Delaware consists of a senate, composed of 9 senators, 3 of whom are elected from each of the three counties of the State, and a house of representatives of 21 members, 7 of whom are elected from each of the three counties of the State. When there are no vacancies in the membership, and all are present in joint assembly of the two houses for the purpose of electing a United States Senator, such joint assembly is composed of 30 members, thus requiring the votes of 16 members to elect.

In the event of one vacancy, caused either by death, resignation, inability to act, or for any other reason, then the joint assembly, all others being present, would be composed of 29 members, in which event the votes of 15 members would be sufficient to elect.

At the meeting of the joint assembly of the legislature of Delaware on the 9th day of May, 1895, which assembly, it is conceded, was in all respects regularly called and held in pursuance of law, the final vote was as follows:

Joint meeting proceeded to another ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Hanby	J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Moore	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Records	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Speaker	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for	J. Edward Addicks,
Mr. Brown	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Davis	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Fleming	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Money	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore	John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard	Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins	J Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd	Edward Ridgley.
Mr. Townsend	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson	Ed. Ridgley.
Mr. Wilson	H. A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker	H. A. Du Pont.

The vote as above ascertained having been announced, as follows:

	Votes.
H. A. Du Pont had	15
Ed. Ridgley had	10
J. Edward Addicks had	4
Ebe W. Tunnell had	1

There being present in such joint assembly, and each casting a vote, 30 persons, each claiming to be a member of the legislature of the State of Delaware and entitled to vote for United States Senator.

It is conceded by Mr. Du Pont, and by your committee, that if this contention is true; that is, if each of the 30 persons so present in such joint assembly, and each of whom cast a vote for Senator, was a duly qualified member of the legislature of the State of Delaware, and under no disability, as such, which would deprive him of his right to a seat in such assembly, and to cast a vote for Senator, then Mr. Du Pont was *not* elected Senator, and is not entitled to a seat in the Senate.

It is admitted upon the part of Mr. Du Pont, and such is the fact, that of the 30 persons so present and claiming a right to vote as aforesaid, 29 of them were so qualified. It is contended, however, that 1 of the 30, namely, William T. Watson, claiming to be a senator from the county of Kent, and claiming to be the speaker of the senate, and claiming the right, as such senator, to be present and participate in the proceedings of such joint assembly, and to cast his vote for Senator, was *not* entitled, under the constitution of the State of Delaware and the laws of the land, to be present in such joint assembly, had no right to be counted therein in making up the number present, and had no right to cast his vote in such assembly for any person for Senator.

If this contention upon the part of Mr. Du Pont is correct, then it is conceded, provided the right to inquire into Watson's qualifications to vote in such assembly now exists, that, inasmuch as in that event there were but 29 members of the legislature of the State of Delaware present entitled to vote, and as it is conceded Mr. Du Pont received the votes of 15 of such members, no one of which was that of Mr. Watson, thus receiving a clear majority of all the votes cast entitled to be cast, he was duly elected Senator, and is entitled to his seat.

The whole question involved, then, in this case is as to the right of Watson to be present in such joint assembly, and to be counted therein in making up the number present, so as to require the votes of 16 members to make an election.

The ground upon which it is claimed upon the part of Mr. Du Pont that Mr. Watson was ineligible to a seat in such joint assembly, and should not have been counted therein in making up the number constituting the same, is based on the fact that, although he had been duly elected a senator from the county of Kent, and from the commencement of the session in January, 1895, until April 9 of that year had held and occupied a seat in the senate, and had been elected speaker thereof, and served in that capacity, he had, on the 9th day of April, 1895, the governor of the State of Delaware, Joshua H. Marvil, having died the day previous, succeeded to the governorship of the State in virtue of a provision of the constitution of that State, and from that date until the 9th day of May following had continued to exercise the functions and duties of executive of the State, and has ever since and still continues to exercise the office of governor of said State, and that, therefore, on that date, May 9, 1895, he, then holding the office of and being the governor of the State of Delaware, was ineligible to a seat in said joint assembly, and had no right whatever, under the provisions of the constitution of the State and of the laws of the land, to be present, either to participate by his vote or otherwise, or to be counted therein.

Your committee hold that this contention on the part of Mr. Du Pont is well founded.

The clause in the Delaware constitution, in pursuance of which Mr. Watson, as speaker of the senate, became governor on April 9, 1895, and which will be commented on later in this report, is found in section 14 of Article III, and is as follows:

Upon any vacancy happening in the office of governor by his death, removal, resignation, or inability, the speaker of the senate shall exercise the office until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified.

It is conceded a vacancy in the office of governor occurred on April 8, 1895, by the death of the then governor of the State, Joshua H. Marvil; also that Senator Watson was then and on April 9, 1895, speaker of the senate, and that on this latter date he took the required oaths, was inaugurated, and entered upon the exercise of the office of governor, and has continued to hold and exercise such office ever since.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LEGISLATURE.

The legislature of the State of Delaware met in biennial session on the first Tuesday of January, 1895, and on that day organized by the election of speakers and other officers for the senate and house of representatives. There were at that time 9 members of the senate and 21 members of the house of representatives, 3 senators and 7 representatives having been chosen from each of the three counties in the State. At the organization of the senate William T. Watson was duly elected speaker and continued in the discharge of his official duties as speaker of the senate, save during occasional absences, until the 9th day of April, 1895, the day following that on which Joshua H. Marvil, governor of the State of Delaware, died.

This legislature being charged with the duty of electing a Senator of the United States for the constitutional term of six years commencing on the 4th day of March, 1895, and having failed to elect such Senator on the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization of such legislature, convened in joint assembly on the next day, being the 16th day of January, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the times and manner of holding elections for Senators in Congress," approved July 25, 1866, and proceeded to vote for a United States Senator.

No one having been elected to that office on that day, the legislature, pursuant to the provisions of said act, convened in joint assembly on the following and succeeding days, Sundays excepted, until and including Thursday, the 9th day of May, 1895. No one was elected United States Senator prior to the day last named.

On the 9th day of April aforesaid, immediately after the joint assembly of the two houses had separated, Senator William T. Watson, who at the time of the death of Governor Marvil, which occurred on the preceding day, had been speaker of the senate, took the official oaths prescribed for the governor of the State of Delaware, and forthwith entered upon the exercise of that office.

It is conceded that from the commencement of the voting for a United States Senator until and including the 9th day of April, Senator William T. Watson took part in such voting except during occasional absences.

Furthermore it is a conceded fact, and if not conceded, fully borne out by the journal entries and other testimony, that from the time he took the oaths of office and assumed the functions of governor in the exercise of such office until the final joint assembly of the two houses on the 9th day of May, Governor Watson did *not* upon any occasion take any part either in the proceedings of the Senate or of the joint assembly.

And further, it is clear to your committee from the record and other evidence submitted that from the hour of his inauguration as governor, by taking the constitutional oaths required of a governor, his name was dropped from the roll call of the senate and was never once called, either as of speaker or as of a senator, on any roll call had on any bill, resolution, or motion until the final adjournment of the Senate. Senator Alrichs, in his affidavit of date January 28, 1896 (Document 9, part 6, page 1), shows this conclusively, and it is not contradicted by any affidavit filed in the case. The following is Senator Alrichs's affidavit in full:

AFFIDAVIT OF SAMUEL ALRICHS.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this 28th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edward G. Cook, a notary public for the State of Delaware in and for Newcastle County, personally comes Samuel Alrichs, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he is a member of the senate of the State of Delaware, as stated by him in a previous affidavit made in the above matter; that he took his seat in said senate on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, for a term of four years; that, *after William T. Watson took the oath of office as governor of the State of Delaware*, upon the death of Governor Marvil, to wit, on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1895, to the expiration of the last session of the senate on the 9th day of May of said year, *the clerk of the senate did not call the name of William T. Watson as a member of the senate. He was neither on the call of the roll at the assembling of any session, nor upon the taking of any roll call upon bill, resolution, or other motion. He was not reported by the clerk as either present or absent; neither was his name called or recorded upon the taking of any yea or nay vote as being present or absent. William T. Watson's name was thus dropped from the rolls after he became governor by reason of no special order, or action, or motion, or otherwise, taken in respect thereto by the senate.* It must have been done by order of the speaker *pro tempore. It was, however, in accordance with the general understanding of the members of the senate that William T. Watson was no longer a member of that body.*

SAMUEL ALRICHS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] EDWARD J. COOK,
Notary Public.

It is conceded, however, that Governor Watson did, on the 9th day of May aforesaid, enter the final joint assembly and assume the right to be counted as a member of such assembly, and the right to vote therein for a United States Senator. During this final assembly 28 ballots were had for United States Senator. The vote upon each ballot, as shown by the record of such assembly, was as follows:

	Votes.
Henry A. Du Pont	15
Ed. Ridgely	10
J. E. Addicks	4
E. W. Tunnell	1

William T. Watson, the governor of the State of Delaware, as aforesaid, cast his vote each time for Ed. Ridgely.

THE VITAL QUESTION.

It will be seen, therefore, the whole question of the right of Mr. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate, as claimed, turns upon the single question: Had William T. Watson, then holding and exercising the office of governor of the State of Delaware, a right, under the constitution of the State and the laws of the land, to exercise the office of State senator, and as such to sit in the joint assembly on May 9, 1895, to be counted therein in making up the number constituting such joint assembly, and to vote therein for a United States Senator? Your committee are clearly of the opinion he had not.

PROPOSITIONS INVOLVED.

In determining this question three different propositions are presented for our consideration:

First. Did the offices of senator and speaker of the senate, held by William T. Watson from the commencement of the session of the Delaware legislature in January, 1895, until April 9, 1895, become *absolutely vacant* on the inauguration of said William T. Watson as governor of the State by taking the oaths of office required of a person entering upon the exercise of that office? Or,

Second. If such offices of senator and speaker of the senate did *not* become *absolutely vacant* upon such inauguration as governor, was the right of Watson *to exercise the functions* of both speaker of the senate and senator held in abeyance and *suspended* for and during the time he should continue to hold and exercise the office of governor? Or,

Third. While holding and exercising the office of governor, did said William T. Watson not only continue to hold the offices of senator and speaker of the senate, but did his right to exercise all the functions of such senator and speaker of the senate while holding and exercising the office of governor continue to exist?

The answer to either or both of the first two propositions in the affirmative settles the question in favor of the right of Mr. Du Pont to a seat, while an affirmative answer to the third proposition, which of course negatives the other two, would be a denial of his right to a seat.

In discussing these several propositions, therefore, it becomes, in the view taken by your committee, wholly unnecessary, in reaching a correct conclusion as to the merits of the present controversy, to determine the question as to whether the offices of senator and speaker of the senate became *absolutely vacant* upon the accession of the speaker of the senate to the office of governor, so as to entitle the electors of Kent County to fill such vacancy by election, or so as to prevent his resuming his place as senator and speaker at the termination of his term of office, and of his right to exercise the office of governor, as it is clear, if the right of Watson, while holding the office of governor and exercising that office, to exercise the functions of a senator, whether for the reason that his office as such senator had *ipso facto* become vacant, or for any other reason, based on a fair construction of the various provisions of the constitution of the State of Delaware, and the well-known rule of law relating to incompatible offices, *was suspended*, then in *either* of such events the presence of Governor Watson in the joint assembly May 9, 1895, and his voting for a United States Senator therein while holding and exercising the office of governor, were *wholly illegal*, and in such event his vote in such joint assembly *should not be counted.*

WHETHER THE OFFICES HELD BY MR. WATSON AS SENATOR AND SPEAKER OF THE SENATE DID OR DID NOT BECOME ABSOLUTELY VACANT ON HIS BECOMING GOVERNOR, IT IS CLEAR THAT WHILE HOLDING AND EXERCISING SUCH EXECUTIVE OFFICE HIS RIGHT TO EXERCISE ANY OF THE FUNCTIONS, EITHER OF THE OFFICE OF SENATOR OR SPEAKER OF THE SENATE, WAS ABSOLUTELY SUSPENDED.

Whether the offices held by Mr. Watson as senator and speaker of the senate did or did not become absolutely vacant on his becoming governor, it is clear that while holding and exercising such executive office his right to exercise any of the functions, either of the office of senator or speaker of the senate, was absolutely suspended.

This conclusion is based on what seems to your committee to be—

First. The only reasonable and fair construction of various provisions of the constitution of the State of Delaware;

Second. Because it is sustained and supported by the well-recognized rule of the common law, which inhibits either the holding or exercising simultaneously by the same person two incompatible offices, and also by the principles of our American system, that legislative and executive offices are incompatible; and

Third. Because the uniform unbroken usage observed in Delaware by its governors, legislators, and people for more than one hundred years is to this effect; that is to say, that the right to exercise the offices of senator and speaker of the senate is suspended and held in abeyance during the time he is exercising the office of governor, and that both offices can not by such person be exercised simultaneously and in perfect harmony with the constitutional provisions of the State, which, in our judgment, *expressly* forbid the simultaneous exercise by the same person of the offices of governor and State senator.

LEGAL PROPOSITIONS.

Before proceeding to analyze these various constitutional provisions in their application to the present controversy, your committee respectfully submit the following propositions, the soundness of which it will endeavor to maintain:

First. It is a well-settled rule of the common law that the same person shall not exercise simultaneously two incompatible offices; and further, the acceptance of one is *ipso facto* a resignation of the other.

Second. Under the American system, executive and legislative offices are incompatible, and the same person can not exercise both simultaneously in the absence of either express or clearly implied statutory or constitutional authority, and the acceptance of a second such is *ipso facto* a resignation of the first.

Third. There is no *express* or *implied* authority in the Delaware

constitution for the simultaneous exercise by the same person of the offices of governor and senator; on the contrary, the constitution *expressly interdicts* such exercise of those two offices, and therefore at the time when Mr. Du Pont received 15 votes in the joint assembly, Mr. Watson, being then governor of the State, holding and exercising that executive office, was incapable of exercising the office of senator.

Fourth. The theory that Mr. Watson can exercise the office of governor of the State and State senator simultaneously involves innumerable constitutional repugnancies, perplexing difficulties, and endless absurdities, while the opposite theory reconciles and harmonizes all the provisions of the Delaware constitution relating to the subject under consideration.

Fifth. Whether or not the offices of State senator and speaker of the senate became *absolutely vacant* when Speaker Watson took the oaths of office, was inaugurated governor of the State, and entered upon the exercise of that office, there can be no doubt, on a fair construction of the several constitutional provisions of the State of Delaware, that his right to *exercise the office of senator or speaker of the senate*, or any of the *functions connected therewith*, while he continued to hold and exercise the office of governor was *absolutely suspended*.

Sixth. That Governor Watson's exercise of the office of senator in the joint assembly and of the office of president of the joint assembly was illegal, and his vote for United States Senator a *nullity*.

Seventh. The journal entries of the proceedings of the Delaware senate on May 9, 1895, are conclusive as to the number and names of senators present, the motions submitted, the votes cast, and of all the proceedings had, and can not be contradicted by *ex parte* affidavits.

Eighth. The right which undoubtedly belongs exclusively to the Delaware senate to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members, does not vest in such senate any such exclusive right as would conclude the Senate of the United States, to determine by construction whether the constitution of the State does or does not recognize a certain seat as *subject to occupation*, nor does it include the power to admit members to seats *not recognized by the constitution of the State as subject to occupation*, or if subject to occupation, to fill them in a manner or *by a person which the State constitution forbids*.

This latter proposition will receive first consideration at the hands of your committee.

PROVISIONS OF THE DELAWARE CONSTITUTION.

The following are the several more important provisions of the constitution of the State of Delaware which have, as it is believed, any bearing upon this controversy. They are all, for convenience of the Senate, inserted here and will be considered and construed *in pari materia*. Certain other clauses will be cited and commented on later in this report:

ART. 2. SEC. 1. The legislative power of this State shall be vested in a general assembly, which shall consist of a senate and house of representatives.

ART. 3. SEC. 1. The supreme executive powers of the State shall be vested in a governor.

ART. 6. SEC. 1. The judicial power of this State shall be vested in a court of errors and appeals, a superior court, a court of chancery, an orphan's court, a court of oyer and terminer, a court of general sessions of the peace and jail delivery, a register's court, justices of the peace, and such other courts as the general assembly, with the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of both houses, shall, from time to time, establish.

Section 14, of Article III, is as follows:

SEC. 14. Upon any vacancy happening in the office of governor, by his death, removal, resignation, or inability, the speaker of the senate shall exercise the office *until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified*. If there be no speaker of the senate, or upon a further vacancy happening in the office, by his death, removal, resignation, or inability, the speaker of the house of representatives shall exercise the office *until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified*. If the person elected governor shall die, or become disqualified before the commencement of his term of office, or shall refuse to take the same, the person *holding the office* shall continue to exercise it *until a governor shall be elected and duly qualified*. If, upon a vacancy happening in the office of governor, there be no other person who can exercise said office within the provisions of the constitution, the secretary of state shall exercise the same until the next meeting of the general assembly, who shall immediately proceed to elect, by joint ballot of both houses, a person to exercise the office *until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified*. If a vacancy occur in the office of governor, or if the governor-elect die or become disqualified before the commencement of his term, or refuse to take the office, an election for governor shall be held at the next general election, unless the vacancy happen within six days next preceding the election, exclusive of the day of the happening of the vacancy and the day of the election; in that case, if an election for governor would not have been held at said election without the happening of such vacancy, no election for governor shall be held at said election in consequence of such vacancy. If the trial of a contested election shall continue longer than until the third Tuesday of January next ensuing the election of a governor, the governor of the last year, or the speaker of the senate or of the house of representatives, who may then be in the exercise of the executive authority, shall continue therein until a determination of such contested election. The governor shall not be removed from his office for inability but with the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature.

Section 12, Article II, provides as follows:

SEC. 12. * * * No person concerned in any army or navy contracts, nor member of Congress, nor any person *holding* any office under this State or the United States, except the attorney-general, officers usually appointed by the courts of justice, respectively, attorneys at law, and officers in the militia holding no disqualifying office shall, during his continuance in Congress or office, *be a senator or representative*.

Section 5 of Article III:

SEC. 5. No member of Congress, nor person holding any office under the United States, or this State, shall exercise the office of governor.

The following is the oath of office taken by each of the governors of the State of Delaware upon his accession to office. It is prescribed by Article VIII of the constitution:

Members of the general assembly and all officers, executive and judicial, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the constitution of this State and to perform the duties of their respective offices with fidelity.

The following are the journal entries of the Delaware senate of proceedings therein on April 9, 1895:

The Hon. James L. Wolcott then administered, in the presence of the members of the senate, to Hon. William Tharp Watson, speaker of the senate, the following oaths of office as governor, to wit: "I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear, on the holy evangels of Almighty God, that I will support the Constitution of the United States of America. So help me God."

"I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear, on the holy evangels of Almighty God, that I will support the constitution of the State of Delaware. So help me God."

"I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear, on the holy evangels of Almighty God, that I will perform the duties of the office of governor of the State of Delaware with fidelity. So help me God."

Thereupon the speaker called Mr. Pyle to the chair and retired from the senate chamber.

Section 1, Article VI, of the constitution is as follows:

SEC. 1. The judicial power of this State shall be vested in a court of errors and appeals, a superior court, a court of chancery, an orphans' court, a court of oyer and terminer, a court of general sessions of the peace and gaol delivery, a register's court, justices of the peace, and such other courts as the general assembly, with the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of both houses, shall from time to time establish.

It is provided in Article III, section 3, that—

The governor shall hold his office during four years from the third Tuesday in January next ensuing his election, and shall not be eligible a second time to said office.

And in Article III, section 4, that—

SEC. 4. He shall be at least thirty years of age, and have been a citizen and inhabitant of the United States twelve years next before the first meeting of the legislature after his election, and the last six of that term an inhabitant of this State, unless he shall have been absent on the public business of the United States, or of this State.

Article III, section 11, provides as follows:

He shall, from time to time, give to the general assembly information of affairs concerning the State, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge expedient.

It is further provided in section 9 of Article III of the constitution, as follows:

SEC. 9. He shall have power to remit fines and forfeitures and to grant reprieves and pardons, except in cases of impeachment. He shall set forth in writing, fully, the grounds of all reprieves, pardons, and remissions, to be entered in the register of his official acts and laid before the general assembly at their next session.

The following are the provisions of the constitution of the State of Delaware bearing upon the election of senators and the constitution of the senate of that State:

ART. 2. SEC. 3. The senators shall be chosen for four years by the citizens residing in the several counties. * * *

There shall be three senators *chosen* in each county. When a greater number of senators shall by the general assembly be judged necessary, two-thirds of each branch concurring, they may by law make provision for increasing their number; but the number of senators shall never be greater than one-half nor less than one-third of the number of representatives.

SEC. 2. The representatives shall be chosen for two years by the citizens residing in the several counties. * * *

There shall be seven representatives chosen in each county, until a greater number of representatives shall by the general assembly be judged necessary; and then, two-thirds of each branch of the legislature concurring, they may by law make provision for increasing their number.

The qualifications of a senator of the legislature of the State of Delaware are prescribed by section 3 of Article II of the constitution of that State, as follows:

No person shall be a senator who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-seven years, and have, in the county in which he shall be chosen, a freehold estate in two hundred acres of land, or an estate in real or personal property, or in either, of the value of one thousand pounds at least, and have been a citizen and inhabitant of the State three years next preceding the first meeting of the legislature after his election, and the last year of that term an inhabitant of the county in which he shall be chosen, unless he shall have been absent on the public business of the United States or of this State.

While the qualifications of a representative in the legislature of the State of Delaware are set forth in section 2 of Article II, as follows:

No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained the age of 24 years, and have been a citizen and inhabitant of the State three years next preceding the first meeting of the legislature after his election, and the last year of that term an inhabitant of the county in which he shall be chosen, unless he shall have been absent on the public business of the United States or of this State.

While section 1 of Article IV provides that—

All elections for governor, senators, representatives, sheriffs, and coroners shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November of the year in which they are to be held, and be by ballot.

Section 2 of Article II provides that—

The representatives shall be chosen for two years by the citizens residing in the several counties.

Section 3 of Article II provides that—

The senators shall be chosen for four years by the citizens residing in the several counties.

Section 4 of Article II provides that—

The general assembly shall meet on the first Tuesday of January, biennially,

unless sooner convened by the governor. The first meeting of the general assembly under this amended constitution shall be on the first Tuesday of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, which shall be the commencement of biennial sessions.

It is provided in Article II, section 6, that—

Each house shall judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

While Article V, sections 1 and 2, are as follows:

ARTICLE V.

SECTION 1. The house of representatives shall have the sole power of impeaching; but two-thirds of all the members must concur in an impeachment. All impeachments shall be tried by the senate; and when sitting for that purpose the senators shall be upon oath or affirmation to do justice according to the evidence. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of all the senators.

SEC. 2. The governor, and all other civil officers under this State, shall be liable to impeachment for treason, bribery, or any high crime or misdemeanor in office. Judgment in such cases shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under this State; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law.

It is provided in Article III, section 14, as follows:

The governor shall not be removed from his office for inability, but with the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature.

Article II, section 5, provides that—

Each house shall choose its speaker and other officers; and also each house, whose speaker shall exercise the office of governor, may choose a speaker *pro tempore*.

Article II, section 7, provides that—

Each house may, * * * with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member, etc.

Article VII, section 3, provides that—

The legislature, two-thirds of each branch concurring, may vest the appointment of sheriffs and coroners in the governor.

Article III, section 14, is as follows:

If upon a vacancy happening in the office of governor there be no other person who can exercise said office within the provisions of the constitution, the secretary of state shall exercise the same until the next meeting of the general assembly, who shall immediately proceed to elect, by joint ballot of both houses, a person to exercise the office until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified.

A PRELIMINARY QUESTION—THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES MAY INQUIRE INTO THE RIGHT OF GOVERNOR WATSON TO A SEAT IN THE JOINT ASSEMBLY AND TO VOTE FOR A UNITED STATES SENATOR THEREIN.

At the threshold in this investigation we are confronted with the question, Has the Senate of the United States the constitutional power to inquire into the question as to the right of Watson, then governor of the State, to a seat in the State senate, and to be present in the joint assembly, and to vote for a United States Senator?

Those opposing the claim of Mr. Du Pont insist no such power exists, and the reason advanced in support of this contention is that the senate of Delaware passed judgment upon Watson's qualifications as a member of that body, and that such decision is conclusive.

Counsel, in opposition to the claim of Mr. Du Pont, cite section 6, Article II, of the constitution of the State of Delaware, as follows:

Each house shall judge of the elections, returns, and *qualifications* of its own members.

Then, conceding that in order to conclude the United States Senate, the State senate must have either *actually* or *constructively* acted, and *rendered judgment* upon the question of his right to a seat therein, it is by the opposition assumed, and the declaration is made, that such action was had, such *judgment* in this case *was rendered*, and hence the Senate of the United States is concluded.

Your committee deny this contention. They deny that the Delaware senate ever at any time after Watson became governor, either *actually* or *constructively*, passed upon his qualifications to a seat in that body. And it is upon this branch of the case there is any controversy whatever as to the facts.

It is conceded by your committee that Governor Watson, after having studiously refrained from attempting to exercise any of the functions of senator or speaker of the senate from the date of his inauguration as governor, April 9, 1895, until May 9, 1895, a fact also conceded by those opposing the claim of Mr. Du Pont, did on this latter date, May 9, 1895, the legislature being about to adjourn *sine die*, enter the senate chamber a few minutes before the hour of 12 o'clock meridian, at which time the senate was to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to meet the members of the house in joint assembly for the purpose of electing a United States Senator, and after conversing with two or more members until a few moments before 12 o'clock meridian, did then, the president *pro tempore* leaving the chair, take the chair of speaker of the senate, all the business of the senate having been concluded, and immediately made this announcement:

The hour of 12 having arrived, the senate will proceed to take part in the joint assembly.

That, while occupying the chair as speaker of the senate, Governor Watson took no part whatever in any of the legislative functions of the senate, other than what related to proceeding to the hall of the house of representatives by the senate for the purpose of attending the joint assembly to elect a United States Senator. These are the facts and *all the facts* in reference to this matter, as found by your committee.

THE SENATE JOURNAL ENTRIES ARE CONCLUSIVE AS AGAINST EX PARTE AFFIDAVITS AS TO WHAT OCCURRED IN THE SENATE MAY 9, 1895.

This brings us to a consideration of the seventh proposition hereinbefore stated, namely: That the journal entries of the proceedings of the Delaware senate on May 9, 1895, are conclusive as to the number and names of senators present, the motions submitted, the votes cast, and of *all the proceedings had*, and can not be contradicted by *ex parte* affidavits.

The law is well settled by more than 120 adjudicated cases in the courts of last resort in more than twenty of the States in the American Union, as also by the Supreme Court of the United States, that where a State constitution prescribes such formalities in the enactment of laws as require a record of the yeas and nays on the legislative journals, those journals are conclusive as against, not only a printed statute published by authority of law, but also against a duly enrolled act. The principle now contended for falls far short of going to this extent.

The question involved in the case under consideration is not whether the legislative journals are conclusive against a printed statute or an enrolled act, but whether they are conclusive as against *ex parte* affidavits by which such journals are sought to be contradicted.

Your committee, without indulging in argument upon this point, beg to attract attention to the following authorities, national and State, which hold to the doctrine that legislative journals are conclusive as against a duly enrolled act. Surely, if this be so, it can not be otherwise than they are conclusive against *ex parte* affidavits, the reason for this application of the rule being infinitely stronger than for the other.

The following is a list of the authorities, 124 in number, relied on. It is believed few Federal or State authorities can be found to conflict with these. Decisions can be found, as, for instance, in Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S., 649–678), to the effect that where the constitution contains no provision requiring entries on the journal of particular matters, such, for example, as calls of the yeas and nays on a measure in question, the enrolled acts can not in such case be impeached by the journal. That, however, is a very different proposition from the one involved here.

The authorities are as follows:

Alabama—28 Ala., 466; 43 id., 721; 48 id., 115; 54 id., 599; 57 id., 49; 58 id., 546; 60 id., 361; 77 id., 597; 77 id., 608; 78 id., 411; 78 id., 517; 82 id., 562.
Arkansas—19 Ark., 250; 27 id., 266; 28 id., 317; 31 id., 701; 32 id., 496; 33 id., 17; 35 id., 237; 40 id., 200; 41 id., 471; 44 id., 536; 48 id., 370; 49 id., 325; 51 id., 559.
California—8 Sawyer, 238; 54 Cal., 111; 69 id., 479; 80 id., 211.
Colorado—5 Colo., 525; 11 id., 489.
Florida—20 Fla., 407; 24 id., 203.
Illinois—14 Ill., 297; 17 id., 151; 19 id., 283; 19 id., 324; 25 id., 181; 35 id., 121; 38 id., 174; 43 id., 77; 44 id., 91; 45 id., 119; 62 id., 253; 63 id., 157; 68 id., 160; 70 id., 166; 70 id., 659; 74 id., 361; 77 id., 11; 81 id., 288; 93 id., 191; 98 id., 156; 120 id., 332; 122 id., 420; 94 U. S., 280; 103 U. S., 683; 103 U. S., 697; 105 U. S., 667.
Kansas—12 Kans., 384; 15 id., 194; 17 id., 62; 24 id., 700; 26 id., 724; 28 id., 243; 35 id., 545; 41 id., 200.
Maryland—41 Md., 446; 42 id., 203; 48 id. 292.
Michigan—2 Gibbs, 287; 1 Douglass, 351; 2 id., 191; 13 Mich., 481; 16 id., 254; 22 id., 104; 47 id., 520; 55 id., 94; 59 id., 610; 64 id., 385; 72 id., 446; 79 id., 59; 79 id., 595; 80 id., 598; 83 id., 13; 84 id., 408.
Minnesota—2 Minn., 330; 24 id., 78; 31 id., 472; 38 id., 143; 45 id., 451.
Missouri—60 Mo., 33; 71 id., 266.
Nebraska—4 Nebr., 503; 9 id., 125; 9 id., 462; 17 id., 389; 18 id., 236; 20 id., 96; 21 id., 647; 24 id., 586.
Ohio—5 Ohio, 358; 3 Ohio State, 475; 20 id., 1; 44 id., 348; 45 id., 254.
Oregon—11 Oreg., 67, 71; 14 id., 365.
South Carolina—2 S. C., 150; 11 id., 262; 12 id., 200; 13 id., 46.
Tennessee—3 Lea, 332; 4 id., 608; 6 id., 549; 86 Tenn., 732; 87 id., 163.
United States—94 U. S., 260; 103 id., 683; 103 id., 697; 105 id., 667.
Virginia—79 Va., 269.
West Virginia—5 W. Va., 85.
Wisconsin—20 Wis., 501; 45 id., 543; 64 id., 323.
Wyoming—1 Wyo., 85; 1 id., 96.

The constitution of Michigan contained the following clause:

No public act shall take effect or be in force until the expiration of ninety days from the end of the session at which the same is passed, unless the legislature shall otherwise direct, by a two-thirds vote of the members elected to each house.

In People *v.* Mahany (13 Mich., 481, 492) Mr. Justice Cooley, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

As the court are bound judicially to take notice of what the law is, we have no doubt it is our right, as well as our duty, to take notice not only of the printed statute books, but also of the journals of the two houses, to enable us to determine whether all the constitutional requisites to the validity of a statute have been complied with. The printed statute is not even prima facie valid, when other records, of which the court must equally take notice, show that some constitutional formality is wanting.

The constitution of California contained the following provision:

No bill shall become a law without the concurrence of a majority of the members elected to each house.

In the Railroad Tax Case (8 Sawyer, 238, 293) Judge Sawyer, with the concurrence of Mr. Justice Field, said:

On March 4 the house considered the senate amendment, and, upon a call of the yeas and nays, as required by the constitution, *thirty-nine* members voted for the amendment and *thirty-two* against it, there being four paired and not voting; thus the votes, in favor of the amendment, were two less than a majority of members elected to the house, and the bill failed. * All this appears upon the journal. * The bill, therefore, was never constitutionally passed, and never became a law. Under the decisions of the courts, upon constitutional provisions in all respects similar to that in the present constitution of California, it is settled that the court, to inform itself, will look to the journals of the legislature.

In Spangler *v.* Jacoby (14 Ill., 297, 300) the court said:

The act in question was signed by the speakers of the two houses, and it received the assent of the executive. *Prima facie*, therefore, it became a law. But the journal of the house of representatives fails wholly to show that it was ever put upon its final passage in that house; in other words, it does not appear that it passed with the concurrence of a majority of the members-elect of that body. The act did not become a law in pursuance of the provisions of the constitution, and it is therefore null and void. The judgment is reversed.

In Berry *v.* R. R. Co. (41 Md., 446, 463, 465), Judge Alvey, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

The question has repeatedly arisen, in several of the State courts of the highest authority, and in all cases, with but few exceptions, it has been held that neither the printed statute book nor the ordinary authentication of the statute after its passage would preclude the inquiry into the fact whether the statute, as published, had in truth passed the legislature; and, as evidence upon the question, the legislative journals and the bills as acted upon by the legislative assemblies have been consulted. * We can have no doubt whatever that the third section of the act in question, as that act was sealed and approved by the governor, is materially different from the third section of the act as it passed the two houses of the legislature, and we must therefore declare that particular section of the act to be null and void.

The constitution of the State of Delaware, Article II, section 17, contains the following clause:

No act of incorporation, except for the renewal of existing corporations, shall be hereafter enacted without the concurrence by two-thirds of each branch of the legislature.

This provision requires the yeas and nays to be recorded in the journals on the passage of every new act of incorporation.

THE DELAWARE SENATE DID NOT, EITHER ACTUALLY OR CONSTRUCTIVELY, JUDGE OF THE QUALIFICATIONS OF GOVERNOR WATSON TO A SEAT IN THE SENATE AT ANY TIME SUBSEQUENT TO HIS BECOMING GOVERNOR OF THE STATE.

As bearing upon the question as to what occurred either of a legislative or quasi-judicial character in the Delaware senate on May 9, 1895, Mr. Du Pont presents a certified copy of the senate journal entries of the proceedings of the senate of that date (Doc. 9, Part II, pp. 431), and insists such journal entries are conclusive upon that question. Mr. Du Pont, however, as is his right, presents also the *ex parte* affidavits of certain State senators and others, not for the purpose, however, of contradicting, but *confirming* such journal entries; while those opposing Mr. Du Pont present certain *ex parte* affidavits tending strongly to *impeach* and *contradict* such journal entries in certain respects.

Should these affidavits tending to impeach the journal entries be considered as competent evidence, then there is a slight conflict of testimony in respect to the exact time and manner in which Governor Watson attempted to resume and did resume his seat as speaker of the senate on said 9th day of May, 1895.

Your committee, however, while protesting such *ex parte* affidavits can not be considered *in so far as they tend to impeach the journal entries*, regard this conflict as immaterial and as not in any manner materially affecting the merits of the case, whatever view may be taken of the testimony.

Upon the part of those opposing Mr. Du Pont and denying his right to a seat in the senate it is contended, which contention it is sought to maintain by these *ex parte* affidavits contradictory of the senate journal entries, and which is, in the judgment of your committee, not sustained, but, on the contrary, clearly contradicted by the senate journal entries and other evidence submitted, except so far as hereinbefore conceded, that Governor Watson entered the senate chamber on said 9th day of May "*between* the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock"—just how long before 12, whether fifty-nine minutes or five seconds before, is not stated in the affidavits filed—the senate being in session, and took the chair as speaker of the senate; that he presided over the senate until 12 o'clock m., the hour for the two houses to convene in joint assembly; how long he so presided, whether fifty-nine minutes or *one* minute or *one second*, is not stated in any of the affidavits filed, nor is it disclosed by the record; that while he presided over the senate, it is claimed in one or more of these affidavits, he "voted in the affirmative *upon at least one corporation bill*," and declared that such bill had passed the senate, it having received the required constitutional majority. What corporation bill it was which it is alleged he so voted on is not disclosed, either by the affidavit of Governor Watson himself, which is filed in the case, or by any other testimony.

It is further claimed he, while presiding in the senate, "put motions made by senators," but what motion or motions he so put is not stated either in briefs of counsel or in any of the evidence submitted. In so far as these several affidavits filed in opposition to Mr. Du Pont relate to the exact time when Governor Watson assumed the speaker's chair in the senate they are not contradictory of the affidavits filed by Mr. Du Pont. The latter say it was after all the legislative business was ended and just as the senate was about to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the joint assembly (which all agree was 12 m.), while the former are to the effect that he entered the senate chamber *between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock*—how many moments before 12 m. is not stated—and that he, of course, subsequently took the chair.

That precisely what Governor Watson says on this subject may be readily seen, your committee present herewith his affidavit in full:

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM T. WATSON, SPEAKER OF THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 28th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally came before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public of the State of Delaware, resident in Kent County, William T. Watson, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, did depose and say that he was elected speaker of the senate on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, and on the 9th day of April of the same year, after the death of Joshua Marvil, the duly elected and qualified governor of the State of Delaware, assumed the exercise of the office of governor; that on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, *between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock m.*, this affiant entered the senate chamber, whereupon William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, vacated the chair, and he, this affiant, took the same and presided over the senate until the hour for the two houses to assemble in joint meeting arrived, and then announced the same and proceeded at the head of the senators into the hall of the house of representatives, where he presided over the joint assembly from the beginning to the end thereof, and voted upon all questions which arose during the session, no objection having been made to his so presiding or voting until at or about the time the last ballot was taken, when *Senator Alrichs read a written protest against his right to so vote and preside;* that while he presided over the senate on that day in its chamber he *voted upon one bill at least and announced its passage by the senate;* that he received and put motions made by senators, and was addressed as speaker of that body, and that no objection from any quarter was made to his acting as presiding officer of the senate and otherwise participating in the proceedings thereof while in session during the hour aforesaid.

WILLIAM T. WATSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year aforesaid.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

It will be seen Governor Watson admits in this affidavit his right to vote and preside in said joint assembly was challenged in writing.

SENATE JOURNAL ENTRIES AND EX PARTE AFFIDAVITS.

As bearing upon this question of fact, Mr. Du Pont has presented the following testimony:

(1) A copy of the journal entries of the proceedings of the senate of that date. (See Senate Document No. 9, part 2, first session Fifty-fourth Congress.) And also, in corroboration of and support of senate journal entries, the following:

(2) The affidavit of John M. C. Moore, a state senator of the Delaware senate from Sussex County. (See Doc. id., 31.)

(3) The affidavit of George F. Pierce, a state senator of the Delaware senate from Sussex County. (Doc. id., 33.)

(4) The affidavit of Samuel Alrichs, a state senator of the senate of Delaware from Newcastle County. (Doc. id., 34.)

(5) The affidavit of Edgar T. Hastings, clerk of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware. (Doc. id., 35.)

(6) The affidavit of John S. Prettyman, jr. (Doc. id., 36.)

(7) The affidavit of Frank Reedy. (Doc. id., 37.)

(8) The affidavit of George L. Townsend. (Doc. id., 38.)

(9) The affidavit of William Michael Byrne. (Senate Doc. 9, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, part 4, pp. 1–3.)

(10) Second affidavit of State Senator Samuel Alrichs. (Doc. 9, part 6, p. 1.)

While in opposition to these journal entries, and *contradictory thereof* and of these several affidavits, those opposed to the claim of Mr. Du Pont have presented the following:

(1) The affidavit of Robert J. Hanby, State senator in the senate of Delaware from the county of Newcastle. (Doc. 9, part 3, p. 1.)

(2) The affidavit of William T. Records, State senator from Sussex County and speaker pro tempore of the Delaware senate. (Doc. 9, part 3, p. 2.)

(3) The affidavit of Charles A. Hastings, clerk of the senate of the State of Delaware.

(4) The affidavit of John B. Pennington (Doc. 9, part 3, p. 2.)

(5) The affidavit of Edward D. Hearne, assistant to Charles A. Hastings, the clerk of the senate (Doc. 9, part 3, p. 4).

(6) The affidavit of William T. Watson, claiming to be speaker of the senate of the State of Delaware (Doc. 9, part 5, p. 1).

(7) The affidavit of Cyrus Cort, chaplain of the senate of the State of Delaware for the session of 1895 (Doc. 9, part 5, p. 2).

For the convenience of the Senate this copy of the senate journal entries of the proceedings of the senate of the State of Delaware on May 9, 1895, also these affidavits, also the certificate of the election of Mr. Du Pont, signed by the speaker of the Delaware house of representatives and attested by the clerk of the house (see Doc. 9, pp. 1–5), together with the affidavits of Edgar T. Hastings, clerk of the Delaware house of representatives, Henry

McMullen, speaker of said house, and Samuel Alrichs, a State senator, attached thereto (Doc. 9, pp. 3–8), are printed together in an appendix hereto attached, marked A, and made a part of the report of your committee.

It will be observed from the inspection of the journal entries of the proceedings of the Delaware senate of May 9, 1895, that at the convening of the senate at 11 o'clock a. m., Thursday, May 9, 1895, but 8 senators were present, including "Mr. Speaker *pro tempore*." No mention is made of the presence of Senator Watson or Speaker Watson (Doc. 9, part 2, p. 4), while the names making up the 8 senators alleged to be present are all given, as follows: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker *pro tempore*.

It will be noticed, furthermore, that the yeas and nays were taken that date on but six different measures, as follows:

(1) On house bill entitled "An act to amend sections 5 and 10 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the town of Frederica.'"

On this question there were, yeas, 8; nays, 0.

(2) On house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Acetyline Light Company."

On the passage of this bill the vote was, yeas, 8; nays, 0.

(3) On house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company," on the passage of which the vote was, yeas, 8; nays, 0.

(4) On substitute for house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Hall Company of Lewes."

On the passage of this bill the vote was, yeas, 7; nays, 0—Senator Hanby being either absent or not voting. The 7 voting for the bill did not include the name of Watson.

(5) On house bill entitled "An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company, in Newcastle County."

On the passage of this bill the vote was, yeas, 8; nays, 0.

(6) On house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown, Sussex County."

On the passage of this bill the vote was, yeas, 8; nays, 0.

The foregoing were the *only* bills placed upon passage in the senate on May 9, 1895, on which the yeas and nays were taken and entered on the journal, and in each instance, except one, there were but 8 votes cast in all, including the speaker *pro tempore*, so called, and entered on the journal; and Watson was not present, either as senator or speaker of the senate, nor is his name anywhere mentioned, nor is his vote recorded on any of these bills, nor is he named as putting any motion to the senate or transacting any other business whatever.

In the one case above mentioned—that is, on the passage of the house measure entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Hall Company of Lewes," there were but 7 votes cast, including the speaker *pro tempore*, Senator Hanby not voting. Watson was not present or voting.

The only other proceedings had in the senate on that date, May 9, 1895, subsequent to the vote on the last house bill, on which the yeas and nays were called as above—that is, on the house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown, Sussex County" (Doc. 9, part 2, p. 7), are best stated by quoting in *hæc verba* the whole of the subsequent journal entries of the proceedings of that day, as follows:

Ordered, That the House be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed and requested the concurrence of the senate in the following house bill entitled "An act to divorce Benjamin O. Jacobs from his wife, Victoria W. Jacobs."

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, presented for the signature of the speaker of the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled house bills, the same having been signed by the speaker of the house.

An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company.

An act relative to bonds, undertakings, and other obligations with surety or sureties, to the acceptance as surety or guarantor thereupon of companies qualified to act as such and to provide a uniform system of procedure by and standard of qualifications for such companies.

Mr. Hastings, the clerk of the house, being admitted, returned to the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled senate bill, the same having been signed by the speakers of both houses:

An act to divorce Ellen Tatem Pusey from her husband, Joshua B. Pusey.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed the following senate bills:

An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company, in Newcastle County.

An act to incorporate Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown.

An act to incorporate the North American Construction Company.

An act to divorce Elzey D. Richardson from his wife, Jennie A. Richardson.

And returned the same to the senate.

From the above record it will be observed no further measures were placed upon their passage, either by a call for the yeas and nays or otherwise. It was simply ordered that the house be advised of the passage of the above-named house bills.

The clerk of the house informed the senate—

(1) That the house had passed a bill to divorce Benjamin O. Jacobs from his wife, Victoria W. Jacobs.

(2) He presented for the signature of the speaker two bills.

(3) He announced that two certain bills had been signed by the speakers of both houses.

(4) He informed the senate that the house had passed four senate bills, and he returned the same to the senate.

From the beginning, therefore, until the end of the journal entries of the proceedings of the Delaware senate on May 9, 1895, there is not only no mention of the fact that Governor Watson was present and voted on any corporation or any other bill, either in the affirmative or negative, or that he put any motion or announced any result, but, on the contrary, the record discloses the fact he was not present, or at least did not vote on any roll call, during that entire day.

The only other bills placed on their passage in the senate May 9, 1895, other than those above mentioned, on which the yeas and nays were taken, and not one of which was a corporation bill, and all of which were acted upon *prior* to the action upon any one of the bills above named, on which the yeas and nays were called, were the following:

(1) An act relating to the salary of the attorney-general. (Doc. 9, part 2, p. 4.)

(2) An act for the relief of Robert Cook, deceased. (Id.)

(3) Joint resolutions in relation to paying William T. Smithers, and John D. Hawkins, secretary of state. (Id.)

(4) An act to prevent bogus sales within the State of Delaware, etc. (Doc. id.)

Your committee, therefore, in response to the contention of those opposing Mr. Du Pont, to the effect that the Delaware senate, as a matter of fact, *acted upon* and *passed judgment* May 9, 1895, on the *qualifications* of Governor Watson to a seat in the senate, say:

First. This is a question which can alone be determined by an inspection of the record of the journal entries of the senate, which record can not be contradicted by *ex parte* affidavits; and that such record is not merely silent on the subject, but affirmatively shows that Governor Watson took no part whatever, either as senator or speaker of the senate, in any of the proceedings of the senate on May 9, 1895, and furthermore, that no question as to his qualifications to a seat in the senate was submitted or acted upon, either *directly* or *constructively*; and

Second. Were it proper to admit *ex parte* affidavits in opposition to the record, a proposition denied by your committee, even then, giving to such affidavits every consideration and weight which should be accorded to them as competent testimony in the case, and taking into consideration all the evidence presented on both sides, the preponderance of such evidence is clearly to the effect that, as a matter of fact and law, the Delaware senate did *not*, on May 9, 1895, in any manner act or pass judgment, either *actually* or *constructively*, upon the qualifications of Governor Watson to a seat in the senate, and hence, for this reason, the Senate of the United States is not concluded from determining, in its own right, as to his qualifications to such seat.

THE JOINT ASSEMBLY HAD NO POWER TO ADJUDICATE UPON THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE GOVERNOR TO A SEAT IN THE STATE SENATE, DID NOT ATTEMPT TO DO SO, BUT PROTESTED AGAINT HIS RIGHT.

The joint assembly for the purpose of electing a Senator had no power to judge of the right of the governor to a seat in the State senate; no power whatever resided in that body to judge of his qualifications, and his presence there and voting and presiding could not possibly have conferred any rights, even if there had been acquiescence on the part of the joint assembly. But there was no acquiescence, but, on the contrary, a *vigorous protest*.

The record shows (see affidavit of Senator Alrichs, *supra*) that he, on behalf of himself and fourteen other members of the joint assembly who had voted for Mr. Du Pont, presented in said joint assembly the following protest:

After the last ballot had been taken in said final joint assembly and before the houses separated I, on behalf of myself and the fourteen other senators voting for the said Henry A. Du Pont, arose and presented the following challenge, protest, and demand:

"I very respectfully challenge the correctness of the announcement of this vote and divers preceding votes, and do now most respectfully insist and demand that Henry A. Du Pont be now declared elected Senator for the unexpired term of six years commencing on the fourth day of March, A. D. 1895, inasmuch as it is now respectfully insisted that this joint assembly consists of twenty-nine members, the honorable gentleman now undertaking to preside and participate therein being governor of the State, and not now a senator."

After the presentation of the foregoing challenge, protest, and demand, and without taking any further ballot, the joint assembly finally separated, with a declaration from William T. Watson that no person had been elected Senator in Congress for said term.

SAMUEL ALRICHS.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 25th day of November, A. D. 1895. And witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] JOHN H. FRAZER, *Notary Public.*

Even had Watson been senator and speaker of the senate on May 9, 1895, both *de facto* and *de jure*, he would not from these circumstances have had any *preference right* over that of any other member of the joint assembly to preside over that body. He would have been there simply as a senator, without any authority whatever in virtue of any law to preside, except by the consent of his associates. This consent was not given, but protested against.

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES IS NOT CONCLUDED BY ANY CONSTRUCTION PLACED UPON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE CONCERNING THE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER A CERTAIN SEAT IN THE SENATE IS, UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THAT STATE, OPEN TO OCCUPATION, AND THE RESULTANT RIGHT OF THE GOVERNOR TO OCCUPY SUCH SEAT.

But your committee respectfully insist that any judgment, either *actual* or *constructive*, of the Delaware senate as to the

right of a person to a seat in such senate to be conclusive on the Senate of the United States, must relate to a seat in the senate *subject to occupation.*

The senate of the State of Delaware, while possessing the exclusive right to determine as to the *qualifications of its members* to all seats *open to be filled*, does not include the right or power upon the part of such senate to judge as to the *number* of seats in that body, or as to what shall constitute a *constitutional vacancy*, or a *constitutional suspension* of the right of a particular seat to be filled by anyone, either temporarily or permanently.

The authority given the senate in virtue of the constitutional provision is to judge of the qualifications of members *who apply for admission to seats*, which seats are provided for *by the constitution*, and *not* by the *judgment of the senate.*

If, therefore, the senate undertakes to determine either that there is a *tenth* place in the senate open to occupation by a member, and proceeds to fill that *tenth* place with a member, when the constitution declares that the senate shall consist of but *nine* members, or if it undertakes to declare that one of the nine seats is open to occupation, and proceeds to fill that seat, when the constitution declares that, by reason of the senator who occupied that seat having under the constitution become governor, *such seat is not open to occupation, and can not be held or its functions exercised by such governor while he continues to hold and exercise the office of governor*, then, in either of such cases, it is respectfully submitted, the judgment of the senate of the State of Delaware, however formal and solemn such a judgment may have been, does *not* conclude the Senate of the United States.

THE DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE DU PONT CASE AND THE TURPIE CASE.

The question for consideration here is widely different from that presented to this committee in the Turpie case, in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress.

In that case there was no statutory, much less constitutional, question involved as to the *number* of seats in the Indiana senate *open to occupation.* The rights of two sets of claimants to two different seats confessedly open to occupation were in issue. There was no question, constitutional, statutory, or otherwise, as to their right to be filled, or as to the duty upon the part of the senate to fill them, provided persons having the requisite qualifications were legally elected and returned. It was not only the right, but the duty of the Indiana senate, under the constitutional provisions in that State, to judge as to which set of claimants was legally elected and returned, and whether these had the proper qualifications. In the performance of this duty the Indiana senate held the two sitting members were *not* entitled to their seats and that the two persons claiming the same *were*, and the sitting members were ousted and the claimants seated. And this committee and the Senate very properly held that in such case the action of the State senate was conclusive.

Here the question rises to one of infinitely greater importance, involving an inquiry not only as to the *qualifications* of a person *claiming a seat*, but the question as to whether, under the constitution of the State of Delaware, *there was any seat to be occupied.* Argument to show the distinction between the two cases is unnecessary. The mere statement of the difference in the cases carries with it all the argument required.

But still further. In the Indiana case it was not questioned that the senate of Indiana had *actually* passed upon the question and judged *actually* of the right of the two claimants who were admitted to the seats to which they were admitted, while here it is clear there were no judgment of the senate of the State of Delaware, either *actual* or *constructive*, upon the right of the governor of the State of Delaware to hold or exercise the duties of senator.

THE SEAT FILLED BY GOVERNOR WATSON IN THE STATE SENATE OF DELAWARE, MAY 9, 1895, WAS NOT, IN ANY CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF THE DELAWARE CONSTITUTION, OPEN TO OCCUPATION ON THAT DATE.

It is clear, if under the constitution of the State of Delaware, as your committee believe it is, that one of two things is true: Either that the office of senator held by Mr. Watson become absolutely vacant on his accession to the office of governor, or otherwise, that his right to exercise the functions of senator was *held in abeyance and absolutely suspended for and during the time he should continue to exercise the functions of governor;* then in the former case there was a vacancy in the office of senator which could only be filled by election, and the right of the governor to fill it was one not open to the consideration or determination of the senate, because that matter is already determined by the constitution, while in the latter case there is by the provisions of the constitution *no seat open to occupation.* It can not in such case be filled by *anyone*, much less by *the governor*, and if the senate undertakes to fill it, either with the governor or anyone else, it is a judgment that is *ultra vires* and does not conclude the Senate of the United States.

In this connection it may be conceded that instances might occur where the judgment of a State senate as to the qualifications of one of its members may be binding on the Senate of the United States, although confessedly the effect of such judgment may be to admit a person to a seat who is lacking in an essential qualification. But it proceeds upon the theory that when certain facts are found to exist, although such finding may be erroneous, the judgment is binding. As, for instance, the constitution of the State of Delaware prescribes as a qualification for State senator that he shall be 27 years of age. Suppose the senate admit a person to a seat in the senate who, as a matter of fact, is but 20 years of age, but there is nothing in the record, nothing in the judgment of the senate passing upon his qualifications that discloses the fact that he was but 20 years of age; in such case, it is believed, the judgment of the senate would conclude the United States Senate. But in such case, suppose the record, the judgment of the senate upon the question of qualification, found as a *fact* that the applicant was but 20 years of age, and then on such finding admitted him to a seat, is it not entirely clear that such a judgment would *not* be conclusive upon this body?

But three other States—namely, Pennsylvania, Maine, and Colorado—have ever had constitutions embracing in corresponding provisions the same qualifying words of the Delaware constitution, namely, "*during his continuance in office.*" Therefore it is that in those States only can we look for judicial decisions or authorities on the question whether Governor Watson can exercise the office of senator during his incumbency of the office of governor.

On the 14th of January, 1830, Joshua Hall was chosen president of the Maine senate. Soon thereafter the governor died, and he became the governor. Sixteen senators, including Mr. Hall, had been admitted and sworn. On the 26th of January the senate decided that there were four vacancies. Under the constitution these vacancies were to be filled by a joint assembly of the two houses of the legislature. On February — the house of representatives sent a message to the senate requesting that body to meet the house in joint assembly for the election of senators to fill the vacancies. On the 2d of February, the senate being in session, a senator moved an adjournment to enable the senate to meet the representatives in joint assembly. Mr. Hall, who was then exercising the office of governor, appeared in the senate and claimed the right to act as president. The vote was taken by yeas and nays. Hall voted in the negative. His vote being counted the result was, yeas 8, nays 8, and the motion was lost. On the 13th of February Mr. Jonathan G. Hunton, having been in the meantime elected governor, submitted certain questions to the supreme court in pursuance of the Maine constitution. One of these questions was the following:

2d. Has the president of the senate, when the office of governor is vacant, and when he ought to be acting as governor, a right to *preside* and *vote* at the senate board?

The answer to this question was given by the chief justice, with the concurrence of the other justices, in the following words:

As to the second question, my opinion is that while the president of the senate, in virtue of his office as such, is clothed with the power of exercising the office of governor, he has *no* right to *preside* over the senate or to *vote as a member of that body.* (Opinion of the justices, 7 Greenleaf, 483.)

The provision of the Maine constitution, it will be seen, is in substance and effect, in fact almost literally, similar to that of the Delaware constitution.

It is as follows:

ART. IV. SEC. 14. Whenever the office of governor shall become vacant by death, resignation, removal from office, or otherwise, the president of the senate shall exercise the office of governor until another governor shall be qualified.

There is a provision of the Maine constitution which to some extent impairs, but by no means destroys, the value of the decision of the Maine court, *supra*, as an authority in the case now under consideration. It is to the effect that while the president of the senate exercises the office of governor, his *duties* as *president of the senate* shall be suspended and a president *pro tempore* elected. The provision is not that his *powers and duties* as president of the senate shall be suspended, but merely that his *duties* as such shall be suspended. It is very clear, of course, that if a man's power to perform certain acts is suspended, his obligation to perform them must also be suspended. He can not be charged with the *obligation* while stripped of the *power* to perform them. But it is not so clear that the suspension of the *obligation* is also the suspension of his *power* to perform the acts. He may have the power without being *required to exercise it, except at his discretion or convenience.* It is not clear that the suspension of the obligation to act as president of the Maine senate did not leave it in the power of the officer, to perform or not perform, at his discretion or convenience, the duties not of *senator*, but of *president of the senate.*

But if this peculiar provision of the Maine constitution does, in truth, suspend the acting governor's *power and duty* to preside over the senate, it certainly does not suspend or purport to suspend his *power*, or his *duty*, to *vote* as senator. If his power or duty to *vote* as senator is suspended, it must be suspended by some other provision of the State constitution. That other provision is to be found in a clause, which is common to both the Maine and the Delaware constitutions, to the effect that "no person holding any office under the State, shall, during his continuance in office, *be a senator* or representative." And this gives great value and weight

to the Maine decision as an authority in the case under consideration, for it makes the Maine case and the Delaware case, so far as this point is concerned, closely analagous. The prohibition against *voting as senator* is the same in both constitutions.

The following is the provision of the Maine constitution, which suspends the duty of the governor *to preside* over the senate:

ART. 4. SEC. 14. Whenever the office of governor shall become vacant by death, resignation, removal from office, or otherwise, the president of the senate shall exercise the office of governor until another governor shall be duly qualified: and, in case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or other disqualification of the president of the senate so exercising the office of governor, the speaker of the house of representatives shall exercise the office until a president of the senate shall have been chosen; and when the office of governor, president of the senate, and speaker of the house shall become vacant, in the recess of the senate, the person acting as secretary of state for the time being shall, by proclamation, convene the senate, that a president may be chosen to exercise the office of governor. And whenever either the president of the senate or speaker of the house shall so exercise said office, he shall receive only the compensation of governor; but his *duties* as president or speaker shall be suspended; and the senate or house shall fill the vacancy until his duties as governor shall cease.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF THE OFFICE OF A DELAWARE SENATOR WHO HAS SUCCEEDED TO THE OFFICE OF GOVERNOR IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AS THAT OF THE OFFICE OF A SENATOR OR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS DURING THE INTERVAL BETWEEN THE 4TH OF MARCH, THE COMMENCEMENT OF HIS TERM, AND THE DATE OF HIS RESIGNATION OF ANOTHER FEDERAL OFFICE HELD BY HIM AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF HIS TERM.

The constitutional status of the office of a Delaware senator who has succeeded to the office of governor would seem to be essentially the same as that of the office of a Senator or Representative in Congress during the interval between the 4th of March, the commencement of his term, and the date of his resignation of another Federal office held by him at the commencement of his term. In each case the office is in *abeyance* whether it be characterized as a *temporary vacancy* or as a *suspension*. If in one case the office of State senator remains in abeyance during the State senator's continuance in the office of governor, so in the other case does the office of Federal Senator or Representative remain in abeyance during the Federal Senator's or Representative's continuance in the prior Federal office.

It is true that in one case the prior office has been actually exercised, while in the other it has not. But this difference would not seem to affect the principle involved, for the following reasons:

First. The constitutions of Delaware and the United States are, on this point, substantially identical. The words of the Delaware constitution are—

No * * * person holding any office under * * * this State shall, during his continuance * * * in office, be a senator or representative.

The following is the corresponding clause of the Federal Constitution:

No person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office.

Second. The seat in the Delaware senate which had been occupied by the governor must, during his incumbency of the latter office, be either (1) *subject to occupation*, or (2) *absolutely vacant*, or (3) *in abeyance*. There is no other possible status of the senatorial office from which the speaker of the senate is transferred to the office of governor. So also the seat of the Federal Senator or Representative must, during the interval between the 4th of March and his resignation of his other office, be either (1) *subject to occupation*, or (2) *absolutely vacant*, or (3) *in abeyance*. If the office of the State senator is subject to occupation by the governor while he is governor, so also is the office of Senator or Representative in Congress subject to occupation by the holder of another Federal office while he holds such office. If the office of Federal Senator or Representative becomes absolutely and permanently vacant, so also does the office of State senator become absolutely vacant. If the office of the Federal Senator or Representative is in *abeyance*, and the right to exercise it *suspended*, so also is the office of the State senator in *abeyance*, and the right to exercise it *suspended*.

The law provides for the payment of the salaries of the Federal Representatives from the commencement of their terms on the 4th of March. This means that they hold their office from that date, provided they hold no other Federal office. But they are not sworn and do not exercise their office until Congress meets after the lapse of eight months. If they hold other Federal offices on or after March 4, their office of Representative is not absolutely vacated, but is only placed *in abeyance*. It is then in abeyance for precisely the same reason for which the office of State senator is in abeyance when he exercises the office of governor. In each case the office is in abeyance because of the temporary exercise of another office. The Federal Representative may not be sworn until the expiration of eight months after his term begins. But the oath does not confer the office. It is not a prerequisite to the tenure of the office. It is only a prerequisite to the exercise of the office.

The decisions of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, fixing the status of the office of Senator or Representative during the interval between the 4th of March and the resignation of another Federal office held on that day, will therefore be valuable authorities for the case now under consideration.

James H. Lane was chosen United States Senator by the Kansas legislature in April, 1861. On the 20th of June, 1861, he was appointed brigadier-general of volunteers by the President, and he accepted the office. On the 4th of July, 1861, he took his seat in the Senate, having previously resigned the office of brigadier-general. On the 8th of July, 1861, the governor of Kansas, assuming that Mr. Lane's acceptance of the office of brigadier-general had vacated his office of Senator, appointed Frederic P. Stanton to fill the vacancy. Mr. Stanton presented his credentials and claimed the seat, but the Senate awarded the seat to Mr. Lane. Numerous cases in the National House of Representatives are to the same effect and recognize the same principle.

NO QUESTION OF FACT IN THIS CASE UPON WHICH THE DELAWARE SENATE WAS CALLED UPON TO ACT.

In the case under consideration there is no question of fact upon which the Delaware senate could act or did act, and which action, although erroneous, would conclude the Senate of the United States; upon the contrary, the senate, assuming for the present it passed judgment on the qualifications of Watson, and taking the facts as they were and are, open, notorious, conceded by all, and disclosed as well by the journals of the senate, and in reference to which there can be no dispute, namely, that Senator and Speaker Watson was then governor, essayed to place him in a seat in the senate which the constitution on these conceded facts declares to be *not subject to occupation*, any more than would be a *tenth* seat in the senate when the constitution declares the senate shall consist of but *nine* members. Hence this is such a judgment, it is believed, as is *not* binding on the United States Senate. The Senate is not concluded by such a judgment any more than it would be concluded by a judgment which on its face disclosed the fact that the senate of the State of Delaware had on the 9th day of May, 1895, instead of admitting Governor Watson to a seat, had admitted President Cleveland or a *tenth* member to that body.

While it is the exclusive right of the senate of Delaware to determine, or, in the language of the constitution, *judge*, as to the *qualifications* of a senator, this does not include the right or power on the part of such senate to declare the *kind* or *number* of qualifications a person must have to entitle him to a seat in the senate. These are *determined by the constitution itself*. The senate can neither add to nor detract from them, can neither increase, reduce, nor modify their *number* or *character*. What the senate *can* do, what it has a *constitutional right* to do, is to *judge* whether a *particular person* is possessed of the *qualifications* which the *constitution and the statutes have prescribed*. Hence it is if the constitution declare that a certain person for any reason is ineligible to a seat in the senate, and the judgment of the senate discloses on its face this fact of constitutional ineligibility, and the senate thus admits to a seat a person whom the constitution declares is debarred, then such judgment, however formal or solemn, it is submitted, does *not* conclude the Senate of the United States.

As bearing upon and in support of this view, your committee attract attention to the following authorities:

AUTHORITIES.

In Prouty *v.* Stover (11 Kans., 235) the validity of the election of a State printer by a joint assembly of the Kansas legislature was assailed. The question arose whether the action of the State senate, admitting and retaining certain senators, was made conclusive of their right to sit in the senate and vote in the joint assembly by the constitutional provision which made each house "the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." This action of the senate practically construed the law of Kansas to recognize certain seats in the senate as subject to occupation. It was claimed that this was conclusive on the courts. But the court held that the power of the senate to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members did not include the power to conclusively construe the law to recognize the seats as subject to occupation, or to admit or retain the occupants of those seats. Judge Brewer, now an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

Defendants claim that this court can not look beyond the action of the house to inquire whether persons, admitted as members, were legally entitled to seats. Article 2, section 8, declares that each house "shall be judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." Its determination is not the subject of repeal or review. It is final and concludes everyone. But what is concluded in this power? Does the power to judge of the qualifications of its members *include the power to increase such membership? Can it enlarge its members without limit?* Is it like an academy of science, or a lodge of Odd Fellows, capable of *indefinite expansion? If* the *law* fixed the number of senators *at twenty-five*, could those *twenty-five admit twenty-five more, on pretense of judging "of the elections and qualifications of its own members," and thus create a senate of fifty members? If this power exists, how easily could a partisan majority secure to itself a two-thirds vote by simply admitting new members.* To create a representative or senatorial district requires a law—the consent of both houses. Neither house, by itself, can create a district and then admit someone to represent it. The district must exist before it can be represented.

In State *v.* Francis (26 Kans., 724) it was contended that a cer-

tain act of the legislature had failed to receive a constitutional majority of votes, and was, therefore, void.

The question was whether four of the representatives whose votes were decisive in favor of this act, in the house, were lawful members of that body. The *house of representatives*, by its action admitting and retaining these four members, *had construed the law and constitution to recognize their seats as subject to occupation at the time.* The court *overruled this construction*, held that there were no seats in the house for these four representatives, and declared the act in question to be void. The court said:

Therefore, whenever the house of representatives consists of more than one hundred and twenty-five members some of such members must be there illegally. Such was the case in 1879. The house of representatives, at that time, consisted of one hundred and twenty-nine members. Four of these members, to wit, the four from Rooks, Rush, Harper, and Kingman counties, who were not provided for by law, and who were the last members admitted to seats, were not entitled to their seats. And the act in controversy was passed only by the assistance of their votes. Except for their votes, or at least three of their votes, the act would not have received a constitutional majority of the votes of the members of the house; and, not counting their votes, the act did not receive a constitutional majority. Now, we do not think that their votes should be counted; and, therefore, we think the act in controversy must be held as not having passed the house of representatives, and as void.

In Yard *v.* Meeser (44 Pa. St., 341) the common council of Philadelphia, which was invested with the power to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members, had construed the law to recognize two seats as subject to occupation by representatives of the Fifth Ward, and had admitted a second member from that ward. The court, in an action to restrain the payment of the salary of the second councilman from this ward, overruled the construction given to the law by the common council, held that the law did not recognize the second seat, and declared that its occupant was not a lawful member of the common council. The court said:

This court has no authority to judge whether the election was regularly conducted or not, for that duty is assigned by law to the councils. Our duty must be confined to the decision of the question whether there was an office or vacancy to be filled.

Judge Cooley, in his Constitutional Limitations, pages 52–55, says:

It follows, therefore, that every Department of the Government, and every official of every Department, may, at any time when a duty is to be performed, be required to pass upon a question of constitutional construction. Sometimes the case will be such that the decision when made must from the very nature of things be conclusive and subject to no repeal or review, however erroneous it may be in the opinion of other Departments or of other officers; but in other cases the same question may be required to be passed upon again before the duty is completely performed. The first of these classes is where by the Constitution a particular question is plainly addressed to the discretion of some one Department or officer, so that the interference of any other Department or officer, with a view to the substitution of its own discretion or judgment, in the place of that to which the Constitution has confided the decision, would be impertinent and intrusive. * * * *But there are cases in which the question of construction is equally addressed to two or more Departments of the Government;* and it then becomes important to know whether the decision by one is binding upon the others, or whether each is to act upon its own judgment. * * * But setting aside now those cases to which we have referred, when from the nature of things, and perhaps from explicit terms of the Constitution, the judgment of the Department or officer acting must be final, we shall find *the general rule to be that, whenever action is taken which may become the subject of a suit or proceeding in court, any question of constitutional power or right that was involved in such action will be open for consideration in such suit or proceeding, and, as the court must finally settle the particular controversy, so also will they finally determine the question of constitutional law.*

This is a case, therefore, if there can be said to be any question open to construction, in which, in the language of Judge Cooley, "the question of construction is *equally addressed to two or more Departments of the Government.*" It is in all respects similar in principle to that class of cases referred to by this eminent jurist wherein action is taken which may become the *subject of a suit or proceeding in court.* Any question of constitutional power or right that was involved in such action will be open for consideration in such suit or proceeding, and the court must finally settle the particular controversy; so also will they determine the question of constitutional law. Here the Senate of the United States, being called to *act judicially* under the constitutional grant authorizing it to judge of the elections and qualifications of its members—and this necessarily involves a construction of the Delaware constitution—hence, it is *not* bound, it is respectfully submitted, by any judgment of the Delaware senate on that subject.

If, as a matter of constitutional law, the office of senator and speaker of the senate held by Watson became absolutely vacant when he succeeded to the executive office, any judgment of the State senate seeking to clothe him with power to hold or exercise the office of State senator would be a mere *brutum fulmen*, an act in all respects *ultra vires*, for the plain reason it would be a judgment assigning him a seat in the senate which, under the constitution, is not assignable or subject to occupation. Such an act upon the part of the Delaware senate would be something infinitely *more in scope and effect* than simply to *judge* of the *qualifications of* a person to a seat in the senate. It would be to declare a seat *subject to occupation* which the constitution declares shall *not* be occupied.

And this view is equally applicable to this case whether the office of senator becomes absolutely vacant on the speaker of the senate becoming governor, or whether the right to exercise the office of senator while exercising the office of governor is merely *held in abeyance and suspended.* And any such judgment, it is respectfully submitted, is not binding on the Senate of the United States, and can not deprive that body under its power to judge of the qualifications of its members of determining whether under the constitution of the State of Delaware the governor of that State can be permitted to hold or exercise the office of senator at the same time he holds and exercises the office of governor.

AT COMMON LAW THE SAME PERSON SHALL NOT HOLD OR EXERCISE SIMULTANEOUSLY INCOMPATIBLE OFFICES.

In support of our first proposition that it is a well-settled rule of the common law that the same person shall not exercise simultaneously incompatible offices, and, further, that the acceptance of an office incompatible with the one held is *ipso facto* a resignation of the other, we attract attention to the following authorities:

In the case of Milward *v.* Thatcher (2 T. R., 81) it was held that accepting the office of town clerk vacated the office of jurat of the corporation of Hastings, although the office of clerk was inferior to that of jurat, the jurats sitting as judges of a court of record; and the court, Mr. Justice Bulwer, in announcing the opinion said:

Now, if the offices be incompatible, his being a jurat before is no objection to his election; and if they be incompatible, the election to the latter office is good, because the acceptance of the second vacates the first office. * * * The case of The King *v.* Sir W. Trelawney, so far as the question was entered into, is an authority. There the court did not distinguish between a superior and inferior office; but Lord Mansfield expressly said that "if the two offices were incompatible, the acceptance of the latter would imply a surrender of the former."

Mr. Justice Bulwer further, in the opinion in that case, said:

If two offices can not be held by the same person at the same time, the acceptance of the latter office vacates the former.

In The King *v.* Pateman (2 Durnf. and East, 777) Lord Chief Justice Kenyon said:

If an alderman be also a magistrate, and the town clerk act ministerially under him, then, indeed, these two offices can not be held by the same person. Now, here is a question whether the town clerk's accounts are not allowed by the alderman; if they are, I think the two offices are incompatible, and this information should be for the purpose of trying that fact.

In The King *v.* Tizzard (9 B. and C., 418) Mr. Justice Bailey gives the following as one definition of incompatible offices:

The two offices are incompatible when the holder can not *in every instance* discharge the duties of each.

And further says Mr. Justice Bailey:

The acceptance of the second office therefore vacates the first. So a man shall lose his office if he accepts another office incompatible.

Can it be said that any man can *in every instance* discharge the duties of both governor and state senator, much less those of governor, senator, and speaker of the senate.

Chief Justice Appleton, in Stubbs *v.* Lee (64 Me., 195), decided in 1874, in discussing what constituted incompatible offices, and also the effect of the acceptance of an office incompatible with one already held, referred to the common-law doctrine, and citing the foregoing English authorities, says:

"The offices in question must be regarded as incompatible. I think," remarks Bailey, J., in The King *v.* Tizzard (9 B. and C., 418), "that the two offices are incompatible *when the holder can not in every instance discharge the duties of each.* * * * The acceptance of the second office therefore *vacates the first.* * * * So a man shall lose his office if he accepts another office incompatible; as if one be under the control of the other; as if the remembrancer of the exchequer be made a baron of the exchequer." (5 Com. Dig., tit. "Officer" (K. 5).) The appointment of a person to a second office incompatible with the first is not absolutely void, but on his subsequently accepting the appointment and qualifying, the first office is *ipso facto* vacated. (The People *v.* Carrique, 2 Hill, 93.)

A vacancy may arise in an office from an *implied resignation*, as by the incumbent's accepting an incompatible office (Van Orsdale *v.* Hazard, 3 Hill, 243). The acceptance of the office of constable of a town by a person holding at the time the office of justice of the peace is *of itself a surrender of the latter office* (Magie *v.* Stoddard, 25 Conn., 565).

Mr. Justice Appleton, in further discussing this question in case *supra*, says:

Where one has two incompatible offices, both can not be retained. The public has a right to know which is held and which is surrendered. It should not be left to chance or to the uncertain and fluctuating whim of the office-holder to determine. The general rule, therefore, that the acceptance of and qualification for an office incompatible with one then held is a resignation of the former is one certain and reliable as well as one indispensable for the protection of the public.

The defendant having been appointed and sworn as a deputy sheriff must be regarded as having accepted that office. By that acceptance he surrendered the office of trial justice, a judicial office incompatible with that of a deputy sheriff. His judicial authority, therefore, as a trial justice was at an end.

Justice Cowen in discussing the question as to the effect of the acceptance of one office upon the other, in The People *v.* Carrique (2 Hill, 97), says:

This is an absolute determination of the original office, and leaves no shadow of title to the possessor, so that neither quo warranto nor a motion is necessary before any other may be elected (*vide* Millcock on Municipal Corporations, 240, pl. 617; to the same point Lord Mansfield, in Rex *v.* Trelawney, 3 Burr., 1616; Butler, J., in Milward *v.* Thatcher, 2 T. R., 87).

Also in Van Orsdall *v.* Hazard (3 Hill, 248) the court said:

A vacancy sometimes arises from a mere *implied resignation* by accepting an office incompatible with that which is claimed to be vacated.

THE AMERICAN RULE IS THAT LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE OFFICES ARE INCOMPATIBLE.

Your committee recognize the doctrine as enunciated in the foregoing authorities as being the well-settled common law and American rule upon the subject of incompatible offices, both as to what constitutes incompatibility and as to the effect of the acceptance of an incompatible office in operating *ipso facto* a resignation of the former. A vacancy in such case is at once created, and it is not necessary there should be any legislative or judicial declaration to that effect. It is such a vacancy as may be filled at once by the proper appointing power. And your committee further hold that the American rule is that legislative and executive offices are incompatible; that this general rule, so far from being weakened, is strengthened and confirmed by the fact that in a number of instances, for *special reasons*, the same person, and sometimes the same legislative body, is, by specific constitutional or legislative provision, clothed partially with both legislative and executive powers.

John M. Clayton, a leading and influential member, as stated by counsel in their brief in opposition to Mr. Du Pont, of the constitutional convention of the State of Delaware of 1831, recognized and strongly urged recognition of this doctrine by that convention. He said:

I have a high opinion of the senators as men; but I object to the principle of conferring on them executive powers. It is highly important to keep as distinct as possible the legislative and executive departments. This principle is recognized in all our bills of rights. But here we should be blending legislative and executive powers.

THERE IS NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED AUTHORITY IN THE DELAWARE CONSTITUTION FOR THE SIMULTANEOUS EXERCISE BY THE SAME PERSON OF THE OFFICES OF GOVERNOR AND STATE SENATOR.

There is no *express* or *implied* authority in the Delaware constitution for the simultaneous exercise by the same person of the offices of governor and senator. On the contrary, the constitution *expressly* inhibits such exercise of those two offices, and therefore, at the time Mr. Du Pont received 15 votes in the joint convention, Mr. Watson being then governor of the State, holding and exercising that executive office, was incapable of exercising the office of senator.

Section 12 of Article II of the Delaware constitution, among other things, provides as follows:

SEC. 12. * * * No person concerned in any army or navy contracts, nor member of Congress, nor any person holding any office under this State or the United States, except the attorney-general, officers usually appointed by the courts of justice, respectively, attorneys at law, and officers in the militia holding no disqualifying office, shall, during his continuance in Congress, or in office, *be* a senator or representative.

Your committee regard this provision as *absolutely disqualifying the governor of the State of Delaware*, whether elected by the people or having succeeded to the office to fill a vacancy caused by the death of the governor, from *being* a senator, or from *exercising any of the functions of a senator*. The provision is clear and specific, open to no ambiguity in its declaration that no person *holding* any office under the State, or of the United States, with certain exceptions, which are stated, shall "during his continuance in such office *be* a senator or representative."

Mr. Watson was, on the 9th day of May, 1895, confessedly the governor of the State of Delaware. He was therefore on that date *holding* an office *under the State of Delaware*. As the governor is not named in the exceptions, namely, "the attorney-general, officers usually appointed by the courts of justice, respectively, attorneys at law, and officers in the militia holding no disqualifying office," he was therefore disqualified from *being a senator* in the senate of the State on that date. In other words, there was a place made vacant in the senate, either *absolutely*, or for and *during the time the speaker of the senate should continue to exercise the office of governor*, which, by *express constitutional provision*, he, the governor of the State, *was prohibited from filling*—a vacancy such as was open only to occupation, if at all, by a person elected by the qualified electors of Kent County.

But not only so. It is further provided, in section 5 of Article III of the Delaware constitution, as follows:

SEC. 5. No member of Congress nor person holding office under the United States or this State shall exercise the office of governor.

What is the effect of this provision? Is it not clear, unambiguous, specific, to the effect, among other things, that no person holding any office under the State of Delaware shall exercise the office of governor; or, in other words, no senator (because a senator holds an office *under the State*) shall *be* governor or shall *exercise the office of governor?*

A senator under the constitution of Delaware may be and is by specific provision *eligible* to the office of governor, but once the office of governor is *accepted*, its *duties entered upon* by such senator, he unquestionably, in virture of section 12 of Article II of the Delaware constitution, *ceases to be a senator* either *absolutely* or by *suspension*.

He ceases to be a senator for two reasons:

(1) Because section 12, Article II, of the constitution declares that no person holding office under that State (and the governor holds office under the State) shall *be* a senator; and

(2) Because the moment he becomes governor he necessarily—the two offices being incompatible—ceases to be senator. Otherwise, moreover, under section 5 of Article III of the constitution, he can not, if he is a senator, *exercise the office of governor*.

There is no conflict or repugnance between these two clauses of the constitution of the State of Delaware, unless an unreasonable construction should be given to them. Should they be construed as to make one, a declaration that the senator who happens to be speaker of the senate when the governor dies shall thereupon become governor, and the other a declaration that no senator *shall ever become governor*, then there would be a repugnance and a gross incongruity. Such a construction, therefore, should not be given if they are susceptible of another construction more reasonable and which would harmonize the two provisions.

In the judgment of your committee the two clauses taken together mean simply this:

In the event of a vacancy in the office of governor, the speaker of the senate is *eligible* to become governor. He is not empowered to exercise the office of governor *ex officio*, but he is *eligible* to fill the office of governor. If he takes the oath and enters upon the duties of the office of governor, then he ceases to be senator, if not *absolutely*, by *suspension for such time as he shall exercise the office of governor*, because the constitution declares, in substance and effect, that inasmuch as he then holds the office of governor, that being an office under the State, he can no longer, at least not so long as he continues to exercise the office of governor, *be a senator*.

The constitution of Delaware, taken as a whole, maintains with great distinctness the lines of separation between the three great branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—and this upon the well-recognized principle in America that legislative, executive, and judicial offices are incompatible with each other, and are not to be *exercised* simultaneously by the same person. While in a few instances there is slight encroachment in one sphere of these branches upon another, there is no instance in which the constitution authorizes the same individual to exercise the power of governor and that of either judge or legislator simultaneously.

This general rule and requirement of the constitution of that State as keeping distinct and separate the three branches of government are but emphasized and strengthened by the exceptions provided for in the constitution, as, for instance, it is provided that in case of a tie vote in the election of a governor by the people the two houses of the legislature are by joint ballot to choose one of the candidates to be governor.

Again, contested elections of governor are to be determined by a joint committee of one-third of all the members of each branch of the legislature.

Again, each house of the legislature is made the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

And still further, all impeachments are to be tried by the senate.

But still further, section 14 of Article III of the Delaware constitution provides, as we have seen, that—

Upon any vacancy happening in the office of governor by his death, etc., * * * the speaker of the senate shall exercise the office *until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified.*

There is nothing in this clause or any other clause of the constitution which declares affirmatively or by fair inference that the person thus exercising the office of governor shall continue to exercise the office of speaker or of senator.

SOME ADDITIONAL CITATIONS FROM THE DELAWARE CONSTITUTION SHOWING THE INCOMPATIBILITY OF THE OFFICES OF GOVERNOR AND STATE SENATOR.

For instance, Article VI, section 14, provides that—

The governor may, for any reasonable cause, in his discretion, remove any of them (judges) on the address of two-thirds of all the members of each branch of the general assembly.

If the governor can be governor and senator at the same time, exercising *both offices simultaneously*, then he may be one of the senators making up the two-thirds of all the members of each branch of the general assembly to *address the governor*, in virtue of *which address alone* he as governor acquires jurisdiction to remove a judge.

Again, Article III, section 11, provides that the governor—

Shall, from time to time, give to the general assembly information of affairs concerning the State, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge expedient.

It would be rather an anomaly in our American system of government to permit a governor to vote in favor of measures in the senate which he as governor deemed expedient and had recommended to the senate.

But still further, Article III, section 12, provides that the governor may—

In case of disagreement between the two houses with respect to the time of adjournment, adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper, not exceeding three months.

Hence it is, if the governor can also be senator at the same time, and exercise both offices simultaneously, he is clothed with power to create a disagreement between the two houses by his vote in the senate, *which fact alone* would give him jurisdiction as governor to adjourn the general assembly to such time as he should think proper.

Article III, section 1, provides as follows:

The supreme executive powers of the State shall be vested in a governor.

While, therefore, the constitution designates the speaker of the senate as an *eligible person* to fill the office of governor, and as *the* person to fill it in the event of a vacancy, it is clear he can not and does not fill the office *as senator*, or because of the fact that he is *speaker of the senate*, for the reason that the supreme executive powers of the State are by the constitution vested in a *governor* and *not* in the *speaker of the senate*.

Again, it is provided in Article V, section 1, that—

All impeachments shall be tried by the senate; and when sitting for that purpose the senators shall be upon oath or affirmation to do justice according to the evidence. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of all the senators.

The governor, moreover, is, in virtue of this same article, *subject to impeachment* by the house of representatives. If Watson was governor on May 9, 1895, and is yet, *and this is conceded*, then he was and is liable to impeachment, and under the theory that he is still senator, and eligible as such to *exercise the functions of senator*, he would *sit in judgment on himself*, and by his vote might defeat a two-thirds vote in the senate and thus render a verdict of not guilty as impeached. Can such incompatibility in office receive the sanction of the Senate?

Article II, section 7, provides:

Each house may * * * with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.

While Article III, section 14, provides that—

The governor shall not be removed from his office for inability, but with the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature.

Here again, if permitted to exercise the office of senator while exercising the office of governor, he may by his vote in the senate defeat a two-thirds vote necessary to remove him as governor for disability.

It is also provided, in Article II, section 16, of the Delaware constitution, that—

In case of vacancy in the office of State treasurer in the recess of the general assembly, either *through omission of the general assembly* to appoint, or by the death, removal out of the State, resignation, or inability of the State treasurer, * * * the governor shall fill the vacancy by appointment to continue until the next meeting of the general assembly.

It is obviously obnoxious to all sense of governmental propriety to permit a governor in such case to act as a legislator, and thus by his vote, and, what is infinitely more potent, by his *executive influence* in the senate, defeat the election of the head of the exchequer in the State, and thus enable him to appoint a man of his *sole* choice to the office.

Again, Article VII, section 1, provides that—

Certain officers * * * may be removed * * * *on the address of both* houses of the legislature—

While Article VI, section 14, provides that—

The governor may for any reasonable cause in his discretion remove any of the judges *on the address of two-thirds of all the members* of each branch of the general assembly.

Here, again, the gross impropriety is made clearly apparent in recognizing a construction that will enable the governor of the State to exercise his vote and his influence as governor of the State in the State senate *in making up the two-thirds vote* that will enable him as governor to remove or appoint judges and a number of other officers of the State.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE USAGE AND WHAT ARE THE PRECEDENTS?

While in the judgment of your committee there is no such uncertainty or ambiguity in the different provisions of the constitution as to require resort to usage or precedents in giving construction, it is well to consider just what the precedents and usage have been.

Since 1792 nine speakers of the senate and one speaker of the house of representatives have succeeded to the office of governor pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of Article III of the Delaware constitutions of 1792 and 1831. Four of these were under the constitution of 1792 and six under the constitution of 1831—the present constitution.

In *not one of these ten cases cited* has any person who has succeeded to the governorship *in the last one hundred and four years* in virtue of this section 14, which, so far as this question is concerned, is substantially similar in the constitutions of 1792 and 1831, whether speaker of the senate or speaker of the house of representatives, *taken any part whatever during his continuance in the governor's office in the proceedings of the senate or of the house of representatives, with the single exception of the present governor of Delaware, Mr. Watson*, and whose act in thus breaking over the precedents of one hundred years' standing, has involved the people and the legislature of the State of Delaware and the Senate of the United States in this controversy. During all this time the ten persons, including Governor Watson, thus exercising the office of governor have during such time drawn the governor's salary and have not drawn the salary of senator or member.

THE FACT THAT THE DELAWARE CONSTITUTION PROVIDES FOR THE ELECTION OF A SPEAKER *pro tempore* OF THE SENATE WHEN THE SPEAKER SUCCEEDS TO THE GOVERNORSHIP DOES NOT IMPLY THAT THE LATTER CONTINUES TO BE SPEAKER OF THE SENATE.

Counsel in opposition to the claim of Mr. Du Pont contend that the use of the words, "speaker *pro tempore*," in the clause of the Delaware constitution which provides "That either house whose speaker shall exercise the office of governor may choose a speaker *pro tempore*," carries with it the implication of the contemporaneous official existence of *another* speaker, and it is also contended that the use of the words, "*may choose*," in the latter part of such clause, implies simply a *discretion in*, and not a *duty upon*, the part of the senate to elect a speaker *pro tempore* in such a case.

Your committee can not concede either of these propositions as the result of a proper legal construction of such provision, even if the provision stood alone, and still much more difficult would it be to consent to such a construction when considered, as the clause must be, in connection with other clauses of the constitution. And as bearing upon the latter proposition it may be properly said that inasmuch as the *public interests* are involved, it being unquestionably for the *public interest* that the senate should at *all times* have a presiding officer, and as it is plain to all that the governor of a State if he would properly discharge the duties of executive, could not possibly, in the very nature of things, for *any part of the time*, much less *at all times* be present and preside over the senate, it follows, under the well-settled rule of law, that the word "*may*," as used in that clause, should be construed as "*shall*."

"The rule is," said the court in Rex *vs.* Inhabitants of Derby (Skinner, 370), and in Rex et Regina *vs.* Barlow (2 Salkeld, 609), "where a constitution or a statute directs the doing of a thing for the sake of justice or *the public good* the word '*may*' is the same as the word '*shall*.'"

This rule has been followed both in England and the United States without any respectable dissent.

A statute of Illinois reads as follows: "The board of supervisors *may*, if *deemed advisable*, levy a special tax," etc., and the Supreme Court of the United States, in construing this statute in the case of Supervisors *vs.* The United States (4 Wall., 435), opinion by Mr. Justice Swayne, said:

The conclusion to be deduced from the authorities is that where power is given to public officers in the language of the act before us, or in equivalent language, where the *public interest* or *individual rights* call for its exercise, the language, though *permissive in form* is in fact *peremptory*.

In Steines *vs.* Franklin Co. (48 Mo., 167), the court held that when a statute provides that the county court "*may*" submit the question to the voters, before incurring certain expenses, it must do so. In Mitchell *vs.* Duncan (7 Flor., 12), it is held that "*may*" is construed "*shall*" where a statute directs the doing of a thing *necessary to the ends of justice*.

In People *v.* Brooklyn (22 Barb., 404) it is held that "*may*" will be construed "shall," where *the good sense of the entire enactment* requires it. In Mayor *v.* New York (3 Hill, 612), the Supreme Court said:

Where a public body, or officer, has been clothed, by statute, with power to do an act which concerns *the public interest*, or the rights of third persons, the execution of the power may be insisted on as a *duty*, though the phraseology of the statute be *permissive* merely.

The theory that provision in a statute or constitution for the election of a speaker *pro tempore* implies the existence at the same time of *another* speaker is wholly dissipated by the precedents of the innumerable American instances of the election of a speaker *pro tempore* when there is no regular speaker. A speaker *pro tempore* is simply a speaker for the occasion—for the time being. There may or may not be another speaker in existence at the same time. A speaker *pro tempore* may be, and frequently is, chosen, and so designated and called when there is no other speaker. There is, therefore, no argument in opposition to the theory of this report to be drawn from the use in the provision quoted, either of the words "*may choose*" or *pro tempore*.

To hold the same person could exercise and discharge the duties and functions of governor and State senator and speaker of the senate simultaneously would be to strike down ruthlessly the line that separates the executive and legislative branches of the Government and to declare a union of these two branches in the same person. This could not be so under the well-recognized American rule, even in the absence of express prohibitory clauses; but in this case such prohibitory clauses exist, as we have shown.

The constitutional provision is not that no person holding any office under the State of Delaware shall be *elected* governor by the people, but that no person holding such office shall "*exercise the office of governor*."

It is quite immaterial how he comes to be governor, whether by *election by the people* or by virtue of the *constitutional provision making the speaker of the senate eligible* in a certain contingency; in *either* case it is considered he *is the governor of the State*, in

every conceivable sense of the term, and hence it is clear he can not, while exercising such office of governor, hold any other office under the State of Delaware. He therefore can not be a senator; he can not *exercise senatorial functions* while *exercising executive functions.*

The court of errors and appeals of the State of Delaware, in the case of Rice *vs.* Foster (4 Harrington, 485–487), drew with clearness and distinctness the line of separation between the three branches of the government established by the constitution of the State of Delaware, and among other things said:

If we consider the peculiar situation of the United States, and go to the sources of that diversity of sentiment which pervades its inhabitants, we shall find great danger to fear that the same causes shall terminate here in the same fatal effects which they produced in those republics. To guard against these dangers and the evil tendencies of a democracy, our republican Government was instituted by the consent of the people. The characteristic which distinguishes it from the miscalled republics of ancient and modern times is that none of the powers of sovereignty are exercised by the people, but all of them by separate, coordinate branches of government in whom those powers are vested by the Constitution. These coordinate branches are intended to operate as balances, checks, and restraints, not only upon each other, but upon the people themselves; to guard them against their own rashness, precipitancy, and misguided zeal, and to protect the minority against the injustice of the majority.

The legislative, executive, and judicial powers compose the sovereign power of a state. The people of the State of Delaware have vested the legislative power in a general assembly, consisting of a senate and house of representatives; the supreme executive powers of the State in a governor; and the judicial power in the several courts mentioned in the sixth article. The sovereign power, therefore, of this State resides with the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. Having thus transferred the sovereign power, the people can not resume or exercise any portion of it. To do so would be an infraction of the constitution and a dissolution of the government. Nor can they interfere with the exercise of any part of the sovereign power, except by petition, remonstrance, or address. They have the power to change or alter the constitution; but this can be done only in the mode prescribed by the instrument itself. The attempt to do so in any other mode is revolutionary. And although the people have the power, in conformity with its provisions, to alter the constitution, under no circumstances can they, so long as the Constitution of the United States remains the paramount law of the land, establish a democracy, or any other than a republican form of government. It is equally clear that neither the legislative, executive, nor judicial department, separately, nor all combined, can devolve on the people the exercise of any part of the sovereign power with which each is vested. The assumption of a power to do so would be usurpation. The department arrogating it would elevate itself above the constitution, overturn the foundation on which its own foundation rests, demolish the whole frame and texture of our republican form of government, and prostrate everything to the worst species of tyranny and despotism, the ever-varying will of an irresponsible multitude.

IT IS CONCEDED WATSON WAS GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE MAY 9, 1895, AND HAD BEEN SINCE APRIL 9, 1895, IN THE FULL SENSE OF THAT TERM.

It is not denied but *conceded by counsel*, in opposition to the claim of Mr. Du Pont, that William T. Watson was, on the 9th day of May, 1895, and had been since April 9, 1895, *governor of the State.* In their able and elaborate brief filed in the case (p. 30), in a reference to certain statements in the brief of counsel for Mr. Du Pont, we find the following:

Thus counsel devote thirty pages of their brief (pp. 34–63) to a demonstration of the fact that the speaker of the senate, in case of a vacancy in the office of governor, becomes governor of the State. The matter counsel present on this head attests their industry and may interest the curious, *but it supports a proposition which we do not contest.*

It is conceded, therefore, by those opposing the claim of Mr. Du Pont, that Mr. Watson, on his inauguration as governor, *became the governor of the State.* He was not merely to exercise the office of governor *ex officio.* Not merely to *act as governor* in the manner the President *pro tempore* of the United States Senate would have acted in the case of vacancies in the offices of President and Vice-President under the act of 1792. The distinction is this: If an office be *appendant*, as the expression is in 1 Leon, 321, to another office, the determination of the first office will determine the second. This is where a person holding any office is *ex officio* entitled to perform the functions of some other office, as was the case perhaps of President *pro tempore* of the United States Senate under the act of 1792. In such case the right to exercise the functions of the second office ceases upon the determination of the office held in virtue of which he exercises such *ex officio* functions of the second office.

If, however, the nomination or appointment to an office, as it is in the case under consideration by *descriptio personam*, of one who holds another office by the title of which he is described, and who, on a contingency, is to enter and fill another office, he answering the description at the time the contingency arises, designates him as the person who is to fill the office, and when, as thus designated, he enters into the office, he holds it in his *natural* and not in his *official* capacity. And hence in this case of Watson, even in the absence of any affirmative constitutional declaration, he would continue to hold the office of governor—if the term continued—*after his term of senator had expired*, his office of governor not being *appendant to that of senator.* But in this case the Delaware constitution, recognizing this principle, declares, in section 14, Article III, not that he shall exercise the office of governor *so long as his term of senator shall continue*, but "*until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified.*" (Chadwick *v.* Earhart, 11 Oregon, 394.)

GOVERNOR WATSON DID NOT RESUME THE CHAIR OF SPEAKER OF THE SENATE ABOUT 12 M., MAY 9, 1895, AFTER A CONTINUED ABSENCE OF A MONTH FROM DATE OF HIS INAUGURATION AS GOVERNOR, ON APRIL 9, 1895, AS THE RESULT OF A *sense of public duty* OR *believing he had any right to do so*, BUT AS AN AFTERTHOUGHT AND AS *the result of pressure from political associates and of a partisan conspiracy*, AND FOR THE *sole* PURPOSE OF DEFEATING THE ELECTION OF A REPUBLICAN UNITED STATES SENATOR.

Senator John M. C. Moore, in his affidavit of January 14, 1896 (see appendix), states that Governor Watson said to him in the senate chamber on May 9, 1895, shortly before he resumed the speaker's chair:

"Mr. Moore, I want to talk with you. I believe you will tell me just as it is. Is Mr. Massey out of this thing?" (Mr. Massey was one of the Republican candidates being voted for for United States Senator.) Senator Moore states he said to him in reply: "Governor, we are not going to cast another ballot for Mr. Massey nor no other who has been balloted for except Henry A. Du Pont. He will be elected on first ballot in the joint session," to which the governor replied to me: 'If that be the case, I shall take my seat.' Against this I remonstrated, and said to him: 'Governor, I hope you will not do it; I think too much of you as a man for you to do it.' That was the last of our conversation. He made no reply to my remonstrance. He arose and went over to the desk of George Fisher Pierce, a senator and one of my colleagues from Sussex County, where I saw him take a seat near Senator Pierce."

Senator George Fisher Pierce in his affidavit filed herein, of date January 13, 1896 (see appendix), says:

About ten minutes before the hour of noon, May 9, 1895, William T. Watson, governor of the State of Delaware, being in the chamber (the senate being presided over by William T. Records, its speaker), came and took a seat alongside of this deponent and said to him: "I am going into the joint assembly and vote for a Senator." This deponent said: "*You are going to do what?*" He answered: "I am going to preside over the joint assembly to-day and vote for a United States Senator." This deponent then said: "Do you think that is right?" Governor Watson answered: "*No; I do not, but my party has overruled me.*" This deponent answered: "Then, I suppose, there is nothing I can say now that would change your mind;" to which Watson replied, "No, my mind is fully made up."

J. S. Prettyman, jr., in his affidavit filed herein, dated January 14, 1896 (see appendix), after reciting that he met and walked with Governor Watson from the railroad station at Milford, Del., into the center of the town, a distance of about one-quarter of a mile, about 6.45 o'clock p. m., May 9, 1895, the day the Delaware legislature adjourned, says: "During this walk Governor Watson said to me that when he went to Dover on the morning of that day *he did not expect to preside as speaker of the senate, believing that he did not have a legal right to act as governor and senator.* After reaching Dover, in response to the *influence of party leaders, he reversed this decision and consented to enter the senate and claim his rights as speaker.* In doing this he said *he put aside his own judgment*, and acted upon the judgment of those whom he regarded as well qualified to advise." This witness further states in this affidavit that on the Friday following the above conversation he had another conversation with Governor Watson, when the latter, becoming somewhat excited, drew from his pocket a paper and handed it to witness, saying, "Read this!"

Deponent says: "I took the paper and read the writing through. It was an agreement between Robert J. Hanby, Newall Ball, Charles Moore, and John Robbins, members of the Delaware legislature, signed with their names, and to the effect that they would vote for J. Edward Addicks for United States Senator, and that they would *not* vote for anyone else, *even though no Senator should be elected.* As I passed the paper back to the governor, he said: 'Wouldn't you have acted as I did, under such circumstances?' I evaded his question by saying, 'Are the signatures genuine?' and he replied, 'Of course they are; look again;' and he passed the paper to me for the second time. I read it through again, and examined the signatures, remarking that I was not familiar with the autographs of these men, but that the names were in different handwritings. He said he was not familiar with the autographs of the men, but that he was sure the names were genuine. The governor also said *that this agreement was brought to him to induce him to take part in the last joint assembly of the legislature, and, influenced by it, through the advice of others, he consented to preside as speaker of that body, and did so preside on the day mentioned.*

"He further said the Republicans had every opportunity to elect a Senator, and had failed to do so, and of course he preferred that the Democratic party should have a representative in the United States Senate from Delaware, rather than the Republican party."

Frank Reedy, in his affidavit of date January 23, 1896, filed herein (see appendix), states he had a similar conversation with Governor Watson on May 10, 1895, in which he showed him the same or a similar paper.

From the foregoing *uncontradicted* testimony it is clearly evident Governor Watson did not reenter the speaker's chair and the joint assembly May 9, 1895, *from any sense of public duty*, or in

the *belief that he had any legal right to do so*, but rather in pursuance of a *partisan conspiracy* and for the *sole* purpose of defeating the election of a Republican in the United States Senate.

IT IS CONCEDED A CERTIFICATE OF DU PONT'S ELECTION FROM THE GOVERNOR OF DELAWARE IS NOT AN ESSENTIAL REQUISITE.

Mr. Du Pont's election is not certified by William T. Watson, then holding the office of governor of the State of Delaware, but is certified to by Henry H. McMullen, speaker of the house of representatives, and attested by Edgar T. Hastings, clerk of the house of representatives. (See Senate Ex. Doc. No. 9, first session Fifty-fourth Congress.)

It is conceded, however, and, in fact, in view of the precedents, could not well be contested by those opposing the claim of Mr. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate. His title to such seat is not impaired by the fact that he fails to present a certificate of election from Mr. Watson, the then governor of the State, as evidence of his election, provided he received a majority of the legal votes cast in the joint assembly. (See argument in opposition to Mr. Du Pont's claim, p. 5.)

THE UNION OF EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS IS ABSOLUTISM OR DESPOTISM ON THE ONE HAND AND SLAVERY ON THE OTHER, WHETHER UNITED IN ONE MAN OR THE MANY.

Dr. Lieber, in his work on Civil Liberty and Self-Government, says:

A principal and guaranty of liberty, so acknowledged and common with the Anglican people that few think of its magnitude, yet of really organic and fundamental importance, is the division of government into the three distinct functions, or rather the keeping of these functions clearly apart.

It is, as has been mentioned, one of the greatest political blessings of England that from a very early period her courts of justice were not occupied with "administrative business," for instance, the collection of taxes, and that her Parliament became the exclusive legislature, while the Parliaments of France united a judicial, legislative, and administrative character. The union of these functions is absolutism or despotism on the one hand and slavery on the other, no matter in whom they are united, whether in one despot or in many, or in the multitude, as in Athens after the time of Cleon the tanner. The English political philosophers have pointed out long ago the necessity of keeping the three powers separate in a "constitutional" government. Those, however, who have no other difinition of liberty than that it is equality, discard this division, except, indeed, so far as the mere convenience of transacting business would require (pp. 154, 155).

MR. WEBSTER'S VIEWS ON MAINTAINING CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS AND JUST DIVISIONS OF POLITICAL POWER.

Counsel for Mr. Du Pont, in their brief, quote the following statement from a speech of Mr. Webster in the Senate of the United States, May 7, 1834, on the "Presidential protest," which your committee deem worthy of consideration in connection with the questions involved in this case:

The first object of a free people is the preservation of their liberty; and liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints and just divisions of political power. Nothing is more deceptive or more dangerous than the pretense of a desire to simplify government. The simplest governments are despotisms; the next simplest, limited monarchies; but all republics, all governments of law, must impose numerous limitations and qualifications of authority, and give many positive and many qualified rights. In other words, they must be subject to rule and regulation. This is the very essence of free political institutions.

The spirit of liberty is, indeed, a bold and fearless spirit; but it is also a sharp-sighted spirit; it is a cautious, sagacious, discriminating, far-seeing intelligence; it is jealous of encroachment, jealous of power, jealous of man. It demands checks; it seeks for guards; it insists on securities; it entrenches itself behind strong defenses, and fortifies itself with all possible care against the assaults of ambition and passion. It does not trust the amiable weaknesses of human nature, and therefore it will not permit power to overstep its prescribed limits, though benevolence, good intent, and patriotic purpose come along with it. Neither does it satisfy itself with flashy and temporary resistance to illegal authority. Far otherwise. It seeks for duration and permanence. It looks before and after; and, building on the experience of ages that are past, it labors diligently for the benefit of ages to come. This is the nature of constitutional liberty; and this is our liberty, if we will rightly understand and preserve it. Every free government is necessarily complicated, because all governments establish restraints, as well on the power of government itself as on that of individuals. If we will abolish the distinction of branches and have but one branch; if we will abolish jury trials and leave all to the judge; if we will then ordain that the legislator himself shall be that judge, and if we will place the executive power in the same hands, we may readily simplify government. We may easily bring it to the simplest of all forms—a pure despotism. But a separation of departments, so far as practicable, and the preservation of clear lines of division between them, is the fundamental idea in the creation of all our constitutions; and doubtless the continuance of regulated liberty depends on maintaining these boundaries. (Works of Daniel Webster, Vol. IV, p. 122.)

And still further—

Mr. President, the contest for ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of executive power. Whoever has engaged in her sacred cause, from the days of the downfall of those great aristocracies which had stood between the king and the people to the time of our own independence, has struggled for the accomplishment of that single object. On the long list of the champions of human freedom there is not one name dimmed by the reproach of advocating the extension of executive authority; on the contrary, the uniform and steady purpose of all such champions has been to limit and restrain it. To this end the spirit of liberty, growing more and more enlightened and more and more vigorous from age to age, has been battering for centuries against the solid butments of the feudal system. To this end all that could be gained from the imprudence, snatched from the weakness, or wrung from the necessities of crowned heads has been carefully gathered up, secured, and hoarded, as the rich treasures, the very jewels of liberty.

To this end popular and representative right has kept up its warfare against prerogative with various success; sometimes writing the history of a whole age in blood, sometimes witnessing a martyrdom of Sidneys and Russells, often baffled and repulsed, but still gaining on the whole, and holding what it gained with a grasp which nothing but the complete extinction of its own being could compel it to relinquish. At length the great conquest over executive power in the leading western states of Europe has been accomplished. The feudal system, like other stupendous fabrics of past ages, is known only by the rubbish which it has left behind it. Crowned heads have been compelled to submit to the restraints of law, and the people with that intelligence and that spirit which make their voice resistless, have been able to say to prerogative: "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther." I need hardly say, sir, that into the full enjoyment of all which Europe has reached only through such slow and painful steps we sprang at once by the Declaration of Independence and by the establishment of free representative governments; governments borrowing more or less from the models of other free states, but strengthened, secured, improved in their symmetry and deepened in their foundation by those great men of our own country whose names will be as familiar to future times as if they were written on the arch of the sky.

Through all this history of the contest for liberty executive power has been regarded as a lion which must be caged. So far from being the object of enlightened popular trust, so far from being considered the natural protector of popular right, it has been dreaded, uniformly always dreaded, as the great source of its danger.

And now, sir, who is he, so ignorant of the history of liberty, at home and abroad; who is he, yet dwelling in his contemplations among the principles and dogmas of the Middle Ages; who is he, from whose bosom all original infusion of American spirit has become so entirely evaporated and exhaled that he shall put into the mouth of the President of the United States the doctrine that the defense of liberty naturally results to executive power and is its peculiar duty? Who is he that, generous and confiding toward power where it is most dangerous, and jealous only of those who can restrain it; who is he that, reversing the order of the state and upheaving the base, would poise the pyramid of the political system upon its apex? Who is he that, overlooking with contempt the guardianship of the representatives of the people, and with equal contempt the higher guardianship of the people themselves; who is he that declares to us, through the President's lips, that the security for freedom rests in executive authority? Who is he that belies the blood and libels the fame of his own ancestors by declaring that they, with solemnity of form and force of manner, have invoked the executive power to come to the protection of liberty? Who is he that thus charges them with the insanity or the recklessness of putting the lamb beneath the lion's paw?

No, sir. No, sir. Our security is in our watchfulness of executive power. It was the constitution of this department which was infinitely the most difficult part in the great work of creating our present Government. To give to the executive department such power as should make it useful and yet not such as should render it dangerous; to make it efficient, independent, and strong, and yet to prevent it from sweeping away everything by its union of military and civil authority; by the influence of patronage, and office, and favor; this, indeed, was difficult. They who had the work to do saw the difficulty, and we see it; and if we would maintain our system we shall act wisely to that end by preserving every restraint and every guard which the Constitution has provided. And when we and those who come after us have done all that we can do and all that they can do, it will be well for us and for them if some popular executive, by the power of patronage and party, and the power, too, of that very popularity shall not hereafter prove an overmatch for all other branches of the Government. (Works of Daniel Webster, Vol. IV, pp. 133, 134, 135.)

Montesquieu, in his Spirit of Laws, volume 1, page 152, says:

When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Again, there is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for the judge would be then the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression.

There would be an end of everything were the same man or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers—that of enacting laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND FACT.

(1) It is a well-settled rule of the common law that the same person shall not exercise *simultaneously* two *incompatible offices;* and further, the acceptance of one is ipso facto a resignation of the other.

(2) Under the American system *executive and legislative* offices are *incompatible*, and the same person can not exercise both simultaneously in the absence of either *express* or *clearly implied* statutory or constitutional authority; and the acceptance of the second is *ipso facto* a resignation of the first.

(3) There is no *express* or *implied* authority in the constitution of the State of Delaware for the simultaneous exercise by the same person of the offices of governor and senator; on the contrary, such constitution *expressly* interdicts such exercise of those two offices.

(4) Whether or not the offices of State senator and speaker of the senate became *absolutely vacant* when Speaker Watson took the oath of office, was inaugurated governor of the State, and entered upon the exercise of that office, there can be no doubt, on a fair construction of the several constitutional provisions of the State of Delaware, that his right to *exercise the office of Senator or speaker of the senate*, or any of the *functions connected therewith* while he continued to hold and exercise the office of governor, was *held in abeyance and absolutely suspended.*

(5) The theory that Mr. Watson can exercise the office of governor of the State and State senator *simultaneously*, involves innumerable constitutional repugnancies, perplexing difficulties, and endless absurdities; while the opposite theory reconciles and harmonizes all the provisions of the Delaware constitution relating to the subject under consideration.

(6) That Governor Watson's exercise of the office of senator in the joint assembly on the 9th day of May, 1895, and of the office of president of such joint assembly was illegal, and his vote therein for United States Senator a *nullity.*

In determining the above propositions, your committee reach the further following conclusions:

(7) In determining the question as to whether the Delaware senate on May 9, 1895, acted upon or *judged*, either *actually* or *constructively*, the qualifications of Governor Watson to a seat in the

senate, the *journal entries* of the proceedings of the Delaware senate of that date are *conclusive* as to the number and names of senators present, the motions submitted, the votes cast, and of *all the proceedings had*, and *can not* be contradicted by *ex parte* affidavits.

(8) The right which undoubtedly belongs *exclusively* to the Delaware senate to *judge* of the elections, returns, and *qualifications* of members does not vest in such senate any such *exclusive right* as would conclude the Senate of the United States to determine by construction whether the constitution of the State of Delaware does or does not recognize a certain seat in the senate as *subject to occupation;* nor does it include the power to admit members to seats *not recognized by the constitution of the State as subject to occupation*, or if subject to occupation, to fill them in a *manner* or by *a person* which the State constitution forbids.

(9) Your committee, applying these rules, find as a matter of fact the Delaware State senate never *judged* of the qualifications of Governor Watson to a seat in the senate, either on the 9th day of May, 1895, or at any other time subsequent to the date of his inauguration as governor.

(10) That on May 9, 1895, the date on which Mr. Du Pont claims to have been elected, the legislature of the State of Delaware consisted of but 29 members; there were in the joint assembly on that date but 29 members of such legislature entitled to seats in such joint assembly and entitled to be counted and vote therein. As Mr. Du Pont received 15 votes, being a majority of the whole number entitled to be cast in such joint assembly, and a majority of all the *legal* votes cast therein, he was *legally elected* Senator from the State of Delaware for the full term commencing March 4, 1895, and is entitled to be seated.

(11) The fact that such election is not certified by the governor of the State in pursuance of the statute on that subject does not invalidate such election in any respect.

Your committee therefore report to the Senate the following resolution and recommend its adoption:

Resolved, That Henry A. Du Pont is entitled to a seat in the Senate from the State of Delaware for the full term commencing March 4, 1895.

APPENDIX.

EXHIBIT A.—*Copy of journal entries of the proceedings of the Delaware senate of dates April 9 and May 9, 1895, and of the proceedings of the joint assembly of May 9, 1895, and affidavits of John M. G. Moore, George Fisher Pierce, Samuel Alrich, Edgar T. Hastings, John S. Prettyman, jr., Frank Reedy, and George L. Townsend relative to the case of Henry A. Du Pont, claiming to have been elected a United States Senator from the State of Delaware for the term commencing March 4, 1895.*

TUESDAY, *April 9, 1895—11 o'clock a. m.*

Senate met pursuant to adjournment.

Prayer by the chaplain.

Roll called—Members present: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker.

On motion of Mr. Records, the reading of the journal was dispensed with.

JOINT MEETING.

The hour of 12 o'clock m. having arrived,

The senate, preceded by the speaker and attended by the clerks and sergeant-at-arms, proceeded to the hall of the house of representatives, for the purpose of voting for a United States Senator in obedience to the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the time and manner of holding elections for Senators in Congress," passed July 25, 1866.

The clerks were directed to call the rolls of the respective houses, and the members, as their names were called, responded by viva voce vote as follows, viz:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for George V. Massey.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for George V. Massey.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for George V. Massey.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for James Pennewill.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Anthony Higgins.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for George V. Massey.

The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Edward Ridgely	10
For Anthony Higgins	9
For J. Edward Addicks	5
For George V. Massey	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1
For James Pennewill	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

On motion of Mr. Records, of the senate, the two houses separated, and the members of the senate returned to their chamber.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed and requested the concurrence of the senate in the following joint resolution, entitled "Joint resolution in relation to the death of His Excellency Joshua H. Marvil, late governor."

Hon. Nathaniel B. Smithers, secretary of state, being admitted, made the following announcement:

Mr. SPEAKER: The issues of life and death are in the hands of the Almighty. His will has been made manifest, and it has become my painful duty to announce to the senate the death of Joshua H. Marvil, governor of the State of Delaware, which occurred last night at his home in Laurel, at about 9.15 o'clock.

Mr. Records offered a resolution which, on his motion, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Hon. James L. Wolcott, chancellor, be, and he is hereby, invited to administer the appropriate oaths of office to William Tharp Watson, speaker of the senate, who, by reason of the death of the governor, the Hon Joshua Hopkins Marvil, shall, under the constitution, exercise the office of governor until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified.

On the further motion of Mr. Records, the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Records, the clerk of the senate was directed to notify the chancellor of the adoption of the resolution and conduct him to the senate chamber.

The Hon. James L. Wolcott then administered, in the presence of the members of the senate, to Hon. William Tharp Watson, speaker of the senate, the following oaths of office as governor, to wit:

I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God, that I will support the Constitution of the United States of America. So help me God.

I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God, that I will support the constitution of the State of Delaware. So help me God.

I, William T. Watson, do solemnly swear on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God, that I will perform the duties of the office of governor of the State of Delaware with fidelity. So help me God.

Thereupon the speaker called Mr. Pyle to the chair and retired from the senate chamber.

Mr. Pierce offered a resolution, which, on his motion, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the senate are eminently due, and are hereby tendered, to Hon. William T. Watson, speaker of the senate, for the courtesy, intelligence, impartiality, and fidelity which have uniformly characterized the discharge of the delicate and responsible duties of said office.

On the further motion of Mr. Pierce, the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Harrington, the senate proceeded to elect by ballot a speaker pro tempore.

Mr. Harrington moved that two tellers be appointed.

Which motion prevailed.

Whereupon Messrs. Moore and Fenimore were appointed said tellers.

Upon the ballots being counted, it appeared that Mr. William T. Records had received 4 votes and that Mr. George F. Pierce had received 4 votes.

Whereupon the speaker pro tempore declared that no person having received a majority of all the ballots cast, there was no election to said office, and directed that another ballot be taken.

Upon the ballots being counted, it appeared that William T. Records had received 7 votes and that "blank" had received 1 vote.

Whereupon William T. Records, having received a majority of all the votes cast, was declared to be duly elected speaker pro tempore.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof.

Messrs. Hanby and Pierce were appointed a committee to conduct the speaker pro tempore to the chair.

Mr. Records, the speaker pro tempore, then addressed the senate as follows:

SENATORS: I desire to express to you my appreciation of the honor shown me and the confidence expressed toward me in making me your speaker pro tempore. I feel that the position will entail much responsibility upon me, and will require from you possibly at times some forbearance. However, I feel confident that we will be able to understand one another thoroughly, and any difficulties that may arise can be easily adjusted.

Again thanking you for the honor conferred, and asking your cooperation in the discharge of my duties, I now declare the senate ready for business.

On motion of Mr. Pierce, house joint resolution was read as follows:

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Delaware in general assembly met, That the members of the general assembly have heard with the deepest sorrow of the death of his excellency, Joshua H. Marvil, late governor of the State of Delaware;

Resolved, That they tender their sincere sympathy to the family and relatives of the deceased;

Resolved, That, as a mark of respect, the statehouse be draped in mourning and the flag displayed at half-mast until after the funeral;

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, the members of the general assembly will attend the funeral in a body and that no business be transacted in the meantime except the daily balloting for United States Senator;

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be spread on the journals of both houses and be forwarded to the family of the deceased.

On the further motion of Mr. Pierce, the joint resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof and the joint resolution returned to that body.

On motion the senate adjourned until 11.50 a. m. to-morrow.

THURSDAY, *May 9, 1895*—11 o'clock a. m.

Senate met pursuant to ajournment.

Prayer by the chaplain.

Roll called—Members present: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore.

On motion of Mr. Alrichs the reading of the journal was dispensed with.

Mr. Alrichs, on behalf of the committee on judiciary, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to amend 'An act fixing the salary of the attorney-general, and for other purposes,' passed at Dover March 23, 1871, and amended by the act entitled 'An act to amend chapter 36, volume 14, of the Laws of Delaware,' passed at Dover March 24, 1873," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pyle the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the question was decided in the affirmative; and the bill having received the required majority passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Alrichs, on behalf of the committee on judiciary, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act for the relief of Robert Cook, deceased," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Moore the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and on his further motion was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? it was decided in the affirmative; and the bill having received the required majority passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had adopted and requested the concurrence of the senate in the following joint resolution entitled:

Joint resolution in relation to paying William T. Smithers;

Joint resolution to pay John D. Hawkins, secretary of state.

On motion of Mr. Hanby, the joint resolution just reported was taken up for consideration, and further on his motion was adopted.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the joint resolution returned to that body.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, presented for the signature of the speaker of the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled house bills, the same having been signed by the speaker of the house:

An act to repeal the act limiting judgment liens upon real estate, and for other purposes, passed at Dover May 4, 1893.

An act to amend the act entitled "An act fixing the salary of the attorney-general, and for other purposes," passed at Dover March 23, 1871, as amended by the act entitled "An act to amend chapter 36, volume 14, Laws of Delaware," passed at Dover March 24, 1875.

Mr. Pierce, on behalf of the committee on accounts, presented the following report:

The committee on accounts recommend the following allowances to members and officers of the senate and to others for services rendered, as follows:

William T. Watson, speaker, 100 days, 27 miles	$408.10
W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, 32 days	128.00
W. T. Records, 99 days, 43 miles	309.90
John Pyle, 131 days, 47 miles	407.10
Samuel Alrichs, 131 days, 36 miles	403.80
Robert J. Hanby, 131 days, 53 miles	408.90
Hezekiah Harrington, 131 days, 20 miles	399.00
John W. Fenimore, 129 days, 7 miles	389.10
George F. Pierce, 131 days, 27 miles	401.10
John M. C. Moore, 131 days, 46 miles	406.80
Charles A. Hastings, clerk of senate	1,000.00
E. Baldwin T. Springer, reading clerk	500.00
William T. Parvis, enrolling clerk	350.00
Rev. Cyrus Cort, chaplain	75.00
Samuel J. Thomas, sergeant-at-arms	300.00
S. Harry Boyer, page of senate	75.00
George Carter, clerk to divorce committee	300.00
James Pennewill, legal services	25.00
John B. Pennington, legal services	25.00
Branch H. Giles, legal services	75.00
Sussex Countian, printing	107.50
William Saulsbury, printing	50.00
McFarlane & Co., printing	45.00
Thomas F. Dunn, printing	25.00
Joshua D. Dean, newspapers for senate	50.00
Rev. Cyrus Cort, expenses of minuit committtee	8.65

We, the undersigned, members of the committee on accounts, have examined the foregoing report and find the allowances therein made to be correct.

GEORGE F. PIERCE,
JOHN PYLE,
J. W. FENIMORE,
Committee.

Mr. Alrichs, on behalf of the committee on judiciary, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to prevent bogus sales within the State of Deleware, being a supplement to chapter 68 of the Revised Code of the State of Delaware," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pierce, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the question was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Harrington, on behalf of the committee on corporations, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to amend sections 5 and 10 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the town of Frederica,' passed at Dover, March 8, 1865, and reenacted March 26, 1885," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Fenimore, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and on his further motion was read a third time, by paragraphs, in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore—8. Nays: None.

So the question was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Harrington, on behalf of the committee on corporations, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Acetyline Light Company," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pierce, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time, by paragraphs, in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore.—8. Nays: None.

So the question was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Harrington, on behalf of the committee on corporations, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pierce, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore.—8. Nays: None.

It was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Hanby, on behalf of the committee on finance, to whom had been referred the house joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution in relation to paying John R. Nicholson and Edward Ridgely one hundred and twenty-five dollars," reported the same back to the senate favorably with an amendment.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, returned to the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled senate bills, the same having been signed by the speaker of both houses:

An act to divorce Margaret McNabb from her husband, John Edward McNabb;

An act providing for an addition to the State library building.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed the following senate bills, entitled:

An act to divorce Katie T. Morris from her husband, Charles T. Morris;

An act to divorce Bettine McKean Rogers from William H. Rogers;

And returned the same to the senate.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed and requested the concurrence of the senate in the house bills entitled "An act relating to the defacing of private property; an act to legalize a certain flower as the floral emblem of the State." Also the senate substitute for house bill entitled "An act in relation to disorderly houses and houses of ill fame and assignation."

Mr. Harrington, on behalf of the committee on corporations, to whom had been referred the second substitute for house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Hall Company of Lewes," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pierce, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time, by paragraphs, in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the Senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore—7. Nays: None.

So the question was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Alrichs, from the committee on judiciary, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company, in Newcastle County," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Hanby, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the Senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore—8. Nays: None.

It was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Harrington, on behalf of the committee on corporations, to whom had been referred the house bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown, Sussex County," reported the same back to the senate favorably.

On motion of Mr. Pyle, the bill just reported was taken up for consideration, and, on his further motion, was read a third time by paragraphs in order to pass the senate.

On the question, Shall this bill pass the senate? the yeas and nays were ordered, which, being taken, were as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alrichs, Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Mr. Speaker pro tempore—8. Nays: None.

It was decided in the affirmative, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, passed the senate.

Ordered, That the house be informed thereof, and the bill returned to that body.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed and requested the concurrence of the senate in the following house bill entitled "An act to divorce Benjamin O. Jacobs from his wife, Victoria W. Jacobs."

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, presented for the signature of the speaker of the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled house bills, the same having been signed by the speaker of the house:

An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company;

An act relative to bonds, undertakings, and other obligations with surety or sureties, to the acceptance as surety or guarantor thereupon of companies qualified to act as such and to provide a uniform system of procedure by and standard of qualifications for such companies.

Mr. Hastings, the clerk of the house, being admitted, returned to the senate the following duly and correctly enrolled senate bill, the same having been signed by the speakers of both houses:

An act to divorce Ellen Tatem Pusey from her husband, Joshua B. Pusey.

Mr. Hastings, clerk of the house, being admitted, informed the senate that the house had passed the following senate bills:

An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company in Newcastle County;

An act to incorporate Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown;

An act to incorporate the North American Construction Company;

An act to divorce Elzey D. Richardson from his wife, Jennie A. Richardson;

And returned the same to the senate.

JOINT MEETING.

The hour of 12 o'clock m. having arrived,

The senate, preceded by the speaker and attended by the clerks and sergeant-at-arms, proceeded to the hall of the house of representatives for the purpose of voting for a United States Senator, in obedience to the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the time and manner of holding elections for Senators in Congress," passed July 25, 1866.

The two houses being convened in joint session proceeded, according to the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the laws of Delaware, to ballot in joint session for United States Senator.

The speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of the respective houses, and the members, as their names were called, responded by viva voce vote as follows, viz:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. DuPont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

The vote, as above ascertained, having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a second ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all of the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a third ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a fourth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For John Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Harrington, Pyle, Records, and Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Sypherd, Watson, of the house—10.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Hanby, Moore, and Pierce of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Mustard, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, Mr. Speaker, of the house—20.

So the motion was declared lost, and the joint meeting then proceeded to a fifth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received the requisite number of the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a sixth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a seventh ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to an eighth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a ninth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Heney A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgley	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Pyle, Records, and Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, and Watson, of the house—12.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Moore, and Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, and Mr. Speaker, of the house—18.

So the motion was declared lost, and the joint meeting then proceeded to a tenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for John Edward Addicks.

Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	1
For Edward Ridgely	10
For John Edward Addicks	45
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to an eleventh ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twelfth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced, as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a thirteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely,
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edgar Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Harrington, Moore, Pierce, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Jolls, Sypherd, of the house—10.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Hanby, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Davis, Fleming, Killen, Money, Moore, Morgan, Mustard, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Watson, Wilson, Mr. Speaker, of the house—20.

The motion was declared lost, and the joint meeting proceeded to a fourteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for John Edward Addicks.

Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

The vote, as above ascertained, having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a fifteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

The vote, as above ascertained, having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For John Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a sixteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a seventeenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to an eighteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Dr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon, the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, moved that the joint meeting take a recess for one hour.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of the respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Pyle, Records, and Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, and Watson, of the house—12.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Moore, and Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, and Mr. Speaker, of the house—18.

The motion was declared lost and the joint meeting then proceeded to a nineteenth ballot, which resulted as follows:
Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twentieth ballot, which resulted as follows:
Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-first ballot, which resulted as follows:
Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgley.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For John Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Records, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Harrington, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, Watson, of the house—11.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Hanby, Moore, Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, Mr. Speaker, of the house—19.

The motion was declared lost, and the joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-second ballot, which resulted as follows:
Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.

Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-third ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-fourth ballot, which resulted as follows.

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-fifth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-sixth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for John Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.

Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For John Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Daly, of the house, moved that the joint meeting take a recess for ten minutes.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Harrington, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, Watson, of the house—11.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Hanby, Moore, Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, Mr. Speaker, of the house—19.

The motion was declared lost and the joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-seventh ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

The joint meeting then proceeded to a twenty-eighth ballot, which resulted as follows:

Mr. Alrichs, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Fenimore, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Hanby, of the senate, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Harrington, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Moore, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pierce, of the senate, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Pyle, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Records, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Speaker, of the senate, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Ball, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Brown, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Burton, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Daly, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Davis, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Fleming, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Jolls, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Killen, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Money, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Moore, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Morgan, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Mustard, of the house, voted for Ebe W. Tunnell.
Mr. Pyle, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Reybold, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Robbins, of the house, voted for J. Edward Addicks.
Mr. Sypherd, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Townsend, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Walker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Watson, of the house, voted for Edward Ridgely.
Mr. Wilson, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
Mr. Speaker, of the house, voted for Henry A. Du Pont.
The vote as above ascertained having been announced as follows:

	Votes.
For Henry A. Du Pont	15
For Edward Ridgely	10
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For Ebe W. Tunnell	1

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared that, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election to said office.

Mr. Records, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and, the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, Watson, of the house—12.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Moore, and Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, and Mr. Speaker, of the house—18.

The motion having failed to receive the required majority was declared lost.

Mr. Davis, of the house, moved that the joint meeting take a recess for five minutes.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and, the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Hanby, Harrington, Pyle, Records, Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, Watson, of the house—12.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Moore, Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, Mr. Speaker, of the house—18.

The motion having failed to receive the required majority, was declared lost.

Mr. Records, of the senate, moved that the two houses separate.

The yeas and nays being called for, the speaker of the senate directed the clerks to call the rolls of their respective houses, and, the members having answered as their names were called, the result was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Fenimore, Harrington, Pyle, Records, and Mr. Speaker, of the senate, and Messrs. Daly, Davis, Killen, Mustard, Sypherd, and Watson, of the house—11.

Nays: Messrs. Alrichs, Hanby, Moore, and Pierce, of the senate, and Messrs. Ball, Brown, Burton, Fleming, Jolls, Money, Moore, Morgan, Pyle, Reybold, Robbins, Townsend, Walker, Wilson, and Mr. Speaker, of the house—19.

The motion having failed to receive the required majority was declared lost.

The hour fixed for adjournment sine die having arrived, the speaker of the senate declared the legislature adjourned without day.

Attest:

C. A. HASTINGS,
Clerk of the Senate.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN M. C. MOORE.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 14th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edwin R. Cochran, jr., a notary public for the State of Delaware for the county aforesaid, personally comes John

M. C. Moore, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he resides in the town of Bethel, Broad Creek Hundred, Sussex County, and State of Delaware; that he was elected senator of said State from Sussex County at the last general election, held on the 6th day of November, A. D. 1894, and took his seat as a member of the senate of the State of Delaware on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895; that he was present in the senate chamber at Dover, Del., on Thursday, the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, at 11 o'clock a. m., that being the time and place at which the final legislative session of the said senate for the session of 1895 was held; that he was present when the said legislative session was called to order, and remained in the senate chamber until the senate proceeded to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the proceedings of the joint assembly for the election of a United States Senator; that when the senate convened in the said final legislative session, at 11 o'clock a. m., on the said 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, occupied the speaker's chair and presided over the session, received and put motions, and voted on bills; that the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, continued to occupy the speaker's chair until near the hour of 12 o'clock noon, and until the senate was just about to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the joint assembly for the purpose of electing a United States Senator; that while the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, occupied the speaker's chair as aforesaid, being from the beginning of the session at 11 o'clock until within a few minutes before 12 o'clock noon, Governor William T. Watson did not receive and put motions, and did not vote on bills then pending before the senate, and did not in any manner participate in the legislative functions of a senator; that on the day of the said last session of the senate of Delaware, while William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, occupied the speaker's chair, near the hour of noon on that day, being, so far as I can remember, about 15 minutes of 12 o'clock, Governor William T. Watson came into the senate chamber and occupied a chair beside me at my desk.

The conversation which occurred between us was as follows: Governor Watson said to me, "Mr. Moore, I want to talk with you. I believe you will tell me just as it is. Is Mr. Massey out of this thing?" I said to him in reply, "Governor, he is. We are not going to cast another ballot for Mr. Massey nor no other man who has been balloted for except Henry A. Du Pont. He will be elected on the first ballot in the joint session." To which Governor Watson replied to me, "If that be the case, I shall take my seat." Against this I remonstrated, and said to him, "Governor, I hope you will not do it. I think too much of you as a man for you to do it." That was the last of our conversation. He made no reply to my remonstrance. He arose and went over to the desk of George Fisher Pierce, a senator and one of my colleagues from Sussex County, where I saw him take a seat near Senator Pierce. That deponent remembers that William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, just about the hour of 12 o'clock noon on the said 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, left the speaker's chair, whereupon Governor William T. Watson proceeded to occupy the said speaker's chair; and this deponent remembers that after the said Governor William T. Watson took his seat as aforesaid he took part in no legislative functions of the senate other than what related to proceeding to the hall of the house of representatives, by the senate, for the purpose of attending the joint assembly to elect a United States Senator; that Governor Watson announced, "The hour of 12 having arrived, the senate will proceed to take part in the joint assembly;" that the said deponent attended the session of the legislature of Delaware from the day on which it was convened, to wit, on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, until the day of its adjournment without day on the 1st day of May, A. D. 1895, excepting a period covering about a week occurring during the lifetime of Governor Marvil, and excepting about one day during the period following the taking the oath of office as governor by William T. Watson; that after the said William T. Watson took the oath of office as governor at the time of the death of the then Governor Joshua Marvil he never took part in the legislative functions of the senate; that he never joined the senators in the discharge of their duties except on the last day of the session, as hereinbefore set forth; that during the session of the legislature of Delaware, convened at Dover on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, and lasting until the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, it was well known to Governor William T. Watson that this deponent had, with others, throughout the said session of the legislature, voted for George V. Massey for United States Senator, and your deponent was led to believe by the acts and words of Governor William T. Watson, and does believe, that he, Governor Watson, would not have undertaken to participate in the election of a United States Senator on the last day of the session as above set forth if he had not assured himself that this deponent would not continue voting for the said George V. Massey, and that the said deponent was led to believe by the acts and words of Governor William T. Watson, and does believe that he, the said Governor Watson, undertook to participate in the election of a United States Senator on the said last day of the session of 1895, to wit, on the 9th day of May, 1895, in order to prevent the election of Henry A. Du Pont as United States Senator from the State of Delaware.

JOHN M. C. MOORE.

Sworn and subscribed to before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] EDWARD R. COCHRAN, JR.,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF GEORGE F. PIERCE.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edward G. Cook, a notary public for the State of Delaware for the county aforesaid, personally comes George Fisher Pierce, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say that he resides at Milford, Sussex County and State of Delaware; that he is a member of the senate of said State, having been elected at the general election held on November 6, 1894, and took his seat in said senate on the 1st day of January, 1895; that he was present in the senate at its final session, which convened at 11 a. m. on Thursday, May 9, 1895, and after a session of one hour ended at noon on said day, when the senate, without motion, proceeded to the hall of the house of representatives and took part in the joint assembly then convened for the election of a United States Senator; that during said hour—from 11 until 12 o'clock—the senate was presided over by William T. Records, its speaker; that about ten minutes before the hour of noon William T. Watson, governor of the State of Delaware, being in the chamber, came and took a seat alongside of this deponent, and said to him: "I am going into the joint assembly and vote for a Senator." This deponent said: "You are going to do what?" He answered: "I am going to preside over the joint assembly to-day and vote for a United States Senator." This deponent then said: "Do you think that is right?" Governor Watson answered: "No, I do not; but my party has overruled me." This deponent answered, "Then I suppose there is nothing I can say now that would change your mind," to which Watson replied: "No; my mind is fully made up."

Throughout the hour William T. Records presided as speaker, put all motions, and performed all the duties belonging to the office. Just as the hour of 12 arrived, and the senate were about to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the joint assembly, William T. Records left the speaker's chair, William T. Watson took it, and all he did, to the best of this deponent's recollection, as speaker, was to announce that, "The hour of 12 having arrived, the senate will proceed to take part in the joint assembly."

On the day following, between the hours of 11 and 12, in the town of Milford, where we both reside, I met Governor Watson at the Central Hotel. Several persons were present; among them I recollect Napoleon Gray, though I can not remember who the others were. They were sitting in a room generally used by commercial travelers for exposing their samples. While the party was sitting there, William T. Watson took a paper out of his pocket, and without saying anything handed it to me. I read it and handed it back to him without saying anything. The paper, as I recollect it to the best of my knowledge and belief, read about as follows: "We, the undersigned, pledge ourselves to vote for John Edward Addicks first, last, and all the time." I think there was a line or two more, but I can not recollect what it was. This paper was signed by Newell Ball, Charles Moore, John Robbins, and Robert J. Hanby. The first three were members of the house of representatives, and Mr. Hanby was a member of the senate.

GEO. F. PIERCE.

Sworn and subscribed before me the day and year aforesaid. Witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] EDWARD G. COOK,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF SAMUEL ALRICHS.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edward G. Cook, a notary public of the State of Dela-

ware for the county aforesaid, personally came Samuel Alrichs, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he resides at Glasgow, in Pencader Hundred, Newcastle County and State of Delaware; that he was elected senator of said State at the last general election, held on the 6th day of November, A. D. 1894, and took his seat as a member of the senate on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895; that he was present at the final legislative session of the senate, held between the hours of 11 o'clock a. m. and 12 o'clock noon on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895; that this deponent was present throughout the entire session; that he presented, as chairman of the committee on judiciary, a number of bills during that session, and that he voted on all bills and motions that were before the senate; that William T. Records was the speaker in the chair when the motions were put by this deponent on the bills aforesaid; that William T. Watson entered the chamber shortly before the hour of noon, but did not take the chair until just after the legislative business was ended, and just as the senate was about to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the joint assembly for the election of a United States Senator; that this deponent has no recollection that the said William T. Watson presided, or undertook to preside, over the senate during said session that morning, or that he put any motions, voted on any bills or other motions whatever as senator or speaker until just as the senate was about to proceed to the hall of the house of representatives to take part in the joint assembly, when he took the chair, and made the announcement that the hour had come for that purpose, and proceeded at the head of the senate to the hall of the house of representatives.

SAMUEL ALRICHS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896.

In witness whereof I have hereunto affixed my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] EDWARD G. COOK,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF EDGAR T. HASTINGS.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 14th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edward G. Cook, a notary public of the State of Delaware, for the county aforesaid, personally appeared Edgar T. Hastings, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say: I reside at Millsboro, in Sussex County, in the State of Delaware. I am 47 years of age and upward. I am the clerk of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware, having been elected thereto at its organization on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895. As clerk of the house, I recorded the proceedings of the legislative sessions of that body, and also of the joint assembly of the two houses of the legislature of the State of Delaware as convened for the election of a United States Senator from the State of Delaware. Both the house of representatives and the senate held their last legislative session between the hours of 11 a. m. and 12 noon on Thursday, the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895.

From the time of the death of Governor Marvil, William T. Watson, theretofore speaker of the senate, took no part in its meetings, and did not preside in said body at any time that I was therein, nor did he take any part in the legislative proceedings until the reassembling of the joint assembly for the election of a United States Senator at noon on the 9th day of May aforesaid, when he appeared and presided, and voted in said joint assembly until he declared it adjourned sine die at 3 p. m. During the hour between 11 a. m. and 12 o'clock noon on the 9th day of May, I had occasion frequently to present to the senate various legislative messages from the house, as appears by the record of the senate for that hour and day. At no time during that hour when I was present did Gov. William T. Watson occupy the chair as speaker or take any part in the business of the Senate.

There were a great many bills pending at the time of the adjournment sine die of the legislature on that day, and a great deal of legislative business was left unfinished. The adjournment sine die took place by reason of a joint resolution of the two houses, passed a week or two previously. This left a great pressure upon each house on the part of those interested in legislation to get their bills passed before the meeting of the joint assembly at noon on that day, and each house was kept busy by legislative proceedings until the very moment of the meeting of the joint assembly. At no time during which I was present in the senate, conveying messages from the house of representatives as its clerk, from the beginning of the session of the senate at 11 o'clock on that day until the last day I was there previous to the joint assembly meeting, did I see Governor Watson in the chair or otherwise acting as speaker of the senate.

EDGAR T. HASTINGS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th day of January, A. D. 1896.

In witness whereof I have hereunto affixed my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] EDWARD G. COOK,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN S. PRETTYMAN, JR.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *County of Sussex, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 14th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Philip S. Graham, a notary public of the State of Delaware, for the county aforesaid, personally comes John S. Prettyman, jr., who, being first duly sworn by me according to law, deposes and says:

I am 35 years of age and upward, and reside in the town of Milford, Sussex County, and State of Delaware.

On Thursday, the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, upon the arrival of the 6.45 p. m. train, I walked from the railroad station at Milford, Del., into the center of the town, about one-quarter of a mile in distance, with William T. Watson, governor of Delaware. This was the day the Delaware legislature adjourned after the contest for the election of a United States Senator, in which the governor presided in the joint assembly as speaker. During this walk Governor Watson said to me that when he went to Dover on the morning of that day he did not expect to preside as speaker of the senate, believing that he did not have a legal right to act as governor and senator. After reaching Dover, in response to the influence of party leaders, he reversed this decision, and consented to enter the senate and claim his rights as speaker. In doing this, he said, he put aside his own judgment, and acted upon the judgment of those whom he regarded as well qualified to advise. He also said that if anyone would convince him that he had acted illegally in the matter he would sign Mr. Du Pont's certificate of election.

On Friday, following this conversation, I met Governor Watson about 11.30 a. m. in T. F. Hammersley's drug store, in Milford. I said to him that the fact of the Speaker of the United States Senate abandoning his functions as Senator upon becoming President of the United States might have some weight with the Senate in considering the seating of Mr. Du Pont. He seemed indignant, and blurted out in an angry manner: "What's that got to do with it? If you would read a little you might know something." I replied quietly that his remark was a very foolish one; that I did not know that he had ever been credited with superior wisdom or learning, and that neither of our opinions was worth very much in the matter. He then quickly and excitedly drew from his pocket a folded piece of writing paper and said: "Read this." I took the paper and read the writing through. It was an agreement between Robert J. Hanby, Newall Ball, Charles Moore, and John Robbins, members of the Delaware legislature, signed with their names and to the effect that they would vote for J. Edward Addicks for United States Senator and that they would not vote for anyone else, even though no Senator should be elected. As I passed the paper back to the governor he said: "Wouldn't you have acted as I did under such circumstances?" I evaded his question by saying, "Are the signatures genuine?" and he replied, "Of course they are; look again;" and he passed the paper to me for the second time.

I read it through again and examined the signatures, remarking that I was not familiar with the autographs of these men, but that the names were in different handwritings. He said that he was not familiar with the autographs of the men, but that he was sure the names were genuine. The governor also said that this agreement was brought to him to induce him to take part in the last joint assembly of the legislature, and, influenced by it, through the advice of others, he consented to preside as speaker of that body, and did so preside upon the day mentioned. He further said that the Republicans had every opportunity to elect a Senator and had failed to do so, and of course he preferred that the Democratic party should have a representative in the United States Senate from Delaware rather than the Republican party.

J. S. PRETTYMAN, JR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th day of January, A. D. 1896.

Witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] PHILIP S. GRAHAM,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF FRANK REEDY.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, Edward G. Cook, a notary public of the State of Delaware for the county aforesaid, personally comes Frank Reedy, who, being first duly sworn by me according to law, deposes and says:

I am 47 years of age and upward, and reside in the town of Milford, in Kent County and State of Delaware.

On Friday, the 10th day of May, A. D. 1895, about 10 o'clock a. m., I met William T. Watson, governor of the State of Delaware, in the town of Milford, where we both reside, that being the day after the adjournment of the general assembly and the ending of the contest for the election of a United States Senator. Governor Watson said to me, "You fellows ought not to be so hard on me for not electing a United States Senator; you ought to blame those other four men." I replied, "We do not blame you altogether, but we think you ought not to have gone in there at the time you did if you had not gone before." Watson then said, "I did not go in until I had the best legal talent of the party advising me so to do, and not until I had got this;" and he handed me a paper. This paper, as well as I can remember, read about as follows: "We, the undersigned, hereby pledge ourselves to vote for John Edward Addicks first, last, and all the time." There may have been a couple more lines, but I can not remember where or what they were.

This paper was signed by Charles Moore, Newall Ball, John Robbins, and Robert J. Hanby. The first three were members of the house of representatives of the State, and the said Hanby was a member of the senate.

Squire Robert J. Beswick came up about that time and I handed the paper back to Governor Watson without anything further being said by either of us.

FRANK REEDY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896.

Witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] EDWARD G. COOK,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF GEORGE L. TOWNSEND.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *District of Delaware, ss:*

On this 13th day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, S. Rodmond Smith, United States commissioner, duly appointed by the circuit court of the United States for the district of Delaware, personally appeared George L. Townsend, who being by me first duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say:

That he resides at Odessa, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware; that shortly after 12 o'clock noon on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, he entered the hall of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware, in the State capitol at Dover, while the joint assembly of the two houses of the general assembly was convened in said room in the election of a United States Senator from the State of Delaware, and remained in said room most of the time until the final adjournment of that body at 3 o'clock p. m. on that day.

That the chair was occupied by William T. Watson, the governor of the State, as speaker, while this deponent was present as aforesaid, and that, while the said William T. Watson was thus presiding as the speaker of the senate, this deponent saw William T. Records, the speaker pro tempore of the senate, in the act of signing sundry enrolled bills that had theretofore been passed by the two houses of the said general assembly.

GEORGE L. TOWNSEND.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of January A. D. 1896.

S. RODMOND SMITH,
United States Commissioner, District of Delaware.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM MICHAEL BYRNE, OF WILMINGTON, DEL., RELATIVE TO THE CASE OF HENRY A. DU PONT, CLAIMING TO HAVE BEEN ELECTED A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

Be it remembered, that on this 23d day of January, A. D. 1896, before me, John A. Kelley, a notary public for the State of Delaware for the county aforesaid, personally comes William Michael Byrne, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

I am 30 years of age and reside in the city of Wilmington, Newcastle County, and State of Delaware. On Tuesday, the 21st day of January instant, I visited the office of the secretary of state of the State of Delaware, in the city of Dover, Kent County and State of Delaware, and by permission of the secretary of state examined all acts, bills, and resolutions mentioned in the senate journal for the session of the senate of Delaware held on May 9, 1895, between the hours of 11 o'clock a. m. and 12 o'clock m., excepting joint resolution in relation to paying William T. Smithers, joint resolution in relation to paying John D. Hawkins, secretary of state, and an act to divorce Benjamin O. Jacobs from his wife, Victoria W. Jacobs, all three of which, upon search, I was unable to find, the act above named having failed of passage and not appearing in the published pamphlet of the laws of Delaware for 1895.

The bill entitled "An act to amend an act fixing the salary of the attorney-general, and for other purposes, passed at Dover, March 23, 1871, and amended by the act entitled 'An act to amend chapter 36, volume 14, of the laws of Delaware,' passed at Dover March 24, 1873," was duly enrolled, but was not signed either by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act for the relief of Robert Cook, deceased," was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to repeal an act limiting judgment liens upon real estate, and for other purposes," passed at Dover May 4, 1893, was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act fixing the salary of the attorney-general, and for other purposes,' passed at Dover March 23, 1871, as amended by the act entitled 'An act to amend chapter 36, volume 14, laws of Delaware,' passed at Dover March 24, 1875," was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to prevent bogus sales within the State of Delaware, being a supplement to chapter 68 of the revised code of the State of Delaware," was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act to amend sections 5 and 10 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the town of Frederica,' passed at Dover March 8, 1865, and reenacted March 26, 1885," was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or by any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Acetyline Light Company" was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company" was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution in relation to paying John R. Nicholson and Edward Ridgely one hundred and twenty-five dollars" was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to divorce Margaret McNabb from her husband, John Edward McNabb," was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act providing for an addition to the State library building" was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the Senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act to divorce Katie T. Morris from her husband, Charles T. Morris," was not signed by Governor William Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to divorce Bettine McKean Rogers from William H. Rogers" was signed by Speaker pro tempore Records on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act relating to the defacing of private property" was not enrolled and was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to legalize a certain flower as the floral emblem of the State" was not enrolled and was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act in relation to disorderly houses and houses of ill fame and assignation" was duly enrolled, but was not

signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Hall Company of Lewes" was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company in Newcastle County," was not enrolled and was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown, Sussex County," was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Silverbrook Cemetery Company," mentioned twice in the said journal of said session, was, as above mentioned, duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act relative to bonds, undertakings, and other obligations with surety or sureties, to the acceptance as surety or guarantor thereupon of companies qualified to act as such, and to provide a uniform system of procedure by and standard of qualifications for such companies," was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act to divorce Ellen Tatum Pusey from her husband, Joshua B. Pusey," was duly enrolled and signed by W. T. Records, speaker pro tempore, on behalf of the senate, and not by Governor Watson.

The bill entitled "An act relating to certain lands of the Wellman Iron and Steel Company in Newcastle County," already mentioned in said journal for said session, was not enrolled and was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the Calhoun-Jones Company, of Georgetown," already mentioned in said journal for said session, was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

The bill entitled "An act to incorporate the North American Construction Company" was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker Pro Tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate, and the bill entitled "An act to divorce Elzey D. Richardson from his wife, Jennie A. Richardson," was duly enrolled, but was not signed by Governor Watson, Speaker pro tempore Records, or any other person on behalf of the senate.

That deponent was unable to find any act, bill, or resolution mentioned in the senate journal for said session signed by William T. Watson in any capacity, whether as governor, speaker of the senate, or otherwise.

WILLIAM MICHAEL BYRNE.

Sworn and subscribed to before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] JOHN A. KELLEY,
Notary Public.

Affidavits of Robert J. Hanby, William T. Records, Charles A. Hastings, John B. Penington, and Edward D. Hearne, members of the legislature of the State of Delaware, relative to the case of Henry A. Du Pont, claiming to have been elected a United States Senator from that State.

AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT J. HANBY.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this 9th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally comes before me, Howell S. England, a notary public for the State of Delaware, Robert J. Hanby, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says as follows:

At the general election held in the State of Delaware on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, A. D. 1894, I was duly elected to the office of senator in the general assembly of said State from Newcastle County, for the term of four years. Upon the organization of the general assembly, in January, 1895, I duly qualified and took my seat in the senate of said State, and have continued as senator ever since. I took part in the proceedings of the senate from day to day, and I was present and participated in the proceedings of the final joint meeting of the senate and house of representatives on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895. Agreeably to and in pursuance of a law passed by Congress for such cases made and provided, the senate and house of representatives, comprising the general assembly of the State of Delaware, met in joint meeting on the morning of May 9, 1895, and took a number of ballots for the purpose of trying to elect a United States Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning March 4, 1895.

After taking six ballots for such Senator, without electing anyone, the joint meeting separated to meet again at 12 o'clock noon of the same day. The members of the senate returned to their chamber and there resumed the exercise of their ordinary legislative functions. Some time between the hours of 11 o'clock a. m. of that day and 12 o'clock noon, and while the senate was in session in its own chamber attending to the regular legislative functions imposed upon it by the constitution of the State of Delaware, William T. Watson, speaker of the senate, and at that time exercising the office of governor, entered the senate chamber and resumed the speaker's chair, which was thereupon vacated by William T. Records, who had been elected speaker pro tempore of the senate during the absence of William T. Watson, speaker. No word of protest was heard from any senator, questioning the right of William T. Watson to resume the speaker's chair and to exercise his functions as a senator.

William T. Watson continued to preside as speaker of the senate until 12 o'clock noon of May 9, 1895, when he declared that the time had arrived for the reconvening of the joint meeting of the two houses of the general assembly, in compliance with a motion to that effect adopted at the morning session of the joint meeting on the same day. William T. Watson, speaker of the senate, accompanied by all the other senators, then proceeded to the chamber of the house of representatives, where the joint meeting reconvened.

ROBERT J. HANBY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] HOWELL S. ENGLAND,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM T. RECORDS.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

On this 4th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally came before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public for the State of Delaware, residing in Kent County, William T. Records, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows: That he is a citizen of the State of Delaware and a senator from Sussex County in the general assembly of said State; that he was elected speaker pro tempore of the senate of said general assembly on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1895; that between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock on the morning of the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, William T. Watson entered the senate chamber, the senate being then in session, and took the chair as speaker of the senate; that he continued to preside over the senate until 12 o'clock meridian; that while he continued to so preside he voted in the affirmative upon at least one corporation bill and declared that the said bill had passed the senate, it having received the required constitutional majority; that when the hour had arrived for the senate and house of representatives to convene in joint assembly, William T. Watson, as speaker of the senate, so announced, and that then the senators, preceded by the said William T. Watson, went into the hall of the house of representatives, and he, the said William T. Watson, took the chair as the presiding officer of the said joint assembly; and that while the said William T. Watson was so presiding over the senate as aforesaid no objection was made by any senator to his so presiding or voting, nor was there any objection made to his presiding over and voting in the joint assembly until after the last ballot for a United States Senator had been taken, when Senator Alrichs presented a formal protest against the action of the said William T. Watson, upon which protest no action was taken by the said joint assembly.

WILLIAM T. RECORDS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES A. HASTINGS.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

On this 4th day of January, A. D. 1895, personally appears before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public for the State of Delaware, residing in Kent County, Charles A. Hastings, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows: That he is a citizen of the State of Delaware and was and is now the clerk of the senate of the general assembly of said State at its session commencing January, A. D. 1895; that between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock on the morning of the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, and while the senate was in session, William T. Watson entered the senate chamber and took the chair as speaker; that Edgar T. Hastings, clerk of the house of representatives of said State, was announced and admitted to the senate on the order and under the direction of the said William T. Watson, and, addressing Mr. Watson as "Mr. Speaker," reported several bills as having passed the house of representatives; that while the said William T. Watson so presided over the senate at least one bill

was passed upon which a yea-and-nay vote was taken, and that Mr. Watson, upon the calling of the roll and the name "Mr. Speaker," voted in the affirmative; and that he, Mr. Watson, continued to preside over and take part in the proceedings of the senate without any objection on the part of any of the senators until the hour arrived for the two houses to meet in joint assembly, when he proceeded to the house of representatives, followed by the other senators and the officers of the senate.

CHARLES A. HASTINGS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year aforesaid, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN B. PENINGTON.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

On this 4th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally appears before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public for the State of Delaware, residing in Kent County, John B. Penington, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, deposes and says as follows:

That he is a citizen of the State of Delaware, residing in Dover, the capital of said State; that on the morning of the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, the legislature of said State being then in session, he entered the senate chamber between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock, and that at the time he entered the senate chamber William T. Watson was occupying the chair and acting as the speaker of the senate, receiving and putting all motions which were made; that upon entering the senate chamber upon the time aforesaid, he took a seat close on the left of Mr. Alrichs, a senator from the county of Newcastle, and that in a brief time Senator Alrichs arose, and addressing Mr. Watson as speaker, reported a bill from the judiciary committee, of which he was a member; and that upon the question of the final passage of said bill Mr. Watson ordered and directed the clerk to call the yeas and nays, and upon the clerk calling the names of the members of the senate he called "Mr. Speaker," and Mr. Watson voted aye, and announced to the senate that the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, had passed the senate; that afterwards another bill was taken up by the senate upon the passage of which the yeas and nays were ordered, but that at the time the roll was being called upon the passage of said last-mentioned bill this affiant was engaged in conversation with some one in the senate chamber and did not notice particularly who voted upon the roll call; that he remained in said senate chamber until nearly 12 o'clock, when Mr. Watson, as speaker of the senate, announced that the hour for the joint meeting of the general assembly having arrived, the senators would proceed to the hall of the house of representatives, and that he, Mr. Watson, speaker of the senate, with the gavel of the senate in his hand, passed by this affiant, followed by the other senators, and went directly to the hall of the house of representatives.

JOHN B. PENINGTON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first herein written, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF EDWARD D. HEARNE.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

On this 4th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally appears before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public for the State of Delaware, residing in Kent County, Edward D. Hearne, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows:

That he is a citizen of the State of Delaware; that on the morning of the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, he was in the senate chamber while the senate was in session, assisting Charles A. Hastings, the clerk of said senate; that between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock on that morning William T. Watson entered the said senate chamber and took the chair as the speaker of the senate, and presided over that body until 12 o'clock meridian, at which time the two houses convened in joint assembly; that while the said William T. Watson was so presiding over the senate as its speaker he received and put a number of motions as speaker of the senate, and was addressed by the clerk of the house of representatives, when reporting the passage of a number of bills by the house, as "Mr. Speaker"; that the said William T. Watson continued to preside over the senate as its speaker until 12 o'clock meridian, at which time he announced that the hour had arrrived for the two houses to meet in joint assembly, and thereupon all the other senators, preceded by Mr. Watson, passed into the house of representatives, and Mr. Watson then immediately took the chair as the presiding officer of the joint assembly and received and put motions as such officer; and that no objection was made by any senator while he presided over the senate as aforesaid, nor by any member of either of the two houses while he so presided over the joint assembly until after the last ballot for a United States Senator had been taken, and that no action was taken by the said joint assembly on the objection or protest then made.

EDWARD D. HEARNE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first herein written, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

Affidavits of William T. Watson, speaker of the senate of the State of Delaware, and of Cyrus Cort, chaplain of the senate of the State of Delaware for the session of 1895, in the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the United States Senate from the State of Delaware.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM T. WATSON, SPEAKER OF THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

Be it remembered, that on this 28th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally came before me, William E. Riggs, jr., a notary public of the State of Delaware, resident in Kent County, William T. Watson, who, being by me duly sworn according to law, did depose and say that he was elected speaker of the senate on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, and on the 9th day of April of the same year, after the death of Joshua Marvil, the duly elected and qualified governor of the State of Delaware, assumed the exercise of the office of governor; that on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock m., this affiant entered the senate chamber, whereupon William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, vacated the chair, and he, this affiant, took the same and presided over the senate until the hour for the two houses to assemble in joint meeting arrived, and then announced the same and proceeded at the head of the Senators into the hall of the house of representatives, where he presided over the joint assembly from the beginning to the end thereof and voted upon all questions which arose during the session, no objection having been made to his so presiding or voting until at or about the time the last ballot was taken, when Senator Alrichs read a written protest against his right to so vote and preside; that while he presided over the senate on that day in its chamber he voted upon one bill at least and announced its passage by the senate; that he received and put motions made by senators and was addressed as speaker of that body, and that no objection from any quarter was made to his acting as presiding officer of the senate and otherwise participating in the proceedings thereof while in session during the hour aforesaid.

WILLIAM T. WATSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year aforesaid.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM E. RIGGS, JR.,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT OF CYRUS CORT, CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Kent County, ss:*

On this 25th day of January, A. D. 1896, personally came before me, Henry R. Draper, a notary public for the State of Delaware, Cyrus Cort, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says as follows:

I am a resident of the State of Delaware, living at Wyoming, in said State. I was elected chaplain of the senate of the State of Delaware for the session of 1895, and in such capacity I performed my functions whenever the senate was in session. I was present and witnessed the proceedings of the senate and the joint meeting of the two houses of the general assembly on May 9, 1895, and I was an eyewitness to the proceedings of those two bodies on that day. On the morning of May 9, 1895, while the senate was in session in its own chamber attending to its ordinary legislative functions, between the hours of 11 o'clock in the morning and 12 o'clock noon, William T. Watson entered the senate chamber and resumed the speaker's chair, which was vacated by William T. Records, speaker pro tempore. The said William T. Watson did preside in the senate, voted on motions, and otherwise took part in the proceedings of the senate, without objection from any senator questioning his right to preside and to perform his functions as a member of that body.

When the hour of 12 o'clock noon arrived, the said William T. Watson, as speaker of the senate, announced to the members of the senate that the hour had arrived for the reassembling of the joint meeting to ballot for a United States Senator, and at the head of the other senators, with gavel in hand, the said William T. Watson went to the chamber of the house of representatives and presided over the joint assembly during the numerous ballots taken for the purpose of trying to elect a United States Senator. At the conclusion of each of said ballots the members of said joint assembly acquiesced without protest in the announcement of the said William T. Watson that "No person having received a ma-

jority of the votes cast for a United States Senator, there has been no election. The clerk will proceed to call the roll for another ballot," or words to that effect. Senator Alrichs presented his protest after all the ballots had been taken. His protest was declared out of order, and the few moments remaining before the joint meeting was adjourned were consumed in motions and roll calls to adjourn or other dilatory motions.

I opened the senate with prayer on the morning of May 9, 1895; was present in the senate chamber while William T. Watson presided, voted, and performed his other legislative functions; joined the members of the senate when they proceeded to the chamber of the house of representatives, and sat with Dr. W. L. S. Murray, chaplain of the house, alongside the speaker's stand, throughout the time required to take the fruitless ballots on the afternoon of said May 9, 1895.

CYRUS CORT.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] HENRY R. DRAPER,
Notary Public.

2.—CERTIFICATE OF THE ELECTION OF MR. DU PONT SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE DELAWARE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ATTESTED BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

I, Henry H. McMullen, speaker of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware, do hereby certify that on Tuesday, the fifteenth day of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, that being the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, the senate and house of representatives of the said State, respectively, proceeded to vote for a Senator in Congress from said State for the term of six years beginning on the fourth day of March, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five; that at twelve o'clock meridian of the day following the members of the said two houses duly convened in joint assembly, and the journal of each house having been then read and it appearing therefrom that no person had received a majority of the votes in each house for said office, the said joint assembly did then proceed to vote for a person for Senator, and no person having received on said last-mentioned day a majority of all the votes of the joint assembly, the said joint assembly did meet at twelve o'clock meridian of each succeeding day during the session and did take at least one vote, without any person having received such majority until the ninth day of May of said year, when Henry A. Du Pont received fifteen votes, Edward Ridgeley received ten votes, John E. Addicks received four votes, and Ebe W. Tunnell received one vote; that the general assembly of the State of Delaware, theretofore duly elected, duly organized on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five; that the members of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State, and took their seats therein at the time of the organization thereof as aforesaid, were Henry H. McMullen, Frederick Pyle, William Wilson, Francis M. Walker, George W. Reybold, Walter S. Money, and John W. Jolls, representatives from Newcastle County; Horace R. Mustard, William R. Davis, Clarence D. Sypherd, Alexander M. Daly, Ellwood C. Killen, Thomas A. Watson, and Ezekiel Fleming, representatives from Kent County; and John M. Robbins, Newell Ball, Edward S. Burton, George H. Townsend, Charles L. Moore, Horace Brown, and Henry L. Morgan, representatives from Sussex County; that the members of the senate of the State of Delaware, who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State at the general election held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-four, or continued in the office of senator by virtue of their election to said office at the general election held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-two, and who took their seats in said senate at the time of the organization thereof on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, were Samuel Alrichs, Robert J. Hanby, and John Pyle, senators from Newcastle County; John W. Fenimore, Hezekiah Harrington, and William T. Watson, senators from Kent County; and John M. C. Moore, George F. Pierce, and William T. Records, senators from Sussex County; that all the said senators and representatives, save in so far as hereinafter stated to the contrary, continued to act as senators and members of the house of representatives, respectively, from the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, to the adjournment of the general assembly on the ninth day of May, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, except during occasional absence, or during the recess or adjournments of the respective houses.

That Joshua H. Marvil was elected governor of the State of Delaware on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-four, and thereafter, on the third Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, duly qualified as governor of said State for the term of four years, beginning on the day last aforesaid and ending on the third Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, and entered upon the exercise of said office of governor; that thereafter, on the eighth day of April, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, the said Joshua H. Marvil, while continuing to exercise the office of governor, died; that on the day following, to wit, on the ninth day of April, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, the said William T. Watson, who, upon the organization of the senate upon the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, had been duly elected and qualified as the speaker of the senate, duly took the oath of office as governor of said State, and thereupon entered upon the exercise of the office of governor of the State of Delaware; that the said William T. Watson, during the said session of the general assembly, and until he assumed the office of governor as aforesaid, was and remained the speaker of the senate, and as such presided over that body and voted therein, and participated and voted in the sessions aforesaid of the joint assembly of the two houses, convened for the purpose of electing a Senator from the State of Delaware in the United States Senate; that upon his qualifying and entering upon the exercise of the office of governor as aforesaid the said William T. Watson ceased to have the right to act as a member of the senate of said State, or to vote in the said joint assembly for the election of a Senator in Congress as aforesaid; that one of the ten votes so as aforesaid received in said joint assembly on the ninth day of May, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, by Edward Ridgely, was then and there given by the said William T. Watson, at that time the governor of the said State; that said vote so given for Edward Ridgely was given by the said William T. Watson illegally and in violation of the constitution of the State of Delaware, and that Henry A. Du Pont, on said ballot having received fifteen votes, and Edward Ridgely having received only nine legal votes, John E. Addicks having received four votes, and Ebe W. Tunnell having received one vote (no person having theretofore been elected to the office of Senator in Congress from the State of Delaware for said term), the said Henry A. Du Pont having thereby received a majority of the votes of all the senators and representatives then constituting the legislature of the State of Delaware, they being all present and voting, was duly elected Senator in Congress from the State of Delaware for the term of six years from the fourth day of March, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, and was then and there duly declared elected to said office for said term by me as speaker of the house of representatives as aforesaid.

HENRY H. McMULLEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:
EDGAR T. HASTINGS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

3.—AFFIDAVIT OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the fourth day of March, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, and ending on the fourth day of March, A. D. nineteen hundred and one.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this twenty-seventh day of June, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, personally comes before me Edward T. Price, a notary public for the State of Delaware, Edward T. Hastings, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows:

That deponent is a citizen of the State of Delaware, residing at Millsboro, in Sussex County, in said State, and that he was, upon the organization of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, duly elected clerk of the house of representatives of said State, which office deponent forthwith accepted and has ever since held and now holds; that the members of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State, and took their seats therein at the time of the organization thereof as aforesaid, were Henry H. McMullen, Frederick Pyle, William Wilson, Francis M. Walker, George W. Reybold, Walter S. Money, and John W. Jolls, representatives from Newcastle County; Horace R. Mustard, William R. Davis, Clarence D. Sypherd, Alexander M. Daly, Ellwood C. Killen, Thomas A. Watson, and Ezekiel Fleming, representatives from Kent County, and John M. Robbins, Newell Ball, Edward S. Burton, George H. Townsend, Charles L. Moore, Horace Brown, and Henry L. Morgan, representatives from Sussex County; that the members of the senate of the State of Delaware who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State or continued in the office of senator by virtue of their election to said office at the general election held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-two, and who took

their seats in said senate at the time of the organization thereof on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, were Samuel Alrichs, Robert J. Hanby, and John Pyle, senators from Newcastle County; John W. Fenimore, Hezekiah Harrington, and William T. Watson, senators from Kent County, and John M. C. Moore, George F. Pierce, and William T. Records, senators from Sussex County; that all the said senators and representatives, save in so far as hereinafter stated to the contrary, continued to act as senators and members of the house of representatives, respectively, from the first Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, to the adjournment of the general assembly on the ninth day of May, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, except during occasional absence or during the recess or adjournments of the respective houses; that Joshua H. Marvil was elected governor of the State of Delaware on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-four, thereafter on the third Tuesday of January, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, duly qualified as governor of said State and entered upon the exercise of said office of governor; that thereafter, on the eighth day of April, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, the said Joshua H. Marvil, while continuing to exercise the office of governor, died, and on the following day, immediately after the taking of a ballot for United States Senator in the joint session of the general assembly, and the separation of the two houses, the said William T. Watson, having had administered to him the oath of office by Hon. James L. Wolcott, chancellor of the State of Delaware, entered upon the exercise of the office of governor of the State of Delaware; that the said William T. Watson during the said session of the general assembly and until he assumed the office of governor was the speaker of the senate, and as such presided over that body and voted therein; that the said William T. Watson, until he assumed the office of governor, as aforesaid, participated and voted in the joint sessions convened for the purpose of electing a Senator from the State of Delaware in the United States Senate; that after the said William T. Watson assumed the office of governor, as aforesaid, and until the last joint session convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid, held at noon on the ninth day of May, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, the said William T. Watson never participated or voted in any of the joint sessions convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid, and as deponent is informed and believes, never during that period presided over or voted in or took part in the proceedings of the senate; that at the final joint session convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid the said William T. Watson assumed the right to preside over and vote in said joint session; that in each ballot during said last joint session, commencing at noon on the said ninth day of May, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, Henry A. Du Pont, of Christiana Hundred, Newcastle County, and State of Delaware, received fifteen votes, and that the said William T. Watson, assuming to act as a member of the said general assembly, did, at each and every of said ballots so had during the said last joint session, vote for Edward Ridgely for Senator from Delaware in the Senate of the United States; that aside from the vote of the said William T. Watson, Henry A. Du Pont at each and every ballot had during said last joint session received fifteen votes, being a majority of all the votes cast exclusive of the vote so cast by William T. Watson as aforesaid; that upon the same day on which the said William T. Watson took the oath of office and entered upon the exercise of the office of governor, and immediately thereafter William T. Records, senator from Sussex County, as aforesaid, was elected speaker pro tempore of the senate, and as such continued to precide over the deliberations of that body until the final adjournment of the general assembly on the ninth day of May, A. D. 1895; that after each and every ballot had during the last joint session, although the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, was present and voting, the announcement in each case that there had been no election was made, not by the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, but by the said William T. Watson, assuming to preside over the vote in said joint session; that the said fifteen votes cast as aforesaid for Henry A. Du Pont at the said last joint session of the legislature was the highest number of votes cast for any one person for Senator during the entire biennial session of the legislature; no person having prior to the day of the last joint session at any time during the joint sessions of the said legislature received so high a number of votes for Senator from the State of Delaware in the Senate of the United States.

EDGAR T. HASTINGS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and seal of office.

[SEAL.] EDWARD T. PRICE,
Notary Public.

Insertions on second page made before execution.

EDWARD T. PRICE,
Notary Public.

4.—AFFIDAVIT OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the fourth day of March, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, and ending on the fourth day of March, A. D. nineteen hundred and one.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this thirteenth day of July, A. D. eighteen hundred and ninety-five, personally comes before me, Howell S. England, a notary public for the State of Delaware, Henry H. McMullen, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows:

That deponent is a citizen of the State of Delaware, residing in New Castle Hundred, in Newcastle County, in said State, and that he was upon the organization of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, duly elected speaker of the house of representatives of said State, which office deponent forthwith accepted and has ever since held and now holds; that on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1895, after the death of Joshua H. Marvil, and immediately after the taking of a ballot for United States Senator in the joint session of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, and the separation of the two houses, William T. Watson, who, upon the organization of the general assembly on the first Tuesday in January, in the year last aforesaid, had been elected speaker of the senate, had administered to him by Hon. James L. Wolcott, chancellor of the State of Delaware, the oath of office as governor of the State of Delaware, and thereupon entered upon the exercise of the office of governor as aforesaid; that the said William T. Watson, during the last session of the general assembly and until he assumed the office of governor, was the speaker of the senate, and as such presided over that body and voted therein; that the said William T. Watson, until he assumed the office of governor as aforesaid, participated and voted in the joint sessions convened for the purpose of electing a Senator from the State of Delaware in the United States Senate; that after the said William T. Watson assumed the office as governor as aforesaid, and until the last joint session convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid, held at noon on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, the said William T. Watson never participated or voted in any of the joint sessions convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid, and, as deponent is informed and believes, never during that time presided over or voted in or took part in the proceedings of the senate; that at the final joint session convened for the purpose of electing a Senator as aforesaid the said William T. Watson assumed the right to preside over and vote in the said joint session; that in each ballot during said last joint session, commencing at noon on the said ninth day of May, A. D. 1895, Henry A. Du Pont, of Christiana Hundred, Newcastle County and State of Delaware, received fifteen votes, and that the said William T. Watson, assuming to act as a member of the general assembly, did at each and every of said ballots so had during the said last joint session vote for Edward Ridgely for Senator from Delaware in the Senate of the United States; that aside from the vote of the said William T. Watson, Henry A. Du Pont, at each and every ballot had during said last joint session, received fifteen votes, being a majority of all the votes cast, exclusive of the vote so cast by the said William T. Watson as aforesaid; that upon the same day on which the said William T. Watson took the oath of office and entered upon the exercise of the office of gevernor, and immediately thereafter, William T. Records, senator from Sussex County, was elected speaker pro tempore of the senate, and as such continued to preside over the deliberations of that body until the final adjournment of the general assembly on the ninth day of May, A. D. 1895; that after each and every ballot had during the said last joint session, although the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, was present and voting, the announcement in each case that there had been no election was made, not by the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, but by the said William T. Watson, assuming to preside over the vote in said joint session; that the said fifteen votes cast as aforesaid for Henry A. Du Pont at the said last joint session of the legislature was the highest number of votes cast for any one person for Senator during the entire biennial session of the legislature, commencing on the first Tuesday in January, 1895, no person having prior to the said last joint session on the ninth day of May, A. D. 1895, at any time during the joint sessions of the said legislature received so high a number of votes for Senator from the State of Delaware in the Senate of the United States as the said Henry A. Du Pont received during said last joint session; that during the said last joint session sundry enrolled bills which had been signed by deponent as speaker of the house of representatives as aforesaid were also signed by the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore, and not by the said William T. Watson, although the latter was then present; and that deponent also saw the said William T. Records, speaker pro tempore as aforesaid, sign one or more enrolled bills during said last joint session which was or were thereafter signed by deponent as speaker of the house as aforesaid.

HENRY H. McMULLEN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, as witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] HOWELL S. ENGLAND,
Notary Public.

5.—AFFIDAVIT OF SAMUEL ALRICHS.

In the matter of the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from the State of Delaware for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and ending on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1901.

STATE OF DELAWARE, *Newcastle County, ss:*

On this twenty-fifth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, personally comes before me, John H. Frazer, a notary public for the State of Delaware, Samuel Alrichs, who, being first by me duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say as follows: At the general election held in the State of Delaware on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, A. D. 1894, I was duly elected to the office of senator in the general assembly of said State from Newcastle County, for the term of four years. Upon the organization of the general assembly on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, I duly qualified and took my seat in the senate of said State, and ever since have continued senator as aforesaid. I took part in the proceedings of the joint assembly of the senate and house of representatives of said State held for the purpose of electing a Senator in Congress from said State for the term of six years beginning on the fourth of March, A. D. 1895. I was present and participated in the proceedings of the final joint assembly of said two houses on the ninth day of May, A. D. 1895, and in each ballot taken during said final joint assembly voted for Henry A. Du Pont for Senator in Congress from said State. The said Henry A. Du Pont, on each ballot taken during said final assembly, received fifteen votes including my own. William T. Watson, who upon the organization of the Senate on the first Tuesday in January, A. D. 1895, was elected speaker of the senate, and who upon the death of Joshua H. Marvil, governor of the State of Delaware, in April of that year, succeeded to the office of governor of said State, wrongfully and without authority, as I believe, participated in the proceedings of said final joint assembly and voted for Edward Ridgely for Senator in Congress for said term of six years. Including the vote of William T. Watson the result of each and every ballot taken during said last joint assembly was as follows: Henry A. Du Pont received fifteen votes, Edward Ridgely received ten votes, John E. Addicks received four votes, and Ebe W. Tunnell received one vote, the said William T. Watson in each and every ballot taken during said final joint assembly voting for the said Edward Ridgely. Prior to said final joint assembly no person had been elected Senator in Congress from said State for said term of six years. After the last ballot had been taken in said final joint assembly and before the two houses separated, I, on behalf of myself and the fourteen other senators voting for the said Henry A. Du Pont, arose and presented the following challenge, protest, and demand:

"I very respectfully challenge the correctness of the announcement of this vote and divers preceding votes, and do now most respectfully insist and demand that Henry A. Du Pont be now declared elected Senator for the unexpired term of six years commencing on the fourth day of March, A. D. 1895, inasmuch as it is now respectfully insisted that this joint assembly consists of twenty-nine members, the honorable gentleman now undertaking to preside and participate therein being governor of the State, and not now a senator."

After the presentation of the foregoing challenge, protest, and demand, and without taking any further ballot, the joint assembly finally separated, with a declaration from William T. Watson that no person had been elected Senator in Congress for said term.

SAMUEL ALRICHS.

Sworn and subscribed before me this twenty-fifth day of November, A. D. 1895, and witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.] JOHN H. FRAZER,
Notary Public.

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following views of the minority in the case of Henry A. Du Pont:

The legislature of the State of Delaware is composed of 30 members—9 senators and 21 representatives. The senators are elected for four years, the representatives for two years.

A regular biennial session of the general assembly of said State began, in pursuance of law, on the first Tuesday in January, 1895, upon which devolved the election of the United States Senator to fill a vacancy made by the expiry of the term of Hon. Anthony Higgins, upon which day aforesaid all the members of each house appeared, and both houses were duly organized for the transaction of business.

Among the members of the senate so appearing was the Hon. William T. Watson, who had been duly elected at the general election held in November, 1892, a senator from the county of Kent, in said State, for the term of four years, who was duly sworn and admitted to a seat in the senate on the last day aforesaid, and was subsequently, on the same day, chosen speaker of the senate.

Afterwards, upon April 9, 1895, the legislature having been officially informed of the death of the Hon. Joshua H. Marvil, governor of Delaware, the speaker of the senate, upon whom devolved, under the constitution, the duty to "excercise the office of governor" until a governor should be elected by the people, was in open senate, and in the public session thereof, sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, of the State of Delaware, and to perform "the duties of the office of governor with fidelity."

On the same day, immediately thereafter, the senate elected the Hon. William T. Records, a senator from the county of Sussex, as speaker of the senate pro tempore, in accordance with the provision of the constitution of the State, "Each house whose speaker shall exercise the office of governor may chose a speaker pro tempore." The speaker pro tempore thus chosen presided while and whenever the speaker of the senate was absent during the remainder of the session.

The members of the two houses so organized met in joint convention on the second Tuesday after their organization, pursuant to the law of Congress July 25, 1866, to elect a Senator of the United States. Two ballots were taken on that day, and at the close of each the announcement was made by the speaker of the senate, who acted as president of the joint convention, and who continued so to act whenever he was present at the session of the same, "that no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election."

On each succeeding day of the session, except Sundays, the members of the two houses met in joint convention, voted for United States Senator, up to and including the 9th day of May, 1895, which was the last day of the session.

On this last day of the session 28 ballots were taken for United States Senator, and at the close of each ballot the same result of no election, for the same reason, was declared in the same words as those above quoted.

The last ballot cast for United States Senator, on the last day of the session aforesaid, is recorded as follows:

	Votes.
For J. Edward Addicks	4
For E. W. Tunnell	1
For H. A. Du Pont	15
For Ed. Ridgley	10

It shows that there were 30 votes cast, and of these votes Mr. Du Pont received 15; an equal number of votes were cast for other persons—for Mr. Addicks 4, for Mr. Tunnell 1, and for Mr. Ridgley 10.

Thereupon the speaker of the senate declared, no person having received a majority of all the votes cast for United States Senator, there was no election, and the two houses adjourned sine die.

In this opinion, action, and decision of the joint convention, that there was no election, we concur. It is not conceived how 15 can be a majority of 30.

That a majority of all the members of the legislature is necessary to a choice when all are present and voting we think is clear, not only from the act of July 25, 1866, but from the language of the Constitution itself upon this subject, prescribing that "two Senators from each State shall be chosen by the legislature." Such a choice is made by preference and is only indicated by a number of votes greater than that cast for all or any others voted for.

OBJECTIONS TO THE VALIDITY OF THE ACTION AND VOTE OF THE SPEAKER OF THE SENATE.

The record shows that Hon. Mr. Watson, the speaker of the senate, appeared, qualified, and took his seat in the senate on the first day of the session, without protest or objection, and continued to act as a senator and as speaker of the senate, whenever he was present, up to the time of the final adjournment.

The action of the senate in allowing him to be qualified and seated as a senator from the county of Kent was in effect an adjudication of the most public and solemn character that he was a senator, a member of the senate, and entitled to act as such. Such adjudication remains unchanged. There are only three ways in which he could lose or be deprived of his right to vote or act as a senator, and, by consequence, of his right to vote and act as a member of the joint convention. One of these is the act of God—death; the second by his own act—resignation; the third is by the action of the senate adjudging the vacation of his seat, either by ouster or expulsion, for such causes as the senate of the State of Delaware might adjudge sufficient to disqualify him as a senator. There has been neither death, resignation, nor adverse adjudication in his case, and he remains in all respects a senator, as fully qualified and as lawfully entitled to act as such as upon the day when he first appeared and was sworn as a senator.

It is claimed that when the exercise of the office of governor devolved upon him as speaker of the senate, that, ipso facto, he lost the office and rights of such senator; that these dual functions are incompatible.

We think it clear, from the language of the constitution of the State of Delaware, that these dual functions are expressly made compatible and competent by the terms of that instrument. We do not think incompatibility, in legal terms or effect, such as to oust a man from one office and to confer upon him another, is to be derived from general considerations resting in nubibus; but that such incompatibility must be plainly inferred from the text of the constitution or statutes of the State or Government to be affected thereby.

Besides this, nothing is more familiar to us in American legislation than the enactment of statutes in contravention of the common law. Statutes in aid of the common law are quite frequent, but we think that statutes in contravention thereof are more numerous.

It was formerly held at common law that one could not be a witness in any case where he had a pecuniary interest. The common law held that there was a sharp and natural incompatibility, founded upon grounds of the highest public policy, between the two positions of a witness in a cause and an interested party therein. In direct contradiction to this principle, and in complete neutralization of its effect, statutes now provide that the parties in suits, and all others, notwithstanding their interest therein, may testify as witnesses. So that the question is not what may be incompatible at common law, but what is the statute in any given case. The statute takes the place of the common law and abrogates it.

The constitution of the State of Delaware is a statute of the highest character, enacted by the people themselves.

It was entirely competent for the makers of that instrument, and for the people in its adoption, to abrogate any common law incompatibility, if such existed, and to make it competent that the speaker of the senate should, notwithstanding any natural or common-law incompatibility, take upon himself for the time "the exercise of the office of governor," still retaining his office of senator and speaker. In any conceivable case the common law must yield to the statute—much more must it give way to a constitutional enactment.

The constitution of Delaware does not provide that the speaker of the senate, on the death of the governor, shall either be or become governor, but only that such speaker "shall exercise the office of governor." It does not provide that he shall in such an event cease to be speaker, or cease to be senator, or that a vacancy exists in either position; and we do not think that we can amend the constitution of a State by the process of an argument in a contested seat here.

Not only is no vacancy created in such instance by the devolution of "the exercise of the office of governor" upon the speaker of the senate, but the constitution of the State expressly provides that "each house, whose speaker shall exercise the office of governor, may choose a speaker pro tempore"—that is, a temporary speaker to preside in the room of the permanent speaker when he may be absent, thus plainly implying that there is no vacancy in the office of speaker, and that there is no vacancy in the office of senator or representative (as no one could be speaker except a member of one of the houses) by this devolution of the exercise of the office of governor.

In section 14 of the constitution, where it is provided that the speaker of the house "shall exercise the office of governor" if there be no speaker of the senate, the distinction between the speaker of either house exercising the office of governor, and the governor as such, is very clearly implied in the phrase, "until a governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified." And in the same section, afterwards, the person elected governor is distinguished from the temporary occupant exercising the office of governor by the recurrence three times of the phrase, "the person who exercises the office of governor." And when the contingency arises of a vacancy in the office of governor, and there be no other person who can exercise the office of governor within the provisions of the constitution, the general assembly shall proceed to elect "a person to exercise the office of governor until a governor elected by the people shall be qualified."

This person so chosen is not called governor, but a "person to exercise the office of governor."

And when, in the case of a contested election, some one is to be designated to perform gubernatorial duties, it is provided "that the speaker of the senate or the speaker of the house who may then be in the exercise of executive authority" shall continue therein until a determination of the contest. It is manifestly expressed that the person exercising the executive authority is not the governor, but that he is, and remains, and must continue to be, speaker of the senate, or speaker of the house, notwithstanding the fact that the "exercise of the office of governor" may for the time being devolve upon him.

If this interpretation of the constitution of the State were at all doubtful, it is abundantly sustained by practical, contemporaneous, and continuous construction in the actual administration of the government of Delaware. Three persons, upon each of whom at different times devolved, under this clause, the exercise of the office of governor (John Sykes, Jacob Stout, and Caleb Rodney), speakers of the senate, who temporarily exercised the executive authority as such speakers, after they had exercised the office of governor ad interim, returned to the senate and served out the terms for which they had been elected as senators in the senate. No suggestion was made that they had vacated their office as senators or had become governors of the State of Delaware by reason of the temporary exercise of executive duties imposed upon them by section 14, article 3, of the constitution.

As to the provisions of section 2, article 12, of the constitution, and section 5 of article 3, we think there is no real conflict between them and the other provisions cited as to the succession of the executive authority.

One of the main provisions in the constitution of Delaware, declared and provided for by three fundamental clauses in the instrument, is that in certain contingencies the speaker of the senate "shall exercise the office of governor" for the time being therein designated. To say that a provision that no senator shall be governor, or that no governor shall be senator at the same time is not in any conflict with the provisions for the temporary exercise of the executive authority by the speakers of either house.

Section 12 of article 2 and section 5 of article 3 evidently relate to the regular elective term of the offices therein named, and provide that such official terms of these positions shall not be held by the same person at the same time. They do not at all relate to casual vacancies in the executive office or to the constitutional means of supplying them. As these two sections contain no allusion to temporary vacancies, so they are not and can not be in conflict with the provisions of the instrument elsewhere appearing intended to provide for such contingencies.

Besides, we understand it to be well-settled law that the different clauses of a written instrument, even those of an ordinary contract, must be always construed so as to be consistent with each other. With such a grave public State paper as the constitution of Delaware the rule is yet more imperative. We submit, therefore, that a proposed construction of this constitution which makes a direct and unavoidable conflict and contradiction between the clauses and sections of the same must be false and unfounded.

It is not to be presumed, and indeed it is in our view preposterous, that the people of that State should have placed in their organic law contradictory provisions on any subject.

WHO ARE LAWFUL JUDGES OF QUALIFICATIONS AND INCOMPATIBILITY

The senate of the State of Delaware is made by law the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members. In the case presented by Mr. Du Pont against the legality of the vote of Mr. Speaker Watson as a member of the joint convention, no question is made as to the election and return of Mr. Watson as a senator. The whole case rests upon the question of his qualifications. And even upon the subject of qualification it is not denied that at the time he took his seat in the senate he was fully and legally qualified to act and vote therein. But it is earnestly insisted that after he had taken his seat he did and performed certain acts and duties which deprived him of his legal qualifications, and had rendered him unqualified, disqualified, and incompetent to vote or act as a member of the senate or of the joint convention.

This position of the claimant, Mr. Du Pont, raises the most serious question in this case, which is, as to who can lawfully decide and determine as to whether or not the acts of Mr. Speaker Watson referred to destroyed or suspended his qualifications as a senator, and by consequence as a member of the joint convention.

We think that the senate of the State of Delaware, whereof he was a member, is the sole tribunal which could either hear or determine lawfully these objections to the qualifications of Senator Watson.

It is charged that he was absent from the senate from the 9th day of April, 1895, until the day of the joint convention. If he were absent in discharge of any duties, executive or official, by the law of Delaware incompatible with the office of senator, or if his absence was contumacious and perverse, this might have constituted a cause for the judgment of the State senate for his ouster from the senate, his suspension as a senator, or the vacation of his seat. If, whether present or absent, during his term he had committed any act in violation of the laws and constitution of his State, or of the United States, this might have constituted a cause for the judgment of the State senate against him for his suspension or for his expulsion, the vacation of his seat and office, and for the issuing of a writ of election for the choice of his successor as senator from the county of Kent.

Causes for judgment of suspension, ouster, vacation, or expulsion against a sitting member or senator are not, however, well-founded judgments. They have legally none of the force or effect of judgments or adjudications. There is no judgment or adjudication shown in the record or journal of the senate of Delaware on any of these objections to the qualifications of Mr. Watson as a member of that body.

If these charges or objections to his qualifications had been presented and heard in the State senate and judgment of suspension, ouster, and vacation had been rendered against him, the case of Mr. Du Pont might have been fully made out. This Senate and court of the United States would have been bound thereby. If such a hearing had terminated in his favor, the same result would have followed. The judgment of the State senate is a finality.

As there was no hearing or judgment in respect to such charges in the State senate, the seat and office of Senator Watson remains undisturbed and unaffected thereby.

Because the State senate did not pass upon these charges or objections to the qualifications of their fellow-member, we in this body are not by law in any way authorized to take jurisdiction. We have no authority to originate, hear, or determine any objections to the qualifications of those who acted and voted as members of the senate of the State, or to revise or review their action or nonaction in the premises.

These considerations rest upon the great doctrine of the due distribution of powers and of the distinctive provinces of independent powers, to which the claimant in this case has so strongly appealed, and which we now justly invoke as showing the error of his position.

The constitution of Delaware, like that of the other States and of the United States, declares that "each house shall judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members."

Each House of Congress is a court in such cases for the judgment of its own members, but neither is a court or can be in any form a tribunal to judge of the qualifications of any member of the State legislature.

It would be just as reasonable and lawful that the State senate of Delaware should adjudge and decide a contested seat in this body from that State as that we should decide here a contested seat in the senate there.

Especially is this the law when it is sought by a kind of ex post facto sentence to unseat by a judgment of the United States Senate a member of the State senate of Delaware after he has acted and voted there.

The Senate of the United States has often considered and decided the question as to which of two bodies claiming to be the legislature of a State is a lawful legislature entitled to hold a joint convention for the election of a United States Senator. The members of this body, sitting as a court, as we are now sitting, has frequently decided as to two contesting branches of a legislature which was the lawful senate or house of the general assembly, but the Senate has always declined to take jurisdiction or to adjudicate the title of any individual member of the State legislature who acted and voted as such in the joint convention.

In Sykes *vs.* Spencer (page 521 of Taft's Senate Election Cases) the following is the opinion of the majority:

> In the opinion of your committee it is not competent for the Senate to inquire as to the right of individual members to sit in a legislature which is conceded to have a quorum in both houses of legally elected members. But, undoubtedly, the Senate must always inquire whether the body which pretended to elect the Senator was the legislature of the State or not, because a Senator can only be elected by the legislature of a State.

And the minority opinion in the same case, upon the same point, is as follows:

> Each house of the general assembly of Alabama is the exclusive judge of the election returns and qualifications of its members, and any inquiry into such question by the Senate of the United States would be as unwarranted by precedent as it would prove dangerous in practice.
>
> In a contest like the one now under consideration between two persons elected to the Senate by different bodies, each claiming to be the legislature of the State, the Senate may look into the constitution and laws of the State to ascertain which of the two bodies, if either, has been organized in conformity with their provisions, but it can not rightfully inquire into the election returns and qualifications of the members of either body.
>
> If the Senate could enter upon such inquiry, where would be the limitation upon its prerogatives? Could it not as legitimately inquire into the manner in which any election officer had performed the duties of his office, and even into the qualification of the electors who had voted for members of the State legislature?
>
> The undersigned would not restrict the Senate in its constitutional right to judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members, but would regret its assumption of powers belonging exclusively to the two Houses of the State legislature. (Sykes *vs.* Spencer, page 528.)

The case of Sykes against Spencer was heard and determined in 1873 and the principle thus decided has been constantly adhered to since that time. In that case no action or adjudication had taken place upon the contested cases of individual members subsequent to their admission, and the decision of the minority and majority upon this point rests upon the action and recognition of persons voting in the joint convention as members of either the senate or house, and consequently of the legislature.

In the case of David Turpie, decided in May, 1888, the same point is decided where there had been an adjudication by the Indiana State senate unseating one of its members and seating a contestant. This Senate decided that it would not revise such adjudication—that it would not inquire into the motives or purposes of the adjudication.

> The committee are of the opinion that the facts offered, if proved, will not warrant the Senate in declaring the sitting member not entitled to his seat. There can be no doubt that the body in question was the constitutional senate of Indiana.
>
> The journals of both houses of the legislature of the State have been submitted to us. It appears that the body was recognized as the senate by the governor and by the house of representatives. Statutes to which its constitutional assent was necessary were enacted and have become part of the law of the State.
>
> We also think that the judgment of the senate of Indiana as to the title of Messrs. Branahan and McDonald, the two members in question, to their seats is binding upon the Senate of the United States. This body is made by the Constitution the judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its members. The senate of Indiana is likewise the judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its own members. We must determine all questions arising out of the proceedings of the electors. But who sustain the characters of electors is to be determined by the legislative body of the State.
>
> We can not inquire into the motives which control its judgment. In rendering that judgment, whether it shall give a hearing to parties, permit debate, examine witnesses, act upon evidence or without evidence, are matters within its own discretion. If that discretion were exercised in the manner charged by the remonstrance, a majority think that a public crime was committed, for which the offenders are responsible to the people of Indiana. But we can not try the question. (Case of David Turpie, page 625.)

It is thus made very plain that the common law of the United States Senate is well settled. When the title of an individual member of the legislature who has once been seated has been determined by a subsequent adjudication of the house to which he belongs, such judgment will not be here disturbed or inquired into. And if there has been no such subsequent adjudication by the State senate or house, the title of the senator or representative rests upon the record of his original credentials and qualifications as a member, and will not here be questioned.

When a person claiming to be a member of the legislative body presents his credentials of election, and the record shows that he was thereupon admitted to a seat and sworn in as a member of the same, his title to the seat is absolute, unquestioned, and so continues until the house of which he is a member has adjudicated that he is not entitled to his seat, or that some other person is entitled thereto. Such is the decision of the Senate in the following case:

> The majority of persons having a right to seats in the house of representatives have a right to organize that house and to transact all its lawful business, including the enactment of laws and the election of Senators. Persons who have the certificates of election have such right to seats. Every act of the assembly in which they take part, and to which their consent is necessary, has as absolute validity as if their title had been affirmed by an adjudication of the house itself. Their title is not, as is sometimes carelessly said, a prima facie title. It is an absolute title, continuing until the house itself has adjudicated that some other person be admitted to their place. This adjudication is only operative for the future, and has no retroactive effect whatever. When the house makes the inquiry on the merits, it may treat the credentials as prima facie evidence upon that question. But until the house tries the case the credential is conclusive to all the world. (Case of Clark and Maginnis *vs.* Sanders and Power, page 637.)

These decisions and judgment of the Senate are founded upon the principle that the States, by constitutional ordinances, have made each house of the State legislature the judges of the elections and qualifications of their own members; it is ultra vires of our powers to revise, review, consider, or pass upon any questions of this character.

If the senate of Delaware had made any adjudication upon the objections alleged against the qualifications of Mr. Speaker Watson, we would have been bound by such adjudication, whether adverse or favorable to his title. If they made none, this does not give the United States Senate any authority to adjudge the case. The jurisdiction of the two houses of the State legislatures, by their own authority, is original and exclusive.

These constitutional enactments have such effect as not only to make the members of each house the judges in each case, but also to forbid that the members of any other tribunal shall be judges therein.

The evidence in this case shows that William T. Watson, on the first Tuesday in January, 1893, held credentials signed and certified by the sheriff of the county of Kent, in the State of Delaware, and by the inspectors of the elections in said county, showing that he had been duly elected senator from said county at the general election held in November, 1892, in said county, for the term of four years—that is, until November, 1896.

The record of the journal of the senate of the State of Delaware shows that on the first Tuesday of January, 1893, aforesaid, the day fixed by law for the meeting of the general assembly, William T. Watson, aforesaid, appeared and presented this certificate of election as the credentials of his seat and title as a senator.

The journal shows that these credentials were read and spread at large upon the record of that day, and that thereupon he, the said Watson, was sworn and admitted as a senator. Mr. Watson yet holds these credentials; the record thereof and the proceedings thereupon are yet remaining, and these credentials so remaining of record are, as is said in the case of Clark and Maginnis *vs.*

Sanders and Power, an absolute title, and they continue to be a full, complete, and absolute title until the senate of Delaware has for some cause pronounced and adjudged them to be no longer valid.

As the senate of the State of Delaware were lawfully, in the first instance, the exclusive judges of the validity of these credentials, so they continue to be the exclusive judges of their invalidity, if from any cause whatever disqualifications have occurred which might vitiate or destroy their legality. Any adjudication by the Senate of the United States upon such a subject is beyond our province. Such action upon our part would be an intrusion, an interference, an unwarrantable usurpation of power vested in another body, ruinous to the autonomy of the States, and disastrous to the character of this body, whose members purport not to be chosen by their own action, but by that of the legislatures of the States.

There is not and has not been up to this day any adjudication by the senate of the State of Delaware adverse to the title of Mr. Watson as a member of that body. A careful search and inspection of the record and journal of the State senate shows no such adjudication. It could only be shown by the record.

The journal does show, as above recited, that he was admitted, sworn, and seated upon his aforesaid credentials. It shows that he was afterwards chosen speaker of the senate; that he continued to act as senator and as speaker whenever he was present, up to and including the last day of the session, when both houses adjourned sine die; that during the entire session, whenever he was present, he voted and acted as a senator in the joint convention of the two houses, and acted as presiding officer of such convention.

If the senate of the State of Delaware were to-day convened, and had adjudged in this case in hearing before them that Mr. Watson's seat was, for any or all of the causes alleged in the claim of Mr. Du Pont, vacant, and that he was no longer a senator, such a judgment at this time could not affect in any manner his action or vote in the senate or joint convention while he acted as a senator.

No one would contend for a moment that such a judgment is retroactive. The acts of the senator de facto are as valid as if de jure. How much less could any adjudication in this body at this time legally invalidate his former vote, seat, or title as a senator.

We therefore conclude in this case—

First. That if there be any questions as to the lawful qualifications of William T. Watson to act and vote as a senator and, by consequence, as a member of the joint convention, this is not the place, the time, or the tribunal to either hear or determine such questions.

Second. The senate of the State of Delaware had paramount and exclusive jurisdiction to adjudge such questions, and whether they exercised such jurisdiction or not, the Senate of the United States has no jurisdiction in the premises.

Third. That Mr. Watson, having acted and voted as a senator and as a member of the joint convention at the time when the vote was taken under which Mr. Du Pont claims his election to a seat in this body, he is to be counted as a member of the legislature of Delaware in joint convention assembled; that the whole number of members voting, being the whole number of members of both houses, was 30; that Mr. Du Pont did not receive a majority of this whole number; that we can not make his vote of 15 a majority of such whole number by subtracting therefrom the vote of one whose right and title to vote is not shown by the record to have been adjudged against by the body of which he acted as a member.

DAVID TURPIE.
JAMES L. PUGH.
GEO. GRAY.
JNO. M. PALMER.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2148) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2149) to increase the pension of James M. Rifenberick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2150) granting a pension to George W. Emery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2151) for the relief of James Parker, formerly a lieutenant-commander in the Navy of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2152) granting a pension to Reuben P. Stephens, late of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 2153) to abolish days of grace on promissory notes, drafts, etc., in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 2154) for the relief of Mrs. Sabina O'Callaghan, administratrix of the estate of Denis O'Callaghan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 2155) for the relief of the Selma and Meridian Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2156) granting a pension to Richard Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2157) granting a pension to Laura C. Vandergriff; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2158) granting a pension to Abraham Rhodes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 2159) granting a pension to John M. Hill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2160) granting a pension to Irvin Dickison; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2161) to place Maj. Robert P. Barry on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE. During the last Congress pretty serious charges were made against the Steamboat-Inspection Service by one of the New York daily papers. Those charges led me to make an investigation, a limited one, to be sure. I found that there were a great many laws obsolete, that there were other statutes which ought to be obsolete, and that there was a necessity for additional legislation. I found that the only justification for the causes of complaint arose, in my judgment, from the fact that the inspectors of hulls and boilers were made political officers; that they were appointed because they voted in one direction and were removed because they voted in another, which of course is utterly absurd in a service which has control of and care for the protection of human life at sea.

I called the attention of the Supervising Inspector-General, General Dumont, to these various matters which I had investigated, and I asked him to spend ample time and prepare a bill which would cover all of these points and whatever else he from his own experience could discover which needed reform. The bill which I hold in my hand is the result of his investigation and was prepared by him. I submit it to the Senate with the request that it be read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2162) to amend certain sections of Title LII of the Revised Statutes, relating to steam vessels, and to codify therein all existing amendments to the same enacted by Congress since the close of the Forty-fourth Congress was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2163) to increase the pension of Jason Booth; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2164) for the relief of Ellen A. Dunn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2165) for the relief of James A. Johnston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. T. Strother, of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Joseph T. Bemis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2168) to expedite the delivery of imported parcels and packages not exceeding $500 in value; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHITE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 77) authorizing persons in the Navy and Marine Corps, when serving at sea, to make allotments of their pay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 78) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to distribute the medals and diplomas awarded by the World's Columbian Commission to the exhibitors entitled thereto; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Select Committee on International Expositions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 79) directing the Secretary of War to furnish an estimate for deepening the channel from Hampton Roads to the navy-yard at Norfolk, Va.,

and also for improving the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 80) requiring the lapsed bids of the latest Treasury loan to be assigned to the highest bidder at the time of the approval of this resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CULLOM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in regard to the bill in behalf of Charles P. Allison be withdrawn from the files of the Senate under the rules of the Senate.

SACRAMENTO RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas Congress on August 18, 1894, passed an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; and

Whereas it was provided that no preliminary examination or survey for new works other than those designated in said act should be made; and

Whereas it was further provided that after the regular report on any examination or survey shall be submitted no supplemental report or estimate for the same fiscal year shall be made without a resolution of Congress; and

Whereas since the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, made his report on the Sacramento River, California, great floods have occurred, washing away the banks of that stream, creating crevasses through which the water finds its way to the lowlands, leaving the bed of a portion of the river nearly dry, and thereby rendering navigation difficult and at low water almost impossible: Therefore

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inquire as to the present condition of said Sacramento River and the effect upon navigation of the recent floods therein, and to estimate the cost of such improvements as may be necessary to restore said river to its natural channel and to report generally as to the nature and extent of such work as in his opinion the circumstances of the case require.

A. H. LAZARE.

Mr. GORDON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the Republic of Haiti has paid the amount heretofore found to be due by said Republic to A. H. Lazare, a citizen of the United States, said amount found due by the Hon. William Strong, justice of the United States Supreme Court, in his award as arbitrator.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. GEAR. I wish to make a brief statement in regard to a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] and considered a day or two ago at a time when I was unavoidably absent. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, of which I am chairman. In the course of his remarks the Senator from Nebraska spoke as follows:

I have noticed by the press from time to time that the Committee on Pacific Railroads has had certain witnesses before them for examination, and I hope the committee will not construe my words as any reflection upon them when I say that I have failed to observe that any of the patrons of the road have been brought before the committee and examined. Their examinations thus far seem to have been confined to stockholders and bondholders of the road, and their agents and attorneys, who come here for the purpose of being heard.

I wish to say in regard to these hearings that a full general notice has been given to all parties in interest. The notice of the hearings, the information as to the hearings, was published in all the daily press from ocean to ocean. Every person, whether he may be a bondholder, a stockholder, or a patron of the road, has had full and ample notice of the hearings. I do not know of any other way to give the information desired. In all the committees in the other branch of Congress of which I had the honor to be a member, and which have covered investigations of great magnitude lasting for months, it is the only way in which notice has been given so that the parties in interest might come before the committee and state their case, and that is the way the information was given in this case.

I wish to add, in addition, that no one has been requested to come before the committee except two gentlemen who will be here in the course of time. Certain gentlemen in New York representing the revisory board on the proposed reorganization of the Union Pacific Railroad came of their own accord to present their scheme to Congress, which is being entertained and will be entertained by that committee. Gentlemen not connected with these roads in any capacity whatever, but connected with other roads, have come of their own accord before the committee.

I simply wished to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to this fact, so that he and the country may know that everybody had the proper notice.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, just one word. I think the chairman of the Committee on Pacific Railroads has not anticipated fully the meaning of what I said, and I want to repeat it now so that there may be no mistake as to my position. The Committee on Pacific Railroads, as I am informed, has sent out no invitation to any person to appear before the committee except to one or two persons who have already appeared.

Mr. GEAR. That is a mistake. The Senator certainly did not understand what I said. A general notice was given through the Associated Press dispatches to everybody who wished to come before the committee. The committee sent out no specific notice to anybody.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think we ought to be confined to the Associated Press. At the city of Omaha is the third if not the second largest packing house and stock yards in the world. At the city of Omaha, which is a city of almost 200,000 people, is a board of trade, a board of commerce, and an association of wholesale merchants. At the city of Denver and other cities there are like institutions. These patrons of these roads ought not to be invited to come here simply by a dispatch sent out by the Associated Press or the United Press, but they ought to have a special invitation from the committee either to send a representative here to lay their claims before the committee or to furnish to the committee, in document form, valuable information which is in their possession.

Mr. GEAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. GEAR. What information has the Senator that the gentlemen in Omaha to whom he refers, with whom I am personally well acquainted, want to come before the committee, may I ask?

Mr. ALLEN. I infer that the patrons of the road——

Mr. GEAR. The Senator simply infers that he knows.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I do not infer that I know. I know.

Mr. GEAR. The committee know——

Mr. ALLEN. I know; I live in that country; I am acquainted with those people, and I know their wishes as expressed to me hundreds and thousands of times.

Mr. GEAR. I live in that country myself, and know something of those people.

Mr. ALLEN. I know the Senator lives in the West.

Mr. GEAR. But I have no specific knowledge that any man on the line of these roads from Council Bluffs to Sacramento wishes to come before the committee. Certainly the Senator does not expect the committee to send notices broadcast to individuals all over that country, not knowing whether or not they may be patrons of the road.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not expect anything of the kind.

Mr. GEAR. They have had the ordinary notice, and the only notice they can have.

Mr. ALLEN. The honorable Senator does not live in that country. I know where he lives. I have known him for thirty-five years. He lives about half a mile west of the Mississippi River, hardly that far, at the city of Burlington, when he is at home. He lives 300 miles east of the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific Railroad, which terminates about two miles and a half on the east side of the Missouri River.

I know very well that there are associations of merchants and shippers of all kinds in the State of Nebraska who are vitally affected by the action to be taken by Congress upon the Pacific railroads, to whom the honorable Senator admits that no special invitation has been extended to appear here by representative or to furnish the information that may be in their possession relative to their wishes or relative to the condition of these roads.

Mr. GEAR. Will the honorable Senator state how notice is to be given to those people?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I could state how, and very easily. The State Farmers' Alliance of the State of Nebraska has much valuable information in its possession, gathered through reliable sources, as to the effect of the present rates upon the farmers of the State of Nebraska and other States of the West. Why not address a letter to the presidents of the State farmers' alliances of the State of Nebraska and to the farmers' alliances in the States of Kansas and Colorado and ask them to lay before the committee the information they have?

Mr. GEAR. I will state that the committee does not know of any such organization. The committee have no official knowledge of any such organization.

Mr. ALLEN. That will not do, Mr. President. The committee have actual knowledge.

Mr. GEAR. That is a mistake.

Mr. ALLEN. It will not do to stand here and say that the committee has no official knowledge. It is a matter of common history that we have a national alliance, that met in this city two weeks ago.

Mr. GEAR. Let me say that it is a matter of common history that those people have had notice through the daily press, and they read the papers, as I know.

Mr. ALLEN. They may have had notice through the daily press, but even the notice that has gone out through the daily press has not specifically invited these men and the farmers' organizations to appear.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the Senator from Nebraska state that the hearings are now going on and are open to everybody? The Senator from Nebraska need not be afraid that any class of men who have any special scheme or any special information which they desire to present will fail to come here at their own expense and be present at the hearings before the committee. We have had propositions presented to the committee to take these bonds and transfer them to a new line of road, which the Government was to build from North Platte to Sioux City, Iowa.

If the Senator is of the opinion that anybody is being shut out from the committee hearings, if he will notify the representatives of the Farmers' Alliance and others who have propositions to present to the committee, there will be plenty of time for them to come and be heard. I know the Senator desires that we shall get through with the hearings in time to make some kind of a report. He does not expect us to summon these people at Government expense, and so far as the members of the Farmers' Alliance are concerned they would probably repudiate the idea of coming to Washington at Government expense. They have the opportunity of coming and of being heard, but the Senate is not called upon to give specific notice to the whole United States, individually and personally, that there is a hearing going on.

Mr. GEAR. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that the committee is not empowered by this body to summon persons here at Government expense, but they have the right to come.

One more word in regard to these hearings. I had the honor of being on a committee in the other House that had hearings for five months, and there were probably 1,500 people, more or less, perhaps more, who came before that committee just in the way these notices have been given—by invitation in the press—and they came from California, from Maine, and from every State in the Union to make their case before that committee. I have many friends in the State of the Senator, I am glad to say, and I probably know almost as many people in that State as the Senator himself. They have the same opportunity to come as have others, and they will be heard with the same cordial attention we give to everybody else.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, that will not do, nor will the suggestion of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], although it is couched in words which carry with them a slight insinuation against the Farmers' Alliance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not the slightest. I have the highest regard for that organization.

Mr. ALLEN. There has been no invitation extended to any person except to the representatives of the railroad interests. I do not say that for the purpose of reflecting on the committee at all, but I say the only persons at least who have come here have been Mr. Collis P. Huntington, Mr. Pierce, and other gentlemen who are representing the financial interests of these railroad companies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no. The Senator never intentionally makes a misstatement.

Mr. ALLEN. Who are they?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Coombs, who represents Sioux City and that great section of the Northwest, wants the Government to go into the building of another road from North Platte——

Mr. ALLEN. Where does Mr. Coombs live?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know. He lives all over, I suppose.

Mr. ALLEN. He lives in Boston, I think.

Mr. GEAR. I will tell the Senator where Mr. Coombs lives, and who his clients are. Mr. Coombs lives, as I understand, in the city of Brooklyn, and his clients are 400 bankers, scattered in every State of this Union, who have invested money in northwest Iowa and northeast Nebraska, who have been interested in building a railroad to Sioux City, which has cost $2,500,000. He comes here now of his own accord, in response to the public notice given, and makes certain propositions before the committee. He is not interested in the Pacific railroads to the extent of a penny, or in their transportation, or anything of the kind.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know where Mr. Coombs lives, but I know what his business is. He is a broker.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLEN. I know that Mr. Coombs represents a great many bankers in the northeastern portion of this country, and represents the financial interests of a great many people in these railroads.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. Coombs is one of the best-known lawyers in all New England, and one of the best.

Mr. ALLEN. He is a lawyer and a broker. I do not care whether he is a lawyer or not. That does not make him any better or any worse, for that matter. I know he represents here 140 different banks.

Mr. FRYE. Over 200.

Mr. ALLEN. In what is called the Credit Commutations Company.

Mr. FRYE. Certainly, but as a lawyer.

Mr. ALLEN. His being a lawyer is a side issue with him. He is a financial lawyer. I do not think he has ever tried many causes.

Mr. HOAR. I know Mr. Coombs very well.

Mr. ALLEN. That man is the representative of the financial interests of these railroads, and his representation is strictly in line with the representation of Mr. Huntington, Mr. Pierce, and other gentlemen of that kind.

Mr. GEAR. One word. I beg to state that the Senator is laboring under a gross mistake. Mr. Coombs is not the representative of any of the Pacific railroads. Mr. Coombs is before the Pacific Railroads Committee asking this Congress to appropriate money out of the sinking fund, which has accrued to the Government under law from those roads, to construct a road 250 miles in a southwest direction from Sioux City to connect with the main line of the Union Pacific.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator diverts me; but let me call his attention to the fact that either Mr. Coombs represents some financial interest in this road or he represents the patrons of the road; and I will say that he does not represent a solitary patron of the road. What he wants is that this Government——

Mr. BRICE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him at that point to correct him?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. BRICE. Mr. Coombs does not represent any Pacific railroad, or any investment heretofore made in any Pacific railroad, or any financial institution, or any persons who are concerned in any way with the stocks, bonds, securities, or other properties in the Union Pacific or any other Pacific railroad.

Mr. ALLEN. What does he represent?

Mr. BRICE. He represents an investment in the northeastern corner of the Senator's State and represents an investment in the northwestern corner of the State of Iowa; he represents a bridge which has just been built from Iowa to Nebraska, and he asks that the sinking fund belonging to the Government be contributed to his people for the development of the State of the Senator from Nebraska and the State of Iowa.

Mr. GEAR. May I add to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that Mr. Coombs asks this in the name of the Farmers' Alliance of the State which the Senator from Nebraska represents on this floor?

Mr. ALLEN. I am inclined to believe the honorable Senator from Iowa on almost all occasions, and I do not want to express any doubt of his veracity upon this occasion, but I should need corroborative proof of the fact that Mr. Coombs represents the Farmers' Alliance.

Mr. GEAR. I will refer the Senator to the printed testimony taken before the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. It may be Mr. Coombs's testimony.

Mr. FRYE. Allow me to say that Mr. Coombs appears practically in opposition to any of the proposed settlements with the Pacific railroad companies, and argues against any of the proposed settlements with those companies, unless the law by which the settlement is provided for shall compel the Union Pacific and Central Pacific railroad companies to permit a union southwest at the one hundredth meridian, and at the same time that they shall be compelled practically to assist him in completing the southwest connection between Sioux City and the one hundredth parallel, which they do not want to do.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I want to answer the interrogatories which have been put to me by Senators as briefly as possible, for I have no desire to consume the time of the Senate in needless discussion.

The Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Pacific Railroads [Mr. GEAR], supplemented by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], says that what Mr. Coombs wants—and they are not sufficiently satisfactory nor lucid in their explanation of whether he is a patron of the road or not—is that a sufficient amount of the earnings of these roads shall be set apart for the construction of a line of railway from Sioux City, Iowa, to near the city of Kearney, in the State of Nebraska, to intersect with the main line of the Union Pacific at that point; but these Senators are singularly silent upon the question why that road was not constructed in 1867 under the act of 1864, which provided for its construction upon exactly that line.

No, Mr. President, that involves the integrity of the Republican party or the Republican Administration in carrying into execution that law. The law expressly provided, and provides to-day, for the construction of that line from Sioux City, Iowa, to the hundredth meridian, a little west of the present city of Kearney, in

the State of Nebraska. No attempt was ever made to construct it there, and the people of that country for twenty-odd years have been deprived of the benefit to be derived from the construction of that road in consequence of its diversion. The honorable chairman of the Pacific Railroads Committee knows quite well that that road was diverted from the original line of its construction to be a road from Sioux City to Missouri Valley, in the State of Iowa, on the east side of the Missouri River. Now, Mr. Coombs comes here, so we are told, as a representative of the Farmers' Alliance. He is not the representative of any alliance in this Union, national, State, or local.

Mr. GEAR. I beg pardon of the Senator for interrupting him. I did not mean to state that he came here as the representative of the Farmers' Alliance, but that he came here practically in the interest of the people of the farming community, who are generally supposed to be members of the order to which the Senator refers.

Mr. ALLEN. He did not come here in the interest of the people of that order or the people of the State of Nebraska or of any other State. He came here in the interest of the Credit Commutations Company, which holds securities to the amount of several hundred thousand dollars, if not several million dollars, arising out of the construction of the new bridge at Sioux City. He wants, in the interest of that bridge company, a road constructed from Sioux City to Kearney, so that it may be tributary to the bridge represented by his clients. He is not concerned in the sod houses of Nebraska.

Mr. GEAR. Does not the Senator think that if the road were built in that direction, through that great rich portion of the State he represents so well, it would be a great thing for the Farmers' Alliance?

Mr. ALLEN. Of course I do.

Mr. GEAR. Of which I suppose the Senator is a member?

Mr. ALLEN. No, I am not a member of it.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator ought to be.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish I was.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator is not eligible.

Mr. ALLEN. I should consider myself as highly honored by being a member of that organization as I consider myself honored now.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator is not eligible by virtue of his profession, as I understand.

Mr. ALLEN. I think I am eligible. I am a farmer, and all I have is in farms.

I think that part of the State of Nebraska would be benefited, and I should be glad to see the construction of a road there, although we have one road running to the southwest now.

But that is no answer to the point I make that the Republican Administration, which had it in its power to compel the construction of that road twenty-odd years ago, failed to do so, and now, when it advances the interests of the clients of Mr. Coombs in the Sioux City Bridge Company, then Mr. Coombs comes here as the ostensible representative of the horny-fisted granger to have that road constructed. That is all there is to that.

What I wanted to say, and what I wanted to emphasize, was this: The Committee on Pacific Railroads will have failed to perform its duty, in my judgment—and that may count for nothing, and it probably does—if it fails to send to the organized farmers of the States whose interests are affected by the operations of these roads an invitation to come here by representative, or to send the valuable information they have gathered up in the form of documents, and place these things before the committee for its information.

What is to be said of the great stockyards that furnish so much transportation to these companies? What is to be said of the wholesale merchants of Iowa and the wholesale merchants of the States of Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas, whose interests are so vitally affected by the solution of this problem? The committee will have failed to discharge its duty, in my judgment, unless it directs its clerk to send to the officers of these associations and companies a specific request to appear before the committee or to furnish it with the valuable information they possess.

I want to say, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, the Pacific Railroads Committee can not hide its action, actual or proposed, behind the assumption that it has sent out by the Associated and United Press agencies a general invitation to everybody to appear and worship at their shrine.

Mr. HOAR. I want to make one statement, if I may. I understand the universal custom in the Senate, since I have been a member of it, is that when there is pending before any committee of the body a matter in which the constituents of any Senator are interested, if he thinks they ought to be summoned, he informs them that the hearing is going on, and he finds out the time when they can be heard, and makes the arrangements for them to appear. I have done that in a great many matters in which people in my own State were interested, and should have felt myself derelict in duty if I had not done so.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator has stated the precedents exactly. The committee gave this notice, understanding and expecting that Senators who had friends who wished to appear before the committee would notify them. Notice that the hearing has been going on has been generally disseminated all over the country, and the persons referred to by the Senator from Nebraska have not appeared.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5819) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and asking a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives and agree to the conference asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENTS IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER February 12, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire and report whether, during the year 1895, or any portion thereof, any of the employees of the Post-Office Department, while receiving pay from appropriations for that Department, did, with the knowledge, connivance, or direction of any clerk or clerks, or chief or chiefs of division, levy and collect assessments of money on and from other employees of the Department to be used, and which was used, for political purposes in States where election campaigns were in progress at that time; whether any person or persons were employed and borne on the Department rolls as employees and regularly paid as such who, while pretending to be discharging the duties of inspectors in the free-delivery service, were in fact actively engaged in aiding and assisting one of the political parties in said election campaign; whether, during such time, in room 3 of the Interior Department building, or in any other room or rooms in said building or in any other building, any employee of the Department was directing or managing the employment of persons for the purposes aforesaid and receiving and disbursing the moneys so assessed and collected, and whether such manager or director kept an account of such moneys in his own name in any bank of the city of Washington or elsewhere.

The committee will inquire and report, further, whether during the period covered by this resolution any person or persons were employed by any clerk or chief of division in the Post-Office Department and kept on the Department pay rolls and paid out of the Department funds, which payment was not authorized by law or by any lawful rule or regulation of the Department, and for which services no appropriation had been made by Congress

Mr. PEFFER. Let that resolution go over, Mr. President, retaining its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BOND SALES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER February 12, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators, not more than two of whom shall belong to one political party, shall be appointed by the Vice-President, whose duty it shall be—

First. To investigate and report generally all material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

Second. To investigate and report specially what amount of available funds, classified, was in the United States Treasury and on deposit in other places, subject to the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the bonds were sold or offered for sale; whether there was or was not coin enough on hand to meet all coin obligations of the Government due at the time said bonds were sold or when they were offered for sale; what obligations were due at that time and the amount of each, stated separately; what was the reason for any unusual withdrawal of coin from the Treasury shortly before bonds were sold or offered for sale, if such unusual withdrawals were in fact made, and by what persons or classes of persons and for what purpose or on what account such withdrawals were made; who purchased the bonds, in what amounts, and where, whether in the United States or in foreign countries, and in what proportions, and from what persons or classes of persons the gold was procured with which to pay for the bonds; what the bonds sold for, and what was the market price of our Government bonds at the time, and what effect the bond sales had on the credit and business of the people of the United States.

Third. To investigate and report as to the manner of disposing of said bonds, by what authority, and what contracts, advertisements, or proposals were made by the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto; what agreements or contracts, and whether oral or in writing, and whether publicly or privately and secretly, were entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury and any other person or persons with respect to the sale and purchase of the bonds; whether any officer of the Government, or any person or persons for such officer and on his behalf and in his personal interest, and with his knowledge or consent, entered into any contract, agreement, or arrangement,

directly or indirectly, with any person or persons, partnership, corporation, company, or syndicate, for the purpose of affecting the price offered or to be offered for said bonds or any of them, with the intent and expectation to receive commission or personal reward by reason of such contract, agreement, or arrangement; whether such contract or agreement had any and what effect on the prices offered for the bonds, what the effect was, and who, if any person, profited by it and to what extent.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask the privilege of making two or three slight amendments to the resolution. On page 1, line 1, after the word "Senators," strike out the words "not more than two of whom shall belong to one political party"; on page 2, line 19, after the word "privately," strike out the words "and secretly"; in line 20, after the word "any," strike out the word "other" and insert "syndicate or," and in line 21, after the word "bonds," insert "and the profits made or to be made by such syndicate, or other person or persons connected with such syndicate, directly or indirectly."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has the right to modify his resolution, and it will be modified in the manner suggested by him.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is my recollection that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, whom I do not now see in the Senate, made a motion to refer this resolution to the Committee on Finance. Am I correct in that?

Mr. PEFFER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that that motion was made out of order. The resolution under the rule would go over to the next day, and I asked to have that done. The motion of the Senator from Vermont to refer was made in connection with that. I had the right to have the resolution go over, and under the rule it would go over anyway; and that was the order made by the Chair, as appears by the RECORD.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. The motion to refer, I think, was properly made when the resolution was offered, and that motion would go over with the resolution.

Mr. PEFFER. The order was made that the resolution should go over.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] is not present, but I feel bound to say that the Committee on Finance, this matter being pending here, has thought it best, on reflection, that the resolution should be sent to that committee. No doubt a subcommittee of that committee can be very readily formed and can make the investigation. It would cost much less in that way than to raise a special committee. It seems to me that a special committee for such a purpose as this should not be made. It appeared to the members of the Committee on Finance that the raising of a special committee might involve a very large amount of expense. I for one, whenever any intimation or insinuation or charge of impropriety is made against an officer of the Government, think it but right that it should be specially examined by the Senate or by the House of Representatives, properly by the House of Representatives, because that is the only body that can follow the examination by anything in the nature of punishment. But it seems to me that questions of this kind ought to be referred to the regular committees, and that we should not start a special committee to probably involve the Senate and the country in a very large expense. It is far better to present this matter to the committee having charge of the subject-matter, and which is familiar with all the details, for examination. Therefore, I think the resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Finance. If the Senate is of the opinion that the state of public opinion would justify it on the facts which have been published, the Senate might proceed to examine So and so upon the various points named in the resolution, but it ought to be done by a regularly organized committee of the body.

Mr. PEFFER. Does the Senator make the motion to refer?

Mr. SHERMAN. It was made yesterday, as I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that no motion has yet been made to refer the resolution, the resolution not having been before the Senate. An objection was interposed when it was originally submitted, so that the motion to refer could not be entertained.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I submit a motion to refer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER. On that I desire to be heard.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, as I can not get the floor in any other way. I should like to know how I lost the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. VEST. I should like to know how I lost the floor. I have been standing here attempting to proceed with my remarks, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has spoken, and now the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] wants to speak, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] will speak. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator had the floor I was unconscious of it, and I will make my apology to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to give the Senator from Missouri the information he seeks. He certainly does not desire to take the Senator from the floor.

Mr. VEST. I am not making any specific charge, but I rise in the interest of the dignity and orderly conduct of the business of this body.

Now, I understand the Chair to rule, in reply to my inquiry—I suppose it is intended as a reply—that there has been no motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a motion to that effect now pending, made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. VEST. I asked the question whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, had not made that motion at the preceding session.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion was made, but the resolution was not then before the Senate. An objection was interposed to its consideration when introduced, and it went over under the rule.

Mr. VEST. But the motion had been made before the resolution went over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion could not be entertained. The motion to refer is now in order, and it has been made by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VEST. It is not a matter of any moment when the motion was made; but I understood—and that was the understanding of the Committee on Finance, and it was certainly the statement of the chairman—that he first made the motion to refer, and then some other Senator raised an objection to consideration, and the whole thing went over. Without being an expert in parliamentary law, it seems to me that motion also went over, but, as a matter of course, it is leather and prunella now, as the motion is pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has answered the inquiry as he understands the rules of the Senate to be.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I, of course, am opposed to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Finance, or I would have asked that reference in the beginning. While there is some force from the standpoint of the Senator from Ohio in his suggestion that the reference be made, yet the reason, and the only reason, that the Senator gives, is one that seems to me trivial, in view of the circumstances and in view of what I think to be really the Senator's meaning.

Of course there will be some expense attending the investigation. I think there will hardly be as much as eight or ten million dollars, however. That much has been expended already—wrongfully, unquestionably wrongfully—and has gone to a syndicate of speculators in New York City and their confrères on the other side of the water.

But without going into that branch of the subject now, I will say that this bond-selling business, as it has been conducted during the period covered by the resolution now before the Senate, is the most remarkable proceeding to be found in the nation's history, and the people do not understand it.

When, in the earlier years of the Republic, it became necessary to borrow money, Congress, in every case and in all cases, provided the appropriate legislation. Every Treasury note and every bond issued was authorized by laws passed for that special and particular purpose.

When the great war of the rebellion came, as we provided men we provided means for paying them. We authorized the issuing of paper money; we authorized the sale of bonds for coin; we authorized different methods of funding the rapidly increasing debt, and we empowered the Secretary to do things never before done by that officer; but in all that was done to carry on that terrible struggle neither the President nor any member of his Cabinet ever felt at liberty to borrow a dollar or incur an obligation without specific and unquestioned authority granted for the particular act. Much as the Treasury Department was criticised in respect to its contraction policy immediately following the war, the people understood that the law authorized the destructive process.

The promise to redeem the greenbacks with coin was authorized by the act of March 18, 1869. The refunding of the public debt was authorized and provided for by the law approved July 14, 1870. Resumption of specie payments was provided for in the act of January 14, 1875.

No act of Congress authorizing the sale of bonds of the United States for any purpose has been passed since 1870, except a supplementary act passed in 1871, adding $300,000,000 to the amount authorized in the law of 1870, and excepting the act of 1875—the resumption act.

Every law relating to the finances enacted during the war and during a period of ten years afterwards was intended to be applied and was applied to a particular purpose specified in the law. Bonds that were sold under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1870, whether for refunding purposes under that act or for resumption purposes under the act of January 14, 1875, were sold at

par for coin. There was some criticism of the method of disposing of the bonds, but the letter of the law was followed in every case, with only one probable exception, and the bonds that were exchanged or sold netted par, minus about one-half of 1 per cent commission to the agents who negotiated the sales.

Twenty-four years after the passage of the refunding act, and nineteen years after the approval of the resumption act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the face of a refusal by Congress to authorize the sale, proceeded to dispose of $50,000,000 worth of ten-year 5 per cent bonds. Senators denounced the proceeding as unlawful. The people were surprised. All of us were mortified. Within a year afterwards a hundred million more were sold without any additional authority of Congress, and it was commonly believed, and never denied, that the proceeds of the sale of the last $62,315,400 netted from eight to ten million dollars profit to the purchasing syndicate, and the Government lost all that the syndicate gained.

The contract was entered into privately. The country knew nothing of its existence except through guesses and sensational charges of the newspapers until after it had been signed and executed by the Secretary of the Treasury of the first part and a few stock brokers of the city of New York of the second part. The country was startled. The people were amazed and bewildered. The Administration was dishonored. The nation was scandalized.

That some person or persons profited by this transaction through dishonorable conduct everybody believes and nobody denies. That the amount of such profits is inconceivably large is as humiliating as it is scandalous and true.

And now we have just passed through another sale, this time $100,000,000 of thirty-year 4 per cent bonds, and this, too, when Congress had refused to grant authority for the sale. It is alleged, and quite generally believed, that this sale would have been made to the same syndicate that purchased the last preceding lot had it not been that popular indignation was manifest in every quarter of the land. As it was conducted, the press and curious persons have asked why certain bidders came in at the last moment, and why one of them altered his bid within a few minutes of the hour for opening the bids.

There has been so much ground for scandal about these bond transactions, there has been so much money taken from the people who will be charged with the debt and taken by persons not entitled to it or to any part of it, and this, too, when the officers' authority is questioned, that the people want to know all about it. And it is to procure that information for them that I have offered this resolution.

A committee of honest, clear-headed men who will search for the truth would have the confidence of the masses to begin with. They would have too much self-respect to stop short of complete work and too much patriotism to needlessly bring reproach on any of their countrymen.

That somebody has gone wrong we all believe; who it is we all wish to know.

Now, it will be observed that in the resolution there are six different lines of thought, suggestive of so many lines of investigation. The first one is that the bond sales in themselves have been unlawful, that the whole proceeding was without authority of law. I do not care to argue the matter, but simply to call attention to it.

Immediately after the first proposition to sell bonds was made in 1894 I called attention to the matter in the Senate and denounced the proceeding as unlawful. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] a few days afterwards followed in the same vein. A resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of this body, and a similar resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives asking the committees to inquire into the legality of the bond selling. No report was ever made in either case, so far as I know.

The people quite generally have been led to believe from what they have heard from speakers upon platforms and writers in the public press that the authority was at least questionable, the ground was debatable. That is one important matter to be investigated in this proceeding.

In the next place, it is alleged and believed by thousands and millions of people in this country, by members of the House of Representatives and by members of this body, that there was coin enough in the Treasury at the time the sales were made to pay off every obligation of the Government due at that time—every one. I tried somewhat extendedly a few weeks ago to prove that matter conclusively before the Senate and the country, citing the figures of the Treasury Department as they have been published from year to year.

In connection with that it was understood by the people at the incipiency of the present Administration that the Secretary of the Treasury understood it to be his duty to pay out coin when coin was asked for; when the contract required coin that coin was to be paid, and that the word "coin" included silver coin as well as gold coin. When his attention was called to the matter by some one interested, he answered that there was no trouble with the Treasury, that there was an abundance of coin to pay all demands upon it, and when upon further suggestion by his inquirer that there was an abundance of silver there he said the Treasury could pay out silver if need be.

That dispatch was published in the evening papers all over the country. The next morning another tune was sung, if I may use that term without irreverence or impropriety. By authority of the President of the United States an Associated Press dispatch stated to the people of the country that so long as this Administration is in power gold will be paid on all the coin obligations of the Government.

That was when the trouble began. The same thousands and millions of people who believe that there was an abundance of coin in the Treasury at the time, as I say, also believe that if the Secretary had paid silver as well as gold all this trouble would have been avoided, and $362,410,350, if I have the figures exactly right, would have been saved in the matter of indebtedness, and all of these scandalous proceedings would have been avoided. That is the second point.

Another point is the unusual method of disposing of the bonds. Heretofore, so far as I know, and so far as the discussion in the Senate a few weeks ago showed, with one single exception possibly, every bond sale before these was made in pursuance of law by public advertisement of thirty days. In these cases the idea of a popular loan has been almost wholly set aside. Certainly as to the second and the third and the beginning of the fourth bond sale no thought of the Department was directed toward a popular loan. I remember very well when the Secretary of the Treasury in the beginning of the first sale spoke about a popular loan, and I felt as if there were anything in the world that would condone for the proceeding it would be that the people at large everywhere should be asked and invited to take part in the bond proceeding.

After the sale was made and it was discovered that the popular-loan feature had been entirely discarded I offered a resolution in the Senate asking for a statement of the names of the persons who purchased the bonds, where they lived, what their business was, the amount of their purchases, etc.; and I remember how promptly the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] rose from his seat and denounced my resolution as impertinent, as if I were trying to pry into the private business of patriotic citizens who were ready with their money to come to the rescue of an imperiled Government. I said to the Senator then that I was amazed and astounded that an American Senator should feel called upon to utter the proposition that the people of the Republic had no right to know who were trafficking in their credit.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me?

Mr. PEFFER. In a moment. Why, I ask, have not the people been invited—Peter and Paul and Silas and Barnabas and all the rest of us with $25, $50, or $100—to take part in this great gold feast? What does the Senator from New York wish to ask?

Mr. HILL. It will hardly be necessary to pass the pending resolution for the purpose of soliciting that information, as the Senate has already passed a resolution——

Mr. PEFFER. I understand to what the Senator from New York refers.

Mr. HILL. As the Senate has already passed a resolution asking the Secretary of the Treasury for the names and residences of the bidders and the amounts of the bids I assume that the only reason why the resolution has not been answered sooner is because several of the bidders have not fulfilled their bids, and undoubtedly the Secretary is waiting to see who will take the bonds, so that he can return a complete list to the Senate.

Mr. PEFFER. I understand very well the object of the Senator's resolution. I thought it was a very proper one, and if I had not been intensely engaged at the time I should have gone over to the other side of the Chamber and congratulated him most heartily, as I did two years ago when he came to my rescue and followed in my lead. Two years before I had asked for similar information, and although my venerable friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], opposed it bitterly, we got the information asked for. I am glad to see that the Senator from New York is following so worthy a lead.

The point I make in respect to this matter, I will say to the Senator from New York, is that the methods of effecting sales have been unusual and I simply referred to the part I had taken for the purpose of emphasizing the unusual character of the proceedings.

Then it is charged that there has been favoritism to bidders. I have not made that charge, and here in this presence I wish to disclaim the intention of either charging or asserting that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury has had any personal connection, of his own knowledge, with any unclean action in these proceedings. I have frequently said and do now repeat that I believe both of those men as men are thoroughly honest, thoroughly patriotic, and sincere. I do believe, in connection with that, however, that both of them, great as they are, have been overreached by bold, bad, shrewd speculators who prey upon

the substance of the people. I think that in that one kernel lies all the meat that there will be found in this great transaction, whatever may come out of this resolution; that all that there has been wrong, all that there has been crooked, if I may use that expression, has come through the speculating habits that our people have grown into within the last few years.

Whether there was favoritism or not, it is evident to the country and to the world and to all of us that one class of men in all these cases have succeeded in getting the lion's share of all of the bonds and in taking the lion's share of all the profits, and especially in the third transaction, when the profits must have been between eight and ten million dollars to the syndicate that engineered the scheme through.

Then it is charged finally that there have been fraud and collusion. I have said all that I care to say upon that point.

Now, Mr. President, about the committee. The country's suspicions have been aroused by these proceedings. If with gloved hands and oily tongues we merely refer the resolution to the Finance Committee, where it may or may not meet the death of most of my resolutions which have been referred to that committee, the people of the country will wonder why the Senators have not been willing to face so plain, so clear, so appropriate and judicious a resolution as this one. Doubtless the Vice-President in the selection of the members of the committee will be pleased to have suggestions from both sides and the center of the Chamber. Let us have two faithful, honest, clear-headed men from the other side, two of the same character from this side, and one from the center. The people of the country would have confidence in those five men, the three great political parties being represented by them. The people would understand that the investigation is to be thorough, it is to be honest, it is to be clean; that the members of the committee would not have the smell of fraud upon their garments; that when they would conclude they would present to the people of the country and the world a clean, unvarnished, completed investigation, exposing all that there is to be exposed, going into the dark places that other persons concerned have gone into.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I have insisted upon a special committee. Whether the expense will be very large or whether it will be very small is a matter about which I care nothing. The money will be well expended. If the Senate sees proper to authorize the committee, the Senate will see fit properly to clothe it with authority and the necessary machinery for carrying out its work.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am opposed to the reference of the resolution. I think the matter should have been investigated long ago. United States 4 per cent thirty-year bonds have always had a high market value. About seven years ago, when they had eighteen years to run, they sold at about 25 per cent premium. Some of them when they had nineteen years to run sold, I believe, as high as 27 per cent premium.

That premium has gradually decreased as the time passed on. Last year, a year ago this month, if I recollect aright, they were at about 11 or 12 per cent premium. When the bonds that fall due in 1907, having eleven years to run, had twelve years to run they sold at about 12 per cent premium. Now they have eleven years to run, and they are at about 10 per cent premium. So a bond with thirty years to run, reasoning from all the sales of such bonds that have taken place in the public markets, ought to sell for over 25 per cent premium; yes, 30 per cent premium, if they sold as bonds have averaged from the time of their issue until now. A bond with eleven years to run carries 10 per cent premium, or 11 per cent even, and certainly the others, having nineteen years longer to run, on any fair calculation should sell as high as 25 per cent premium.

The usual mode of soliciting loans by all Governments is to fix a price and then allow the public to bid. In the great Paris loan the price, I think, was fixed at par, and then the public were allowed to bid, and they were allowed to have a pro rata share of the amount they bid for. Nobody who put in a bona fide bid was cut out altogether. Now, when our Administration desired to borrow money and sell the fours, if it had fixed a price corresponding with the average price for which such bonds have sold ever since they were issued, or at least for which they have sold for the last fifteen years, and the public at large had been invited to bid in the usual way, and they had been notified that each bona fide subscriber should have his pro rata, does anybody doubt that the fours that were sold a year ago for 4½ per cent premium would have sold readily for 20 per cent premium? These same bonds which were then put out in less than three months, or within a few months after the transaction, rose to $1.23 or $1.24. The Administration had those facts before them and they wanted to make a new loan. If they had fixed the price so that it would have produced exactly 3 per cent, which would have been between 19 and 20, about 19½ for the last sale of bonds, does anybody doubt they would have all been taken?

I say the radical change from the usual method has excited suspicion and demands an investigation, and the fact is that these transactions have taken place and have been freely criticised by the public while the committees of both Houses have been silent. The Finance Committee of the Senate that had this matter in charge has been silent. The last session passed away and more than two months of this session have already passed without any attention being called to these unusual transactions. It seems to me the country would be better satisfied with a special committee. As the Senator from Kansas has inaugurated it, I do not think it ought to be taken out of his hands. I think he ought to be on that committee and chairman of the committee, as he has had the courage and the patriotism to call for an investigation of the method of disposing of United States bonds, which the public know is a sacrifice of the interests of the people. Everybody knows that if these bonds had been sold in the usual way they would have brought very much more money upon any basis whatever. The idea that thirty-year bonds or twenty-nine-year bonds should sell substantially at the same price as bonds that run only eleven years is absurd.

I have simply called attention to the great loss which the people have suffered by reason of these unusual methods, and an investigation will bring to the attention of the country the ill-advised methods employed. Though no one be implicated in any improper transaction, it will pave the way for better methods in the future and a return to the usual methods by which loans are placed.

I shall not occupy the attention of the Senate to repeat what I have often said, that the issue and sale of these bonds had no authority of law. There was no necessity for it and the sale is cruel at this time, because it is impounding the money of the country and making times worse. I shall not allude to these matters; I am only alluding to the great loss the country has suffered by what has been done and the absolute necessity for an investigation.

Mr. LODGE. In view of the circumstances in regard to these bonds, as well as the charges that have been made and the fact that they involve the credit of the United States, it has seemed to me for a long time that an investigation into them ought to be made. I have no desire to delay the resolution or make any argument about it. I think the Finance Committee is the proper committee to make this inquiry and investigation. I move to amend the resolution by striking out the first three lines and inserting the words "the Committee on Finance be directed to."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "Resolved," strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 of the resolution and insert:

That the Committee on Finance be directed.

Mr. GRAY. What are the words proposed to be stricken out? I ask the Secretary to read them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the words proposed to be stricken out.

The Secretary read as follows:

That a committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the Vice-President, whose duty it shall be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am opposed, from the present information which I have, to any investigation whatever on this subject, either by the Finance Committee or a special committee. I do not agree to the proposition that every time there is an idle rumor in the newspapers about some irregularity alleged, some statement that the precise right conduct has not been had, or some vague and indefinite charge that the right course has not been pursued, without any proof, without any substantial charge by some responsible people, the Senate should make haste to empower either a special committee or even a standing committee of this body to investigate the subject.

It has been said here that the people are curious and they ought to know all about it. Are we to institute investigations to satisfy the curiosity of people? Is that worthy of this great body of Senators? Have we not had enough experience in proceedings heretofore had, when, at the instance of the same persons who are now asking for this investigation in part, the Senate has proceeded to dignify matters that were to a large extent unimportant by a serious investigation?

Mr. President, has any Senator risen in his place and charged any distinct irregularity here? Has not the very Senator who proposed this extraordinary resolution disclaimed any intention to reflect either upon the President of the United States——

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HILL. Or upon the Secretary.

Mr. STEWART. I make the charge now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. I charge that it was irregular.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will charge anything.

Mr. STEWART. No; but let me make the charge.

Mr. HILL. I will not yield to the Senator to make the charge

now. It comes rather late. I was speaking of the author of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. STEWART. Do not be afraid. There will be charges enough.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kansas, who is the author of this resolution, or the joint author, specified nothing in particular that needed investigation. Look at this resolution. Among the things that the committee is to investigate is by what authority these bonds have been issued. Do grave Senators want to appoint a committee to investigate this legal question? Has not this question been discussed over and over again in the Senate? Has not this very statute authority been pointed out over and over again? Was not the Secretary of the Treasury heard at the last session before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Judiciary Committee, I do not recall which, when he was asked his authority? He gave it. It has been stated in the messages of the President; it has been reiterated in the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury; and yet as a part and parcel of this resolution we are now at this day to inquire why and by what authority these bonds are issued.

Of course Senators may rise in their place and say that they doubt the authority. Are not the courts open? Can not Senators go to the courts? Can not there be found some remedy to restrain a public official who insists upon the issuing of bonds contrary to law? What are your courts for? Are we to follow every idle assertion here when Senators rise in their place and doubt the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue these bonds?

Mr. STEWART. Is it an idle assertion to state——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. The Senator will allow me——

Mr. HILL. I am so anxious to complete my remarks before 2 o'clock——

Mr. STEWART. Ah, yes.

Mr. HILL. That I can not yield to any interruption on the part of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HILL. I repeat, my anxiety to complete my remarks is so great that I can not even yield to my friend from South Carolina, and I would yield to him as quickly as to any Senator in the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. It was in regard to 2 o'clock that I wanted to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I can not be interrupted in regard to 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York declines to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. The other day we saw the Senator from New York trip up a resolution to which he was opposed by similar sharp practice. That is the point I want to ask him about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York declines to be interrupted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will be the judge of how long I shall speak and when I shall speak.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, of course.

Mr. HILL. And I will not govern my conduct by the Senator from South Carolina. I was proceeding to say, when I was interrupted by the impulsive Senator from Nevada, that it is proposed by the resolution to investigate by what authority these bonds were issued. Then look at the ridiculousness of the resolution. When we come to analyze it, the Senate is to determine by a committee from what persons or classes of persons the gold was procured with which to buy bonds. You are to take these bidders and bring them before the committee and ask them, "Where did you get your gold?" Possibly he may have to borrow. It is an inquiry into private affairs as to where a man gets his gold with which he invests in the bonds of the Government. Is there no limit to which an inquiry into private affairs shall go?

I said a moment ago that I thought the Senate had had some experience in this matter. What is the use of the Senate dignifying these criticisms by proceeding to have a formal committee to pass upon them? Senators rose in their places in 1894 and called attention to some newspaper articles to the effect that the Senate was indulging in the purchase of sugar stock. You would think from reading the newspapers of the country that all we were doing here that summer was speculating in sugar stock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock——

Mr. HILL. I am very sorry to stop right here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from New York will be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. HILL. I think the resolution had better go to the Calendar to-day.

Mr. HOAR. I thought the Senator said he was sorry to stop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution relative to the war in Cuba.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that that may be informally laid aside so that we may continue the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PEFFER. With the consent of the Senator from Colorado, if I am not out of order, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which has just been laid before the Senate may be temporarily laid aside in order that we may proceed with the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the business which has been laid before the Senate be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution that was pending at the time the unfinished business was laid before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my conception of my duty requires me to object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York objects.

Mr. PEFFER. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CALL. Oh, Mr. President, I hope not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which was under consideration before 2 o'clock.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator from Kansas will not make that motion now. Let us get through with the pending appropriation bill. I trust the Senator will not insist upon the motion.

Mr. PEFFER. I would be willing to withdraw the motion if the bond resolution may be permitted to go over and retain its place, so that we can take it up again to-morrow morning during the morning hour.

Mr. HILL. The bond resolution is not different from any other business in the class of resolutions. It must take its place with the others in the usual course.

Mr. PEFFER. I should like to have it disposed of, and if Senators are ready to vote upon it it can be disposed of in five minutes.

Mr. HILL. It has gone to the Calendar. That settles it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that we can probably take it up just as well to-morrow, and perhaps better, if he will withdraw his motion.

Mr. PEFFER. I will withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas withdraws his motion.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, the pending question being on the amendment submitted by Mr. VILAS.

Mr. CHANDLER. The exciting business of the morning being over, it is now in order for all Senators to retire from this body while an appropriation bill is being considered, except some half dozen members of the Appropriation Committee, one of whom, being in the chair, will, of course, remain there, and the ex-Secretaries of War, and the other military gentlemen, constituting some fifteen or twenty Senators, who took part yesterday in the consideration of this bill, included among whom I recognize the eloquent and energetic Senator from Wisconsin, who proposed the pending amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Have we your permission to retire?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Missouri has certainly my permission to retire.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am very much obliged.

Mr. CHANDLER. I always like to see the Senator here when he is in his present genial frame of mind, but knowing that his omniverous intellect takes charge of and investigates every subject which, by any possibility, can come before the Senate, if he wishes to pursue his inquiries in the silence of his room, I certainly do not now object to his doing so.

Mr. President, I am inclined to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. It occurred to me yesterday that perhaps it would have been better if it had been reported formally from a committee and embodied in a separate bill. In connection with such a bill I should certainly move to include the enlargement of the number of cadets at the Naval Academy. I do not

believe, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin and to the ex-Secretaries of War now upon the floor participating in this discussion, that to include——

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CHANDLER. I always yield.

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to have the pending amendment read. Let us know what we are talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for the purpose of having the amendment read?

Mr. CHANDLER. No one knows better than the Senator from West Virginia what the amendment is; but of course I will yield if he desires to have it read again at this point in my remarks.

Mr. ELKINS. Let the pending amendment be read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill insert as an additional section:

SEC. —. That the corps of cadets shall consist of 2 from each State at large, 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, and 10 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and those appointed at large may be residents of any State in the Union. The two appointed at large from each State shall be actual residents of the State from which they are appointed, and the others shall be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts or the District of Columbia, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed. Any graduates unassigned to existing vacancies within one year after their graduation shall be honorably discharged from the service: *Provided*, That of the two cadets from each State at large one shall be appointed on the recommendation of each Senator from such State, and that the one from each Congressional district and Territory shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Representative in Congress from such district or the Delegate from such Territory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am anxious to educe from the Senator from Wisconsin and the other Senators favoring this amendment exactly what is proposed. Is it proposed that we shall adopt as a deliberate policy the education at West Point of a large number of cadets—a considerable number of cadets, in any event—to be sent out at the end of their courses into civil life, there to remain until called for in some exigency in which the country may find itself? Is that the object? If it be the object, then I was, when interrupted by the Senator from West Virginia, about to say it will be necessary to adopt the same course with reference to the cadets at the Naval Academy; so that if 90 additional cadets are to be educated at West Point, 90 additional cadets will be educated at the NavalAcademy. There is quite as much necessity, the country will say, to have distributed throughout the body of the people, ready for any emergency that may arise, young men educated at the Naval Academy as it will be to thus distribute in civil life young men educated at the Military Academy. The two propositions will have to go along pari passu—the one set to go into civil life from the Naval Academy if the other set goes into civil life from the Military Academy.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire, while he is on that point, to the alleged fact—he would know whether it is a fact perhaps better than anyone else in the Senate—that at least one-half of the class that graduates each year at Annapolis is turned out into civil life, there being no places for them in the Navy, so that the condition of things in regard to the Academy at West Point, if this amendment should pass, would be about what it is now at the Naval Academy, if I am correct in that supposition.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from Delaware is mistaken. He has given close attention to this subject, but he has not taken note of the fact that of late, since the new system has been adopted, the graduating classes at the Naval Academy have been reduced, and there has not been sent into civil life any considerable number of Naval Academy cadets at the close of the six years' course. When the law was first adopted assimilating the Naval Academy to the Military Academy at West Point that was the result as to one or two classes, but it was not the result as to the last class, and it will not be the result, I predict, as to future classes unless there is an addition to the number of cadets.

Mr. President, I repeat for the benefit of the Senator from Wisconsin, that if educating young men to send them into civil life is the object and purpose, or if it is a contemplated result of his amendment, the two results must necessarily follow, for it is quite as important to educate surplus graduates at the Naval Academy as it is to educate surplus graduates at the Military Academy.

As I understand the present situation (and inasmuch as the Senator from Delaware called my attention to this point, I ask his attention now), it is that practically all the graduates of West Point enter the military service. There are not discharged into civil life, and have not been for years, any considerable number of West Point cadets. There is the supernumerary list. Temporary commissions are issued, and in the course of a year or two the supernumerary graduates, if there are any, are absorbed into the body of the Army. The Senator from Wisconsin will correct me if I am mistaken in that respect.

Mr. VILAS. I suppose the Senator from New Hampshire refers to the law which now requires the appointment of graduates as additional second lieutenants whether there be a vacancy or not.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do refer to that provision, and I believe (I want the Senator to correct me if I am wrong about it) that sooner or later they are required for the purposes of the Army, and that practically no surplus graduates are against their will discharged into civil life under the operation of the present law.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if there is not a measure reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, or pending there, to allow the competitive examination of a certain number of graduates of other institutions than the Naval Academy for commissions in the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is now pending, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, a proposition to allow a limited number of graduates in steam engineering from the private institutions of the country to come into the Navy.

Mr. HOAR. So that they shall have an opportunity to compete for commissions?

Mr. CHANDLER. Such a proposition is pending in the Committee on Naval Affairs, but it has not yet been adopted. Let me state the practical situation in reference to the Navy. In 1882 a great increase in the number of naval officers was taking place. There being about 1,500 naval officers and about 2,500 officers of the Army, the casualties requiring new appointments in the Army were more than the casualties in the Navy requiring new appointments, and therefore the Navy was filling up, was increasing the number of its officers faster than the Army was increasing the number of its officers. So there was adopted in 1882, thirteen years ago, the provision that no more appointments should be made from the graduates of the Naval Academy than would be sufficient to fill vacancies in the Navy. More than that, there was provision made for the gradual reduction of both the line and staff corps of the Navy, and that all cadets not required to fill the vacancies while the reduction was going on and afterwards should be discharged into civil life.

The result was that for two or three years there was a surplus of naval cadets, and they were given their honorable graduation certificates, with one year's pay for each, and were discharged into civil life. After a little time, the reductions required by the act of 1882 having taken place, it came to be seen that the classes themselves in the Naval Academy were being gradually reduced during the six years' course. Of late years the net result of the whole proceeding has been that the graduating class at the end of a six years' course is just about sufficient to fill the vacancies in the Navy. The cadets come to know what the number of vacancies will be, the instructors know what the number of vacancies will be, and somehow or other, in accordance with the fitness of things, when a class graduates finally at the end of the six years, it finds waiting for it just enough places, either in the line or the Marine Corps or the Engineer Corps, to require all the graduates.

Mr. President, at the last graduation in June, 1895, there were only three final graduates who did not get commissions. They were graduates who had been prepared especially to enter the line of the Navy. There were surplus vacancies in the Engineer Corps; and there is to-day a bill pending before Congress, which will doubtless be passed, to allow these three surplus graduates of the Naval Academy destined for the line to enter into three vacancies in the Engineer Corps.

If I have made myself understood as to the present situation, it is that under the existing system all the graduates of the Military Academy get into the military service and all the graduates of the Naval Academy get into the naval service.

In addition to graduating a sufficient number of young men to fill the vacancies in the Army and to fill the vacancies in the Navy, I ask, if the supplemental amendment or proposition of the Senator from Wisconsin shall pass Congress whether it is the intention also to educate at the Military Academy and at the Naval Academy a considerable number of young men in each year and send them out into civil life in order that they may give the benefit of their education to the community when no war exists, and in order that they may be drawn from civil life in case a sudden increase of the Army and the Navy should make their services desirable? Is that the object? If it is, then I say that it should be thoroughly and distinctly understood. There should be a sufficient enlargement of the Academy so that when twenty or thirty surplus graduates are found they shall go into civil life in considerable numbers.

I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the misfortune which happens when only two or three graduates of either Academy shall go into civil life. There seems to be a stigma upon them. I know that at first when this plan was adopted in reference to the Naval Academy, twenty-five or thirty cadets went

out into civil life, and there was no such stigma implied, but to-day, when the case is that two or three cadets are threatened with the deprivation of commissions in the Navy which their comrades receive, they feel that they are degraded. Although they pass their examinations they are the lowest on the list, and they are sent out into civil life, not entitled to commissions in the Navy. Unless we increase the number of young men to be educated at the Military Academy, largely increase it, and unless we increase the number of young men to be educated at the Naval Academy, largely increase it, so that the policy shall be a fixed policy of sending at least twenty or twenty-five young men from each Academy out into civil life, the experiment had better not be undertaken.

If the effect, in other words, of the amendment that is proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, and which is now advocated by Senators upon this floor, is going to be to graduate ten or fifteen young men every year—that will be the number if the Senator from Wisconsin is right about it; and the Senator from Iowa will take notice that if you divide 90 by 4 it will be about 23 and not 90; the first class that comes in will remain four years, the Senator will see, and there will be no appointment during the four years; but in the process of time, through vacancies happening in one way and another, the times when these appointments shall be made will become so distributed that the net result (the Senator from Wisconsin will correct me if I am wrong) will be that there will come to be eventually a graduation every year of one-fourth of 90——

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. Under the amendment there will be 90 appointed this year, for example, and under the amendment there will be 90 appointed next year.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is wrong about that.

Mr. ALLISON. I want to be corrected.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is where the Senator makes his mistake. Ninety more may go there, but that is all until vacancies happen. If 90 go, one for each Senator, no other appointment can be made until there is a vacancy. The Senator will see that.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that.

Mr. CHANDLER. So if 90 go for four years, of course there will be 90 graduates for four years.

Mr. ALLISON. And no appointments in the meantime?

Mr. CHANDLER. And no appointments in the meantime. But I am explaining to the Senator that that will not be the result at the end of the first year. Three or four will drop out at the end of the second year, and then the new appointments will be made. The result will be that within two or three years this bunch of 90 will be broken up and the net result after half a dozen years will be that we shall have added to the graduates of the Academy less than 20 and probably not over 15 in each year.

Mr. PROCTOR. Twenty-five per cent from the 22.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Vermont is undoubtedly right.

Mr. ALLISON. I misapprehended yesterday. I supposed from the amendment that one would be appointed each year.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator was right in saying that if the 90 remained there would be 90 appointed this year, and they would stay four years, and then we should have 90 new officers.

Mr. ALLISON. Ninety new officers at the end of four years minus the number that had dropped out in the meantime; but they would come in later.

Mr. CHANDLER. They would come in if there were any considerable danger, I would say to the Senator, that this body would not be broken up of itself. It would be advisable to break it up by legislation by providing that there should be so many appointments this year, so many next, and so many next, but I am entirely certain that the corps of 90 first introduced into the Academy would break up of itself with sufficient rapidity.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, he has very lucidly and plainly explained the result, which is in correspondence with the present rule to require the appointments that might have been made, or perhaps might yet be under a contingency made, all in a single year; but there wants to be added, to understand the full effect of the breaking-up process which he has explained, that when any vacancy occurs by the failure of an appointee to pass an examination the new appointee usually goes in at the beginning of the succeeding year; he is not received in the course of the year, and that contributes still more to the distribution of the right of appointment.

Mr. CHANDLER. So I say, Mr. President, in aid of the Senator from Wisconsin, if this method is to be adopted, there is no great harm in making the appointments at the present time. The number of graduates at the Naval Academy each year, as Senators will see, would be even less, because there you divide 90 by 6, it being a six-year course, and that, if my arithmetic is right, would be 15 each year, if they all graduated, and in practice it would be found that it probably would not add over 10 graduating cadets to the present classes.

Mr. President, I recur to my original idea. I say, if this is to be done, it ought to be established as a policy that you are to send a considerable number of these cadets into civil life every year, and that it is not done as an indirect method of enlarging either the Army or the Navy. If we wish to enlarge the Army, and if we are to create additional cadets for the purpose of enlarging the Army, that is one thing, but we want to steer clear of enlarging the Army in order to take care of a certain number of cadets who, having been educated at the Military Academy, want to get into the Army like their fellow-graduates. I say it is necessary to steer clear of this danger. If it is not the intention of the Senator who proposes the amendment, and not the intention of Senators who advocate it, then the true policy ought to be declared; and after it is adopted, when there are half a dozen graduates of the Military Academy for whom there are no places, or when there are half a dozen graduates of the Naval Academy for whom there are no places, we ought not to be worried in Congress with propositions for special legislation setting out that these young men went into these Academies expecting to get into the military or naval service, but they find themselves, two or three or a half dozen of them, humiliated by the fact that there are no places for them in the Army or Navy, and Congress is appealed to to make new offices in both the military and the naval service in order to protect them.

I ask if it is the deliberate opinion of the Senator who advocates this policy that there should be sent out into private life a considerable number of these graduates every year? There are two opinions on that subject. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] yesterday certainly advised that such a course should be pursued. I think he advocated the education for civil life every year at the Military Academy of a body of these young men. On the other hand, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], who I now see in his seat, and who has had experience and is a close observer on this subject, mentioned, if I am not mistaken, one of the classes in the Naval Academy from which a considerable number of cadets were discharged into private life, and said he understood that the education of those young men at the Naval Academy did not fit them for civil pursuits, and that they were not successful in private life.

Mr. President, that may not be because the education at the Naval Academy was not calculated to fit them for civil life. It may be that the reason they did not succeed was because instead of going promptly into civil life, recognizing that as their fate, recognizing that as the policy of the Government, they continued to wait and wait and wait, with special bills, such as I have alluded to, pending in Congress to give them commissions in the Navy, until they had ruined three or four or a half dozen of the best years of their lives seeking to avoid a civil career and to get back into a position where they could enter upon a military career. That may be the explanation of the result which came to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey. I do not know whether that is a fact or not.

Having called attention to these obvious difficulties in the way of the proposition of the Senator from Wisconsin, having insisted that the same course ought to be pursued for the Naval Academy which is pursued for the Military Academy, and contending, as I do, that if this new departure is to be taken a large number of cadets should be introduced into the Military Academy and the Naval Academy, so that the surplus graduates may be considerable in number each year, it is right that I should state my own opinion on the subject.

I am inclined to think that it would be wise to do this. I am inclined to think that it is good policy to enlarge the number of cadets at both Academies, to use liberally for the education of the youth of this country the facilities which are afforded by those schools, and to send out into civil life at the close of each year, say twenty or twenty-five graduates of the Military Academy and twenty or twenty-five graduates of the Naval Academy, but I insist that this change must be made in pursuance of a deliberate policy which will send these young men out into civil life the moment they find they can not get commissions in the Army or the Navy, and will keep them away from the halls of Congress, so that they will not be here, after we have educated them, according to this policy, claiming, as they have done in so many instances, that because we educated them at these military institutions, paying them $500 a year to go there and be educated, therefore we are under an obligation to give them commissions in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, I was unfortunate in not being in the Chamber when the Senator from New Hampshire began his remarks, and I beg to inquire of him whether I misunderstand him or not in reference to the effect produced by an education at either of those Academies upon young men as to their fitness in after life for the ordinary vocations of life?

Mr. CHANDLER. I say to the Senator from Georgia now, as

I had the honor to say to him in conversation this morning or last evening, that there was a difference of opinion developed between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Jersey on that point, which is one of importance, and one that ought to be settled before we adopt this legislation. The Senator from Wisconsin was of the opinion that it was a good preparation for a civil career to educate young men at West Point. The Senator from New Jersey said that his attention had been called to instances where surplus graduates of the Naval Academy sent into private life had not succeeded in civil life, and that their education at the Naval Academy had been of no benefit to them. My own impression—to answer the Senator as I have already done—is that if this system is one which immediately sends these graduates into private life, so that they do not stay about Congress seeking to get into the Army and the Navy because we have educated them for the Army and the Navy, no harm will be done, and the education which they receive at those two great establishments will be an admirable preparation for the duties of civil life.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, as to the failures of the cadets from either of those academies in private life, I apprehend that, as a general proposition, they would have failed if educated at any other institution. There are failures of lawyers, physicians, educated specifically for those duties in life. Certainly there can be nothing in the curriculum or in the training at those institutions calculated to disqualify young men for any of the avenues of life. The branches they study at West Point are of the most solid character; their habits, by the regulations of the institution, are compelled to be orderly, systematic, and prompt. Every one of the requisitions necessary for success in any avenue of life is cultivated, stimulated, and required by the tuition at those institutions.

Besides, Mr. President, I apprehend, if the question were asked of any Senator upon this floor whether he could point to more failures than successes in other avenues of life by young men who had graduated at those institutions, the answer would be prompt that the successes largely prevailed, for there are more successes than failures of that class of men. That is certainly true as to my experience. I recall one instance just now of a man who rose to the very highest eminence as a lawyer in my own State after graduating at West Point and serving in the Army, who served as our minister abroad only a few years ago, and was for a long time president of the Bar Association of the United States. I might mention others. I only want to insist that, so far as the tuition and regulations and orderly requirements of those institutions are concerned, certainly no man who has examined them will doubt that they are calculated to fit men for any of the vocations of life rather than to destroy their prospect of success.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. The amendment is in the interest of those who are struggling for commissions in the Army. Anyone who will analyze the two propositions will appreciate the object of the amendment. With this proposed increase, unless there is some provision made for the deserving noncommissioned officer, who is now studying and working hard for a commission, he can not possibly succeed.

I think the amendment I propose to offer will meet with the favor of the Senator from Wisconsin, and in fact with that of all of the Senators who are interested in this change. I myself am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on general principles, but I should vote against it unless this provision is made by which the President shall have the power to appoint as an officer one who has passed an examination as a noncommissioned officer in the Army.

I have kept the run of the Army for a great many years, having been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in my past service in this body. I have taken a pride in the study, and it may be almost said that I have made a hobby of it, so that I know as much of it as anybody else.

There are probably 100 young men to-day, gentlemen of character and education, young fellows who can not get commissions and can not get appointments to West Point, who have enlisted for four years in the Army in order to finally secure commissions; but the vacancies arising do not supply places for one-fourth of the officers' sons who are anxious to follow the profession of their fathers. I know to-day a number of college graduates who have actually gone and taken a musket and are serving in the Army, so that they can be made corporals and sergeants, meantime pursuing their studies, so as to secure commissions directly from the Army. I should deprecate very much indeed any legislation that would say to these young men, whose pluck I admire, "You can not obtain what you wish, because we have barred the doors to you by providing that everybody must go through West Point to get a commission."

I ask to have the amendment read, and I trust the Senator from Wisconsin will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the pending amendment it is proposed to add:

And provided further, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint to vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant meritorious noncommissioned officers of the Army, when recommended according to the provisions of the act of June 18, 1878, although graduates of the Military Academy may remain in service unassigned.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment which has just been offered is in the line of what I have been thinking about while I have listened to this discussion. While our Government in many respects is the freest and best upon the face of the earth, yet if we look at our Army and our military system it is perhaps the most aristocratic and the most exclusive in the world. There is perhaps no country where in time of peace, or, indeed, in time of war, it is more difficult to rise from the ranks to that of a commissioned officer in the regular army than it is in the Army of the United States.

It was my lot to serve during the war of the late rebellion as a private and a noncommissioned officer. I marched and countermarched with my knapsack and musket. I rode in the cavalry and charged and countercharged, guarded the rear and rode in front as corporal and enlisted man, and my sympathy always extends to the men in the ranks.

I have time and again seen examples of the spirit which is manifested by some of the people from West Point. A short time ago an officer was restored to his place in the Army by a bill passed by Congress. He was shot in a camp near Chicago, and they had a court-martial to try the man who shot him. I remember what scant justice the military court administered in that case to a poor fellow who had come over from abroad during the war and had risen in the ranks to be an officer.

His widow came to me when I was the executive of Minnesota to attend the court-martial as a witness. I sent my private secretary over with her to attend the court. I had an inkling that they would hardly accord decent courtesy to her, and so instead of going myself with the lady I sent my private secretary. The treatment that the court-martial accorded her was the scantiest and poorest courtesy that ever a woman could have. They subpœnaed her as a witness and then kept her outside on the pretense that she could not hear the testimony and the proceedings of the trial of the man who had killed her own husband.

That man came over here, as I have said, during the days of the great rebellion. On his own merits and without any friends at court he got a position in the Regular Army. The West Pointers disliked him. They got him court-martialed in New Mexico and had him removed from the Army. He had a faithful wife. He came on here, and twice a bill was passed authorizing the President to restore him. The first time the bill was passed it was sent to the War Department, and the officers there, with the West Point spirit in their midst, advised the President not to sign it. The time being short, President Cleveland had no time to examine the bill, and so when it was first passed he refused to approve it. But he gave the friends of the officer to understand that if he had opportunity he would look into the matter and restore him to the ranks.

At the next session of Congress a similar bill was passed. It, too, was referred to the War Department, and from there it came with an adverse report. President Cleveland himself sat up one of the long summer nights to read the proceedings of the court-martial in New Mexico. After reading it he became convinced that injustice had been done, and he signed the bill and restored the man to the ranks. From that day I have always admired President Cleveland for the great interest he took even in an humble soldier who had been unfairly treated.

Mr. President, I have referred to this incident for the purpose of calling attention to a spirit that is in the Army, more or less. You read every day of desertions from the Army. You read how men get into the Army and how they run away; and you hear of court-martial proceedings every once in awhile. Why is this? It is because the military system has made an impassable gulf between the private and the commissioned officer, and what has aided in that direction is West Point. We have the line there preventing the enlisted man from obtaining high positions in the Army.

I should be in favor of increasing the force of cadets; I am in favor of increasing the number of officers in the Army; but, in heaven's name, let us take those men from the ranks. Let us give the American soldier, the private and the noncommissioned officer, an opportunity to rise in the ranks and become an officer. In that way we can get a better class of privates, as a better set of men will enlist. They know now that there is no hope for them, or, at least, very little; next to nothing. To be sure, a few men can get in, but they know that the chance of coming to the front in the Army is almost hopeless; and hence we get an inferior class of men.

Once throw the doors open so that the private soldier, the educated and intelligent soldier, can rise and become an officer in the

Army, and you will have a superior class of men, and instead of half of our Army on the frontier being devoted to court-martialing the other half you will have an army of the best enlisted men on the face of the globe.

During the war of the rebellion our Army, composed of volunteers, especially those who enlisted during the early years of the war before it became necessary to resort to big bounties and to the draft, contained a superior class of men. We all know how many of the men in the ranks were the equals in character and standing and ability of the men who commanded them. We know, too, how those men, with that spirit of patriotism which was so magnificent in the bosom of the American people, coming from the vocations of civil life not only wore the garb of the soldier, but did that which was more humiliating than anything else, yielded the most abject obedience to their superiors; yes, the superiors who at home were their inferiors. It is this spirit which was manifested in the ranks of the common soldiers during the late war that I should like to see given a show to come to the front. It is this element that I should like to see recognized; and for that reason if we could have an increase of 90 cadets once in four years from the ranks of the Army, I should support it with all my heart. But as the amendment is submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] I never can support it. It is making a bad matter worse.

Mr. HAWLEY. Has the Senator from Minnesota noticed the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]?

Mr. NELSON. I concur in the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment, so far as it goes. It is in the right spirit, but it does not go far enough.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator would not have all the officers selected from the Army?

Mr. NELSON. I should formulate the amendment so that the 90 cadets would in one way or another come from the ranks.

Mr. ALLEN obtained the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] a verbal amendment, which perhaps the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] will allow me to do, now that I am up.

Where the amendment says, "residents of any State in the Union," I suggest that he strike out "of any State" and insert "anywhere"; so that it will read, "residents anywhere in the Union." The President, as to his 10 cadets, certainly ought to have the right to take meritorious youths from the Territories or the District of Columbia as well as from a State.

Mr. VILAS. The language of the amendment as originally proposed was copied from the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HOAR. I understand, but there is an inadvertence in the respect I have mentioned.

Mr. VILAS. I observe the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, and if he will offer the amendment I shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. HOAR. I move to strike out the words "of any State" and insert "anywhere."

Mr. CULLOM. "In the United States."

Mr. HOAR. The amendment says "in the Union."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 6 of the amendment strike out the words "of any State" and insert "anywhere," so as to read:

They shall be appointed by the President, and those appointed at large may be residents anywhere in the Union.

Mr. VILAS. "Of any part of the Union."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. I rose to ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] if he would have any objection to an amendment to his amendment to include private soldiers as well as noncommissioned officers. I suggest the propriety of broadening the amendment, so that it shall include not only noncommissioned officers, but private soldiers.

Mr. SEWELL. I merely adopted what is the rule now. If a young fellow is capable of being made an officer, he will rise to the rank of a noncommissioned officer first. That demonstrates his first capability to be an officer. I do not think we ought to change that system.

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. BATE. In regard to the appointment of noncommissioned officers, I stated yesterday, and so believed, that promotion from the Army is confined to the appointment of noncommissioned officers, corporals, and sergeants, on the theory that the commander of a regiment or a company would recommend his best men for those positions, and thus they would gradually get up. I find that in the law it is not so confined. It seems to take in the enlisted men. Allow me to read it. It is to be found in General Orders, No. 79, Headquarters of the Army, November 26, 1892.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to prescribe a system of examination of enlisted men of the Army, by such boards as may be established by him, to determine their fitness for promotion to the grade of second lieutenant.

And then it goes on to give the necessary qualifications:

Provided, That all unmarried soldiers under 30 years of age, who are citizens of the United States, are physically sound, who have served honorably not less than two years in the Army, and who have borne a good moral character before and after enlistment, may compete for promotion under any system authorized by this act.

So I think it already includes enlisted men.

Mr. SEWELL. In reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], if that is the rule I have no objection to the substitution of the term "enlisted men" for "noncommissioned officers." That covers both branches.

Mr. ALLEN. Do I understand the Senator from New Jersey to accept my suggestion?

Mr. SEWELL. Yes; to substitute "enlisted men" for "noncommissioned officers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification of the amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "noncommissioned officers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "enlisted men."

Mr. SEWELL. Let the amendment to the amendment be read as it will read if the change is made.

The SECRETARY. So that if amended the amendment to the amendment will read:

And provided further, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint to vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant meritorious enlisted men of the Army, etc.

Mr. ALLEN. That is not the modification which I suggested. I suggested that after the words "noncommissioned officers" the words "and enlisted men" be inserted.

Mr. CULLOM. This language comprehends the whole thing.

Mr. SEWELL. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the term "enlisted men" includes noncommissioned officers.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that point well, but I understand that the statute read by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], under the regulations of the Department, has been confined to noncommissioned officers, and in order that there may be no mistake about it, to the prejudice of the enlisted man as distinguished from the noncommissioned officer, because there is a distinction——

Mr. HAWLEY. Not always.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest that the amendment to the amendment be modified so that it will include not only noncommissioned officers, but enlisted men as well.

Mr. SEWELL. I have no objection to it.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the Senator from Nebraska is mistaken about the matter. Under the recent act the regulations allow every enlisted man to enter the examination. They are examined first with the company and then with the regiment, and those who pass the best examination are brought on finally and recommended for commissions. The opportunity is not confined to noncommissioned officers. It is open to the entire enlisted force of the Army.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont what objection there can be to the amendment as it now exists? Let the Secretary again read the amendment as it now stands.

Mr. PROCTOR. There is not the slightest objection. It is merely unnecessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will again be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

And provided further, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint to vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant meritorious enlisted men of the Army.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the Senator from New Jersey accepts the suggestion to insert "and enlisted men."

Mr. SEWELL. I have no objection to that suggestion.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have. It is simply using up so much time and paper for nothing. Every noncommissioned man is an enlisted man. It is making a distinction that does not exist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] has a right to modify his amendment if he desires to do so.

Mr. HAWLEY. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that I would not do it.

Mr. SEWELL. Very well; but I see no objection to it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think I do. It is making a distinction that does not exist.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut is shedding any light upon the world as to the distinction he makes.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is needed while the Senator from Nebraska is talking.

Mr. ALLEN. It may be needed in the Senator's direction. It is not needed in mine, nor is it needed from the source from which it comes. I understand what an enlisted man is and what that term means; I understand it from actual experience, and I do understand that in Army circles (and we who have served in the Army all understand it) a distinction is made between noncommissioned officers and enlisted men as such. Now, there is no use of caviling about it. The distinction does exist and has existed.

The amendment to the amendment, in the language which was first used by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], supplemented by my suggestion, prevents any distinction of this kind being made in Army circles in the future, and it certainly does not consume so much paper as the proposed amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. VILAS. I think the Senator from Nebraska will recognize on a moment's reflection that the term "enlisted men" comprehends noncommissioned officers, and that the term "privates" is the one used as against noncommissioned officers. If you say "enlisted men" it is the same as if you say "noncommissioned officers and privates." If the Senator prefers the term "noncommissioned men and privates," why not use it?

Mr. ALLEN. I have recognized, of course, the superior information of Senators upon this subject, but I insist that in its technical interpretation, its practical interpretation, in Army circles the term "enlisted men" does not embrace noncommissioned officers.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that when we use the word "private" it is proper to say "noncommissioned officer and private."

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that point.

Mr. NELSON. But the term "enlisted men" includes both classes in law and in fact, and you can not get any better term than "enlisted men." It includes everything below an officer.

Mr. PROCTOR. I read from the order of General Schofield based upon this law, which shows the method in which it is administered:

Any soldier—

That, I think the Senator from Nebraska will admit, includes noncommissioned officers.

Mr. ALLEN. That includes everything.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will proceed:

Any soldier, otherwise qualified, whose age will not exceed 30 years on the 1st of September following, and who shall have served honorably not less than two years in the Army on or before that date, may (on or before the 1st day of February of any year after 1892) make application, through the regular military channels, to his department commander for preliminary examination, with a view to determine his eligibility for entering the competitive examinations.

That is the method in which the law has been administered.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no objection to having the word "soldier" inserted in lieu of what has been inserted, but I want to repeat, in answer to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], that I understand the term "enlisted men," in its generic sense, includes not only the private soldier, but the noncommissioned officer. I do not think any new light is being shed upon that point.

But I want to assert also in this connection, as the honorable Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] well knows from experience, that in actual Army life we do recognize a distinction between a noncommissioned officer and a private soldier, and now to cover the case of a private soldier I want this language or some equivalent language inserted, so that no discrimination can be made in favor of the noncommissioned officer as against an enlisted man.

Mr. SEWELL. If the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. SEWELL. If the Senator from Nebraska will be satisfied with the insertion of the word "soldier," which covers everything just the same as "enlisted men," I will agree with him in that respect and ask to have the change made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the change suggested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The SECRETARY. The amendment to the amendment, if modified, will read as follows:

And provided further, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint to vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant any meritorious soldier of the Army.

Mr. ALLEN. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. SEWELL. Now, if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] will accept the amendment to the amendment, it will simplify the matter.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to make one suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey. The amendment to the amendment as proposed by him refers to the law of 1878. I should like to suggest to him that it would be well to add a reference also to the law of 1892 since this change.

Mr. SEWELL. I accept that suggestion.

Mr. VILAS. Then I will accept the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. Before the amendment to the amendment is disposed of, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether, as he has got the amendment to the amendment, it does not authorize the President to fill all vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant with these soldiers, excluding altogether the graduates of West Point, and without any qualification as to age.

Mr. SEWELL. It gives the President the discretion to appoint under the rule.

Mr. HOAR. Then we may have the curious spectacle of a law providing for the education of 300 cadets. Let me ask how many men are there in the House of Representatives now?

Mr. SEWELL. Three hundred and fifty-six.

Mr. VILAS. The possible number of cadets is 371.

Mr. HOAR. There will be 356 cadets, and 90 more, and then the addition that will come when there is a new redistricting, which will increase the number probably thirty or forty in the other House, so that within five or six years we shall have a military school having classes entering at least numbering a third of about 450, and the President of the United States authorized by the same law to exclude every one of those young men from appointment in the Army, and to appoint from the Army at large. We have careful limitations of age in the matter of entry, and it of course affects the graduation of the young men, but there is no limitation whatever in point of age as to these appointees.

Now, of course we could trust a great deal to the discretion of any President of the United States in such a matter, but it is a pretty strange thing to put it in a law.

Mr. SEWELL. The original limitation as to age is in the law now, and it covers that point. It does leave the discretion to the President as to how many he shall appoint.

Mr. HOAR. But the Senator's amendment to the amendment provides that notwithstanding any number of graduates of West Point may remain unassigned the President may fill the vacancies—I give the substance and not the language—in the Regular Army by appointing meritorious soldiers.

Mr. SEWELL. He has that discretion.

Mr. HOAR. Without any limitation.

Mr. SEWELL. There is a limitation in the law.

Mr. HOAR. I have looked at the law, and there is nothing in it that limits it in regard to soldiers.

Mr. SEWELL. The law limits it to soldiers 30 years of age.

Mr. HOAR. They must have served not less than two years.

Mr. SEWELL. And be not over 30 years of age?

Mr. HOAR. It is not in this law. The Senator may find it, but it is not in section 4, which is referred to in the Senator's amendment to the amendment.

This is not a matter with which I am very familiar, but I repeat that it seems to me exceedingly singular to have an extensive military establishment—leave out the limitation as to age—by which an average of 150 soldiers or thereabouts a year are to be educated in the near future, if they all get through, and then provide in the same breath that although all of those men remain unassigned, the President may, in his discretion, appoint and fill up the whole Army list from the soldiers.

Suppose we should have a President who takes the view of the honorable Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who stated his views very earnestly, and there are a great many people in this country, good, sensible people, who have done great patriotic service themselves, who dislike the very idea of a West Pointer. I could call the attention of my honorable friend, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], to men who served with us in the Senate—famous soldiers themselves—to whom it was like shaking a red rag at a bull to mention West Point. Suppose we had a President of that way of thinking. It seems to me it is rather a strange way to legislate.

Mr. SEWELL. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that we could very soon amend the law if any President should make such a radical change.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps he would not consent to the change of the law.

Mr. SEWELL. Oh, yes, he would. I do not think that even in that case you would do such great injustice as you propose to do now without the amendment to the amendment. I can cite on pretty good authority the cases of eight graduates of Harvard who are serving as privates in a regiment for the purpose of obtaining commissions.

Mr. HOAR. I have no doubt that an occasional private——

Mr. SEWELL. I have no doubt they would make good officers.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I could not distinctly hear the colloquy that has been going on across the Chamber, only that it was concerning the practical operation of this law, and as to what is being done now in regard to the matter of the appointment of men from civil life and also from the Army.

I find by examination that in 1895, 14 enlisted men were presented for what they call "candidates" for commissions. That is about as many as has ever been presented in any one year. Of those, 4 have already been commissioned and are in the Army. Eight of the number are to be nominated to vacancies, and those vacancies already exist, or virtually so, because the names of officers for promotion have been presented, and some of them are now before the Senate. That accounts for 12 of them, leaving only 2 of all those who came from the Army in 1895. Those 2 will be provided for in a month or six weeks, I was informed by the Adjutant-General, for 4 officers are about to retire who have commands in the Army. So there will soon be 4 vacancies, and no West Pointer is to come until June. Hence those 2 will be provided for and complete the list for that year of those who became applicants from the Army. This was the practical operation of one year, and I suppose it to be a fair sample of other years, and furnishes us practical information as to the operation of the law governing these promotions.

Now, what is the mode of doing it? In the first instance, under the regulations, as I understand, there is a board appointed by the Secretary of War, perhaps a departmental board and afterwards a general board, to which they can appeal. These men go before the board for examination. They have, however, to file an application in writing three months before they are permitted to go before that board. The applicant must have been in the Army two years as an enlisted soldier, either as a private soldier or as a noncommissioned officer. They must be unmarried and 21 years old, and not exceeding 27 years of age. It is confined to that limit.

As to the West Pointers, the 30th of June is the annual period, I believe, for their graduation, and their commissions date from that time. They are then assigned to the various commands according to the grade and rank of the cadet in the class. This assignment is controlled by the judgment of the professors of the institution, due consideration being given to his grade or rank in his class. The West Pointers under the existing course of assignment have preference in filling these vacancies. In other words, if there are only so many vacancies to be filled and there are also candidates in waiting from the Army, and some appointed from civil life, the West Pointers have precedence. That is their regulation. Next in precedence are the men who come up from the Army and have undergone this examination—physical as well as a mental examination—which, I believe, is pretty much the same that is observed at West Point. It is a very severe test. Those men who have come up from the Army, after pursuing the course which is prescribed, stand second in precedence for these vacancies.

Then the third class are those who are appointed from civil life, and they are dependent solely upon a vacancy. There are rarely any vacancies under this process during the summer and fall, because this brilliant corps of young men, highly educated and prepared for their official duties, fill up all the vacancies at first. But after that period vacancies gradually come until, as has been shown in this debate, there are perhaps not more than 22 per cent, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, who are left in the class.

That is the mode pursued in getting these various classes of military appointments in the Army, some coming from West Point, some from the Army, and some from civil life. It has, I understand, worked very well. At least it would seem so from the facts I have just given, that out of the 14 who came from the Army last year every one of them now has virtually received appointment.

I care not to make any invidious distinction as to who should take precedence, the cadet, or the man who comes up from the Army or is appointed from civil life. My sympathy would most naturally be with the man who comes from the Army, who works his way up, who studies for two years, and undergoes the examination by the critical and severe board appointed by the Secretary of War. Precedence should always be given to merit, whether found in the cadet or the man from the Army. Let that be as it may, it seems to me that under the present operation no one stays outside of the Army who wants to get there and has the merit to command the place.

Then the question practically presents itself, suppose we increase the number to 90, 1 to each Senator, which makes the 90, what will be the practical effect? I do not know, but I think the amendment to the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is a very good one, a wise and a practical one; that is, if there should be anyone unprovided for after all these vacancies are filled they should be, after one year's time, retired, discharged honorably, and returned to civil life. That, I think, would work well.

A criticism has been made to the effect that men who live in the Army and become used to that kind of life are unfit for the duties of civil life. That may be true in many instances, but I know some instances to the contrary. This criticism will not attach to young men who leave the Army early. After a man remains ten or a dozen years in the Army and gets familiar with its duties and regards it as his life business, looks to it alone and does not care for outside matters, or come in contact with the world, has been confined to his barracks or his camp and wedded to military life, it is not natural to believe that he can be a success in that every day life where he comes in contact with a different class of people and enters a different kind of employment. It seems to me, however, that it will be beneficial to this country to have scattered through it men of finished scientific education, especially in the military, as they can become teachers to our State National Guards and, in the event of war, would be the nucleus around which to form commands.

If these men when young are retired under this amendment, if there is no vacancy for them to fill, if they come along and present themselves and there is no place for them in the Army, then after a year retire them. Their habits have not been perfectly formed, their tastes have not become fixed, and their habits of life are not incorrigible, and they go, as any other young man would from any other college, splendidly equipped with educational advantages for any kind of life that may come to them, whether of a scientific or of an ordinary and practical character.

I say, Mr. President, that is one of the reasons why I favor this proposition. As to the appointment by each Senator I would, as a Senator, gladly be relieved from the embarrassment which I know such things bring on men in our position, but I believe it to be for the good of the country, and when I say so I want to say in connection with it that I am not in favor of increasing the Army in order to give these men places. I am against that, but I think they should be retired to civil life if there is a surplus of them upon the rolls of the Army, and as graduates of West Point let them go into these various avocations well equipped and make themselves distinguished.

Without going into it, I believe that most of the distinguished men who figured in the late war on the Federal side came from civil life after having graduated at West Point, not to say anything of Confederates, because we had fewer men from West Point with us, but we did have some of them, and as great and grand military characters as are known in the history of any country, and equal to any upon the other side or, perhaps, in the world. That is my faith in some of the men from West Point who fought with us Confederates.

But, Mr. President, there are some singular facts that may be mentioned in this connection. I speak not of the Confederate, but Federal side. It is a remarkable fact that on January 1, 1860, there were 1,085 officers in the Army. I have gotten this from Heitman's Historical Register of the Army and from some other sources. I say that on January 1, 1860, there were 1,085 officers in the United States Army. Seventy per cent were graduates of West Point. Of these, 282 resigned, leaving 80 as a nucleus on which to form the vast armies that followed. At this date there were in civil life, approximately, between 175 and 200 ex-officers who had ceased to belong to the Army, most of them having discarded it, but some few of them were discarded by it, because many of them had retired of their own will for the purpose of entering into various avocations and some of those men who were leading officers of the Federal Army in the late war did so.

In this connection comes the remarkable and instructive fact that for twenty-two years after the retirement of General Scott from the head of the United States Army, who retired November 1, 1861, the Army was commanded exclusively from this latter class who had retired from the Army and had assumed duties appertaining to civil life—McClellan for one year, Halleck for two years, Grant for five years, and Sherman for fourteen years. All those men had retired from the Army and had taken civil duties, and then when the war broke out they returned to the Army. They are men who had mixed with the world and had been graduates of West Point and who became, as I said, the nuclei around which the strength of the Army gathered.

Then comes the additional instructive fact that of the 13 distinguished Army and corps commanders, Fremont, Rosecrans, Hooker, Burnside, Meade, Howard, Dix, Hancock, Thomas, Buell, Pope, Slocum, and McDowell, 8 came from the same class and only 5, Hancock, Thomas, Buell, Pope, and McDowell, remained in the Army continuously, and all but 2 of the 13 were graduates. Only those remained in the Army continuously, but the others had left the Army and gone into civil walks of life, and then when the war came they resumed their military careers.

On the 1st of of April, 1863, when war was flagrant, there were 326 general officers of the Army on the Register, and of those but 112 were from the 801 in continuous service, while 45 were from

the 175 to 200 ex-officers before referred to, and 169 from the volunteers. In other emergencies may we not expect similar valuable results from those disbanded officers and graduates?

Almost the only explanation I can offer for these remarkable facts is that after five or ten years' service in the Army in time of peace the ambition, grasp, individuality, and self-reliance is dwarfed, where the duties are entirely of a perfunctory character, as compared with the school of the ex-officer who enters the list of civil pursuits on the line of the survival of the fittest.

General Scott was spoken of yesterday by my distinguished friend from Georgia, Senator GORDON, but the Senator was a little in error. Scott, who was at the head of the Army, was not a graduate of West Point, and General Taylor was not a graduate of that institution. General Worth was not a graduate. Percifer F. Smith, of the Mexican war, was not a graduate, and I might go on down the line to the useful and efficient agency that was behind these men. There were such graduates of West Point as Lee, and Grant, and Sherman, and Johnston, Bragg, and others who served in the Mexican war as captains, but the real commanders of the Army in the Mexican war were men who had not graduated at West Point.

So I say I will support the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which requires a number of these men to be retired if there are no vacancies after one year; that after being in the Army one year, if there is no place for them, they may go into the private walks of life and make themselves useful as citizens; and then when we have trouble, which I hope we may never have, they will constitute the nuclei around which can gather the strength of this people, for our strength rests in the volunteer corps of this country, and not exclusively in the Regular Army. We have a small Regular Army, but if it was necessary we would have without delay a million of men in the field, sir, inspired by the spirit of patriotism that guides our people under the volunteer system. I think, then, this amendment ought to be passed, for I believe it will inure to the benefit of the country.

Mr. HAWLEY. I glanced hastily over the register of the first 10 regiments of infantry. They average 35 officers to a regiment, making 350 officers. I find that 60 of them, or 17 per cent, were appointed from the Army.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, I shall accept, if there be no objection on the part of others, the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], being in entire accord with that feeling which has been manifested on the floor of a desire to preserve the spirit of emulation in the ranks of the Army which is to be engendered by the hope of promotion to the line.

I wish to make only a very few observations, but in the beginning I should like to make one or two in correction of a misunderstanding which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] was laboring under yesterday in the remarks which he submitted to the Senate as to the mode in which the power of appointment has been exercised. I know nothing in respect to the appointments to the Naval Academy, and I make no comment upon so much of his observations as related to the Naval Academy, for I am not advised; but he confounded, without discrimination, appointments to the Military Academy and to the Naval Academy, and added:

> The law as it exists has been construed by some person, I do not know by whom, to authorize the President, if there is a failure to recommend within the time specified, to select a cadet from any part of the United States and accredit him to any Congressional district whose quota is not full. I know, for instance, that during the last Congress, possibly the preceding Congress, there was appointed to represent my Congressional district, the northeastern or Third district of the State of Nebraska, a boy from the District of Columbia, who perhaps was never 10 miles west of this city, and the thousands of boys in that district who are competent and are perfectly willing to represent the district in the Military Academy were deprived of their right to do so in consequence of that appointment.

The Senator from Nebraska may be correct in the statement that there was some failure to make an appointment upon the recommendation of a member, but, if so, it must have been to a cadetship in the Naval Academy. I took pains to inquire carefully into this matter, and I shall submit, and ask to have incorporated, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska, as I do not see him present, and for the information of others, a list of all the appointments that have been made to cadetships in the Military Academy since 1885 from the State of Nebraska. I will not ask the indulgence of the Senate to read it, but I ask that it be inserted in my remarks. It will be seen that not a single one was appointed except upon the recommendation of the proper Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the paper will be printed in the RECORD.

The list referred to is as follows:

Persons appointed as cadets from the State of Nebraska since 1885.

William E. Catlin, Fremont, Third district; by Hon. E. K. Valentine, February 19, 1885.

Frederick W. Sladen, Omaha, First district; Hon. A. J. Weaver, February 24, 1885.

Alvin H. Sydenham, Kearney, Third district; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, August 20, 1885.

Alternate, Lewis A. Tillson, Buffalo County; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, August 20, 1885.

George E. Sundburg, Wayne, Third district; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, April 26, 1889.

Arthur M. Edwards, Hastings, Second district; Hon. James Laird, June 15, 1889.

George T. Patterson, North Platte, Third district: Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, August 5, 1889.

Alternate, John W. Eagleson, Craig, Third district; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, April, 26, 1889.

Allen P. Brown, Schuyler, Third district; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, August 5, 1889.

John B. Jack, Peru, First district; Hon. W. J. Connell, November 4, 1889.

Atwood B. Sydenham, Kearney, Third district; Hon. G. W. E. Dorsey, January 30, 1889.

Alternate, James W. Broatch, Omaha, First district; Hon. W. J. Connell, November 4, 1889.

James W. Broatch, Omaha, First district; Hon. W. J. Connell, November 15, 1890.

George T. Patterson, North Platte, Third district; Hon. O. M. KEM, August 5, 1891.

John B. Jack, Peru, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, June 13, 1892.

Horace F. Bishop, Lincoln, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, July 5, 1892.

Alternate, Alfred W. Pressly, Oconto, Third district; Hon. O. M. KEM, August 5, 1891.

Horace F. Bishop, Lincoln, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, June 10, 1892.

Benjamin M. Koehler, Blue Hill, Second district; Hon. W. A. McKeighan, July 11, 1892.

Clarence B. Gallagher, Omaha, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, February 8, 1893.

Evan H. Humphrey, Omaha, Second district; Hon. D. H. MERCER, May 2, 1893.

David M. Hill, Bellwood, Fourth district; Hon. E. J. HAINER, May 29, 1893.

Jay E. Williams, St. Edwards, Third district; Hon. G. D. MEIKLEJOHN, June 3, 1893.

John R. Waugh, Plattsmouth, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, June 22, 1893.

Evan H. Humphrey, Omaha, Second district; Hon. D. H. MERCER, July 6, 1893.

Alternate, Albert M. Niles, Juniata, Second district; Hon. W. A. McKeighan, July 11, 1892.

Fred R. Klumb, Hampton, Fourth district: Hon. E. J. HAINER, May 29, 1893.

W. R. Newman, Hartington, Third district; Hon. G. D. MEIKLEJOHN, June 5, 1893.

Halsey E. Yeates, Lincoln, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, June 22, 1893.

John R. Waugh, Plattsmouth, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, October 18, 1893.

Ernest V. Scott, Dewitt, Fourth district; Hon. E. J. HAINER, December 6, 1893.

Alternate, Halsey E. Yeates, Lincoln; First district, Hon. W. J. Bryan, October 30, 1893.

L. L. Gregg, Osceola, Fourth district; Hon. E. J. HAINER, December 6, 1893.

Halsey E. Yeates, Lincoln, First district; Hon. W. J. Bryan, January 19, 1895.

Alternate, John R. Waugh, Plattsmouth; Hon. W. J. Bryan, January 19, 1895.

Evan H. Humphrey, Omaha, Second district; Hon. D. H. MERCER, January 14, 1895.

Frank S. Bowen, Cedar Rapids, Third district; Hon. G. D. MEIKLEJOHN, November 15, 1895.

Frank P. Amos, Kimball, Sixth district; Hon. O. M. KEM, June 24, 1895.

Alternate, Juan A. Boyle, Kearney, Third district; Hon. O. M. KEM, June 24, 1895.

It has for many years been the practice of the War Department to appoint cadets to the Military Academy from Congressional districts upon the nomination of members of Congress. This practice is never departed from.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, *February 18, 1895.*

Mr. VILAS. I wish to add a further remark in regard to this matter, in order to correct a mistake, which was somewhat a misapprehension, induced, perhaps, by the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, and that was apparently accepted on the floor by other Senators. For over twenty years, the Adjutant-General of the Army informed me this morning, not a single appointment has been made to the Military Academy as a representative of a Congressional district or within that clause of the law which provides for the appointment of one cadet from each Congressional district, except upon the nomination of the Representative in Congress of that district. During the war, in consequence of the absence of Representatives from some of the States of the Union, the Secretary of War, or the President, did appoint a number of cadets assigned to those Congressional districts which were not then represented for certain reasons. After the war there was a single instance in a Congressional district in the State of New York in which Secretary Belknap appointed a cadet without its being made upon the recommendation of the Representative from the district; but it caused so much controversy and remonstrance that in the end I believe that appointment was not carried into effect.

One other instance, the Adjutant-General assured me, had been made in the course of his knowledge. There was a Congressional district in the State of Massachusetts whose Representative was of that religious faith which is of peace, a Quaker, and he was unwilling to recommend the education of a man of war, but consented to the Secretary of War making the appointment of the cadet from that district.

The Adjutant-General assures me that those are the only instances known to him of any violation of the observance of the appointment of cadets from the Congressional districts upon the nomination of the Representatives in Congress from those districts.

Mr. President, I think that statement is enough to show that we have no occasion to insert in the law the provision which I had the honor to submit in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and I believe he now

agrees that if we shall simply provide a sufficient length of residence to make the residence actual and certain, he does not care to have it inserted. I am willing to agree to it if there be no objection in the Senate; so that the amendment shall read:

The two appointed at large from each State shall have been for two years actual residents of the State—

It now reads "shall be actual residents"—

and the others shall have been for two years actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial district, etc.

And I will suggest that it be amended by striking out the word "be" in the seventh line and the word "be" in the eighth line and inserting the words "have been for two years" in each case.

Mr. HILL. What does the Senator mean by the words "actual residents"?

Mr. VILAS. That is the language of the law as it is. It is copied from the Revised Statutes as it has stood ever since they were adopted.

Mr. HILL. The residence might be out of the State.

Mr. VILAS. I presume it means not a mere legal or constructive residence, but that the appointee shall be a genuine actual resident of the district or the State.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the residence of a minor follows legally the residence of his father. A boy might have been out of the State to school. Why do you put in the word "actual" there? The boy may have been to a boarding school out of the State. Is not the word "residence" sufficient? I only ask the question.

Mr. VILAS. I readily recognize the force of the observation of the Senator from New York as a matter of argument, but that word has stood in the Revised Statutes for more than twenty years without causing the least trouble that I happen to be aware of. Nobody has challenged it.

Mr. HILL. Then it must have been held to have no particular significance.

Mr. MILLS. The actual residence of the boy would be the actual residence of his father.

Mr. VILAS. I think so. I do not think it cuts much figure. I agree with the Senator from New York about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment as modified by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The SECRETARY. In line 7 strike out the word "be" and insert in lieu thereof the words "have been for two years," and in line 8 strike out the word "be" and insert the words "shall have been for two years"; so that it will read:

The two appointed at large from each State shall have been for two years actual residents of the State from which they are appointed, and the others shall have been for two years actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Wisconsin now accepts the amendment suggested by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. VILAS. If there be no other objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question recurs on the adoption of the amendment as now read.

Mr. TELLER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. VILAS. I wish to add a word or two. I have not finished the remarks I desire to submit to the Senate in connection with it.

Mr. TELLER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. VILAS. Not quite. I wish to make another remark. Something was said in reference to the President's appointment of the ten and something in complaint of an alleged practice, it is said, to appoint too much from the District of Columbia. I wish to remark in regard to this point that during the two terms of the present Executive the practice has been, as I was assured by the Adjutant-General, universally to select the son of some officer of the Army or someone in direct descent from a deceased officer of the Army, so that the children of the meritorious and useful military persons of this country should be recognized in that way as worthy of the military instruction which the country provides. I think that must have been in truth the design of the law. At all events, I believe not only President Cleveland but General Harrison and other Presidents have followed the same practice. It is by no means a new idea.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. VILAS. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I think that provision was put in with the distinct understanding that the President should be allowed in that way to take the sons and descendants of army officers who had practically no fixed residence.

Mr. VILAS. I suppose that was the object of it.

Mr. TELLER. That was the object of the provision.

Mr. BATE. And that that idea might be carried out to a fuller extent, it was urged in committee by persons interested in the Army that the number of appointments given to the President should be extended to 20 instead of 10.

Mr. VILAS. I wish the number had been preserved; but the Committee on Military Affairs chose to leave the law as it is in that respect and I have not raised any point upon it. I ought to add, to be exact, that this is the practice, not alone in respect to the sons or grandsons of officers of the Army, but of the Navy also, who are occasionally appointed in this way.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. VILAS. It may happen that from that practice a number have been designated as residents of the District of Columbia, because officers may be residing here in the District of Columbia. In a great many cases they have no local affiliation so that they can designate any State as the State of their residence. But nobody can for an instant doubt the excellence of that practice. Let me mention as illustrative of it that there are two wishes now in existence which it will be some day, undoubtedly, the pleasure, as he will feel it the duty, of the Chief Executive of this nation to execute. The illustrious general who commanded our armies at the close of the war left his letter to the President of the United States, requesting, when his grandson became of sufficient age, that he might be educated at the Military Academy, and a son who bears the illustrious name of Philip H. Sheridan carries also a letter from that distinguished and noble soldier of similar purport, and either one of them will be respected as sacred wishes.

Mr. President, a word or two in respect to the scope of this amendment. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] asked what was the purpose of the amendment in respect to the extent to which it would carry into civil life the instructed pupils of the Military Academy. I should like to answer him by quoting a recommendation made by the Board of Visitors in the year 1893, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] was the president, and which was concurred in by the entire Board. At that time Mr. Justice White was his associate appointee from the Senate. The language of that recommendation in brief is this:

The Board is impressed with the belief that the Academy should be required to educate as many young men as its capacity will justify. Any policy which fails to secure to the nation the full benefit of the institution in the education and training of its young men is neither economical nor wise.

The amendment which I have proposed is precisely in line with that recommendation. The capacity of the Military Academy now is equal to the reception of this additional number. There might be some little change required in the barracks, but they are sufficient, as shown by the report of the adjutant of the post, given in the report for this year of the Board of Visitors. The instructional force is substantially adequate. Not more than four or five or possibly a half dozen subaltern officers, if any at all, and I think none, would be required to be added for the full instruction. There is involved, therefore, in this proposal practically nothing except the additional pay of the cadets.

Sir, it may be true that if the policy were to be distinctly adopted that we are to educate a considerable number of young men for civil life at the Military Academy, a greater addition to the cadetship ought to be provided than this will provide; but let us not go too fast. We have there the means; we are now seeking only to use those means according to their capacity. I showed yesterday that the cost to the United States of the education of a single cadet at that establishment exceeds a thousand dollars per year, while in ordinary colleges the cost hardly exceeds $125 per pupil per annum. Let us avail ourselves of this expenditure. I ask for no retrenchment of the expenditure; I believe it is well and wisely made; but let us avail ourselves of the fruits which it is equal to realizing for the country.

The Senator from New Hampshire says that perhaps this might result in there being some men left at the end of the period of instruction who could not be assigned and would be obliged to be sent to private life, and therefore there might be some stigma in connection with it. He really answered that objection himself by saying that in the course of his experience with the Naval Academy, and we all know how great it was, he had found that when there were so many as fifteen or twenty to be sent to private life at the end of the course of instruction there was felt to be no imputation upon any. This will provide, I hope and I believe, about that number to be sent back to private life every year from the graduates of the institution. If so, we at once avoid that criticism upon the limited increase to the cadetship which is now proposed.

But, let me ask for a moment, if we do not need much more than that in the country? We have not simply an Army of the United States, for whose experience and power we ought to provide. The Regular Army of the United States, which to-day alone is supplied with instructed officers through this institution, is a body of 25,000 or 30,000 men. When the 70,000,000 people of the United States shall engage in war it is much more probable that the number of the Army will be 250,000, or mayhap 500,000, and where shall we find the instructed officers to immediately organize and put into active service such enormous battalions as our great population and our strength would undoubtedly require us to provide for the exigencies of a war such as we are likely to engage in, if in any? I trust and believe there can be no prospect of any anywhere in the sky.

The Senator from New Hampshire also spoke of the necessity of a similar course of proceeding with reference to the Naval Academy. I do not know that the Senator from New Hampshire meant to put that in as an objection to the adoption of this amendment, nor am I able to discuss the question with him whether or not there should be an increase in the Naval Academy. He is far better instructed in the conditions which affect that institution than I am; but I will draw his attention to one or two features of difference between the Naval Academy and the Military Academy in the possible usefulness of this course of procedure.

We do not keep in our various States any body of naval recruits, any body of seamen. We have no organizations intended to be used upon the sea, except what is called a Naval Reserve, quite insignificant in number, at this time amounting to but very little, and the Naval Reserve, wherever it exists, is chiefly, I think, upon the coast. Now, in every State of the Union there is a body of militia, generally designated as the National Guard of that particular State. I think that it would be a service for which we could well afford the money to pay, which it would be well for us to enter upon the execution of, to provide that the various States should have instructed officers, who shall be competent to teach the National Guard all that can be taught or is needed to be taught to them in the way of military discipline. We shall perhaps thus have the skeleton of an army upon which we can build with the rapidity which occasion demands. We have proceeded in all our history, and hitherto without default in time of trial, upon the theory that it is better to have a small army and a live, active, vigorous, dauntless, free people from which to form an army in time of war, with sufficient means only in instructed men at hand to organize them into proper corps and lead them into whatever service may be required.

There is a very great difference between the Army and the Navy, therefore, in the need, as it seems to me, of having a class of men instructed who shall take their places in civil life. I shall not pause at this hour to elaborate the argument. I suggest it as a sufficient distinction now, by no means intending to antagonize by it any proposal which at a proper time may be made, if any shall be made, in reference to the Navy. Let that take care of itself according to reasons which may be presented in reference to it.

Mr. President, I shall take only the further time in the discussion of this amendment to say that it has had for a great many years the approbation of the instructional force and the superintendent of West Point, together with the commandant of cadets. It has had the continuous recommendation of every Board of Visitors which has examined that institution for years. It may happen that not always has that recommendation been written in the report, though it has been repeatedly reiterated. It has had, as is evidenced upon this floor, the constant and continued recommendation of the Secretaries of War. We have here two gentlemen, distinguished upon this floor and in the country, who have occupied the post of Secretary of War. Both of them are here to speak for the desirability of the amendment.

We know with what difficulty changes in our law of any kind are accomplished, what a tremendous power the power of inertia is even in the words of law; and I trust that the Senate now will adopt this modest, this very gentle step toward the accomplishment of a reformation by which only the power of the Military Academy is to be used, as we now maintain it, simply for the benefit of the country to the extent to which we expend money to make it useful, and that in the end the committee which may have charge of this matter, if the Senate shall adopt it, will feel that the Senate desires this amendment to be made to the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], upon which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. CALL and Mr. PROCTOR. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following as an additional section:

SEC. 2. That the corps of cadets shall consist of two from each State at large, one from each Congressional district, one from each Territory, one from the District of Columbia, and ten from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and those appointed at large may be residents anywhere in the Union. The two appointed at large from each State shall have been for two years actual residents of the State from which they are appointed, and the others shall have been for two years actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts or the District of Columbia, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed. Any graduates unassigned to existing vacancies within one year after their graduation shall be honorably discharged from the service: *Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint to vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant any meritorious soldier of the Army, when recommended according to the provisions of the acts of June 18, 1878, and July 30, 1892, although graduates of the Military Academy may remain in service unassigned.

Mr. VILAS. The paragraph in the amendment as it now stands, which reads—

Any graduates unassigned to existing vacancies within one year after their graduation shall be honorably discharged from the service—

which was inserted upon the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], I believe he agrees ought to have one qualification. That qualification I move to place there by inserting, after the word "graduation," the words "except those in the Engineer Corps."

That amendment is proposed upon the recommendation of the Department, received to-day, on this ground: The Engineer Corps receives regularly from the Academy one, two, three, rarely over four, of the graduating class, as specially recommended by reason of their success in scholarship and their peculiar attainments for the engineering branch of the service. It sometimes happens, I am told by officers of that corps, that no one is recommended from the graduating class as sufficient in qualification and character for assignment to the Engineer Corps. Therefore it has been the practice to hold over the second lieutenants appointed as additional lieutenants for such vacancies as may occur in the Engineer Corps, because they do not occur in anything like regular number. Sometimes there is a considerable number of vacancies, at others the vacancies are few, and they regard it as especially desirable that all second lieutenants specially recommended by the graduating board shall be held in the Engineer Corps, and additional lieutenants to fill such vacancies as are required by the peculiar nature of that establishment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "graduation" it is proposed to strike out the words "except those in the Engineer Corps"; so as to read:

Any graduates unassigned to existing vacancies within one year after their graduation shall be honorably discharged from the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment comes practically from the Committee on Military Affairs; it certainly has not been considered by the Committee on Appropriations. It is a pointed illustration, in my judgment, of the impolicy of placing general legislation upon appropriation bills in this body. In the body in which appropriation bills originate they are considered by committees who are in charge of the special subjects-matter, and the rules governing in that branch would prohibit the possibility of such legislation as is here proposed. Under our rules I suppose this amendment might have been excluded. I believe the Senator from Colorado having the bill in charge has not made the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation; but it is important legislation, Mr. President. It is a subject which I think ought to be thoroughly considered in a separate bill. It provides practically for the appointment of a cadet to West Point by each Senator in this body. To my mind it is a most objectionable form of legislation, for it is a matter which comes home to each one of us. The proposed increase may be proper and right in itself—I do not discuss that at this time—but it ought not to be put on an appropriation bill when it comes so near to each of us on this floor.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] assigns as a reason that the facilities at the Academy are such that the increased number of cadets proposed to be provided for can be educated there without additional cost, except as to the mere matter of pay. It so happens that for the past six or eight years, and I take it it has been the case from the beginning with the War Department, the Board of Visitors to West Point and all who are concerned in looking especially into this institution have been to Congress and to the Committee on Appropriations insisting upon increased facilities and increased buildings for the accommodation of the present corps. It has not been two years since we were called upon to increase the facilities to accommodate the number of cadets now provided for by law. If the Senator from Wisconsin be correct, the improvements that were made at West Point for the number of cadets now authorized by law will be taken advantage of by the increased number he proposes to provide.

Mr. President, there may be necessity for an increased number of these young men at both the Naval Academy and at West Point, but it will not stop with the increase of these educated officers. It means with the Army and with the Navy largely increased appropriations for the men in those two services.

Mr. GEORGE. The men for the officers to command?

Mr. GORMAN. The men for the officers to command. One year ago we provided $500,000 for an increase of a thousand men in the Navy.

Mr. BATE. There is a clause in the amendment which covers that objection; that is to say, where there are no vacancies under the law as it now exists and there are no places for the surplus men, they shall be retired after one year to civil life. I have had the same opinion the Senator from Maryland has in regard to this increase, but that has been guarded against in this bill.

While I am up, I will say in regard to legislation upon appropriation bills that I think the practice generally is radically wrong. This, however, is a peculiar amendment. It applies especially to

West Point, the appropriations contained in this bill are for West Point, and this appertains directly to it. It does not come exactly under the condemnation of ordinary legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I know that there never has been a case yet presented where there were not some good reasons given for adopting it on an appropriation bill. That always comes, and it is the most difficult matter to resist it. The present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and those who preceded him, as well as all the members of that committee, know how difficult it is to object to a provision of this character, and the tendency of the Senate always is to permit a vote unless in the concluding hours of a session.

If we are to increase the Army and the Navy, as has been proposed in the many bills and propositions pending before Congress, it ought to be done separately. We have been and we are increasing the Navy, a thousand men last year and 2,000 men are wanted this year, and as we go on and construct ships two or three thousand men will be necessary within the next three or four years in a time of peace.

In the Navy there may be, and I think there is, a necessity for a slight annual increase to man the ships we have already constructed and those which we shall be obliged to construct. In the matter of the Army it is a different question. We have a magnificent body of men drilled by the States, the great volunteer army, that is ready to meet any emergency, officered—and they can be officered as they were in the last war—by the skilled men who are found in the walks of private life, who have never passed through and who never can pass through one of these military institutions.

I do not, for one, believe that it is wise for us at this time, or at any time except in an emergency, to increase the standing Army of the United States. I would provide a proper number of ships, which must be built for the Government; I would provide proper armament for our ports on the coast, and rely upon the people at the proper time to furnish the necessary men and officers for the service of the Government. I do not believe in our present condition that we should be preparing for the increase in the Army, which, in my judgment, will follow this proposition.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], who, I know, has given great attention to this subject and has carefully looked into the conditions at West Point, has possibly not yet felt, but he will feel, the pressure from all the men who pass through these institutions to secure for them commands. It will come, Mr. President. This is but the beginning. I do not believe—and this is all I intended to say when I rose—that it is proper to make that beginning upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to call his attention to the fact that the United States Government donates every year $15,000, and it will soon be $25,000, under the Morrill Act, to the land-grant colleges? Those colleges are compelled by law to teach military tactics, and each one of them has a West Pointer detailed to drill those schoolboys. They are furnishing all the military training that this country needs.

Mr. BATE. In that connection, I will say the law allows a hundred at least for that purpose, and now there are many colleges who can not secure the detail of officers for that service.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, Mr. President; officers are detailed to these colleges; they are detailed as aids to the governors of States, and they are detailed to all sorts of schools of training, so that we have now more than can be utilized for the purposes of the Army, and enough for all the details required by law for the colleges and the States.

Mr. BATE. There are colleges applying to have officers detailed to instruct their pupils in military discipline who can not get them now, owing to the fact that sufficient money is not appropriated, although the law allows such details. It has never been possible to assign to the colleges the number of officers required in that direction.

Mr. GORMAN. I had supposed that all the assignments were made. However that may be, I believe that this matter ought to be taken up and discussed upon its own merits, and without reference to an appropriation bill.

After what I have read in the newspapers of the comments made elsewhere upon this body for making appropriations, that we have assumed a right which does not exist, and practically it was claimed that we had no right to amend an appropriation bill or to make provision for the support of the Government and the payment of the claims and judgments against it—there has been talk of the Senate riding with hobnailed shoes over a coordinate branch of the Government.

The Senate, of course, will resent any such imputation, because it has the right to amend appropriation bills and to provide for the support of the Government; and, as was well stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], it is the duty of the Senate to make such appropriations. It has always exercised the right, and has had the courage to make appropriations sufficient to pay the current expenses of the Government; but I doubt the propriety of the policy, Mr. President, and I think the Senate weakens its position with the country when, out of order, it proposes to amend an appropriation bill, no matter how much merit there may be in the proposition, by giving to each Senator the right to name a young man to go to West Point. I do not believe we can maintain our position in so doing. I do not think that we can insist upon such a measure upon an appropriation bill; and I think it would be misunderstood everywhere.

Outside of the question of the increase of the Army, I should like to see this body go on as it has in the past, increasing appropriations where the necessities of the Government require it and in conformity to law, but to avoid all such propositions as are now pending.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, as to the propriety of putting legislation of this kind upon an appropriation bill, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to the fact that it has been done every year for a great many years in a matter quite related to this. If he will omit the inhibition against more soldiers than 25,000, which appears every year in the Army appropriation bill, the existing and continuing statute will apply, providing for an army of 30,000. That is the law of the country to-day, and it is only by every year forbidding more than 25,000 that the number is kept down to 25,000.

I remember very well when that was done in another place. A gentleman who had not considered the question at all jumped up and moved that it should not be more than 25,000 men enlisted for the year under the money appropriated, or words to that effect. It seemed to meet the feeling of the House of Representatives, which is the body to which I refer, and it has been renewed every year since then.

I say frankly that having doubled in population since that inhibition was established, we need a larger police. Whenever there is a serious disturbance of any kind—none involving foreign nations has come upon us—and such a disturbance is likely to come among 70,000,000 people, some of whom are uneasy, then you have to transport your little body of troops, all you can gather together, to the point where they are needed. You can not afford to collect in one body more than two or three thousand troops, as you have not more than 23,000 when you should have 25,000. They must stay in certain places to protect property. You have to collect and weed out and shift and run them out on trains, with a very heavy bill of expense, and they perhaps arrive at the place after the damage has been done. As an internal police we ought to have not less than 25,000 soldiers if it were right to have 30,000 twenty-five years ago.

Our friend says that the volunteers, right out of the population, who had not drilled a day, made their own officers well enough in the late war. I know something about it myself, sir. I know that as a captain, to which grade I was unwillingly advanced when I tried to be a first lieutenant, I hunted around for young men who knew how to drill; how to teach not only my men, but myself. I found them, happily, some of them in a good military school in my State, and then we got West Point officers to help us. A good many months elapsed, not to say years, as some men would say, before we all became what soldiers should be, well-trained soldiers, accustomed to all the necessary maneuvers, and before the officers became really fit to be trusted to take men in battle except when the exigencies were such that we had to die at least if we could not drill or march or change our formation.

You might as well argue that special training is of no advantage in any pursuit anywhere. I do not know any place where it is of as much importance as it is in the conduct of an army upon which depends the lives of tens and hundreds of thousands of men and the expenditure of hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars. It is there important, and the officers feel it. No general officer, or captain either, can say he does not feel the tremendous responsibility, the poignant regret that he was not better prepared for that place, and how often he criticises himself after an expedition or a battle, finds fault with himself, and says he ought to have known better.

No, sir; there is no place where training is more needed, and this little addition of about 17 a year, which I think it will give, will do us no hurt, for there is a great demand for these officers in the military schools and in the militia of the States. I am very glad to see that there is some measure proposed to provide for it. The boys, 12 or 15 years of age, in the military schools make but a beginning, but the instruction there is valuable, for it goes as far as squad drills and company drills if it does not involve the science of tactics or anything of that sort.

The idea that we can not amend in the manner proposed, that we can not add to the number of cadets, is very much as if we should say that we have no right to add to the number of clerks and employees of the Senate. Every year when we are making provision for the Senate under the legislative, executive, and judicial bill we assume to ourselves a perfect freedom and right to increase the number of any class of workmen and employees, I do not care what they are, and to change their compensation, to give

a larger or smaller sum. The doctrine of the English House of Commons even does not apply here. They may not raise the appropriation above that which is dictated to them by their ministry. With due respect to what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] stated the other day, in my judgment we have nothing to borrow from the processes of the great British Parliament. We assume the perfect right to increase or diminish the number and compensation of men for whom we are providing in an annual appropriation bill, and we have always done it.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and I am sure it will be to the good of the country.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not believe in taking any step at this time to increase the Regular Army. It may be necessary when building ships to increase the officers of the Navy to command those ships, but as was suggested by some Senator, we are already educating a vast number of young men. The agricultural schools provide pretty good military training. The officers of the Regular Army are doing very effective service in multiplying the number of young men capable of doing military service.

The States are organizing as they never did before, and at this time there should be no increase of the Army. There ought to be a decrease rather than an increase, from the fact that we have no more Indian wars. We have built railroads and settled up the territory all over the Indian country. So the soldiers we have have been brought to and concentrated about the cities. We do not want a large Army for that purpose. A very small Army is all that is necessary. Nobody is going to resist the United States forces. Things are very different now. There is nothing like the demand for a large Army that there was twenty years ago. So we ought to be decreasing rather than increasing the Army, it seems to me.

This is an entering wedge for increasing the Army, when we have made ample provision for educating a vast number of men for military service and when the States have taken an interest in it and have their volunteers and everything prepared to improvise a large army quickly. Now, when there is no use for it, to increase the standing army that is to be located in your cities will create a feeling of discontent among the people. They look upon the Government as tending toward monarchy and pomp and splendor. There is use to increase the number of officers of the Navy to command the ships, but there is no necessity for increasing the Army. Consequently, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Besides, I do not think the Senate should be seeking patronage for itself. It looks as if we were reaching out for appointments, to which there will certainly be objection, unless there is some advantage to come to the country from it. I see that, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, but upon consulting with the chairman of the committee, we concluded, after the criticisms of the committee a few days ago as to arbitrary methods, that we would let the matter run and would not raise the question, and I do not desire to raise it now.

The estimates of the Department for the Military Academy were $619,169.61. The amount carried by the bill as it came from the other House was $448,117.61. To that we have added $3,000 in two items, one being for repairs to barracks of detachment of army service men and the other for fitting up the ordnance museum in the new Academy building. The proper officer stated that that was essential in order to have any use of that building. We have reduced some other items, so that the net increase on the bill as it came from the other House is only $2,408. The House committee, in reporting the bill to the House, make the following statement in their report:

> The following items in the estimates the committee believe to be desirable, but not essential, to the preservation of the property, or the actual needs of the institution, and have not, on account of the depleted condition of the Treasury, recommended them to the House.

They amount to $129,277, which they say are essential, but not absolutely necessary. Out of that sum we have taken $3,000, that the proper officer made the majority of the committee believe was essential to the building and for the use of the Academy.

The other House evidently did not intend that there should be any increase of the Army for any purpose, because, while providing for the detail of some enlisted men at the Academy, they make this statement:

> But the number of enlisted men of the Army shall not be increased on account of this proviso or the two preceding paragraphs of this act.

I do not mean to detain the Senate by any discussion, as I desire to get a vote. I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote on this question, because the committee are entitled to take the sense of the Senate on it, as we know it will meet with some opposition. But I merely wish to say that so far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad always to be relieved of any patronage of this kind. I do not myself want any of it. I do not believe that there is any necessity for increasing our Army. I wish to say in reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] that I do not believe there is any occasion now, or that it is consistent with the genius of our Government that we should increase the National Army for police purposes. I recollect very distinctly that a number of years ago I broke away from my party in the Senate and voted with three other Republicans, and three others only, for a provision of law which, I think, still remains on the statute books, that the United States Army should only be used in such cases as are explicitly provided for by law.

I do not know whether it is always observed; possibly it is not; but I am one of those who do not believe that the General Government should attempt to police the States with the United States Army. I will never vote for the increase of the Army except it may be for the purpose of national defense, and I do not believe that any considerable number of the American people will ever be willing that the American Army shall act as a police force and discharge for the States the duties which the States are able to discharge for themselves.

The constabulary of a State is the police force, and the freedom of this country would be jeopardized by attempting to displace the constabulary of the States with the United States Army. Never since I have been in public life, now nearly twenty years, have I failed to enter my protest whenever it was suggested that the United States Army was to be taken from the high purpose for which it was created, that of national defense, and degraded, in my judgment, to the performance of the duties of constables or deputy sheriffs. We do not need any increase of the Army, and in my judgment we do not need any increase of cadets in the United States. It is true that we might in time of war avail ourselves of the skill of these young men, but in my opinion those who are so educated in the immediate future will be old men before there will be any occasion to call them into use, unless it may be for the purpose of putting down civil strife in this country.

There is no possibility, in my judgment, that any power will assail us. If any power does assail us, the contest will not be upon the land, but upon the water, and if we have any money to educate young men in any line of warfare, the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] is, I think, exceedingly pertinent, that it ought to be in the line of the naval forces and not of the land forces. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I beg pardon for troubling the Senate, but I wish to say just a few words more.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] is of the opinion that while it is right and necessary to increase the number of enlisted men in the Navy—and that is obvious to everybody—there is no such necessity in the case of the Army. The Navy is hopeless without a good system of coast defense. There must be strong forts, there must be large docks, there must be magazines of cannon and ammunition, and all that at our principal ports which can be defended not more by the Navy outside than by the forts; and the harbors there must be harbors of refuge for a retreating force, and also harbors of supply. If we are to go on with anything like a systematic and partially thorough system of coast defense it will be utterly and absolutely useless unless there be some force of men to take care of it in case of necessity. Of all things, the greatest waste of money is the use of raw men in the handling of great guns where it costs $500 to fire a single shot.

I will not discuss at any length the propriety of providing for a good Army—though an exceedingly small one in the judgment of the world—because that is not a practical question on the pending bill, but I think the Army is at a safe point; it is a factor of safety, as the engineers say, when we have but one soldier out of 2,800 of our population, and there is no danger in an increase of 3,000 or so.

The Senator from Colorado denounced the use of the Army for police duty. So do I in the sense in which he describes it; but, of course, I did not mean the ordinary brass-buttoned man with a locust stick, walking about the street. I mean that higher police which is behind the majesty of the country and behind the majesty of a State. Civil government is not worth a farthing unless there be behind the sheriff a colonel and behind the marshal a regiment or a brigade to be used in the execution of the law, though never to fire a shot except where repeated warnings have failed to stop men from destroying property or openly defying national laws.

I understand those limitations. I accept them. I am a strict constructionist in all that regard. But I do not care to be always telling the world, not as anyone does here, but some men are always saying to the people of the United States that there is no necessity for a soldier and no necessity for force or anything of that sort. That is false mercy. The time has come when that sort of talk is simply murder; that is all.

Mr. TELLER. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that behind the sheriff there may properly be a colonel with a regiment, but according to my doctrine it should be a colonel of the

State, not a colonel of the United States. He should act under the authority of the State. The State is derelict when it does not protect national property, when it does not protect transportation, when it does not protect the mails. The State should do it with its constabulary first, if it can, and if it can not do it in that way, then let it do it with its militia—its soldiery. That is the way to maintain peace and order in this country; that is the way to maintain liberty and law.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator from Colorado is exactly right again, and yet quite wrong at the same time. Of course, behind the sheriff stands the colonel, and they should cover the larger part of the great field of armed defense of our liberties and laws; but there are times when they are insufficient (and the very emergency is provided for in the Constitution) to do this, and when governors and legislatures have called for help. We remember when they did do it. How was it at Chicago? Was there no necessity under the sun? Was it thought folly and crime that Miles should march down from Fort Sheridan with his troops? Did not every man in the United States acknowledge the propriety of it? Was not life saved and property saved and the majesty of the Federal law saved when the blue coats, riding into Pittsburg, quelled the mob at the very sight of them?

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to say a single word. I shall vote against the pending amendment, but I shall not do it because I think legislation ought not to be placed upon an appropriation bill. I shall not do it because I think it would increase the standing Army of the United States, although I never would vote for a single addition of a man to the standing Army of the United States except when war is imminent. I would vote for the amendment with pleasure to give to the young men of this country an opportunity of the highest military education that the present capacity of the two Academies will permit. But there is no provision in the amendment for the Academy at Annapolis and for the Navy, which is the most important branch of our armed service. It is far more important, in view of any possible contingencies, than any other species of military education. Under those circumstances, with an amendment imperfectly prepared, doing this great injustice to the naval branch of the service, I shall vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], upon which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have so much of the amendment read as provides for the appointment of cadets on a recommendation by Senators. It was not a part of the original amendment.

Mr. VILAS. It is not in the amendment now.

Mr. TELLER. It is not in now.

Mr. VILAS. It was withdrawn.

Mr. HOAR. How are they to be appointed?

Mr. VILAS. Just as they are—four by the President.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the pending amendment be read, so that we may know exactly how it stands.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to try the sense of the Senate on the proviso which the clerks will find in substance near the bottom of the first column of page 1796 of the RECORD. I suggest the following modification of the language appearing there:

That the two cadets at large shall be appointed only on the written recommendation of the governor of the State from which they are accredited, and all cadets, etc.

I should like to move it in that shape. I think it would tend very much to popularize West Point and make it in the interest of the people to give the governors of the States the appointments at large. Probably the Senator from Wisconsin will accept it. Let the Secretary read it, substituting for the word "Senators" the words "governor of the State."

Mr. TELLER. The Senator proposes that the governor shall recommend the appointment?

Mr. HOAR. Yes; that it shall be made on the recommendation of the governor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That the two cadets at large shall be appointed only on the written recommendation of the governor of the State to which they are accredited, and all cadets, except those reserved to the President by general law, shall be made only on the written recommendation of the Representative of the Congressional district or Territory to which they are respectively accredited.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I should like to say one word in favor of the amendment which I have proposed. This is a provision for the appointment of the two cadets at large from each State. As the Senator from Wisconsin finally left it, that appointment is to be made wholly by the President. The Senators, I understand, are not proposed to be included at all. Now, it is pretty difficult to get to the President from distant parts of the country the qualifications of a boy 15 or 16 or 17 years old. Several Senators have thought it would create great jealousy in the House, or injure the Senate in the estimation of the country, if we insert this as a matter of patronage to ourselves; but I do not suppose any Senator cares about having the responsibility thrust on him of selecting one cadet. He will disappoint forty or fifty every time he gratifies one. On the other hand, I propose that the recommendation shall be made by the governor of the State. Take a State like Oregon, or California, or Nebraska, or any of the more distant States. It is very difficult for the President to know much about the boys whom he selects. So if we do not give the power of recommending to the Senators it seems to me it is very proper to have the President make the appointment on the recommendation of the governor.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is not for me to show any special solicitude for the Constitution of the United States lest the Senator from Massachusetts should neglect that time-honored instrument, but it does occur to me that as the cadets are officers of the United States there is an impropriety in requiring by law that the President of the United States shall appoint a particular United States officer only on the recommendation of the governor of the State. It strikes me that there is an incongruity, a mixing up of national and State functions that would be unwise even in so little a matter as this. I should defer to the mature judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts, but it seems to me that his hasty suggestion in this regard may fairly be open to constitutional objection.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will defer to the mature judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts. If he does, he will vote for the amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have made that promise, but I shall have a constitutional scruple all the same.

Mr. HOAR. The appointment in all cases comes from the President of the United States. The Constitution provides that officers of the United States shall be appointed only by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, but that Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of Departments, with a special provision regarding the officers of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. BATE. Do I understand that it is proposed the governor shall have the power of appointment, or that he would merely recommend the appointment to the President?

Mr. HOAR. The governor will only recommend the appointment to the President. It is just as much a compliance with the Constitution to have the President make the appointment on the recommendation of the governor of a State as the present arrangement for both the schools is that he shall make it on the recommendation of a legislative officer. Our constitutional theories keep legislative officers out of executive appointments, but still we allow the sense of the State or district to be conveyed to the President by the recommendation of the officer. It is not an improper thrusting into the national arrangement when you consult an executive of the State about the opinion of the people or the fitness of a particular person in his State.

The Constitution of the United States itself confers upon the executive of the State the great function of appointing members of this body when the legislature fails to elect. This is merely a mode by which the President is to be instructed in an official, authoritative, and formal way, in a manner which he can not get at without the instruction of somebody. So either this function is to be conferred upon the Senator, to whom it will be nothing but a plague, especially in great States like New York, Pennsylvania, or Virginia, or it is to be conferred on the President alone.

Now, how difficult, how annoying it will be for the President of the United States to make selections, especially from distant parts of the country, between the recommendations of the interested friends of these boys. The governor is on the spot. I think this little arrangement, if it were to be adopted, would do more to make West Point and the Naval Academy popular than anything else we could do. I do not find any difficulty at all either in the letter of the Constitution or in its spirit and arrangement.

Mr. CHANDLER. The fact still remains that these cadets are officers of the United States, and if the President is authorized to appoint them only on the recommendation of the governors of the States, then the governors participate in the appointment of every one.

Mr. HOAR. Has not the Representative the appointing power now?

Mr. CHANDLER. Then it is constitutional to require that when the President appoints a circuit judge or a district judge of the United States he shall have the nomination of the governor. The governor is on the spot; the Senator says the governor knows more about the citizens of the locality than the President does. It must be extremely awkward for the President to obtain his knowledge from the residence and locality, and so the governors of the States can suggest or nominate to the President the judges

more conveniently than if the President alone has the appointing power.

Mr. HOAR. The President of the United States knows personally and by observation the character of the great jurists of all the country, and I do not find in that suggestion the mature judgment of my honorable friend from New Hampshire. But let me ask the Senator if he is in favor of the present law applicable to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, that of the nomination made by the President of the United States only upon the recommendation of a Representative from a distance? If he is, he is violating a constitutional principle, if that is what this accomplishes, because he is thrusting a member of a legislative body into the function of an executive appointment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Since this debate has commenced I am inclined to think that the provision in reference to the naval cadets which does not exist with reference to cadets at West Point is unconstitutional.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is my impression. I have been convinced by the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts that it is unconstitutional. Now, it is a constitutional question, and it is not a question of convenience. If it were a question of convenience, then the same law might apply to the appointment of collectors of customs.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask whether it is also unconstitutional to provide that the President shall appoint through the Civil Service Commission to the Executive Departments?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think it is. I think that is a wise and proper limitation and regulation of the appointing power. It is not at all like a case where the President is prohibited from making an appointment except on the nomination of the governor of a State. If this rule is applied here it can be applied just as well to the appointment of a collector of customs. I am very certain that if the Senator from Massachusetts thinks this matter over for a day or two his views will be the other way.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me one sentence only, which is that the logic of the Senator from New Hampshire would make unconstitutional all the legislation in which he has himself so often participated, where we enact that the President of the United States may appoint a single named individual to the Army and then put him on the retired list or otherwise, as the case may be, which has been expressly adjudged constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Massachusetts knows very well that I do think it is unconstitutional, and have always thought so since the veto in the Fitz John Porter case, for Congress to pass a law, create an office, and then name the officer to fill it, whom the President must appoint if he appoints anyone. I did not know that the Supreme Court had decided otherwise. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts call that decision to my attention. Nothing is clearer in my mind; and I adhere to my constitutional opinions just as tenaciously as the Senator from Massachusetts does, and I yield them just as unwillingly to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States as he does. Nothing is more unconstitutional than to pass an act and make an office and name the man to fill it. It can not constitutionally be done by Congress, even if it is done as a matter of fact every day in the week.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, that is right. Both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts are right. But I have not heard the matter alluded to, which undoubtedly is true, that there is nowhere in the statutes of the United States now a provision of law that authorizes a Representative in Congress to nominate a cadet to the Military Academy. The custom of appointing the nominees of Representatives in Congress has grown up as a matter of courtesy on the part of the Executive, and it has obtained so long that the popular impression has gone out that the Representative in Congress has, as the phrase goes, an appointment to West Point or an appointment to the Naval Academy. So uniformly has that custom been carried out that by the——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, the provision is in regard to the Naval Academy. The Senator will observe when I put my question to the Senator from New Hampshire I selected the Naval Academy and not West Point for the very reason the Senator states, that it was only a custom in regard to the latter.

Mr. GRAY. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts to allow the governor to nominate two cadets at large from each State as an amendment to the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin is put upon the ground that it would popularize these institutions. I do not see how the nomination of the governor would tend to make the Academies more popular than the nominations by Senators or the nominations by Representatives.

If the provision of the Senator from Wisconsin should become a law, I presume that the Executive would establish the custom of nominating the cadets at large upon the suggestion of Senators from the different States just as they are nominated from the districts on the suggestion of the Representatives, and I should think that that would be quite as popular a way of getting at the sentiment of the State, and distributing the benefits of the Academies, as the nomination by a governor. I for one should prefer that method. I do not hesitate to say that it is not because I want patronage, for I do not want it, but I think it would be a better way, if the Executive should adopt it, to distribute the cadets evenly over the country, so that those who are appointed at large should be nominated upon the suggestion of the Representatives and Senators. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I ventured to suggest yesterday as an amendment to make this whole subject clear that the cadets at large from the State shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Senators from the State. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] accepted that amendment, and I thought it was a part of the present amendment before the Senate, but it has vanished somehow or other. Now, I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and after it is voted upon, if it is voted down, which I hope it will be, I shall offer the amendment which I tried to get adopted yesterday, providing that the appointments at large shall be made upon the recommendations of the Senators.

I shall do this for another reason. My friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], has constitutional scruples. He is restless enough now, and I do not want to add to his restlessness for the remainder of the session by having him carry around this about the Constitution. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. Now, in order to settle this question clearly, I wish the Senator from Wisconsin would accept the amendment that I intend to propose. I propose to amend the amendment so as to make the clause read:

That the two cadets appointed at large from each State shall be actual residents of the State from which they are appointed, and they shall be appointed on the recommendation of each of the Senators from such State.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ELKINS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin accept that amendment?

Mr. VILAS. I was about to say that if I were to express my choice as to recommendation I should prefer the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, believing that it would be better that the governor of the State should have this power of nomination than that Senators should take it upon themselves. But if it is objectionable that we shall limit it in that way (and I think that objection was recognized as having great force in the vote of the Senate which has just been heard), that objection exists just as much to this as to the other recommendation. If the Constitution vests the right of Congress to authorize the appointment by the President alone, then we execute that part of the Constitution only when we give the President power to appoint alone. If, on the other hand, we are to exercise the other branch of the constitutional authority and give the President power to appoint by and with the consent of the Senate, that can be done only by the consent of the Senate in proper manner.

This subject was thoroughly ventilated. The Senator from Nebraska considered it himself carefully and suggested, or at least agreed to, the idea that if two years' actual residence were provided for in the amendment as it is now proposed, there would be no risk of any abuse, and the amendment was left in that way, in accordance with his judgment. I really hope the Senator from West Virginia will not insist upon that idea.

Mr. FRYE. Before the Senator sits down let me ask him if he has the slightest doubt but that the two cadets at large will be appointed by the President, on the recommendation of the Senators, whether the provision in the bill says so or not?

Mr. VILAS. I have not the slightest doubt, and I called attention to-day to the fact—I think the Senator from Maine was not present at the time——

Mr. FRYE. No; I am running Pacific railroads now all the time.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator is very competent to run anything he sets his hand on.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VILAS. In just a moment. I was going to add that in the whole course of the existence of the statute which gives the power of appointment to the President of one in each Congressional district, it has invariably been exercised, with a very limited exception, which I explained, by the Representative in Congress from that district.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator, who has

stated that he has no doubt what the President will do, whether he feels authorized to speak for any President who may be in office after the term of the present Administration expires. [Laughter.]

Mr. VILAS. I have quite as much authority to speak for one as for the other.

Mr. ELKINS. It seems that the law regulating the appointment of cadets at Annapolis expressly states that it shall be done upon the recommendation of the Representative from the district. Now, why not make this provision plain and beyond a doubt? The Senator from Massachusetts offers his amendment upon the ground that the governors might make the recommendation. There is nothing in the amendment as it reads now to prevent the President of the United States from taking the advice of the governor of a State, and inasmuch as it is new legislation, not new in the sense that it offends the Appropriations Committee or the Senator from Maryland, but it is legislation germane to the pending bill—why not have it exact and definite while we are passing on the subject and not leave it in doubt? I will ask that the amendment that I offered to the amendment may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 9 of the amendment, after the word "appointed," insert:

Shall be appointed on the recommendation of each of the Senators from such State.

Mr. ELKINS. That is right.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

Mr. TELLER. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who, I see, is not in his seat. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. He being absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], which I should like to transfer, with the consent of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN], to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], as those Senators stood paired on another question the other day. I will vote "yea," if the Senator from Michigan will agree to that transfer.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That arrangement is satisfactory to me, and I vote "yea."

Mr. TURPIE (when Mr. VOORHEES's name was called). My colleague [Mr. VOORHEES] is detained at home by indisposition. I do not know how he would wish to vote on the pending question, and I therefore have not sought a pair for him.

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHOUP. Having a general pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], and he having informed me that he would vote "yea" on this question, I voted "yea," and will allow my vote to stand as recorded.

Mr. CARTER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON] and will transfer that to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I do not know how he would vote on this question if present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY].

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] that we transfer our pairs. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] and the Senator from Idaho is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. We may transfer our pairs and vote if the Senator desires.

Mr. DUBOIS. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. HARRIS. I vote "nay."

Mr. DUBOIS. I vote "nay."

Mr. TELLER (after having voted in the negative). I have voted. I now withdraw my vote and stand paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GORMAN. My colleague [Mr. GIBSON], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. CARTER. Being advised that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], with whom I paired the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], would vote the same way that the Senator from Maryland would vote, I wish to withdraw my vote so that the Senator from Colorado in charge of the bill may cast his vote.

Mr. TELLER. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE. I am assured by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] is absent unpaired, and would vote "nay." I therefore transfer my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] to the Senator from South Dakota, and will let my vote in the negative stand.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bate,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Wis.	Shoup,
Brown,	Gray,	Pasco,	Squire,
Cannon,	Hawley,	Platt,	Vilas,
Chandler,	Hill,	Proctor,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Lodge,	Roach,	Warren,
Elkins,	McMillan,	Sewell,	Wilson.

NAYS—27.

Allen,	Daniel,	Gorman,	Perkins,
Allison,	Dubois,	Harris,	Pugh,
Bacon,	Faulkner,	Hoar,	Stewart,
Berry,	Frye,	Lindsay,	Teller,
Butler,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Tillman,
Call,	Gear,	Nelson,	Vest.
Chilton,	George,	Peffer,	

NOT VOTING—38.

Aldrich,	Cockrell,	Mantle,	Sherman,
Baker,	Davis,	Martin,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Thurston,
Blanchard,	Hale,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Brice,	Hansbrough,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Burrows,	Irby,	Murphy,	Wetmore,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Palmer,	White,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Wolcott.
Carter,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Clark,	McBride,	Quay,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I offer an amendment the subject-matter of which has been considered by a standing committee of the body and was unanimously reported by the Military Committee. It is also recommended by the War Department. It will not add to the expense of the Academy, but will improve its discipline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after line 22, on page 7, the following:

The President of the United States is authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a director of gymnastics and instructor in swordsmanship at the United States Military Academy as a first lieutenant of infantry, with the rank, pay, and emoluments of officers of that class.

Mr. TELLER. I think on that amendment I shall have to raise the point of order that it is general legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I think there will be no discussion of the amendment, and I trust the Senator will withdraw the point of order. If there is discussion, I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. TELLER. I think I shall have to make the point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken and that the amendment is not in order.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the pending order may be informally laid aside in order that we may consider the pension appropriation bill. As I have reason to believe that this bill will occupy very little time, for my own convenience I shall be glad if the Senate will continue in session until it is disposed of.

Mr. CALL. I have no objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid

aside, and that the bill the title of which will be stated may be now considered.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations may be acted upon as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he intends to go on with the bill to-night?

Mr. ALLISON. I should prefer to do so, as it is a brief bill and is in accordance with the estimates, and only one or two slight amendments have been reported to it as it came from the House of Representatives. I think it will take but a short time.

Mr. VILAS. I think it will probably lead to debate, and we ought to have a brief executive session.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall consent to that also if we get through with the bill in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 9, before the word "whenever," to strike out "during the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation," and insert "that"; so as to make the clause read:

That whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been, or shall hereafter, be rejected, suspended, or dismissed, and a new application shall have been, or shall hereafter be, filed, and a pension has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided the evidence in the case shall show a pensionable disability to have existed, or to exist, at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seven hundred and fifty" and insert "eight hundred"; so as to read:

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons for services rendered within the fiscal year 1897, $800,000. And each member of each examining board shall, as now authorized by law, receive the sum of $2 for the examination of each applicant whenever five or a less number shall be examined on any one day, and $1 for the examination of each additional applicant on such day.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, to increase the appropriation for rents for pension agencies from $23,070 to $25,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the bill is passed I simply desire to occupy the attention of the Senate for a moment.

Had it not been for the fact that the Committee on Appropriations complained, and I think very justly, that appropriation bills were loaded down with amendments submitted by Senators during the consideration of those bills, I should have offered several amendments to this bill covering matters which I think ought to become law as speedily as possible; but in deference to the committee, and I think the sentiment that is prevailing in the Senate at the present time, I have withheld those amendments.

If I had supposed, Mr. President, that it would have done any good, I should have indulged in some observations by way of criticism of the administration of certain pension laws by the present Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions. I believe there are very great abuses in the Pension Bureau to-day. I think the Bureau means well, but the regulations are calculated to do injustice to worthy claimants under the laws of the United States. I have satisfied myself that such criticisms could do no good; that they would not change the regulations of the Bureau, and they certainly would not amend the laws; and for that reason I have felt it my duty to withhold such criticisms and to permit this bill to pass without any discussion.

That is all I care to say.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from New Hampshire has refrained from offering additional legislation on this bill. I think the only legislative provision in it is on page 2, which requires that hereafter whenever a claim for pension under the act of 1890 shall be rejected, suspended, or dismissed on account of any informality and a new application is made, the pension shall date from the filing of the first application. How much that provision will take from the Treasury I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will observe that in that clause there is a provision that the evidence in the case must show a pensionable disability to have existed from the time of the first application.

Mr. GORMAN. Still the provision is intended to correct one of the rulings of the Department, which may have been wrong or may have been right; and how much is involved in that provision I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I think it will be a very small amount. It certainly can not be a large one. There are few such cases; I think only a few; and it has seemed to some of us who take an interest in this matter of pensions that it is a very great injustice, and if the disability is shown under the act of June 27, 1890, to have existed at the time of the first application, that application should be treated as all other applications are under the other laws. It will amount to but a trifle.

Mr. GORMAN. It seems to be conceded that this provision is right, and otherwise I believe the bill is free from legislation, and I trust it will ever be kept free from legislation. The fact that this bill, which has been read here in the last five minutes and which the Senate will probably pass in five minutes more, contains an appropriation of $142,000,000 or $143,000,000, in round numbers, shows the rapidity with which we can dispose of the public funds.

When the act of 1890 was under consideration, I took it upon myself to discuss that act very thoroughly, or as thoroughly as I could, showing by the estimates that were made at the time that the expenditures of the Government on this account would reach from $165,000,000 to $175,000,000 per annum for a certain period. The expenditures did reach about $160,000,000 under the operation of the law; but under the strict construction placed upon the law by the last two Commissioners of Pensions, both of whom, I believe, served in the Union Army, these amounts have been cut down, unjustly, possibly, in many cases, but still there remains this budget of some $140,000,000. I stated at that time that under the operation of the McKinley revenue law, then in force, unquestionably the revenues of the Government would have to be increased or there would be a deficiency in the Treasury. It has so operated, and it hangs to-day over the Treasury like a pall; it can not be removed; it can not be lessened.

Mr. HAWLEY. Why not?

Mr. GORMAN. It will only be lessened as time passes on.

Mr. HAWLEY. Why can not the deficiency be provided for?

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator's friends have possession of the only power in the Government——

Mr. HAWLEY. Without a vote of the Democratic party to help us.

Mr. GORMAN. We can collect sufficient revenue. That question, however, I do not propose to discuss at this time. We shall reach it later, when the Senator from Connecticut with his party and his allies shall have presented the revenue bill, which I trust will be very soon. But, Mr. President, there stands the pension law. It can not be modified; it can not be repealed; the amount of the appropriations can not be reduced except by the administration of the Department; and it is here to swell up the appropriations of every Congress to half a billion dollars per annum.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word. I have no disposition to discuss the questions raised by the Senator from Maryland. If this pension appropriation bill be a pall that hangs over the Congress and the country, I for one am glad that it hangs over the Congress and the country. I believe we ought to provide very generously for the men who saved the Union.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the fact that there is, as I conceive, one other item of new legislation on this bill, and that is contained in the proviso in lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 3:

Provided, That the report of such examining surgeons shall specifically state the rating which, in their judgment, the applicant is entitled to.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think during the entire period of the administration of the pension laws in this country, until very recently, possibly until two years ago, the examining boards were required to state on their ratings what, in their judgment, they found the soldier entitled to, so that if a Representative or a Senator went to the Pension Bureau to examine the papers he could ascertain specifically what the opinion of the surgeons who made the personal examination of the soldier was as to the amount which, in their judgment, he was entitled to receive under the law. For some reason or other the Pension Bureau saw fit, a couple of years ago, I think, to instruct the medical examining board that they should not make any ratings at all; that they should simply state the physical or mental disabilities they found the soldier to be suffering from. The result is that if a man in public life, trying to serve his constituents, goes to the Pension Bureau and examines those papers, he is utterly in the dark as to

the opinion of the medical examining boards or the surgeons detailed to make an examination as to what the rating ought to be.

On the last appropriation bill I offered an amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, in precisely those words, but it was dropped out in conference. I am very glad to find it in this bill, because I think that we ought to insist that the custom which had been followed for so many years, which so helped to a correct understanding of the rates of pension, ought to be insisted upon, and that the Bureau should return to that very proper custom, which for some reason or other was discontinued.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that the amendment offered by him last year was retained. It is in the law of the current year.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had overlooked that. From the fact that it is in this bill I supposed it had been then dropped out.

Mr. ALLISON. It has not been dropped out. It has been carried into the present bill in the same phraseology as in the existing law.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eleven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1896.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Woodward Baldwin, of New York, to be Third Assistant Secretary of State of the United States, vice William Woodville Rockhill, appointed Assistant Secretary of State.

CONSUL.

Peter Victor Deuster, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Crefeld, Germany, vice Charles Jonas, deceased.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

P. A. Engineer John R. Edwards, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from the 5th of November, 1895, vice Chief Engineer Edward A. Magee, retired; and Asst. Engineer Josiah S. McKean, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 5th of November, 1895, vice P. A. Engineer John R. Edwards, promoted.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Louis S. Clayton, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the district of Annapolis, in the State of Maryland, to succeed Arthur Carter, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

POSTMASTERS.

Joseph M. Young, to be postmaster at London, in the county of Laurel and State of Kentucky, in the place of James I. Weaver, resigned.

Albert B. Dresser, to be postmaster at Needham, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, his commission having expired January 21, 1896.

E. M. Thompson, to be postmaster at Curwensville, in the county of Clearfield and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Jacob B. Way, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Louis Schalk, to be postmaster at Rawlins, in the county of Carbon and State of Wyoming, in the place of Richard C. Magor, removed.

J. M. B. Petrikin, to be postmaster at Greeley, in the county of Weld and State of Colorado, in the place of Le Baron B. Willard, whose commission expired February 16, 1896.

Clinton O. Talcott, to be postmaster at Glastonbury, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in the place of William E. Gates, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Martin V. B. Smith, to be postmaster at Morrison, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois, in the place of John Grierson, whose commission expired December 16, 1895, John Clark, whose nomination was sent to the Senate December 20, 1895, having since died.

Scott W. Carney, to be postmaster at Downs, in the county of Osborne and State of Kansas, in the place of John W. Pugh, whose commission expired February 8, 1896.

Robert M. Todd, to be postmaster at Halstead, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas, in the place of John Lehman, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

Samuel W. Gould, to be postmaster at Skowhegan, in the county of Somerset and State of Maine, in the place of Forrest Goodwin, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

George R. Fitzsimmons, to be postmaster at Reading, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan, in the place of Alfonzo Schafer, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Henry C. Howard, to be postmaster at Lake Crystal, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota, in the place of Henry Humphrey, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

George D. Muggah, to be postmaster at Cloquet, in the county of Carlton and State of Minnesota, in the place of William A. Wright, sr., whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

J. Wheelock Marsh, to be postmaster at Forest Grove, in the county of Washington and State of Oregon, in the place of William H. Crosley, whose commission expired January 27, 1896.

Joseph A. Bing, to be postmaster at Jeannette, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Edwin J. Vinton, whose commission expired February 16, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1896.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Jasper N. Morrison, of Missouri, to be judge-advocate.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

To be captain by brevet.

Second Lieut. Robert Goldthwaite Carter, Fourth Cavalry, brevet first lieutenant, United States Army (now first lieutenant, retired).

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. John Thomas Martin, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Charles Dodge, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. William Abram Mann, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Millard Fillmore Waltz, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. William Robert Dashiell, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Eli Alva Helmick, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Charles Grant French, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Robert Weldon Rose, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William Clarence Bennett, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Cavalry arm.

Candidate Corpl. Alvord Van Patten Anderson, Troop B, Sixth Cavalry, to be second lieutenant.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Patrick S. Nagle, of Oklahoma Territory, to be marshal of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma.

Matthias A. Smalley, of Ohio, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Ohio.

MEMBER OF MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. William Henry Heuer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Missouri River Commission.

POSTMASTERS.

William C. O'Leary, to be postmaster at Hancock, in the county of Houghton and State of Michigan.

Frederick H. Fowler, to be postmaster at Walpole, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Luther Clarke, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Eureka and State of Nevada.

William R. Odor, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri.

William O. Luce, to be postmaster at Caro, in the county of Tuscola and State of Michigan.

William M. Dooley, to be postmaster at Highland Park, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn February 18, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

John Clark (since deceased), to be postmaster at Morrison, Whiteside County, in the State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 18, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

KANSAS CITY, FORT SCOTT AND MEMPHIS RAILROAD.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5382) to authorize the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company to extend its line of railroad into the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company be, and the same is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad and telegraph line from a point on the south line of the State of Kansas near the city of Baxter Springs to the town of Miami, in the Indian Territory: *Provided*, That work shall be commenced on such construction within a reasonable time from the approval of this act, and completed so as to have trains running to the town of Miami within twelve months from said date.

SEC. 2. That before said company shall enter the territory of any nation or tribe of Indians for the purpose of constructing its line of railroad and telegraph it shall have the written consent of the general council of such tribe thereto, which shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That said company shall have authority to acquire a right of way for its line of railroad and telegraph from individual allottees upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the parties, and in cases where the l ne of said railroad runs through the lands of minor allottees the judge of the United States court for the district wherein said lands are situated shall have power to regulate the manner, terms, and conditions whereby such right of way shall be acquired.

SEC. 4. That in cases where a right of way can not be acquired from adult allottees by agreement between the parties, the same may be acquired by proceedings in condemnation in the United States court for the proper district, or before the judge thereof in vacation, according to the provisions of chapter 58 of Sanders and Hill's Digest of the Laws of Arkansas, 1894, respecting "eminent domain," so far as the same can be made applicable.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

Add to the bill:

"*Provided*, That in addition to the compensation herein provided for said railroad company shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the tribes through whose lands the said railroad may be constructed, the sum of $50 per mile for each mile of road constructed through tribal lands which have not been allotted to individual Indians. Said company shall also pay, so long as said lands are owned and occupied as tribal property, to the Secretary of the Interior, the sum of $15 per annum for each mile of railway it shall construct through the said Territory. And the money paid the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act shall be apportioned by him among the several tribes in accordance with the number of miles of road that may be constructed through each reservation: *Provided further*, That Congress shall have the right, so long as said lands remain as tribal property, to impose such additional taxes upon said railroads as may be deemed just and proper for their benefit, and the like power may be exercised by any State or Territory which may hereafter be formed."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FORT KLAMATH HAY RESERVATION.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5286) providing for the disposal of lands lying within the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands lying within the boundaries of the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation, not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, shall be open to the operation of the laws regulating homestead entry: *Provided*, That the disposal of said lands shall be made in tracts not exceeding 80 acres to any one bona fide settler thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, let us have the report read to see what the nature of the case is.

The report (by Mr. ELLIS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5286) for disposal of Fort Klamath hay reserve, submit the following report:

The body of land sought to be restored to the public domain by this bill consists of about 2,000 acres. It was originally set apart as a hay reserve for the use of the United States military post at Fort Klamath, Oreg., which fort has long since been abandoned and the post vacated. The land embraced within the reserve has been transferred from the jurisdiction of the War Department to that of the Department of the Interior. Under existing law the land is not subject to homestead entry.

It being desirable that occupation by bona fide settlers shall be encouraged as to said lands, and in consideration of the fact that the Commissioner of the General Land Office, under date of January 23, 1895, recommended as follows:

"After further consideration of the subject, and influenced by a wish to secure for actual settlers every possible facility for acquiring homes, I may state * * * that I now amend the report of September 12, 1894, and recommend that the two small reservations under consideration be divided into 40-acre tracts, and that the lands be disposed of under the homestead laws."

Of the two small reservations referred to, the Fort Klamath hay reserve is one.

By the bill reported, which was drafted by the Department, it will be seen that 80 acres is made the limit of homestead entries on said tract instead of 40 acres, and your committee so report, and recommend the passage of the bill without amendment.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill why the recommendation of the Secretary has been disregarded as to the extent of the tracts into which this reservation is supposed to be divided?

Mr. HERMANN. I will state that the Department concluded that 40 acres would be entirely too small a limit to induce settlers to occupy the land, inasmuch as there is a large body of the public land still unoccupied in that region and subject to settlement, and deemed 80 acres to be a sufficient and satisfactory limitation.

Mr. DINGLEY. We are not able to hear the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. HERMANN. I was just answering the gentleman from Tennessee that the Department, which had formerly recommended the distribution of this land in 40-acre tracts, had concluded that 80 acres would be necessary to induce settlers. That is the present recommendation.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman please explain why this reservation does not come under the McRae bill passed in the last Congress?

Mr. HERMANN. It is owing to the fact that the lands have not been surveyed. If they were surveyed they might come under the provisions of that bill and be offered at public sale to the highest bidder. But the Department thought, inasmuch as the body of land is very small in area, that it would be much better to induce settlers rather than offer the land at public sale, and therefore the bill is drawn in its present form to meet that opinion and wish of the Department.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I understood the recommendation of the Department to be that this is to be divided into tracts of 40 acres.

Mr. HERMANN. Yes, two years ago a report was made which embraced 40-acre lots, as suggested by the Department. Since then the Department has concluded that 80 acres would be a proper limitation, and so report.

There is no objection in the Department; it has been carefully considered, is desired by the people in the surrounding country, and meets the unanimous report of the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

F. L. TAYLOR.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill No. 1889, granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of Capt. F. L. Taylor, late of Thirty-fourth New Jersey Volunteers, and to issue to said officer a certificate of honorable discharge as of December 2, 1864.

Mr. MARSH. Is there a report accompanying this?

Mr. STEELE. Let us have the report.

Mr. LOUD. I think that this is one of those bills which should have its consideration in the Friday night session.

Mr. OTEY. It does not come, under the rules of the House, in the class of bills to be so considered. This comes from the Military Committee.

Mr. LOUD. Is it to remove a charge of desertion or to correct a military record?

Mr. OTEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOUD. We consider these bills in the Friday night sessions.

Mr. OTEY. This is not for desertion, for an order of the President reinstated this officer in 1866. He was dismissed because he resigned in December, 1864.

He was a private and served three years in the Army, and was promoted to the position of captain. He is mentioned favorably many times in the Records of the Rebellion, and stood high in the estimation of his officers and among the people in his own State, which is New Jersey. Every member from that State, I believe, knows of him. He belonged to the Thirty-fourth New Jersey. He asked for leave of absence December, 1864, which was declined, and he then asked either to be given leave of absence or a dismissal from the Army.

He was dismissed. Seeing his hasty action, he then asked the President to revoke the order, which the President did. He has stood on the rolls ever since until 1894, drawing a pension of $12 a month. In 1894 the Secretary of the Interior decided that the President had no right to make such an order. This bill is simply ratifying the order of the President of the United States, and I hope no gentleman will object to it. It is not a question of a pension at all.

Mr. LOUD. If this matter can properly come before a Friday night session, I shall object; otherwise not.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman states that it is not a bill to remove a charge of desertion. Bills removing charges of desertion properly come up for consideration at the Friday night session.

Mr. OTEY. This is unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEELE. I have no objection. I do not care for the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MARSH. Let the report be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. PARKER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864, have had the same under consideration and respectfully recommend that the same do pass.

This is a bill to correct the military record of Captain Taylor and to issue to him an honorable discharge as of December 2, 1864. He served gallantly as private, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain for nine months in 1862-63 and as captain in 1863-64. While on detached duty he applied for leave of absence (his wife being very ill), and on its refusal asked to resign or be dismissed, and was dismissed. He was still in service and promptly applied to be restored, pleading hasty action on his part and long and meritorious service, and the President revoked the former order and granted an honorable discharge January 29, 1866.

So matters rested till October, 1894, when, on call of the Pension Department, it was decided that the President had no power to revoke the dismissal. His small pension of $12 a month was stopped April, 1895.

The committee are of opinion that the action of the President should be ratified and the disgrace removed from this meritorious officer.

The facts appear in the records hereto annexed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. OTEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA AND RED MOUNTAIN RAILWAY COMPANY, WASHINGTON.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, granted to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, a right of way to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the center line of said railway across the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, commencing at a point at or near the Little Dalles on the Columbia River, in Stevens County, in said State, and running thence in a northerly direction by the most feasible route to the international boundary line between the United States and British Columbia, together with all the rights granted to railroads by the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads a right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875; and for the purposes of this grant and the construction of said railway all the provisions of said act are hereby declared to be applicable thereto to the same extent as though the lands in said reservation were open to settlement and sale.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HYDE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DIFFERENCE OF EXCHANGE BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be directed to inquire what effect the difference of exchange between gold-standard and silver-standard countries has upon the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States, and report by bill or otherwise.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this inquiry, although it may cause, perhaps, considerable trouble, but it is an interesting question, and I have no objection to entering upon the inquiry.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that this resolution is prompted by the action of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, which in resolutions recently passed called the attention of the country and of Congress to the invasion of manufactured products from Oriental countries, particularly Japan, and called upon Congress to prevent this disastrous competition with American industries.

In California we have felt the effect of various phases of Oriental competition. You all recollect the agitation over the Chinese immigration. At first the opposition of California to Chinese immigration was regarded as a coarse expression of race prejudice. That sentiment was indulged by the higher intelligence of the Pacific Coast at first, and was almost unanimously the sentiment of the East. Gradually the entire country came to the conclusion that race preservation demanded that legislation should be secured that would cut off the ruinous competition of Chinese labor in California and adjoining States. We found there that whatever industry they attacked they absorbed. They attacked the industry of fruit culture and absorbed it. They attacked the industry of cigar making and absorbed it. They attacked the industry of boot and shoe and slipper making and absorbed that. Wherever they attacked an industry they absolutely drove out the competition of American labor.

That coast now finds itself threatened with a new form of Oriental invasion, not the invasion of the laborer from China or Japan, but an invasion of the products of the cheap labor of the latter country. Recently an American firm of high standing in Japan has established an agency in San Francisco and is engaged in selling all the various products of Japanese manufacture. There is scarcely anything that is manufactured in America that is not included in the catalogue of Japanese products—watches, bicycles, rugs, carpets, cotton, woolen, and silk goods, and almost every other form of product. They have been put upon the market at such low prices as to absolutely defy competition from the production of American manufacturers. Bicycles are put down and sold in San Francisco at $12 apiece, and I am told that they are equal to the bicycles made in this country.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman state whether, if this bill should pass the House and go over to the other body, a free silver coinage amendment would be attached to it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I hope so. [Laughter.] But this is simply a resolution of inquiry, not a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Nevada that he is now considering this without the consent of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask the privilege of making an opening statement, Mr. Speaker, and by unanimous consent I will proceed.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let the resolution be read again.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I shall only take a few moments.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the gentleman can proceed.

Mr. STEELE. Let us have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution again.

The resolution was again reported.

A MEMBER. That ought to go to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. NEWLANDS. With the consent of the House, I will proceed with my statement. The bicycle is laid down at San Francisco at $12.

Mr. MERCER. Can the gentleman from Nevada assure the House definitely that bicycles are made in Japan now?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am so informed.

Mr. MERCER. I do not think any bicycles are made in Japan at present. In Yokohama there are at least 400 bicycles, or were last June and July, in use; a great many of them in use by Europeans and by Japanese, but I saw no Chinaman riding a bicycle there. Most of the bicycles I saw were of American make. I do not think that any bicycles are made in Japan; but I think, as the gentleman says, they soon will be made there, and they can make them for a song. I met Mr. Butler, a citizen of San Francisco, at Yokohama, with a watch made at Osaka. It was a gold-filled case, and I was told that they were made for about a dollar apiece. The Japanese can make anything, no matter how complex, providing they have an original to copy. As imitators they have no equals and the future has in store for us great danger from Japan, if we do not revise our tariff along Republican lines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for having stated a part of what I intended to state, but nearly all the newspapers of San Francisco are filled with various items relating to this new invasion, and great apprehension is felt there regarding it. In reference to the bicycle, it is stated by the newspapers to be one of the products of that country which is now being sold in San Francisco; and if the newspapers are to be credited the bicycle is manufactured in Japan for $12 in silver. It is sold in San Francisco for $12 in gold. The seller takes that $12 in gold, turns it into $24 in silver, pays the cost of production, $12 in silver, pays the freight and duty and has a profit of $4 or $5 upon each bicycle. There is the same competition with reference to matches, lamps, hats, brushes, rugs, and other products of that

country. The fall in exchange between silver and gold has thus resulted in doubling the efficiency of the cheap labor of silver-standard countries in its competition with the labor of gold-standard countries. We have a tariff wall which in a measure protects us from the cheaper labor of European gold-standard countries, but no tariff wall can be made sufficiently high to keep out the products of silver-standard countries, which, measured in gold, cost only one-half of what they used to. The only relief is to be found in combined tariff and financial legislation, the former raising the tariff wall a little higher and the latter increasing the value of silver by increasing its use, and thus increasing or doubling the labor cost of silver-standard countries, as measured in gold. We are now feeling the competition of European countries. The competition of the Orient is now about to attack our manufactured products, as it has for years attacked our agricultural products. I think the Ways and Means Committee will devise legislation which will deprive that competition of half of its effectiveness.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, is this a request for unanimous consent to address the House or to pass the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not object to the passage of the resolution, but there are others who would like to have measures considered.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the RECORD will show that leave was given by the House for the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. STEELE. I think not.

The SPEAKER. No objection had been made, and question had not been put.

Mr. McMILLIN. It was peculiarly stated; the gentleman asked permission to make a statement. I believe the Chair did not put it, but the gentleman said, "If there is no objection, I will proceed with my statement." I think the RECORD will justify my statement.

Mr. DINGLEY. As long as there is no objection to the resolution, I submit to the gentleman whether it would not be well that it be immediately passed; and then if there is to be any discussion, it can be had when a report is made. If the gentleman were to proceed, it would very likely call for some reply. I merely make this suggestion, as there is no objection to the inquiry.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not wish to take up the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations will finish the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill during the day. I would be glad, for the purpose of expediting business, to have the unanimous consent of the House that when finished the bill may be reported to the House by handing it to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois requests permission, instead of reporting the legislative appropriation bill to the House, that the committee may be permitted to report it by handing it to the Clerk.

Mr. CRISP. Points of order being reserved.

The SPEAKER. Points of order being reserved. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 6249) making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CAPT. FRANCIS A. BEUTER.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill that I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to correct the muster of Francis A. Beuter, that he be recognized as captain from the 4th day of September, 1863, in the Fourth United States Colored Troops, cavalry.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury pay to the said Francis A. Beuter his pay as captain of cavalry from the 4th day of September, 1863, to the date that he was mustered and paid as captain in the Fourth United States Colored Troops, April, 1864, deducting all payments on account of any other sums heretofore paid.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. This bill has been reported by five Congresses favorably, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let us have the report read.

The report (by Mr. COOPER of Texas) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter, submit the following report:

This claim was presented to the Committee on War Claims of the Fifty-third Congress, and was favorably reported upon by that committee.

A careful investigation of the facts involved brings your committee to the same conclusion as that reached by the committee of the last House. A copy of said report is hereto attached and made a part of this report.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. That simply adopts another report and sheds no light on the question at all. If it is all, I shall have to object.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I ask for the reading of the preceding reports which were adopted.

The preceding reports were read, as follows:

[House Report No. 329, Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

The facts out of which claim arises will be found stated in the House report of the Committee on War Claims of the Fifty-second Congress, which is hereto appended as part of this report.

Your committee adopt the said report as their own, and report back the bill and recommend its passage.

—

[House Report No. 1984, Fifty-second Congress, first session.]

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2033) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter, submit the following report:

Your committee adopt the report of the Committee on War Claims of the Fifty-first Congress on this case, a copy being hereto attached, and recommend the passage of the bill.

—

[House Report No. 230, Fifty-first Congress, first session.]

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5037) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter, report as follows:

The facts out of which the bill for relief arises will be found stated in House report from the Committee on War Claims of the Fiftieth Congress, a copy of which is hereto annexed for information.

Your committee adopt the said report as their own, and report back the bill and recommend its passage with the following amendment:

In line 6 strike out "first" and insert in lieu thereof "fourth."

—

[House Report No. 2036, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of Francis A. Beuter, submit the following report:

This officer claims he was ordered and commissioned by General Banks in 1863, in September, as a captain and recruiting officer; that pursuant to that instruction he went into the Teche country to recruit for the Fourth United States Colored Cavalry, and avers that he did report to General Weitzel, as ordered, and was by him ordered to take 25 recruits to New Orleans the latter part of September, 1863, and while on duty at New Orleans a few days was ordered to proceed to Texas, which he did, and reported to General Washburn; participated in the capture of Fort Esperanza in November, 1863, and was detailed by General Washburn as commissary of subsistence, and served as such until December 25, 1863, and was then sent with General Fitz Henry Warren to Indianola, where he was assigned to duty by General Warren in command of two companies of infantry to act as post commander. In about two weeks he was relieved by two regiments. The duty at Indianola had been very dangerous and difficult to perform. He was then sent in command of 20 scouts to gather the products of the country and provide subsistence for the forces in Texas until March, 1864, when he was ordered to New Orleans as captain in the Fourth Regiment of United States Colored Cavalry, which occurred in the early part of April, and received pay only from about the 8th of April, 1864; that his petition reciting his service, and the fact that he was not mustered until April 8, 1864, is marked Exhibit A.

He files a letter from the War Department, dated May 6, 1876, marked Exhibit B, giving date of muster.

Also copy of letter of Maj. Gen. N. P. Banks, stating that he believes this claimant received a provisional commission in 1863, and served under said commission as alleged; that he was a competent, faithful officer, and deserves consideration; marked Exhibit C.

Also a certificate of G. Weitzel, major of engineers, that this applicant did report to him for duty under a commission from General Banks, for the purpose of recruiting, and shortly was returned to New Orleans; marked Exhibit D.

The affidavit of Capt. A. J. Whittier, late of Washington, showing the identity of the officer making this claim, that he is the identical Franz Beuter who was a captain in the Fourth United States Cavalry. It is marked Exhibit E.

The commission, orders, and other papers referred to in client's petition are lost. He relies upon the five papers, Exhibits A to E, as proof of his allegations.

The report is submitted, recommending the passage of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be nothing in that report as a foundation for this bill except the claimant's own statement of his case. I do not wish to stand in the gentleman's way in having this matter considered, but I will ask him to consent that the bill be held over, and in the meantime I will take occasion to examine the certificates instead of occupying the time of the House by having them read now. The report, it will be observed, seems to be founded exclusively on the man's own statement.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, there is the report of the Secretary of War and the report of General Banks, who employed this man——

The SPEAKER. The statement of the gentleman from Tennessee is equivalent to an objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST-OFFICE AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the House for the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to sit during the ses-

sions of the House until the Post-Office appropriation bill is completed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The next thing in order is the call of committees. The call rests with the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The Clerk proceeded with the call.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. There were some bills reported favorably by the Committee of the Whole at the last Friday evening session. Would it be in order to have them considered under this call?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

The call of committees was completed.

HARBOR OF MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ask for its present consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the House with such information as he may have in his possession as to (first) the plans of the proposed project for the establishment of a channel of the depth of from 20 to 21 feet in the harbor of the city of Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin; (second) the approximate cost of such project; and (third) whether the same could not be advantageously adopted as a needed addition to or extension of the existing Government improvements at that harbor.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to whom was referred House resolution No. 159, respectfully report that they have had said resolution under consideration, and recommend that the same be amended by inserting the words "Senate and" before the word "House" in the first line of said resolution, and that as so amended said resolution be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin for the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation from the gentleman as to whether the adoption of this resolution would not put the House in a position to make a direct appropriation, which would not be permissible under the present law?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It might, Mr. Speaker; but it must go the Senate and be there considered and passed before that result can follow. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors recommend the adoption of this resolution by the House because of the very great importance of this project. The data are now in possession of the War Department. The improvement involves nothing but the extension of the piers. No additional survey is required, and it simply remains for the Government, through the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, to send the data to Congress for its information. I will state further that when the gentleman from California suggested the other day that to obtain this information did not require a joint resolution, he had evidently forgotten the law of 1894, which follows the law of 1892, and requires that no such information as that here called for shall be given except in pursuance of a resolution of Congress, not a resolution of either House alone, but a resolution of Congress. That law has been construed by the War Department—and I do not think it required any special construction—to mean a resolution passed by both Houses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, of course the passage of the law to which the gentleman has referred was intended to prevent the very object that he seeks here to attain. The gentleman seeks to bring before Congress a proposition empowering Congress to go beyond the existing law and to appropriate directly for this work. Without the adoption of this resolution he would have to get an order for a survey at this Congress and then wait two years before the work could be proceeded with. Now, there are a great many projects of this general character which are urgent, and if the House makes an exception in this case, possibly there are many others that will stand upon the same footing. Therefore, I assume this to be a dangerous precedent for the House to set. Personally, I shall not object to the consideration of this resolution, my object being merely to present the gravity of the question to the House as it strikes my mind.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the gentleman from California that there are a great many projects of this character that are equally urgent and requiring immediate appropriations.

Mr. LOUD. We have two in my own State.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have heard such claims made before the committee, but I think it is the sense of the committee that only very few of these matters are at all urgent, and it is only the extreme importance of this project that has impressed itself upon the committee and has resulted in a unanimous report for the passage of the resolution at this time.

I do not understand that that law was passed to prevent all measures of this kind from being put on their passage. The law, as I understand, was passed to prevent undue haste in such matters. But if, when a matter of this sort is presented to a committee of either House, it is, in their opinion, of sufficient importance to warrant the immediate passage of the measure, there certainly is no reason why it should not be promptly acted on by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LOUD. I will only say that there are two similar projects in my own State which I hope the House will also adopt.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have no doubt that, if they are of equal importance, the committee will decide in their favor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The House accordingly proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The question being taken on the amendments reported by the committee, they were agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to resume the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. HULL in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the pending amendment, offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER].

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 25, page 20, after the word "dollars," insert:
"And it is hereby made mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to make said purchase and distribution as was done in the years prior to 1895."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the proposition which has been offered as an amendment to the amendment just read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars" in line 25, page 20, insert:
"Distribution to be made in the same manner as was done by the previous Secretary of the Department of Agriculture."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment last read is not properly an amendment to the substitute, because it applies only to the distribution of seeds.

Mr. RAY. I did not understand the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment last read is not in any sense an amendment to the substitute, as the substitute applies to the purchase of seeds, while the other proposition relates to their distribution only. The question of the distribution of seeds has not yet been reached. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, is another amendment in order at this time, or should it be offered as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute is in order.

Mr. RAY. Then I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, in line 20, strike out "as required by law," and, after the word "dollars," in line 25, insert:
"And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, directed, and required to expend the said sum in the purchase, propagation, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and is authorized, empowered, directed, and required to expend not less than $130,000 of such sum in the purchase, at public or private sale, of valuable seeds, the best he can obtain, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which the same are to be distributed as hereafter stated; and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] to the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee for a moment I will endeavor to have this matter distinctly understood. I do not understand that there is any difference of opinion among the members of this House on the subject of having seeds purchased and distributed substantially in the manner that has been followed in years gone by. Of course we all understand that the present Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to the purchase and distribution of seeds. It is therefore the purpose of this committee and of the House, as I understand, to adopt such legislation in this bill, or to guard this appropriation of money in such a way, that it shall be mandatory upon the

Secretary of Agriculture to purchase these seeds and distribute them.

I have therefore carefully prepared an amendment to this subdivision of the bill, which I have shown some of the best lawyers of the House, and we all agree that if this amendment be adopted it will compel the Secretary of Agriculture to expend this appropriation in the purchase and distribution of bulbs, seeds, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and that the law will be mandatory and compel him to purchase these seeds, cuttings, etc., at public or private sale, and to purchase and distribute the best he can obtain, and to distribute them, as heretofore, through Members of Congress and Senators, reserving for his own personal distribution one-third.

I think this result is what we all desire. There is nothing indefinite about it. There is nothing in the provision of the amendment that reflects in any manner upon the Secretary of Agriculture. That is not the intention of the proposition. The only purpose and effect will be to make it mandatory upon the Secretary to expend the money appropriated in the purchase and distribution of such seed as he can find, and he may purchase them at private or public sale. The amendment provides that the purchase shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States.

I trust the substitute that I have just presented will be adopted, because I feel satisfied, after consultation, as I have already said, with some of the best lawyers of the House, that it will be mandatory upon the Secretary, and will secure to the members of Congress their quota of seed, and secure at the same time to the farmers in the United States what we all desire and what they so much need.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire, if the gentleman will yield to me a moment, to call his attention to a matter which he seems to have overlooked. While I am not opposing his amendment, the section of the Revised Statutes, 527, at present stands in the way. That statute provides definitely how the Secretary of Agriculture shall make the purchase of seeds, bulbs, cuttings, etc. His amendment, as the gentleman stated it, provides that the Secretary shall purchase the best seeds available, etc. Now, he does not repeal section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows——

Mr. RAY. I know how it reads, and suppose every member here does.

Mr. RICHARDSON (continuing)—

The purchase and distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country.

Now, the gentleman's amendment is inconsistent with the section of the Revised Statutes which defines that he shall purchase rare and uncommon seed, while the amendment provides for the purchase of the best quality of seed. Therefore a Secretary of Agriculture may see fit, if he chooses to do so, to assume this position, that the rare and uncommon seed are the best quality, or might refuse to execute the law because in his judgment the best quality of seed would not be rare or uncommon.

Now, we have got to get rid of those words in the statute by some means. They must evidently be eliminated from the law if we expect to accomplish anything by the amendment proposed here, because this statute provides that the seed shall be limited to rare and uncommon. They may not be, as I have just said, of the best quality. If the gentleman wishes to rid us of that provision he had better move to repeal section 527. It can be repealed, and if the gentleman will offer his amendment either to amend or repeal that section of the statute, I think he will accomplish a good deal in the direction contemplated.

Mr. McRAE. I ask consent to offer an amendment——

Mr. OGDEN. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. RAY. I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAY. I ask unanimous consent to occupy the floor for a moment to hear a question I understand the gentleman desires to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. OGDEN. Do I understand the amendment of the gentleman from New York is to reduce the appropriation from $130,000 to $80,000?

Mr. RAY. Not at all; my amendment does not reduce the appropriation provided in the bill.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent to have a vote on the amendment that I now present. I admit that it is a change in the existing law and subject to a point of order, but the disposition of the committee appears to be strong to amend the law, and if the amendment can be adopted the paragraph in the bill now under consideration can be easily changed to meet what appears to be the decided wish of both sides of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are two amendments pending, but the amendment can be read for information.

Mr. McRAE. My object in sending it up is to have it considered prior to the other amendments and not to interfere with them. I ask consent that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by providing that section 527 of the Revised Statutes be amended so that it will read as follows:

"SEC. 527. That purchase and distribution of vegetable seed and flower seed, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable and adapted to general cultivation."

Mr. McRAE. If we can adopt this amendment, then we will have taken the first step to change the original law and will be legislating in this bill with reference to the proposed change, and will have no difficulty by reason of the trouble that grows out of the limitation in the present law, "rare and uncommon seed." What is not "rare and uncommon" to the Department may be to many of our people who want to experiment with varieties not heretofore had by them.

What the people want is seeds that will increase the yield and quality of the products, as well as "rare and uncommon" products—seeds that can be adapted to general use throughout the country and made of benefit to the great body of farmers. We want to excite a spirit of rivalry among our people who till the soil.

I ask consent to have the amendment voted on now, not to interfere with the amendments that have already been offered.

Mr. RAY. If there is no objection to adopting the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas, I should be pleased to have it done, of course. But it seems to me that there is no necessity for it and it seems to me, further, that the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is without any particular force for this reason: The amendment which I sent to the Clesk's desk and had read——

Mr. SWANSON. Will the gentleman object to its being read again?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if the words "improved and valuable seeds," on pages 21 and 22, are left in the bill, the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be worthless. The Secretary can take shelter under that phraseology.

Mr. RAY. The trouble with gentlemen in discussing this amendment is that they have not read it, nor have they listened carefully to the reading of it. I ask your attention for a moment while I read it, so that you can all hear, and then let me make a suggestion. In this Agricultural appropriation bill we make an appropriation of money—$130,000—for the purchase and distribution of seeds, etc. The bill as reported from the Committee on Agriculture says: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, "as required by law."

Now, those words refer of course to the law now in the Revised Statutes; and if we leave those words in this bill the whole matter, with any amendment that we might make to it, will be referable to the Revised Statutes and controlled by existing law. But we have the right to appropriate money for the purchase of seeds and to direct the purchase and distribution of seeds with the money so appropriated entirely independent of that section of the Revised Statutes to which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more in which to explain this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to continue for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Now, the very first proposition contained in my amendment, and which was read from the Clerk's desk, is that we strike out the words "as required by law." Then this appropriation in the Agricultural bill will not be referable at all to the Revised Statutes and will not be controlled by the section referred to.

Mr. SKINNER. Will the striking out of the words "as required by law," in the opinion of the gentleman, repeal section 527 of the Revised Statutes?

Mr. RAY. In effect, so far as this appropriation is concerned, it will repeal it. The amendment will render that section nonapplicable. There is no question about that as a matter of law. This bill will be the latest expression of the legislative will, and will control.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then if you leave the bill as it now stands, with the words "valuable and improved seeds," will not those words nullify your amendment?

Mr. RAY. No. Now, let us look at this amendment offered by me as it reads:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and empowered, directed and required, to expend the said sum in the purchase, propagation, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and is authorized and empowered, directed and required, to expend not less than the sum of $130,000 in the purchase, at public or private sale, of valuable seeds, the best he can obtain, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned and in which

the same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated; and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States.

Now, that is an explicit provision of law which goes with and surrounds and controls the appropriation and expenditure of this money, and I assert here that if any executive officer of this Government, be he a Cabinet officer or a lesser officer, should refuse to carry out that provision in the spirit and the letter he would be subject to impeachment. And even the present Secretary of Agriculture would not undertake to defy the expressed will of this Congress. If that amendment is adopted, Mr. Chairman, there will be no reference to existing law heretofore enacted, but this provision and this appropriation of money will stand here as an independent act of Congress, the direction to purchase applying simply to this appropriation and continuing during one year and no more, and the law will be mandatory, and will accomplish, I believe, just what this House desires to accomplish. And, as I stated, before undertaking to submit the amendment to this committee I carefully prepared it and submitted it to the judgment of several of the best lawyers in this House, and they all concurred with me in the opinion that if adopted it would carry out the intent and purpose of this House as expressed upon this floor; that it leaves no possible excuse for the Secretary of Agriculture should he refuse to comply with its provisions. This provision, if adopted, will not be disregarded. It is plain, explicit, and commands the Secretary to purchase and distribute the best seeds he can obtain—"valuable vegetable and flower seeds."

Mr. SKINNER. I believe that the discussion now going on is with respect to my amendment. As I understand, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] is an amendment to my amendment, and the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] is a substitute for both.

Mr. MCRAE. If the gentleman will allow me, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered and adopted to precede the others. I see nothing inconsistent in mine and the one you offer. One is permanent law and the other is only for one year.

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, we are all aiming at the same purpose. We all have the same desire in respect to this matter. What I want to do, if it can be done in a parliamentary way, is to accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], and then also to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], as they are not inconsistent. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas repeals section 527, whereas the amendment of the gentleman from New York only does so by implication.

Mr. TRACEY. I desire to inquire if it will be in order to offer a substitute for the pending amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] is offered as a substitute.

Mr. MCRAE. I should like to have my request submitted to the House. If no one objects that will dispose of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] to object.

Mr. PICKLER. No; the gentleman from New York does not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are two amendments pending to this part of the section, but the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] offers another amendment to another part of the section entirely.

Mr. MCRAE. I ask unanimous consent to submit it. I do not offer it as a substitute. I think we ought to change the general law, and to do this I have asked to have the amendment I offer inserted in the bill as an independent paragraph. I ask the Chair to submit my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the two pending amendments be held in abeyance and his amendment be acted upon. Is there objection?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I object.

Mr. TRACEY. I would like to offer the substitute I hold in my hand, because I feel it reaches the root of the whole trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer his amendment as a substitute for the two amendments?

Mr. TRACEY. I offer it as a substitute for the two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order then.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," line 25, page 20, add the following:

"And such purchase and distribution by the Department of Agriculture shall include such seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture in the United States, and section 527 of the Revised Statutes is hereby modified to that extent."

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in reference to the substitute that if adopted it simply reaches and will cure the evil beyond question. There seems to be a universal disposition among the members of the House to direct the purchase and distribution of seeds, but section 527 of the Revised Statutes stands in the way and will stand in the way so long as it is neither modified nor repealed. Now, when that language is attached to the provision of the law already in it this section 527 of the Revised Statutes will be modified to that extent. The second clause of that section is already precisely such as the language adopted by this substitute. It only refers to the first clause, which provides that only such seed as are rare and novel shall be included in the purchase of seed. This provides that the seeds, plants, trees, etc., shall all be put upon precisely the same plane; and if the substitute should be adopted there would be no further trouble about the execution of the appropriation. That is all I have to say.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] has presented the most practical amendment that we could possibly get in this bill, and I hope this House will adopt it. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas would be pertinent at the end of the paragraph, and would be proper. Of course it would be subject to a point of order; but I hope the gentleman from Arkansas will present his amendment at the end of the paragraph providing that section 527 of the Revised Statutes shall be modified to this extent, and then with that exception I hope the committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCRAE. I do not care where it comes in, but if the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill makes the point of order against it, of course it can not be adopted. I stated in the beginning that it was subject to the point of order, and if he objects to it of course it is useless to present it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York covers the case entirely and completely. The trouble with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER] was that he made it mandatory, but yesterday there was left in it the words "as required by law." Now, the law is at present mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase "rare and uncommon seeds." The Secretary says he is unable to find "rare and uncommon" seeds. He has refused to make purchases this year for this reason. So if you leave those words in there, "as required by law," you may put in any other additional amendment that you see proper and he could ignore it practically by saying that he could not get rare and uncommon seed, so that no amendments would be valuable to secure what this House desires unless that provision "required by law" is eliminated.

Now, an appropriation bill can repeal existing law. It can repeal a general statute. It has been held repeatedly if an appropriation bill and the general statute disagree, the provisions of the appropriation bill are followed as the last act of Congress. If you eliminate "rare and uncommon" and make it mandatory, then the Secretary of Agriculture can not fail to purchase the best seed he can get. So I can not see how this can be held to be objectionable, or rather subject to the point of order, because it is an amendment to carry out an existing purpose, and it has been repeatedly held that wherever an amendment to an appropriation bill carries out a purpose already in progress it is not subject to the point of order. Now I desire, in conclusion, to say that I am earnestly in favor of this appropriation for seeds. I can not conceive of a small appropriation of money that has resulted in more general good to the country.

I know that in my own State, in the counties in my own district, some of the best samples of wheat, of corn, and of vegetables of every kind and description have been obtained from seeds furnished by the Department of Agriculture. Now, if you only get in a county one good quality of wheat, it pays for the entire expenditure incurred in distributing the seed to that county; if you get in one county a good quality of lettuce or onions or any of the vegetables the country is well repaid for the small expense of distributing them. We can not afford to do away with this means of supplying the farmers throughout the country with valuable seeds.

In Virginia we get wheat that has been grown in Missouri and elsewhere, and the transplantation makes it better, and we get clover in the same way. In the same way we get all kinds of vegetable seeds. I repeat, that numerous farmers in my district have told me that the very best qualities of seed wheat, seed corn, seed oats, and seed clover, and vegetables have been obtained through this distribution. The expense of the distribution is comparatively small, and it has resulted in great good, and we can not afford to give it up on account of the expense, because the benefits which accrue from the system far exceed in importance the cost. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this appropriation for the distribution of seeds; I am in favor of compelling the Secretary of Agriculture to make the distribution, and I am not willing that it shall be left to his discretion. I regret that he has, as I think contrary to law, refused to purchase seed for distribution this year. But I am glad to see that this House will not only restore but increase the appropriation for this purpose. The farmers are deserving of every consideration and aid possible at the hands of the lawmaking power. They shall ever receive my aid and support.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. How many amendments are pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments and a substitute for the amendments.

Mr. McRAE. Would another amendment be now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute would be in order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER]—not a substitute for it, but an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRACEY] has offered a substitute for the two amendments.

Mr. KEM. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion relative to this distribution of seeds, but there is one point which has been overlooked, so far as I am aware, and that is that by the time this bill becomes a law it will be an absolute physical impossibility to distribute these seeds in time for them to be planted this year.

Mr. STEELE. What of it?

Mr. KEM. What of it? Simply that you throw this money away.

Mr. SWANSON. This bill provides for the next fiscal year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph be limited to twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph be limited to twenty minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DINGLEY. Before that request is acted upon, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know just what amendments are pending? Some explanation of some of the amendments may be desired.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending and one substitute for the two amendments. Is there objection to the request that all debate on this paragraph close in twenty minutes?

Mr. PICKLER. I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. There is an amendment pending to the original text and an amendment to the amendment, and then a substitute for it. Now, is there any amendment offered to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the substitute has yet been offered.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire, before consenting to the request to limit the debate, whether any member who has views opposed to the pending proposition can have an opportunity to be heard. Apparently I am the only member who entertains such views, and if I may have a few minutes of the twenty I shall not object to the request to limit debate. I should like to have an opportunity of saying, in a very few words, what I think is the objection to these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. When the question of limiting debate is determined the gentleman can be recognized.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. It is this: The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER] offered the original amendment. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], as I understand, does not propose to amend that amendment, but offers his proposition as a substitute for that amendment. Am I right in that?

Mr. RAY. That is the way I intended it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Because the amendment of the gentleman from New York would not apply to the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina as an amendment, being perfect and complete in itself. I understand that the gentleman from New York offers his proposition as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina, because if it be adopted it will take the place of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand it that way. The Chair understood that the gentleman from New York offered it as an amendment to the amendment, and the Chair asked the Clerk if the two propositions would go together, and the Clerk said they would.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Chair will see if he examines them that they will not.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to report the several amendments pending.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to accept the substitute of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may accept the substitute of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. McRAE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the proposition which I submitted a moment ago as an amendment to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRACEY] to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] was offered previous to that of the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. But it was offered to another part of the text.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman did not offer it as an amendment, because he stated distinctly that it was a substitute. Now, I move the amendment which I had read a while ago as an amendment to the pending amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be in order, but this is the first time the gentleman has offered it in that way.

Mr. PICKLER. Let that amendment be reported.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it, we have now the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] to which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] offers an amendment. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas be reported.

The amendment was read, as follows:

That section 527 of the Revised Statutes be amended so that it will read as follows:

"SEC. 527. That purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable, and adapted to general cultivation."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, for that I understand the gentleman from Missouri offers a substitute.

Mr. PICKLER. Let us have that substitute reported.

The substitute was read, as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 25, page 20, add the following: "And such purchase and distribution by the Department of Agriculture shall include such seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture in the United States, and section 527 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to that extent."

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Chairman, while I believe that the language used in the substitute I offered is better than that which has been adopted, yet, since the same result is reached, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be limited to twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the limitation on debate is agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that some other member of this committee would present the other side of this question. Apparently the amendment of the gentleman from New York and that of the gentleman from Arkansas find favor with this Committee of the Whole. It seems to me that we ought to pause and consider in what direction we are moving. We are attempting to change the long-considered policy of Congress upon very slight grounds indeed. Because the Secretary of Agriculture has not conformed to the ideas of this House with respect to his duty under the law, the House undertakes to change a policy which is the only one under which seeds have ever been distributed by the Congress of the United States.

Up to the present time we have simply distributed what have been called rare and uncommon seeds for the purpose of encouraging agriculture generally, not for the purpose of benefiting any individual farmers. Under the law as it has existed heretofore, the farmer, when he received his seeds from the Government, was an equal partner in the enterprise. He did not receive the seeds as a gratuity or as a matter of charity. He joined in an experiment, the materials for which were furnished him by the action of Congress. He was acting not for his own benefit simply, but for the benefit of the agricultural interests of the whole country.

Now we propose to change this policy. We propose to take ordinary merchantable seeds, such as can be obtained anywhere in any seed store throughout the country, and to distribute them pro rata through the Congressional districts of the country. I believe this is a policy which is wrong and vicious—one which, as a precedent, will open the way to legislation which we shall all regret.

Why, I ask gentlemen of the committee, should we distribute seeds to farmers rather than nets to fishermen, lasts to shoemakers, or tools to the mechanic? This is a first step—a slight one, I agree—in the progress toward mere communism. I believe it ought not to be adopted. See what it leads to. The proposition here is to distribute $130,000 worth of ordinary merchantable seeds to the farmers of the country. That will not give every farmer in the land a share of these seeds.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. MOODY. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Is not the Government now distributing "fish to the fishermen" as seed fish? Have we not a Fish Commission here doing that very thing?

Mr. MOODY. Ah, we are cultivating the fish industry; we are not distributing "fish to the fishermen." The fishermen of the country go out and catch their own fish. The Fish Commission is for the purpose of propagating fish for the benefit of the whole country. So anything which Congress may do to help the propagation of rare and uncommon seeds helps the development of agriculture in this country, and I am in favor of it. But I am not in favor of going further. I do not believe the farmers of this country want such a measure as this. They certainly do not in my own State. They do not want to approach the Government of the United States in the attitude of beggars.

Why, sir, if you make this distribution as proposed, it will necessarily be unequal. There is no possibility of distributing these seeds with any equality throughout the various Congressional districts. They will reach only the favored few. I believe the proposition ought not to pass. I know, as I think members of the House know, that the protest I now undertake to enter will not be of the slightest avail. I do not set up my views against the views of this House by making any point of order. I only ask members to stop and consider in what direction they are going when they undertake to distribute indiscriminately seeds to farmers in our various Congressional districts. For one I enter my protest, unavailing though I know it will be. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to notify the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] that any seeds are rare which are foreign to the localities where they are to be used.

Mr. MOODY. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will permit me a word. I agree with him in the statement he has just made, and I do not agree with the construction of the law as adopted by the Secretary of Agriculture. But because the Secretary of Agriculture has made a mistake in the performance of his duty there is no reason why this House should initiate a vicious policy of legislation which may end we know not where.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, one reason why, in my judgment, this appropriation is proper, and why I shall vote for an amendment to make it impossible for the farmers of this country to be deprived of an opportunity of improving the culture of their lands and the quality of their crops, is this, that the farmers of this country produce all the wealth of our land. When the farmers prosper the fisherman, let me tell my friend from Massachusetts, gets a good price for his fish; the manufacturer gets a good price for his wares; the merchant collects his debts; the lawyer, the doctor, the minister, and followers of all other vocations are well paid. When the farmer is prosperous, smiling peace and plenty bless all parts of our land.

What has Congress ever done for the farmer? I answer nothing. What have the farmers done for this country and for Congress? I answer everything; and yet every act of national legislation since 1861 has been against the farmer; and those beautiful farm homes, from which sprang nearly all of the great and good men of this country, have ceased to exist and in their place we find the cabin of the laborer toiling for a mere subsistence.

Now they propose to stop the distribution on the part of the Government of the few seeds that heretofore have been given to the farmers, and which costs this great Government only about $100,000, which appropriation has done more than any like sum expended for any other purpose. This distribution of rare seeds has done much to develop and improve the agricultural interests in all parts of the land. It is not local in any sense of the word. It applies to all parts of the country.

All the great men, Mr. Chairman, of our country were reared on the farm. Back in the early history of our Government you will find that all of our great people were farmers. Putnam, Wayne, Stark, Morgan, Lincoln, Greene, Wolf, were all reared on the farm; Grant and Lincoln, in later days, were reared on the farm; Lee and Stonewall Jackson——

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. WHEELER. A very short one.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Did these men come as the outgrowth of the distribution of seed from the Federal Government, or by the exercise of their own intellectual acquirements?

Mr. WHEELER. They came as the outgrowth of wise Democratic legislation for the farmers and all agricultural interests of this country; an advantage they never have had since the Republican party came into power. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman, in the course of his remarks on this subject, has used the word "charity," as applied to the farmers of this country. The farmers of our country would spurn that suggestion. After all that Congress has done in the interest of navigation, in the interest of railroads, steamship companies, banks, and for the wealthy of the land, when it is proposed to set aside a little sum and distribute a few seeds to farmers that are not accessible to them, an appropriation that would cost less than 2 cents for each person benefited, the farmers of this country are to be insulted by saying that it is a charity given to them by the Government.

It does not make, I wish to say, a great deal of difference which of the amendments now pending ought to be adopted. One muss be adopted, and we must, before leaving here, frame a law to strong and clear that no future Secretary of Agriculture can go to an Attorney-General and get an opinion which will justify him in declining to execute it. I do not wish to unjustly criticise the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that he has endeavored to inaugurate wholesome and beneficial reforms and exact rigid economy in his Department. I do not, however, approve all his opinions. I see it stated in an interview published a short time ago that he desires to have the purchasing power of the American dollar the greatest possible—greater than the purchasing power of any other dollar in the world—and that can only mean that he wants to see agricultural products in this country sell for the least possible price. I am opposed to any such doctrine. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MOODY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD].

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I do not wish to be understood as indorsing the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture in so far as he deems it his province to make law instead of conforming to the law, but when the gentleman from Massachusetts spoke as he did upon this question, I have considered it to be my duty to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the last two or three days I have received resolutions adopted by farmers of my district protesting against this indiscriminate use of seed on the part of the Government. The farmers there are organized into a club, and at a meeting recently, about a week ago, discussed this very question, when this resolution of protest, which I now call to the attention of the committee, was the result. Therefore there is at least one district in the United States where the farmers unanimously protest against this indiscriminate use of seed on the part of the United States Government.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I want to inquire if there were any wholesale seedsmen in that meeting?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. There are no wholesale seedsmen in my district.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman in which of the wards of New York City these farmers had this meeting? [Laughter.]

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, I will answer my colleague by stating that my district not only includes more than half of the territory in New York City, but it also includes a very large section of the farming district in Westchester County, and that it was the farmers of that farming section, who are organized into this club, who passed these resolutions of protest.

Mr. SHERMAN. It must have been some farmers who wanted to sell their farms for city lots.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the twenty minutes allowed for debate on this amendment expired?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman has about four minutes remaining.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. I would like to state that my district adjoins the district of the gentleman who last spoke [Mr. FAIRCHILD], and I have just received a very urgent letter from the hat manufacturers there, stating that owing to Democratic legislation on the tariff their workmen have got to go to farming and they want seeds to begin with. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I simply wish to say on behalf of the committee that we very gladly accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] as amended by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE]. That will be perfectly satisfactory and I think will correct the evil.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask the gentleman to yield a minute to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it right and proper to publish the letter of the Attorney-General in which he gave his opinion to the Secretary of Agriculture. I ask permission to print it as a part of my remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The following is the letter of inquiry which the Secretary sent to the Attorney-General:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1895.

SIR: An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and approved March 2, 1895, provides, under the head of "Division of Seeds, purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, etc., $180,000."

Can the Secretary of Agriculture legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to wit, seeds "rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by fre-

quent changes from one part of our country to another," under authority of the act of March 2, 1895?

Would it be proper and lawful for the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of the verbiage of the act of March 2, 1895, and the wording of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, "to advertise for proposals to furnish the Department of Agriculture seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants, rare and uncommon to the country, and for such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another," reserving the right to reject any and all bids?

Respectfully, yours, J. STERLING MORTON,
Secretary.

Hon. RICHARD OLNEY,
Attorney-General.

The following is the reply of Attorney-General Olney:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, D. C., April 20, 1895.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge yours of the 18th instant, in which you call my attention to a portion of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and approved March 2, 1895, and running as follows: "Division of Seeds, purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, etc., $130,000."

You make two inquiries, as follows:

"Can the Secretary of Agriculture legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to wit, seeds 'rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent change from one part of our own country to another,' under authority of the act of March 2, 1895?

"Would it be proper and lawful for the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of the verbiage of the act of March 2, 1895, and the wording of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to advertise for proposals to furnish the Department of Agriculture seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants 'rare and uncommon to the country, and for such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another,' reserving the right to reject any and all bids?"

1. The seeds purchasable under the act of March 2, 1895, are limited to those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, there being no reasonable ground for claiming that the act of March 2, 1895, operates, or was intended to operate, as a repeal of the earlier statute.

2. If not obligatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, trees, etc., conformably to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, it is certainly competent for him to make the purchases conformably to said statute, the right to reject any and all bids being reserved. But the form of the question is such that I think it proper to call attention to the fact that while seeds purchased must be such as are "rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," the trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings to be purchased are such "as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interest of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States."

Respectfully, yours, RICHARD OLNEY,
Attorney-General.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Then the Secretary of Agriculture expressed his conclusion in the following words:

No seeds or plants have been purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1896, for the reason that after using the legal method provided in section 3709 of the Revised Statutes for securing the same none were found which came within the requirements of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, which determines the character of the seeds and plants to be so purchased.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. That amendment has been accepted by myself and by the committee.

The amendment of Mr. RAY, as amended by the amendment of Mr. MCRAE, was agreed to.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to offer another amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] if his request to limit debate applied simply to the two amendments pending, or to the entire paragraph.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Simply to the two amendments then pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair was that all amendments to the paragraph were included in the request.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The request applied only to the amendments then pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will then direct the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] to be reported.

The amendment of Mr. PICKLER was read, as follows:

Strike out the word "thirty," in line 25, page 20, after the word "and," and insert the word "fifty"; so that it will read: "$150,000."

Mr. PICKLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment ought to prevail. There are 25 or 26 more members in this House now than there were when the sum of $130,000 was adopted as the proper sum for the distribution of seeds among members. I believe it has been developed by debate in the House here that we are almost unanimously in favor of this distribution, and the sum of $150,000 ought to be appropriated, instead of $130,000, in order to give us the proportionate amounts.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PICKLER. I fear the gentleman is not sincere. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, yes, I am.

Mr. PICKLER. Even if we appropriate $150,000, it will give us a less amount of seeds for distribution in the future than there was at the time when this amount was fixed. It will emphasize the proposition that we mean to stand by the farmers in the distribution of these seeds, and I believe our farmer constituents will appreciate that.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to know of the gentleman from South Dakota if the market price of seeds has not declined as rapidly as the price of silver, and kept pace with the increasing population of the country?

Mr. PICKLER. Well, I believe the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and has full jurisdiction of that question.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, we do not know about it, and we refer to South Dakota for information.

Mr. PICKLER. I believe this amendment ought to carry. I believe each member ought to have as many seeds to distribute now as at any time in the past. It will require this much and more to give it to us.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think there is any real need for that increase. I think the present amount is ample. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has well said, seeds are a great deal cheaper than they were. The sum of $130,000 has satisfied the wants of this House heretofore, and I do not see any good reason for the increase.

Mr. PICKLER. It has satisfied us like we have been satisfied with a good many other things——

Mr. WADSWORTH. But there are some people who are never satisfied.

Mr. PICKLER (continuing). Because we could not do any better. I think it is cheeseparing. I do not think it can be emphasized too often that, seemingly, Congress always wants to claim something at the expense of the farmers. I am not saying that for buncombe, either. [Laughter.] But it seems to me that there ought not to be objection on every little matter like this, while if it was for building a ship or a gunboat, or for fortification, Congress would not hesitate to appropriate a million dollars; but if it is something that may be of some benefit to the farming community there seems to be an opposition to it. I do not think the chairman of the committee ought to object to this. The gentleman from Massachusetts a few minutes ago thought we ought to do something for fishermen.

Mr. MOODY. Oh, no, indeed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Which fisherman?

Mr. PICKLER. We are propagating fish of new kinds and sending out the best new varieties of fish, and the best food products for fish, to benefit the people who are engaged in that industry, and I say that we ought to give the same advantage to the farmers that you are trying to give to these fishermen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLSON. What does the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota provide?

Mr. PICKLER. It increases the appropriation from $130,000 to $150,000.

Mr. COLSON. I was going to offer an amendment to make it $160,000.

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. OGDEN. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 13.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. I know it displays ignorance, but I should like to ask the Chair whether when it is the purpose of any member to offer an amendment to strike out any portion of the section about to be read should it be done now or at the close of the reading?

The CHAIRMAN. It should be done at the close of the reading. It has not been reported to the House yet. The Clerk will report the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of seeds, purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, $130,000.

An equal proportion of two-thirds of all seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents or be directed and mailed by the Department upon their request; and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein alloted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of May shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the Department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the

Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of improved and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to the Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and tthiry-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January or at the earliest practicable time thereafter.

Mr. COUSINS. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, in line 12, page 22, after the word "thereafter," the following:

"*Provided also*, That no part of the sum appropriated in this bill for seeds shall be available or payable until the sum appropriated for seeds in the act approved March 2, 1895, entitled an act "making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896" shall have been expended for seeds; *And provided further*, That no part of the $8,000 for compensation of the Secretary of Agriculture provided for in this bill shall be available or payable, except $25, until the said Secretary shall have expended for seeds the amount appropriated in said act approved March 2, 1895, and shall have purchased and distributed the seeds provided for in said act."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, of course, I should rather hear the gentleman's point of order before I offer any remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask if the chairman of the committee made a point of order upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. He reserved the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to reserve it if he had not.

Mr. COUSINS. I should prefer that the gentleman from New York make known his point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COUSINS. I do not know whether the gentleman desires to be heard or not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire a decision?

Mr. COUSINS. If the Chair is ready to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved with the understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture was willing that the gentleman from Iowa should discuss his amendment; but if the gentleman insists upon a decision being made, the Chair is ready to make it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I reserved it for the purpose of allowing the gentleman to make his remarks.

Mr. COUSINS. I do not wish to use this or any other opportunity for the purpose of making remarks if the Chair has already reached a conclusion. On the point of order, I want to hear what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from New York to raise the point of order that it is new legislation. The Chair would have to hold that it is new legislation, and that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. RAY. If I may be permitted to make the suggestion, I presume that after the gentleman from Iowa shall have concluded his remarks as to the merits of his amendment my colleague from New York, chairman of the committee, will probably withdraw his point of order; and therefore I would suggest that we hear the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I first reserved the point of order, and then the gentleman stated that he was willing that there should be a decision. Now, I will still reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is perfectly willing to consider the point of order reserved, but the gentleman said he desired a decision.

Mr. COUSINS. It is very evident that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture considers the amendments that have been already adopted here as ineffectual to produce the result desired by the committee. It is evident to my mind that the amendments already adopted would not secure to the farmers the seeds which Congress thinks they ought to have.

It is evident to my mind that from the beginning the Secretary started out upon a conspiracy to defeat the law that was passed a year ago. My object in offering this amendment, providing that the amount appropriated in this bill shall not be available until the amount appropriated in the last bill, approved March 2, 1895, has been expended, is to take care that this money shall not be tied up in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, since it has become apparent to Congress that it can not be safely intrusted to his hands. If you will examine his report made to the Senate, you will find on the first page that $1,610 of the money appropriated by the last Congress for seed has already been used by the Secretary of Agriculture to defeat the appropriation. [Applause.] He constituted a commission, he suborned referees and paid them $500 apiece for the purpose of defeating the legislation which appropriated $140,000 for seeds, and he used $1,610 of that same money to defeat that legislation and the objects thereof.

The Secretary shows that in his own report. So far as this talk is concerned about not being able to procure new and rare varieties of seeds, the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture himself is the very best evidence in the world that this system of seed distribution has been highly beneficial; because if, within the very short period that it has been in operation, we have reached such a splendid state of advancement that there is absolutely no new or rare variety of seeds to be found that can be advantageously distributed from one part of the country to another; if within so short a period the system has produced such splendid results, certainly, as I have said, the testimony of the Secretary to that fact is the very best evidence of the advantages of the system of seed distribution. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, we find in the letters addressed to him in answer to his circular inviting proposals that all but three of them do offer to furnish new and rare varieties. We find in letters addressed to the Secretary as early as July last some of the greatest seed houses of the country offering, and specifying in detail, the kinds of new and rare seeds that they can furnish; and we find, also, that while that correspondence was in progress, while the negotiations were still going on, this suborned and corrupted commission of his, upon which he spent $1,600 of the money appropriated by Congress for the purchase of seeds, were replying to individual correspondents that "there will be no seed distributed this year."

They let the cat out of the bag before the time arrived for them to do so, showing that they had been instructed by the Secretary of Agriculture that whatever propositions might be made, whatever detailed and specified statements and offers of new and rare kinds of seeds might be furnished, all of these proposals were to be held by the commission as not meeting the requirements of the Secretary's circular; and when he was informed that the seeds which he asked for had not yet ripened and that it would require at least a month longer to get them in a condition to be furnished, his corrupted and suborned commission answered the gentleman proposing to furnish those seeds that there would be "no distribution of seeds this year."

Thus it appears that after the Congress of the United States has directed the purchase and distribution of seeds and has appropriated the money therefor, and after the President of the United States has indorsed that law and that appropriation, along comes a mere Secretary of Agriculture and, by the grossest usurpation known in recent times to the annals of official violence, annuls the law. This servant of the people takes the great Government of Washington and Hamilton, the House and the Senate, and the "strong" President in his lap, reads them a lecture on the subject of their own particular business, then pats the House of Representatives on the head, strokes the gray beard of the Senate, scowls at the President, and says: "My children, you shall not have any seeds in this year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, not if the Secretary of Agriculture knows himself." [Great laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, my object is to secure that which we are entitled to. The attitude of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture leads me to believe that he thinks that the amendments already adopted will not attain that object, and I do not think they will.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not admit the correctness of the gentleman's statement, and I do not see on what ground he bases it. I am perfectly satisfied with the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. RAY] as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], and I believe that it will accomplish the desired result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

By unanimous consent, the time of Mr. COUSINS was extended five minutes.

Mr. COUSINS. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if he will not withdraw his point of order against this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir; I will not.

Mr. COUSINS. Then I understand that the chairman of the committee wants the Secretary of Agriculture to keep on drawing his salary while he is violating a law of Congress. I do not think the gentleman's point of order against my amendment is good. The amendment that I have offered reduces the salary of the Secretary, and it has always been held to be in order to offer, on an appropriation bill, an amendment which reduces the salary of a public officer. It was one of the rules of Congress that any amendment to an appropriation bill reducing the salary of a public employee was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the rule of the last Congress, but not of this.

Mr. COUSINS. But there is no rule against it in this Congress, and it has been the common law of all Congresses.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. COUSINS. There has never been any rule against that position. Rule XXI of the last Congress was merely an embodiment of all previous rules on this subject. There has never been a different rule in any Congress. There is no different rule in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is.

Mr. COUSINS. If there is I should have been very glad to hear the gentleman cite the rule. I do not think there is any different rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rise to a point of order. Has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled, but has consented to hear the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then there is nothing before the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COUSINS. This does not change the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture. It merely regulates the expenditure of an appropriation which is being made in this bill. The law provides what the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be just as it provides what my salary shall be; but it does not provide when the money shall be available. This amendment merely pertains to and regulates an appropriation which is carried by this bill. It changes no existing law, none whatever. It does not propose to reduce or to increase the salary of this officer; it merely says the appropriation shall not be available or payable until the officer has complied with the law of this Congress. That certainly seems to me to be in accordance with the rules of order pertaining to the pertinency and germaneness of amendments. The amendment merely delays the operation of the bill so far as this appropriation is concerned until such time as this officer has complied with the law. I repeat, it does not change existing law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why does it not change existing law? The present law provides that the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be payable monthly. This amendment provides that it shall be paid when he does a certain thing. That is a change of existing law.

Mr. COUSINS. The amendment does not undertake to say when his salary shall be paid. This bill carries an appropriation to pay this salary, and the amendment proposes to regulate the expenditure of that appropriation. I will ask the gentleman whether, if the bill did not contain an appropriation for this salary, it would fail by reason of being a change of existing law? Would the bill be invalid because it did not provide for the salary which the law gives this officer?

Mr. LACEY. There is one point which perhaps the gentleman has not sufficiently considered. Of course he is aware that last August, when the English Parliament stopped £100 of the salary of their secretary of war because he had not spent the money which had been appropriated for cartridges, the ministry at once resigned. Does not the gentleman fear that some such result might follow the passage of this amendment? [Laughter.]

Mr. COUSINS. And that was in a kingdom, too. We are living under a republican form of government. It has always been supposed that our form of government consisted of three departments, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial; but we know now that it consists of the legislative, the executive, the judicial, and the Secretary of Agriculture, who supervises and looks over matters of legislation and determines what shall be effectual in the end. At present this is not a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"; it is evidently a government of J. Pierpont Morgan and J. Sterling Morton. That is the way it looks. [Laughter and applause.]

Sir, when some citizen of the United States may undertake hereafter to violate some law of this Government, and we have on record this performance of one of the heads of Departments violating this law of Congress, and asking, as he did in the Post of February 9, that he be impeached—defying Congress to impeach him—what will be the answer of this humble citizen when you undertake to compel him to obey the law of your country?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should like to know why the gentleman, in enumerating——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to know what question is pending before the Committee of the Whole—whether it is the question of order, or whether it is the amendment on its merits?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish to know why the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COUSINS], in enumerating the different departments of this Government, omits as part of the organization the gentleman from Ohio who is now acting as Comptroller of the Treasury, Mr. Bowler? [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is there an amendment pending, or a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COUSINS] has not exhausted the second five minutes to which he was entitled by the consent of the committee.

Mr. COUSINS. I have finished, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this is clearly out of order, and will, for the information of the House, ask the Clerk to read the clause of the rule bearing upon the subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is therefore constrained to hold, under this rule, that the amendment is not in order.

There is a decision in the Fifty-first Congress covering precisely the same point. This amendment would, if adopted, change a salary, payable monthly, and make it contingent on the beneficiary doing something or refraining from doing something, and therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the first seven lines and the first two words of the eighth line on page 21; and beginning with the word "provided" on page 21, line 10, down to and including the word "Department" in line 18, page 21; and beginning with the word "provided" in line 2, page 22, to and including the word "after" on page 22, line 12.

Mr. PICKLER. On that amendment I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order upon it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I will state briefly——

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order upon the proposed amendment.

Mr. MOODY. If I can have about three minutes, then I am perfectly content that the committee should take a vote on the amendment or reject it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there is not a man in this House who desires less than myself to seem discourteous to anybody. But we are spending a great deal of valuable time over this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. It is a very important bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a very important bill, and for that reason we ought to be spending the time on those things that are pertinent, and not on those things that are out of order. We ought to be considering the bill where we can hope to accomplish some good, and I feel compelled to insist on the point of order.

Mr. MOODY. Very well, Mr. Chairman; I desire to be heard for a few moments on the point of order.

In order to present the case clearly to the Chair, I think I ought to explain to the committee and to the Chair precisely the effect the amendment would have if adopted.

This amendment, as you have observed, strikes out from the opening paragraph of the provision under consideration all that part of it which provides for the distribution of any of the seeds authorized to be distributed under the bill by Senators and members of the House of Representatives, and leaves the distribution of the seeds under the bill to be provided for in the section on the preceding page to be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, it provides that he shall distribute three-thirds of the seeds instead of two-thirds, as the bill now contemplates.

The amendment has one conspicuous merit, or rather a conspicuous difference, from any other amendment that has been presented, to which I ask your attention. I do not think that anybody is in favor of it but myself, but I do want the House to consider it, and I ask the members to take home and consider for further action the suggestions that I shall make.

I was much struck with the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina on yesterday afternoon, that he had not time to answer his mail, filled as it was with requests for the distribution of seeds. Now, we are called here to consider the great questions of public policy pertaining to the Government of this country; questions of financial reform; questions as to what shall constitute the currency of the country; questions of our foreign policy; questions of national defense; international questions, and similar duties that I might enumerate almost without stopping. I say, therefore, that the duty of distributing these seeds, and the duty of distributing the publications of the Government in the shape of books and pamphlets, ought to be in the hands of some officer who has the ability to understandingly and intelligently perform it. I would be unable, I admit, to distribute the seeds intelligently. I doubt if there are many members here who could do so. I shall do the very best I can to get the seeds allotted to me distributed into the hands of those who can use them to the best

advantage. But the very best that I can do, or that any member of the committee can do, would be poor, idle, and futile compared with the distribution that could be effected by sending them through some officer of the Government selected for that purpose.

A word more, inasmuch as the committee has done me the honor to listen to the few remarks that I have made, and then I will close. It is upon an entirely different branch of the subject: the distribution of public documents. I came here, as most of you did, no doubt, thinking that the publications of the Government were despicable and of no use to anybody in the world.

I had been in the habit of seeing them thrown into the corners of newspaper offices and into waste baskets. I came here and examined the list of publications, and I found they were publications of the greatest value to the people of this land. The difficulty is with the system of distribution. The man who wants books upon navigation gets books upon agriculture, and the man who wants books upon agriculture gets documents relating to foreign affairs. It has been suggested by those who have charge of the publications of the Government that we ought to change the system and see to it that the benefactions of the Government, whether in the way of seeds or publications, should be so intelligently distributed that the people would get all the good possible from that publication and distribution.

Mr. Chairman, one word more. The difficulty is—it is suggested to me and I do not repeat it to approve it—that the people of this country will look at the action of this committee, believing that they have in mind not so much the cultivation of the soil by the farmers as the cultivation of the farmers by their Congressmen.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MOODY. With great pleasure.

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if a member of Congress does not know, and if it is not his duty to know, the people of his district and their occupations and needs better than any other officer of the Government?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Including the Secretary.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes; including the Secretary.

Mr. MOODY. In my opinion, no. I undertake to know the occupations of the people of my district, and I venture to state that in the distribution of these seeds I shall use just as much care and just as much time as any other member of this House. As a new member I have not very much else to do.

Mr. PICKLER. Has not the gentleman received requests for seeds?

Mr. MOODY. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. Does not the gentleman respond to those requests?

Mr. MOODY. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. Seeds which are sent out in response to requests are generally sent where they will do the most good.

Mr. MOODY. So far as they are sent in response to requests there is no trouble, but that does not distribute all the seeds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only this: I am not wedded to the present distribution of seeds at all. As a member of the committee, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the last Congress, as members will remember, I attempted to change the distribution of seeds by having them distributed through the agricultural experiment stations of the country. That, however, is not the point under discussion here. It is simply a point of order. It is totally useless to argue the point of order. I merely make the point, and it is self-evident that this striking out of the means of distribution in an appropriation bill is a change of existing law and amenable to the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the amendment is out of order. Are there any further amendments?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DINGLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives; had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate amendment numbered 4; had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL as the said conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. HULL in the chair.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a very slight amendment which I desire to make here, in order to have it conform to the work already done.

The amendment was read, as follows:

From line 25, page 21, and line 1, page 22, strike out the words "improved and."

Mr. RAY. If that is adopted it will read "for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs," and so forth. It will not leave a chance for the Secretary to say that he can not find any improved seeds.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 12, page 22, the words:

"Division of Seeds: One chief of division, $2,000; one expert, $1,600; two clerks of class 1, $2,400; one skilled laborer, $1,000; eight employees, at $840 each, who shall in addition to other duties execute the requests of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for the distribution of seeds among their constituents; in all, $13,720."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer an amendment to that, which I send to the Clerk's desk. With that amendment, I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; in addition to it.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add the following:

"Payable out of the appropriation for the purchase of rare and valuable seeds."

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will accept that, and will simply say that this is the provision in the appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1896. It is inserted now for the simple reason that without it possibly the Secretary of Agriculture might claim that he had not the material with which to execute the law.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of the act of May 29, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry, and of the act of August 30, 1890, providing for an inspection of meats and animals, and also the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, providing for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, the sum of $650,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, in such manner as he may think best, in the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products, to compile the records of the tests of dairy cows at the Columbian Exposition and prepare the same for permanent preservation, and to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, sheep scab, and other diseases of animals, and for this purpose to employ as many persons as he may deem necessary, and to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State into another, and for printing and publishing such reports relating to animal industry as he may direct; and the Secretary is hereby authorized to rent a suitable building in the District of Columbia, at an annual rental of not exceeding $1,200, to be used as a laboratory for said Bureau of Animal Industry: *Provided*, That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, be amended to read as follows:

Mr. PAYNE. I raise the point of order against that provision contained in lines 2, 3, and 4 on page 23:

To compile the records of the tests of dairy cows at the Columbian Exposition and prepare the same for permanent preservation.

That is an appropriation for a purpose not authorized by law and changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York. Has the chairman of the committee anything to say on the point of order?

Mr. BRODERICK. I ask to have an amendment read and pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks that the gentleman from New York simply have his point of order reserved.

Mr. BRODERICK. I want my amendment pending while the point of order is being discussed.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not propose to make any further discussion on the point of order.

Mr. BRODERICK. If there is any discussion on the point of order I want my amendment pending.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something on the point of order.

Mr. BRODERICK. I desire to have my amendment read and pending.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be in order until the point of order is determined.

Mr. CLARDY. I desire to be heard on the point of order. If you will take this first line with reference to this object you will find that it reads that the—

Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient in such a manner as he may think best, for the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products.

Now, I would like to call attention especially to the fact that this is what the money is appropriated for. This is to compile

the record of tests of dairy cows at the Columbian Exposition, and prepare the same for permanent preservation. That is exactly in the line of this paragraph; and does not inject into it any change of law at all. It only enlarges to some extent the scope of this work, and explicitly expresses what it is; so that I deny there is any change of existing law in this case. Another matter, Mr. Chairman: I will say that when this test was made I was at Chicago and know something about this matter and what it cost to make those tests. It does not increase this appropriation a single cent. It does not change the purpose of this paragraph in any particular; it simply seeks to put into permanent form the greatest test that has ever been made in this country or any other country on this particular subject.

It was made carefully by the best chemists that could be obtained in the United States, and it was made under the inspection of a gentleman whom I know well, and I know that there is no fraud, no wrong, or anything improper in these tests. It cost about $100,000 to secure these valuable statistics, and the farmers of this country are entitled to the benefit, which they never can have while there is but a single copy in existence. This only gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority not to print this test, but simply to have it compiled in a form in which it may be reached in the future if it is desirable to have it printed, and where private parties who desire to have it printed may receive it in such a form as it can be usefully employed.

Now, I want to say another thing in this connection, which has been peculiarly pleasing to me. When I came here to this Congress I thought I would be very lonely. I thought there would be very few farmers in this House, and I have been very respectful to these gentlemen all this time because I thought they were great lawyers and great statesmen, men who had not always associated with those who have lived in the country or on the farm and who had not associated with farmers. I have associated with farmers all my life; and I say I am peculiarly gratified to find that these gentlemen are not distinguished lawyers, not gentlemen from cities, and not profound statesmen, but that every single man that I have seen or heard is from the country and is a bona fide farmer. [Laughter.] And I say it is peculiarly gratifying to me to find that is so, and to find that I have so many friends here from the farm who will stand by me in this instance and see that this appropriation is kept in the bill, because it is for the benefit of the farmers and dairymen. I wish to say further that while I am a farmer, raising stock for sale, I am not personally interested in this matter. I am not a dairyman and do not raise dairy cows, but raise another kind of stock for other purposes, and therefore I have no personal interest in the matter to subserve. These are the most valuable statistics made in this country or any other country, and the provision to compile them ought to be kept in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the gentleman from Kentucky takes his seat, the Chair would like to ask him the question, Was the test made by the authority of any law of the United States?

Mr. CLARDY. It was made by authority of the law authorizing the World's Fair—by a law of the United States. It was made under the auspices of the World's Fair, but whether there was any special law with reference to it I can not say. That has nothing to do with the question. It certainly is in the line of duties imposed by this paragraph on the Secretary of Agriculture; that is to say, in the collection of information. It shows where he can get this information, which is the most valuable information he can get any place in the world concerning the subject of dairy tests. It specifically states that information is to be obtained concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this is not exactly in the line of this paragraph I am wholly unable to understand what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether the law authorized the compiling of those statistics.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new question in this House, although it is a new one on this point of order, so far as I have any recollection. All of this work was done by the board of control of the Centennial Exposition, and it was within the scope of their jurisdiction and clearly came strictly within their proper action under the law of their creation. I presume there can not be any doubt on that subject. I do not care to follow up the other question, for I am not especially interested in it, but there is no doubt that the various boards of the exposition were empowered by the law of their creation to make these examinations and tests and reports, to gather this information and these statistics, and they did so, and I do not think the point that the actual work itself was not done in pursuance of law can by any possibility be maintained.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the World's Fair was run by a private corporation. That corporation, it is true, was authorized by an act of Congress, but it can not possibly be maintained that every act that that private corporation performed could in any way bind the United States, or that the United States could be required to make appropriations for the various things which that corporation authorized to be done by its numerous committees, subcommittees, and commissions, in whose appointment the United States had nothing whatever to say. This matter came up in the last Congress, and the advocates of it went at it then in a straightforward way by introducing a resolution which was referred first to the Committee on Agriculture and then to the Committee on Printing, to print these very same tests.

The Committee on Printing reported upon that proposition adversely, and from the report it appears that the publication of these dairy tests would cost some $60,000. Not only were there dairy tests made at the World's Fair, but there were competitions as to the different breeds of horses, sheep, hogs, and nearly everything else that the farmer raises. There were also tests in regard to agricultural implements, and, in fact, there were tests in nearly every branch of industry. Now, it can not be said that all these tests and competitions were held in pursuance of any law, or that there is any law which authorizes the publication of such tests.

In regard to this particular test, it appears that while there are seven pure breeds of cattle in the United States, but three of them participated in those tests, for the reason that the jury seemed to have been fixed up in advance, and the rules were fixed up in advance, to favor particular breeds. In consequence of that, the owners of the other breeds kept out of the competition. So valuable was the final report of the commissioners who were appointed by this corporation to supervise the tests, that breeders of Jersey cattle, at their own expense, to the extent of $25,000, provided for the publication and distribution of it. If the simple desire here is to perpetuate the record of those tests in a permanent form, then all that need be done is to ask the Jersey Dairymen's Association for one of those pamphlets and file it away in the archives of the Department of Agriculture.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not what is sought to be done here. This is simply a covert way of getting Congress to publish the results of those tests, a proposition which the House in the last Congress voted down after half an hour's discussion. It can not be said that there is any law which authorizes such an appropriation as is here proposed, and if there is no such law that is the end of it. If you go in now and put this amendment upon the bill you simply change existing law.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has said, I want to add that this matter was reported adversely by the Committee on Printing in the last House, and after a full debate, in which the question was considered on its merits, the House refused to print these tests. In fact these tests were private tests. The Government had nothing to do with them; the Government had nothing to do with conducting that exposition; the Government did not appoint anybody to take part in these tests in the dairying department of the exposition; the Government had nothing to do with the matter; and the object here is simply, as the gentleman from New York has stated, to "boom" one kind of dairy cattle as against the other breeds. As the gentleman from New York has said, there are seven pure breeds in this country, and only three of them participated in these tests. The four others did not take any part, and therefore these tests were not really tests as to the comparative merits of the different breeds of dairy cattle.

Mr. CLARDY. Why did not the other four breeds participate?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is wholly immaterial. They did not participate, and that fact prevents these tests from being valuable as showing the comparative merits of the different breeds.

Mr. CLARDY. Did they not have an opportunity to participate?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Even if they had participated that would not make the test a public matter. It was something with which the Government had nothing to do. We might as well undertake to print and perpetuate the tests as to fine horses or beeves which were made at that time, or the tests of so many other kinds which were carried on under the authority of the exposition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no interest one way or the other in this question, but the gentleman from Tennessee has put forward as an argument which should govern our action on this occasion the fact that the last House passed unfavorably upon this question. Now, does the gentleman understand that we ought to be either bound or influenced by any action of the last House? [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman should understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] first used that argument, and all that I said was in confirmation of his statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I want it understood that I protest at all times against the precedents of the last House being cited as a guide for us. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to say to the gentleman that he might very well follow some of the examples set by the last House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Possibly, by adjourning. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason in the world why the point of order which the gentleman from

New York has made is not good. There is no law authorizing the perpetuation of these records. The whole object is to get them into the hands of the Department of Agriculture, so as to give them some kind of official sanction, by which the breeders of Jersey cattle may obtain some food for their stock. That is all their is in it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wish simply to state the position assumed by the Committee on Agriculture in reference to this item. It was not the intention of the committee to help "boom" any breed of cattle. We believed that these statistics would be of value to the agricultural interests of the country, and so believing we inserted this provision in the bill, though I am frank to say there was a suspicion that it might be open to a point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to ask the gentleman, with all respect, whether the request to the Committee on Agriculture to insert this provision in the bill did not come from the breeders of Jersey cattle?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I think not. I think it came from one of the experimental stations——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did it not come from the American Jersey Club?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It came to me personally from one of the chiefs of the State experimental stations. I do not know how it came to other members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BRODERICK and Mr. CONNOLLY addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize first the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CONNOLLY] and afterwards the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK].

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, the words proposed to be stricken out on this point of order provide for "compiling records of the tests of dairy cows at the Columbian Exposition and to prepare the same for permanent preservation." The object, of course, is to distribute the information as to the result of these dairy tests among the people of this country. The gentleman from New York says that the Columbian Exposition was not carried on by the United States Government. I say in reply that if it had not been for the United States Government and the financial assistance and encouragement which it gave to the Columbian Exposition it never would have been carried on upon the magnificent scale on which it was so successfully conducted.

Now, these dairy tests were provided for by the proper committees of that Columbian Exposition. All the breeders of cattle of the United States were invited to participate in those tests. Why? For the purpose of obtaining authentic information as far as possible as to which was the best breed of dairy cattle in the United States. Was it not important to the people of the country to determine that question? Is the dairy question of so little importance that it may be brushed aside by the question of order raised by the gentleman from New York, who may possibly have no dairy cattle in his district and may be used to living on oleomargarine? [Laughter.]

This is a question of vast importance not only to the State in which I live but to all the States from the Mississippi eastward to the Atlantic Ocean. This is one of the greatest industries of the country, one which is growing constantly. It is quite as important that this question should be understood as that the sheep scab, for instance (the investigation of which is provided for in the same paragraph), should be diagnosed and its remedy distributed to the people. Why not make your point of order upon the compilation of records about sheep scabs? I may say, sir, in passing that if the present tariff law shall continue in force two years longer you will not have any sheep to be affected with the scab, or, I might say, all that you will have will be the scab. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order. The gentleman from New York says there is no law authorizing this publication. I suppose it would be immodest for a new member to presume that he knows anything about what a question of order is in this House or what the law is; but notwithstanding the positive statement made by the gentleman from New York, I advise him that he is mistaken; that there is a law authorizing this very publication. The gentleman may have overlooked it. If he has done so, I will call his attention to it. Section 520 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides:

> There shall be at the seat of Government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Thus it will be seen that one of the provisions of the law governing the Department of Agriculture requires that Department "to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture." Apply that test to this question. Is this a useful subject? If it is, has the Department of Agriculture any information—acquired I do not care how? The gentleman may say that the Agricultural Department has not acquired this information; that it has been acquired by a private test at the World's Fair. Yes; but we know that under the law which I have cited the Department of Agriculture acquires information by having professors of veterinary surgery in Canadian colleges write monographs upon diseases of the horse; and those monographs are published by that Department and scattered throughout the United States.

The Department of Agriculture has acquired such information by buying it from a professor of veterinary surgery in a Canadian college. So with many things which the Department does under the law. It buys articles written by professors of colleges. Why? Because they contain useful information to be distributed among the people of the United States. That is the duty of that Department—to diffuse this information. Hence I say that under the law this information, if this House thinks it useful, should be distributed among the people. It is the duty of the Department to do it. It is simply our duty to furnish the money to pay the expenses necessarily incurred in doing it.

The secret of the gentleman's opposition seems to be here—he stated it in his conclusion—that this provision is simply a means by which an attempt is being made to advertise the Jersey cattlemen. He says there are seven different breeds of cattle in this country. Now, sir, the raisers of all those seven breeds were invited to this test at the Columbian Exposition. The representatives of three breeds only responded—the Jersey, the Guernsey, and the Shorthorn.

The Holstein men and the Anglesea men stayed out; all of the three or four other kinds of breeders staid out from the test. Why? If they were satisfied that they could succeed, we all know they would have entered the test, for this information is given and published to the people generally, and shows exactly the merits of the three different breeds who did compete in this test. Now, if these merits can be kept from the public, if the Holstein and Anglesea men, and all of the others, whose interests my friend from New York represents, can smother this report, then the public will be as ignorant in the future as they were before the tests were made as to which is the best breed of dairy cattle.

Coming back now for a while to the question of order pure and simple, I maintain that under the law as it stands this is useful information; it is the duty of the Department to collect and distribute it under the law as it is our duty to appropriate the necessary money if we think it is useful information for the people. It is not fair for the House to join in the interests of the Holstein and Anglesea men and others who want to smother this information and keep it from the people, and I insist, therefore, that the amendment should be held in order just as much as any other part of this whole provision concerning the publication, investigation, and information about pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, sheep scab, and other diseases of animals. There are other qualities about cattle, their meat-producing qualities, their milk-producing qualities, and their uses for the dairy, and other information concerning them which is just as essential to the people as to know about their diseases. [Applause.]

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, as has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], this is not by any means a new proposition in this House. In the last session of Congress the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Hatch, then the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, introduced a resolution for the publication and distribution of these tests. It was referred to the Committee on Printing. At that time I had the honor to be a member of that committee, and during the time it was pending there, probably six weeks, I received a great number of letters and remonstrances against the publication of the tests, and they were based on the ground, generally, that the tests were not satisfactory to a great majority of the representatives of the dairy and cattle interests in the country.

I do not know how true that statement was. The claim was made, however, that the rules were so executed that no interests were represented except the Jersey cattle breeders and two other interests; that no others could get in, and for that reason the other dairy interests had not competed and had not been considered at all in making these tests.

I do not know how these tests were made, but there was undoubtedly a suspicion among the dairy interest, outside the Jersey interest, that something was unfair about the rules under which the tests were made. But, Mr. Chairman, if these words be stricken out of the bill the law will still authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to publish such information as he collects with reference to all of the subjects named, among them being the dairy interest. I want them stricken out because it is made the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to do a particular thing, giving him discretion in other matters and then directing him to publish this particular matter which the House refused to provide for in a separate bill on another occasion.

It seems to me that this particular interest ought not to be marked out specifically in this matter and special directions given to the Secretary in regard to it. It is a proposition on its face to do something for the dairy interest, when it can at most only sat-

isfy a small portion of this interest. This seems to be new legislation, and I hope it may go out on the point of order. If not, I trust it will be stricken out on the motion I shall submit.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the question of order.

Mr. CLARDY. I would like to be heard for a few minutes before that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have not a Jersey cow in my possession and never owned one in my life, nor had anything to do with the dairy business, and of course I can have no personal interest in this matter. But what I desire to impress upon the committee is this: The gentleman from New York says that there is no law in this country to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to get information from this source; but I say that it is not necessary that there should be a specific law to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to get information from any particular source. He is already authorized to get information from any source that is available. He is authorized, for instance, according to this bill, to get information with reference to live stock. Is not this information with reference to live stock?

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARDY. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. Without that clause in the bill it leaves the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire the information that the bill says he may acquire, but by putting it into the bill, does not it compel him to take that information, although he may not consider it desirable? You compel him to do a thing which in other cases is left to his discretion.

Mr. CLARDY. It authorizes him to do it.

Mr. STEELE. It does not need authorization if he thinks it is worthy. You compel him to put in the bill what he would not put in, except you coerce him to do so in the way proposed. To that extent it is a change of existing law. He could have taken it in his last report if he had desired to do so. He did not do so, and now it is proposed to say he must do it in the next report. Therefore it is making new law for the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARDY. My point is, the gentleman assumes that this adds to the expense. It does not do so.

Mr. STEELE. Oh, no; I understand about that.

Mr. CLARDY. It simply authorizes him, not to print or publish these statistics, but simply to compile them and preserve them in such permanent form that they may be printed in the future if it is desirable to do so. The object is not to lose this valuable work, which cost so much. The work is valuable not only to Jersey people, but to everybody who has anything to do with dairying or cheese making, because it shows the chemical composition of milk, butter, and cheese, and how much butter can be made from milk, and a great many things which do not apply specifically to Jersey cattle, but to all kinds of cattle and all kinds of butter and cheese making, and for that reason it ought to be retained. There is nothing in this which changes the law in any particular.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I only wish to take one moment of time. This legislation is not asked for here by the owners of any one breed of cattle. It is not the Jersey interest, as has been intimated, that asks for this legislation. The Chicago dairy tests were made under the direction of scientific men. The rules of the test were broad enough to embrace all breeds of cattle, and were intended to embrace all breeds of cattle. Of course one breed was necessarily the victors. It happened to be the Jerseys; but the request for this legislation did not come from the Jersey people. The request was presented to the committee by the scientific men who conducted the test, by President Goodell, of the Massachusetts Agricultural College; by Professor Scovel, of the Kentucky Agricultural College; by Professor Babcock, of the Iowa Agricultural College, and the compilation of these records is in behalf of the dairy interests of the whole country. There is no extra expense provided for. Possibly the provision may be ruled out upon a point of order, but I regret very much that any man upon this floor should raise that point in a matter of this importance.

Mr. GROW. Has the Chair ruled on this point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but if the gentleman desires to be heard of course the Chair will hear him.

Mr. GROW. I had no idea of taking part in this discussion. It seems to me that what was done at the exposition at Chicago has very little to do with this question. By law the Agricultural Department is established for certain purposes. It is to diffuse useful knowledge on the question of agriculture. I do not understand that there is any general law for the distribution or propagation of plants, bulbs, and so forth—that is, there is no law which specifies those particular things. The law establishing the Smithsonian Institution was in pursuance of the will of Mr. Smithson, for the diffusion of useful knowledge among men. If we make an appropriation for it, it appeals to our discretion whether it is knowledge useful to man or not; but not to our power, nor to the constitutional right to legislate upon that subject. Whatever, then, is beneficial and useful to agriculture in our opinion we can appropriate money for; and if we can, it must be in an appropriation bill. I can not quite see how a point of order is good which strikes out an appropriation for the very purpose for which we have established a branch of the Government.

Mr. STEELE. We do appropriate the money, and we leave it to the Secretary as to what shall be considered by him as useful information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been willing to allow all the debate that was desired on this subject, because the Chair recognizes the importance of the clause which is sought to be stricken out. This is not simply a question of the Agricultural Department being authorized to acquire useful information, but it is an instruction to the Department to accept tests which have been made without authority of law, not made by any officer appointed by the Government to make the test. It seems to the Chair that there would be no question as to the right of the Agricultural Committee to insert a clause requiring the Department of Agriculture to make dairy tests and publish the results, but this is a different thing, because this language goes further than that and instructs the Department to accept a certain specific test which was made without any authority of law; and it seems to the Chair that in order to do that it would be necessary, first, under the rules of this Congress, for the House and Senate to pass a resolution or bill authorizing and directing the Secretary to accept this as a Government test. The Chair believes the point of order to be well taken.

Mr. NEILL. I desire to submit an amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 23, line 5, amend by inserting, after the words "sheep scab" and before the word "and," the words "glanders or farcy."

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I apprehend that among the members of this Congress who have lived in the rural districts and who are acquainted with horses there should be no question as to the propriety of this amendment. I had an experience in this matter myself, or my own people did at home last summer. We had an object lesson in the town in which I live. A disease broke out among the horses which was supposed to be glanders or farcy, a deadly disease that may even be communicated to the human race with fatal effect.

I telegraphed to the Secretary of Agriculture at my own expense and endeavored to get an inspector to go there and to determine as to whether it was glanders. We did not know that it was, but believed it, and a number of valuable animals had to be destroyed and killed as a matter of safety. The Secretary of Agriculture replied that he had no authority; he had no horse inspector. I then telegraphed to the Agricultural College of Arkansas, where they have an experimental station, and I could not get any help there. I got the opinion of the gentleman there in charge whether it was glanders or not. Now, I hope that my friend in charge of this bill will accept this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee has no objection to the amendment, but we think it is covered already.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall also cause to be made a careful inspection of all live cattle, the meat of which, fresh, salted, canned, corned, packed, cured, or otherwise prepared, is intended for exportation to any foreign country, at such times and places and in such manner as he may think proper, with a view to ascertain whether said cattle are free from disease, and their meat sound and wholesome, and may appoint inspectors, who shall be authorized to give an official certificate clearly stating the condition in which such cattle and meat are found, and no clearance shall be given to any vessel having on board any fresh, salted, canned, corned, or packed beef being the meat of cattle killed after the passage of this act for exportation to and sale in a foreign country from any port in the United States until the owner or shipper shall obtain from an inspector appointed under the provisions of this act a certificate that said cattle were free from disease and that their meat is sound and wholesome."

Also, that section 4 of said act be so amended as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That said examination shall be made in the manner provided by rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and after said examination the carcasses and products of all cattle, sheep, and swine found to be free of disease, and wholesome, sound, and fit for human food, shall be marked, stamped, or labeled for identification as may be provided by said rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Any person who shall forge, counterfeit, simulate, imitate, falsely represent, or use without authority, or knowingly and wrongfully alter, deface, or destroy any of the marks, stamps, or other devices, provided for in the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, of any such carcasses or their products, or who shall forge, counterfeit, simulate, imitate, falsely represent, or use without authority, or knowingly and wrongfully alter, deface, or destroy, any certificate or stamp provided in said regulations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may decide to be necessary to prevent the transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into any other State

or Territory or the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, of the condemned carcasses or parts of carcasses of cattle, sheep, and swine which have been inspected in accordance with the provisions of this act. Any person, company, or corporation owning or operating any such slaughterhouse, abattoir, or meat curing, packing, or canning establishment, or any employee of the same, that shall willfully violate any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 17, page 23, after the word "industry," all of that page after said word and all of page 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 23 has been passed entirely.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It is the same paragraph right through to the end.

The CHAIRMAN. In section 2 it is.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It is on page 23, after the word "industry," in line 17, the whole of page 23. You will see what it is if the amendment is read through.

The Clerk read as follows:

All of that page after said word; all of page 24, and all of page 25, and page 26 down to and including the word "court," in line 4 on page 26.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the reason for offering this amendment is this: That on pages 732 and 733 of volume 28 of the Statutes at Large we have the very identical words in this paragraph already in existing statute. There is nothing whatever, nothing preceding this in the clause under the title of "animal industry" which requires any reenactment of it. The amendment which is here proposed is no amendment whatever. It says that the section "shall be amended to read as follows." It absolutely reads that way now, and consequently there is no cause whatever for this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The question was considered a great deal by the Committee on Agriculture, and we decided it was the safer way to leave it, and then there would be no mistake. Now, there is in the language which the gentleman wishes to be stricken out that which can be taken out, but the last part of the bill is the amended statute. The last end of page 25, which he wants stricken out, was on the appropriation bill of last year. It have no objection to striking out all of page 24 and page 25, down to an including line 12, and page 23 after the word "provided." I think that is unnecessary, but I do not agree with the gentleman in regard to the last half of page 25.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on an examination of this statute, there seems to be no doubt but that this is merely reenacting existing law. I hold the statute in my hand. It is not worth while to read it, except to say that on page 732 of volume 28 of the United States Statutes at Large, commencing with the word "provided" on said page, the law as enacted in 1895, is the language in the bill verbatim, and all the amendment covered in the matter sought to be stricken out by the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire is the law now.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if that provision of the statute is now an independent law or on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. It was legislation enacted upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. SAYERS. Is the gentleman satisfied that it is continuing legislation.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me it is. If I understand anything of the law, there is no question about it, and it covers the full page of this volume of law.

Now, I want to say, while I am speaking about this, that a just criticism made upon our legislation is that it is too voluminous. I think it is a very just criticism. It is expensive, first, to enact; second, to publish, and is a constant annoyance to people who must find out what the law is. When a law is once enacted it does not make it any more binding to enact it again. Now, one other word, and I say it in all kindness touching this bill. After some little examination of it—and possibly the subject that is covered by the bill is responsible as well as the committee that represents it—I want to say in all kindness that, in my judgment, a well-prepared agricultural bill might carry less money than this carries by one-third, and amply care for the public service, if it was properly prepared and administered properly, as other Departments of this Government are administered. I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that the people and the country would get better service than we now get for one-third less money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the objection it is this, and I ask the careful attention of the committee and of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], because I do not want to misstate his position. The objection is that we have here practically repeated the language of a previous appropriation bill; that is what it comes down to.

Mr. CANNON. No; previous legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. I still say that is all it amounts to, because "previous legislation in an appropriation bill" of course means the language of a previous appropriation bill, and the point is that this language which we repeat here is not the language of an independent statute, but is the language of a previous appropriation bill. That being the case, the question would arise as to whether this is continuing legislation or not.

Now, I am not going to argue the question whether it is continuing legislation or not, but merely to state two successive Committees of Agriculture of which I have been a member in two successive Houses, counting this one, after due and great deliberation, concluded that it was safer and better not to run any risk of an unfavorable decision upon the question whether this was continuing legislation or was not, not to run any risk of having this Secretary of Agriculture who, as the gentleman from Arkansas said a moment ago, can not find that the language "and other diseases of animals" covers farcy or glanders among horses, so technical is he—that it was better not to run the risk of having him misunderstand the plain intendments of this act, or the risk of a decision that this was not continuing legislation, or the risk of leaving any uncertainty as to this law—these two successive committees, I say, came to the conclusion that rather than run any of these risks, it was better to reproduce the language just as it existed and as it appears in this appropriation bill.

Now, addressing myself not to the point of order, but to this Committee of the Whole, I say that it will not cost the Government of the United States one picayune more to include in the act this language, which safeguards every point, and to follow what the better judgment of committee led it to recommend, than to leave this language out of the act. I understand, of course, that it makes somewhat more printing, but, as a matter of practical fact, as the gentleman from Illinois knows, it would not cost the United States Government one cent more to include this than to omit it. By including it you conserve everything, you save all possible doubt, you run no possible risk, you hurt nobody in any possible manner, and you merely add a little to the length of this act.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Let me ask the gentleman one question. If we reenact this provision, do we not thereby say that it is not continuing legislation, but is merely a yearly matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have done that once already, so that if the gentleman's point be well taken we have already put ourselves in that attitude, because the last Congress reenacted verbatim et literatim this very language, although it then stood on the statute book.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Still, had we not better stop that foolishness?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be, but that is a different argument.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that my friend from Mississippi is going on the assumption that it is necessary and practical to make that which is absolutely plain by itself still plainer. The gentleman might make a letter A on a piece of paper and might go to a great deal of trouble to prove that it was a letter A, but after he had submitted pages of proof that it was A, I guess the fact would not be any plainer than it was at the beginning, and this is a proceeding like thereunto.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is just an assumption. The gentleman assumes that the legislation would be plain by itself, which is the very thing I am questioning.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, that the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi is incorrect and that this is not necessary is undoubtedly shown by the fact that in the Supplement to the Revised Statutes all of the independent legislation contained in the appropriation bills heretofore passed is included—not the matters of appropriation, but the independent legislation contained in those bills, exactly such matter as that about which we are now contending.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 46, noes 9; so the amendment was adopted.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Insert after line 4, page 24, after the word "court," the following:

"For the printing and binding of 70,000 copies of the Special Report on Diseases of Cattle and on Cattle Feeding, prepared in the year 1892, under the direction of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, to be distributed as follows, namely: Twenty thousand copies for the use of the Senate, 40,000 copies for the use of members of the House, and 10,000 copies for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture, $45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is new legislation.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Chairman, I can discuss the point of order at the same time that I discuss the merits of the question. This is a very meritorious amendment, and I hope the point of order

will not prevail against it, and that the amendment will be adopted. I am glad that my friend from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] succeeded in having the bill amended yesterday to provide for the distribution of a reasonable number of copies of the book on the Diseases of the Horse, and I am sorry that the point of order prevailed to-day against the amendment providing for the distribution of the report of the dairy tests made at the World's Fair, so that we shall not be able to distribute that valuable document among our constituents.

This Report on Diseases of Cattle (a copy of which I hold in my hand) was prepared in the year 1892 under the direction of the chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry and under the instructions of the then Secretary of Agriculture—"Uncle Jerry Rusk." It was intended to form a companion volume to the book on the Diseases of the Horse, and was prepared in very much the same form by eminent specialists in the several branches of the pathology of cattle. The letter of transmittal sent by the chief of the Bureau to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1892, and which forms the preface to the published volume, sets forth the purpose of the publication in brief terms:

[Letter of transmittal.]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith a report upon the diseases of cattle, to which has been added a section upon cattle feeding, the whole forming the second volume of the series of reports upon the diseases of the domesticated animals. The large demand for and the great popularity of the Report on the Diseases of the Horse has been an additional reason for adhering as closely as possible to the plan adopted in the preparation of that volume. In preparing the illustrations for the report on diseases of cattle an effort has been made to supplement, as far as possible, the illustrations which appeared in the Report on the Diseases of the Horse, so that the two series would together cover the field of veterinary surgery, which it is important to present to the reader in a graphic manner. On account of the importance of the alimentation as a factor in the maintenance of health and cure of disease, as well as in the profitable management of cattle, a section has been added on cattle feeding, which has been written both from a practical and scientific point of view. This may justly be regarded as the clearest and most succinct presentation of this subject which has ever been published, while it is probably the only article of the kind in which the results of the latest scientific researches have been incorporated.

The writer has seen no reason to change his views, presented in the letter of transmittal accompanying the Report on the Diseases of the Horse, as to the value of such publications to the farmers of the country. On the contrary, many letters have been received testifying that the writers had saved valuable animals by following the advice given in that report. In most of these cases it has been stated that no veterinarian was accessible, and that except for the report the animals would have been without intelligent treatment. In so large a country as ours there must for years to come be many sections in which no skilled veterinarian is located, and, consequently, there must continue to be many demands from stock owners for information of this kind.

It is well, however, to remind the reader who has not made a special study of this subject that it would be absurd for him to conclude that even with the best of books he can treat his animals as well as they could be treated by a properly educated veterinarian. Careful study of the allied sciences and practical experience are as necessary to make a man successful in the treatment of diseased animals as in the case of sick people. The employment of a veterinarian is, therefore, advisable in all cases where a competent one can be obtained. In the many cases, however, where professional examination of the affected animal is out of the question, the reader may feel assured that the treatment here recommended is safe and the best that can be advised for his use.

It is hoped that this volume may have an important influence in bringing about more intelligent and more humane care and treatment of animals in health and disease. To this end the writers of the several sections have been requested to give a brief description of the various organs of the animal body and a statement of their normal functions. This information is essential to a proper understanding of the nature of disease or the principles of treatment. When carefully studied it should do much to prevent the unnecessarily cruel and injurious practices which are still too common in the treatment of sick animals even in our enlightened country.

It is plain from what has just been said that this report has been prepared for the farmer and stock owner rather than for the student or veterinarian. As much practical information as possible has been brought together on the subjects treated, but it has been stated in brief and plain language. Readers desiring a more detailed account of any subject are referred to the various special treaties. Notwithstanding the popular character of this work, there is no doubt that it will be found useful to the veterinarian as well as to the farmer. The preceding volume of the series is found on the shelves of many practitioners, who regard it as the most valuable work in their library, and it is believed that the accompanying report will be equally serviceable.

Very respectfully,

D. E. SALMON,
Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Hon. J. M. RUSK,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, if I may have the attention of the Committee of the Whole and of the Chairman, I wish to say that this amendment is intended for one of the very purposes for which the Department of Agriculture was created. I ask the attention of the Chair not only to section 520 of the Revised Statutes, which was quoted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CONNOLLY] in debating the question of order on the proposed publication of the World's Fair dairy tests, but also to the following sections under the same title, which I think make it perfectly plain that this publication, as well as the publication of the dairy tests, is an object contemplated and required by existing law, so far as Congress shall authorize appropriations for carrying out that object. Section 520 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

The general design and duties of [the Department of Agriculture] shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, in the argument of the point of order as to the publication of the World's Fair dairy tests, the objection was made that those were not official tests, that the information was not official information, and that without a change of existing law the money of the Government could not be spent for the purpose of publishing unofficial information acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture. But I wish to call the attention of the Chair to this additional section of the law creating the Department of Agriculture, section 526, which provides that—

The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence, and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power.

And section 528 provides that the Commissioner of Agriculture (now the Secretary of Agriculture)—

shall make special reports on particular subjects whenever required to do so by the President or either House of Congress, or when he shall think the subject in his charge requires it.

Mr. Chairman, it is plain from the provisions of section 526 that not only can official information, not only can the results of official tests made by employees of the Department of Agriculture, be lawfully published under the existing law by that Department, but that Department can, and if it fulfills the purpose of its organization, ought to, seek information from other sources and publish that information for the benefit of the agricultural community.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Can the Secretary of Agriculture publish one volume without authority of law—that is, any one volume which the gentleman is asking to have published now?

Mr. PITNEY. Can he publish them? Certainly he can. The law authorizes him to do so.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Then why do you want this provision in this bill?

Mr. PITNEY. I want the money provided with which to pay for the publication; that is all.

Mr. NORTHWAY. But you limit the publication. Everything in regard to the publication is limited by law, is it not?

Mr. PITNEY. Limit the publication?

Mr. NORTHWAY. The number of volumes.

Mr. PITNEY. I propose to limit the number of volumes.

Mr. NORTHWAY. And that is new legislation, is it not—legislation in addition to that already on the statute book?

Mr. PITNEY. The limitation has the same relation to existing law that every limitation has which provides that a certain number of books shall be printed or published with a certain amount of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey this question: The law has provided for the publication of these volumes—has provided that a certain number shall be published——

Mr. PITNEY. No, sir; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it not provided that a certain number shall be printed?

Mr. PITNEY. No, I think not. Subject to correction by the Chair, I will state that, as I understand it, the law which authorizes the preparation and publication of this special report on diseases of cattle, like the law authorizing the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, is the law by which the Department of Agriculture was created, and which I have already read to the Chair. The publication, that is the distribution, of this special report on the diseases of cattle was done by virtue of a concurrent resolution—not even a joint resolution—a concurrent resolution which has not the force of law, but is merely an agreement between the two Houses. That resolution was passed on the 13th of January, 1893, and is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress, volume 129, page 540.

This concurrent resolution was offered, I think, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] and reported by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] from the Committee on Printing. It provided—

That there shall be printed and bound of the special report of the Bureau of Animal Industry on the diseases of cattle and cattle feeding 60,000 copies, of which 20,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 40,000 for the use of the House.

The resolution was passed on that date in the House, and ten days later, without any debate, was passed in the Senate. It was then treated as an official direction to the Department of Agriculture to publish the information gathered by the Secretary, information that had been gathered by virtue of the law creating the Department of Agriculture, which commanded that this information be obtained.

Now, the Secretary of Agriculture is already in possession of this information, and under the present law it is made his duty to publish it whenever in his opinion it shall be requisite and when we

have made the necessary appropriation to provide for the expense of such publication. That is the only effect of the amendment that I have offered. It simply provides an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to publish the information already acquired under the law.

Now, that this is a proper exercise of the functions of the Department admits, I think, of no possible doubt. Take my own district, for instance, in New Jersey. We have a very large number of dairies and of creameries, and also a large number of horse breeders. My constituents raise horses, sheep, and cattle, and from the cattle they produce milk, and in the creameries they produce butter—all after the most improved modern methods, not only for their own benefit, for it is also a public benefit, and is so recognized in the law which creates the Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the law is to develop the best methods of rearing cattle, breeding horses, caring for the cattle and the horses, and the best methods of running the creameries, so that the people may obtain better and cheaper milk and butter, better kinds of cattle, better breeds of horses, and so on. It is therefore a public object, and it is an important one.

Now, inasmuch as the Chair had his attention diverted at the time when I was calling attention to these statutes, I hope the Chair will not rule upon the point of order submitted until he has first read the sections of the Revised Statutes to which I have called attention—the sections creating the Department of Agriculture. The gentlemen who argued the point of order on the dairy-test amendment did not call attention to the section which provides specifically for the publication of other information besides that gained by the Department officials themselves—other information besides that which is official. The law requires that such information shall be published by the Department of Agriculture whenever Congress authorizes the expenditure. Under that law the Secretary may, and if he performs his duty he will, publish that information for the benefit of agriculturists throughout the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PITNEY. I do not desire to yield the floor——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I simply wish to say a word on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is still on the floor.

Mr. PITNEY. I should like to have the point of order decided first, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Tennessee desires to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, must be sustained. As it is now, the resolution is not in order on an appropriation bill.

The eleventh rule of the House, item 49, provides that all proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House. Now, the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House has the matter of this amendment now pending before it, and it is not in order for the Committee on Agriculture to take up a question pending before the Committee on Printing over which it has no jurisdiction and undertake to incorporate it upon this appropriation bill.

Mr. PITNEY. Will the gentleman point to the rule to which he has referred?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I said Rule XI, item 49.

Mr. PITNEY. If the Chair will permit me, I have noticed a tendency to-day to run points of order into the ground, and I think this is an instance of it.

Rule XI, a clause of which the gentleman refers to, simply prescribes the jurisdiction of the several committees of the House. The forty-ninth clause of that rule provides that all proposed legislation relating to the examination of accounts and expenditures in the Department of Agriculture shall be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman probably has not the latest revision of the rules. The forty-ninth provision of the rules provides that all proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

Mr. PITNEY. It does not say so in the copy of the rules which I have at hand.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; because the gentleman probably has the copy that was in use before the revision. It simply provides that the Committee on Printing shall deal with all matters of printing on the part of the House.

Mr. PITNEY. But this is not proposed legislation for printing. It is a matter relative to the Department of Agriculture, and properly belongs to the Committee on Agriculture. And it may properly be put in the Agricultural bill by an amendment when the committee's bill is under consideration in Committee of the Whole, as it is now being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Before any further discussion takes place the Chair will request the Clerk to read the rule which he thinks covers this matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that this covers the point which is involved here. This is not work in progress. Does the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] wish to discuss this?

Mr. PICKLER. No. Has the Chair ruled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, and believes that the point of order is well taken, under the rule read by the Clerk.

Mr. PICKLER. Did I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to say that the Committee on Printing had decided to favorably report this?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I did not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing before the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to offer an amendment consisting of the proposal of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PITNEY] with the addition of the following language:

Provided, That the same shall be paid out of the sum of $650,000 appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota to the fact that the Chair has ruled the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to be out of order. Therefore it is not before the House for amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. But I offer a new amendment, in the language of the gentleman from New Jersey, adding the words, "Provided that the same shall be paid out of the sum of $650,000 appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry." This is a new proposition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make the point that that is new legislation. It does not make any difference whether it comes out of that appropriation or not, it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is raised by the gentleman from New York, and it covers practically the same ground. The proposition is practically the same as that offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. It is not for work already in progress.

Mr. PICKLER. But under this appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry various things pertaining to animal industry are described, in one way or another, and this would simply add an item to these provisions for the expenditure of the money. There is no new legislation about it. It is simply placing another item in the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not regard it as a vital question, in the determination of the point of order, that it does not increase the appropriation. The Chair regards the proposition as subject to the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU.

Salaries of the Weather Bureau—Office of Chief of Weather Bureau: One Chief of Bureau, $4,500; two professors of meteorology, at $3,000 each, for service in the city of Washington or elsewhere, as the exigencies of the Bureau may demand, $6,000; three professors of meteorology, at $2,500 each, for service in the city of Washington or elsewhere, as the exigencies of the Bureau may demand, $7,500; three forecast officials, at $2,000 each, for service in the city of Washington or elsewhere, as the exigencies of the Bureau may demand, $6,000; one chief clerk, $2,250; three chiefs of division, at $2,000 each, $6,000; three clerks of class 4, $5,400; one assistant chief of division of supplies, $1,600; five clerks, class 3, $8,000; fifteen clerks, class 2, $21,000; twenty-five clerks, class 1, $30,000; fifteen clerks, at $1,000 each, $15,000; one telegraph operator in the city of Washington or elsewhere, as the exigencies of the Bureau may demand, $1,000; six clerks, at $900 each, $5,400; three copyists or typewriters, at $840 each, $2,520; one copyist or typewriter, $720; one chief mechanician, $1,200; one captain of the watch, $1,200; one engineer, $900; one batteryman, $840; four skilled artisans, at $840 each, $3,360; two skilled mechanicians, at $840 each, $1,680; three assistant messengers, at $720 each, $2,160; two firemen, at $720 each, $1,440; three watchmen, at $720 each, $2,160; one carpenter, $840; five laborers, at $660 each, $3,300; eight messengers or laborers, at $600 each, $4,800; five messengers or laborers, at $450 each, $2,250; three charwomen, at $240 each, $720; for temporary employment of messengers and laborers as may be necessary in the office of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, $800; in all, $150,540.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I make the point of order upon so much of the paragraph on page 28 as begins with the word "for" in line 2, and ends with the word "dollars" in the fifth line, upon the ground that that is new legislation.

There certainly is not any law at present existing which provides for the temporary employment of messengers and laborers in the fiscal year beginning on the 1st day of July next, and it certainly is not in continuance of any existing appropriation.

I want to find out how tight this jacket is under which we are laboring. The Chair has ruled that notwithstanding there is a lump appropriation for the publications and expenses of the Department, it can not print a publication that is not already provided for by law. I bow to that decision. It is a little step in advance of anything in that direction that I have ever heard of before, and I want the Chair now to tell me, in his decision, what

law there is which provides that next year, in case a contingency shall arise in which some extra help is wanted, the Bureau may employ that extra help. If there is no such law, then this is new legislation, and hence obnoxious to the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One minute, please. The gentleman's point of order is not well taken. That same item was provided for in the act of March 2, 1895.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Suppose it was?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then it is not new legislation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. These cattle books were provided for, too.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman from Ohio should keep this distinction in his mind. There is an independent statute that provides for the Weather Bureau under the Agricultural Department. Now, in carrying out that statute it is perfectly competent to afford sufficient clerical service and messenger service without any change of existing law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think so; but I want to show the ad absurdum of the position the gentleman has taken here. There is no provision in the law that the Bureau may employ extra help. The gentleman can not put his finger on any such law, and evidently this is a loophole such as has been made use of constantly in that Department, first to turn out a large number of men, and then, under the emergency clause, to put in laborers not provided for in the general statute. There is a law which provides that there may be certain clerks in that Department, certain artificers, and certain skilled laborers, a battery man, and all that sort of thing, but there is nothing in that law which provides that they may make temporary employment of messengers and laborers.

Now, the gentleman from New York has placed himself upon a most remarkable pedestal. He says that because in some former appropriation bill there was this provision, that therefore it is the carrying out of existing law. We have had provision after provision for the publication of these cattle books, and yet the Chair has decided that if there is not a general proposition authorizing these publications they can not be published. So the gentleman plants himself upon the position that he has already repudiated, in advance, on the very basis of the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a word——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Just one word. As a matter of course, I do not care anything about these temporary messengers, nor do I care how much that Department carries on; it is only as to the bringing of water to the wheel of good government hereafter that I do care. I want to point out that we have provided in this series of decisions for a decision which, in my humble judgment, is erroneous and will have the effect to impair our efficiency as a committee rather than benefit legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a word in reply to the gentleman, and therefore move to strike out the last word. The principle that covers appropriations of this kind is very plain. The law provides what the publications of the Government and its various Departments shall be. That is a permanently fixed law. It provides for their publication and for their distribution of so many copies of each publication. Now, that runs along the whole public service. Here we refuse to appropriate except that appropriation is necessary to carry out a provision of law.

Gentlemen have seen a representative of the Joint Committee on Printing from time to time rise in his place and move a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution to utilize contingent funds providing for additional copies of a certain matter because the law does not provide for enough. That proceeding is regulated by law. Now, the proposition is, that to publish more copies of any report than the law provides for is the making of new law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, then, will the gentleman concede, with reference to employees, that having more help than the law provides for is new legislation?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman tell us how having one bound in leather and another bound in muslin has a different effect upon the matter? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. The principle is not similar. The law provides for the creation of the Weather Bureau. Now, then, when the Weather Bureau is created and placed in the Agricultural Department, the appropriations are in order to enable the Weather Bureau to perform that class of service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is exactly our position, and that all appropriations necessary to carry out the purposes of the Bureau in sending out useful knowledge are also a part of the work of the Bureau.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman would strengthen his position if he would say he stands on the general-welfare clause in the Constitution. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no position in it. I only wanted to see the position that you take in it. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Any person who shall knowingly issue or publish any counterfeit weather forecasts or warnings of weather conditions, falsely representing such forecasts or warnings to have been issued or published by the Weather Bureau, United States Signal Service, or other branch of the Government service, or shall display for any purpose other than indicating the official weather forecasts, hurricanes, cold waves, or other special warnings of the United States Weather Bureau, any flag or other device adopted by said Bureau for such purposes, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof, for each offense, be fined in a sum not exceeding $500, or imprisoned not to exceed ninety days, or be both fined and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation, or else it is a change of existing law. I do not know which and do not care; and secondly, that it is an imperfect provision, and ought to be amended if it is to be retained in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I concede the point of order. There are three or four lines of new legislation in the section. I do not want to detain the committee about it, although the committee thought it was wise to put it in.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I may possibly withdraw my point of order in a moment, but I shall not be hurried by the gentleman from New York. The enactment is one that no intelligent legislative body would have ever voted for with a full knowledge of its meaning, for under that legislation every officer of the Bureau would have been subject to indictment. [Laughter.] At all events, it makes the innocent publication of a false forecast a criminal offense, without any criminal intent alleged, without any allegation that it was for the purpose of defrauding anybody. I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the language on which he makes his point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The new legislation commences on page 30, line 6:

Or shall display for any purpose other than indicating the official weather forecasts, hurricanes, cold waves, or other special warnings of the United States Weather Bureau any flag or other device adopted by said Bureau for such purposes shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

Now, if the gentleman raises the point of order it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on so much of it as is stated to be new legislation, and the balance of it ought to be stricken out as immaterial, for if it is already present legislation why should we reenact it? If the other five lines the gentleman speaks of is already the law of the land, why enact it over again? If it is not already the law of the land, then it is new legislation all through.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is the law of the land, and it is a repetition in this bill. There are a great many other items that are simply a repetition of existing law. It was simply part of an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ascertain which language is said to be subject to the point of order as being new legislation. Will the gentleman indicate what the language is?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is to the whole of the paragraph on page 30 down to and including line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order on that that it is new legislation?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, sir; but I have made it in two propositions. The first, that so much of it as extends to the end of line 5 is already the law of the land, and as to the balance of it, it is new legislation. I make those separate propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that language reenacting existing law would not go out on the point of order, but it could be struck out by an amendment. The part of the bill that is new legislation is, of course, subject to the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order against the five lines of new legislation, but not against the remainder.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order as to that part which is new legislation. Does the gentleman from Ohio move, as an amendment, to strike out the remaining part?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not care to do that. I want that repeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill until he had reached the last paragraph.

Mr. SIMPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to recur to page 16, where I desire to offer an amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the following paragraph, beginning on page 16:

Public-road inquiries: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States; to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making; for labor, traveling, and other necessary expenses, and for preparing and publishing bulletins and reports on this subject for distribution, and to enable him to assist the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, $8,000.

The amendment of Mr. SIMPKINS was read, as follows:

Page 16, line 22, after the words "methods of road making," insert "and the best kinds of road-making materials in the several States."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I accept that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House for favorable action.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, had made sundry amendments thereto, and had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, and that the bill do pass.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments were adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) I return herewith Senate bill 879, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory.'"

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *February 18, 1896.*

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—VAN HORN VS. TARSNEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the House that on next Tuesday, as soon after the meeting of the House as is practicable, I shall call up for consideration the contested-election case of Van Horn against Tarsney, from the Fifth Congressional district of the State of Missouri. The report of the majority of the Committee on Elections and the views of the minority have been submitted to the House and printed, so that in the meantime members will have an opportunity of familiarizing themselves with the case. I will add that before making this announcement I have consulted with the minority of the committee.

CORRECTION OF A BILL.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the House passed a Senate bill (S. 879) with sundry amendments, in one of which there occurred a verbal error. The bill was sent to the President and subsequently a resolution was adopted requesting him to return it for correction, which he has done. I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was ordered to be read a third time and passed be reconsidered, and, if that be granted, I shall ask consent to correct the error by striking out the word "three," in section 3, and substituting the word "two."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the vote whereby the bill to which he has called attention was ordered to a third reading and passed be reconsidered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the word "three," in section 3, be stricken out and the word "two" be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as amended be considered as passed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the report of the Commissioners on the Nicaragua Canal, which was recently sent to the House.

The SPEAKER. The matter which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes; the report is with that committee.

There being no objection to the request that the report be printed, it was so ordered.

SUITS TO VACATE PATENTS UPON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 5474) to provide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul patents upon public lands, and for other purposes. This is the bill that the House was considering and which was temporarily laid aside in order to dispose of the Agricultural appropriation bill. It has been read in full, and is now pending upon the amendments submitted by the committee. Perhaps there ought to be some brief explanation of the measure. I will occupy only a moment in refreshing the memory of the House upon the subject.

This bill has been prepared by the Committee on Public Lands in response to the President's message which was laid before the the House on the 17th of January last. A question arose the other day as to the insertion of the proposed amendment to include the Mexican and Spanish grants. I can only say for myself that I did not favor that amendment. A majority of the committee, however, supported it, and it was, therefore, reported to the House. These Spanish and Mexican grants are very ancient; they date back to the earliest recollection of old men now living; many of them had their origin in a past generation. The limitation provided in the act of 1891 will, if not interfered with, become absolute on the 3d day of next March. Speaking only for myself, I have no objection to the modification of that part of the bill, so as to include railroad and wagon-road grants only, omitting the proposed provision in regard to Mexican and Spanish grants. Some member of the committee who favored this proposed amendment would perhaps like to be heard on the other side of the question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state the reasons why I do not favor this bill in the form in which it is before the House. I am one of the members of the committee who have joined in filing a minority report. I am in favor of extending the time allowed the Government for forfeiting these public-land grants, but I do not favor the report of the majority of the committee. While I prefer the bill as reported by the majority to no legislation at all, my views are represented by a substitute which the minority of the committee have offered, and which simply repeals the statute of limitations passed in reference to these lands and fixes no time of limitation. Let me state my reason for preferring no limitation to an extension of the present limitation of five years.

The Government of the United States can act only by and through its agents. Those agents are appointed at different times, usually changing office with each new Administration. They can not always keep themselves fully advised as to the public business, nor can they watch the interests of the United States as an individual can watch and protect his interests. Matters of grave importance with reference to these public lands may escape the attention of agents who have recently come into office. I know of no limitation that has ever been adopted by any State on any question except on the assumption that by reason of lapse of time the presumption had arisen that the title was perfected or the claim vested in the party exercising the right thereto.

Now, we know that to-day the Government of the United States claims that a large amount of these public-land grants should be forfeited, that the railroad companies to whom they were made have received, either through mistake or fraud, a large quantity of public lands to which they were not entitled. Now, I believe that the Government ought to give the railroad companies every acre of land that it agreed to give them. These land bounties were offered in order to secure the building of these great railroads, and the companies are entitled to the lands which the Government agreed to give them. But, Mr. Speaker, they are not entitled to land which was not covered by those land grants; and so long as the land remains in the hands of the railroad companies or the original patentees there can be no injustice done if the Government takes back that which properly belongs to it.

But it is contended that if these grants be forfeited it will work injustice to innocent purchasers from the railroad companies or from the patentees. If that were the case, I would say that as the Government has issued its certificates of patent, which have gone into the possession of persons who did not know that the railroad companies or the patentees had entered lands to which they were not entitled, we ought to protect such innocent purchasers. But I say that under the law as it stands to-day the courts of this land have thrown ample protection around those innocent purchasers.

Under the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States, no man who has really purchased any of this land as an innocent purchaser can be affected or harmed by the repeal of this statute. In support of that position, Mr. Speaker, I might refer to a number of cases. The act of 1887 itself protects innocent purchasers. I will not occupy the time of the House in reading many cases (for there are many which support my position); I will refer to only one decision, that of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States *vs.* The California and Oregon Land Company, decided only about two years ago. In that decision (which was delivered by Justice Brewer) the court expressly decides that innocent purchasers under these land grants are protected.

I send the decision to the desk and ask the Clerk to read the portion I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

The right, therefore, of this defendant, the California and Oregon Land Company, to avail itself of a plea can not be doubted, and the plea which it made in the case, that of a bona fide purchaser, is one favored in the law. In the act directing these suits was a clause "saving and preserving the rights of all bona fide purchasers of either of said grants, or of any portion of said grants for a valuable consideration, if any such may be." In Story's Equity Jurisprudence, section 411, the author says: "Indeed, purchasers of this sort (bona fide purchasers) are so much favored in equity that it may be stated to be a doctrine now generally established, that a bona fide purchaser for a valuable consideration, without notice of any defect in his title at the time of his purchase, may lawfully buy in any statute, mortgage or other incumbrance upon the same estate for his protection. If he can defend himself by any of them at law his adversary will have no help in equity to set these incumbrances aside, for equity will not disarm such a purchaser, but will act upon the wise policy of the common law, to protect and quiet lawful possessions and strengthen such titles." And the reason of this is given in Boone *vs.* Chiles (10 Pet., 177, 210), as follows: "This leads to the reason for protecting an innocent purchaser, holding the legal title, against one who has prior equity; a court of equity can act only on the conscience of a party; if he has done nothing that taints it, no demand can attach upon it, so as to give any jurisdiction. Strong as a plaintiff's equity may be, it can in no case be stronger than that of a purchaser, who has put himself in peril by purchasing a title and paying a valuable consideration without notice of any defect of it or adverse claim to it." (See also, Lee *vs.* Polk Copper County Company, 21 How., 493, 497, 498; Croxall *vs.* Shererd, 5 Wall., 268.)

In United States *vs.* Burlington, etc., Railroad Company (98 U. S., 334, 342) it was said: "It (the United States) certainly could not insist upon a cancellation of the patents so as to affect innocent purchasers under the patentees." And again, in Colorado Coal Company *vs.* United States (123 U. S., 307, 313): "It is fully established by the evidence that there were in fact no actual settlements and improvements on any of the lands, as falsely set out in the affidavits in support of the preemption claims and in the certificates issued thereon. This undoubtedly constituted an equity as against the parties perpetrating it, or those claiming under them with notice of it, to justify the cancellation of the patents issued to them. But it is not such a fraud as prevents the passing of the legal title of the patents. It follows that to a bill in equity to cancel the patents upon these grounds alone the defense of a bona fide purchaser for value without notice is perfect."

The land company therefore has a right to set up a special plea, and the plea which it did set up, that of a bona fide purchaser, was sufficient, if true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the highest court in the land has sustained the proposition that these innocent purchasers are protected, though it may be contended that they ought to go into court and establish that they are bona fide purchasers, while under this bill, or any act that you may pass, if the Government of the United States sees proper to raise the contention that they are not bona fide purchasers they will have to go into court to maintain the proposition that they are innocent purchasers.

You can not say that the Government shall not litigate, if you are going to pass any bill that will authorize the forfeiture of these land grants; and I contend if you pass the bill as it stands instead of the amendment, that in attempting to try to give these innocent purchasers what the law already gives them you will cut off the rights of other innocent persons to these transactions.

There are certain cases where the patentee—the homestead settler—went on the land first; entered and took up his homestead and the railroad company also filed its line of definite location and asked a certificate for particular classes of land so covered. Although the settler was first in possession of the land, although he is an innocent purchaser, under the law the railroad company, having filed its claim with the General Land Office first, has the first standing with the Government; and yet, in some of these very cases, and in many of them, there are instances where the railroad has improperly entered land and is claiming land that does not properly come under the grant. That line of cases has been covered in the decision in the United States *vs.* The Winona and St. Paul Railway Company and Thomas Marshall, jr., reported in 69 Federal Reports, page 948.

If you pass this act you absolutely cut off any right of the Government to protect the men who went on as bona fide holders and entered their homesteads on the land. But if you repeal the act entirely, as we ask in the substitute, you leave the question open, so that, as to the lands the roads have improperly taken, the Government can forfeit them, and it leaves the homestead settler in possession of his home.

Another view I take in reference to these purchasers—the innocent purchasers (and the Government, I say candidly, ought to protect all of them)—under the existing law, under the statute of 1887, and the decisions arising under that act, similar to the decision I referred to and had read from the desk, all of these people are protected. The courts have gone through that law and have construed it; the settlers know what it is; there is no doubt and nothing left for construction; but if you put a new law on the statute book you establish something that before it is settled must be construed, and you all know that before this statute can be construed some time must elapse, and you only increase the amount of litigation that the settler will be subjected to instead of lessening it.

For that reason I advocate the substitute that is offered by the minority instead of the bill that is offered by the majority; but I say we ought to have some legislation, and if the House is unwilling to accept the substitute, then I shall vote for the bill offered by the majority.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to amend section 1 of the bill by adding:

Provided, That all lands patented or certified to any State, corporation, or individual, under the rulings or constructions of law of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, or the Secretary of the Interior, at the time of the issuance of said patents or certificates, and when no fraud has been committed by the agent of the State or corporation or by the individual, shall be excepted from the operation of the provisions of this act as to extension of time and bringing of suits, and of the act approved March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker, in the district in which I live there are at least 200,000 acres of land granted to the State of Iowa, to aid in the construction of railroads, nearly forty years ago. This land grant was adjusted and the certification made in 1859. Thirty-seven years have elapsed since the corporation taking under this grant from the State became the owner of these lands. Every acre of this land was sold many years ago, and is now in the hands of settlers—of farmers. In my judgment this bill, notwithstanding the opinions that have been presented here by some gentlemen, does disturb this class and throws a cloud upon every one of these titles.

It is true that there is a clause in this bill whereby at the end of litigation or by filing evidence of the title of the new holder he may not be seriously disturbed. But no one of all those settlers knows what particular tract of land will be selected by the Secretary of the Interior under the act of 1857 as the subject of litigation. Every man's land is clouded with the thought, with the certainty, that the Secretary of the Interior may institute a suit against him. He may be conscious of his ability to defend himself, but he does not want to go to a Federal court, possibly 100 or more miles away, into a community in which he is a stranger, and there make his defense. He can not do it without incurring expense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of importance. Only a week ago one of my clients wrote to me that, under the act of 1887, although he had his certificate, his duplicate—which under the laws of the State of Iowa is all the evidence of title that he needs—although he has held that for more than forty years, he has recently been notified by the Department that under the readjustment of that Department, going over the old entries, they have discovered that his land was within the limits of a railroad, and was double-minimum rather than single-minimum land. On those lands he had located a Mexican land warrant, paying the difference for the fractional quarter. He was notified of the annulment of his patent, and required to pay the additional sum that would make the aggregate of the double-minimum price, after forty years. I say that is not right, and that there ought to be a statute of limitations that would be a bar against the Government as against individuals.

There is no reason why the officers may be negligent for forty years and then at the end of that time come upon a purchaser, as in this case, not the original purchaser, and require the new owner to make this payment. The other man is dead and gone long ago and his estate has been settled, so there is no possible redress for the present holder. It is not right or proper.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], in a speech that he made to this House the other day, told the House that the statute of 1887—to be continued in its operation by this act—was a statute for the recovery of lands fraudulently obtained from the Government. I have taken occasion to make inquiry, and I find that in all of the adjustments in every case where the company has been required, under the provisions of the act of 1887, to make reconveyance, in not a single instance has there been an allegation of fraud.

These cases do not arise even from any mistake of fact. There is neither mistake of fact nor fraud involved in this. They grow out of the changes of construction by the officers to-day differing from those of the officers of twenty, thirty, or forty years ago. For instance, years ago the Department held that in case of a fraudulent preemption, or where a preemption had been abandoned, the preemption entry did not serve to extract the land from the operation of the donating statutes. Under that, in cases of that kind, where the preemption filing had been made, but abandoned, or shown in contest to be fraudulent, the lands were certified to the State, and from the State of Iowa to the railway company. The Department has recently changed that ruling, perhaps under a late decision of the Supreme Court, which holds that that kind of an entry did serve the office of extracting those particular lands from the operation of the granting statute.

Although these lands were long ago certified to the company, although they have sold them, now they require the company to

reconvey the lands conveyed to them long ago, which requires the holder of those lands to show that he is at present a bona fide holder in order to prevent the institution of suits against him, and in failure of that, requires him to go to a distant court to make defense to show that he is a bona fide holder. I do not believe that there is any justice in that.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] the other day said in his speech to the House that these certificates were a mere matter of form (substantially he said that), prepared often by the railroad companies; that their office was simply to serve as notice that those particular lands were claimed by the railway company as lying within the grant. The gentleman was certainly mistaken. This form of patent, this method of certification, was authorized by the statute of 1854. They take the place of patents in land grants. The Federal courts have held that they serve every purpose of patents, and of all the grants that have been made to the State of Iowa or to the railroad companies within that State not one acre is to-day held under any other muniment of title than such a certificate as the gentlemen told us the other day was a mere formal something intended to serve the purpose of notice.

They were authorized by the statute of 1854. At the time of some of the earlier grants his own State was one of the grantees under the act of 1849 of the swamp lands lying within her borders, and the State of Illinois was a grantee under that act to aid in the construction of the Illinois Central Railway. It makes them muniments of title. It was found to be an impossibility almost for the old form to be observed and for patents in each individual case to be issued. It was an almost interminable work, and then the act of 1854 was passed, and it has all the effect, so far as taking its title from the Government is concerned, of the most formal patent that ever was issued in the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these lands are patented and have been occupied for thirty or forty years. There is no reason or justice why repose should not be given by statute to all of these titles. If we simply allow time to pass, repose will be given to every one of them on the 3d day of next March, and no one of these settlers can be disturbed. In some of the proposed suits, I learned from the district attorney of the district in which I live, it will be necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of 1887 to make 2,000 people defendants to these suits. Two thousand people! In these particular cases, when it is all done, what boots it to the Government? It is a conflict between the beneficiaries of two grants.

The Government granted land to the State for swamp-land purposes, and the Government granted land to the State for railroad purposes. There was a conflict between the company and certain counties, who were in their turn grantees, as to who was the owner. These disputes were all composed twenty or twenty-five years ago by compromises and concessions, the one or the other party quitclaiming as to the other. The Government has no title of any kind. It is a conflict that they are proposing to carry on with reference to grants, and when this is all settled, at an expense of infinite litigation, not an acre goes to the Government. Why, then, should we not give repose in this class of cases?

In another instance that I am familiar with, Mr. Speaker, in your own State [Mr. MERCER in the chair], there was a grant to a company when practically, by an error or an oversight on the part of the officers of the United States, the lands lying on the line on either side of the file plat of the road were not withdrawn from market for a considerable period. Settlers came in and took these lands. Later, when the railroad was constructed, it was found that there was not within the limits of the grant a sufficient quantity to meet the purposes of the grant. The Department held that lieu lands might be given—lands in another locality—and the company was compelled to go away beyond its grant to lands that did not have the benefit of the construction of this road and take 201,000 acres, and one block of 10,000 acres of it they sold for $2,500—25 cents an acre; but they took these lands under the then ruling of the Department.

Under the advice of the law officers of the Department, subsequently the Department changed its view. When this was done men of eminence held the position. The lists were not made by railroad attorneys. Some of the lists of which I am speaking bore the signature of Thomas A. Hendricks, the then Commissioner of the General Land Office. He was not a man who transacted his business in the loose way characterized by the gentleman from Arkansas. He was certainly mistaken in the statement that he made that that ruling was adhered to until quite recently. Then they changed the ruling and held that lands must be taken within the prescribed limits or else the entries and selections were void. Now, one of the suits ordered is to recover the title of these lands taken in lieu of those that the company lost through the failure of the Federal officers to withdraw the lands from market.

I am not prepared to say that successful tests might not have been made, but they elected to take the other course and leave the settlers in quiet occupation. Now, sir, these lands in turn are settled. They are not in the hands of corporations, and if my amendment is adopted, every recovery can be had except in cases where the mistake has occurred—if it is a mistake, for I want to say to gentlemen that any lawyer will agree that these are close questions about which men may well differ, though the party in power has said otherwise.

Every acre, I say, will be recovered where a mistake of law, not of fact, a misconstruction of law, an improper ruling, has been made by the officers of the Government, and, in addition to that, where no fraud appears. If there is fraud, notwithstanding the fact that the error was that of the representatives of the Government, recovery may be had. Now, if there is no question of fact; if there is no fraud; if there is no right save that which is grounded in a charge of ruling or construction, I submit that there is no such equity, no such justice, no such condition of affairs as to justify either the remarks made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] the other day or the demands that are made by the provisions of this bill. I hope that the amendment which I have offered may prevail.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill, in every line of it, from the beginning to the end, was drawn with special reference to the protection of the rights of bona fide purchasers. As to the instance that my colleague cites as having occurred in Nebraska, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment which I think will cover the points he has in mind. I will send the amendment to the Clerk's desk to be read as a part of my remarks, so that it may appear in the RECORD for the information of members.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add at the end of section 1: "*Provided*, That no suit shall be brought or maintained, nor shall recovery be had for lands or the value thereof, that were certified or patented in lieu of other lands covered by a grant which were lost or relinquished by the grantee in consequence of the failure of the Government or its officers to withdraw the same from sale or entry."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague will not offer that until a vote has been had on my amendment.

Mr. LACEY. I do not propose to offer it at this time. Let me now briefly call the attention of the House to a difficulty in relation to one of the points embraced in the amendment of my colleague, which is this: His amendment provides that where patents have been erroneously issued without fraud they shall be confirmed. Now, these patents were erroneously issued frequently by the mistake in law or fact of a twelve-hundred-dollar clerk, and subsequently the Supreme Court of the United States decided that they were issued through mistake in the construction of the law. Evidently, if any of the lands thus patented to the company, which it does not own and ought not to have, are still held by the company, they ought to be reconveyed.

This bill protects the title where the lands have been sold, but if any of those lands are still in the hands of the company there is no reason why the patentee should not give them back if they have been erroneously patented, even though there was no fraud whatever. The amendment I have suggested will protect the interest of the settlers on these lands and at the same time it will leave the Government the privilege of acquiring again the titles to unsold lands that were erroneously patented.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the general debate is closed, or that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa could be considered at this time. I understand it has only been read for information.

Mr. LACEY. It has only been read for information.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee; when the Speaker signed the same.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of William T. Fanber against The United States, and S. M. Weaver, administrator of Jonathan Summers, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the purpose of conducting negotiations with certain Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the use of certain unexpended balances of appropriations for Northern Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

By Mr. TYLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4454) to authorize the admission into the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of veterans of the war of 1812 and of the Mexican war who subsequently entered the service of the Confederate States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 422); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr. CHICKERING, from the Committee on Railways and Canals, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 34) for ascertaining the feasibility and probable cost of constructing a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the navigable waters of the Hudson River, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 423); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HERMANN, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6246) to provide topographic surveys and mark elevations on the arid lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 424); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5217) making one year's residence in a Territory a prerequisite to obtaining a divorce there, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 428); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. PUGH, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Humphries. (Report No. 408.)

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 2735) for the relief of Enoch Davis. (Report No. 409.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 4424) to correct the military record of George I. Spangler. (Report No. 411.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 5127) for the relief of Abraham O. Waucop. (Report No. 413.)

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Peter F. Kendall. (Report No. 414.)

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others. (Report No. 416.)

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neeb, jr. (Report No. 417.)

By Mr. COLSON, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 467) for the relief of Samuel McKee. (Report No. 418.)

By Mr. PUGH, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of T. J. Pitzer. (Report No. 419.)

By Mr. COLSON, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of William Lock and James H. Tinsley. (Report No. 421.)

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 2944) for the relief of William B. Caldwell. (Report No. 425.)

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 959) for the relief of Alexander Moffitt. (Report No. 426.)

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief Edwin F. Mathews. (Report No. 427.)

By Mr. AVERY, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 1614) for the relief of Mary H. Noonan. (Report No. 429.)

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

By Mr. HURLEY, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 772) for the relief of H. C. Armistead. (Report No. 410.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 6250) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, in the county of Aitkin, State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6251) to divide the district of Nebraska into two divisions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6252) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rome, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Little Falls, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6254) to provide for the erection of a monument to Abraham Lincoln—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 6255) to aid in establishing homes in the States and Territories for teaching articulate speech and vocal language to deaf children before they are of school age—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 6256) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to George F. Fuller Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Manistique, Mich., a condemned cannon—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6257) for the erection of a public building at the city of Yonkers, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 6258) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate four pieces of condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the Grant County Union Soldiers' Monument and Memorial Association of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6259) to expedite the delivery of imported parcels and packages not exceeding $500 in value—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 6260) to provide compensation for a bridge and for buildings and other improvements constructed by certain persons upon public lands afterwards set apart and reserved as the Yellowstone National Park—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 6261) to amend section 1791, Revised Statutes, United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 6262) to establish a farmers' market in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOOMER: A bill (H. R. 6263) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lebanon, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 6264) to further define the duties of the Federal courts concerning contempts and punishments therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) to provide for the assessment, by jury, of the punishment of persons found guilty of felony in courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6266) making an appropriation for the improvement of Hot Springs Creek, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 6305) creating an art commission of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 6306) granting right of way for an irrigating canal—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 6303) to increase the effective strength of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6304) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 6305) creating an art commission

of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 6306) granting right of way, etc., for an irrigating canal—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GROUT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 122) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to deliver condemned cannon to Chamberlain Post, Grand Army of the Republic, to be posted by the soldiers' monument at St. Johnsbury, Vt.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A joint resolution (H. Res. 123) authorizing persons in the Navy and Marine Corps, when serving at sea, to make allotments of their pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A resolution (House Res. No. 172) requesting of the Secretary of the Treasury a detailed statement in regard to blanks for nickels and pennies used at mint in Philadelphia, Pa., since April, 1890—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A resolution (House Res. No. 174) directing the Secretary of War to inquire as to the present condition of the Sacramento River and estimate the cost of such improvements as may be necessary to restore said river to its natural channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KERR: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio relative to the singling out of wool for the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the general assembly of the State of Ohio concerning the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of each State—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAYTON: A memorial of the general assembly of Ohio relating to the tariff on wools and woolen goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT: A memorial of the legislature of Massachusetts relative to the navigation of the Connecticut River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6267) to remove the charge of desertion from Charles Ambsler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) to increase the pension of William N. Wells—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 6269) for the relief of James M. Blackburn, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 6270) to correct the military record of Exeum Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 6271) granting a pension to Lyndon J. Cole, late a first lieutenant of Company G, Twenty-fourth New York Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) to remove the charge of desertion from Francis W. Osterhout, Company F, Sixteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) to remove the charge of desertion from James W. Penny, alias Frederick Stanley, Company F, Second Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6274) for the relief of Arthur F. Weaver, of Scotland County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOKE of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 6275) to extend the patent granted to Richard S. Rhodes for an improvement in audiphones—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) to authorize the Postmaster-General to credit the account of James A. Sexton with the amount of funds stolen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 6277) for the relief of N. F. Palmer, jr., & Co.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) to reimburse the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty of the city of New York for moneys expended for the United States in raising, equipping, supplying, and arming militia and volunteer forces, and in other ways to aid in suppressing the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 6279) granting a pension to Olive H. South, of Jackson, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) granting a pension to William J. Carrell, of Pine Grove, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) for the relief of Ammon McLaughlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6282) to increase the pension of Alexander McBride—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 6283) granting a pension to Elizabeth Watts Kearny, daughter of the late Philip Kearny, major-general, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 6284) to pay the estate of Anna Irons, deceased, for beef cattle furnished United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 6285) for the relief of W. B. Horner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 6286) to correct the military record of John Gifford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 6287) granting a pension to Francis Sternberg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) for the relief of Mary E. Brady—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) for the relief of Lemuel Tanner, of Lafourche Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) for the relief of Dr. Joseph H. Pugh—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 6291) granting a pension to Indiana Christie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief of Thomas M. Emerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6293) to increase the pension of Peter Rafferty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6294) granting a pension to Samuel D. Gilman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) granting a pension to Mary J. Furber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 6296) for the relief of H. W. Rookwood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6297) granting a pension to Mary Van Wormer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6298) to correct the military record of Charles K. Jenree, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6299) to complete the military record of Matthew Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 6300) to amend the military record of George W. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 6301) granting an honorable discharge to Michael Monahan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 6302) for the relief of William H. Buckley, of Camba, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Resolution of settlers, for correspondence and information as to the action of the Secretary of the Interior relative to the Maxwell land grant—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of the Rhode Island Central Labor Union, in favor of the passage of the bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Exeum M. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition to accompany House bill for the relief of Arthur F. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petition of Oliver Levasseur and 65 others, of Portsmouth Township, Bay County, Mich.; also Birdsey Knight and 69 others, of Monitor Township, Michigan, praying that the import duty on chicory be restored, so as to foster a growing industry in the State—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of merchants and tea dealers of New York City, protesting against the passage of any bill imposing an import duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of F. V. Morrison and 101 others, requesting that Congress authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of citizens of Natchez, Miss., for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of certain leaseholders of lands in Quapaw Indian Reservation, for relief against an order of the Secretary of the Interior requiring new leases under bond—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: Petition of various church denominations of Plattsburg, Mo., for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Resolutions of the town council of Moultrieville, S. C., relative to protection of life-saving station on Sullivans Island from encroachment of the sea—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of L. P. Plummer Post, No. 50, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, advocating a new system of distributing seeds by the Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HART: Petition of citizens of Northampton County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of Charles F. Stuart and others, of Wickes, Mont., remonstrating against appropriating public moneys for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of 27 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nashville, Chautauqua County, N. Y., remonstrating against the sale of liquor to immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 27 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nashville, Chautauqua County, N. Y., against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of 41 citizens of Alpine County, Cal., in favor of the recognition of the Cubans as entitled to belligerent rights—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolutions of J. B. Culver Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Duluth, Minn., indorsing the position of Senator C. K. DAVIS on the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of L. A. Plummer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of House bill No. 306, known as the Hainer bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of W. G. Burder and 26 others, also W. S. Pendleton and 26 others, all citizens of Oklahoma, asking for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, evidence in support of a pension for Alexander McBride, of Rose Hill, Iowa—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolutions of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, asking for sufficient appropriation to complete the harbor of refuge in Milwaukee Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEWIS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6215, relating to the pension claim of Ambrose D. Manion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6217, in behalf of a pension to William L. Chamberlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 6214, for a pension to Robert L. Akridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky: Petition of Col. J. S. Fish and others, of the Rockcastle and Lincoln County Home Guards, in Kentucky, asking that they may be placed on an equal footing as regards pay, pensions, and benefits, for services during the rebellion, as other volunteers in the Union Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of ministers and others of Danville, Ky., regarding bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCEWAN: Memorial asking for the passage of House bill No. 3618—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: Petition of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, accompanied by papers, asking for an amendment of the Harter Act, entitled "An act relating to navigation of vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with carriage of property"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: Petition of soldiers and sailors in the Union Army during the rebellion, residing at Eureka, Nev., asking for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition and papers to accompany House bill No. 6222, for an increase of pension to Czar Dunning, of Palmyra, N. Y.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Remonstrance of 32 citizens of Monona County, Iowa, against the passage of House bill No. 5737, granting to the town of Onawa for public uses a certain lake known as Blue Lake—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PITNEY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Madison, N. J., consisting of 40 members, in favor of the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Jersey, 7,000 members, favoring a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of B. P. Gilleland, Henry Bonner, and others, of Fayetteville, Tenn., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas Emerson, praying that his claim for property taken by the Army during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Resolution of Post No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of a bill pensioning soldiers who were confined in Confederate prisons during the civil war, 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., to the President and Congress of the United States, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition af Rev. Joseph Vance, pastor, and 300 members of the Second Presbyterian Church, Chester, Pa., in regard to Sunday rest and compulsory education—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Rev. Joseph Vance, pastor, and 300 members of the Second Presbyterian Church of Chester, Pa., with regard to age-of-consent law and divorce laws in the Territories and the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of J. W. Perkins, F. A. Weer, and 67 other citizens of Delaware County, Pa.; also, of Arthur G. Ash, S. S. Wells, and 78 other citizens of Chester County, Pa.; also, of Harry M. Zook, W. H. Broschard, and 114 other citizens of Downington, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 300 members of the Second Presbyterian Church of Chester, Pa., asking for the passage of the Erdman bill, providing for industrial arbitration, and the Phillips bill, providing for a labor commission—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of 300,000 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, remonstrating against the introduction of military education in the public schools of the country—to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions unanimously passed by a farmers' institute at Kennet Square, Chester County, Pa., second month, thirteenth day, condemning the action of J. Sterling Morton, Secretary of Agriculture, for his high-handed, arbitrary, and illegal refusal to carry out an act of Congress distributing seeds, etc., to farmers—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Resolutions of Post No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of a bill pensioning soldiers and sailors confined in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS (by request): Recommendation of the members of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, that the present method of and appropriation for the distribution of seeds be abolished—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAFT: Memorial of Encampment No. 123, Union Veteran Legion, against a change in the grouping of the stars on the national flag—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6234, to grant a pension to J. R. Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6231, in support of a pension to Jonathan Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6230, favoring a pension to Tim Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper in support of House bill No. 2747, to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John R. Killingsworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mary Vanwormer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper in support of House bill granting a pension to W. S. Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of H. W. Rookwood—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of Allen R. Thompson and 35 other citizens of New Buffalo, Pa.; also, of A. W. Beard and 125 others, of Middletown, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 19, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

POST-OFFICE MAIL BAG REPAIR DIVISION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of the 5th instant relative to the mail bag repair shop of the Post-Office Department, an abstract from the rolls for the first fifteen days of February, 1896; which was read.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the letter be printed and lie on the table. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], who is interested especially in this matter, is not present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. CALL. I desire to say, without detaining the Senate, that I have been requested by some of the employees of the mail bag repair shop to state that the foreman, Mr. Cullen, and Mr. Tyler, who have been somewhat implicated in the statements and charges heretofore made or implied, are, in the opinion and judgment of these employees, both capable and efficient men and entirely innocent of any charges of neglect or improper conduct. I know both of these persons, and I regard them both as men of character and integrity, and as capable officers in every respect, considerate of the employees and their interest and that of the Government. I desire to make that statement in this connection.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented sundry petitions of citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1886, or some similar measure, requiring the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company to adopt rapid transit on its lines, and remonstrating against the extension of the tracks of that company until its existing lines are modernly equipped and operated; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to the passage of a bill to establish a military and national park upon the Palisades of the Hudson; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution. Relative to the passage of a bill by Congress to establish a military and national park upon the Palisades of the Hudson.

Whereas a bill has been introduced and is now pending in the House of Representatives, known as House bill 2187, to establish a military and national park on the Palisades of the Hudson: Therefore

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of assembly concurring), That the Senators of the United States and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey be respectfully requested to use their influence for and to urge the passage of said bill.

2. *And be it resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, duly certified by the president of the senate and speaker of the house, be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey.

LEWIS A. THOMPSON,
President of the Senate.
LOUIS T. DEROUSSE,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by both houses of the legislature February 3, 1896.

Mr. PEFFER presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of Kansas people residing in Oklahoma Territory, signed by T. N. Athey, local secretary, Blackwell, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve them in the matter of free homes, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tescott, Kans., through its officers, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, praying for corresponding action on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petition of N. W. Finley and sundry other citizens of Dallas, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of 61 citizens of Newton, Newton Center, and Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty, in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protection system; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented the petition of Hugh J. Edwards and 67 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., soldiers of the late war; and a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by William Nelson Post, No. 97, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, of Douglas, Wyo., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of citizens of St. Augustine, Fla., recommending the passage of the bill (S. 1159) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses. This petition I handed to the Senator from Florida nearest me [Mr. PASCO]. He stated that it is signed by influential and responsible people representing the business interests of that part of the State of Florida, but he declined to present the petition himself, because he said he regarded it in some sense as a compliment to me as the introducer of the bill, the petition having been sent to me.

The petition sets forth that, "in view of the great commercial interests centering in our seacoast cities and of their present defenseless condition," the bill for the defense of our harbors and seaports should receive attention at the hands of Congress.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the common council of Lynden, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the appropriation of public money for sectarian institutions; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Klickitat County, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect agricultural staples by an export bounty; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, remonstrating against the introduction of military instruction in the public schools; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Farmers' Institute of Kennett Square, Pa., favoring the step taken by Secretary Morton in refusing to distribute seed at public expense; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GEAR presented the petition of Rufus L. B. Clarke, a citizen of the United States, praying the Senate to investigate the matter of his removal from the office of examiner in chief of the Patent Office, and remonstrating against the power of the President to make such removal; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of John Leezer and 306 other citizens of Keokuk, Iowa, praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the appropriation of money by the Government or by the respective States to aid any church or religious denomination; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Tennessee and sundry petitions of citizens of Georgia, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Bladen County Alliance, of Elizabethtown, N. C., expressing sympathy with Cuba and indorsing the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Francis Adams, president, Edward F. Slafter, and Albert Bushnell Hart, a committee of the Massachusetts Historical Society, praying that a sufficient appropriation be made to enable the Secretary of State to prepare the records and papers of the Continental Congress for early publication as a national document; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of Rev. T. W. Moore, D. D., and 19 other citizens of Quincy, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South for the use, consumption, and destruction of the property of that corporation by and under the authority of the United States during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LINDSAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Russellville, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VILAS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Commandery of Wisconsin, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, praying for the passage of the bill to establish a military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ORDER OF PETITIONS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand several hundred petitions which have been sent to me from various parts of the country, and especially from the State of New York. They have accumulated during the past ten days. They relate principally to the question, the important question, of the sale of beer on Ellis Island.

Ellis Island, as the Senate well knows, is where the immigrants land on coming to this country. The persons engaged in this movement have been very industrious and have prepared printed petitions which have been circulated all over the country. I desire simply to read one of the petitions:

Petition to the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

Your petitioners, citizens of the State of New York and representatives of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, realizing the demoralizing effect which the sale of beer has upon immigrants landing at Ellis Island, and believing the payment of $10,500 annually into the United States Treasury for the privilege of such sale to be a stigma upon our National Government, etc.

And the petitioners request the passage of a measure that will prohibit the sale of beer at Ellis Island. There is another petition upon the same subject, printed in a little different form, which says simply that the sale at Bedloes Island "is a source of serious injury to the men stationed there."

Mr. President, I can not very well see how the sale of beer to immigrants landing at Ellis Island can be of very great injury to the temperance cause or can seriously affect the health or lives of the immigrants who land there. On the contrary, I am disposed to think that a glass of beer would be very welcome to the immigrants upon their landing in this country.

The vast effort made by well-meaning, but misguided people in endeavoring to flood Congress with these petitions shows the crusade, the extreme Puritanism, or the extreme Rooseveltism, if I might use that term, that is in progress in the State of New York and in the country.

Not only that, but I have also received from various parts of my State divers petitions from various societies asking that Congress should pass a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; and some of the petitioners state that they desire to have Congress pass a law for the District of Columbia that is equal to the most efficient State Sunday law anywhere in the country. It is difficult for me to see exactly how the people of my State are particularly interested in a Sunday law for the District of Columbia, unless possibly it may be to affect or regulate the conduct of their Senators and Members of Congress.

Of course the people throughout the country have a right to petition Congress on any subject. The right of petition I would carefully preserve and guard. Yet we all know that in these days of newspapers and telegraphs and other improvements petitions are not of that great value practically that they used to be, when about the only way the people could manifest public sentiment and acquaint Congress with their desires was by petitions.

I venture the assertion that very soon after these petitions are received they are quietly packed away and but little attention is paid to them. That must necessarily be so. My friend upon my right [Mr. ALLEN] suggests that they go to the junk dealer; and possibly in that respect they may relieve the wants of our Treasury.

Mr. ALLEN. No, I did not make that suggestion; I suggested that possibly they might go to the junk dealer in violation of the spirit of the law.

Mr. HILL. The spirit of the law requires these petitions to be presented, read, acted upon, and disposed of.

Mr. President, I am disposed of course under the present rules of the Senate to present these petitions, as I received them, calling the attention of the Senate to them as heretofore. However, this mania for the presentation of petitions has broken out especially upon the temperance subject. I find that among these petitions sent to me there is one which recites that the sale of cider, especially in the villages and towns, is a source of great harm to the community, and the petitioners want the sale of cider prohibited. But I discover that the petition, which comes in a folder addressed to Congress, is a part of the crusade in my State and is addressed to the legislature of the State, so carelessly is this whole business conducted.

I will inflict upon the Secretary of this body this immense number of petitions, but I think that we ought to be relieved from their presentation each morning. The morning hour is very much crowded, the morning two hours, and if we could relieve this time from the presentation of petitions it strikes me it would expedite public business. I think we might well follow the precedent which has been set in various parts of the country in doing away with the public presentation of petitions. The Constitution will stand; the Government of our fathers will not be injured by it. In a large number of the legislatures of the States it has been done away with, and boxes are provided for the receipt of the petitions. I would still have them entered upon the Journal, but I would allow Senators, if they see fit, to present them to the Secretary quietly each day of the session, and then they could thereafter be properly entered. The House of Representatives has such a rule. The legislature in my own State has such a rule; and in a large number of legislatures throughout the country the old practice of formally rising and presenting petitions, which are never thereafter heard of or very seriously considered, has been done away with.

In the presentation of these petitions this morning, and in connection with this subject, I give a notice which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the notice.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senator HILL gives notice that at some future day he will move to amend subdivision 4 of Rule VII of the Senate so as to read as follows:

"4. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist, and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate, or the petition or memorial may be delivered to the Secretary with the name of the Senator presenting the same, and the disposition to be made indorsed thereon; when such petition or memorial shall be entered in the Journal and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the same as if presented from the floor. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by the citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President."

The purpose of such amendment is to facilitate the transaction of business in the Senate, and to leave it optional with each Senator whether he will present petitions and memorials in open Senate or to the Secretary.

Mr. HILL. I ask simply that that be presented, and I assume, of course, that it will lie on the table. The only change which it makes in the existing rule is that Senators may still continue to present petitions, if they desire to do so, in open session, but it permits any other Senator who prefers to do so to hand the same quietly to the Secretary.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire the attention of the Senator from New York for a moment. I understand the fact to be, and that the petitions he now presents assume the fact to be, that no spirituous liquors, nothing but malt liquors, are sold or used at Ellis Island.

Mr. HILL. The petition seems to assume that other liquors are sold. While it only speaks of the sale of beer, yet at the conclusion of the petition the petitioners ask that not only beer shall be prohibited from being sold, but all other liquors.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator, as he has called public attention to this subject in this emphatic way, whether he does not understand it to be the fact that at the immigrant station at Ellis Island there are sold no spirituous liquors whatever; nothing but beer?

Mr. HILL. I had assumed so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think that is the fact, and it should be known; and that there is no more quiet or orderly place in the country than Ellis Island as it is now conducted as an immigrant station.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from New York will be appropriately referred.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864;

A bill (H. R. 5286) providing for disposal of lands lying within the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation, not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon;

A bill (H. R. 5382) to authorize the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company to extend its line of railroad into the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 121) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in relation to the harbor at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee.

MANITOWOC HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask that the joint resolution calling upon the Secretary of War for information in regard to the harbor of Manitowoc may be laid before the Senate. It is a concurrent resolution under the law that was passed requiring both Houses to join in certain requests for information, and it merely asks for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 121) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in relation to the harbor at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin, was read twice by its title.

Mr. HILL. Is that a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution?

Mr. VILAS. I understand that there is now a necessity for both Houses of Congress, under a recent law, to concur in such a resolution. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. FRYE. It must be a joint resolution under the law.

Mr. VILAS. It must be a joint resolution under the law in order to obtain the information.

Mr. HILL. And the President must sign it?

Mr. VILAS. The other House have asked for the information and were obliged to put their request in the form of a joint resolution, as I was informed by one of their members, who desired me to call it up here.

Mr. HILL. And the President must sign it?

Mr. HARRIS. Necessarily.

Mr. VILAS. I suppose so.

Mr. HILL. Of course if it is a statute, a joint resolution, that settles it. I rose to make the inquiry whether a concurrent resolution is not the proper measure. Then the President, of course, would have nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. HOAR. I wish this matter might stand over until the close of the morning business. The Chair in his discretion may lay it before the Senate after the routine business is concluded.

Mr. VILAS. I did not suppose that it would lead to one moment's objection or delay.

Mr. HOAR. Let it go over until after the morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there are no further petitions or memorials, reports of committees are next in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 713) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 534) for the relief of L. A. Davis, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 190) for the relief of J. M. Billings, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to report a bill, which I ask to be read twice and placed upon the Calendar with the accompanying report. As soon as the report is printed I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take it up at the earliest possible day.

The bill (S. 2169) to regulate mail matter of the fourth class was read twice by its title.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It appears that the custom has grown up in the different Departments of this Government of shipping as fourth-class mail matter, under a construction of the law which is not in my opinion tenable, all sorts of material. The Treasury Department ships great bundles of locks, electric motors, and other heavy ironware all over the country free, and it is charged to the Post-Office Department. The Interior Department ships roller desks and typewriters with their desks, which go all over the country free. The Coast and Geodetic Survey ships by mail as fourth-class matter tents and tent poles and the baggage of its members. All this great weight is carried in the mails of the country free, against the protest of the Post-Office Department, and is charged to the Post-Office Department and not to the Department which ships it.

The abuse has grown to be so gross that additional men have to be employed at the leading post-offices of the country to handle the enormous and bulky freight, sometimes weighing from twelve to fourteen hundred pounds, which is turned in as fourth-class mail matter and shipped for nothing. At times the postal-car doors have to be taken out and widened in order that this stuff may be carried free at the expense of the Government.

The amendment to the law which the committee has reported is to the effect that the matter emanating from the Department must be written or printed, so that all packages of material must be limited to 4 pounds in weight or must be written or printed matter emanating from the different Departments of the Government.

As I said, I ask that the report and the appendix which accompanies it may be printed, and I give notice that at the earliest possible day I shall call up the bill and ask the Senate to act upon it, for the sooner the abuse is corrected the better.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2146) to amend section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1895, being an act amendatory of an act with reference to the postal service, reported the same favorably, with amendments, and moved its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary; which was agreed to.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1722) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge across the Sulphur River, in the State of Arkansas, by the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1724) authorizing the Kansas City, Watkins and Gulf Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Black River, in Louisiana, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1725) authorizing the Kansas City, Watkins and Gulf Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across Red River, at the city of Alexandria, La., reported it with amendments.

Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 927) for the relief of Chester B. Sweet, of California, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 76) authorizing Lieut. William McCarty Little to accept a decoration from the King of Spain, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 278) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, heirs and children of Thomas U. Walter, deceased, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 482) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Sherwin, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 652) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the draft of a resolution presented by Mr. CULLOM February 12, 1896, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to close up the sinking-fund account of the Pacific railroads, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads; which was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Peter Daly, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1211) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land opposite to the Gosport Navy-Yard, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 2170) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant temporary occupation of certain rooms in the United States building at Jefferson City, Mo., to the courts of Cole County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Margaret D. Sharp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2172) to authorize a reliquidation of certain entries of merchandise; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2173) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Mellsop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Marthon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 2175) granting a pension to James Loyd Young, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 2176) granting a pension to Thomas Pollock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Conway; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BROWN introduced a bill (S. 2178) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Salt Lake City, the capital of the State of Utah, and at Ogden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2179) regulating the disposition of lands granted in aid of the construction of what are known

as the subsidized or bond-aided railroads of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. ALLEN. In this connection, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to withdraw a resolution upon this subject introduced by me on Monday last.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be withdrawn.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2180) for the relief of the trustees of McDaniel's Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Shellmound, Marion County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2181) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 2182) for the relief of Anton Gloetzner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2183) further to amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, A. D. 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2184) granting a pension to William F. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2185) pertaining to the sale of liquor to Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2186) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Bay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2187) to pension Thomas F. Leahy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2188) granting increase of pension to John J. Boatwright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL. I introduce by request a bill to provide for the publication of a periodical which shall be known as the Congressional Cloture. I have not examined the measure and I do not wish to be held responsible for it.

The bill (S. 2189) to provide for the publication of a periodical which shall be known as the Congressional Cloture was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 81) to revive the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. CARTER. I offer a resolution and ask that it be read for information and that it lie on the table. I desire next Monday, or on such other day as may suit the convenience of the Senate and when the public business will permit, to submit some observations upon the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

SALES AND PROCEEDS OF SALES OF BONDS.

Mr. LODGE. I offer a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be directed to investigate and report generally all the material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896, and how the proceeds of such bonds were disposed of, and to what purposes the said proceeds were devoted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. I should like to examine the resolution more carefully than I have time to do now, and I suggest that it go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENTS IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. PEFFER, instructing the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to make an investigation as to the levying and collection of assessments for political purposes from employees of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. PEFFER. Let the resolution be passed over, retaining its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to that course? The Chair hears none.

MANITOWOC HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution from the House of Representatives, for which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] desires present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. Res. 121) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in relation to the harbor at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. HILL. Will it not be sufficient, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, to have that a concurrent resolution? Otherwise it must go to the President to be signed. I can not think, unless we have passed some statute inadvertently, that Congress has tied its hands so that it can not get one of these estimates from a Department of the Government without the approval of the President.

Mr. VILAS. I have been trying to find the law with the aid of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the committee from which the law emanated originally, but I am unable to find it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me a moment, I am able to furnish him the law.

Mr. VILAS. Certainly.

Mr. BLANCHARD. This law was passed, not inadvertently, as the Senator from New York seems to think, but——

Mr. HILL. Let me ask what is the law? Let us understand that. Is a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution required?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will read the law. In the river and harbor act approved July 13, 1892, the following provision may be found, being the last paragraph of that law:

That after the regular or formal report on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed is submitted, no supplemental or additional report or estimate, for the same fiscal year, shall be made unless ordered by a resolution of Congress.

Mr. HILL. That means not a joint resolution, but a concurrent resolution, of course.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It does not contemplate such a resolution as requires Executive signature, but it does require a resolution which must be passed by both Houses of Congress.

I will state the reason briefly for the enactment of this law. Those who have been chiefly concerned with river and harbor improvement appropriations in Congress for some years past are aware that the aggregate of estimates submitted by the United States engineers for all the river and harbor projects of improvement throughout the United States usually foot up from $35,000,000 to $45,000,000 annually. Now, it has been found impossible to pass any river and harbor act of anything like that size. Accordingly, the River and Harbor Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate have been under the necessity of reporting appropriations very much below the estimates of the engineers. They have been compelled to report appropriations amounting only to from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the estimates.

With estimates for a fiscal year amounting to about $40,000,000, and it being impracticable for the committee to bring in a river and harbor bill for any such aggregate sum, it was found that to permit a resolution to be passed through one or the other House calling upon the War Department for additional estimates to be piled on top of the $40,000,000 was simply adding to the embarrassment already existing. So the matter was brought to the attention of the River and Harbor Committee of the House at the time when I had the honor to be chairman of that committee, and the Chief of Engineers appeared before the committee and advised legislation to prevent it.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask——

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the Senator will allow me one minute, it was deemed advisable to stop, in some measure, this custom that had grown up of adding constantly, by the simple method of having one House ask for it, additional estimates to embarrass the committees. So the provision I have read was incorporated in the river and harbor act of that year. Now I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana if under that law the concurrence of both Houses is necessary to this resolution?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The concurrence under this law of both Houses in the resolution is necessary.

Mr. HOAR. Then I want to ask the Senator what he thinks of this provision of the Constitution:

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States, and before the same shall take effect shall be approved by him.

If it is necessary that both Houses concur, as the Senator states, how is it possible that such a resolution can have any legal effect whatever without the President's approbation?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I believe as regards concurrent resolutions it has been the practice to pass them through both Houses, and thus to give force and effect to them without being submitted to the Executive. I suppose it is intended that the present resolution shall follow this custom. There is a question, as I understand from older legislators than myself, whether a concurrent resolution, like a joint resolution, does not have to be signed by the Executive.

Mr. HOAR. As I understand, the concurrent resolutions which may be adopted by both bodies without the assent of the President are resolutions which have no legal force or operative effect as laws, or as affecting the duties of any Department of the Government, but are mere expressions of opinion or purpose. But in this case the War Department is prohibited by law from making surveys and estimates or sending them into either House of Congress, unless there be a resolution of both Houses. So that that is a resolution having legal effect and determining the rule or law of action for an Executive Department and having the force of law. I do not see, therefore, why, taking the Senator's answer to my first question, a joint resolution is not necessary, as it comes within the very letter of the Constitution, as well as the spirit and purpose of it, and should therefore go to the President for his approval.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts be a correct one, that all resolutions passed by the two Houses of Congress, before force and effect can be given to them, must receive the approval of the Executive, then this resolution must be approved by the Executive; but I am told, I repeat, by Senators who have had longer experience in these matters than I have, that what are called concurrent resolutions have heretofore been given force and effect without being required to be submitted to the Executive. The only point I was making was that under the terms of the law which I have read no additional estimates in a fiscal year for river and harbor projects of improvement can be made unless ordered by a resolution of Congress, not merely by one House of Congress.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, this question has been before the Senate heretofore. As I have understood the contention of those who believe that a concurrent resolution does not require the Executive sanction, it is based upon a technicality, and a mere technicality, and that is the word "concurrent." I have never myself had any doubt that the concurrent action of the other House is the action of Congress. Whether the other House concurs or acts in a primary way, if you so term it, makes no sort of difference as to the effect on the Constitution. I have not myself the slightest doubt, and never have had, that concurrent resolutions of both Houses of Congress require the action of the President upon them. I know the custom has grown up here and the question has been raised at least twice in the Senate within my service, but it has gone by without any determinate action on the part of the Senate. I simply state my individual opinion. I never could see any valid argument against it.

Mr. VILAS. I think it perfectly clear from what has been said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] that this ought to be a joint resolution, and that it was properly sent here by the House of Representatives in the form in which it is now presented. Obviously, when the law requires a resolution of Congress to accomplish a certain end, that resolution must be passed in accordance with the Constitution. I take it that a concurrent resolution has simply the force of the body which passes it, subject to its taking effect upon the contingency that the other body concurs in it, and it can have no more effect than the resolution of one House of Congress. Whatever one House of Congress can do can be done by concurrent resolution, but no more.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, if there be any difference between a concurrent resolution and a joint resolution, and if that difference be that one must be approved by the Executive and the other not, and this resolution which has been called up for consideration by the Senator from Wisconsin is a joint resolution, it would have, of course, the effect which it is intended to have, if it be passed by this body, it having already been by the House of Representatives, and is approved by the President. It will do what the law I have read requires to be done before an additional estimate can be sent to Congress. I contend that additional estimates could be had, under the law which I have read, through the instrumentality of what is called a concurrent resolution. A fortiori will a joint resolution accomplish the same purpose?

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the joint resolution be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this being a joint resolution, it must be sent to the President of the United States for his signature; but that was not what was contemplated by the law which was read to us by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. The object of that law was undoubtedly to prevent unusual and unnecessary calls by committees of the two Houses and by individual members upon the War Department for papers, often very difficult to obtain, and sometimes necessary to be copied.

It seems to me a concurrent resolution is not a law in any sense, and therefore need not be signed by the President. It is a mere request upon an executive officer to furnish a legislative body certain information, and it never has been regarded in any other light than as a request which may be declined, and has been declined over and over again, by the heads of Departments, either for want of clerical force or from some other cause. Such resolutions may be passed, and are always respected by the Executive Departments, but they are not imperative or mandatory, nor have they in any sense the force of law.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to ask if this is a joint resolution which has come over from the House of Representatives?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. LODGE. Has it been before any committee of the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has not been before a committee of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I think it ought to take the usual course, Mr. President, and I object to its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed——

Mr. VILAS. The joint resolution is already in Committee of the Whole, as has been twice announced by the President of the Senate. If objection were to be made, it should have been made in the beginning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An objection to the joint resolution being read the third time will take it over for the day.

Mr. VILAS. Then I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

A. H. LAZARE.

Mr. GORDON. On yesterday the Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the Secretary of State for certain information. I now offer a resolution, and ask that it be adopted, in order to secure additional information to that asked for.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate what efforts, if any, have been made by the Department to induce the Republic of Haiti to pay to A. H. Lazare, a citizen of the United States, the amount awarded him by Judge William Strong in his award as arbitrator.

Mr. GORDON. I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution at this time.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

CATTLE QUARANTINE IN SOUTHWESTERN STATES.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, some days ago I moved to refer a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, in answer to a resolution which I had the honor to offer calling upon him for information in regard to the cattle quarantine line in Texas, to the Select Committee on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] then asked that the motion lie over, in order that he might address the Senate on the subject. I now desire to call up that motion for the action of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PEFFER and Mr. PLATT. What is the motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri moves to refer to the Select Committee on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products a communication the indorsement on which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate dated February 12, 1896, copies of the regulations establishing the quarantine line in the Southwestern States for the years 1895 and 1896.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I beg to say that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri two or three days ago, in which he cast some censure on the Secretary of Agriculture, I felt that the resolution ought to be discussed. Since then I have learned, by intercourse with friends in Illinois, that this is a very interesting question, and that it ought properly to go to the committee indicated by the Senator from Missouri. Therefore I shall not at this time detain the Senate with any remarks upon the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri, to refer the communication to the Select Committee on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.

The motion was agreed to.

REGULATION OF MARRIAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, if the morning business is through, I have a bill in charge which it is very important should be passed, and I do not think it will give rise to much discussion.

It is the bill to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1904) to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator who reported the bill if it be intended as a complete code or collection of all the provisions of law in relation to the solemnizing of marriages, or is it merely by way of amendment?

Mr. FAULKNER. There are a number of provisions which are not absolutely obsolete in the statutes of the District which have been compiled under the authority of Congress which are not affected by this bill.

Mr. HOAR. I was led to put that question by the first section of the bill, which provides:

That if any person intending to marry in the District of Columbia be under 21 years of age and has not been previously married, the consent of the father or guardian, or, if there be none, of the mother of such person, shall be given either personally to the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia or his deputy, or in writing, etc.

Suppose the father is in a distant country, suppose the person desirous of marrying be a German, a Russian, or an Armenian, and 20 years old, what is to happen if the law of the District, as this bill leaves it, absolutely prohibits such marriage?

Mr. FAULKNER. If the persons appear before the clerk and admit that they are under the age prescribed by the statute and have no guardian, I suppose it would be a prohibition, as would be the case by the law of any State of which I have knowledge.

Mr. HOAR. I think not, but I will not speak hastily——

Mr. FAULKNER. The remedy can be applied at once by the party having a guardian appointed to give consent, when there is no natural guardian.

Mr. HOAR. I will not speak hastily, but I suppose in most of the States that some fine or penalty is imposed upon the magistrate or clergyman performing a marriage in such cases, but that the marriage itself is valid.

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not mean to say that the marriage would be invalid, because, in my judgment—and I believe that is the concurrence of authority—no marriage is declared invalid by the court unless the language of the statute is such that it compels that conclusion as the intent of the legislature in passing it.

Mr. HOAR. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator's desire to have the marriage laws in this District regulated by some clear, simple, and just enactment, and I have no doubt that the Senator has made such a provision; but if it be true, as I understood the first answer of the Senator, that it is essential to the validity of the marriage of a minor, not merely as a matter for the punishment of a magistrate or a clergyman, but that it is essential to the validity of the marriage, then the question I put becomes a very serious one; and that is, what is to happen if the parent live in a distant country and can not give his assent? Take the case of a young woman 20 years old. The Senator answers that the matter can be remedied by having a guardian appointed who shall give his consent. That suggests another question. Is there any provision of law here by which, there being no property, it not being intended to intrust the guardian with the care of property, a guardian may be appointed for the mere purpose of giving assent to a marriage?

Mr. FAULKNER. I will answer that question by saying that any next friend or the minor himself may have a guardian appointed, where there is no natural guardian, in all the jurisdictions that I know of. But if the Senator understood me to say that if a party under the age prescribed by the statute should marry, this provision would invalidate that marriage, he misunderstood me. Such is not my understanding of the trend of the decisions in this country. There is no provision of the section invalidating the marriage by reason of one or both of the parties being under age, and under authorities construing such directory provisions I am satisfied the courts, for that reason, would not avoid the marriage.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me to express my dissent from his views of the law, with great deference, I did not suppose that it was a rule of law in the jurisdictions with which I have been familiar that a guardian could be appointed whether there were property or not. I understand that guardians can be appointed by the proper courts always for persons who have the control of property, and that guardians ad litem may be appointed to represent the interest of the minor in any particular legal proceeding, and that guardians may be appointed also in other cases especially provided for by statute, but I am not aware that there is existing in those places with which I am familiar any law by which a guardian can be appointed for the mere purpose of giving or withholding consent to the marriage of the minor, and for no other purpose whatever. If there be such a law in the District of Columbia, I should like to see it.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask that the amendment reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia to strike out section 6 may be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. That if any female under the age of 21 shall marry without the consent of her father or guardian, or, if she has none, of her mother, the supreme court of the District of Columbia shall, upon the petition of her next friend, commit her estate to a receiver, who shall give bond before the court and shall hold the said estate and pay out the rents and profits thereof to her separate use, under the direction of the court until she arrives at the age of 21 years, and at any time thereafter the court may direct the same to be delivered to her as her sole and separate property.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. Section 6 having been stricken out, it is necessary that the numbers of the sections following should be changed so as to conform to the new arrangement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

Mr. FAULKNER. In section [8] 7, on page 4, line 10, I move to insert:

Whether he or she is a citizen of the United States or of a foreign country if a citizen of a foreign country, whether all the requirements of the laws relating to marriage in the country of which he or she is a citizen have been complied with.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest objection to the general purpose of this bill, though I am not able to say what provisions in the Maryland statutes will be repealed by the last section; but I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia who is in charge of the bill why the marriageable age has been fixed at 21 years in the first section as to both sexes. In the State of Missouri—I will not undertake to answer for other States—the age of lawful consent upon the part of the woman is 18 years.

Mr. CULLOM. So it is in Illinois.

Mr. VEST. And I think, as Senators around me state, that is the provision generally in the statutes of the different States.

As a matter of course the object of these laws and of such a provision as I am now discussing is to prevent improvident marriages, where it is to be presumed that the parties are not of the age to give that maturity of judgment and legitimate consent that ought to be given to a transaction so important as marriage. On the other hand, the statutes of every State, it goes without saying, ought to conform to natural law. I submit that when we say that a woman 18 years old has not come to marriageable age it is rather a strained conclusion, and one to which I think no man of judgment would give his assent. As to a man, 21 years is the age at which he is presumed to have arrived at all the responsibilities of manhood throughout the different States of the Union; but that is not so as to women. I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia if it would not be better to make that limitation of 21 years apply to the male sex, and as to women 18 years, and then it would conform to the general provisions of the statutes of all the States.

Mr. FAULKNER. In reply to the Senator from Missouri, I will state that that is exactly the way in which I myself drafted that section, but the sentiment of the committee, after giving most thorough examination to this bill, in fact more so than to any other bill I have ever known to be before it, holding two sessions on the subject, was adverse to my own views, and they seemed to think that the age of both should be 21. Personally, I agree with the Senator from Missouri, that the age of the male should be kept at 21 and that of the female fixed at 18. If the Senator should offer an amendment to that effect, I should not feel as if I could controvert the proposition contained in it.

Mr. GEORGE. Section 4 seems, so far as I can understand it, to make a very radical, not to say revolutionary, change in the relation to marriages which are not consummated according to law. Marriage statutes have usually been construed to be merely directory, and persons who violated them were subject to penalties; but it has not heretofore, I believe, as to the mere forms, ever been held or enacted that a marriage contrary to these forms consummated should be null and void. Certainly it would be a very extraordinary position in which at least the alleged wife of one of these marriages would find herself, if, after the consummation of the marriage, after living together for some time, it should be discovered and then adjudged that the marriage was null and void from the beginning, and that she had been living in a state of unlawful cohabitation.

Marriage laws have been carefully framed heretofore to prevent that state of affairs, although they have prescribed certain rules as to age, as to getting consent, as to license, as to the publication of banns, and all that sort of thing, yet the law up to this time, generally at least, has been that, notwithstanding the omission to observe these forms, still the marriage is good if the parties be above the age of what is called consent—12, I believe, in the common law in a female, and 14 in a male.

After very careful reading of section 4, I believe under that section that, unless all the forms prescribed in the statute be observed

except one, the marriage is null and void; and I call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to what I am now about to read:

SEC. 4. That every marriage in this District shall be under license, and solemnized in the manner herein provided—

Then follows this provision—

but no marriage heretofore or hereafter solemnized by any person professing to be authorized to solemnize the same shall be deemed or adjudged to be void, nor shall the validity thereof be in any way affected on account of any want of authority in such person.

So the only case, according to this section 4, in which a marriage contrary to the rules prescribed by this statute shall not be void is the case where there is a want of authority on the part of the person solemnizing it; that is to say, that as to anything else, any other nonobservance of the statute, the parties after marriage find themselves in a condition where they are not married. I call the attention of the Senator and of the Senate to that.

I should be unwilling to ever put upon the statute book any provision which would make void a marriage actually solemnized where the parties are of the age of consent, or where there was no duress, or anything of that sort, which enabled the parties afterwards to escape.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will say very frankly to the Senator from Mississippi that if his construction of that section is correct the committee are unanimously opposed to the section, and the section fails to accomplish the purpose for which it was inserted in the bill. It is a saving clause sustaining the validity of marriages, noncompliance in which provision some of the courts have held would be sufficient to invalidate a marriage.

As to the other subjects to which the Senator refers, such as licenses, banns being published, etc., the Supreme Court of the United States in passing upon questions arising under this old law of Maryland has held that such provisions, as the Senator stated very properly, were directory, and therefore the marriage was not invalidated by a failure to comply with them; but that the minister and the parties contracting the marriage were liable to the penalties imposed by the statute. Where a party assumes to be a minister, or where a person is married by a party not authorized in any way to solemnize the rite of marriage, some of the courts have held that in such a case the marriage is invalid and void. The object of this section is to correct and to relieve past and future marriages of that character, where the parties honestly believed they were married by a person having authority to perform that ceremony, so that the marriage could not be invalidated by reason of that fact.

As to the provision relating to the honest belief on the part of the man or woman that the person solemnizing the marriage was authorized to do so, I should like to obtain the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and I submit to him that the only construction which can be fairly put upon that section is that it does not permit the court to declare marriages invalid which have been solemnized by a person pretending to have the authority to perform such ceremony, but who, in fact, is not clothed with that power, the parties contracting, or one of them, believing the person was authorized to perform the marriage rites.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question arising out of the second and third sections of the bill. Suppose a man does not belong to any religious society?

Mr. FAULKNER. Under those circumstances and under the law of the District to-day he could not solemnize the rites of marriage. He must belong to some religious society.

Mr. HOAR. I am not speaking of that; but it answers one thing I should like to know. But suppose the persons to be married do not belong to any religious society; they may have a religion of their own, or they may deny that they have any religion of their own, and they do not propose to agree to the doctrine of the church that marriage is a sacrament to be celebrated only by persons authorized to administer the sacraments of the church, is it the purpose of the framers of this bill not to allow such persons to be married at all?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes; there is no question about that, provided they decline to be married by a minister or one appointed by his religious association to perform the ceremony of marriage.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have added to this bill two things, and I wish the Senator from West Virginia would allow it to go over to enable me to prepare them. One is a provision for marriages by either a justice of the peace or some other civil magistrate. I suppose it is needless to say that my opinions on such subjects would induce me to desire to have a relative of mine married according to the rites and forms of the religious denomination to which I belong; I have no scruple of my own, of course, but there are a great many persons who do not wish to consent to the forms of any religious society in existence. The Quakers, who, of course, are protected by this bill, can not be conscientiously married by an Episcopal clergyman. Of course this bill would probably treat Quakers as a religious society without ordained ministers and recognize marriages according to their particular forms, but there are other persons not Quakers who have the same right. So I think the District of Columbia should follow what I suppose is the practice of all the States, and allow persons who deem marriage a civil contract, not a sacrament, to be lawfully married by a civil magistrate.

In the next place, I think the bill should contain and not leave, considering the history of the law of this District especially, to obscure or doubtful interpretation or construction the legality of the marriage entered into by a young woman who supposes she is lawfully married, and that the person marrying her has the right to do that when in fact there is a mistake, where a minister of the gospel is impersonated. Everyone who is familiar with English fiction or English history knows how often in past times in England young women of beauty and attraction were deceived by infamous and designing men. The plot of one of the most celebrated fictions, Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield, turns on that very thing; and it turned out that the person——

Mr. FAULKNER. I should like to know if the fourth section does not answer that very point?

Mr. HOAR. It turned out that the supposed minister of the gospel was not such, but was in fact a fraudulent person. It seems to me that ought to be put in unmistakable language.

Mr. FAULKNER. Is not the fourth section of the bill in unmistakable language?

Mr. VEST. Section 4 covers that point.

Mr. FAULKNER. I call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to that section. It gave me as much trouble to draw as any section in the bill, and I think clearly expresses that idea.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps it does. The fourth section escaped my attention at the moment.

Mr. FAULKNER. As to the other point. I should like to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I did not attempt to make any radical changes in the law. I found the law in the District of Columbia in reference to marriage in such a condition that it is a disgrace to the civilization of this country and to the capital of this nation. I regard marriage as one of the most important subjects of legislation, as on its validity depend not only legitimacy, but the transmission of property and all the rights that grow out of those two great subjects. For that reason it was important the law should be amended, obsolete provisions repealed, and full evidence preserved of the fact of marriages in this District.

The provisions of the old Maryland act have been obsolete, unknown, and unacted upon for many years. There has not been a marriage solemnized within the limits of the District of Columbia within the last fifty years which conformed fully with those provisions. The courts have wisely held them directory and sustained the validity of the marriage, but have left the parties who have violated its provisions amenable to its penalties. It is, therefore, an important, urgent necessity that the law shall be amended and those sections repealed, as publicity has now been given to its provisions, encouraging the malicious or the blackmailer to seek the enforcement of penalties prescribed by the terms of this antiquated and forgotten law.

I think the proposed law has been carefully drawn to remove the absurdities and doubts of the existing law, while at the same time it modernizes and simplifies the law upon this important subject for the future. The reason the committee did not put in any clause giving civil magistrates authority over this subject was that it had never existed in the District, and we did not deem it wise to bring forward too many new questions, the main object in view being to secure the enactment of a law under which marriages could be solemnized in the District without the contracting parties or the person authorized to officiate being subject to onerous penalties.

Mr. HOAR. I beg the Senator's pardon, but there is a third point that I think ought to be considered, besides the legitimacy of children and having a proper record, and that is the security of women who could be made the objects of artful and designing and unprincipled persons. I think if we are going to pass any law on this subject it ought to contain what I believe every Senator will agree should be the law; that is, a provision that parties who desire to be married by a civil magistrate may have that opportunity. It will take only a line or two to draw it, to insert a clause providing that parties may be married by a justice of the peace.

In the next place, I think there should be some more distinct provision as to what is to happen if the parents be at a distance and there be no guardian. I do not think that the question of the right to appoint a temporary guardian under such circumstances, like a guardian ad litem, should be left to construction or inference or doubt; it ought to be put into the law. I wish the Senator would let his bill lie over one day and let that clause be inserted.

Mr. FAULKNER. Of course I will comply with the Senator's

request; but if he inserts the provision authorizing the civil magistrates to marry he will find that almost every section of the bill will have to be rewritten or amended.

Mr. HOAR. I think not.

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes; because the theory upon which the bill is framed is that in the clerk's office of the superior court of the District every question that involves the validity or the regularity of a marriage shall be of record.

Mr. HOAR. The civil magistrate can send his records there just as well as clergymen.

Mr. FAULKNER. With the understanding that the bill will be taken up to-morrow after the routine morning business, I will let it go over so that the Senator from Massachusetts can examine it.

Mr. VEST. Before the bill goes over I wish to make a single observation. At the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia I will offer an amendment now, so that if there is any objection to it it may go over with the bill.

In line 3 of the first section of the bill, between the words "any" and "person," I propose to insert the word "male"; so as to read "if any male person intending to marry in the District of Columbia, and being under the age of 21 years."

Then, between the word "age" and the word "and," in the fourth line, immediately succeeding, I propose to insert the words "and any female under 18 years of age." That simply requires that the man shall be 21 and the woman 18 instead of 21. It diminishes the marriageable age of the woman from 21 to 18 years, which I think is in the interest of the purity of woman and of society.

I wanted, however, to make one other observation before the bill went over. I think it is eminently proper that marriages should be solemnized in the District of Columbia by a civil magistrate where the parties desire it. It is very well known that there are very reputable people and intellectual people in the United States—yes, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] says, moral people—who have a prejudice against being married by ministers of the gospel. It is not necessary for me to say that I do not share in any such opinion, but it exists; and in a country like ours, where there is no union of church and state and no interference by the Government with religious opinions, it is eminently proper that in this District, which belongs to all the people, there should be an absence of anything like religious legislation.

In all the States of the Union civil magistrates can perform the marriage ceremony as well as ministers of the gospel. In the State of Missouri we have a very stringent statute which requires justices of the peace or judges of courts of record, who can perform the marriage ceremony, to make return to the recorder of the county, who keeps a book in which a record of all marriages is kept, and it is an indictable offense for these civil magistrates to fail to make such return, because evidence of marriage and legitimacy of children and of descent in a District 10 miles square, where there can be only a limited number of civil magistrates, practically one city, for this District is rapidly becoming the city of Washington, there can be no sort of difficulty about a certificate from the civil magistrates.

Besides that, I make the general remark that it has been the policy of all civilized and Christian countries to facilitate marriages, to encourage marriages, and it has been considered as against the welfare of the state to throw any obstacle in the way of marriage. Therefore, instead of closing the functions of the civil magistrates to the performance of this ceremony, we ought to encourage it and give to every citizen of this country who is to be married in this District the privilege of going before a justice of the peace or a judge of a court of record, as he can now do in any State of the Union.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

Mr. FAULKNER. I understand there is an understanding that it shall be taken up after the routine business is concluded to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GAINESVILLE, M'ALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, in line 10 of the enrolled bill, to strike out the word "three" and insert "two."

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1894, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 5286) providing for disposal of lands lying within the Fort Klamath Hay Reservation, not included in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 5382) to authorize the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad Company to extend its line of railroad into the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. FAULKNER a director, on the part of the Senate, of the Columbia Hospital for Women, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of his term as director.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HALE. I move to take up the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

Mr. CALL. It is just 2 o'clock. I hope the Chair will lay the unfinished business before the Senate before that is done, and then I will give way.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to that, of course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution reported by Mr. MORGAN from the Committee on Foreign Relations, in reference to the war in Cuba.

Mr. HALE. Let that be informally laid aside in order that the appropriation bill may be taken up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to make the request that when the appropriation bill is concluded, if there be time for that purpose, we shall go to the Calendar for the consideration of private pension bills favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. I simply should like to move another bill and I do not want to be foreclosed; that is all. Why not take up the unobjected cases upon the Calendar? Is there any objection to that course?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator insists upon that I shall gracefully yield, but I would much rather have the pension bills passed, which would take a very short time. We have been in the habit of doing that in former Congresses. We have not had that privilege as yet during the present session.

Mr. HILL. I shall not object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, and it is so ordered.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the amendments of the committee be considered as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 12, line 19, after the word "Singapore," to insert "Cape Town (Africa)," and in line 21, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirty" and insert "thirty-three"; so as to make the clause read:

Consuls-general at Apia, Constantinople, Dresden, Guayaquil, Frankfort, Ottawa, Rome, St. Petersburg, Singapore, Cape Town (Africa), and St. Gall, at $3,000 each, $33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 4, to increase the total of the appropriations for salaries of consuls-general under Schedule B from $102,000 to $106,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "seventeen"; so as to make the clause read:

For salaries of consuls, vice-consuls, and commercial agents, $417,000, as follows, namely:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "Nagasaki," to strike out "(and Osaka and Hiogo)" and insert "and Osaka and Hiogo"; so as to make the clause read:

Consuls at Nagasaki and Osaka and Hiogo.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 21, after the word "Barbados," to strike out "Cape Town (Africa)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

INSPECTION OF CONSULATES.

To provide for the expenses of an inspection of consulates to be made by officers of the Government, such officers not to receive any compensation in addition to their regular salaries, which shall continue to be paid to them during the period of their employment in this special service, $10,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has an amendment to submit from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORGAN. On page 3, after line 17, I move to insert, under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations:

For secretary of legation to Liberia, $1,500.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps I had better state that they have neither clerk nor secretary at the legation in Liberia and that the post is getting to be more and more important every day. In fact all our interests in Africa are getting to be very important now. The Secretary of State has recommended the sum of $1,500 as the amount to be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. HALE. I think the amendment is right.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. HALE. The Secretary of State recommends it and the Committee on Foreign Relations reports it unanimously.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I have no further amendments, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Maine to line 121. The total should be made $379,000, should it not, the Senate having just added $1,500?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I move that amendment. I am obliged to the Chair for suggesting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, that amendment will be agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 15, 20, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To open Jupiter Inlet, in Florida, for the passage of boats and small vessels, to be expended under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, $500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in the amended paragraph insert "$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

EUGENE HALE,
W. B. ALLISON,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. G. CANNON,
S. A. NORTHWAY,
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the agreement of the conference in regard to the Jupiter Inlet provision be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To open Jupiter Inlet, in Florida, for the passage of boats and small vessels, to be expended under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, $500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Mr. HALE. The only difference is that the conference committee made it an absolute appropriation instead of taking it out of another appropriation.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Maine a question? What is the amendment from which the Senate conferees propose to recede entirely? I think there is only one which it abandons entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 15, 20, and 31.

Mr. CHANDLER. Those are the amendments concerning which I desire information.

Mr. HALE. Those are amendments in relation to the Mexican boundary and a report of a scientific nature relating to that exploration. The House conferees insisted strongly upon the appropriation being left as it came from that body, and not being willing to yield, and the Senate conferees, not believing the appropriations absolutely essential upon this bill, gave it up.

Mr. CHANDLER. That explanation covers all the items where the Senate receded entirely?

Mr. HALE. It covers those items, 5, 6, and 7, whatever the numbers are.

Mr. PASCO. I rose to make an inquiry in reference to an amendment that was reported by the committee with reference to the naval station at Key West. Four thousand dollars was appropriated for a coaling shed. I should like to ask if that amendment still remains in the bill, or whether it was affected by the action of the conference?

Mr. HALE. That amendment goes out, on the understanding that it will be placed upon the regular deficiency appropriation bill, it not being an urgent deficiency. The appropriation was for $10,000, and the Secretary reports that he could get no bid for less than $14,000, and that, therefore, there would be no use to attempt to expend the $10,000. No objection was made to the item except that it did not, perhaps, properly belong upon this bill. I can say to the Senator from Florida that it will be considered in the next bill.

Mr. PASCO. The purpose, I understand, is to raise the amount from $10,000 to $14,000.

Mr. HALE. To $14,000.

Mr. PASCO. And the action of the conference by the rejection of the amendment now will not affect that purpose?

Mr. HALE. No; it is not a begun work; nothing has been done about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the report.

The report was concurred in.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the special order be executed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of pension bills on the Calendar in view of the unanimous agreement.

Mr. CALL. The unfinished business is the Cuban resolution. That was made the unfinished business by uanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That resolution was laid temporarily aside in order that the Senate might take up some pension bills.

Mr. CALL. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions to state how many pension bills there are and what length of time their consideration will occupy.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state to the Senator from Florida that there are between 50 and 60 private pension bills on the Calendar. We may not complete them all to-day. I have not consulted the Senator from Florida, but I think the general feeling among the friends of the Cuban resolution is that it shall go over until to-morrow and be taken up early to-morrow. Of course I have no disposition to do anything that is hostile toward that resolution.

Mr. CALL. I am very anxious to have the Cuban resolution considered. I think it is very important that we should have action upon it at the earliest possible date.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is the first opportunity, I will say to the Senator, that we have had in the present Congress to consider the pension bills, and I am sure that he will not interpose an objection. It will not take a great while.

Mr. CALL. Very well; I will agree that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose, but after that I shall insist on the unfinished business being proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pension bills will be considered without prejudice to the Cuban resolution.

Mr. MORGAN subsequently said: I desire to give notice that to-morrow at 2 o'clock I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the regular order of business, which is some resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in reference to Cuba.

Mr. CHANDLER. Are we to understand from the Senator

from Alabama or the Senator from Florida that the Cuban resolutions will not be taken up this afternoon?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I ask unanimous consent that no other business be done this afternoon after the special order is executed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If none, it is so ordered.

Mr. VILAS. One moment. I suppose that agreement does not have any reference to an executive session.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will except an executive session.

Mr. TELLER. Why should not we take up the Calendar, if we get to it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to my colleague to except the Calendar and executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I will make the request that no other business be done to-day after the special order is executed except the Calendar of unobjected cases and executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate hears the agreement proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. Is there objection? ["Agreed!"]

Mr. CALL. The agreement is made with the understanding that the Cuban resolution shall continue to be the regular order?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; to be taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Cuban resolution will come up as the unfinished business to-morrow at 2 o'clock. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of pension bills, and then unobjected cases on the Calendar, and the consideration of executive business will follow, if desired.

Mr. CHANDLER. And no other business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And no other business is to be transacted to-day. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The pension bills on the Calendar will be proceeded with.

RUSSEL N. REYNOLDS.

The bill (S. 1100) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Russel N. Reynolds, late of Company E, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT KIRACOFE.

The bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Robert Kiracofe was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twelve"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Kiracofe, late a private in Company G, Eighty-first Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of the amount he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA D. CROSS.

The bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Ella D. Cross was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension rolls the name of Ella D. Cross, widow of Richard E. Cross, late lieutenant-colonel of the Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUFUS H. PAINE.

The bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rufus H. Paine, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOAR. The pension bills are all in accordance with one formula, "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll," etc. It would be a great relief to the clerks and a great saving of time if the name of the beneficiary and the amount of the pension should alone be read, instead of the formal reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The clerks will be directed to so read the bills, if there be no objection. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

SAMUEL C. TOWNE.

The bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Towne was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel C. Towne, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is a clerical error in the bill. In line 6, I move to strike out the word "Eighth" and insert "Ninth"; so that it will read, "Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JARED S. CHAMBERLAIN.

The bill (S. 878) granting a pension to Jared S. Chamberlain was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jared S. Chamberlain, late a private in Company E, Twenty-third Ohio Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NELLIE L. GROSHON.

The bill (S. 625) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "in," to strike out "private" and insert "captain"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nellie L. Groshon, widow of Thomas C. Groshon, late a captain in Company G, First Regiment of Mississippi Marine Brigade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELAIDE MORRIS.

The bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Morris was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adelaide Morris, widow of the late Arthur Morris, formerly captain of the Fourth United States Artillery, at the rate of $50 per month, which rate of $50 per month shall be in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHUBAEL GOULD.

The bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Shubael Gould was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the word "Gould," to strike out "Shubeal" and insert "Shubael"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Shubael Gould, late a private in Company G, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Shubael Gould."

JOHN L. BRITTON.

The bill (S. 1276) granting a pension to John L. Britton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that he is now receiving"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John L. Britton, late of Company A, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $30 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John L. Britton."

CELESTE A. BOUGHTON.

The bill (S. 1291) granting an increase of pension to Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton, late of the United States Army, retired, and to pay her a pension of $75 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUE R. BROWN.

The bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Lue R. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lue R. Brown, widow of the late William A. Brown, formerly first lieutenant and adjutant of the Sixth Indiana Cavalry, and to pay her a pension at the rate of $25 a month, in lieu of the pension she now receives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY E. SESSIONS.

The bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Mary E. Sessions was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Mary E. Sessions, mother of Henry Eels, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteers, upon the pension roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHIA J. CHILCOTT.

The bill (S. 1149) granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sophia J. Chilcott, widow of James C. Chilcott, late a sergeant of Company I, Thirteenth Maine Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETSEY J. WEBBER.

The bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Betsey J. Webber, mother of Otis Webber, deceased, late private of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Infantry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA KELLEY.

The bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna Kelley, of Manchester, N. H., widow of Charles T. Kelley, alias Charles J. Kelley, who served in Company C, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteers and on the United States ships *Ohio* and *Macedonia* in the United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JANE STEWART WHITING.

The bill (S. 1511) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Stewart Whiting was considered as in the Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "$100" and insert "$75"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, at the rate of $75 per month, the name of Jane Stewart Whiting, widow of the late Commodore William Danforth Whiting, of the United States Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELEANOR CARROLL POE.

The bill (S. 804) granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Carroll Poe, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll, at the rate of $100 per month, the name of Eleanor Carroll Poe, widow of the late Col. Orlando M. Poe, of the United States Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN KINGSLEY.

The bill (S. 1215) granting a pension to Ellen Kingsley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ellen Kingsley, widow of Henry E. Kingsley, late of Company F, Second New York Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATHAN KIMBALL.

The bill (S. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Kimball was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nathan Kimball, late a brigadier-general in the United States Army, at the rate of $100 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY W. KEEFFE.

The bill (S. 905) granting a pension to Mary W. Keefe was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments: In line 6, after the words "Mary W.," to strike out "Keefe" and insert "Keeffe"; in the same line, after the word "Joseph," to strike out "Keefe" and insert "Keeffe," and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary W. Keeffe, widow of Joseph Keeffe, late captain, Fourth Infantry, United States Army, at the rate of $30 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Mary W. Keeffe."

CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

The bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Charles Williamson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "volunteers," to strike out "and to date from the filing of his original application for pension in the Pension Bureau, on September 1, 1890"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles Williamson, late assistant surgeon of the Twelfth Regiment Kansas State Militia Volunteers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN NICHOLS.

The bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to John Nichols was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "forty-five" and insert "thirty-six"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Nichols, of Durham, Butte County, Cal., late sergeant Company I, One hundred and eleventh Illinois Infantry Volunteers, at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving under certificate 75345.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE HUGHES.

The bill (S. 522) for the relief of George Hughes, of Portland, Oreg., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place on the pension rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George Hughes, late a soldier in the Mexican war, at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving under certificate 10517.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH R. WEST.

The bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Joseph R. West, brigadier and brevet major-general, United States Army Volunteers, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph R. West, brigadier and brevet major-general, United States Volunteers, at $100 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMELINE FILGATE.

The bill (S. 1631) granting a pension to Emeline Filgate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Emeline Filgate, widow of James Filgate, late of Company G, Sixth United States Infantry, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NANCY T. DUNCKLEE.

The bill (S. 1787) granting a pension to Nancy T. Duncklee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nancy T. Duncklee, dependent stepmother of Lucian A. Duncklee, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

T. CLARKSON INGALLS.

The bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus C. Ingalls was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "name of," to strike out "Theophilus C." and insert "T. Clarkson"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of T. Clarkson Ingalls, late of Company E, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to T. Clarkson Ingalls."

CAROLINE B. BRADFORD.

The bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Bradford was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Caroline B. Bradford, widow of Robert Forbes Bradford, late captain United States Navy, at $50 dollars per month, in lieu of the amount she now receives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE L. BUCKINGHAM.

The bill (S. 651) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jane L. Buckingham, widow of Philo B. Buckingham, late lieutenant-colonel Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of $30 a month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RHODA CHICK.

The bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Rhoda Chick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rhoda Chick, daughter of James Wills, deceased, who was a soldier in the Revolutionary war, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN EWING.

The bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Ellen Ewing, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Ewing, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ellen Ewing, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Ewing, at $100 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENOCH G. ADAMS.

The bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Enoch G. Adams, late captain of Company D, First Regiment United States Infantry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving, to commence from the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH W. SUTHERLAND.

The bill (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five," and in line 9, after the words "rate of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth W. Sutherland, widow of the late Charles Sutherland, deceased, formerly Surgeon-General of the United States Army, at the rate of $75 per month, which rate of $75 per month shall be in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HANS JOHNSON.

The bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Hans Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Hans Johnson, late corporal of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay said Johnson at the rate of $50 per month from and after the date of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATILDA GRESHAM.

The bill (S. 616) granting a pension to Matilda Gresham, widow of the late Walter Q. Gresham, at the rate of $200 per month, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "two" and insert "one"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Matilda Gresham, widow of Walter Q. Gresham, at the rate of $100 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] desired to address the Senate on this bill, and he is now ill. His colleague [Mr. TURPIE] also expressed a desire to be heard on the bill, but is not prepared to speak to-day. I therefore ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to offer an amendment. I move to insert in line 6, after the name "Walter Q. Gresham," the words "late a brigadier-general." I wish the amendment to be now made, and then the bill may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the name "Walter Q. Gresham," in line 6, it is proposed to insert "late a brigadier-general."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over, in accordance with the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

CATHERINE SMITH.

The bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Catherine Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "month," to insert "and the further sum of $2 per month for each of the three children of said soldier until they respectively become 16 years of age"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Catherine Smith, widow of the late James Smith, a private in Company I, Sixteenth Indiana Volunteers

and pay her a pension of $12 per month and the further sum of $2 per month for each of the three children of said soldier until they respectively become 16 years of age.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMILY B. MUNCEY.

The bill (S. 705) granting a pension to Emily B. Muncey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension rolls the name of Emily B. Muncey, Topeka, Kans., widow of Leonard D. Muncey, late private in G Company of the Forty-eighth Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NANCY CARSON BLUNT.

The bill (S. 246) granting a pension to Nancy Carson Blunt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nancy Carson Blunt, widow of Maj. Gen. James G. Blunt, deceased, and pay her a pension at the rate of $75 per month from and after the passage of this act, in lieu of $30 per month she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALLACE M'GRATH.

The bill (S. 247) granting a pension to Wallace McGrath was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "volunteers," to strike out "and rate him according to the degree of his disability and to date from the filing of his application for pension in the Pension Bureau" and insert "and grant him a pension at the rate of $50 per month from and after the passage of this act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Wallace McGrath, late lieutenant and aid-de-camp of the Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers, and grant him a pension at the rate of $50 per month from and after the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET M. KNOWLTON.

The bill (S. 719) to restore a pension to Harriet M. Knowlton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to restore to the pension roll the name of Harriet M. Knowlton, widow of the late Major Knowlton, of the Twenty-ninth Maine Volunteer Infantry, at $25 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE LEARY.

The bill (S. 819) granting a pension to Catherine O'Leary was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 5, to strike out "O'Leary" and insert "Leary," and in line 6, after the words "rate of," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine Leary, a nurse in the war of the rebellion, and to pay her a pension at the rate of $8 per month on and after the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Catherine Leary."

MARY CLARE KELLY.

The bill (S. 1493) granting a pension to Mary Clare Kelly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of" to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Mary Clare Kelly, widow of the late Benjamin F. Kelly, brevet major-general of volunteers, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 a month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAROLINE REED.

The bill (S. 826) granting a pension to Caroline Reed was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. Caroline Reed, widow of Richard Reed, a soldier of the Florida Indian Seminole war of 1836 and 1842, at $12 a month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM T. WALKER.

The bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to William T. Walker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William T. Walker, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Cavalry, at $25 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY B. HULINGS.

The bill (S. 893) for the relief of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Mary B. Hulings on the pension roll, and that she be paid a pension at the legal rate as the widow of Thomas M. Hulings, colonel Forty-ninth Pennsylvania Infantry, who was killed at the battle of the Wilderness, May 10, 1864.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE C. ABBEY.

The bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to George C. Abbey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "pay him," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of George C. Abbey, late a private of Company M of the First Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him $20 per month from the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. ISAAC D. TOLL.

The bill (S. 996) to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll, late of Company E, Fifteenth United States Infantry, in the war with Mexico, from $8 to $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA SOMERLAT.

The bill (S. 1323) granting a pension to Maria Somerlat, widow of Valentine Somerlat, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "12" and insert "8"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Maria Somerlat, widow of Valentine Somerlat, late a private in Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and to pay her a pension at the rate of $8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZA SANDFORD.

The bill (S. 1189) granting a pension to Eliza Sandford was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 11, after the words "pension of," to strike out "50" and insert "25"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Eliza Sandford, permanently helpless and destitute daughter of William Sandford, a

sergeant under Captains Huntington, Wheeler, Squire, and Gilman in the years 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780, and 1781, in the Army of the Revolution, and pay her a pension of $25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPHINE I. OFFLEY.

The bill (S. 1621) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "60" and insert "50"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Josephine I. Offley, widow of Robert H. Offley, late colonel of the Tenth United States Infantry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension to which she is now entitled by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISABELLA MORROW.

The bill (S. 1128) granting a pension to Isabella Morrow was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "pension of," to strike out "100" and insert "75"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to place upon the pension rolls the name of Isabella Morrow, widow of the late Henry A. Morrow, colonel of the Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, colonel and brevet major-general of the United States Army, and pay her a pension of $75 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JANE DULANY.

The bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Mrs. Jane Dulany, widow of Col. William Dulany, from $50 to $72 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARRIE L. YEATON.

The bill (S. 1924) granting a pension to Carrie L. Yeaton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Carrie L. Yeaton, widow of Lewis D. Yeaton, late a private in Company F, Eighth Maine Volunteer Infantry, at $8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY NEWMAN.

The bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Mary Newman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported the bill with amendments, in line 6, after the name "Newman," to strike out "who is blind and is the only child" and insert "blind and dependent daughter," and in line 11, before the word "dollars," to fill the blank by inserting the word "twelve"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Newman, blind and dependent daughter of Thomas G. Newman, now deceased, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, who was a pensioner under certificate No. 328003, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month during her life.

Mr. ALLEN. I move to amend by striking out "twelve" and inserting "twenty-four."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 11, before the word "dollars," it is proposed to strike out "twelve," the amendment reported by the committee, and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four."

Mr. GALLINGER. As I understand it, the beneficiary of the bill is a dependent and an invalid daughter. The committee have reported three cases of this kind during the present session, and they have fixed the rate at $12 per month. The other two have passed, and one of them has become a law. The cases are on all fours; the circumstances and conditions precisely the same; and I trust the Senator will not insist upon increasing the rate in this particular case. If they could all be increased to $24 per month, I certainly should not object.

I will say about this class of cases that, when I was a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of another body, we had a rule or custom of allowing this class of invalid and dependent children $18 per month. I undertook to get one through in the last Congress, but the other body insisted upon reducing it to $10 per month, and it passed the Senate in that form. As I say, we have in this Congress rather established a rule in the committee of making $12 per month the rate.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator how old this girl is?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a case in which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] is especially interested, and he can state.

Mr. COCKRELL. She is over 20 years old.

Mr. ALLEN. Is she entirely dependent?

Mr. COCKRELL. Absolutely so.

Mr. ALLEN. And requires some attendance?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; she can not go about by herself, and can not do any work.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not resist the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator will realize the great justice of increasing this pension, and possibly, by that means, of equalizing it with some that have just been passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is a point to which I will simply call the Senator's attention, and that is, that we propose to pension the child of a soldier who has no pension under the law. It is a gratuity pure and simple, and yet I am glad to accept any suggestion of the Senator that tends to equalization of pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. In reply to the Senator, I desire to say that the records in the Pension Bureau show that the children of soldiers have been pensioned by special acts of Congress for a year or two.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly; but not in accordance with the general law.

Mr. ALLEN. If this young lady is blind and entirely dependent, she can not get along with $24 a month.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is entirely true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAROLINE STOCKTON BROWN.

The bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Caroline Stockton Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, after the words "pension," to strike out "one hundred and"; and in line 9, after the word "month," to strike out:

From and after the 3d day of August, 1894.
This act shall take effect from and after its passage.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Caroline Stockton Brown, widow of William Rawle Brown, late major in the Marine Corps of the United States, and pay her a pension of $50 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN M. MALLERY.

The bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Mallery was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Helen M. Mallery, widow of Garrick Mallery, late captain and brevet lieutenant-colonel, United States Army, and lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry, and brevet colonel, United States Volunteers, to $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION M'KIBBEN.

The bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Marion McKibben was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Marion McKibben, widow of David B. McKibben, late colonel of the One hundred and fifty-eighth and the Two hundred and fourteenth regiments Pennsylvania Infantry, and brevet brigadier-general, United States Army, to $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FANNIE MOALE GIBBON.

The bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Fannie Moale Gibbon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Fannie Moale Gibbon, widow

of Maj. Gen. John Gibbon, United States Army, and pay her a pension of $100 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPHINE FOOTE FAIRFAX.

The bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Josephine Foote Fairfax, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Donald MacNeil Fairfax, of the United States Army, and pay her a pension of $50 per month in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE W. CASE.

The bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension roll the name of George W. Case, late a private of Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry, at $50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him under act of June 27, 1890.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. E. PHILBROOK.

The bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Philbrook, widow of Alvah Philbrook, major of Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five," and after the word "receives," in line 9, at the end of the bill, to insert:

Provided, That no claim for arrears shall be allowed by reason of the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of C. E. Philbrook, widow of Alvah Philbrook, major of Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers, and pay her a pension of $25 per month, the same to be in lieu of the pension she now receives: *Provided*, That no claim for arrears shall be allowed by reason of the passage of this act.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions why this pension is proposed to be reduced from $30 to $25 a month?

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. As I reported the bill, I can give the information to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I shall be glad to get it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. Mrs. Philbrook is the widow of Captain Philbrook, who was killed at the battle of Franklin. He had at the time a major's commission in his pocket from the governor of his State, and he had been acting major for six months previous to his death. The committee thought that the widow was entitled to the pension that a major's widow gets, which, I believe, is $25 a month. So the amount was reduced from $30 to $25 a month on my suggestion.

Mr. ALLEN. As the author of the bill does not want any more than $25 a month, I certainly can not ask for any more; but I can not resist the temptation of making the remark that the line of distinction between a brevet major, or an embryo major, and a lieutenant-colonel or a colonel seems to be very broad in these bills.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. With the consent of the committee I will withdraw the amendment and let the amount stand at $30 a month, if that is the desire of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. I think it ought to be $30.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. Then I withdraw the amendment, with the assent of the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. The amendment can not be withdrawn, but it can be nonconcurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment reported by the committee, before the word "dollars" to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five."

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the last amendment reported by the committee, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee report to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That no claim for arrears shall be allowed by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LORING SPENCER.

The bill (S. 1699) for the relief of William Loring Spencer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Loring Spencer, widow of George E. Spencer, late colonel First Regiment Alabama Cavalry, at $50 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. I see that the Secretary very properly hesitated when he read "William Loring Spencer, widow of George E. Spencer," but notwithstanding that, the lady was christened "William," and that is her name.

I want to make a statement concerning this particular case, inasmuch as I have promised to do so to certain parties who are very deeply interested in it, one of them an ex-Senator.

The committee have reported this bill giving Mrs. Spencer $50 a month? Her husband had a distinguished service as an officer in the Army, as I remember, having the title, or the brevet title, at least, of brigadier-general. He was brevetted brigadier-general to date from March 13, 1865, for gallant and meritorious services during the campaign through Georgia and the Carolinas.

General Spencer had letters of commendation from General Vandever, from General Kilpatrick, from Major-General Dodge, from Major-General Sherman, and from Secretary of War Stanton.

He was a member of this body for twelve years, as I remember it, from the State of Alabama, and friends of his have said to me that they thought this allowance, Mrs. Spencer being in absolute destitution, ought to be $75 per month, and I rise to move an amendment making the rate $75 instead of $50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, before the word "dollars," it is proposed to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-five"; so as to read: "$75 per month."

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what is the pension of the widow of a colonel under the general law?

Mr. GALLINGER. Thirty dollars a month.

Mr. BERRY. We have passed a number of bills to-day giving, I believe, $50 a month in such cases.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; $75 in some cases, and $100 in others.

Mr. BERRY. Have these increases been proposed because of the destitution of these widows over and above the general line of widows of colonels?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the committee and Congress have been governed by more than one consideration in this class of cases. First, the unusual service of the officer has been taken into account, if it has been unusual; next, the destitution of the widow has been a consideration; and I will say frankly to the Senator from Arkansas—because I would not deceive him if I could, and I certainly could not deceive him in this matter—that my motion is made somewhat upon sentimental considerations, in view of the fact that this particular officer had been a member of this body for twelve years, and left a widow in utter destitution. It, in other words, puts this case upon all fours with the case that first passed the Senate at this session of Congress, that of Brigadier-General Cogswell of Massachusetts, he having been a member of the House of Representatives for a long time, and there being perhaps a little sentiment in that.

I will say in reference to this case—and I am not going to urge it very strongly—that I have made this motion rather in behalf of men whom I regard very highly and who have made a special plea in this case.

I will say further that this is a very meritorious case, both so far as the service of the soldier was concerned and so far as the destitution of the widow is concerned. If the amendment does not pass, I have no objection; but I shall vote for it myself in view of the considerations which I have presented.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I realize how difficult it is for one who comes from the section of the country I do to make any objection whatever to the passage of pension bills. I realize furthermore that it is resented, when made by one who was on the other side of the controversy, as an effort to deprive the Union soldiers of that to which they conceive they are entitled, but it does seem to me that it is a great injustice, when the general law says that the widow of a colonel shall receive $30 a month, that the widows of particular officers shall be picked out here and given $50, $75, and $100 per month. There ought to be some uniformity in regard to these pensions.

It can not be said that this officer was more meritorious or that he rendered better services than thousands of other officers. Then why should his widow be given $75 per month, and others only $30 or $50, as the case may be? It seems to me it is unjust, and it is unfair.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] a few days ago made a speech here on this subject, and he convinced me, at least, if I had not already been before convinced, that the widows of privates, so far as pensions are concerned, should be put on an equal-

ity with the widows of officers, and I say to-day that there can be no reason to the contrary. I realize that in the case of an officer, while war is going on, in order to get the best service, the Government is obliged to pay a larger sum, but a pension is given for the support of the person drawing it, and it is even more necessary in the case of the widow of a private, because the private leaves his widow in a more helpless condition than the officer leaves his.

In addition to that, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] states as another reason why the pension in this particular case should be given that the husband of this lady was at one time a United States Senator. Is it a fair reason, is it a real reason, why this Government should pay that widow more because her husband had been a member of this body than should be paid to a man who was not so fortunate or unfortunate, as the case may be, as to have been a member of the Senate? Because he was a member of the Senate should his widow have more than the widow of a soldier equally meritorious? It seems to me that is an unjust reason and unfair reason, and while the Senator says it is actuated by sentiment, sentiment is very well when you are dealing with your own money; but when we are dealing with the money of the people of the United States, and trust money, I do not believe we have a right or that it is fair and just to take other people's money and pay it out and give it to parties on sentiment.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. BERRY. Of course, I say this in a general way. I realize and understand that it is utterly impossible that anything I can say can defeat any character of pension bill that may be brought here. I have tried it for years and years, but it goes on. This Congress has expended $140,000,000 already under the general appropriation act, but, not content with that, the Calendar is crowded from session to session with bills for increases and for new parties and with special acts. One or two were reported this morning to pension the dependent child of a soldier, and if it continues, the pension roll, at the end of forty years from the close of the war, will continue to grow instead of decreasing.

In the case of any soldier who served in the war and was wounded in the line of his duty I would not cast a vote against giving him a fair and reasonable pension, but it seems to me that where pensions are given by special act it is unjust, unequal, and unfair, and when given, as the reason here is given, because the husband of the woman happened to be a United States Senator, it is not such a reason as should control this body.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Arkansas is one of the most kindhearted men in this body, and I think one of the most fair-minded, and he will do me the justice to amend his remarks, I think, and not insist that I gave that as the reason. I gave it as one reason.

Mr. BERRY. Not as the sole reason, but as one of the reasons.

Mr. GALLINGER. I said it was sentimental to that extent, and it is. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if General Spencer had died while he was a member of this body, sentiment would have given his widow his pay for the remainder of his term. There is no law for doing that; it is pure and unadulterated sentiment and nothing else. Sentiment does enter into these matters. If the Senator should die to-morrow his widow would be granted the remainder of his salary for the term to which he was recently elected, as I remember the practice.

Mr. BERRY. No, I think——

Mr. GALLINGER. Or for one year, perhaps.

Mr. SHERMAN. For one year.

Mr. GALLINGER. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. BERRY. Those who have been here a little longer than the Senator from New Hampshire know that I have invariably, on all occasions, voted against giving the widow of any Senator or Member a year's salary after his death. I have said on a former occasion, I have said it more than once in this body, that if that was to be the rule it ought to be inserted in the law, and let it be so understood before Senators and Members were elected; that it was unjust and unfair, and simply giving away the people's money, where it was put into an appropriation bill when the law did not exist. If Congress believes that the widow of a Senator or a Member should have a year's salary after his death, then it ought to be put into the general law, so that the whole country would understand it and Congress would be held responsible, and it should not be put into an appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Probably the Senator has never offered an amendment to the law touching that matter.

Mr. BERRY. I have voted against it upon various occasions. I fought against giving it to the widows of Supreme Court judges. I fought against giving it to Senators' widows, and have voted against it on the yeas and nays. I never offered the other amendment, because I did not believe it ought to be the law, but I say if it is going to be done that would be the fair way to do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no doubt that the Senator has been consistent in that matter, and I simply called attention to it to show him that sentiment in this body is not entirely confined to the granting of pensions. It is a rule that I think is never departed from in this body that if an employee dies his widow is granted, as I remember it, one-half a year's salary, and there is a case on the Calendar of that kind which will undoubtedly be passed when it is reached.

I am not going to argue this case at length. I do not propose, while I chance to be the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, to be drawn into any angry discussion of pension legislation. I stated frankly, openly, and without qualification why I suggested this amendment, and I shall have no fault to find if the Senate votes against it. I trust that the Senate will vote the amendment into the bill, and I do think that the fact that this woman is the widow of a United States Senator and that she is in utter destitution does carry a little weight in the matter.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I would have been entirely satisfied with a pension of $600 a year to Mrs. Spencer, and I am quite satisfied with the proposition of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions to increase it to $75 a month. I have sentimental reasons for supporting the amendment that I may as well state.

I knew Colonel Spencer, afterwards brevetted as brigadier-general; I know the service he performed, and it was a very interesting and important service to the country. There was in the State of Alabama, as I happen to know by my personal experience, a large number of Union people. I became acquainted with them during the war. They were not the people who inhabited the Tennessee Valley about Tuscumbia and Decatur and Huntsville, but they were people who lived in the hills; and when we retreated from the Tennessee River, in order to meet General Bragg's advance by the way of Chattanooga and through Cumberland Gap into Kentucky, there followed me, I should think, 500 people from those hills.

Colonel Spencer went into those hills and organized a military force devoted to the Union, and furnished a rallying point for the element of which I speak. They were not the individuals of whom I spoke as following the Union Army, but a class resembling them—Union people who occupied the mountains south of the Tennessee River in the broken region between that and the rivers that flow into the Gulf of Mexico. He rendered a most important service. As I said, he went into that region and organized a regiment of Alabama Unionists and furnished a nucleus for the Union people who lived in that particular region.

He rendered important service, valuable service; and it was rendered at a time, too, when there was great doubt as to the direction much of that population would take. They were surrounded by opposing influences; but they clung to their faith in the Union of the States. Colonel Spencer organized a regiment of that class of people and he furnished a nucleus and protected them to that extent. To that extent, therefore, this strikes me as being a sentimental amendment. As I said, I should have been satisfied with the original amount, but as the amendment is proposed and as it is opposed it occurs to me that I now see reasons why it should be made a special case in view of the conditions that prevailed at the time when he entered Alabama to organize that regiment.

Mr. President, I wish to state another thing, too, that has had influence with me. Every gentleman present, whatever part he may have played in the late unpleasantness, as we sometimes pleasantly term it, is aware that in the beginning of the struggle there was much doubt as to what were the duties of citizens. Men, right-minded men, hesitated as to the course they would pursue. I have always felt that the men who took ground distinctly and positively—and I am not excepting those who were prompt and earnest in opposition to my views, but I say the men who acted promptly and earnestly at the beginning of the struggle, and thus aided in guiding public opinion, are to be remembered as being the most valuable men who took part in that great civil controversy.

Colonel Spencer earnestly took part very early in the struggle. He was a young man full of energy, full of ambition, and his capacity was such that it finally brought him into this body. I do not know that he came into the Senate regularly, but I feel about the men who came from the reconstructed States very much as I felt when I went to New Orleans in 1876. I learned when I went to New Orleans that there was an element, largely from the North, who had seized that great city, and had conquered that country and held the Mississippi River by a grasp, with all its vast productions. I said to myself, "This may not be honest, but men must have capacity who have been able to win such triumphs." Colonel Spencer came into this body after having served his country in the manner I have indicated, and in that he evinced his capacity and his energy and his force. It was the same energy and force that he employed when he was organizing those mountaineers in Alabama and furnishing them the means of defense as well as a nucleus for organization.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions if there is a written report accompanying this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. There is.

Mr. ALLEN. What special reasons are set forth in the report in support of the bill at the sum of $75 a month.

Mr. GALLINGER. Nothing beyond what I have stated. I could not make it any stronger if I tried. The bill was introduced at $50, and it passed the committee at $50, and was so reported. There was not any discussion in committee on the matter at all.

Mr. ALLEN. On the 14th of last month, in discussing the bill granting a pension to the widow of the late Brevet Brigadier-General Cogswell, I got into some difficulty with the Committee on Pensions and some other Senators for opposing that bill at the sum of $75 a month. I thought then, and I think now, that $50 a month under the circumstances is ample compensation for that lady as compared with the pensions that have been granted to the widows of like soldiers during the last twenty-five years by special act of Congress. I was so thoroughly impressed with that fact that I took occasion to address a letter to the Commissioner of Pensions, asking him to furnish me a list of the colonels and brevet brigadier-generals, because there is only the distinction of rank and not of pay between those, whose widows have been pensioned by special act of Congress from the close of the war until the present time.

I now want to call the attention of the honorable Senator from New Hampshire to some of these cases. This list goes no higher than the rank of brigadier-general. There are pensions granted to the widows of major-generals beyond these.

I find the first case to be that of Mrs. Juliet Opie H. Ayers, widow of Romeyn Beck Ayers, colonel of the Second United States, and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers. She was pensioned by act of Congress June 3, 1890, at the rate of $15 a month. I do not know much about General Ayers. He seems to have held the rank of a brevet brigadier-general, and he seems to have received an honorable discharge from the Army. I have no doubt in my own mind that he discharged his duty faithfully, and bravely, and well, and intelligently as he was called upon to discharge it during his service in the Army.

The next one I find is Harriet M. Bailey, widow of William P. Bailey, colonel of the Second Delaware Volunteers, who receives a pension of $30 a month. The next is Mary Bailey, widow of Joseph Bailey, brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, who receives a pension of $30 a month. Emma Biddle, widow of Charles J. Biddle, receives a pension of $45 a month, under an act of Congress of February 13, 1889. Emily B. Bidwell, widow of Daniel B. Bidwell, brigadier-general of volunteers, receives a pension of $50 a month and her daughter a pension of $12 a month. So this list runs through. There are 63 of these pension cases, I think. In a great majority of the cases the rate of pension is $30 a month, and there are but two above $50. Caroline S. Webster, widow of Fletcher Webster, colonel of the Twelfth Massachusetts Volunteers, was pensioned by act of Congress, June 28, 1879, at $100 a month, and I presume there was some sentiment in that pension. Henrietta O. Whittaker, widow of Walter C. Whittaker, brigadier-general of volunteers, was pensioned by act of Congress, August 15, 1890, at $100 a month. All the rest run from $15 a month up to $50 as the highest, and, as I stated, in the great majority of cases the rate is $30 a month.

Mr. President, if there is sentiment in this matter (and I admit there is much sentiment in so far as I am concerned, because I was impressionable at that particular period in the history of the country), let me call the attention of the honorable chairman of the Committee on Pensions to a few cases that ought to have embraced a little bit more sentiment than appears to have characterized the passage of some of these acts. I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the case of Annie A. Hays, widow of Alexander Hays, brigadier-general of volunteers, who was pensioned July 14, 1870, at $50 a month by special act of Congress. I call the honorable Senator's attention to the fact that there was no brigadier-general in the Army during the history of our late civil strife who won greater fame or who rendered greater or more brilliant service to the cause of the Union than did Gen. Alexander Hays. Yet his widow was pensioned at $50 a month.

And let me call attention to another conspicuous case. Mrs. Meagher, widow of Thomas Francis Meagher, brigadier-general of volunteers, was pensioned by act of Congress, February 22, 1887, at $50 a month. It was notorious in this country during the days of the war that Thomas Francis Meagher was one of the greatest Irish generals we had upon the side of the Union. He rendered most conspicuous services. He was a great man intellectually, a man of great qualifications, who discharged his full duty in the cause of the Union from the opening to the closing of the war. Yet his widow receives but $50 a month.

I call attention to another case that my honorable friend, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER], will recognize. I call attention to the case of Martha Ann Wallace, widow of W. H. H. Wallace, brigadier-general of volunteers, pensioned by special act of Congress, July 23, 1868, at $50 a month.

Mr. PALMER. A gallant fellow.

Mr. ALLEN. The honorable Senator says he was a gallant fellow. He was killed at the head of his troops at Shiloh. He was a very great man, a man whose life gave promise of standing at the head of one of the great armies of the North if he had lived. He was a man of military genius, a man whose record as a soldier and whose competency and qualifications as a soldier could not be questioned. And yet his widow receives a pension of only $50 a month.

I would not draw any invidious distinction between the widows of these deceased soldiers and comrades of mine, nor would I draw any distinction between their services that would look like a reflection upon the one and an undue laudation of the other, because each of these men no doubt performed his duty well at the time and under the circumstances under which he was called into service, and perhaps would have performed greater and more brilliant service than he did if the opportunity had been afforded him. I call attention to these cases—and there are others equally as conspicuous as those I have pointed out—for the purpose of showing that there has been an irregularity in the granting of pensions to the widows of the same class of officers in times past, and that some uniformity ought now to be established.

In glancing over this letter of the Commissioner of Pensions, I came across another conspicuous name. Louise A. Starkweather, widow of John C. Starkweather, colonel of Wisconsin Volunteers and brigadier-general of volunteers, was pensioned by act of March 2, 1891, at $60 a month. There was another conspicuous example of a great soldier——

Mr. PALMER. He was a fine soldier.

Mr. ALLEN. My honorable friend from Illinois says he was a fine soldier.

Mr. PALMER. I knew him well. He served with my command.

Mr. ALLEN. He says that he knew him well and he was a part of his command. Why was not this widow's pension raised to $75 a month? I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the granting of just pensions to the widows of meritorious soldiers. I believe in it, although there has been an attempt among a certain class of people since my discussion of the Cogswell case here last month to put me in the attitude of antagonizing the granting of just pensions.

Mr. President, I believe every man who gave his services to his country, who offered his life to his country, and who performed his duty meritoriously and well, should be recognized equally with every other man who did the same thing. That has been my position throughout my life. It will be my position the remainder of my life. For when a man gives his life to his country, whether he be in an arena where he shines conspicuously as a leader of men, or whether he be in an arena of mud and dust and fever, exposed to the inclemency of the weather and carrying his musket and his knapsack and discharging his duty to his country as faithfully as he can, what more can any man do than to offer his life in defense of the flag of his country? And where comes the spirit which we see manifested, especially in this Chamber, from time to time, that seems to say that because some man by the fortunes of politics or by some other fortuitous circumstances was made a leader of men for the time being, therefore, the great Creator of man had made some distinction between men of the same race and that distinction must exist under institutions like ours, which recognize the political equality of all men, when the great armies of which they were members have been mustered out of the service of the Government and they have returned to the peaceful walks of life?

Mr. President, I am a democrat, not a Democrat in the sense of belonging to the Democratic party, as a distinguished associate of ours has frequently announced, but I am a democrat in the broader and more comprehensive and catholic sense of the term. I believe every human being who walks upon the face of this earth, male or female, who discharges his or her duties conscientiously, reverently, in the fear and sight of God, in the station in which he or she may be placed, is the equal politically, naturally, and socially of every other man or woman.

I want to denounce, as far as I am capable of using the English language, the spirit that has grown up in this country of making unwarranted and invidious distinctions among men and women. We would suppose at times when we listen to orations upon deceased brigadier-generals and colonels that there was nothing in the late army—and I say it with a spirit of entire reverence—below the rank of a brigadier-general. In these degenerate days it is very hard to find a man who is willing to admit that he was a private soldier, because the fact that he was a private soldier seems, under the influences of modern society, to carry the imputation that he was not much of a man.

What would have become of this country in the late struggle if there had not been 2,500,000 honest men who came from their workshops, from their offices, from all the humble walks of life

and shouldered their muskets and marched to victory under the leadership of many of these distinguished majors and brigadier-generals?

Mr. TURPIE. The man with the musket was a hero.

Mr. ALLEN. My honorable friend, the Senator from Indiana, says the man with the musket was a hero. I am perfectly willing to divide honors with those gentlemen so far as I am concerned and so far as concerns those with whom I associated during that period. It was my fortune and sometimes my misfortune to march with some of those gentlemen on long, weary, muddy, and disagreeable marches, and to participate in skirmishes and battles. Some of them were great men; some of them were competent and brilliant men. Many of them, however, were not worth the clothing they wore. The same is true of the private soldiers in the ranks. Out of a regiment embracing a thousand men you never could get to exceed 500 of them in fighting contact with the enemy. Some were sick, some were detailed, some were stragglers, some managed by hook or by crook to get out of the road of danger, and about one-half of the whole number on the roll bore the brunt of the battle.

Now, thirty years after the great conflict has ended, should we set up this standard of distinction in the United States Congress and say that one man, because he wore epaulets upon his shoulders during that struggle, receiving the honor and the pay incident to his rank, is superior to his more humble companion who trudged after him in the ranks weeks and months and years, fighting the great battles, winning victories, and sometimes losing a battle?

Mr. President, the distinction not only is not real, but it is an insult to the great rank and file of that Army. It is an open insult thrown into the faces of the great masses of the American people. We are a Republic in this country. The rights of the private soldier and the rights of the humblest citizen in this land are as sacred under our form of government, under our fundamental and statutory laws, under the protecting folds of the American flag, as are the rights of the most exalted and the most accomplished citizen; and we do ourselves injustice when we encourage this invidious distinction.

When the war was over, when the armies disbanded, when those men returned to the peaceful pursuits of life, the inequality that was forced upon them in consequence of the necessity of military discipline disappeared; the relations as they existed before that great event were reestablished. Whenever I hear the honorable Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] plead the cause of one of those brigadier-generals or his widow I can not help but think how many thousands and hundreds of thousands of poor, careworn widows of private soldiers there are in this country who must furnish evidence which would be sufficient to convict a man of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt before they are permitted to take out of the Treasury of the United States the pittance of $8 a month. Some persons can ride to the Pension Office in their carriages and draw $100 or $200 a month, and live in luxury. Another, equally meritorious, but the widow of a private soldier or the widow of a noncommissioned officer, goes in a well-worn and faded calico dress and almost without shoes, and, getting upon her knees, must beg for the pittance of eight or twelve dollars a month. It is wrong, and it ought not to be encouraged.

The time has come when this distinction must be wiped out. In my judgment no Senator in this body will gain political preferment, if that is what he seeks (and I have sometimes suspected that even in this Chamber political motives control the action of Senators), who undertakes to force upon the country an unnatural distinction like this. When the general went to the war with the increased pay and the increased honor that his position brought him, and his humble neighbor went to the ranks carrying a musket to discharge his duty, and both of them gave to the country what they had, they should now stand alike upon the pay rolls of the Government. They should occupy the same position in the hearts of their countrymen and in the history of the nation. Their widows should stand side by side as the honorable widows of men who yielded up their lives in defense of the flag of their nation.

I desire to insert the letter of the Commissioner of Pensions in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

Letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, transmitting a list, compiled from the Statutes at Large of the United States, showing the names of widows of colonels, brevet brigadier-generals, and brigadier-generals of the volunteers who are in receipt of pensions under special acts.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1896.

SIR: In compliance with your letter of January 15, 1896, requesting information relative to certain pensioners under special acts of Congress, I transmit herewith a list, compiled from the Statutes at Large of the United States, showing the names of widows of colonels, brevet brigadier-generals, and brigadier-generals of the volunteers who are in receipt of pensions under special acts.

It is proper to add that the list is not believed to be complete, for the reason that many special acts do not give the rank or service of the soldier on account of whose service the pension is granted. The list, however, is as complete as can be furnished by this Bureau from the Statutes at Large.

Trusting that the information may be of service to you, I am,

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. WILLIAM V. ALLEN,
United States Senate.

Name.	Rank.	Date of act.	Rate.
Juliet Opie H. Ayers, widow of Romeyn Beck Ayers.	Colonel Second United States and brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	June 3, 1890	$15.00
Harriet M. Bailey, widow of William P. Bailey.	Colonel Second Delaware Volunteers.	Feb. 26, 1885	30.00
Mary Bailey, widow of Joseph Bailey.	Brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Apr. 14, 1888	30.00
Emma Biddle, widow of Charles J. Biddle.	Colonel First Pennsylvania Rifles and acting brigadier-general volunteers.	Feb. 13, 1889	45.00
Emily B. Bidwell, widow of Daniel D. Bidwell.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	July 27, 1868	50.00
Frances E. Bidwell, daughter of Daniel D. Bidwell.	.....do.....	Feb. 22, 1891	12.00
Mary A. Blaisdell, widow of William Blaisdell.	Brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Oct. 1, 1890	50.00
Martha A. Bowling, widow of William Bowling.	Colonel Thirty-first Kentucky Volunteer Infantry.	.....do.....	20.00
Charlotte D. Crocker, widow of Marcellus M. Crocker.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 8, 1886	50.00
Gustavus Alonzo Draper, son of Alonzo G. Draper.	Brevet brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 24, 1890	18.00
Caroline E. Duryee, widow of Abraham Duryee.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	Feb. 14, 1891	50.00
Morris Dwight, father of A. W. Dwight.	Colonel One hundred and twenty-second New York Volunteers.	Mar. 3, 1879	30.00
Betsey A. Eaton, widow of Willard G. Eaton.	Colonel Thirteenth Michigan Volunteers.	Mar. 3, 1875	30.00
Valeria B. Elliott, widow of W. L. Elliott.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	Feb. 28, 1891	50.00
Virginia L. M. Ewing, widow of Charles Ewing.	.....do.....	Aug. 29, 1890	50.00
Elizabeth K. Gallagher, widow of Thomas F. Gallagher.	Colonel Eleventh Reserve Corps, Pennsylvania, and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 7, 1886	30.00
Mary A. Green, widow of William A. Green.	Colonel Twenty-ninth Wisconsin Volunteers.	Sept. 29, 1890	30.00
Sarah Hackleman, widow of Pleasant A. Hackleman.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	July 17, 1868	50.00
Juliet E. Hall, widow of William Hall.	Colonel Eleventh Iowa Volunteers.	Mar. 1, 1869	30.00
Juliet E. Hall, daughter of William Hall.	.....do.....	May 15, 1874	30.00
Margaret G. Halpine, widow of Charles G. Halpine.	Lieutenant-colonel and brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Feb. 14, 1885	30.00
Montraville A. Harrington, father of Fazello A. Harrington.	Colonel Twenty-seventh Illinois Volunteers.	Sept. 30, 1890	30.00
Appolonia Hassendeubel, Maria Hassendeubel, sisters of Franz Hassendeubel.	Colonel Seventh Missouri Volunteers.	Feb. 12, 1891	30.00
Annie A. Hays, widow of Alexander Hays.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	July 14, 1870	50.00
Louise M. Humphrey, widow of George Humphrey.	Colonel Eighty-eighth Indiana Volunteers.	Jan. 15, 1889	30.00
Patsey Jackson, widow of James S. Jackson.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 8, 1886	50.00
Sue B. Johnson, widow of Gilbert M. L. Johnson.	Colonel Thirteenth Indiana Volunteers and brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Mar. 1, 1889	50.00
Maria T. Karge, widow of Joseph Karge.	Colonel Second New Jersey Cavalry.	Mar. 2, 1895	30.00
Elizabeth H. Lawler, widow of Michael K. Lawler.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	July 3, 1884	50.00
N. W. Leasure, widow of Daniel Leasure.	Colonel One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers.	Oct. 1, 1890	30.00
Belinda Macdonald, widow of Christopher R. Macdonald.	Colonel Forty-seventh New York Volunteers.	Feb. 7, 1879	30.00
Melvina A. Maltby, widow of Jasper A. Maltby.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 14, 1878	30.00
Rebecca C. Maxwell, widow of O. C. Maxwell.	Colonel One hundred and ninety-fourth Ohio Volunteers.	Mar. 22, 1878	30.00
Julia E. Lock, formerly widow of Daniel McCook.	Colonel Fifty-second Ohio Volunteers, and brigadier-general volunteers.	Feb. 13, 1895	30.00

Name.	Rank.	Date of act.	Rate.
Lorain McCook, widow of Edwin S. McCook.	Colonel Thirty-first Illinois Volunteers, and brevet major-general volunteers.	Feb. 14,1891	$30.00
Hettie McConnell, widow of H. K. McConnell.	Colonel Seventy-first Ohio Volunteers.	Sept. 29,1890	30.00
Ada H. McDonald, widow of Charles McDonald.	Colonel First Tennessee Militia.	Mar. 3,1873	30.00
Marion McKibben, widow of David B. McKibben.	Colonel One hundred and fifty-eighth and Two hundred and fourteenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, and brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Feb. 27,1891	30.00
Elizabeth M. J. Meagher, widow of Thomas Francis Meagher.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	Feb. 22,1887	50.00
Jennie S. Mitchell, widow of Robert B. Mitchell.	----do----------	June 27,1882	50.00
Sophia A. Morgan, widow of Charles H. Morgan.	Brevet brigadier-general volunteers and brigadier-general volunteers.	Mar. 3,1885	50.00
Marion A. Mulligan, widow of James A. Mulligan.	Colonel Twenty-third Illinois Volunteers.	June 22,1882	50.00
Mary E. Murray, widow of William G. Murray.	Colonel Eighty-fourth Pennsylvania Volunteers.	June 27,1884	18.00
Elizabeth A. Neibling, widow of James M. Neibling.	Colonel Twenty-first Ohio Volunteers.	Mar. 13,1876	30.00
Margaret Proctor Noyes, widow of Edward F. Noyes.	Colonel Thirty-ninth Ohio Volunteers and brevet brigadier-general Volunteers.	Feb. 14,1891	50.00
Jane Robinson, widow of Harai Robinson.	Colonel First Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry.	Oct. 17,1888	30.00
Sallie Rodman, widow of Isaac P. Rodman.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	Feb. 10,1885	50.00
Emma L. Selfridge, widow of James L. Selfridge.	Colonel Forty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers.	Apr. 30,1890	30.00
Abby Slocum, widow of John S. Slocum.	Colonel Second Rhode Island Volunteers.	Feb. 26,1889	50.00
Louise A. Starkweather, widow of John C. Starkweather.	Colonel Wisconsin Volunteers and brigadier-general volunteers.	Mar. 2,1891	50.00
Jeannie Stone, widow of Charles P. Stone.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	June 9,1888	50.00
Mary J. Stover, widow of Daniel Stover.	Colonel Fourth Tennessee Volunteers.	Mar. 2,1883	30.00
Ann E. Tew, widow of George W. Tew.	Colonel Fifth Rhode Island Volunteers.	Feb. 28,1891	30.00
Kate Lane Townes, widow of Robert R. Townes.	Colonel (staff Fifteenth Army Corps) volunteers.	Sept. 29,1890	30.00
Ellen E. Truex, widow of William S. Truex.	Colonel Fourteenth New Jersey Volunteers; brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Feb. 12,1891	30.00
Martha Ann Wallace, widow of W. H. H. Wallace.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	July 23,1868	50.00
Ellen A. Vance, daughter of Joseph W. Vance.	Colonel Ninety-sixth Ohio Volunteers.	Feb. 14,1885	18.00
Sallie T. Ward, widow of W. T. Ward.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	May 24,1890	50.00
Elizabeth Ward, widow of Durbin Ward.	Brevet brigadier-general volunteers.	Jan. 27,1887	50.00
Caroline S. Webster, widow of Fletcher Webster.	Colonel Twelfth Massachusetts Volunteers.	June 28,1879	100.00
Henrietta O. Whittaker, widow of Walter C. Whittaker.	Brigadier-general of volunteers.	Aug. 15,1890	100.00
Adelaide H. Woodall, widow of French B. Woodall.	Colonel One hundred and fifty-first Illinois Volunteers.	July 22,1890	30.00

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, in reference to this bill, it is a matter of duty that I should say a few words. The widow who is to be the recipient of the pension proposed to be granted is the daughter of a citizen of Florida whom I knew in my early life. I happen to have some information in regard to the peculiar circumstances which would constitute this an exception even to the rule proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], if it were a correct rule, which I do not think it is.

The husband, General Spencer, for whose service the pension is to be granted to his widow, lived for some years in a condition of feebleness and inability to perform any work for himself, and was dependent upon his wife, I understand, and not upon the Treasury of the United States. By her exertion he was for years supported and sustained in time of sickness, and I understand from some personal knowledge of herself and her affairs that he derived from her labor and her efforts that support which was due to him from the Treasury of the United States. In consideration of this fact, if none other, the pension should be enlarged beyond that granted to others. I mention this fact because it is known better to me than to others.

Now, I wish to say a few words more. I have always considered that it was the part of the Union soldiers and the representatives of the Northern people to determine the pensions that should be granted to their soldiers and widows on account of services during the late war, and I have voted for whatever they, by the majority, said was the established sentiment and opinion of the Northern people. I am still prepared to do so. But I do not agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. It is reasonable to assume that the man who is selected by the private soldiers themselves to be in command gave something more to his country than the average private soldier did. He gave a higher degree of intelligence than did the average man in the ranks.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Is the Senator willing to assert that the officers had a monopoly of intelligence?

Mr. CALL. No; not a monopoly.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator mean to assert that if all of them, by some mysterious power of Providence, had been taken away; there were not men in the ranks competent to perform their duties?

Mr. CALL. No. But that has nothing to do with the Senator's proposition. When the man in the ranks was chosen by the soldiers, and had the ability to perform that duty, he rendered a service greater than that of his fellows. It was greater in responsibility and greater in its requirements and its labor and self-sacrifice.

Mr. ALLEN. Why does the Senator assert that the officers had the superior intellect?

Mr. CALL. Because their comrades chose them for those places for that reason.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me call the Senator's attention to one thing. The private soldiers of the late war have succeeded in civil life to a greater extent than have the officers.

Mr. CALL. That may be, and yet it has nothing to do with the argument. I question, however, whether the Senator has any data whatever upon which to base that proposition. They were infinitely more numerous; unquestionably the number was much greater, and therefore their success is more obvious than that of the officers.

But I want to speak about this proposition. I am as much in favor of doing everything that is possible for the great masses of the people, in the individual and in the aggregate, as is anybody else; but I am not in favor of any policies or laws which will militate against the benefit of the individuals who constitute the great mass of the people. If I had the power I would give all brave and meritorious soldiers of either army unable to earn a support, and their widows and children, an adequate pension. Now, the argument of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is just as forcible as if he were to say that the members of this body, the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, and the judges of the courts should be given the same pay as the workman who constructs a house or who engages in any of the useful and necessary occupations of labor. They are more necessary perhaps than the brains of the country. The intelligence of the country could not live without them, but neither can they live without the brains which their humble circumstances furnish to the country to constitute its guide and its light.

The genius and the intellect of the country come from the poor people. The private soldier becomes an officer and is chosen by private soldiers. When they are placed in position to guide and direct, manifestly an additional responsibility, an additional duty, an additional expense is imposed upon them. Unless you make the Army and Congress a plutocratic body and forbid a representative of the poor or of the privates from coming here or being an officer, how could Senators live here or officers give their time to the performance of their public duties upon the one, two, three, or four dollars a day which is the pay of the laborers of the country?

That is the proposition of the Senator. The people honor themselves when they honor their meritorious public servants. We live in a Republic where the people govern, and it is our boast and pride that the private, the poorest man is not excluded from the highest offices and the greatest responsibilities. We are a people who, in contradistinction to monarchy, to royalty, to hereditary estates, to riches, rank, and power, desire to see their representatives chosen by ourselves from the people placed in positions where they will stand equal with any others in any other Government and under any other circumstances. This is democracy, and this alone.

I do not agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY]. The poor man who comes here and renders faithful service to his country has a right to have his children educated; he has a right to have them appear decently and in good shape to the rest of

the people of the country; and he has a right to have compensation sufficient to make provision for his family. It is to the disgrace of ourselves and our country that the descendants of Thomas Jefferson, the great light of the people, and of Madison, and of many of our other public men, who have given their services to the country, were left in the most absolute poverty. It is to our disgrace that our inefficient means of industrial education leave in a condition of destitution the children of many of the men who have rendered most important service in the cause of freedom and of the people, and who might have acquired fortunes and given comfort to their family.

No, the argument is a wrong one. The public service rendered by faithful public servants, either in the Army or in civil life, ought to be adequately rewarded, and the families of such men ought to be provided with reasonable comforts. To say that because you can not do this for all the widows of this country—I wish you could—is no argument why you should not do it so far as you can. To say that you can not do this for all the widows in the country because their husbands have rendered meritorious service, but yet not the same kind of service as others, is no argument.

The question is, does the established and necessary order of things require superior ability and guidance? Does it require that when the people charge one of their fellow-citizens with extraordinary and important duties he shall not be surrounded with the circumstances to enable him to perform those duties, and that when to the exclusion of gain to himself he has passed through life in the people's service his family shall have no provision made for them, even in the shape of the small sum of money which he would have earned in a few months? I do not agree with the argument.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in response to those uttered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. His first statement was that he thought that those who served in the Union Army, or at least were in sympathy with that Army, ought to determine the amount of pensions that should be granted here, thereby inferring, I suppose, that no one who did not serve in that Army, although he is a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives, has any right to express any opinion about it, but is simply bound to let those who were in sympathy with the Union cause determine it.

I think a great many Senators here from the South have been silent from time to time because of the very idea expressed by the Senator from Florida, that any attempt upon our part to regulate the amount of the pensions would be resented and perhaps misunderstood. But we are here as the representatives of our people. If we are not equal in all respects to every other Senator, with a perfect right and the duty incumbent upon us to vote for such bills as we think are proper and just, and against such as we think are hurtful, then we ought not to be permitted to have seats upon this floor. If we are unequal, if we have no right to express an opinion upon any matter that may become public legislation, then we never ought to have come here. As I feel, our States at least have equal rights in this Union, and if we are permitted to represent them upon this floor we are equal with every other man in every respect so far as the right to vote and to express an opinion upon any public measure is concerned.

Now, the second proposition of the Senator from Florida is that there ought to be a civil list, and that the widows and children of Senators or men who have served the public ought to be on the pension roll, or, to use his language, ought to be provided for by the Government. Mr. President, I protest against any such idea or any such proposition. The Senator says that we spend our lives in serving the public. The truth is, and everybody knows it, that there is not a man here who did not want to be here, and he would not be here unless he sought the place and thought the compensation and the honor were equal to the service he might render. Because men who seek these positions, when they are sought for by hundreds of their countrymen, are so fortunate as to secure them, is no reason why the balance of the people of the country should contribute of their means to support the wives and children of those who have been in public life.

I say that our Government, if I have understood its object and purposes, is founded upon different principles. I have been taught to believe that this is a Republic in which each man is equal before the law. I have been taught to believe that if you build up a privileged class, a class of officeholders, whose wives and daughters shall be foisted upon the Government, to be supported by the balance of the people of this nation, then we will no longer be a Republic where equality exists.

I wish to say another word or two. The Senator from Florida says it is perfectly proper that this distinction shall be made in the matter of pensions because the officers of the Army had more intelligence than the privates. That might be a reason why in time of war we should pay the officer a greater salary than the private, because the situation might be such that it would be impossible to secure the best talent of the country unless you did pay an additional price. But the pension of a widow is upon a wholly different principle. It is given to her for her support, because her husband lost his life in time of war. The man she married was an officer; it may be true that he had more intelligence than the private soldier, yet I do not believe in the theory that she, too, must be placed upon a higher plane and given an additional amount because of the higher intelligence of her husband.

As I said in the beginning, I well know that nothing I can say here would tend to defeat any pension bill, however unjust or absurd it may be; but when I sit by, day by day, and see these distinctions made; when I see one colonel's widow given $30, another $50, another $75, and all equally meritorious, while the private soldier's widow receives from eight to twelve and a half dollars, I believe it is unjust, and I believe I would not be true to myself if I did not express my objection to such legislation.

As I said a while ago, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] who reported the bill gave several reasons why this widow should receive $75, when others receive only $50. The reason to which I most objected is the one given by him that she is the widow of a United States Senator. That is no reason, no cause, sentimentally or otherwise, why this distinction should be made.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] resorts to the old practice of knocking down a man of straw instead of the real point of objection to his argument. The reason why Southern men, Confederate men, whose sympathies were against the war of the Union, have not been conspicuous in fixing the rates of compensation to be paid to Union soldiers is an obvious one. Recognizing the right and the duty of Senators, without reference to their past, to do that which seems to them best for the country, the question then arises, is it wise and proper that we, with our prejudices and animosities, after the war shall say what would be the proper compensation for those people to whom we were antagonistic?

The sentiment of the Northern people would revolt at it, and it would then have been unwise, as it is now unwise for us to endeavor to oppose that public sentiment which has a right under the circumstances to fix the compensation of their own people. If we had triumphed in our cause we should have resented opposition on the part of the Northern people to such compensation as we thought fit to prescribe to the men who had accomplished success for us.

This contention about the private soldier has nothing to do with the question. We are all private soldiers. The danger to the private soldier and to the people of this country is not from giving adequate rewards to Senators and public servants and officers; it is in the great public policies which build up a class of people so enormously rich that they alone can hold the places of power and public trust. The friend of the people, the real democrat, is he who provides for the poor man's coming into places of power and for his adequate support.

Those who seek to reduce the public servant, the poor man who has risen to position by the voice of other poor men, to such poverty that he can not perform those public services, who discriminate against him and his family in the ordinary walks of life, are not the friends of the people, are not the defenders of republican institutions, however much they may think they are. The true policy of popular government is that the representatives of the people, they whom the people select, shall be removed from the influences of wealth and power, and made independent to exercise proper judgment for the people, responsible to them, and responsible for public policies which are in their interest, and not in the interest of concentrated power and wealth and herditary influence.

Mr. President, that is the true democracy, and the only possible democracy. I do not say that officers are more intelligent than the private soldiers; I have never made that affirmation. I say that the private soldier when he selects a leader selects a man of the greatest intelligence. I say the officers selected by the people are more intelligent than the average of the private soldiers. I say that the public man in this body is more intelligent than the average of the people; he has had greater opportunity presumably, from his having the confidence of the poor people of the country who, in most cases, elevate him to power. That very fact is evidence that they consider that he is above and beyond the general average.

I am not in favor of that kind of democracy which sentences the man chosen by the people to exercise important public functions to poverty and his family to want. I have said nothing about favoring a pension for a civilian or a civil list. I am not in favor of a pension to the civil-service employees. What has the fact that a man seeks a particular place, that he wants the honor and the emoluments of a public office, to do with a public policy which shall provide a reasonable compensation and an inducement to public men to qualify themselves for public service? That has nothing more to do with the proposition of the Senator from Arkansas than it has with the North or South Pole.

The proposition is, what is the best public policy? Is it one which

shall offer inducement to the poor people of this country, to the boys and the women who wish to qualify themselves for important public places, or is it one that offers them no inducement to honorable ambition? What is the best public policy? Is it to say you shall take, as the penalty of this elevation by the choice of your people, of this seeking for place, poverty and social inferiority for yourself and family—that this shall be your reward for faithful public service? Is that the kind of Government which the argument of the Senator from Arkansas demands? It is to punish merit, it is to punish honorable ambition, it is to punish faithful public service, to punish devotion to the people and to true Democracy. It is to exclude the body of the people, who are poor, who are privates, from holding office. To that kind of policy I am opposed; and if Senators on the other side and the people of the North see fit to award to their generals and the officers of their Army pensions, and to make differences between them and the mass of the soldiers, I have not one word to say in objection to it.

As to the proposition that every private soldier should have a pension, yes, and every widow, and be put in luxury for meritorious service of the 500 referred to out of the 1,000 who, as the Senator from Nebraska says, fought the battles of the country, I agree to it. I would like both them and the Confederate soldiers and their widows all to have a general's pension, if you can so manage it; but how can you do it? You can not give a great pension to every widow. You can not find out now who were the 500 who fought and the 500 who did not. The people who labor, and out of whose labor pensions are paid, can not bear such great increase of their burdens. The Senator from Nebraska can not ascertain the fact as to who were the meritorious 500 who bore the brunt of battle. He himself says that there were 500 men out of every 1,000 who were not in the thick of battle, but some of them in other duty, and some stragglers and in no duty.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I did not say so, Mr. President.

Mr. CALL. Did you not say that some were stragglers? That 500 bore the brunt of the action?

Mr. ALLEN. No; I did not say so.

Mr. CALL. I will take that back, then. I think those were the words used by the Senator, though he did not mean that, and I do not mean to impute to him any reflections on either officers or soldiers, for I have a high respect for him and for his opinions and for the Senator from Arkansas. I am discussing the reasonableness of these arguments and the public policy they advocate in this respect.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I know what I say generally. I said out of a regiment of 1,000 men that experience had proved that never to exceed more than one-half of them came in fighting contact with the enemy, that the other 500 were on detail duty or on the sick list, and some of them were straggling and at other places rather than in fighting contact with the enemy.

Mr. CALL. Then you do not want stragglers to be pensioned?

Mr. ALLEN. I never in the world would pension a straggler, if I had my way.

Mr. CALL. It is impossible to carry out the idea of the Senator from Nebraska to pension the widows of every private soldier, so that they will be in abundant comfort; but it is possible to pension those of whom we have ascertained records of distinguished and extraordinary service. And in this there is no distinction between officer and private or officers' widows and privates' widows; wherever they rendered the same service the same pensions should be awarded; but the question is, is the officer's service the same, are the duties the same as the private's, are the responsibilities the same? Is the service of a faithful public servant or officer on the same or a larger scale than that of the private citizen or soldier?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I will make answer to the Senator from Florida. Take the widows, for instance, of two equally meritorious men, of equal intellectual capacity, of equal capacity in private life, women who are equal in their social life from girlhood to womanhood, who are equal in the literary and the other acquirements that go to make up perfect womanhood—I want to ask the Senator from Florida if, when their husbands die, he would give to one of them $50 a month and to the other $8 a month because of the distinction that existed between their husbands during their service?

I want to emphasize the statement. I can not agree with the Senator from Florida, and I am certainly surprised to see the distinguished Senator from Florida join the plutocrats in this Chamber.

Mr. CALL. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLEN. If any man has been constant, in season and out of season, during this Congress and during the Fifty-third Congress in preaching the cause of reform and the cause of the common man, that man has been the senior Senator from Florida. And now all this preaching of his is to go for naught at this time, and he wants to impress upon the Senate and upon the country that there is some kind of distinction existing between men in this country—I do not know how, and he has not explained how—and between the meritorious widows of the men who consecrated themselves, in different lines, it is true, to the cause of their country at the call of the country. Why, Mr. President, if I believed that doctrine I would expatriate myself in twenty-four hours. I would go over to Great Britain, where Queen Victoria rules supreme over the British Empire, and I do not know but that I should go to Russia, where the Emperor is the Government.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator believed that, he would go to England or to Russia, as he says; and I ask him whether he ought not to take but a dollar and a half a day for his service here, and is he not bound to decline every dollar that the Government pays him over a dollar and a half a day?

Mr. ALLEN. I am perfectly willing to enter into a contract with the Senator from Florida to take the same pay he takes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALL. Oh, well, I would not take that. You are safe in making that proposition.

Mr. ALLEN. And I think I can earn as much here or elsewhere as can the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Florida is un-American. We are not only to have this distinction exist in military life, but it is to exist in private life, in the life of the citizen. The Senator would go further and would convert this country into an aristocracy——

Mr. CALL. Oh, no. That is what your policy would do by excluding all poor men and all privates from holding office and confining the offices to the rich.

Mr. ALLEN. With a ruling class of people, where a few men, through the influences of wealth or rank, would control the destinies of a great nation, while the great masses of our people would simply be their serfs, contributing by their labor and their taxes to the strengthening and upbuilding of that class. I am absolutely surprised and completely amazed at the attitude of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the Senator will allow me to say——

Mr. ALLEN. Let me go on.

Mr. CALL. Very well; go on.

Mr. ALLEN. Not only that, but the Senator would build up a civil list in this country——

Mr. CALL. I did not say so and I am not in favor of any such proposition.

Mr. ALLEN. So that we should have the widows and children of men in public life pensioned for their lives, like the widows and daughters of brigadier-generals, until, in the course of a few years, we should have upon the civil pension list of this country a million people. Why, Mr. President, is that Florida Democracy?

Mr. CALL. I am astonished at the Senator. He is here advocating a policy which demands that a million soldiers and their widows shall be put upon the pension list in comfort and luxury, with brigadiers' pensions, an impossible thing, and he turns around and asks me about putting a million pensioners on the civil list. I have never said that I was in favor of a civil pension list, and I am opposed to it; but the Senator has said, and he is arguing here, that every soldier and every soldier's widow, more than a million in all, shall be put away up above the present rate. If that were possible I might agree with him, but he turns around and charges upon me just what he is in favor of and has been urging here, which is impossible, and which he would not do if he had the power, and charges on me propositions which I have never stated and to which I am entirely opposed.

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President; I am not unwarrantably accusing the Senator from Florida. I say that I drew distinctly from the language the Senator used the conclusion that he wanted to see pensioned the widow and the children of a man because he happened to have been in the Senate or the House of Representatives, thus discriminating in their favor as against the widow and the children of the poor men in this country who are working for a livelihood.

Mr. CALL. The Senator should always stick to the point. The Senator from Arkansas attacked the allowance of a year's salary to the widow of a Senator; I defended it and said it was right. That is nothing like a civil pension list. I again repeat, as I have constantly done, that I am opposed to pensioning Senator's widows or any civil employees' widows.

Mr. ALLEN. What was the Senator doing when he was talking about distinguished men serving their country in this Chamber?

Mr. CALL. I was arguing the point of reasonable compensation for valuable public services.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator was arguing the point that there was some distinction between those men and the men whom they represented.

Mr. CALL. The only distinction is that one renders public service and the other does not. That is all that I said, and all that is involved in the argument.

Mr. ALLEN. One renders service, so the Senator from Florida says, and the other does not; but the other is perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. CALL. I am willing to admit that.

Mr. ALLEN. I have not the slightest doubt that we can find in the State of Florida 10,000 of its citizens who would be perfectly willing to represent that great State in this Chamber.

Mr. CALL. And the same is true of Nebraska, too.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; and Nebraska, too. I know that. [Laughter.] And there are 10,000 citizens, with no disparagement to my honorable friend from Florida, who would represent that State equally as well.

Mr. CALL. Possibly better.

Mr. ALLEN. Now, what? Because we are so fortunate, perhaps, or unfortunate, as to be members of this body—and it is a question yet whether it is a fortune or a misfortune to be in this Chamber—are our widows and children to be put upon a civil list, and become a civil aristocracy in this country, as against the widows and children of the great masses of the people who have built up this magnificent and splendid Republic?

Mr. CALL. Of course not.

Mr. ALLEN. No; of course not. It does not sound right when put in proper language, does it?

Mr. CALL. You do not put it in proper language.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, what I stated a while ago I repeat at this moment. The distinction that Senators would make is between the widows and the children of brigadier-generals and the great masses of the unknown soldiers, the humble men who performed services to this country in the late war, and who will perform those services in the great war to come with Great Britain on the Monroe doctrine, because it seems to be imminent now; and I am surprised again at the Senator from Florida, and not only surprised, but I am absolutely amazed to think that the Senator from Florida would rise in his place in the Senate of the United States and say that a lieutenant had a brighter, a stronger, and a better intellect than a private soldier.

Mr. President, there were hundreds and perhaps thousands of officers who could not write their own names until some private soldier taught them how to do it; and yet the Senator rises in his place and declares to the world that the officer has a superior intellect to the man who wore the blue or the man who wore the gray.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, nothing of that sort has been said. If the Northern Army was, as the Senator has said, officered by men who could not write their names, it was an extraordinary condition of things. I am sure he does not mean this.

Mr. ALLEN. I said some of them.

Mr. CALL. We were not speaking of some. If you were speaking of some, then you were not arguing the case; but we were speaking of the mass; and I said the soldiers themselves chose one of their comrades, a private, to be their leader; and if the Senator assails their intelligence by saying that they chose the most ignorant among them, it is he that is assailing the private Union soldier and not I.

Mr. President, what the Senator has said about a civil list I deny. I said nothing about a civil list; but I said that to the widow of the public servant who sat here and labored here and did service here and died, Congress gave a year's salary, and it did right, because his people had chosen him, he had accepted, and had faithfully rendered service to the public, and dying left in most cases a family without adequate support. So I say about ths officers of the Union Army who were privates and became officers at the request of their comrades or with their consent. I take it for granted that when the patriotic and able and great President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who was the author of all appointments in the Army, appointed an officer, he did it either because of his proved record of superior intelligence, capacity, and bravery, or because the public sentiment and judgment of the private soldiers had selected their fellow-soldier for this more responsible position. And if the Senator says that President Lincoln and that Grant and Sherman selected for leadership men who were neither capable nor brave, it is he, and not I, who assails the Union private soldier.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has not made any statement of the kind. I regret exceedingly to see my friend from Florida beating about the bush now and undertaking to get out of the uncomfortable position in which he has placed himself.

Mr. CALL. Oh, no; you are the one who is bushed. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. I said that there were hundreds and thousands—perhaps I should not go any further than that—of these men who were even taught to write their own names by private soldiers, and I will say that that existed North and South, too, because it is correct.

Mr. CALL. No; not in the South.

Mr. ALLEN. And yet we are told openly in the Senate of the United States that by force of the fact that one man was an officer and the other was a private soldier, therefore there was a distinction between their intellects and their moral courage.

Mr. CALL. I must correct the Senator. I say we are told there was a difference in their service, because the private soldier of the army said so; and not because one was a colonel and the other was not.

Mr. ALLEN. He never said so, and no reasonable man upon the face of this earth ever said so honestly.

Mr. CALL. How, then, did the man get to be an officer?

Mr. ALLEN. By hook and by crook; by political influences many times.

Mr. CALL. Did President Lincoln appoint men to be officers by hook and by crook, or because of merit?

Mr. ALLEN. No; President Lincoln did not have anything to do with the appointment of many of them.

Mr. CALL. I supposed he had.

Mr. ALLEN. Most of them were appointed by the governors of the States.

Mr. CALL. Then your governors were very bad men. That is your proposition.

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President; no worse than the governor of the State of Florida at the same time.

Mr. CALL. I have nothing to say about that.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to say to the Senator from Florida that he can not get away from the proposition he has laid down here, that the fact that there was a distinction in the rank of these men was conclusive and indubitable proof of a distinction in their intellectual capacity.

Mr. CALL. I said nothing of that sort.

Mr. ALLEN. Did not the Senator say that there was a distinction in the intellectual capacity of the officers and men?

Mr. CALL. I deny the statement entirely. I have never said, and do not believe, that because you call one man "colonel" and another man "Tom" that there is a distinction between those men; but if a great mass of men say that a man who is called colonel is called so because of his distinguished valor and his superior ability, I believe those men. That is what I said.

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to the Senator from Florida that a few years ago I took a trip down into the section of country where the Senator lives——

Mr. CALL. That has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; it has something to do with it.

While driving over the mountains, as I remember, of an adjoining State I would say to the driver: "Who lives over there in that nice mansion?" "Colonel Moore." "Who lives over here at that place?" "Colonel Smith." "Who lives over here at this other place?" "Colonel Jones." I said to him: "All these men must have been in the army during the war." "Oh, no," he replied, "not one of them; they inherit their titles down here as colonel." And, Mr. President, in two days' drive in a country that had been settled for over two hundred years I could not find a man below the rank of major. [Laughter.] All the private soldiers seemed to have mysteriously dropped through the earth or disappeared in some form.

Mr. CALL. It is no harm for a man to be called major or colonel if he has a right to the title.

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose it is a little sign of weakness, however, if he is not entitled to it, and sometimes it is a sign of weakness if he insists on it when he is entitled to it.

Now, the Senator wants to supplement this military aristocracy by a civil aristocracy——

Mr. CALL. Oh, no; I am opposed to any aristocracy, and have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. ALLEN. The first thing you know this country will be turned over to the keeping of a few men, and the great masses of our patriotic citizens will become agricultural serfs to the ruling power.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CALL. I protest against the Senator turning around to me and accusing me of such conclusions and opinions, when the Senator is proposing that every man shall be so poor that none but plutocrats and rich men can hold public office. The Senator is the man who is advocating a plutocracy and not I.

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. ALLEN. In a moment I will yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. You are very kind; thank you.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want a plutocracy in this country. I should like to get the plutocracy out of the Senate; I should like to get it out of the House of Representatives; I should like to get it out of the White House; I should like to get it out of the Supreme Court; and I should like to get the people enthroned in this Government, in every branch of it.

Mr. CALL. By making them so poor that they can not afford it?

Mr. ALLEN. I want to tell the distinguished Senator from Florida that now that the Populists have succeeded in destroying the Democratic party——

Mr. HARRIS. Since when?

Mr. ALLEN. In this Chamber; like the locusts, we are migrating to the Republican party, and we propose to destroy them, too [laughter], and the result will be in 1900 that the people will come into the inheritance of their own.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why does the Senator put it off to 1900, let me ask?

Mr. ALLEN. I put it off to 1900 because the scalawags who have revolutionized this Government have fastened their fangs so deeply in every department for the last thirty years that it will take six or seven years to uproot them and throw them out, and I do not anticipate——

Mr. HARRIS. To what scalawags does the Senator refer?

Mr. ALLEN. There are some things in this life that are so sacred that they ought not to be told; and I decline to answer my distinguished friend from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRIS. I supposed you would. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Let me make one more remark regarding the argument of the Senator from Florida, and then I shall be done. The Senator seems to think because a few men get into public life—and a great many of the people think that they get here wrongfully—that, therefore, instantaneously there springs up something that is sacred about their persons and about the persons of their wives and children that does not apply to the persons of the wives and children of the common masses.

Mr. CALL. Oh, no. I neither said nor think anything of the kind.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator says we give our great ability to the public service.

Mr. CALL. No, I did not say that.

Mr. ALLEN. Therefore our wives and children should be rewarded.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator will not misrepresent me. I ask him if he thinks it is right to state that I said things which I did not say? I never said anything about any great ability. No such word and no such idea will be found in my observations. I said the people had sent us here, and we had accepted the position, to perform certain duties, certain labor, which we did perform, and that a reasonable compensation for a proper method of life, enough to enable a person to live in decent comfort, and not in hovels and in extreme poverty, was a reasonable consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. I have heard the Senator from Florida insinuate, if not assert, on more occasions than one, that it was somewhat questionable whether the people sent all these Senators here or not.

Mr. CALL. I did; but what has that to do with the argument?

Mr. ALLEN. I think I have heard him intimate that probably those powerful corporations had reached out their tentacles like a great octopus and occasionally put a man into the Senate.

Mr. CALL. No doubt about that.

Mr. ALLEN. No doubt about that. Then, that destroys the argument that the people sent us all here.

Mr. CALL. The people sent some of us. The Senator must confine himself to facts. Sometimes the people send Senators here, and I suppose they have sent about nine out of ten, if not all. I have said that corporations have too much influence in elections, and that they ought to be restrained. And I say so now, and shall so vote on all occasions.

Mr. ALLEN. I agree with you.

Mr. CALL. But I have not said that the Senate of the United States was constituted of men sent here by the corporations. What I said was that the influence of corporations was a public evil that needed legislation, and I say it again, to restrain it, and that the poor people of the country should have the right to come here and be represented, and when they come they, with their families, should not be placed in circumstances of extreme poverty as a penalty for their honorable ambition and their public service.

Mr. ALLEN. Why do not Senators and other high officials, if they are undergoing the stress of poverty, turn their attention to the fruitful fields of money making in commerce and the law?

Mr. CALL. They have a right to come here.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly you have a right to come, but you have a right to take the consequences when you come. You can not separate the office and the consequences which flow to the individual or his family from its occupancy.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator if he thinks it proper to make extreme poverty and being discriminated against, as compared with the average of the people, the penalty and consequence of accepting public service? Does the Senator advocate that?

Is that the treatment he would give to the people who had selected one of themselves to perform public duties which required him to devote all his time to the people's service? Does he think that would encourage the poor man, the private soldier, to devote his time to the people's service to say to him, if you serve the public you must content yourself with poverty and discomfort to yourself and family? I am opposed to all pensions for Senators and their families and for all civil employees, but the question of a reasonable compensation for services is certainly different.

Mr. ALLEN. Oh, no, Mr. President. If I could not make enough money out of the salary of my position in the Senate to support my family I would go back to my profession, where I can double it. I can make money there.

Mr. CALL. The Senator can not get out of it in that way. He fixes the salary, and upon his principle he would make it but $1.50 a day.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I would not agree to that. I should want at least $2 a day. No, Mr. President, if the salary is not large enough for the Senator from Florida——

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Florida has said nothing about it; nothing about its being too small or too large.

Mr. ALLEN. Or any other Senator; and he thinks that this Government should pension his widow and his children when he is gone——

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Florida said nothing about that.

Mr. ALLEN. Let him shake the dust of the capital from his feet, and go back into the fruitful fields of Florida, and earn ten or fifteen thousand dollars a year practicing law.

Mr. CALL. Let me again interrupt the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator reiterates here that because I may be a poor man I have no right to be in the Senate. What sort of a proposition is that? I said before that according to his argument, although I do not believe the Senator really believes it, we would have a Government in which none but the wealthy, the rich people, would hold office.

The Senator talks to me as if I did not think the salary is sufficient. I have said nothing about whether it is sufficient or insufficient. He is the one who has spoken of that matter.

Mr. ALLEN. I have said nothing about the poverty of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. Oh, yes; the Senator did. Not meaning me, but any poor man who might be a Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I am infinitely poorer than the Senator from Florida. The Senator had the distinguished honor, I understand, to enjoy some of the emoluments of official position——

Mr. CALL. Very few.

Mr. ALLEN. Very few and very little. I have been a grounding from childhood up. I had nobody to help me; not even to learn the alphabet of my native language. I had no one to help me to rise. The only possessions I had were a disposition and good health; and I am willing to take my chances in this world with any man, I care not who he may be, and I do not want my wife and my children to be pensioned if I happen to fail.

Mr. CALL. I do not want my wife and children, or the Senator's, to be pensioned, but I want my wife and children, and his, to have the $5,000 that has been allowed Senators in case of death and insufficient means of living. I should be very sorry if they were left in poverty.

But the Senator from Nebraska is not different from the great majority of Senators in this Chamber. They were all poor. If they have anything they have made it. They grew up from the ground, as he did, as I did, and as all our people do. He can not claim any merit because of that fact over other Senators here. We were all privates, and have all been chosen by the people, and are content to be of the people and take our chances in life.

Mr. ALLEN. I think I am through with the Senator from Florida, and I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nebraska will not get into any discussion with me to-day. The Senator and the Senate will bear me out that I have taken very little of the time of the Senate. I wish to have a vote on the pending bill, but before a vote is taken I desire simply to read two sentences from the petition of Mrs. Spencer in asking for a pension. She says:

I asked him—

That is, her husband—

why, like other men, he did not have a pension.

This man was pensionable. He might have drawn thousands of dollars if he had applied for a pension, as most other men did, but he did not do it.

He answered what he had done for his country had been done with all his heart, and he would do it over again and never ask for a money reward. He was cast in a heroic mold, and I felt the nobility of his thought too much to press the matter further. As he became more ill I changed my thought and said that for his child's sake he should apply for a pension, and he promised he would when he was better. But he died. His widow and his young son are left penniless, and the world is hard for a woman, and an ill woman, to make a way to support herself and educate her child.

It is in this position I come to you.

That is, to Congress.

I ask of the country for which my husband fought and suffered the pension of $75 a month. This much I ask, for with strict economy I can with it

educate my son and support us both until I, in some measure, regain my strength. I would not have more, for nothing but poverty, absolute poverty, could make me a pensioner even of the Government. I do not ask less, for with less I do not believe my purpose could be accomplished.

On former occasions I have combated the position so ably sustained by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. I do not agree with him in any of his propositions, but I have no disposition to detain the Senate now, and I am sure that I shall not do so on the discussion of any pension bill during the present Congress. I trust that a vote may now be had on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for a division.

There were on a division—ayes 22, noes 7; no quorum voting.

Mr. PASCO. I suggest, as the vote has shown the absence of a quorum, that the rule requires a roll call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Squire,
Allison,	Gear,	Mantle,	Teller,
Bacon,	George,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Tillman,
Bate,	Gorman,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Berry,	Gray,	Palmer,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Hansbrough,	Pasco,	Vilas,
Call,	Harris,	Peffer,	Walthall,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Warren,
Cockrell,	Hill,	Platt,	Wilson.
Cullom,	Hoar,	Proctor,	
Dubois,	Kyle,	Sewell,	
Frye,	Lindsay,	Shoup,	

Mr. TURPIE. My colleague [Mr. VOORHEES] is detained at his room by indisposition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a single question. At what rate did the Committee on Pensions fix the pension in this case?

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill as introduced provided for a pension of $50, and the committee voted to grant her $50.

Mr. HARRIS. And the Senator from New Hampshire proposes to increase the pension to $75?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have moved to increase the amount to $75.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I wish to state that I have knowledge that the lady who would be the beneficiary of this bill is at present in absolute want, wholly dependent, and has not a thing in the world. I hope a pension of $75 will be granted to her.

Mr. PASCO. I suggest that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions, so that the additional facts which have been brought out in debate may be considered by it, and if the committee sees fit to report the bill at the increased amount, it can do so. I make that motion.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to the bill being recommitted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GRAY. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] if the pension cases have been disposed of?

Mr. GALLINGER. There are several other cases, but it will not take much time to finish them.

Mr. COCKRELL. There are three or four other cases. Let us finish them.

Mr. GRAY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. VILAS. Let us finish the execution of the order. I ask the Senator from Delaware to withdraw his motion.

Mr. GRAY. I will withdraw the motion. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire to say that there were no further cases.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I said there were a few more cases.

Mr. VILAS. There are a few more cases. Let us dispose of them.

Mr. GRAY. I withdraw the motion, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn, and the next pension case on the Calendar will be stated.

JOSEPH PORTER.

The bill (S. 1945) granting a pension to Joseph Porter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "rate," to strike out "provided for total blindness" and insert "of thirty dollars per month"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Porter, late a private in Company K, Eighth New York Heavy Artillery, at the rate of $30 per month, in lieu of the pension he now receives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH A. BULL.

The bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bull was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws, the name of Sarah A. Bull, widow of Hiram C. Bull, late a major and paymaster of volunteers in the United States Army, and grant her a pension at the rate of $25 per month, in lieu of the pension of $8 per month which she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN B. MEIGS.

The bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to John B. Meigs was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John B. Meigs at the rate of $12 a month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. SARAH B. LEET.

The bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five," and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Sarah B. Leet, widow of the late Bvt. Lieut. Col. George K. Leet, United States Army, at the rate of $25 per month, which rate of $25 per month shall be in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMMA BROUGH GERARD.

The bill (S. 1414) granting a pension to Emma Brough Gerard was announced as the next pension bill in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] desires to be heard on the bill, and I ask that it may be temporarily laid aside, as he may come into the Chamber within a moment. If he does not, I ask that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

MRS. HYPOLITE HUARD.

The bill (S. 1790) granting a pension to Mrs. Hypolite Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 4, after the word "roll," to strike out "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws"; and in line 9, after the word "her," to strike out "the same rate per month as is paid to soldiers who served sixty days in the war with Mexico, or en route thereto, and that this payment begin from the date of the filing of the application for pension in the Pension Bureau," and insert "$12 per month"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. Hypolite Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, private Captain Mauberret's Battalion Louisiana Volunteer Light Artillery, Mexican war service, and pay to her $12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CORNELIA I. SKILES.

The bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles, widow of John W. Skiles, late major of the Eighty-eighth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers, at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of the pension now received.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KATE EZEKIEL.

The bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Kate Ezekiel, widow of David I. Ezekiel, late lieutenant of the Tenth Virginia Volunteers, at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of the pension now received by her.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENA D. SMITH.

The bill (S. 1342) granting pension to Lena D. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Lena D. Smith, widow of Green Clay Smith, late colonel Fourth Kentucky Cavalry and brigadier-general United States Volunteers, and to pay to her a pension of $50 per month from and after the date of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANN M. MADDEN.

The bill (S. 568) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann M. Madden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Madden," to strike out "widow" and insert "dependent mother"; and in line 7 after the word "Volunteers," to strike out "subject to the limitations of the general pension laws" and insert "at the rate of $8 per month"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Ann M. Madden, dependent mother of Harry O. Madden, late a member of Company F, Second Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers, at the rate of $8 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ADALINE V. BASSETT.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senate to consider the resolution proposing to give a sum equal to one year's salary to the widow of the late Isaac Bassett.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Adaline V. Bassett, widow of Isaac Bassett, deceased, late assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's salary, at the rate allowed by law to said assistant doorkeeper, out of the "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate; said payment to be considered as in lieu of all funeral expenses or other allowances.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GRAY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 20, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19, 1896.

AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

William H. Pugh, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the Navy Department.

CONSUL.

Peter Victor Deuster, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Crefeld, Germany.

POSTMASTERS.

Knudt Schyan, to be postmaster at Flandreau, in the county of Moody and State of South Dakota.

James W. French, to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa.

J. Wheelock Marsh, to be postmaster at Forest Grove, in the county of Washington and State of Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 19, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOHN S. EVANS.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1601) to amend the military record of John S. Evans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to restore to the muster rolls of Company E, Twenty-seventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry, the name of John S. Evans, and to grant him an honorable discharge from the service: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not serve to entitle him to any pay, bounty, or allowances.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope we shall have a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. This man whose military record the bill proposes to correct was a good soldier. He was arrested in connection with a dance which the junior officers of the regiment gave. Col. Michael Churchill, of Jamesville, Ohio, has sent here a very strong letter in favor of granting the relief asked. It is found that this man was not immediately responsible in connection with the disturbance which occurred. The citizens of the town where he now lives have unanimously asked this relief in a long petition which has been sent here. The man's record as a citizen from the time he left the service up to the present time has been good. There is no reason why the disability which he incurred should not be removed.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is understood that this bill carries no pay.

Mr. PERKINS. No pay—nothing of the kind. The favorable report of the committee, submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON], is unanimous.

Mr. MILES. Is this the bill which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] asked time yesterday to consider?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir.

Mr. LOUD. What is the present status of this soldier? Is he a deserter?

Mr. PERKINS. Under the charge which was made against him he was court-martialed.

Mr. LOUD. He is not a deserter?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SUITS TO VACATE PATENTS UPON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. I call for the regular order.

The House, as the regular order, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5474) to provide the extension of time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul patents upon public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. LACEY. I ask my colleague [Mr. HEPBURN] to withdraw his amendment now pending until we can dispose of the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. HEPBURN. For the purpose suggested, I withdraw my amendment for the present.

Mr. LACEY. Now I desire to call for a vote on the committee amendment to insert before the words "special grant" the words "railroad, Mexican, Spanish, or other." So far as I am concerned, I think this amendment ought to be voted down, though I do not feel at liberty to withdraw it. The amendments which other gentlemen desire to offer can come up later.

Mr. LOUD. I wish to submit as a substitute for the amendment of the committee an amendment which I think will cover the whole proposition.

Mr. LACEY. Let it be read.

Mr. LOUD. I will read it myself:

In line 5 strike out the words "special grant" and insert in lieu thereof "railroad or wagon-road grants."

Mr. LACEY. I am not at liberty to accept that on behalf of the committee, but I think it ought to pass; and I call for a vote.

The amendment of the committee and also the proposed substitute of Mr. LOUD were read.

Mr. DOLLIVER. We would like to have a statement of the effect of this amendment.

Mr. LACEY. The effect will be simply this: The language of the original bill is "special grant." The substitute of the gentleman from California proposes to strike out those words and to insert the words "railroad or wagon-road grant," covering the two classes of grants in the adjustment of which the Department is now engaged.

There is no question of adjustment as to the grants to individuals; but the amendment proposed by the committee is broad enough to open up the entire question as to Mexican grants, the Spanish grants, and other special land grants mentioned in the bill. Now, if the substitute of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] shall be adopted, it would eliminate everything from the bill in relation to the Spanish, Mexican, and other special grants, and would leave them untouched, and confine the scope of the bill to the railroad and wagon-road grants.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised that the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, who reported this bill with the committee amendment as printed, now recommends its abandonment. With that amendment out and nothing substituted, there is nothing whatever in the bill that would be of much value to the Department or the settlers.

Mr. LACEY. I do not think my colleague heard the proposition correctly. Something is substituted for the amendment of the committee. But all the Spanish and Mexican grants are eliminated from the bill, and we insert in lieu thereof the railroad and wagon-road grants. So that the whole matter is substituted except as to the Spanish and Mexican grants, upon which, as the gentleman remembers, we were not fully agreed in committee, and yet it was a question, in view of the fact that there was no special opposition to it, that we did not care to call to the attention of the House excepting in the shape that has been presented in the bill.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, the hearings before the Committee on Public Lands showed that some of the most outrageous frauds that were alleged to have been perpetrated were in connection with these very grants to which the gentleman has referred. I have in mind a single Mexican grant made, if made at all, when the Mexican law did not permit the granting of more than 11 leagues of land to any one individual, and yet it has been so surveyed and manipulated by the officers of the Government that it now includes 14 leagues of land; and we are informed that there are people in that vicinity who desire to enter these public lands as homesteads and they want the Government to at least purge the grant of fraud. If the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] is adopted, then all patents and certifications are confirmed, and we will be deprived of all right to investigate as to the validity of the original grant, the survey of it, or any fraud or mistake connected with its confirmation. I think that all of these grants, railroad, wagon-road, Mexican, Spanish, and special, should be put upon an equal footing and adjusted upon the same basis. There should be no special exceptions in favor of any of them.

The gentleman who spoke on yesterday questioned some statements of mine which were made in the discussion of the bill on a previous occasion. The information I gave to the House was, in substance, such information as came to the committee in the hearings on the bill; information that came from the Department which is supposed to know something of the early practice in making lists for railroads; information which I believe to be true, notwithstanding the denial of the gentleman. But, Mr. Speaker, if I am in error in stating that many of these lists were made under the impression that they should not be treated as patents, and if the gentleman is correct in stating that they were always treated as patents, then all the certificates behind which the gentleman undertakes now to shelter the railroads are the more outrageous, because he admits that there are many mistakes. I made no charge of actual fraud against the Department. I prefer to believe and would exonerate, as far as possible, the gentleman who made up the list. I know that the Commissioner, whoever he was, could not personally examine the tract books to find mistakes, and that he signed the lists prepared for him. I adopted what appeared to me to be a reasonable excuse for these errors. Now, if that is not true and these men knew that these lists were to have the force of patents, then the thousands of errors which are in many cases admitted, and in all cases in favor of the grantees, drive us to the conclusion that they were procured by corrupt methods either on the part of the railroad companies or the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a class of settlers, and they have been entirely overlooked in the consideration of this bill, that is, those who claim under the public-land laws, whose rights should be protected in some way. This bill does protect, and it seems that its main object and purpose is to protect, purchasers from railroad companies. But little has been said and nothing done for the settlers who claim under the public-land laws of the United States. The interests of these two classes of settlers often conflict. For instance, A buys from the railroad company, which has an erroneous certificate or patent, as the case may be; B applies to enter the land under the homestead law, and alleges that the land did not pass to the railroad company and is of right a part of the public domain.

Now, this bill will confirm the land to the purchaser from the company and defeat the settler who has undertaken to claim under the public-land laws. There are many such settlers, but they have few friends here. That is the class I wish to protect first of all. They have stood in the breach and contested every inch of ground with the corporations from the time the grants were made, and yet they are now to be denied the right to take the land because the road has sold it to some speculator. I deny that this is right or just to claimants under our public laws. The proposition would confirm and fully protect the railroads. But no effort has been made to aid or protect that class of homeless citizens whom it is our duty to protect, and who have spent their time and money to vindicate the law. I hope this bill will not pass until some provision is made to protect bona fide settlers as was done by the act of 1887, and when their rights conflict with the rights of purchasers from railroads to give to them a preference.

In your efforts to give quiet and repose to speculative purchasers do not destroy the legal and the equitable rights of those honest settlers who have been contesting and expecting to finally acquire homes on these lands.

Mr. Speaker, I have already said I do not believe there should be any statute of limitations against the Government which will prevent the unearthing and exposure of frauds. I am not afraid that the settlers of the country who have patents will be troubled by lawsuits. In the history of the Government, prior to 1891, I believe only 25 suits have been recommended by the Land Department against agricultural patents. There is no danger of any honest settlers being troubled with lawsuits on the part of the Government. What the Department wants, and what it ought to have, is the right to correct any errors in these lists if they contain mistakes and to purge them of all frauds; and let us not, because some of these lists were signed by that great and good man, Thomas A. Hendricks, say that we will not examine any of them. I was a little bit amused at my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yesterday, when he talked so eloquently about the lamented Thomas A. Hendricks. During the lifetime of that illustrious man I do not suppose that my friend from Iowa was ever heard to say a kind word concerning him, but when he is dead, and the gentleman from Iowa is speaking for a class of persons who hold as purchasers under great railroad corporations, he would shelter them behind that grand and glorious name. I revere the memory of Hendricks. The first Presidential vote that I ever cast in my life was a ticket upon which his name appeared as a candidate for Vice-President of the United States. No purer and no better man ever lived within the borders of the United States. I wanted to see him President.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MCRAE. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. You seem to quarrel with me because I speak well of Mr. Hendricks after his death.

Mr. MCRAE. No; I do not quarrel with you for speaking well of him even now.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is the post-mortem virtues of Democracy that I usually applaud. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCRAE. It is the improper use that you make of his good name and the outrageous purposes for which you would use it—perhaps unintentionally—to which I object. I challenge your right to use the good name of Thomas A. Hendricks, because he was once Commissioner of the General Land Office, to cover the mistakes or the frauds or the misconstructions, if you please, of these railroad certifications by which corporations and syndicates have secured millions of acres of land that they are not entitled to.

I deny that the statute of limitations which was passed in 1891 has been of any benefit to anyone. It passed without consideration. No one, so far as the record shows, knew of any such purpose. It was put in by a conference committee, and nobody except the conferees had any idea that there was any such provision in the bill. It did not belong there, and I think we should lose no time in repealing it to enable the Department and the courts to purge these railroad grants of fraud. When the 3d of March comes, if Congress does not act by repealing the whole statute of limitations or extending the time, you will find all these errors and frauds confirmed, and it will be done in the name of settlers. For ten years, upon this floor, I have tried in my humble way to reclaim some of the lands granted to railroad companies, and every time we have made an effort we have been met by just such eloquent vehemence as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] can furnish, insisting that it will disturb the titles of some innocent purchasers. In every step that has been taken we have tried

to protect purchasers and settlers, and yet with every step the railroads, in the name of their purchasers, have grown bolder and more determined until finally they procured a statute of limitations, and with only one-fourth of the grants examined a proposition is made to stop the investigations, and the cry comes for repose to them and their purchasers.

Mr. LACEY was recognized, and yielded five minutes to Mr. LOUD.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] has expended a great deal of force, aimed presumably at Spanish and Mexican grants, but still his shaft has ultimately landed in the railroad camp. His remarks were directed presumably at the substitute amendment offered by myself, which simply eliminates from this bill the Spanish and Mexican grants and leaves intact the railroad and wagon grants. Now, let me say to the gentleman and to this House that there is not a Spanish or Mexican grant in this country which is not musty with the age of more than fifty years. There are no claims for Government lands pending upon any of these Spanish grants. We have been troubled in my State for a great many years, and we think the time has arrived, after more than half a century, when the bona fide settlers who have settled upon or who have purchased from these men who received Mexican grants should be protected in the title which they to-day have. For argument's sake I would admit that every acre of the Mexican grants was stolen, but they have been recognized for fifty years, and I hope the good sense of this House will now confirm the titles in these lands.

Mr. LACEY. I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, two days ago the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] made a statement to the House that the certifications under which these lands were held were in the early days not regarded by the authorities as anything more than mere notice to the world that the railway companies claimed these lands. The gentleman made that statement in face of the fact that before the first one now in controversy was issued that a statute of the United States required the officers of the Government to issue these certificates and the law gave to them all of the effects of patents. They are patents; and the gentleman ought to know it. For years he was chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and he must be familiar with the land system and the legislation; yet he made that statement here in the presence of this House.

I say that these lands are held under muniments of title as solemn as any that can be given by the Government of the United States, and the statement of the gentleman, lacking every feature of verity, was possibly made for the purpose of throwing some cloud or slur upon this class of cases. The gentleman says that he wants to unearth fraud. No man is proposing to throw a barrier in the way of such an inquiry. If he had read the amendment against which he declaims he would have seen that in that there was a provision whereby the Government can inquire into every case where a title had been secured through fraud or mistake. No one wants to throw an impediment in the way of such an inquiry. The gentleman was misleading when he said that the purpose of this bill was to secure inquiry in such matters. I make the statement to him now, and I challenge him to contradict it, that in all the investigations that have been made that have resulted in demands for reconveyance under the act of 1887 not one single instance can he find where fraud is alleged. In every instance the Department has simply urged that there was at a time an improper construction given to the statutes; that they now give another construction; and they want these suits to be brought to enforce a new construction that they now, after more than twenty years, give to the statute.

Wherever there has been a demand for reconveyance that demand is for the reconveyance of lands that were patented under the rulings of the Department as they then existed and as they were continued, not alone under the administration of Mr. Hendricks, but under the administration of gentlemen who have for many years, more than twenty years, administered the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and of the Interior Department. There was no variation in them for more than twenty years, and I want to state again to the House that the controversies are not with reference to fraud, that the controversies are not with reference to mistakes, but they are controversies growing out of changed rulings and new constructions that have been given by the Department in cases of this kind. That is the only subject of inquiry that the Department proposes to make, and they have not yet brought a suit or attempted to bring a suit which made claim for reconveyance except in cases where this was the only difficulty. Now, lately they have changed this ruling and changed their construction, and they want to bring suit because of new light that they claim to have had, and thus cloud and disturb titles held by settlers for almost a generation.

Mr. LACEY. I now yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. BOWERS].

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was under consideration by the Committee on Public Lands for over three weeks, occupying the time of every meeting of that committee. It came in there through a message of the President of the United States calling attention of Congress to the fact that the time would expire on the 3d of March when the United States, by its own action, was debarred from commencing action against patentees where patents had been obtained through mistake, error, or through fraud. During the whole of that time the members of the committee were occupied in satisfying themselves that the title of every bona fide purchaser should be protected. There are three sections in the bill, and in each section that is provided for. Before the committee appeared the law officer of the Department, Mr. Hall, and his proposition was simply that the time be extended to commence suits against railroad patents. That is all. At the last meeting, when this bill was reported, the words "to include Spanish and Mexican grants of lands," at the last moment, was included. I will come to that in a minute. I want to say to the members of the House, if they will give me their attention a moment, that if they will look at the bill they will find that the bona fide purchaser, whoever he may be, is protected, no matter if the railroad grant was made in error, or if it was made under fraud, still the bona fide purchaser under that notice is protected; and the bill provides always that the recourse of the United States shall be against the patentee and not the purchaser.

Section 1 provides that—

No patent to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser shall be vacated or annulled, but the right and title in such purchaser is hereby confirmed.

In section 3 it is provided that—

No suit or action shall be brought to cancel or annul any patent or certification for said lands until such claim is investigated by the Department.

We have provided all through the bill for protecting the rights of bona fide purchasers. Now, a word as to this amendment. As has been truly said, most of these Spanish grants are from forty to fifty years old, and there has been fraud in the granting of some of those patents; there is no question about that. But in the course of thirty, forty, or fifty years those lands have been settled, and whether the grants were fraudulent or not, this bill provides that every bona fide purchaser of those lands shall be confirmed in his possessions, and it is a very grave question, Mr. Speaker, whether we should reopen those cases. The Department has manifested no disposition to open up that field of inquiry. In fact, I may say that the representatives of the Interior Department have stated that in their opinion this bill protects every bona fide purchaser, and that the Department has no disposition to open up these cases except to investigate the various land grants made to railroads and wagon roads.

The reason they ask for this extension is that the amount of money they have had for making surveys and determining these matters has been insufficient, while the general business of the Department has not afforded them time to investigate these cases. For that reason they want a little more time to make the proper surveys and to prepare themselves fully in regard to these railroad and wagon-road grants. I can assure every member of the House that every lawyer on the committee (and I believe they are all lawyers but myself), together with the lawyers of the Interior Department, have agreed that this bill does provide for protecting every bona fide purchaser of lands, whether the original patent was issued in fraud or error or not.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD].

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment and also the substitute proposed by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read first the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, after the word "a," insert "railroad, Mexican, Spanish, or other."

The proposed substitute was then read, as follows:

Strike out in line 5, page 1, the words "special grant" and insert in lieu thereof the words "railroad or wagon-road grant."

The question being taken, the substitute was agreed to by a vote of—ayes 73, noes 36.

The amendment as amended was then agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the second amendment of the committee.

The amendment was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, there are some other amendments that members desire to offer to the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add to the first section the following language:

"*Provided*, That all lands patented or certified to any State, corporation, or individual, under the rulings or constructions of law of the Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior, at the time of the issuance of said patents or certificates, and when no fraud has been committed by the agent of the State or corporation or by the individual, shall be excepted from the operation of the provisions of this act as to extension of time and bringing of suits, and of the act approved March 3, 1887, entitled 'An act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move as a substitute for that proposed amendment the amendment which was read in my time yesterday.

The amendment of Mr. LACEY was read, as follows:

Add at the end of section 1: "*Provided*, That no suit shall be brought or maintained, nor shall recovery be had, for lands or the value thereof that were certified or patented in lieu of other lands covered by a grant which were lost or relinquished by the grantee in consequence of the failure of the Government or its officers to withdraw the same from sale or entry."

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word of explanation. My colleague [Mr. HEPBURN] on yesterday explained that in Nebraska and in some other localities "lieu lands" had been patented in place of lands that the railroad companies had lost by reason of mistake in the Department in allowing settlement upon those lands. The amendment that I offer confirms the title to those lands that have been thus patented to railroad companies where they have lost other lands by reason of mistake committed in the Department. That will cover the point upon which my colleague based his argument yesterday.

Mr. TAWNEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. Your proposed substitute and the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] relate solely to "lieu lands."

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, the act of 1887 applies to lands that are known as "in place" lands as well as to "lieu lands."

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then why should we except lieu lands and still let the "place" and "indemnity" lands sold to bona fide purchasers remain under the provisions of the act of 1887?

Mr. LACEY. We do nothing of the kind. The bill in express terms already protects the bona fide purchasers of all kinds of lands, "lieu lands," "place lands," or any other kind of lands.

Mr. TAWNEY. It protects them at the end of a lawsuit.

Mr. LACEY. Not at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. It does not protect the bona fide purchaser so as to prevent a suit being brought by the Government against him and thus disturbing his title and the title to a great deal of land in the States where these suits are brought.

Mr. LACEY. That may be. But so it is always with any person. A suit may be brought to attack the title of anybody. But when we frame a bill which perfects the title of these men, which says their title shall be confirmed, and is confirmed, and that if suit be brought it shall be the duty of the court to at once confirm the title, nothing more, certainly, can be done.

But let me call the attention of the House and of my friend who wants light on this subject to the proposed amendment of my colleague, providing that when a patent has been issued, unless it has been issued by reason of fraud, that the title never can be assailed, although the railway company still remains in possession. It is true that by reason of some mistake tracts of land here and there have been certified or patented to railway companies that ought never to have received them, and the bill as we have prepared it will enable the Government to reclaim or recover those lands within the next five years. But if the amendment proposed by my colleague [Mr. HEPBURN] be adopted, that is the end of it. Unless you can show that the railway company was guilty of actual fraud, then, although the company may hold hundreds of thousands of acres that ought never to have been patented to it—lands which were patented to it by mistake—those lands can never be recovered. There is no reason why the railway companies should be thus protected and permitted to hold lands which do not properly belongs to them. There is reason why the settler should be protected. Whether the land which he purchased from the railroad company actually belonged to it or not, the company had the muniments of title, it had the patent, was clothed with apparent authority to make the conveyance, and the settler has purchased the land, entered upon it, taken possession of it, and improved it. In such cases, no matter how defective the railroad company's title may have been, the settler should be protected.

But while the lands are still in the hands of the company I see no reason why we should be careful to protect their title, if the land was conveyed to them by mistake.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman will concede, will he not, that when a railroad company has sold to bona fide purchasers, those purchasers ought to be protected by the Government?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly. Not only do I concede that, but we have expressly provided in the bill that they shall be protected.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, when we know, as we do, that the greater part of the lands granted to the railroad companies have passed into the possession of bona fide purchasers, ought we not to take notice of that fact and protect them?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. But ought we not to protect them against suits being brought by the Government to disturb their title?

Mr. LACEY. I advise my friend to read the bill; he will find that such purchasers are protected by it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Not against suits.

Mr. LACEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Why should we give protection against suits and confirm the title in the remainder of the lands which the railroad company has not conveyed and which ought never to have been patented to it?

Mr. TAWNEY. I am not in favor of that proposition. I have here a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman's colleague, and in my amendment it is provided expressly that the provisions of this act shall not apply to lands that are sold by a railroad company in good faith. This would leave the act applicable to all lands that are still held by the railroad company and which were granted by the General Government to the State for the benefit of the railroad company.

Mr. LACEY. The last part of section 1 provides expressly that—

No patent to any lands held by a bona fide purchaser shall be vacated or annulled, but the right and title of such purchaser is hereby confirmed.

Now, in order to protect settlers still further, so that they might not even be required to go into court and make defense, the option has been given to them under sections 2 and 3 to simply file their statement with the Secretary of the Interior (if they want to avoid litigation), setting forth the fact that they are bona fide settlers; and then it is provided in express terms that no suit shall be brought in relation to those lands until the matter is first investigated in the Department; and if, after adjudication there, it is held that they are not bona fide settlers, that adjudication is not conclusive against them, but they can still make their further defense in the courts.

The committee has been very tender in behalf of these bona fide settlers and has endeavored to protect them, not only in the courts but out of the courts, and has provided means by which they may avoid going into the courts at all.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. HEPBURN. I hope my colleague will not do that. I want to correct a misstatement which he has fallen into.

Mr. LACEY. How much time does my colleague want?

Mr. HEPBURN. Five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Very well; I withdraw the demand for the previous question and yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman assures us that these suits will not be brought. Now, I know personally of an instance where, in the southern district of Iowa, the district attorney has been instructed to bring suit to recover some 25,000 acres of land. In order to bring any one of these suits, he says that it will be necessary for him to make parties to the suit all of the inhabitants of the town of Hastings, in Mill County, Iowa. There will be nearly 1,000 defendants in that suit alone. They can not recover without going through that process. It is true that no judgments will be rendered against any one of those persons by this fact, because they are bona fide holders; but they must appear in court and affirmatively show that fact. And my colleague ignores that condition of things entirely.

My colleague is in error again in another statement. The proposition I urged as an amendment to this bill does not do that which he says it will do. Whenever a mistake of fact has been made or a fraud perpetrated, actual or constructive, under my amendment suit may be brought. I only want to protect the settlers where there has been nothing of this sort, neither a mistake of facts nor a fraud of any kind. If fraud be found to exist, suits will be brought notwithstanding the adoption of my amendment. No lands are covered in the operation of this statute except, as I have said before, those issued under the rulings or construction of the Department, which has been continued from 1849 up to about 1875, twenty-five years or more of a continuous, uniform construction, which they are now seeking to overturn by later regulations or rulings.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is fair, and I do not think it is just to the people. My friend from Iowa says that suits could not be brought in many cases. I assert that every man living in the Eighth Congressional district of Iowa who owns lands that were conveyed under any one of these grants will have reason to fear a suit if this bill becomes a law. He can not know what particular land the Secretary will select for the purpose of suits. Everyone will fear, and he will feel it incumbent on him to affirma-

tively show to the Secretary, in order to prevent action, that he is a bona fide holder. He will be put to that expense, and it will cost the people of my district tens of thousands of dollars to make this showing, and what I say of that district may be truthfully said of every district in the State of Iowa, in Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and in many parts of the State of Illinois.

Every Representative, Mr. Speaker, is interested, it seems to me, in behalf of his people in preventing this kind of litigation. If we adopt my amendment there will be no danger of that, and all the purposes the bill seeks to accomplish will still remain unimpaired.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman in charge of this bill yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman from Iowa state in a word what objection there is to the adoption of the substitute offered by his colleague from Iowa?

Mr. LACEY. It is very simple and only this: If the amendment be adopted we may as well kill the bill. There would not be enough left to swear by, although there might be enough to swear at. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Will not every case of fraud be still open to investigation under the bill?

Mr. LACEY. I was trying to answer my friend from Illinois. The amendment amounts to this: That no patent shall be hereafter canceled or annulled in behalf of the United States by suit except in cases where actual fraud is shown.

Now, hundreds of thousands of acres of these lands, by reason of departmental mistakes in construction of the law, have been patented to the railroad and wagon companies that never should have been patented to them. If the land has been sold we confirm the title of the purchasers from the companies. But if it has not been sold there is no reason why the company should retain it. That is the only difference between my colleague and myself. His proposition that we shall only go behind the patents in case of actual fraud would nullify this bill and also the act of 1887, which requires that all these railroad grants should be reexamined and readjusted in the light of the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, just a further question. If I understand you correctly, if the amendment of your colleague is adopted it will confirm in the railroad and wagon-road companies all lands that they hold patents to that have been issued by mistakes in the Department?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly; every acre of them. Now, that ought not to be done, either.

Mr. HOPKINS. And that will take away all chance of upsetting these titles or again acquiring title to that property.

Mr. LACEY. We should not pass this bill after putting that sort of an amendment in it which will confirm all these mistakes, because the number of fraudulent patents is not very great. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the pending amendment affects the title to about 201,000 acres of lieu lands in the State of Nebraska. If there should be any disturbance of the titles held upon those lands the whole matter could be carried back to affect injuriously an equal amount of land in another portion of the State, and thus involve the interests of settlers on over 400,000 acres of land in the State of Nebraska. About 201,000 acres of land were accepted by a certain grantee, in lieu of other lands to which that grantee was entitled in the South Platte country. The lands accepted in the North Platte country, in the State of Nebraska, were, in some instances, less valuable than those in the South Platte country. Nevertheless, the grantee accepted these lieu lands rather than disturb the settlers who had filed homestead and other entries upon South Platte lands properly included in the grant to which I have referred.

Mr. LACEY. May I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. ANDREWS. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask him whether he deems it important for the interests of this large number of settlers in the great tract of public lands in his district that this bill should go through, confirming these titles so as to protect them?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do, Mr. Speaker, and I earnestly hope that the amendment proposed by the chairman of the committee will prevail. We have had an experience in Nebraska on a question like this, and I urge that no mistake be made in protecting our people from another experience so unsatisfactory to the settlers in the State of Nebraska. With this amendment, and another slight amendment that may be proposed later on, I earnestly hope that the bill may become a law. But, with the permission of the House, I desire to call attention to another important fact bearing upon this question.

The grant under consideration covers a period of about twenty-five years. Farmers have purchased lands under it and have invested the labor of almost a quarter of a century in the building of their homes.

If a period of ten years is sufficient to acquire title in other cases, why should not fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years be sufficient for these pioneer farmers to secure absolute titles to their lands? Why should they be held in continued dread that they may be called into court to defend their titles?

They have earned their homes by the patient toil and struggles of years and should be given the absolute assurance that their titles will be confirmed without further delay.

Mr. TAWNEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he has any objection to incorporating in this bill a provision that will throw upon the Government the burden of proving in the first instance whether or not the sale from the railroad company to the purchaser was made in good faith, instead of putting the burden of proof of that fact, as the law of 1887 does, upon the purchaser in the first instance? The Government now proceeds upon the assumption that he is not a purchaser in good faith, and throws the burden of proof of ascertaining that fact upon the purchaser. I will ask the gentleman if he has any objection to a provision imposing upon the Government the burden of ascertaining as a condition precedent to its right to bring suit whether or not the settler is a bona fide purchaser? That will be a substantial protection to the actual, bona fide purchaser.

Mr. LACEY. Why, certainly I have an objection to that. The law is very simple now, and if a bona fide purchaser is brought into court, he, above all persons in the world, knows his own innocence, and if he can not prove it—if he is afraid to go into court and prove it—it certainly is of a very doubtful character. Now, to have the presumption of innocence apply to all these cases would practically handicap the Government to the extent that it could never rectify any of these errors in patents.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman did not understand my question.

Mr. LACEY. I understand it fully. You want to shift the burden of proof.

Mr. TAWNEY. Only in cases where the land is certified erroneously; not where it is certified through fraud or misrepresentation. Only where the error has been committed by the officers of the Government, and because of that error the land has passed into the possession of an actual, bona fide purchaser.

Mr. LACEY. This bill absolutely confirms the title to all that kind of land, and the assumption that the Government will bring suits where it knows it will fail, where the officers of the Government know the act of Congress has confirmed the title, is an assumption of something that I do not think we shall ever be faced with in the future. I do not think the suggestion ought to be put into this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the amendment and the substitute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move the previous question upon the bill?

Mr. LACEY. There will be perhaps one other item of the bill to consider before the previous question is moved upon the bill. I move it upon the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the previous question is ordered upon the amendment and the substitute, and if the substitute offered by the gentleman is voted down, will it be in order then to offer another substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

The SPEAKER. It will.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is the substitute.

The SPEAKER. It is an amendment to the amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. LACEY. Has the amendment been agreed to?

The SPEAKER. The amendment has been adopted as amended. The effect of it is the adoption of the amendment of the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. The question now is on the amendment to the original proposition offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this pertains to section 2. I misunderstood the section. I am not offering an amendment to section 1. My amendment relates to section 2.

The SPEAKER. Is the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas a substitute for the first section?

Mr. LACEY. No, sir; it is a substitute for the entire bill, so that it will come up later on.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all between the word "be," in line 9, and the word "and," in line 12 of section 2, and insert in lieu thereof "more than the minimum Government price thereof."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, a moment's reflection will show that the terms of the bill would involve an inconsistency in some cases. For instance, $1.25 was the minimum Government price for certain lands which have been sold for less than that amount per acre. If the terms of the bill should go into effect, the maximum price in such cases would be 25 cents or 50 cents, while the minimum price would be $1.25. It would be very difficult to harmonize the provisions of the bill in practice if the wording should remain as it now stands. The amendment I have offered would, as a rule, require the grantee to pay to the Government the price at which he could have purchased the land from the Government in the open market.

Some of it may have been sold for more than the Government price, some of it for less. This amendment would leave the amount below the Government price, to be determined and adjudicated by the court. In my judgment, this plan would be far more reasonable than the one proposed by the terms of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the bill and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. McRAE. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 63.

Mr. McRAE. The yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 72, nays 151, not voting 132; as follows:

YEAS—72.

Abbott,	Dockery,	McClellan,	Robbins,
Allen, Miss.	Downing,	McCreary, Ky.	Shuford,
Bailey,	Elliott, S. C.	McCulloch,	Skinner,
Baker, Kans.	Erdman,	McDearmon,	Sparkman,
Bartlett, Ga.	Hall,	McKenney,	Stallings,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Harrison,	McLaurin,	Stokes,
Berry,	Hart,	McMillin,	Strowd, N. C.
Black, Ga.	Hendrick,	McRae,	Sulzer,
Cobb, Ala.	Kendall,	Meredith,	Swanson,
Cobb, Mo.	Kyle,	Meyer,	Talbert,
Cockrell,	Latimer,	Moses,	Terry,
Connolly,	Lawson,	Neill,	Tucker,
Cooper, Tex.	Layton,	Ogden,	Turner, Ga.
Cox,	Lester,	Otey,	Tyler,
Crisp,	Little,	Owens,	Underwood,
Culberson,	Livingston,	Patterson,	Williams,
De Armond,	Lockhart,	Pendleton,	Wilson, S. C.
Dinsmore,	Maguire,	Richardson,	Yoakum.

NAYS—151.

Acheson,	De Witt,	Johnson, Cal.	Powers,
Adams,	Dingley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Prince,
Allen, Utah.	Doolittle,	Joy,	Pugh,
Andrews,	Draper,	Kerr,	Quigg,
Arnold, R. I.	Eddy,	Kiefer,	Ray,
Atwood,	Ellis,	Knox,	Reeves,
Avery,	Evans,	Kulp,	Robinson, Pa.
Babcock,	Fairchild,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Baker, N. H.	Fenton,	Lefever,	Sherman,
Barham,	Fischer,	Leighty,	Simpkins,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Leonard,	Smith, Mich.
Barrett,	Gamble,	Linton,	Snover,
Bartholdt,	Gibson,	Loud,	Sperry,
Bennett,	Gillett, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Steele,
Bishop,	Graff,	Mahany,	Stephenson,
Black, N. Y.	Griffin,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Blue,	Grosvenor,	Marsh,	Stewart, Wis.
Bowers,	Grout,	McCall, Mass.	Stone, W. A.
Brewster,	Grow,	McCall, Tenn.	Strode, Nebr.
Broderick,	Hadley,	McCormick,	Sulloway,
Brosius,	Hager,	McLachlan,	Taft,
Brown,	Halterman,	Mercer,	Tawney,
Brumm,	Hardy,	Milnes,	Tayler,
Burrell,	Harris,	Minor, Wis.	Thomas,
Burton, Mo.	Hartman,	Moody,	Towne,
Burton, Ohio	Hatch,	Murphy,	Treloar,
Calderhead,	Heatwole,	Noonan,	Updegraff,
Cannon,	Hemenway,	Northway,	Van Voorhis,
Chickering,	Henderson,	Odell,	Warner,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Conn.	Otjen,	White,
Coffin,	Hepburn,	Overstreet,	Wilber,
Cooke, Ill.	Hilborn,	Payne,	Willis,
Cousins,	Hooker,	Pearson,	Wilson, Idaho
Crowther,	Hopkins,	Perkins,	Wilson, N. Y.
Crump,	Hubbard,	Phillips,	Wood,
Curtis, Iowa	Huff,	Pickler,	Woomer,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hull,	Pitney,	Wright.
Dayton,	Hurley,	Poole,	

NOT VOTING—132.

Aitken,	Daniels,	Kem,	Sayers,
Aldrich,	Denny,	Kirkpatrick,	Settle.
Anderson,	Dolliver,	Leisenring,	Shafroth,
Apsley,	Dovener,	Lewis,	Shannon,
Arnold, Pa.	Ellett, Va.	Linney,	Shaw,
Baker, Md.	Faris,	Long,	Smith, Ill.
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald,	Lorimer,	Sorg,
Beach,	Foote,	Low,	Southard,
Belknap,	Foss,	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick,
Bell, Colo.	Fowler,	McClure,	Spalding,
Bell, Tex.	Gardner,	McEwan,	Spencer,
Bingham,	Gillet, N. Y.	Maddox,	Stahle,
Boatner,	Griswold,	Meiklejohn,	Stone, C. W.
Boutelle,	Hainer, Nebr.	Miles,	Strait,
Bromwell,	Hanly,	Miller, Kans.	Strong,
Buck,	Harmer,	Miller, W. Va.	Tarsney,
Bull,	Heiner, Pa.	Milliken,	Tate,
Catchings,	Henry, Ind.	Miner, N. Y.	Tracewell,
Clardy.	Hermann,	Mondell,	Tracey,
Clark, Iowa	Hicks,	Money,	Turner, Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Hill,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Codding,	Hitt,	Mozley,	Walker, Mass.
Colson,	Howard,	Newlands,	Walker, Va.
Cook, Wis.	Howe,	Parker,	Walsh,
Cooper, Fla.	Howell,	Price,	Wanger,
Cooper, Wis.	Hulick,	Raney,	Washington,
Corliss,	Huling,	Reyburn,	Watson, Ind.
Cowen,	Hunter,	Robertson, La.	Watson, Ohio
Crowley,	Hutcheson,	Royse,	Wellington,
Cummings,	Hyde,	Rusk,	Wheeler,
Curtis, Kans.	Jenkins,	Russell, Conn.	Wilson, Ohio
Dalzell,	Johnson, Ind.	Russell, Ga.	Woodard,
Danford,	Jones,	Sauerhering,	Woodman.

So the substitute was rejected.

Pending the announcement of the result, the following proceedings took place:

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. STRAIT, is confined to his room by sickness, and I ask that he be excused for the day.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. HAINER and Mr. MEIKLEJOHN, are absent, but paired. If present, they would vote "no."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, being paired with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KIEFER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MCCLEARY, is absent, sick, and I ask that he be excused. Were he present, he would vote "no."

Mr. MCCLEARY was excused.

Mr. WOODMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, and did he fail to hear his name called?

Mr. WOODMAN. I do not think I was in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain the gentleman's request.

Mr. WOODMAN. If permitted to vote, I would vote "no."

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut with Mr. CLARKE of Alabama.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. STRAIT.

Mr. MOZLEY with Mr. ELLETT of Virginia.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. SORG.

Mr. HENRY of Indiana with Mr. SHAW.

Mr. HULICK with Mr. PRICE.

Mr. HANLY with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. LOW with Mr. BELL of Texas.

Mr. LINNEY with Mr. HUTCHESON.

Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. MILES.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. MONEY.

Mr. SAUERHERING with Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia.

Mr. HUNTER with Mr. MINER of New York.

Mr. MILLIKEN with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. MORSE with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. LEISENRING with Mr. TATE.

Mr. SETTLE with Mr. TURNER of Virginia.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas with Mr. COOPER of Florida.

Mr. APSLEY with Mr. BUCK.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN with Mr. SAYERS.

Mr. RANEY with Mr. COWEN.

The following for this day:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. TRACEWELL with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MADDOX.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to pro-

vide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate or annul land patents, and for other purposes."

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I desire to present a report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HULL. I do, if it is merely a report to be printed.

SALE OF INTOXICANTS.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to submit a report in writing on House bill No. 2764 regulating the issuance of license for the sale of intoxicants. The committee are unanimous in the opinion that the bill ought not to pass, but in view of the importance of the question they have instructed me to ask the consent of the House that 500 copies of the report be printed for the use of members, and I now make that request.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The report was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Army appropriation bill; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed in thirty minutes.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, for the present I think we had better go into Committee of the Whole and see what the bill contains. Have points of order been reserved on the bill?

Mr. HULL. All points of order are reserved.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there will be no difficulty in coming to an early agreement even in committee as to the length of the debate, but I do not think we ought to undertake to limit it at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

The motion of Mr. HULL, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, to act as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and, in his temporary absence, will ask the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HOPKINS, to take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPKINS). The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if members will take the bill (which is House bill 5359) with the report, I think I can explain it so that it will not be necessary to take up much time in general debate, the understanding, of course, being that under the five-minute rule there will be no attempt made to cut off a full expression of opinion when any particular item is under consideration. This bill carries $23,271,902, being a reduction from the estimates of over $817,000. It carries $23,000 more than the bill for the present fiscal year.

The committee have increased the appropriation for the Army proper—the pay of the officers and men of the Regular Army—over the bill of the present fiscal year, because the evidence submitted by the War Department was that under the appropriations made at the last session of the Fifty-third Congress large deficiencies in the pay of the Army have resulted.

We have made a reduction in the amounts appropriated for supplies for the Army, and this reduction was made after taking the testimony of the officers in charge of the different bureaus and departments showing they could stand the amount of reduction which the committee has made from the estimates without injury to the material interests of the Army.

I suppose the main matters of interest to the members of the committee and of the House will be those parts of the bill embracing new legislation. We have incorporated in the bill several provisions of new legislation, and can only appeal to members to permit them to be enacted into law by showing that they are calculated to be of great benefit to the different branches of the Army or that they put into better shape the different items to which they apply. They are largely administrative, and in no case a change in law not easily understood. I want to call attention now to these matters of new legislation.

On page 2, line 4, the committee has inserted a provision that hereafter no pay shall be retained from the enlisted men. Heretofore men have enlisted for a period of five years; and the amount of $12 was retained from their pay during the first three years of their enlistment. Now the enlistments are for a period of only three years; and the continuance of this practice is simply an annoyance to the men and an additional item of bookkeeping to the Paymaster's Department. The provision in the bill on this subject was inserted at the request of the Paymaster-General of the Army, who said that it could not possibly result in any harm to the Government, and would not affect the men except so far as to give them their pay in full from month to month, while saving the department much trouble in the item of bookkeeping.

On page 2, in lines 6 to 10, inclusive, will be found a provision that—

There shall be no appointments of hospital stewards until the number of hospital stewards shall be reduced below 100, and thereafter the number of such officers shall be fixed at 100.

This is new legislation. The statement of the Surgeon-General before the committee showed that on account of the reduction of posts no new appointments of hospital stewards are now being made, and that there would not be needed more than 100 hereafter. It was also stated by the Surgeon-General that if a further consolidation of the posts should go on in the future the number could ultimately be reduced below 100. This provision has been inserted upon the suggestion of the Surgeon-General of the Army, upon whose information the committee were bound to believe that they were in the line of proper legislation.

On page 3, lines 4 and 5, we propose to insert the words "inspection districts." This has been done at the request of the Inspector-General. At this time messengers serve at army headquarters districts or stations. There are one or two headquarters districts that are separated from inspection districts. This is notably the case in New York, where the headquarters of the army is at Governors Island, while the inspection district for the same division of the army is in the city of New York. While it is true that under the law as it now stands these messengers have served both at the inspection stations and the headquarters of the district, yet the provision to which I refer has been inserted to make it clear that the inspection districts have a right to their services. The provision involves no increase of expenditure; it adds nothing to the number of messengers employed in the Army; it simply makes clear as a matter of law what is now the practice.

On page 7, in lines 12 to 14, inclusive, will be found a provision that—

Hereafter a monthly allowance of $9.50 be allowed in lieu of the allowance for subsistence and clothing.

This matter, in which we have simply followed the recommendation of the Paymaster-General, is a mere simplification of bookkeeping. I call attention to the statement of the Paymaster-General on page 3 of the report:

General STANTON. I want to submit to the committee a matter of the estimated amount. I have made a memorandum I would like to explain. Now, when you come to make up these amounts for salary they are entitled to an allowance for rations of 20 cents a day, a clothing allowance provided by law. They are entitled to two-thirds of each of these allowances. The clothing allowance is constantly increasing or changing, and it is a great deal of bother to pay this account. It requires a great deal of minute detail, and it would be much simpler to give them a fixed sum. These men do not draw any clothing from the Government. The Government pays their allowance for clothing and rations in money. If a fixed sum be given it would be better than to have it constantly changing.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the amount necessary?

General STANTON. Nine dollars and fifty cents would be about the sum in round figures. After careful figuring I think that would cover it and not increase the appropriation.

I then asked him whether $9 would not be sufficient, and he replied:

In answer to your question if striking out the 50 cents and making it $9 would be sufficient, I would say that it would not cover it. The $9.50 is simply a matter of simplification. There are a thousand on the retired list now; increasing all the time.

So that, according to the evidence of General Stanton, this is simply a question of bookkeeping.

On page 5, beginning at line 25, and including lines 1 and 2 on page 6, it is provided—

That hereafter all appointments made in the Pay Department of the Army shall be made by selection from the line of the Army.

Mr. Chairman, this provision was not inserted at the request of any officer of the Government. It simply reflects the opinion of the committee that these positions of high rank should be kept for men who devote their lives to the service of their country. Heretofore these positions in the Pay Department have been open to civilians, so that captains in the Army who have served twenty years—educated gentlemen without prospects of any promotion outside of the Army—have been deprived of these positions (which have the rank of major), while the places have been given to men who have never served in the Army, who have probably never been in any business for their country, and who, in many cases, are absolutely without any business experience—young men who have had influence enough to go to the President and secure appointments over the men who have been educated at the ex-

pense of the Government and who have served in the Army all their lives.

This, besides being a matter of justice, is also a matter of retrenchment. If you take for one of these positions an officer from the line of the Army you simply entail the increased expense of the difference between the pay of captain and that of major, while if you take a man from civil life you increase the charge on the Government by paying a new officer. That was one reason why we inserted this provision.

Mr. STEELE. I think the gentleman from Iowa is in error in his statement. If a captain of the line is appointed a major in the Paymaster's Department at the same time the vacancy is immediately filled by the first lieutenant——

Mr. HULL. Who is already in the Army.

Mr. STEELE. And the promotion of the first lieutenant is followed by the appointment of a second lieutenant to be first lieutenant——

Mr. HULL. The second lieutenant being also in the Army.

Mr. STEELE. And there is a vacancy to be filled from West Point or from the line of the Army——

Mr. HULL. I beg pardon of my friend from Indiana. The West Point man is already provided for. At the time of his graduation he is given a commission as second lieutenant, and if he is not assigned to duty then he has his commission, although he may be on detached service.

Mr. STEELE. But the vacancy may be filled by the appointment from the Army, and not necessarily from West Point.

Mr. HULL. But every graduate of West Point is provided with a commission as second lieutenant.

Mr. STEELE. But the line of the Army is not decreased. What I mean is that the appointment of a paymaster from the line of the Army does not decrease the line.

Mr. HULL. I think the gentleman is in error, although I yield to his superior army experience and knowledge.

But if a man graduates at West Point he is given a commission as second lieutenant—and we have several of them on detached service—and this provision simply makes a place for one of these officers to go on duty, but does not in any sense of the word undertake to provide a new second lieutenant in place of one who is promoted.

Mr. STEELE. All that I am suggesting is that the line of the Army is not decreased.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Paymasters may now be appointed from civil life, I believe.

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir; under the present regulations there is no restriction upon the President. He can appoint as he pleases.

Mr. PICKLER. Either from the Army or from civil life?

Mr. HULL. Either from the Army or civil life.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the object in applying this provision to army officers?

Mr. HULL. Well, one great object is that the man in the Army who was educated at West Point at the expense of the Government has no other mode of promotion or advancement except in the line of his duty. He must look solely to that. The man in civil life, on the contrary, has the whole world, except the Army, open to him.

Now, in this period of profound peace, when we are not calling for the services of any of our civilians to defend the flag or the honor of the country, it seems to me that the men who, by their profession, are limited in opportunity for promotion or preferment should have at least their chosen profession reserved to them. That seems certainly to be reasonable and proper. And I call the attention of the gentleman, and the committee also, to the fact that while it is no reflection on the President, yet it is true that in repeated instances men have been appointed to army and navy paymasterships who have no claim upon the country except through friends who had a "pull" with the President. And that is not confined to either party.

Mr. PICKLER. Is it not true that the Army is continually encroaching on the civil employment?

Mr. HULL. No, sir; it is not by any means true. And further, the Military Committee of the House believes that in reserving the right to promote men from the ranks to be second lieutenants by competitive examination that it reserves all that we ought to reserve to any civilian in the Army. And for myself, I have opposed all increases in the cadets at West Point for the very reason that I wished to preserve to the boys who enlist from civil life, and those who study by the camp fires, and read and obtain information to enable them to stand the competitive examinations in the Army, the right to reach this position of lieutenant directly from the ranks. [Applause.] I say it should be preserved to them exclusively. If a boy has enlisted and served two years and studied day and night when off duty, and has shown himself possessed of the metal to make an officer, I want, when he has gone into that, to preserve to him all the possibilities that may come to him by successful competitive examination that can be afforded by the military service of the United States. [Applause.]

These civilian officers are not in touch with the men. They never come in contact with them. They step from civil life to a majority in the Army. To keep the Army in touch with civil life you should not commence at the top, but rather keep the close sympathy by letting the active, intelligent young fellows work out of the ranks into second lieutenants, and then stand on an equality with the West Point graduate.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to a provision which is inserted in the bill on page 8, lines 7 to 14, inclusive, in the following words:

Provided, That hereafter, in case the public quarters at any station are so full as to prevent the assignment of quarters in kind to a commissioned officer there stationed on duty with troops, commutation of quarters at the usual rates shall be paid to him as is now authorized by law to officers on duty without troops; the question of inadequacy of quarters in each case to be determined by the Secretary of War.

Mr. McMILLIN. Before the gentleman enters upon the discussion of that branch I should like to call his attention to one fact, and I do so because I think he has probably unintentionally misled the House as to the effect of the amendment concerning the appointment of officers in the Pay Department. He says that it is an economy to have it in the way proposed in the bill, rather than according to the old law, because the officer appointed from the rank of captain would only receive the increase of pay between the rank of captain and that of paymaster, whereas, if appointed from civil life, there would be the additional expense of his entire salary. But does it not follow that when the captain is taken from the captain's rank and made a paymaster by operation of law all the grades under him move up and are promoted, so that the line is just as expensive as it was before?

Mr. HULL. I think not, and I think I can show my friend why it is not so. When you appoint a captain to be a major, you move a first lieutenant up to be a captain, and a second lieutenant to be first lieutenant, but you do not increase the number of men in the Army. Now, when you put in a paymaster from civil life you have a paymaster in addition to the other officers.

Mr. McMILLIN. But do not your inferior officers in each case come up a step and fill up the different ranks?

Mr. HULL. You do not increase the number of second lieutenants; you do not increase the number of men in the Army.

Mr. McMILLIN. You have still a captain drawing pay; you have still a first lieutenant drawing pay; you have a second lieutenant drawing pay, just as you had before. So I think the gentleman upon reflection will see that there is really no saving.

Mr. HULL. No; you decrease absolutely the number of second lieutenants, to put it at the very lowest point, because you have a second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and a captain already in the Army who are promoted one grade, and there is another second lieutenant not assigned to duty who is already in the pay of the Government, while in the other case you have your unassigned second lieutenant, your assigned second lieutenant, your first lieutenant, and captain, and a major who has not been an officer in the Army, in addition to the others who are already in the Army.

Mr. STEELE. That is, assuming that there are surplus second lieutenants who are eligible to assignment.

Mr. HULL. There always have been a certain number of unassigned second lieutenants.

Mr. McMILLIN. But when there is no surplus of second lieutenants, what I stated is true.

Mr. HULL. Then you would have the same number; but you take your men from the Army still, in order to fill the vacancy; but there are now and always have been unassigned second lieutenants, drawing pay from the Government.

Mr. RAY. As I understand you, then, this proposition of yours simply puts a lieutenant in active duty who has been drawing pay, and who was not before in active duty as a second lieutenant?

Mr. HULL. That is the effect of it. In the other case it takes a man from civil life and makes a major of him; that is, if you do not pass this provision; while if you do pass this provision, it makes a major out of a captain who has probably served twenty years under the Government.

Mr. STEELE. Then, according to the gentleman's argument, the main abuse comes on account of the appointing power not exercising his duty with discretion. He might appoint a volunteer officer of the late war, who has won glory on the field, and then you would not object to it?

Mr. HULL. I would not object to it; but I have not heard of any of those men being appointed within the last twenty years.

Mr. STEELE. I think there have been one or two.

Mr. HULL. There were some appointed soon after the close of the war, but none in recent years; and I think it safe to say none such will ever again be appointed.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will this section prevent the appointment of a paymaster's clerk.

Mr. HULL. It has nothing to do with the position of paymaster's clerk?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will it prevent the appointment of such a clerk to be paymaster?

Mr. HULL. Yes; it will prevent any civilian from being appointed paymaster.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Paymaster's clerks are not civilians.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; they are civilian employees.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. They are subject to martial law.

Mr. HULL. They are civilians. They are not in army life.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The duties of a paymaster are not military in their character at all. The very best paymaster would be a bank teller; and when you confine the appointment of paymasters to the Army to officers of the line, then you take those men away from their regular duty, the regular military service, for which the country has paid enormous sums to educate these men.

Mr. HULL. That simply comes back to a question of judgment.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I know of two or three cases of gentlemen who are now serving as paymasters' clerks, and who have served in that capacity for thirty years, some of them, waiting for the chance to be appointed paymasters of the Army. They have handled millions of dollars without bonds.

Mr. HULL. That question will come up in a few minutes, if I can have an opportunity to go forward. I was giving an explanation of the new legislation. There is no doubt about it being subject to a point of order, so that my friend from Missouri can kill it if he wants to. I want to call attention to the item giving commutation of quarters to officers on duty with troops. Under the present law if on duty without troops where there is no commutation of quarters, a captain gets three rooms at $12 a month each, a major gets four rooms at $12 a month each, and so on, according to rank. The law as it now stands provides that in case an officer is in active service with troops and quarters are found inadequate he can not have commutation of quarters.

The Secretary of War, through Major Davis, states that it would not probably amount to more than $500 a year if this provision should be adopted. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to be entirely frank with the committee and state that the general in charge of the department of the Government furnishing quarters has stated to me that if this new provision became law it would be open to great abuse and would probably cost the Government $20,000 a year, instead of $500. Now, the younger officers on duty with troops, being generally unmarried men, are consolidated together in what they call a bachelor's hall. They do not have the number of rooms that the law really gives them, if they are not on duty with troops. If the officers are dissatisfied with their quarters, under such a provision as proposed the officers could condemn a large number of the quarters in order that officers might get $12 a room per month, and they would go out and rent rooms, paying the rent from money received as commutation of quarters. I want to make this statement, because it came too late for me to put it in the report.

Mr. STEELE. You can knock it out on a point of order.

Mr. HULL. I understand. On page 10, line 24, and on page 11, lines 1 and 2, there is a provision:

For toilet articles, barbers', laundry, and tailors' material for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowance.

That gives them the right to expend money for these items. Under the old law our prisoners were confined at the military prison at Fort Leavenworth. That was turned over to the Department of Justice, and these prisoners are now confined at posts. There is no law that authorizes them to have any toilet articles, any soap, or barber's supplies whatever. This is simply to meet the changed conditions since the military prison was turned over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there any new legislation on page 9? I see there are several "provided furthers."

Mr. HULL. Not at all. That is the old law.

On page 15, lines 7 to 9, there is a new provision:

For a donation of $5 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement, under court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge.

They are now turned out without any transportation whatever, and we have followed in this the recommendation of the War Department, and in addition to that, we have followed the humane law of all the States, I think, of this Union.

On page 20, lines 20 to 23 inclusive, we provide:

For a suit of citizen's outer clothing, to cost not exceeding $10, to be issued upon release from confinement of each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge.

As the law stands to-day every prisoner discharged from the service of the United States is turned out in prison clothes, without any allowance whatever, and we believe it is an inhumanity in the General Government to turn the prisoner out from his confinement dressed in prison garb; so we make this provision. I wish to say, in addition, this is made necessary for the same reason that they are confined in different posts on account of turning over the military prison to the Department of Justice, so that we have no national military prison now.

Mr. STEELE. As a matter of information, I want to inquire if prisoners in our army posts are dressed in striped clothes?

Mr. HULL. I do not know how they are dressed. But the information we have is that they are turned out in their prison garb.

Mr. STEELE. The inquiry I was making was for the purpose of knowing whether they were dressed in striped clothes.

Mr. HULL. I do not know what they are dressed in. The gentleman will probably know better than I.

Mr. STEELE. I think that the prison garb is the uniform of a soldier.

Mr. HULL. Just what they use I do not know. The Secretary of War recommends it.

Mr. STEELE. I am in favor of the proposition.

Mr. HULL. The Secretary informs us that these men are simply turned adrift, and have no other dress than the prison garb. What that is I do not know.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is the uniform of the service of a common soldier, worn very much.

Mr. HULL. I am simply submitting the language; and we think that the soldiers so discharged should be given a suit of civilian's clothes.

Mr. STEELE. I think so, too.

Mr. HULL. Now, to go back to page 9, after the word "fare," in line 11, the committee have stricken out the words "and transfers"; so that under this amendment, if adopted, the Government would pay the entire transportation of officers going from one part of the country to another on orders of the Department except parlor-car and sleeping-car fare. Those they have to pay themselves, but they claim that they are frequently subjected to annoyance in being compelled to pay 50 cents for a transfer. The estimate was that this item might perhaps amount to $100 a year, and the committee thought it desirable to insert it here, but of course it is new legislation.

Mr. RAY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if an officer of the Army is ordered from Washington to San Francisco, traveling of course by rail, he must pay his own sleeping-car fare?

Mr. HULL. Yes; he pays his own sleeping-car fare and parlor-car fare, but he is allowed 4 cents a mile for it.

Mr. RAY. Then he would simply have 4 cents a mile allowed him on which to travel from here to San Francisco?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no. He would get his transportation from the Department, the actual railroad fare from here to San Francisco, and 4 cents a mile in addition.

Mr. KIEFER. The Government furnishes the transportation?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KIEFER. And the Government pays him 4 cents a mile in addition to that for other outlays?

Mr. HULL. The Government furnishes transportation by the officer paying for his ticket and charging it on his expense account.

Mr. DINGLEY. Four cents a mile on a long railroad journey would amount to $20 a day.

Mr. HULL. Yes; for a long distance it would be high, but for a short distance it would not amount to much.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a pretty large allowance on a long journey.

Mr. STEELE. But not on a short one. If the officer traveled 40 miles the allowance would amount to $1.60, while he might have to pay a hotel bill of $6 a day.

Mr. HULL. That is so. The officers generally take their families with them on these journeys, and a man who does that is generally subjected to large expense.

Then, on pages 9 and 10, there is a proviso:

And provided further, That advance mileage may be paid for all distances over 2,000 miles, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may provide.

It was formerly the practice, under a ruling of the Treasury, to advance this money, and the Inspector-General tells us that never was a cent lost by that practice, but now if an officer is ordered from here to California he has to pay all of his expenses himself and then come back on the Government, and in many instances the officers are compelled to borrow money to do it.

Now, this provision simply authorizes the officer, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, to draw in advance money sufficient to meet the cost of making the journey. That is all there is in it, and every member of this Committee of the Whole is as competent to judge of its propriety as we are.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will that interfere with the system of adjudicating the accounts in the Treasury Department? All amounts must now be drawn from the Treasury under the law that was

enacted by the last Congress, which provides special safeguards for the Treasury. Now, this varies that system of accounting, does it not?

Mr. HULL. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, that it would vary the system of accounting. The law fixes the amount that an officer is entitled to receive, and this is regarded as a desirable reform. General Breckinridge, in his statement to the committee, among other things, said:

General BRECKINRIDGE. There is another matter I wish to call your attention to. We travel a good deal in my department, and there is a matter there which I think can help us without increasing expense, and that is if you will authorize an advance of mileage. We had it for a long time and there has never been any loss. Mr. Kent will read the proposed amendment.

Mr. KENT. Insert, after the word "railroad" after the last "and," "*Provided further*, That advance mileage may be paid, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, for all distances exceeding 2,000 miles."

General BRECKINRIDGE. The officers have to borrow money and pay interest on it whenever they go out under orders of the Government. It does not affect me, because I have a bank account. It has never caused any loss, and I do not believe it will. The mere idea is to fix it so that the Government for carrying on its own business shall stand its own expense.

Mr. KENT. Under the old practice the Treasury advanced mileage, and permitted it to be paid for all distances exceeding 2,000 miles and in special cases distances exceeding 1,000 miles. That was the case until the Second Comptroller called a halt by referring to the statutes, which provide that no advance of public money shall be made on any account whatever. He construed that as cutting off the authority of the Secretary of War. When an officer gets orders to travel distances over 2,000 miles he must make the advance himself sufficient to cover the mileage.

It is simply an advance of the amount of money which the law provides that he shall have for that purpose.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No other officer of the Government is allowed to draw in advance in that way.

Mr. DINGLEY. I was about to say that this changes the whole system of adjudicating the accounts of the Government. Of course no vouchers accompany this proposed advance of money. Has the gentleman consulted the Treasury officials about this?

Mr. HULL. No. I have stated all the information we have about it. All that we have received comes from the War Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think the Treasury officers ought to be consulted as to how it would affect the settlement of the accounts.

Mr. STEELE. It will not make any change at all. An officer is ordered to-day from here to San Francisco. As a general rule officers live up to their pay. Now, instead of going to an individual and borrowing the money, often at a high rate, this permits the paymaster or the quartermaster, or whoever has charge of the funds, to advance the officer the necessary amount with which to make the journey. When he has completed the trip he is required to make up his vouchers, which show that the Government owed him this amount, but that it has been paid in advance. That is all there is in it.

Mr. KIEFER. It is simply an advance.

Mr. HULL. For many years this was the rule under the same law that now exists, but some Treasury official held that these advances could not be made under the law, and so, for nine or ten years past, they have not been made.

Mr. RAY. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs can give me a little information that I desire. As I understand it, the pay and allowances of an officer in the Army who is an unmarried man are precisely the same as the pay and allowances of a married man.

Mr. HULL. Exactly the same.

Mr. RAY. And when they travel from one point to another are officers who are married allowed anything for the transportation of their families?

Mr. HULL. They are not. The Government does not take into consideration the family of the officer at all. It is the officer only that the Government deals with.

Mr. RAY. So that the married officer is compelled to bear this expense out of his pay?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAY. Then the law is rather a discouragement to officers of the Army to enter into matrimonial alliances.

Mr. DINGLEY. The case is not different with these officers from what it is with all other Government officers.

Mr. HULL. There are supposed to be compensating advantages to a man with a family which will induce officers to enter into the marriage relation.

Mr. STEELE. And they do have families.

Mr. HULL. Yes, and some of them quite large families.

On page 11, line 13, we have inserted another provision of new legislation.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has the gentleman stated all the new legislation on page 9?

Mr. HULL. There is one other matter; we have left out the words "and transfer."

As I was about so say, on page 11, in line 13, we provide for the publication of 3,000 cookbooks. Of this book the last Congress authorized the publication of 1,500 copies. The edition was at once exhausted by demands from the National Guards of the different States and from the Regular Army. There is a very large demand now for this publication from all parts of the country. In the language of General Morgan, this is something that is wanted North, South, East, and West. The only question in the mind of the committee was whether 3,000 copies would meet the demand from the National Guard, the military schools, and the Regular Army. Anything which will teach a better method of cooking in our Army is, it seems to me, a very good provision. But it is new legislation.

The provision on page 16, lines 5 to 9, inclusive, is not new legislation, but it appropriates $30,000 in excess of the estimates. If gentlemen will turn to page 5 of the committee report they will find the statement of General Batchelder, Quartermaster-General of the Army, showing that upon the appropriation of $80,000 for this item last year there has been a deficiency amounting to $49,900. The Secretary of War cut down the estimates from $130,000 to $100,000, but in conversation with me he stated (and he agreed to send a letter to that effect, which I have not yet received) that he believed the amount estimated by General Batchelder of $130,000 was the very least that ought to be appropriated by Congress. As there is a deficiency of $49,900 under the law of last year, it makes practically the $130,000 in this bill; so there is no increase in fact.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman again state the page of the bill to which he refers?

Mr. HULL. Page 16, lines 5 to 9. The provision to which I am now referring is not subject to any point of order. I simply want to call attention to the fact that it is an increase over the estimates.

On page 23, in lines 18 and 19, the committee have inserted new legislation providing ammunition for burials at the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. To-day there is no authority of law for the issuance by the Government of a single grain of powder for the firing of a salute over the grave of an old volunteer when his remains are carried from the Soldiers' Home to their last resting place. The committee believe that as a simple mark of respect to these veterans the Government should make provision for this expense and not allow the surviving comrades of an old soldier to provide by subscription for furnishing this powder to fire a salute over his grave. The salute is now always fired, but it is done at the expense of the inmates of the Home. Of course this provision is subject to a point of order.

On page 24, in lines 8 to 13, we provide for firing a morning and evening gun at the National Homes for Disabled Soldiers. There is now no law for this. General Flagler in his statement before the committee said that on account of the cheaper methods of manufacturing the powder to fire these morning and evening guns no increase in the appropriation would be necessary. The best grade of powder is not used for these purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say further that in the formation of this bill the committee gave the highest amount asked for by the Ordnance Department of the Government. If we had not believed that the provision would be subject to a point of order, and if we had not been held back by the condition of the Treasury, the committee would have been in favor of a larger appropriation for the additional manufacture of small arms. This Government, with its million of men ready to enter the military service whenever the necessity may arise, is absolutely without the means of arming them for the defense of the Government. There is no other Government of the magnitude or power of ours that has not a reserve of arms that can be used in case of war.

We have increased the appropriation over last year for the manufacture of the smokeless powder, and, according to the evidence submitted before the committee by General Flagler, with this increase of $25,000 we shall not accumulate more than $15,000 worth of powder each year. We ought to accumulate a stock of powder that would give us an available supply in the event of hostilities. We have not now such supply. But the increased appropriation of $25,000 will gradually increase our reserve in this respect.

Some gentlemen may say we ought not to increase our stock of this powder because it will deteriorate. The evidence before the committee was that the powder will be as good fifty years from now as it is to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe I have explained the bill in probably more minute detail than was necessary, and I yield the floor to anyone who desires it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Then I retain the floor in order to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I wish to ask the gentleman whether in his statement of new legislation embraced in this bill he has included the provision on page 5, in lines 24 and 25?

Mr. HULL. I have already stated that it was new legislation, and I called attention to the fact that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. KIEFER. To what page do you now refer?

Mr. HULL. To page 5, as to the Pay Department—the proviso at the bottom of the page.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I desire to reserve the right to make the point of order upon that provision.

Mr. HULL. All points of order have been reserved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, after the very full and satisfactory explanation of the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I do not deem it necessary to consume the time of the committee by adding anything. But on behalf of the minority of the committee I wish to say only this, that we indorse everything in the bill and every statement made by the chairman of the committee, and add that the bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. It was ordered to be reported favorably by every member of the committee, and the report was voted for by all of the members, the majority and the minority alike.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, if no other gentleman desires to occupy the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read by sections for debate and amendment under the five-minute rule; of course with the understanding that anyone can have his time extended who wishes to occupy the floor during the five-minute debate for a longer time on any provision.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that an unusual amount of general legislation is carried in this bill. It has been explained in a very careful and systematic way, each different item in detail, by the chairman of the committee.

I struggled, when we were debating the rules, to get the right for the appropriation committees to change the law so as to reduce expenditures on an appropriation bill. But it could not be done. There was no spirit, it seems, to have that rule in force which had worked so advantageously for so many years and under which the main economies that have been effected in this Government have been forced.

Now, I am not going to take up the time of the committee in anything like an extensive commentary on the provisions of the bill. I only wish to say——

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman pardon me for a suggestion?

Mr. McMILLIN. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are there any amendments proposing new legislation on this bill that would come under that provision of the old rule? There is no provision to reduce expenditures which would have brought it under the old rule.

Mr. McMILLIN. No, sir; that is just the very point that I am complaining of. You can increase expenditures, it seems, on a general appropriation bill, but you have no right to diminish them.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, no; you can not increase expenditures by adding new legislation. The new legislation is subject to the point of order, of course, if it be new legislation.

Mr. McMILLIN. And while I have great confidence in my good friend from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who has spoken of the bill, and also my friend from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], who has spoken in favor of it, I think it would be decidedly better if we were to pursue that old policy in reference to appropriation bills; or else, if we were to pursue the new policy, let us hew to the line and let legislation come on legislative bills and appropriations on the appropriation bills.

As I understand the gentleman from Iowa, he has indicated that the officers of the Army say that on this question, of the commutation of quarters, the expenditure will probably involve an increase of $20,000.

Mr. HULL. He did not say that it would be an increase, but that it might be liable to that.

Mr. McMILLIN. And the gentleman said further that the testimony of the General of the Army was that it would be subject to grave abuses.

Mr. HULL. No, I did not say that the General of the Army said that.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. May I ask what official made that statement?

Mr. HULL. I said the general in charge of the disbursements said it was liable to abuses. The General of the Army, I wish to say, has never made any statement at all upon the subject.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then I misunderstood what the gentleman said. But the officer having the matter in charge has indicated that it would involve an increase of expenditures of $20,000, as well as be liable to great abuses.

I wish only to call the attention of the committee to the fact and suggest how much better it would be if we could have our appropriation bills simply what their names indicate, and not legislative measures.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friend and colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] will not frighten the House by any such declarations, of an immense amount of new legislation involved in the pending bill, as he seems to indicate. The subcommittee in charge of the bill, and, the whole committee, were exceedingly careful in framing the bill, and, as stated by the chairman of the committee, were unanimous in reporting the bill to the House.

I am not personally aware of any legislation vicious in its character in this bill that increases appropriations or that is legislation per se. If there had been any, I should certainly have opposed it in the committee. There were some little matters that the committee found, after careful and thorough investigation, should be changed from existing law, and those little changes are made in the bill. When they are reached in reading the bill by sections, if a point of order will lie against them, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] can have them stricken out, unless we can explain them satisfactorily to the House. I do not believe my friend, when he hears this bill read by sections and explained, will find any legislation in it that he will seriously object to.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, a single remark. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Tennessee that it is not wise as a rule to attempt legislation upon appropriation bills, no matter whether it is done under the guise of reducing appropriations or for any other purpose. We all know that the old rule that an amendment providing for legislation in an appropriation bill to reduce appropriations might be held to be in order was subject to great abuses under which very important changes of law were proposed, under the guise of reducing the appropriation. I think that it is appropriate that on appropriation bills we should not attempt to legislate unless there is incidentally some matter in which the whole House unanimously agrees there ought to be something done. Of course where the whole House agrees, in the matter of administration especially, that some particular item of legislation is desirable, then it will go in without objection and there can be no evils arise from that.

But it is true that ordinarily legislation attempted upon a general appropriation bill is hasty legislation, or, if not hasty legislation, is such legislation as would have been much better if considered by the appropriate committee and brought in in a separate bill. As to these incidental matters of legislation relating to administration, if any particular one seems to every member of the House to be desirable and wise, then no objection will be raised and it will go through, as a matter of course. If there are any which seem to individual members of the House to be unwise, then they will go out on a point of order, and must be brought into this House from the appropriate committee in a separate bill.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, the statements made by the gentleman from Tennessee for the benefit of the chairman of the committee are about such statements as are made on every appropriation bill that comes into this House, and notwithstanding such statements there has never been an appropriation bill brought into the House which has not had in it legislation of the character indicated in this bill, and I venture the assertion that there never has been an appropriation bill brought into the House in which the changes of existing law have been so minutely described by the chairman of the committee as they have been by the chairman of this committee, giving every gentleman in the House an opportunity of striking them out if desired. They meet the very point made by the gentleman from Maine, that if there is a single man who has an objection to any one of these items, it has been brought to his notice, so that he can strike it out if he desires to do so.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that we proceed under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1897:

FOR PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE LINE.

For pay of officers of the line, $2,768,000.

Mr. PICKLER. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding after line 9, page 1, the following:

"*Provided*, That such officers shall not hereafter be detailed as Indian agents."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order on that amendment that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PICKLER. It is very doubtful whether it is new legislation or not. Under the existing law the President may detail army officers.

Mr. STEELE. And this says he may not. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. PICKLER. I should say that that provision is put in the appropriation bill from year to year. That is the reason why I say it is questionable whether it is existing law or not.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if the law fails by not being put in the appropriation bill, the gentleman from South Dakota will have gained his point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PICKLER. I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding after line 9, page 1, the following:
"*Provided*, That such officers shall not hereafter be detailed as Indian agents unless nominated to such place by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Mr. HULL. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will accept that amendment.

Mr. HULL. Well, I shall not.

Mr. SAYERS. I want to suggest to the gentleman that if an officer of the Army should be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate to any other office he would not only lose his salary, but his place also.

Mr. PICKLER. That is something for the army officer to look after. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa reserves his point of order, that this manner of the detailing of army officers for the performance of civil duties is contrary to the genius of our republican institutions.

Mr. BOWERS. Contrary to the interests of a great many contractors. That is what is the matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. The detailing of these army officers to civil positions is not upheld by any report that has ever been made in the investigation of the Indian question, and it is only upheld by an officer here and there having friends in Congress, and who desires to remain in that place. Now, as a general thing army officers do not wish this detail. Their hearts are not in the Indian work. They are army officers. They are concerned in the business of the Army, and so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of keeping them in the line of army work. I am for the Army; for sustaining the Army. I am in favor of army officers having the widest possible use in the line of their military duty, but I am opposed to their being detailed to the civil service of the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PICKLER. No; the gentleman can never talk sanely on this question. [Laughter.] He is always daft on this line. The reports are all against these army officers being detailed for this service. They are detailed. They are more interested in the real work of an army officer than in this civil work. They are simply detailed to these positions, remain for a time at the agency, and then are detailed somewhere else. The consequence is that they do not become interested in the Indian service. They are not interested in the promotion of the education of the Indians. They are not interested in the development of the Indians like the civilian. The civilian is always appointed by the party in power, and is therefore responsible to his party, responsible to the Indian Commissioner and to the Secretary of the Interior; and it so universally happens that there is scarcely an exception—I speak of it from knowledge, as I have seven agencies in my State—that the civilian gives better satisfaction than an army officer as an agent.

Mr. STEELE. Has the gentleman ever seen any official report that has been made, except one that has been made by some officer of the Indian Department, some gentlemen connected with that Department?

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes; General Sherman, years ago, I think, was at the head of that committee. He was a member of the committee of army officers. They went into this question in detail, and they were unanimously against it.

Army officers, Mr. Chairman, do not care for this duty. Occasionally there is one who does. It is put upon them, and there is often friction. I am pretty well up on this question as to how it works. There is continually friction between the army officers and the Secretary of the Interior. The army officer reports and is subject to the Secretary of War, while the Indian agent is under the Secretary of the Interior, and so there is a conflict of jurisdiction all the time.

Mr. BOWERS. Have you heard of any conflicts?

Mr. PICKLER. These army officers ought to remain in the Army. They ought to perform military services; and, as I said, Mr. Chairman, a while ago, by way of query, I believe the Army should not be allowed to encroach upon the civil service, and that we ought to have these Indian agents appointed from civil life. They are appointed by a party that is responsible for them, and are under the Secretary of the Interior, where the Indian work is found. These army officers are under the Secretary of War. If it suits them to obey the Secretary of the Interior they will do so, but if it does not, while they will, perhaps, not altogether refuse to obey orders, they obey the orders one way or the other so as not to violate the orders exactly, and do not carry out the instruction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. STEELE. As the gentleman referred to the committee of which General Sherman was a member, I will state that he spoke in the highest terms of the efficiency of army officers as Indian agents; but what he objected to was the employment, because it was not military employment.

Mr. PICKLER. And that is the best reason in the world, I think. There are some army officers who make good agents, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. But in nine cases out of ten the civilian makes a better agent than the army officer.

Mr. HULL. Conceding every word that the gentleman from South Dakota has said is true, that is only a reason why he should bring in a bill and change the law. I raise the point of order against the amendment that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOR PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

For pay proper of enlisted men of all grades, $4,235,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no pay shall be retained.

Mr. BOWERS. I desire to offer an amendment at this point.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to line 4, page 2, the following:
"*And provided further*, That no part of said sums for pay of officers or enlisted men shall be paid to officers or enlisted men employed in guarding or policing forest reservations or national parks."

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HULL. I shall have to reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. BOWERS. I want to talk on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves his point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. I only want to bring the attention of the House to one fact. Last summer I visited the Sequoia Forest Reservation, in Tulare County, Cal. I traveled to that reservation two days over a mountain road built by the miners at their own expense. I met armed United States troops upon that road, which they had taken possession of to search wagons to see that men did not bring into that reservation guns or fishing tackle unless they had a permit from the officer of the United States Army.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Where was the officer?

Mr. BOWERS. The officer was on the reservation, at the headquarters of the company. I found on the night of the third day, when I arrived at Mineral King, 8,000 or 9,000 feet above the sea, above the timber line, with the exception of a few scrub fir trees, there was a little valley below——

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Concerning those permits, is there any regulation which enables people to obtain permits? Is the officer stationed where the public can get access to him?

Mr. BOWERS. He was stationed then at Mineral King, three days' travel from the inhabited country. One can go into that reservation only for about ninety days in the year. The snow falls there from 25 to 30 feet in the winter. Some four or five bodies of soldiers under charge of a sergeant were stationed in different parts of this park to guard it and see that people did not catch fish or kill deer without a permit. No citizen is allowed to go into that reservation to kill deer, but I assert here that the company of soldiers that I found at Mineral King killed 200 deer there this summer. A man who owns several hundred acres of patented lands in that reservation started in last summer to take in a few of his cattle. He was met by these troops and his cattle were driven back down this road out of the reservation and got lost, so that some of them were never recovered. I found the best part of that little valley occupied by troops. They had a nice, easy, splendid time of it. On the way up I passed three heavily loaded six and eight mule teams, drawing up supplies for this company, among which was a very fair amount of beer, perhaps not quite so large a proportion as Shakespeare mentions, of ten barrels to one of bread [laughter], but sufficient.

Mr. CANNON. Was it of good quality?

Mr. BOWERS. I did not sample it. I had something better. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I assert that the right to use the Army of the United States on public highways, built by the people themselves, to keep the people off the public lands, to keep them from enjoying these reservations that have been set apart professedly for the public benefit, is entirely wrong. The proper way to protect these reservations is for the Government to appoint special agents, or deputy marshals, if you please, who can take care of them at an expense of $1 where it now costs $100 by the use of the Army. I am not going to press this amendment at this time, but I want to see whether it is the judgment of this House that the troops of the United States shall be used to meet and drive back citizens upon the roads that the citizens themselves have built, and prevent their going into these public reservations which have been set apart for their benefit.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to enter into any discussion with my friend from California on this question, but conceding all he says to be true, it is his duty to bring in a bill to

correct the evil of which he complains instead of trying to amend this bill. I insist upon the point of order that this is absolutely new legislation.

Mr. BOWERS. A word on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. This bill sets apart a certain amount of money for the pay of certain officers, and certain amounts for enlisted men, and then it adds a proviso that no pay shall hereafter be retained. Now, that proviso is simply directing what shall be done with this money that we are appropriating, and my amendment is directly in line with it, and can not be subject to the point of order, because there is no existing law requiring or authorizing troops to be used on these reservations. They have simply been sent there by order of the Department. There is no law providing for it at all.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is mistaken so far as the Yellowstone Park Reservation is concerned. By current law part of a company is stationed there, and very properly.

Mr. BOWERS. I understand that in the case of the Yellowstone Park there has been some special legislation in regard to troops, but that legislation is not general, and we have certainly the right, in appropriating this money, to say what shall be done with it. In this bill the committee have said that this money shall be used for the pay of these men and these officers, and they have also provided that hereafter no pay shall be retained. Now, is not that proviso new legislation?

Mr. HULL. If you want to make a point of order against it, do so.

Mr. BOWERS. I do not; but I say that proviso is subject to the point of order, while my amendment is not, because it is in entire harmony with the existing law.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the Regulations of the Army provide that the Secretary of War, or the General of the Army, may order troops to any part of the United States, and also provides that those troops shall be paid. Now, the proposition of the gentleman from California is that if they happen to be ordered on this particular reservation they shall not be paid, and therefore it is a proposition to change existing law.

Mr. HULL. It is simply a limitation on the power to use the Army.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, here is a committee charged with the duty of reporting appropriations to this House under existing law, and their duty is thus restricted by the rules of the House, yet they come in here with a bill stuffed full of changes, additions, and modifications of existing law, and they say so frankly and ask the House to allow them to pass, without opposition or criticism, these provisions changing existing law; but when a good, sound, healthy proposition is made by some member, then the most rigid adherence to the rule against new legislation is insisted upon by the chairman of the committee. I point this out, Mr. Chairman, simply to show the singular condition that the Committee of the Whole has got itself into by submitting to the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs on this question of new legislation in this bill.

They are to be the judges of the "new legislation." That is what it amounts to. The trouble is not what was stated by the gentleman from Maine just now, that legislation on appropriation bills is against the public policy of the House; the trouble is that it is against the public policy of the House to legislate upon an appropriation bill except in so far, of course, as the committee reporting the bill may favor such new legislation; and it is against public policy that the Committee of the Whole shall be permitted to have anything to say about it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, I hope the gentleman from Ohio will not put me in any such attitude as that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not say that that was the position of the gentleman from Maine; I simply referred to what he had said about public policy.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has certainly paid very little attention to the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole, or he would not have made the charges and insinuations that he has just made. The Committee on Military Affairs has not asked one thing from this Committee of the Whole that it does not concede to every member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield one moment?

Mr. HULL. No; I can not yield now. I wish to say further that we were honest enough to point out in detail every single clause of new legislation embraced in the bill, so that every member of the House could raise objection and have any of these provisions stricken out on a point of order if he wished to raise such a point under the rules. I went over the bill in detail, quoting pages and lines.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Of course you did.

Mr. HULL. So that no man can say that we have been trying to smuggle anything into the bill.

Now, when any member rises here to offer an amendment he is simply doing what he has a perfect right to do, and if no member of the Committee of the Whole desires to raise a point of order on the amendment, it is perfectly proper for the Committee of the Whole to adopt or reject it. But I certainly would not waive my right to raise a point of order against any amendment which might be offered to this bill which I have in charge simply because some other member is opposed to the committee reporting amendments for the action of the House. And, Mr. Chairman, I shall not feel aggrieved if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] should raise a point of order against every provision that the Committee on Military Affairs have reported as new legislation in this bill. We concede that right to him, and after his years of experience in legislation he ought to be willing to concede the same right to the representatives of the different committees of this House. He has no right, in fairness, to use the language he has employed in criticising this committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. STEELE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. 3527) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the enrolled bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Before we resume the consideration of the Army appropriation bill I wish to give a notice. I shall be glad if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] at some convenient time before 5 o'clock, say half past 4, will move that the committee rise so as to enable me to submit a conference report on the urgent deficiency bill. The report having been adopted by the Senate, I wish to bring it before the House.

Mr. HULL. I shall be glad to comply with the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I give notice that I will call up this conference report during to-day's session.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HOPKINS. I wish to say that in my judgment it would have been better if the new legislation proposed in this bill had been indicated by italics, so that a person reading the bill could see at once what measures of new legislation the committee reporting the bill had proposed and what were the ordinary appropriations under existing law. As the bill is now printed, no person reading it, unless familiar with this class of legislation, can tell what are the provisions which embrace new legislation.

Mr. HULL. Allow me to state to the gentleman that I went over the bill in order to give this information at the beginning, but I shall take pleasure, as we proceed, in calling the attention of the Committee of the Whole to each provision which is a matter of new legislation.

Mr. RAY. If the new legislation proposed by the committee in this bill is proper to be considered by the House at all—if it is here for our deliberation and for us to say whether we will enact it or not, then, it seems to me, we may do so in any form we may deem proper, without regard to the form which the committee reporting the bill may have adopted. It would be a strange doctrine that when a member of this House undertakes to offer an amendment to a provision which changes existing law, such an amendment is not in order on the ground that it is a change of existing law. The very thing that the pending provision does is to change existing law, and it is held that with such a provision before us we can not change its purport and put it in such a shape as we desire.

Mr. STEELE. In order to settle this question, I make a point of order against this provision.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is too late now to make the point on the new legislation proposed by the committee. That point has been waived, and an amendment to the provision has been moved and discussed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOLLIVER). The Chair sustains the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of Hospital Corps, $206,280: *Provided*, That there shall be no appointments of hospital stewards until the number of hospital stewards shall be reduced below 100, and thereafter the number of such officers shall be fixed at 100.

Mr. BOWERS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOWERS. We understand that these words, on which the point of order was made with reference to retaining pay, remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. No point of order was made against them.

Mr. HOPKINS. I reserve the point of order on the new legislation in the paragraph just read.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think I must have been very unfortunate in the statement I attempted to make a few moments ago when so astute a member as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] utterly misunderstands what I was trying to get at. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] had inveighed in a general way against an amendment or amendments carrying new legislation in this appropriation bill. The gentleman from Maine, as I understood him, indorsed that proposition very strongly. I discover in looking over the pending bill and listening to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, that there were not less than fourteen, I think it is as I now count them, items of new legislation incorporated in the bill, each one of which is obnoxious to the rules of the House.

I commented on the fact that the committee had disregarded the rules of the House in bringing in the bill; and the chairman himself in his statement admitted that the bill, in the various items to which I have referred and to which he called attention specifically, was in violation of the rules of the House.

Then, his position can only be tolerated on the hypothesis that the new legislation is needful, is valuable to the Government, and that it is necessary to incorporate it upon the bill in this manner, because otherwise there is no possible justification for the additional provisions, which are in derogation of the rules of the House in the first instance. So he comes and presents this proposition to the House: That they have found it necessary, in violation of the rules of the House, to present a very large amount of new legislation. Then I commented on the fact that the moment somebody else attempted to ask the judgment of the House on the important legislation which the committee had added to the bill the point of order was insisted on by the very chairman who had himself offered, as it were, an apology to the House for coming before it with the bill in its present shape, embodying this new legislation.

Now, what I have to add is simply this: That if the committee found the condition of legislation in reference to the Army was so imperfect that in a single bill of this small magnitude they must violate the rules of the House in fourteen or fifteen instances, then they ought to take the judgment of the Committee of the Whole and the other members of the House as to these important matters of legislation which they have seen proper to append to the bill.

I undertake to say, and I repeat this, that the committee either ought to stand by the rules of the House, or else, if they break down the rules of the House by this sort of legislation, they ought to let somebody else be heard as to the necessity of the changes of legislation or the shape of the amendment of the legislation that they themselves propose.

Mr. RAY. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think it entirely proper, if we are to put this amount of new legislation on the bill, to at least permit the members present to amend the new legislation and make it carry out the ideas and wishes of the House?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think that anything short of that would be a most remarkable condition of things. I have been endeavoring to show just what I thought of such a proceeding.

This committee comes and says: Here is new legislation; we propose not only to violate the rules of the House, but we ask you to consent, and if you think some improvement ought to be made, you shall not be permitted to propose it, because we will invoke the rules of the House against you.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the committee ought to rise—the Committee of the Whole—and refuse to sit under such circumstances. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will permit me, as I understand the rules of the House no legislation is admissible on an appropriation bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is my understanding of the rules.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, when members of the House—those who happen to be members of a committee—bring in an appropriation bill after agreeing upon legislation of this character in the committee room, but refuse, when the matter comes before the House, to allow any other member to offer a suggestion, is it not to the decided disadvantage of every other member in not being allowed to offer anything in the shape of an amendment or suggestion; and does not it give the members of the committee a decided advantage in the framing of such measures?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I have been trying to show just that, and to show the committee that such was my opinion. If I have not been able to do so, and make myself understood, I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. I want to ask further if it is not absolutely out of order, and if it should not be prohibited to the committee, to bring in such matters at all?

Mr. GROSVENOR. In my judgment it is a violation of the rules of the House—a plain, open violation of the rules—and I doubt whether or not a point of order on the bill, when it first came into the House, would not have been sustained on the ground that it was a plain, palpable violation of the rules of the House, and as such admitted by the committee itself.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I have only one thing to say. Of course on the objection of anybody these small changes will be ruled out; but when the War Department comes to the committee and say, as they did in one case or another, "Here is a little thing that everybody will probably agree to," we say to the House, "If you want to violate your own rules by unanimous consent, we make this suggestion and nothing more."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, is it not equally proper that a member of this Committee of the Whole may suggest some little thing that probably everybody will agree to?

Mr. PARKER. Why, certainly, and we have not objected to that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But there is no discussion allowed. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs makes the point of order that it is new legislation ruthlessly, without considering the rights of anybody else.

Mr. PARKER. I do not think it is fair to say that the chairman of this committee made the point ruthlessly. We have heard two speeches on the various amendments that were proposed. Each gentleman spoke some five minutes upon them. It is not ruthless to invoke the rule if we think it is legislation which is of such importance that it ought to be separately considered.

Mr. PICKLER. When the War Department came to the chairman of the committee and wanted these little changes made, why did not the chairman of your committee answer the War Department as he answers us, by saying, "It is a very easy matter to bring in a bill and pass that law as a separate matter"?

Mr. PARKER. It is a question whether it is a very easy matter to bring in a bill and pass it.

Mr. PICKLER. That is what we think.

Mr. PARKER. There are some of these things that are very small, but if they were put into an army reorganization bill they would be kept back until the end of the session. Here are men who want their pay. This is what we are talking about now. They are kept out of their pay. This is what we are considering now. They are kept out of their pay, and I never thought that anybody in this whole House would object to this.

Mr. PICKLER. We do not complain particularly, at least I do not, of the committee reporting the amendments, but what we do complain of is that when you report an amendment, and then we offer an amendment to that, although it is germane to that amendment which you bring in as new legislation, you put us out on a point of order, without any consideration.

Mr. PARKER. I will answer that in a word. The committee report a proviso that men's pay shall not be retained. You put in an amendment as to how those men shall be used and where they shall be sent. That would destroy the Army, to take the power out of the hands of the Commander in Chief, the President. It is not germane, and I want to say that the committee will not complain if anybody in this House objects to any one of these things which the committee have offered. They are only suggestions to the House to be passed by unanimous consent. On the other hand, the committee are compelled to reserve the right to raise the point of order when a matter that is doubtful is brought up. One of these questions was the use of officers in the guarding of public parks. The other was the use of officers as Indian agents. These were questions that we might discuss for hours. It is a question of the organization and use of the Army. We must retain our right to use our discretion, as every member of the Committee of the Whole has the right to object to any proviso which is not considered a proper subject of unanimous consent.

Mr. PICKLER. Why should not the House pass on them?

Mr. PARKER. Because it would delay the House and occupy its time. We do not want to have the House delayed by a long discussion, but we are ready to have anybody object to anything that we have brought in.

Mr. PICKLER. The Appropriations Committee take up nearly all the time of the House anyhow.

Mr. PARKER. Only when there is discussion of proposed amendments; but if our amendments or those of anyone else are objected to and ruled out, it is all right.

Mr. HOPKINS. I reserved a point of order against the new legislation here, but I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain why this legislation is proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. HOPKINS. It is new legislation.

Mr. HULL. I understand you reserve the point, but you do not make it. If you insist upon it I do not want to say a word.

Mr. HOPKINS. No, I reserve it.

Mr. HULL. The proviso commencing on line 6 and ending in line 10, on page 2, is new legislation. It reduces the number of hospital stewards to 100. It was done at the suggestion of the Surgeon-General of the Army, who has charge of the hospital stewards. He states that on account of the consolidation of posts they will not need to exceed 100 hospital stewards, and that they were now making no additional appointments. The law now authorizes 112 hospital stewards; and the Surgeon-General further stated that after the further consolidation of posts which is going on the number could in a few years be reduced below 100, but that at this time no injury could come to the service by limiting the number to 100.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, I want to say——

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me right there? Under existing law if these posts are consolidated they are not required to appoint any more hospital stewards than they have posts.

Mr. HULL. They can appoint 112 hospital stewards whether they have 112 posts or not.

Mr. HOPKINS. I understand that. But suppose they only had 60 posts; they would require but 60 hospital stewards. Now, they are not required by law to keep the full quota of 112 in the service, are they?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. That is a point I would not want to determine. They have 112, but do not want any more than 100. The idea of the committee was that they should make no more appointments until the number was reduced to 100.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana be correct, that under existing law they are compelled to pay 112 hospital stewards, I should be in favor of this amendment; but if my construction of the law be correct, if we are only compelled to appoint the number of stewards that we have posts in the country, then I see no reason for this new legislation. Now, it may be that under existing conditions we do not need the number that are limited by the law; but it seems to me that it would be better to leave that point so that if at any time in the future we increase this arm of the Government service and increase the number of posts in the country we will not be compelled to come to Congress to get permission by new legislation to appoint these hospital stewards. Now, my understanding is this: That under the law at the present time we are not compelled to appoint any more of these members of the service than we have posts, and I think it is much better for the service to leave the law as it is than to limit it as is proposed in this amendment of the bill; and therefore I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

And said clerks and messengers shall be employed and apportioned to the several headquarters, stations, and inspection districts by the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a change in the existing law.

In lines 4 and 5 the words "and inspection districts" are inserted. It is done to cover the case of New York, where the inspection district is in the city and the headquarters of the army is at Governors Island.

Mr. DOCKERY. No one has made a point of order.

Mr. HULL. I know; but some gentlemen say they want to know where the new legislation is.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay Department: For pay of officers in the Pay Department, as now authorized and provided by law, $74,000.

For additional pay to such officers for length of service, to be paid with their current monthly pay, $22,200.

In all, $96,200: *Provided*, That hereafter all appointments made in the Pay Department of the Army shall be made by selection from the line of the Army.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I raise the point of order against this last paragraph.

Mr. HULL. It is new legislation, and it would have to go out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETIRED ENLISTED MEN.

For pay of the enlisted men of the Army on the retired list, $386,287.25: *Provided*, That hereafter a monthly allowance of $9.50 be granted in lieu of the allowance for subsistence and clothing.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the proviso here is new legislation. It is put in at the request of the Paymaster-General for the purpose of simplification of the books.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a single observation. Some criticism has been made in connection with the fact that legislation is carried by this bill. I can speak disinterestedly, except, perhaps, as to one paragraph. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in reply to that criticism: In my judgment it is exceedingly important for committees having in charge appropriation bills now and then to report wise administrative legislation, inasmuch as this is usually the only way in which you can enact such legislation into law.

Now, then, so far as I am concerned, I am disposed upon all of these merely administrative questions to follow the judgment of the committee having the matter in charge, especially a committee reporting a bill which has both the legislative authority and the authority to appropriate. I am not prepared to say that all these administrative provisos found in this bill are wise. There is no question that points of order will lie under our rules, but before they are interposed I suggest to the members of the committee that we ought to be very sure we are right, because for more than twenty years some of the best and wisest administrative provisions that have gone into our statutes have gone there on appropriation bills. It may, perhaps, be said in answer that some of the worst have also gone on appropriation bills. That may be true; but as a rule, so far as this body is concerned, provisions that have thus been enacted into law have first been carefully considered by a committee of this House. Now, then, this bill being in charge of a gentleman who is noted for his conservatism, I trust that unless the exigency seems to be sufficient members will refrain from raising points of order.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Suppose it is conceded that it is a proper thing for these committees to report legislation?

Mr. DOCKERY. I said mere administrative legislation.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, confine it as you like. Now, what does the gentleman say when these measures are reported as to the rights of members who are not on the committee to offer germane amendments to the amendments proposed?

Mr. DOCKERY. I say this, that unless a point of order is interposed, any legislation upon the bill will be subject to amendment, provided the amendment is germane to the proposition in the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not think anybody has complained about this committee reporting new legislation on the bill, but what does excite complaint is the fact that although these amendments changing existing law are reported by committees bringing in bills, the practice is almost universal for the gentleman in charge of a bill to make a point of order against any amendment that may be offered by a member on the floor, so as to confine us entirely to the consideration of the report of the committee.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I will say in defense of the committee that about everything new we have recommended in this bill is purely administrative. We have not tried to change existing laws except in two cases—one with reference to the paymasters and the other relating to the payment of officers on duty with troops for commutation quarters. The provision in regard to hospital stewards is clearly administrative; the provision in regard to pay for clothing and rations is purely administrative. That is the character of all the changes that we have recommended; and I want to say to my friend from South Dakota that if he had something that he thought the committee ought to have reported in this bill it would have been very little trouble for him to have appeared before the committee and stated it, but we did not have the pleasure of seeing him there. I want to say further that to suddenly spring new legislation in regard to the Army upon the Committee of the Whole without its having received any consideration whatever by a committee of the House, or by the War Department, and to ask the Committee on Military Affairs to consent to it is not fair.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining of this committee to-day any more than I complain of other committees. It is futile for the gentleman to say that if I had anything to suggest I ought to have gone before his committee. I have too much to do to run around suggesting every little amendment that occurs to me on any subject. But here to-day I have suggested an amendment providing that army officers shall not be detailed as Indian agents, and I would like to have a vote upon it. The proposition is germane; it is in order; it is one that requires no elaborate consideration by a committee, and I would like to have a vote upon it. And by the way, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to our rule as it stands. I think it is a bad rule. I very much prefer the one which prevailed in the last House. I hold that it is just as suitable to legislate on an appropriation bill as upon any other bill,

and that if general legislation on appropriation bills were prohibited only during the last fifteen days of a session of Congress there would be no danger whatever in it. The only danger there is in legislating upon appropriation bills is in the expiring hours of a session of Congress, but up to within two weeks of the end of a session, when we are considering these appropriation bills and have plenty of time, I think it would be entirely proper to enact legislation in that way.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

Mr. PICKLER. I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STEELE. What amendment is the gentleman speaking to?

Mr. PICKLER. I do not yield the floor. I am speaking in my own time to this amendment.

Mr. STEELE. I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. PICKLER. I am speaking to the paragraph.

Mr. STEELE. I make the point that there is no matter before the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. I am speaking to the paragraph.

Mr. STEELE. What paragraph?

Mr. PICKLER. The last one that was read. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman has made no motion on which to found a speech.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not need to make a motion. The gentleman ought to know that I do not have to make a motion.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling upon the point of order. If the gentleman is speaking to any question before the committee, I should like to know it.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I shall be protected in my rights. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment has been offered.

Mr. PICKLER. I am speaking on the last paragraph read.

Mr. STEELE. But the gentleman has made no motion.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, well, if the gentleman is so technical, I move to strike out the last word, and now I want five minutes from this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman can not have it.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, I can.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. How many times can a gentleman be recognized to speak on the same subject?

Mr. PICKLER. This is a new amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman from South Dakota have unlimited time.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not yield to the gentleman. I have the floor. There are occasions in this House when a member can retain the floor even against a man in charge of an appropriation bill, and I claim that right now. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the rule as it at present prevails makes it almost impossible for us to secure desirable legislation. It is all well enough for the gentleman from Iowa to say to me, "Bring in your little bill providing that a military officer shall not be detailed as an Indian agent"; but what does that suggestion amount to? What I complain of is that we are too much narrowed down. I believe there would be no danger arising from legislation on appropriation bills if the prohibition against such legislation were confined, for instance, to the last two weeks of the session. But under the rule as it is at present we are absolutely deprived of the opportunity to legislate on many important subjects connected with these appropriation bills.

Some gentlemen here seem to think that we are directing our attacks against this committee especially. We are not doing so. The point I am trying to make is this: That when the committee in charge of one of these bills has reported a particular provision, and in the Committee of the Whole a germane amendment to that provision is offered, the chairman of the committee reporting the bill should not get up and arbitrarily make a point of order against any such amendment, denying to the friends of the proposition an opportunity to be heard. That is what I complain of.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the Committee on Military Affairs have not the slightest desire to curtail in any way the prerogatives of our friend from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER]. It seems to me that the discussion in which he has just indulged might have been more appropriate when the rules were under consideration. That was the proper time to discuss the propriety of the rule which now prohibits him or any other member from offering an amendment in the shape of general legislation upon an appropriation bill. It is not the fault of the Committee on Military Affairs that we have such a rule.

Mr. PICKLER. I am not blaming that committee.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Furthermore, it seems to me, as a very quiet observer, that the chairman of the committee has not cut off any of the rights of the gentleman from South Dakota by pressing his point of order. The gentleman from South Dakota has been heard repeatedly; and the chairman withheld his point of order especially to hear the eloquence of our friend, which is always enjoyed by the House. I am sure if the gentleman will examine carefully into the new legislation embraced in this bill, he will be convinced of the truth of what has been stated, that it is almost entirely administrative, and all of it is in the interest of economy and retrenchment. I know the gentleman is an economist.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commutation of quarters to commissioned officers on duty, without troops, at stations where there are no public quarters, $210,725.48: *Provided*, That hereafter, in case the public quarters at any station are so full as to prevent the assignment of quarters in kind to a commissioned officer there stationed on duty with troops, commutation of quarters at the usual rates shall be paid to him as is now authorized by law to officers on duty without troops; the question of inadequacy of quarters in each case to be determined by the Secretary of War.

Mr. HOPKINS. Reserving a point of order on this provision, I would like to have from the chairman of the committee an explanation of this new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Why not have a ruling on the point of order?

Mr. HOPKINS. It may be that we shall all acquiesce in the provision.

Mr. CANNON. No, sir.

Mr. HULL. I am ready to let the Chair rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order insisted upon?

Mr. HOPKINS. Not by me.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I also make the point of order, because I believe that this provision, in addition to being new legislation, is mischievous legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mileage to officers when traveling on duty without troops, when authorized by law, not to exceed $140,000, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to the War Department and to the several military departments; and not more than three-fifths of said amount shall be expended during the first half of the fiscal year, and not more than one-half of the remainder during each of the remaining quarters: *Provided*, That hereafter the maximum sum to be allowed and paid to any officer of the Army shall be 4 cents per mile, distance to be computed over the shortest usually traveled routes, and in addition thereto the cost of the transportation actually paid by the officer over said route or routes, exclusive of parlor-car or sleeping-car fare: *And provided further*, That when an officer so traveling shall travel in whole or in part on any railroad on which the troops and supplies of the United States are entitled to be transported free of charge, or over any of the bond-aided Pacific railroads, he shall be allowed for himself only 4 cents per mile as a subsistence fund for every mile necessarily traveled over any such railroad: *And provided further*, That the transportation furnished by the Quartermaster's Department to officers traveling without troops shall be limited to transportation in kind, not including sleeping or parlor car accommodations, over free roads, over bond-aided Pacific railroads, and by conveyance belonging to said Department, and the Secretary of War shall so apportion this sum as to prevent a deficiency therein: *And provided further*, That advance mileage may be paid for all distances over 2,000 miles, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may provide.

Mr. HULL. I desire to call attention to the fact that in line 11 of the paragraph just read we have left out the words "and transfer." If these words be not inserted the Government will pay the expense of transferring these officers from one place to another.

Mr. HOPKINS. Why is that change made?

Mr. HULL. It is a small affair; and the change was made at the instance of the Inspector-General of the Army. These officers are now compelled to bear that expense themselves.

Mr. HOPKINS. But the allowance of 4 cents a mile is more than they are compelled to pay for transportation, is it not?

Mr. HULL. I believe so. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to further new legislation in this paragraph. I refer to the provision beginning at the bottom of page 9:

And provided further, That advance mileage may be paid for all distances over 2,000 miles, under regulations as the Secretary of War may provide.

This is new legislation.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is new legislation, and I am afraid legislation that is not healthful. I wish to reserve a point of order for a few moments until we can understand this matter further.

As will be recollected, the law provides absolutely that no advance of public money shall be made to any other person than a disbursing officer, who is a bonded officer. I have never known any such legislation as this, proposing that the Government advance money to a person not a disbursing officer—not under bond. I am a little afraid of this kind of legislation.

Mr. HULL. Very well, then, make a point of order upon it.

Mr. DINGLEY. But if it is proper legislation I do not want to raise a point of order.

Mr. HULL. We believed that it would relieve a very worthy class of officers of the burden of having to borrow money to pay expenses of this kind when they are transferred from one place to another.

Mr. DINGLEY. But under existing law no officials anywhere have money advanced to them except disbursing officers, who, as I have said, are under bond.

Mr. HULL. The officers of the Inspector-General's Department are placed at a great disadvantage in the absence of such a provision as this.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is a departure, however, from the uniform policy of the Government.

Mr. HULL. If an inspector, for instance, is sent from Washington to California to inspect a post, he has got to advance the money to take him there. The statement of the Inspector-General was that they are in many cases poor men, and have to borrow this money at high interest.

Mr. STEELE. In order to save time I will make the point of order on the paragraph that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Subsistence of the Army—Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue, as rations to troops, civil employees, when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, general prisoners at posts, prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), estimated for the fiscal year on the basis of 9,746,230 rations; for sales to officers and enlisted men of the Army; for authorized issues of candles; for toilet articles, barbers', laundry, and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and recruits at recruiting stations, to be issued under regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of War; of matches for lighting public fires and lights at posts and stations and in the field; of flour used for paste in target practice; of salt and vinegar for public animals; of issues to Indians visiting military posts, and to Indians employed with the Army, without pay, as guides and scouts. For payments: For meals for recruiting parties and recruits; for hot coffee, canned beef, and baked beans for troops traveling, when it is impracticable to cook their rations; for scales, weights, measures, utensils, tools, stationery, 3,000 cookbooks, blank books and forms, printing, advertising, commercial newspapers, use of telephones, office furniture; for temporary buildings, cellars, and other means of protecting subsistence supplies (when not provided by the Quartermaster's Department); for extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty in the Subsistence Department for periods of not less than ten days, at rates fixed by law; for compensation of civilians employed in the Subsistence Department, not exceeding $100,000; and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army. For the payment of the regulation allowances for commutation in lieu of rations; to enlisted men on furlough, to ordnance sergeants on duty at ungarrisoned posts, to enlisted men stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, to enlisted men traveling on detached duty when it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, to enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in department and army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War; in all, $1,650,000.

Mr. HULL. In line 24 on page 10, commencing with the word "for," down to and including the second line on page 11, providing for the issue of toilet articles and so on for the use of prisoners, is new legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. How have these been provided for before?

Mr. HULL. They were heretofore confined in the military prison. But the military prison has been turned over to the Department of Justice. This is necessary to provide for such cases.

And then, on page 11, line 13, there is the insertion of 3,000 cookbooks, which I explained before. This is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clothing, and camp and garrison equipage: For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the manufacture of clothing for the Army, for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army Regulations; for altering and fitting clothing, and washing and cleaning when necessary; for equipage and for expenses of packing and handling and similar necessaries; for a suit of citizens' outer clothing, to cost not exceeding $10, to be issued upon release from confinement to each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge, $1,050,000.

Mr. HULL. There is new legislation in this provision—that relating to citizens' clothing for prisoners.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Before the gentleman proceeds will he allow me to make a suggestion to him? On page 18 of the bill, in line 6, the following paragraph occurs:

Provided, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, etc.

I suggest to him that he strike out the word "tariff" where it appears in this provision and insert "charges." The use of the word tariff in this connection is a misuse of a well-understood term.

Mr. HULL. We have already passed that provision of the bill. I do not know that there is any special objection to it. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent to go back, I shall not object, and let him take the sense of the committee on striking it out.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that the word "tariff" be stricken out and "charges" substituted.

Mr. HULL. I do not consent to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I have no objection to going back. That word has stood in the appropriation bills for a great many years, and its meaning is well understood. It is as well defined as anything else in the bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I object to the word being stricken out.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. HULL. With reference to the paragraph just read by the Clerk, beginning with line 14, the provision in line 20 for a suit of citizens' outer clothing at a cost not exceeding $10 for each prisoner under a court-martial sentence, is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Homes Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, including material for cartridges, bags, etc., $20,000.

Mr. HULL. That provision for the firing of the morning and evening guns at the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is new legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Manufacture, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, $400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be applicable to the manufacture of the magazine arm recommended for trial by the Board recently in session, and approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. I desire to offer an amendment to this part of the bill, after the word "War," line 21.

This is an amendment that was left out in the preparation of the bill. It is simply the same provision that has been enacted the last two Congresses and is recommended by the Chief of the Ordnance Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That not more than $60,000 of the money appropriated for the Ordnance Department in all its branches shall be applied to the payment of civilian clerks in said Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, and recommend that as amended it do pass.

Mr. MERCER. I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, if by that he means to conclude all action on this bill?

Mr. HULL. That would conclude all action on the bill.

Mr. MERCER. I have an amendment which I desire to offer, on page 24.

Mr. HULL. We have passed page 24. The bill is finished.

Mr. MERCER. I ask unanimous consent of the House to offer the amendment.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman submit his amendment for information? I should prefer to hear it before I consent to return to that page.

Mr. MERCER. I was busily engaged in writing the amendment and did not know that we had got so far along with the bill. My proposed amendment is this:

On page 4, line 21, after the word "War," add:

"*Provided further*, That so much of the above sum as may be necessary shall be expended by the Secretary of War for the purchase of cadet rifles to be supplied to boards of education or other proper authorities in cities where military instruction has been introduced in the public schools, on condition that such boards of education or other proper authorities shall furnish a good and sufficient bond, to be approved by the Secretary of War, for the care, custody, and safe return of such cadet rifles."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, as that would involve a large expenditure that the committee could not pass upon in the House without having a great deal more information, I shall have to object to returning to that page, and insist upon my motion that the committee rise. The gentleman can have that proposition submitted in the Senate.

Mr. MERCER. Asking the indulgence of the committee, I have a proposition milder in form. I have a double-barreled shotgun here, Mr. Chairman. I have two amendments, and I desire to submit the second one to the gentleman's generosity. It is as follows:

On page 24, line 21, after the word "war," add:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall distribute the discarded rifles, or so many thereof as may be necessary, among the boards of education or other proper authorities in cities where military instruction has been introduced on condition that an application therefor be made by such boards of education or other proper authorities accompanied by a good and sufficient bond to be approved by the Secretary of War for the care, custody, and return to the Government of such rifles."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to have the gentleman go to the Senate with that. I shall have to insist on the motion that the committee rise. It is late, and the Committee on Appropriations have a conference report which they wish to present.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection being made to returning to this part of the bill, the Chair holds that the amendment is offered too late, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, that the committee rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MERCER. Division.

Mr. HULL. I hope the gentleman will not insist on a division.

Mr. MERCER. I withdraw my request.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOLLIVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5359) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, presents a conference report, which the Clerk will report to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 15, 20, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To open Jupiter Inlet, in Florida, for the passage of boats and small vessels, to be expended under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, $500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in the amended paragraph insert "$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. G. CANNON,
S. A. NORTHWAY,
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

EUGENE HALE,
W. B. ALLISON,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the statement of the House conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 4321) submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as finally agreed upon appropriates $6,305,436.52, being $1,884,033.91 more than as it passed the House; $300,000 of which sum, however, was added by the House when the bill was last under consideration, for the publication of the Agricultural Report for 1895.

All of the amendments are agreed to without change, except the following:

On amendment numbered 5, $20,000 is appropriated, as proposed by the House, instead of $25,000, as proposed by the Senate, to complete the survey of the international boundary between the United States and Mexico.

On amendment numbered 6, the appropriation of $10,000 proposed by the Senate for the publication of the report of Dr. E. A. Mearns on the natural history of the region covered by the boundary survey between the United States and Mexico is stricken out.

On amendment numbered 15, the appropriation of $7,000 proposed by the Senate for completing the improvement of roads owned by the United States at Antietam is stricken out.

On amendment numbered 17, the sum of $25,000, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, is given for the purchase of horses for cavalry and artillery for the Army.

On amendment numbered 20: Strikes out the appropriation of $4,000 proposed by the Senate for coaling shed at the naval station at Key West, Fla.

On amendment numbered 23, the sum of $9,000 is appropriated, instead of $10,800, as proposed by the Senate, for work at the Capitol and general repairs thereof.

On amendment numbered 26, the sum of $3,500 is appropriated, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for continuing the work of the Puyallup Indian Commission.

On amendment numbered 31: Strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate, directing the Auditor for the Interior Department to state the account of A. Wilson Norris, late pension agent at Philadelphia.

On amendment numbered 33, the sum of $400, instead of $600, as proposed by the House, and of $200, as proposed by the Senate, is appropriated for additional salary of the clerk in charge of accounts in the Department of Justice.

J. G. CANNON,
S. A. NORTHWAY,
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the report briefly states the result of the conference. It is proper for me to add that, substantially, the House conferees recommend a report that carries the Senate amendments. I stated when the Senate amendments were under consideration before the House I apprehended that most, if not all, of them abounded in estimate. We found that to be the fact when we met the Senate conferees. In other words, we found that after the urgent deficiency bill had been considered in the House and had passed the House the Executive Departments forwarded additional estimates for the service of the current year and deficiencies for past years that increased the bill as indicated. As the money was either due or necessary to carry on the Government, the House conferees recommend that the House accede in the main to the Senate amendments, with the exceptions we have indicated in the report. I want at this time to protest that it seems to me that it is the duty of those who submit estimates connected with the Administration to obey the law and submit them as the law requires them to submit them, in ample time, so that they may receive consideration before the body that prepares general appropriation bills.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, just a few words. I desire very briefly to call the attention of the House to the fact that in this bill there are carried many items which, properly speaking, are not deficiencies. Three items aggregate $830,000, and neither one of them can be considered as a deficiency. I, however, fully concur in the report which has just been read and in what has been said by the gentleman from Illinois. They are very proper and very necessary appropriations; but at the same time they are not deficiencies. For instance, an appropriation of $300,000 for printing the Agricultural Report for 1894 is an unusual appropriation.

In the last session of the last Congress an appropriation of $300,000 was made for printing the Agricultural Report for 1894; and there was no estimate to that Congress for printing the report of 1895. This is the first time, with the exception of one other instance some years ago, where a Congress had failed to make any appropriation at all for the purpose, where we will have two appropriations for printing two Agricultural Reports at the same session of Congress. The reason for this appropriation is that it will enable the Public Printer to get out the Agricultural Report for 1895 about the month of June instead of in October or November. I therefore concur in it, although it is not properly a deficiency appropriation.

There is another appropriation—for Brooklyn dockyard, $50,000—which is not a deficiency. It is an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Navy to amend a contract which has already been entered into and which if executed would not require an additional appropriation. I have recognized the importance of this appropriation and have agreed to it, and think that the House also ought to agree to it.

For the Library of Congress building we have an appropriation of $480,000. The officer in charge of the construction of this building says that not one penny of this money will be expended during the present fiscal year, and that the appropriation made by the last Congress will not be entirely expended before July 1 next; but either this appropriation should be made or authority should be given to him to contract in order that the building may be entirely completed and turned over to Congress in February next. If this appropriation should be delayed until the passage of the sundry civil bill, upon which it would regularly appear, then the building would not be completed until some time in the coming spring or summer.

I have called the attention of the House to these particular items, in order that no one might think that this very large urgent deficiency bill is a result of any dereliction on the part of last Congress to make the necessary appropriations. My judgment is, as I have heretofore stated, that there will upon the whole be smaller appropriations for deficiencies at this session of Congress than for many years past. There are other appropriations in the bill which are not deficiencies, but I will not delay the House further by reference to them.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment. I desire to say that the gentleman from Texas and myself do not disagree about it being necessary for the public service at this time to make these appropriations.

Mr. SAYERS. Not at all. We are in entire harmony as to their necessity.

Mr. CANNON. That is all I desire to say about that, except as to the Agricultural Report. The sundry civil appropriation bill for the current year for the first time carries the appropriation for the Agricultural Report—the publication thereof, of 1894. That was made necessary by the passage of the Richardson printing act. Prior to that time every appropriation of that kind was by joint resolution reported from the Committee on Printing. But for the change of that law it would not be necessary to have it come upon the sundry civil bill. The report for 1894 has been published. Now this item comes upon this deficiency bill because of the Richardson printing act which provides for the publication—a fixed law—of the Agricultural and other departmental reports. If that law had not passed, why then, following the usual course, this appropriation ought to have been made, and would have been made, by a separate joint resolution covering one item.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAYERS. Just one moment. Mr. Speaker, I think either the gentleman from Illinois misunderstood what I said or that he has not retained in his recollection the appropriations made heretofore for the publication of the Agricultural Report. The fact that I desired to impress upon the House was this: That until, I believe, the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, there never have been two appropriations, either by joint resolution or upon appropriation bills, for the publication of Agricultural Reports at any one session of Congress, and two appropriations were then made only because at the last session of the Fiftieth Congress there was a failure to make any appropriation at all for the purpose. There was, as I have said, an appropriation for the publication of the Agricultural Report at the last session of the last Congress, and it was carried, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, upon the sundry civil bill.

Now, the Public Printer comes to Congress and says: "If you will give the appropriation for 1895 at this time, instead of waiting for the sundry civil bill, I shall be able to give you the Agricultural Report for 1895 in June, instead of in October or November next."

Mr. CANNON. There is, as I understand it, substantially no disagreement between the gentleman from Texas and myself?

Mr. SAYERS. None at all.

Mr. CANNON. I will state again that the Agricultural Report for 1894 was printed by virtue of an item in the sundry civil bill instead of, as theretofore, by authority of a joint resolution reported from the Committee on Printing. Now, the report of 1895 dwells in this deficiency bill instead of dwelling in a separate joint resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to the printing bill, I wish he would state to the House that there is no increase in the amount of the appropriation by reason of the change.

Mr. CANNON. None at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And that the amount is identically the same in this bill as it would be in the other.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. It is fixed by law.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came from the Senate, I asked the chairman of the committee about item No. 11. I wish to inquire now whether the committee of conference inquired into facts relating to that matter, as to whether the report had been made in due form, by due authority, and according to law. My information is that it has not been so made, and I ask the chairman of the conference committee now whether that particular item was inquired into by his committee?

Mr. CANNON. In answer to the gentleman I have to state that upon inquiry we found that the money that was appropriated for the national commission, and was intended in part to cover the making of the report, had been used in paying the expense of bringing the commission together, which cost something over $20,000, and that, so far as the report was concerned, no money was left to pay for it. There was no means of calling the commission together again, because there was no money to pay the members for coming together. We found that the director-general eighteen months ago, with this condition of things existing and the law making it his duty to make a report, went to work and spent a year and a half upon it, calling to his assistance such aid as was necessary.

Counting his own pay at $5,000 a year, the eighteen months made $7,500, which is paid him by this appropriation, and the committee ascertained that the balance, to make the $18,000, was actually paid out for clerical assistance. This report of the director-general had not been delivered to anybody, because there was nobody to deliver it to. The committee on the part of the Senate, and the House committee also, examined into the matter far enough to be satisfied that the director-general had honestly and intelligently made this expenditure, and he desired to make some disposition of the report and to be reimbursed. It seemed to the committee of conference, the managers on the part of the House as well as those on the part of the Senate, that there was equity in his claim. Therefore we recommend concurrence substantially in the Senate provision, and the provision as recommended by the committee of conference leaves the report of the director-general in the hands of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Now, let me go one step further. The president of the national commission has not yet made any report. We looked into that just far enough to ascertain that there is a great mass of undigested material, covering, particularly, I presume, the action of the board of awards, material which has not been edited, although there was nearly $2,000 advanced for editing it; and we recommend the payment of that. The women's commission (if that is the correct name of it), headed by Mrs. Palmer, has not yet made a report, but we understand in a general way that there is sufficient appropriation to that board to enable it to make a report.

Now, my own belief is, from such representations as have been made to me, that the report of the director-general, covering the matters that it does, is in very good shape. We do not authorize any publication of the report. We only provide for reimbursement of the director-general by this appropriation, and leave his report in the possession of the Joint Committee on Printing of the House and the Senate, expecting and hoping that later all the material will come into possession of that joint committee, upon which are found as members the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. PERKINS, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, and one other member of the House, and Senator HALE in the Senate. Knowing these to be industrious gentlemen and quite competent, we hope and expect that such steps will be taken as will lead to the full examination of the report of the director-general and a full inquiry as to the material that exists elsewhere, and will finally lead to an intelligent editing of a report, doing justice to everybody, care being taken that there shall be no duplications in the report, having regard also to the number of volumes that ought to be published and what the report ought to contain.

Mr. SAYERS. Will my friend allow me a moment right there? I wish to supplement what he has said, possibly by restating what he has already said, by remarking that the only thing that has been done by the committee of conference in this matter has been to provide for repaying the director-general moneys that he has absolutely expended and for receiving his work and transmitting it to the Joint Committee on Printing, leaving that committee to make such adjustment between the different parties as to the preparation of the final report and for its publication as in their wisdom may seem proper.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman might add, expecting that that committee later on, after they have looked into the matter, will originate and submit for the consideration of the House and the Senate such recommendations with reference to legislation and appropriation as they may deem proper.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah rose.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah five or ten minutes, or any reasonable time he may desire.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House any great length of time, and I have not the temerity to suppose that what I shall say will make any difference as to the adoption or rejection of this report. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon either the director-general of the Columbian Exposition or upon the committee that has reported in favor of this appropriation. But I do submit, after the labored explanations—if I may use the expression—of my eminent friend, I can not see that there is any reason for permitting this appropriation to be made at this time.

The subject has not been before this body or any of its standing committees. It has not been before any committee of the House, so that it could be fully investigated, and from the explanation we have it is evident that here is a report upon an exposition held under the authority of the United States which is not authoritative. It has not stamped upon it the authority of anybody. Yet if this appropriation be made and this report gets into the hands of the Printing Committee it becomes authoritative; it will be printed and put forth as embodying the views of that commission when it does not contain their views, so far as we know, but simply the views of the director-general of the commission. As I am informed—I have not been able to see the report—it is not even signed. It has not been put forth by the authority of the commission, yet under these circumstances we are asked to appropriate money to its author. I submit that this matter ought to be fully investigated, and before we make an appropriation of more than $18,000 to pay for this work we ought to be in a position to know what it is and by whose authority it has been made.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word in reply. The gentleman is mistaken when he speaks of this matter not having been before any committee of this House. It was before the Committee on Appropriations when the Senate amendments were

referred. It was considered in the House by unanimous consent when we acted on the question of nonconcurrence. It was considered as fully as was practicable in the committee of conference, the result of whose deliberations has been given to the House.

The gentleman speaks of my "labored explanation." Well, sir, I have at times worked harder than in making this explanation. The gentleman says that this report of the director-general was not made to the national commission, and that it is without authority. I admit that it was not made to the national commission; and I think I have progressed far enough to be certain that there never will be a report made by the director-general or anybody else to the national commission. That commission is functus officio, unless Congress should breathe the breath of life into it and call its members from various points throughout the length and breadth of the land—I will not say as the prophet, by breathing upon them, called the dry bones together in the valley. But after all, while that required the spirit of the Lord, Congress can not call the national commission together without an expenditure of $20,000, and I believe I know that an expenditure of $20,000 for that purpose would be thrown away.

The exposition has been held. It was a magnificent success. It has passed into history. The report should be made. The director-general has made this expenditure, and we believe has wisely made it; and he ought to be reimbursed. By the provision now submitted we lodge this report with the Joint Committee on Printing, as I have already explained, that that committee may take it, examine it, go into the whole question of preparing these reports for publication, for the proper editing of the same. That committee, after an examination which is in their line and which I have no doubt they will take the time to make, will report to this House, I believe, such apt provision as will give us a reliable report of that exposition and an economical one.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. As I understand, the gentleman's position is that the Committee on Printing of this House can properly edit this report of the Columbian Exposition?

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment the joint Committee on Printing, with this report of the director-general and with such other information as it may be able to obtain, can devise a scheme that will bring about a proper report, can tell us how much it will cost and how large it ought to be.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is it understood that this conference report proposes an appropriation for the printing of this report?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; this appropriation is merely to reimburse the director-general $18,000.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then, as I understand, this is a matter about which there is nothing in dispute—as to which there is no issue here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, with his long experience and great abitity in these matters, if he would venture to offer a word of suggestion or advice to the Joint Committee on Printing as to how far they might go in their recommendations on this subject?

Mr. SAYERS. The committee would probably resent the giving of such advice by anyone. The gentleman from Illinois should beware. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; they would not resent it when it is called for, and I ask the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Tennessee has long been a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, and the House is well aware of his ability and recognizes him as a practical man of great industry, and I have also before me the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS], who is the chairman of that committee, whose life has been largely spent in publishing and kindred pursuits, and in whose intelligence and industry we all have full confidence, and with these gentlemen I am satisfied that the investigation will be in proper and safe hands, and am willing there to leave it.

Mr. STEELE. Before the gentleman from Illinois takes his seat I hope he will give us the name of the prophet that called the "dry bones" together. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will have that part of my remarks edited by my eminent theological friend from Indiana. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois with reference to the small item for deputy surveyors in the bill—did that remain in with the conference committee?

Mr. CANNON. I think it remained in the bill.

I now ask a vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

HOUSE BILLS WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following bills with Senate amendments were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3527) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TRACEY, for eight days.

To Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania, for one week, on account of sickness.

To Mr. PRICE, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BISHOP, for one week, on account of important business.

A. H. M'LAWS.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of A. H. McLaws, of Dublin, Ga., late second lieutenant in Captain Dill's Company (B), First Georgia Regiment, Mexican war, to $50 per month.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The Committee on Pensions recommend an amendment striking out "fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PICKLER. Has this bill been reported by the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Yes; unanimously reported by the committee.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TURNER of Georgia, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of a bill for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska, with recommendations relating thereto—to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Metropolitan Railroad Company, transmitting a statement of the receipts and disbursements for the year ended June 30, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3281) to authorize reassessments for improvements and general taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 430); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4179) to amend section 3719 of the Revised Statutes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 431); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4575) to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report

(No. 440); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1972) in aid of the exposition to be held under the auspices of the Baltimore Centennial Association, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 441); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 445); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred a House document (No. 90), reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 6345) to establish a criminal jurisdiction over places ceded to the United States for certain purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 446); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3462) to regulate the business of storage in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 447); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2331) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stevenson. (Report No. 432.)

By Mr. CROWTHER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2844) granting a pension to Martha McNeil. (Report No. 433.)

By Mr. ERDMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1734) to increase the pension of Ann Catherine Hull. (Report No. 434.)

By Mr. LAYTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1261) for the relief of John Kehl and to restore him to his former rating. (Report No. 435.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3937) granting a pension to Miriam V. Kenney, widow of Samuel W. Kenney. (Report No. 436.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 75) granting a pension to Mary F. Davenport. (Report No. 437.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1299) to pension Harriet Woodbury, of Windsor, Vt. (Report No. 438.)

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 6210) for the relief of the heirs of Asa Chilson, deceased. (Report No. 439.)

By Mr. COFFIN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4913) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Wyse, widow of Lieut. Col. F. O. Wyse. (Report No. 443.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4383) granting a pension to Gen. William H. Morris. (Report No. 444.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 6307) to amend section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1895, being an act amendatory of an act with reference to the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 6308) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6309) to provide further security to persons and property in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 124) relating to printing additional copies of the Official Records of the Navy during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A memorial of the senate and assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the passage of a bill by Congress to establish a military and national park upon the Palisades of the Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolution of the general assembly of Ohio, asking Congress to take steps to relieve the suffering of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 5932) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah H. Wood—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4953) to grant a pension to John Thurston, of Island Pond, Vt.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Papers to accompany House bill No. 4380, in relation to the pension of Margaret Hawthorn—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Affidavit to accompany House bill No. 5349, In re John Lavigne—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petition to accompany House bill No. 5148, praying for the passage of the bill to increase the pension of David Matlock—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Papers to accompany House bill No. 5451, granting a pension to James C. Brickley—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Resolution of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of a bankruptcy law—Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolution of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club, for the passage of a general bankruptcy bill—Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York, N. Y., in favor of the passage of a bankruptcy law—Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 5425) to grant a pension to Charlotte O. Van Cleve, widow of Gen. Horatio P. Van Cleve—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Resolution of Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for appropriations for protection of seacoast towns—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 6310) for the relief of Benjamin Evans—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of Elindsley W. Murray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 6312) to grant a pension to Mrs. Eliza Whitney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 6313) for relief of Frank Johnson, of White County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 6314) for the relief of Henry Cook, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 6315) for relief of Clarence W. Turner and Pleasant Porter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6316) for the relief of John D. Reed, administrator of J. P. C. Reed, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 6317) for the relief of Margaret Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 6318) for the relief of the heirs of David B. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6319) granting increase of pension to Alfred P. Buss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 6320) granting a pension to John M. Killian—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 6321) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia J. Capron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 6322) granting a pension to

Maria Hall, dependent daughter of Asa Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of Gauley Bridge Baptist Church, of Fayette County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) for the relief of the trustees of St. Mark's Protestant Episcopal Church at Coalsmouth, Kanawha County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 6325) for the relief of Eliza Dickerhoff, widow of Louis Dickerhoff, deceased, of Company A, Cape Girardeau (Mo.) Home Guards—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6326) to increase the pension of Berry C. Craddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) granting a pension to Mrs. N. A. D. Biggers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 6328) granting a pension to Joseph R. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) granting a pension to Charles H. Carlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6330) to remove charge of desertion against W. B. Summers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6331) for relief of Alfred A. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6332) for the relief of the personal representative of William C. Stribling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 6333) for the relief of Jonathan T. Knapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 6334) granting a pension to George William Hodgdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PENDLETON: A bill (H. R. 6335) to pay the administrator of the estate of Bluford West, deceased, for the Bluford West Saline, in Cherokee Nation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 6336) granting a pension to Lucy D. Heady, widow of Henry Heady, late Company F, Eighty-ninth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6337) for the relief of M. H. McCoy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting a pension to R. Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) granting a pension to Thomas J. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) for the relief of Richard Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6341) for the relief of J. W. Searles—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6342) for the relief of William Thorpe, trustee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 6343) to appoint Samuel Bickerstaff to the United States Navy as chief engineer, and to place his name on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOMER: A bill (H. R. 6344) for the relief of Michael J. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6346) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah M. Ozborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R 6347) granting a pension to Maria E. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of O. A. Phillips and 82 other citizens of Venetia, Washington County, Pa.; also, petition of W. H. McMillan and 24 other citizens of the fourth precinct of Mifflin Township, Allegheny County, Pa.; also, petition of Frank Beck and 57 other citizens of Boston, Allegheny County, Pa.; also, petition of Benjamin F. McIntyre and 55 other citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Henry C. Newton and 41 other citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of a bill granting a pension of $8 per month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war of the rebellion, and who was honorably discharged and a pension of not less than $12 per month to widows of such as have died—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, protest of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against the passage of any measure providing for military instruction in the public schools—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of W. K. Allen and 83 other citizens of Fayette City, Fayette County, Pa., praying for the free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of 328 citizens of Clearfield County; also, petition of 312 citizens of Center County; also, petition of 177 citizens of Clarion County and 64 citizens of Elk County, State of Pennsylvania, for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 125 citizens of Osceola Mills, Pa., praying for constitutional amendment prohibiting appropriations for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6301, for the relief of Benjamin Evans—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of Henry B. Williams and others, of Newton, Mass., for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, in relation to the distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the St. Louis Paint, Oil, and Drug Club, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 2779—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Petition of General Logan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chatham, N. Y., asking for passage of pension bill for veterans of more than ninety days' service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Henry H. Darling, Bro. & Co. and other jobbers of Troy, N. Y., against proposed duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Resolutions of mass meeting at Lancaster, Pa., asking that the age of consent be raised in the District of Columbia; also, for a Territorial divorce law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting at Lancaster, for industrial arbitration and the Phillips labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of mass meeting at Lancaster, in favor of a Sunday-rest law and a compulsory education law in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, protest of citizens of Adamstown, Pa., against the sectarian appropriations of the Indian appropriation bill, together with a petition urging the passage of proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Lititz, Pa., in favor of amending the preamble to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of various churches of Decherd, Tenn., for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill relating to the case of Frank Johnson, White County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of N. Simons & Co., of Neenah, Wis., and W. F. Abrahams, of Mobile, Ala., together with memorials containing the names of 478 citizens of the city of Mobile, Ala., the cities of Neenah and Menasha, and the towns of Clayton, Winchester, Winneconne, and Vinland, Wis., including merchants, manufacturers, cheese makers, farmers, and tradesmen, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3010, regulating and controlling the manufacture and sale of filled cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petition of 111 citizens of Walker County, Tex., for the enactment of a law granting a uniform pension of $12 a month to Mexican war veterans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution passed by the board of regents of the University of Texas, asking national aid to State universities—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John D. Reed, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petition of Thomas Cranage and 66 vessel owners of Bay City, Mich., against the building of a bridge across the Detroit River at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDDY: Petition of ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army residing at Alexandria, Minn., asking for a general pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions adopted by the citizens of Campbell, Minn., protesting against the outrages committed upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: Memorial of the city council of Baker City, Oreg., asking that the Nicaragua Canal be constructed by the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, remonstrance from W. H. Klinefelt and 17 others of Baker

City, Oreg., against appropriating any money for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of citizens of Peoria, Ill., against sectarian appropriations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL: Petitions of Lewis Hall, C. W. Zirkle, and others, of Avalon and vicinity, Missouri, favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of John T. G. Duncan, Daniel Humphries, and 114 other citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of "An act for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls, for the restriction of immigrants who are unfit socially, morally, and physically to become citizens of this country"—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Paper from the department commander, Grand Army of the Republic of Nebraska; also, from the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, urging favorable action on the bill to establish a national military park at Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of a mass meeting called by the Ministerial Union of Alameda, Cal., asking the United States Government to cooperate with other Christian powers in affording protection to suffering Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE: Memorial of the Vancouver Commercial Club, favoring the improvement of Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Stillwater, Minn., in favor of the improvement of the St. Croix Lake and River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of citizens of Liberty Township, Tioga County, Pa., praying for legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEWIS: Paper to accompany House bill No. 6326, for an increase of pension to Berry C. Craddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6327, for a pension to Mrs. N. A. D. Biggers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of S. S. Weaver, Samuel Gibson, and others, of the Union Army during the civil war, in favor of the passage of the bill granting a pension of $8 per month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy, and was honorably discharged, and a pension of $12 per month to the widows of those who have died—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society opposing the free distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the trustees of public reservations of Massachusetts, relative to the preservation of the Palisades of the Hudson—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Petition of citizens of Jamaica, N. Y., on the Armenian question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany House bill, for the relief of representatives of William C. Stribling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of R. A. Tittle and 26 other citizens of Moorefield, W. Va.; also, petitions of Thomas H. Rabe and 42 others, of Canton, Ohio, and W. B. Wheeler and 5 others, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the recognition of God in the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of various church denominations of Memphis, Tenn., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of George G. Willey and 24 others; also, petition of D. G. Ricketts and 69 others, all of Rock Island and Mercer counties, Ill., asking for certain improvements on the Upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. QUIGG: Paper to accompany House bill No. 120, relating to medals to National Guard regiments in 1863—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Preamble and resolutions adopted by Rockdale Council, No. 803, Junior Order United American Mechanics, praying for the passage of such legislation as will recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban insurgents, signed by officers and members of the council and over 500 citizens of Rockdale, Delaware County, and vicinity—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Resolutions unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Michigan Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, held January 23, 1896, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, introduced by Hon. E. J. HAINER, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOVER: Protest of Armstrong & Graves and others, of Port Huron, Mich., against import tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Petition of Union soldiers and sailors of the late war residing at Cuba, Mo., favoring the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: Paper in support of House bill No. 6247, granting a pension to Miss Jennie E. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petitions of various churches of Kosciusko, Miss., for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Scott County, Miss., for the improvement of the Mississippi River and tributaries—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of D. R. Frank and 129 other citizens of Richland, Lebanon County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. Berg Esenwein, principal, and 8 professors and teachers of Albright Collegiate Institute, of Myerstown, Pa.; and also of Mrs. W. L. Block, president, and 24 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Myerstown, Pa., in favor of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 20, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. CALL, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, certain information as to the amount of coin and currency and forms of notes and money of the United States in existence on January 1, 1896, and the amount held as reserves by national and State banks, private banks and bankers, loan and trust companies, and other financial institutions and concerns, etc., together with statements showing the amount of paper and coin in existence in the United States, and the amount outside of the Treasury from 1800 to 1894, both inclusive; which, with the accompanying statements, was, on motion of Mr. PEFFER, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Utah, praying that a portion of Arizona lying north of the Colorado River be annexed to the State of Utah; which was, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salt Lake City, February 15, 1896.

To the President of the Senate:

I have the honor to transmit herewith, to be laid before the Senate, a certified copy of the memorial of the legislature of the State of Utah, praying that a portion of Arizona lying north of the Colorado River be annexed to the State of Utah. I am, sir,

Very respectfully,

JAMES T. HAMMOND,
Secretary of State.

—

Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States.

Your memorialists, the governor and the legislature of the State of Utah would respectfully represent to your honorable body that those portions of Coconino and Mohave counties, of Arizona Territory, lying north of the Colorado River should properly belong to Utah for these reasons:

First. The Colorado River forms an impassable barrier between said portions of Coconino and Mohave counties and the main bodies of said counties and Arizona.

Second. The residents of said portions of Arizona herewith attach a petition asking for said annexation to Utah, because all their interests are in common with the people of Utah, being cut off from communication with the citizens and courts of Arizona, except by a far circuitous route through a wild and rough country occupied by the Navajo and Apache Indians; that they live within 4 miles of Utah and desire her protection, as they receive inadequate protection from Arizona.

Third. That the taxpayers of said lands who are residents of Utah also herewith attach a petition asking for said annexation for the reason that said lands are sparsely settled and are unprofitable for irrigation and suitable only for grazing purposes. That the herds and flocks thereon are owned in Utah; that, owing to the wildness of said lands, it has become a place of refuge for desperate and lawless men; that Arizona affords the stock owners no protection, and that the defense of their property and prosecution of said lawless citizens has devolved upon Utah, to the detriment of those counties adjoining said Territory, and that they should have the benefit arising from the funds derived from taxation. We therefore earnestly ask that those portions of Coconino and Mohave counties north of the Colorado River be at-

tached to and made a part of the State of Utah, and that the Colorado River be the dividing line.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Approved February 12, 1896.

HEBER M. WELLS,
Governor of Utah.
GEORGE M. CANNON,
President of the Senate.
PRESLEY DENNY,
Speaker of the House.

—

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, residents and landholders of that portion of Coconino County, Ariz., lying north of the Colorado River, ask you to annex said portions of Coconino County to the State of Utah, for various and divers reasons set forth in the memorial passed by the legislature of Utah, and as may be presented to you by the honorable Representative of Utah; and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Lorum Pratt, Jesse Hortt, Saren Christiensen, W. G. Potter, jr., Josiah W. Juhrulizter, W. G. Potter, M. S. Emett, J. T. Jackson, D. B. Stewart, James Hartt, A. W. Brown, Thomas P. Jensen, B. L. Sterbar, O. W. Hart, and Ira M. Judd.

—

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, residents of Kane County, Utah, and taxpayers in that portion of Coconino County, Ariz., lying north of the Colorado River, respectfully ask you to annex to the State of Utah the said portion of Arizona lying north of the Colorado River, for various and divers reasons set forth in the memorial passed by the legislature of Utah, and as may be presented to you by the honorable Representative of Utah; and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

A. D. Young, F. T. Titten, A. D. Findlay, Charles Little, Jesse W. Crosby, jr., E. B. Woolby, Jesse N. Johnson, Nephi Johnson, jr., Murray Averett, Joseph Hamblin, Aquile Nebeker, E. D. Woolby, Jesse W. Crosby, jr., Ed. Lamb, Jonathan Heatan, H. S. Jolley, G. W. Hicks, Lorenzo Jolley, B. A. Jolley, and E. L. Clark.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lititz, Pa., praying for the adoption of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of L. E. Rowley, postmaster, and the clerks in the Lansing (Mich.) post-office, praying for the passage of the so-called Sperry classification bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of C. D. Mosher, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Elm Grove Grange, No. 644, Patrons of Husbandry, of Williams County, Ohio, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, and a petition of 43 citizens of Canton, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of A. J. Barrett and sundry other citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation allowing settlers on the Mille Lac Indian Reservation to make homestead entries of the land on which they have settled; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., praying Congress to amend the act known as the Harter Act, relating to navigation of vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with carriage of property; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of H. N. Cushman, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for military training in the public schools of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. DAVIS presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the building of a pier bridge across the Detroit River at Detroit, Mich.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by L. P. Plummer Post, No. 50, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who were confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Garden City, Minn., relative to the adoption of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oreg., on the importance and the need of the thorough protection and propagation of salmon in the Columbia River, and the propriety of the United States Government acting promptly in this matter. As is well known, the Columbia River forms the boundary line between the State of Washington and the State of Oregon. There is at present a conflict between the statutes of the bordering States. That river is the great source of supply of salmon. The salmon industry there runs into millions of dollars per annum. It amounted last year to $3,342,928. I move that the petition be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Lacenter, Wash., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting further appropriations to institutions under ecclesiastical control; which were referred to the Committee on the Judicary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by Wisconsin Commandery, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish the Vicksburg national park; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of House bill No. 2563, to provide for the enrollment and organization of naval reserve forces; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the board of trustees of Silverton, Colo., and a petition of the board of aldermen of Aspen, Colo., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Flandreau, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by Ransom Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of South Dakota, of Mitchell, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the restoration of the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the common council of Lead, S. Dak., praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a Government building at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of J. K. Yost and 44 other citizens of Dauphin County, Pa.; the petition of H. W. Richard and 33 other citizens of Shamokin, Pa., and the petition of C. C. Dennis and 69 other citizens of Erie County, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Myerstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade of the United States, praying that appropriations be made to place the United States navy-yard at League Island, Pa., in a condition to dock, repair, and construct vessels of war; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Elizabethville, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Woodward, Pa., remonstrating against the appropriation of moneys for sectarian institutions; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., to the President and Congress of the United States, on the attitude of Congress relative to the Monroe doctrine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Lincoln Association of the Union League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln be made a national holiday; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Pine Tree Grange, No. 3, of Lisbon, Me., praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, providing for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of William W. Shaw and sundry other vessel masters and owners, of Ashtabula, Ohio, praying for the construction of a breakwater at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorial J. A. Calbick and sundry other ship masters and owners, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the erection of a pier bridge over the Detroit River at Detroit, Mich.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MORGAN presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a convention of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, and of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the appointment of a commission to investigate the question of Japanese manufactures, exporta-

tions, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a memorial on behalf of the Klamath and Modoc tribes and the Yahooskin band of Snake Indians, occupying the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, in the matter of their claim for land excluded from that reservation by erroneous survey of the outboundaries thereof; the boundaries not having been run and marked as prescribed by the treaty of October 14, 1864. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, as it relates to an important matter before that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of Surprise Grange, No. 233, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oregon, and sundry petitions of the Oregon State Grange of Turner, Oreg., praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of A. H. Rhodes, A. J. Holmes, J. A. Wilson, and 21 other citizens of Eaton, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Hanover, Ind., praying for the adoption of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1696) making an appropriation for the construction of an electrical cruiser and to provide electrical equipment for one or more cruisers already in service, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1244) to relieve James Messer from the charge of desertion, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1779) to relieve John Hughes from the charge of desertion, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1482) to authorize the Corpus Christi and Padre Island Harbor Company to import free of duty certain materials for the construction of an outer harbor on the coast of Texas, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 663) to remove the charge of desertion against Philip Pflueger, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Wisconsin Infantry, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1238) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Philip Pflueger, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Wisconsin Infantry, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1266) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that that bill be placed on the Calendar with the report of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1307) authorizing the retirement of certain officers of the Army, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WARREN. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 53) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion, to ask that the committee be discharged from its further consideration, the bill having been favorably reported from another committee of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 94) for the relief of Henry J. Hewitt, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1770) providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and fixing their pay and allowances, to report it adversely. I am also directed by the committee to ask that the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] wishes to make a statement.

Mr. BACON. I introduced the bill by request. There is a very large number of persons throughout the United States who are deeply interested in it. I therefore ask that the bill may go upon the Calendar, to await such further direction as the Senate may see proper to give it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee, and the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, January 29, 1896.*

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 25, inclosing bill S. 1770, providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service, etc., and requesting that I furnish the committee with such suggestions as may seem proper touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

In reply I transmit herewith a copy of the Regulations of the Marine-Hospital Service, on page 17 of which (paragraphs 50 to 61, inclusive) will be found the regulations concerning appointment, qualifications, compensation, allowances, grades, promotions, discipline, and general duties of hospital stewards.

From these paragraphs it will be seen that hospital stewards are required to pass an examination as to their general and special qualifications, and that their compensation is fixed by this Department. At present this compensation is as follows: For hospital stewards of the first class, $40 per month, with quarters, subsistence, fuel, light and water, and laundering; after the expiration of one year they are promoted to the grade of second-class stewards, with pay of $50 per month, with the same allowances, and after one more year's service they are promoted to the grade of third-class stewards, at $60 per month, with the same allowances. When serving at stations where no quarters are provided, $25 per month as commutation of quarters is allowed, and when traveling under orders they are allowed usual traveling expenses and transportation of 500 pounds of baggage.

Section 1 of the said bill provides that the hospital stewards shall be called "pharmacists," and shall be warrant officers of the United States Marine-Hospital Service.

With regard to the term "pharmacist," I have to state that the duties of hospital stewards in the Marine-Hospital Service cover a much wider field than is designated by this term. It is true that hospital stewards must be graduates of pharmacy, but the time consumed in actual pharmaceutical labor is limited and would not warrant their employment for this duty alone.

Hospital stewards in the Marine-Hospital Service, besides filling prescriptions, are obliged to have charge of property, records, and correspondence, purchase and issue of supplies, and general oversight of the attendants. The United States marine hospitals are not provided with matrons, nor with hospital clerks. When the work is too great for one steward, two are assigned to a station. If these employees of the Treasury Department are by law designated as "pharmacists" the value of their services in other respects would be impaired.

Moreover, if hospital stewards are appointed by law to be "permanently attached to the Marine-Hospital Service," "to continue during good behavior of the appointee," it will deprive the Department of discontinuing their services should necessity require a reduction in the number employed.

The same section provides that the hospital stewards or pharmacists shall be known as "warrant officers" of the United States Marine-Hospital Service. I have to state that no such officers are known in the Treasury Department. It is not clear exactly what is meant by the term "warrant officer" in this bill.

Section 2 provides for the pay of said pharmacists. This section is objected to because it gives a newly appointed steward the same compensation as one who has served any number of years less than five, and does not provide for promotion as a result of satisfactory service, as is now provided by the regulations of the Marine-Hospital Service. The matter of compensation of hospital stewards should be left to the Department, subject to such modification as may be necessary by reason of the condition of the fund from which they are paid.

There is nothing provided in this section which can not be as well provided, and more properly, by regulation.

Section 3 provides for the examination before a board of officers of the Marine-Hospital Service. This provision is practically in force at present under regulations; but as these examinations must be held frequently, at remote points, where only one marine-hospital officer is stationed, to require a board to be summoned as provided by this section for said examination would entail additional and unnecessary expense.

Sections 4 and 5 are simply confirmatory of previous provisions of the bill, with the addition of provisions relating to order and precedence in the list and to allowances, both of which are now fixed by regulation.

For the above reasons I am convinced that it would be detrimental to the interests of the Marine-Hospital Service for this bill to become a law.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. HAMLIN, *Acting Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
United States Senate.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ELKINS. The Calendar shows that February 6 the bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., was reported by by me from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment, when in fact the report was adverse and for indefinite postponement. I ask that that order be made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 110) for the relief of Lieut. Herbert Cushman, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 762) for the relief of Henry Lane, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom

was referred the bill (S. 1460) for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Gulf of Mexico and tributary waters, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 79) directing the Secretary of War to furnish an estimate for deepening the channel from Hampton Roads to the navy-yard at Norfolk, Va., and also for improving the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WALTHALL. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 930) to require the auditing and payment of the volunteer soldiers who served in the Seminole Indian wars in Florida, and for horses and equipments lost in the service, to submit an adverse report thereon.

Mr. CALL. I ask that that bill be placed on the Calendar. I wish to say that it is an exceedingly meritorious claim which the people of Florida are greatly interested in. It has been presented to every Congress for many years past. I hope that it will be placed upon the Calendar and that the bill may be passed, notwithstanding the adverse report of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1019) to change the boundaries of the collection district of Key West, Fla., and make Punta Gorda a port of entry, and create a new collection district, to submit an adverse report thereon, and to move its indefinite postponement.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the bill be placed upon the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1796) making an appropriation for a governmental survey of the mouths of the Yukon River, in Alaska, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1920) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1897) to establish a classification division in the United States Patent Office, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3886) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid United States, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 187) to amend the laws relating to navigation, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of War to cause Lieut. Col. Jared A. Smith, Corps of Engineers, to submit a plan and estimate for the further improvement of Conneaut Harbor, in the State of Ohio, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 425) to provide for the register of copyrights, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 27) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., for the ornamentation of the national capital and in honor of Samuel Hahnemann, reported it without amendment.

IMMIGRATION INVESTIGATING COMMISSION.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a resolution providing for printing the report of the Immigration Investigating Commission appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to report it with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, in line 2, before the word "copies," to strike out "bound," and after the word "copies" to insert "in paper cover"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,500 copies in paper cover of the report of the Immigration Investigrting Commission, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury under date of June 13, 1894, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 1,500 copies for the use of the Bureau of Immigration, Treasury Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SPEECH ENVELOPES.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution which I ask may be considered at the present time.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to deliver to the Public Printer such speech envelopes as were in his possession upon the taking effect of the act governing the public printing and binding, etc., approved January 12, 1895; the Public Printer to receipt to the said Sergeant-at-Arms for the said envelopes.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the necessity for that?

Mr. HALE. I do not know that there is any. It is thought that possibly it might require a resolution. It certainly does no harm.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the accompanying letter from the Public Printer be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

MANITOWOC HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 121) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in relation to the harbor at Manitowoc, to report it favorably, without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution was read at length when under consideration yesterday.

Mr. HILL. This resolution presents the same question that was before the Senate yesterday as to the necessity of a joint resolution to procure estimates from the Department. I understand that that is the object of the joint resolution. Of course, if the joint resolution passes it must necessarily go to the President. The Senate may be of opinion, and conclusive opinion, that we are required to have a joint resolution. Ought not the question to be passed upon by some committee? Ought not the Committee on the Judiciary, or some other committee, make a report upon that question, that we may know precisely where we stand and whether we have not the power under the existing status of affairs to ask substantially for information (for that is about what it amounts to) without the consent of the President of the United States? If Senators prefer to introduce joint resolutions from time to time and have the action of the President upon them, that, of course, is their privilege. It strikes me, however, that it is an unnecessary burden cast upon the Senate.

Yesterday the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who now is present, expressed his view, hastily, it is true, that a joint resolution is necessary, and hence the President must approve of this resolution. I now call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to the subject, and ask whether he is inclined still to adhere to that opinion. The point I make is, that it seems to me, before we go much further with this class of resolutions, we ought to have some opinion from some committee that has given the matter attention, in order that we may know how to proceed in the future, or else if we pass a mere concurrent resolution objection may be raised by the Department or by some one else in regard to it.

I merely make this suggestion, not in hostility to this particular resolution, but out of regard to the whole subject. Has it come to this, that we are obliged to have a joint resolution of Congress approved by the President for the purpose of eliciting this class of information when the act of Congress simply provides that the information may be procured by resolution of Congress? It strikes me that it is an important matter, that in some way ought to be determined.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from New York, I beg leave to state that by the last section of the river and harbor act of 1894, the following provision was made and enacted into a law by Congress, and it is the provision under which this resolution has been introduced:

Provided further, That after the regular or formal report on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed is submitted, no supplemental or additional report or estimate, for the same fiscal year, shall be made unless ordered by a resolution of Congress.

That clearly implies both Houses of Congress. The last clause of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution contains the following provision:

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States, and

before the same shall take effect shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

The last Congress having enacted a law prescribing that such reports can only be called for by a resolution of Congress, which means both Houses, I think it is perfectly clear that under this provision of the Constitution, in view of the law of 1894, such resolutions have to be approved by the President.

Mr. HOAR. I made a statement yesterday in substance the same as that just made by the Senator from Minnesota, but I am bound to say that on reflecting on the matter more carefully I have come to the opinion that I was mistaken and that the clause in the Constitution which provides that where the assent of both Houses of Congress is necessary to a measure it must be laid before the President means constitutionally necessary, and that it would not prevent making an arrangement that anything which without a law could be done by one House or perhaps even by one Senator, as a direction for information, might be done by both Houses. The practice in regard to printing—if I am mistaken the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is chairman of that committee, will correct me—has been in that way for a great many years, that where a matter of printing is to cost less than $500 either House may order it of itself, but where it is to cost more than $500 it requires a concurrent resolution. I understand that those resolutions are never sent to the President, and the Senator from Maine affirms this statement, although under the law the assent of both Houses is necessary. So I am satisfied that I was incorrect in what I said yesterday in regard to the matter.

Mr. HILL. Permit me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Minnesota. Is there any special hurry about this resolution? If there is not, I was going to suggest a reference to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator from New York that there is a necessity for prompt action. Parties have been here from Manitowoc, Wis., and they are very anxious to have the harbor deepened there by reason of the fact that two lines of railroads have been built into that place within recent years, and during the winter those roads have to ship their freight on large boats across the river to Michigan, as the outlet by the upper lakes is frozen. In view of these facts it is important to get this report and estimate so that it may be acted upon by the River and Harbor Committee of the House.

I trust the Senator from New York will let this resolution go through this morning. There are a number of other resolutions pending before the committee, where the Senator can have this question investigated further if he desires.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will accede to the request of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances I shall not ask that the resolution go to the Judiciary Committee, although I shall take an opportunity in the near future, either when some such resolution is presented again or in some other shape, to get some authoritative decision on this subject by the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. Why does not the Senator introduce an order asking the opinion of the Judiciary Committee on this subject? There are three or four more of these resolutions, and they are all of them joint, and the reason they are joint is because the War Department has construed the law as requiring that they shall be so.

Mr. HILL. I think I will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Maine and do so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VILAS. I will take no further time now, the objection having been withdrawn.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SACRAMENTO RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. WHITE. From the Committee on Commerce I report a substitute for Senate resolution No. 134, and I ask its immediate consideration. It has a favorable report from the Committee on Commerce.

The joint resolution (S. R. 82) directing the Secretary of War to inquire as to the present condition of the Sacramento River, California, and to estimate the cost of such improvements as may be necessary, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inquire as to the present condition of the Sacramento River in California and the effect upon navigation of the recent floods therein; and to estimate the cost of such improvements as may be necessary to restore said river to its natural channel; and to report generally as to the nature and extent of such work as in his opinion the circumstances of the case require.

Mr. WHITE. I will state that by reason of recent floods, occurring last month, the Sacramento River has practically left its channel, to the destruction of navigation; and the object of this joint resolution is to relieve the Department from the inhibition of section 13 of the last river and harbor act.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHITE. I also report back from the Committee on Commerce resolution No. 134, with a recommendation of indefinite postponement, the matter being covered by the joint resolution which has just been passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

MERCHANT MARINE ENGINEER SERVICE.

Mr. SQUIRE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1242) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve. to report it favorably with amendments.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] has just reported a bill providing that certain engineers, officers on steamships, shall be American citizens. He introduced the bill some time since, and on its introduction censured very severely indeed the American International Navigation Company for its attitude toward this question of American citizenship, making charges which could not be sustained by facts; not that he himself would deal unjustly with anybody—I know that he would not—but he was simply crammed with misinformation. I can not allow that to pass without notice, because the International Line is, to a large extent, a child of my own, and I am proud of it.

In the course of his remarks the Senator from Washington cited the fact that the *St. Paul*, with her foreign engineers, had run aground and that several of them had been killed. As a matter of fact two of the engineers who were killed were native-born American citizens and the other one had filed his intention to become a naturalized citizen. I assert without fear of contradiction that there is not a line of steamships in the United States which has done so much to promote American citizenship as this same International Line. They are educating to-day under the law—and no other company is doing it—46 American-born boys as cadets, who are to be thoroughly educated to fill the petty offices and up to that of commander of the ship, taking, I think, from four to six years' time.

Furthermore, it was stated by the Senator that the engine rooms were officered almost entirely by foreigners. The *St. Louis* has 24 men in the engine room, 21 of whom are citizens, 13 of them native born, and 3 have declared their intention to become citizens. The *St. Paul* has 27 men in the engine room, 22 of them citizens, 9 of them native born, and 5 have declared their intention to become citizens. The *Paris* has 24 men in the engine room; 18 are citizens, 3 native born, and 4 have declared their intentions to become citizens. The *New York* has 25 men in the engine room, 14 of whom are citizens, and 11 have declared their intention to become citizens. In other words, out of a total of 100 men engaged in the engine rooms of these four ships 75 are citizens, 27 native born, 23 have declared their intention and will in due course of time become citizens, and only 2 of the entire force are aliens who have not declared their intention.

The act of March 3, 1891, provided that vessels employed in the mail service should be officered by American citizens in conformity with existing law. Under the advice of the Attorney-General it was held that engineers were not officers. Complaint was made by the American engineers that this was a wrong construction of the law, and the bill reported to-day is intended to correct the law and require American citizenship, and it is reported unanimously from the committee.

I am in favor of American citizenship for the officers of our ships just as earnestly as the Senator from Washington, but when the *New York* and *Paris* came under the American flag they had in their engine rooms men who had been brought up with that machinery, who understood it thoroughly and completely; and with the number of lives that might be put in peril on board those great ships, and with the enormous amount of property, they could not at once change every one of those officers, and they ought not to have done it, but so fast as they could they have made the changes.

Now, consider another thing. The law required that within a certain time 25 per cent of the crew of these vessels should be American citizens. They have gone away beyond that requirement of the law. The *St. Louis*, with an average crew of 382, has 164 of them American citizens. You can not find the same proportion on another vessel in the United States, in my judgment—sailing ship or steamship. The *St. Paul*, with an average crew of 309, has 162 citizens. The *New York*, with an average of 413,

has 156 citizens. The *Paris*, with an average crew of 382, has 159 citizens. Many of the aliens in all the departments of the steamers have declared their intention, taken out their first papers, and are only awaiting the time required by the law before taking final papers and becoming citizens.

Under the law and regulations the deck officers below the grade of second mate are not required to be citizens, but on this American line, which has been so seriously criticised as employing foreigners, every officer in each ship is a citizen of the United States, and the foreign element is made up largely of waiters and stewards, and you can not always get Americans to act in those places. That is the reason they are foreigners.

Nor is this disposition to favor and promote citizenship confined to the four ships which have been Americanized or which are floating the American flag. The International Navigation Company has 22 steamships. Of those, 9 sail under the American flag, 4 under the British flag, and 9 under the Belgian flag. One of the British ships is a spare, not now in commission. Of the 21 ships in commission, 19 are commanded by American citizens and only 2 by aliens, notwithstanding the ships themselves are alien and under foreign flags. There are employed upon those 21 steamers 85 officers, 65 of whom are citizens and only 20 aliens. Out of a total of 106 commanders and officers, 84, or 79¼ per cent, are citizens of the United States, and those, remember, are engaged on Belgian and British ships as well as on American steamers.

Mr. President, I believed it to be my duty, in justice to this line, to say what I have and to indicate to the Senate how marvelously well this line, which has been so seriously attacked, is performing its duty touching American citizenship, and is more than meeting all the requirements of law.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I think it is perhaps due to this question and to myself that I make a few remarks, although I may say that this subject has been unexpectedly sprung upon me this morning. I had no supposition that the honorable Senator from Maine was about to bring up the question or to refer to what I said when I introduced Senate bill No. 1172, which was afterwards superseded by the introduction of the bill which was reported favorably this morning and which I also introduced.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I ask that I may be allowed to read from the RECORD a few sentences, quoting the remarks which I made on the occasion of the introduction of the bill. I then said:

> Mr. President, still another most important feature of the bill is to increase the efficiency of our Naval Reserve. When, a few years ago, a bill was passed granting, under certain conditions, a subsidy to American steamers for carrying the mails to foreign countries, there was a stipulation in that bill that these ships should be "officered by American citizens." When this bill was passed I am sure that it was the belief of every Senator that this meant that, in all parts of the ship upon which her movements and her navigation depended, the responsible men in charge—call them what you will—should be American citizens.
>
> When the steamers of the American Line were accorded the privilege of carrying the American flag, and thus taking advantage of the provisions of the postal subsidy act, the managers of this great line of steamers openly and successfully contended that the provisions regarding citizenship did not apply to the engineers, because, forsooth, in the eyes of the people who control this great line, an engineer was not an "officer"; and so it goes to-day. The ships which we are annually paying a large subsidy for carrying the mails, under the supposition that they are officered by American citizens, actually have only a few real American citizens on board (of course in the engine room to which this bill refers). The rest are foreigners upon whom we could not count in an emergency; men who have no interest in the ships save that which comes from their employment in time of peace. And thus is lost to us the very thing for which we are paying a subsidy—the building up of an American merchant marine and the officering and manning of the ships by truly American citizens——

Mr. FRYE. Now the Senator sees how dreadfully mistaken he was in that statement.

Mr. SQUIRE. If the Senator will pardon me, I will finish the sentence—

> so that in the event of the services of these steamers being required by the Government in case of war with a foreign Government, they would be in a condition to at once be pressed into service. As it is now—

This is the language which I understand the Senator from Maine to criticise:

> The ships of the American Line are officered in their engine rooms almost entirely by foreigners, and this fact was apparent a few days ago, when the papers gave an account of a sad catastrophe on board the American liner *St. Paul*, where most of the engineers are not citizens of this country.

This is every word I said about the St. Paul; referring, of course, to the published list of names and residences as I thought I had a right to do.

The Senator says that he acquits me of any intention to misrepresent in this matter. I thank him for his courtesy in that regard; but he also states that he thinks that I have been misinformed, and that certain pretended facts had been presented to me which were in reality not at all in accordance with the truth. I was governed in making that statement by the reports in the public prints that these engineers were not citizens of the United States, and by statements of men in whom I had a right to place confidence—officers of the American merchant-marine service—highly respectable and responsible men, and in their statements they were backed up by officers of the United States Navy who were familiar with the facts in the case, as was represented to me, and I still have a right to believe they were correct in the main points originally at issue; although it is doubtless true that the conditions have since partly changed, probably in large measure due to the agitation created by the discussion upon this subject. I give the honorable Senator from Maine credit for his loyalty to the great line whose American registry for two ships was secured through his efficient cooperation. At present I am unable to criticise the figures which he submits, as it will take days to verify the records and even their authenticity. I am informed there are men serving on these ships who claim to be Americans who will be unable to prove their citizenship.

Now, let me say in regard to this matter that, as I understand, when these steamships of this great company called the American liners were built there were employed at the time of their construction in England engineers not belonging to this country, who were present from the laying of the keel to the putting in of every element affecting the mechanical construction, and that those engineers were, perhaps, mainly of Scottish nationality.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SQUIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand the Senator from Washington to state that officers of the Navy of the United States had given him information in conflict with the statement of the Senator from Maine in reference to the matter?

Mr. SQUIRE. That is what I stated.

Mr. FRYE. That officers of the Navy had given the Senator information?

Mr. SQUIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRYE. Of course no information can be given which controverts the statement I have made, because it is taken from the records and can be confirmed in the Treasury Department here at Washington.

Mr. SQUIRE. If the Senator will allow me, I do not think we differ so greatly about this matter. As a member of the Committee on Commerce, I have concurred in the amendments to the bill, which was carefully studied and prepared by the chairman of the committee and the other members. I am well aware of the fact that there was some feeling originally generated on both sides; first, among the American engineers from their sense of the injustice perpetrated; and, second, among those who were criticised for what was thought to be an evasion of the law; but it has all been allayed and placated, and it does not seem to me that it was best at this stage of the matter to bring up anything that might seem acrimonious, and therefore——

Mr. PLATT. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to inquire what is the matter before the Senate?

Mr. SQUIRE. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me, I will say I reported a bill from the Committee on Commerce——

Mr. PLATT. In there any question before the Senate?

Mr. SQUIRE. I reported from the Committee on Commerce a bill, with amendments, as authorized by the committee, and the chairman of the committee saw fit to make some statements, in which he called in question statements that I had previously made on the floor of the Senate, and I was endeavoring to briefly explain the situation as I understand it. I shall not occupy the Senate for five minutes.

Mr. PLATT. Suppose that we have unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington is exonerated from any blame or criticism.

Mr. SQUIRE. I prefer, if the Senator will permit me, to complete the explanation.

I wish to state, following up what I remarked at the beginning, that there is no doubt of the fact that the engineers originally employed upon this line were of foreign nationality. I do not think that is disputed. The statement has been made that it was needful that men of such nationality should be employed, that it was impossible to secure the requisite number of competent engineers for those vessels from American sources, of American nationality, and that therefore this company did employ engineers of foreign nationality. There has been no dispute about that; but the provisions of the law were very plain that the officers shall be Americans. To get around that law, a construction of it was obtained, as I understand, from one of the branches of the then existing Administration, namely, the Department of Justice, that the engineers, forsooth, were not officers.

That seems to me to have been a very remarkable and strained construction of the law. In view of the fact that this great company is receiving a large subsidy—I voted for it, and am very glad it is receiving the subsidy, and I do not now object to it—I maintain that it should conform to the spirit of the law as was intended, and that if there is any doubt of the letter of the law that should be corrected as proposed in the bill as reported. I also say that it is right and proper that these engineers of the United States commercial marine should be recognized, and that their rights should be respected as well as the rights and interests of this great corporation. I believe that American engineers are

fully competent for the duties to be performed and that some are showing their competence on this very line.

Furthermore, I wish to explain that, while it is probably true that most, if not all, of these engineers were originally of foreign nationality, many of them did declare their intention to become citizens, and I do not doubt some of them did so in sincerity and with the fullest intention to become citizens of the United States; yet it is not yet proved that they have all become citizens of the United States by any means. There are some of them who have declared their intentions; probably some of them have become citizens; I do not doubt that the number is increasing from day to day and from month to month of those who become citizens; but what the representatives of the engineers of the United States desire, what their friends desire, is that all these men shall in good faith become American citizens if they are to pursue their vocation as engineers of this line of steamships, which is supported by subsidy of the United States Government on the distinct condition that those engineers shall be Americans, that is, that the officers shall be Americans, and we believe that according to any sensible construction engineers are officers, and they are entitled to the rank and the consideration which officers receive, because they have so much to do with the management and the running of these great craft, with their vast and complicated machinery, holding the interests of life and property in their charge.

Again, I may add that I do not wish to assail the patriotism of the officials of the American Line. I rejoice with other Americans that these great ships carry the American flag. If none but Americans are on guard in the engine rooms of these vessels then no injury can befall the company by the passage of this act.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. SQUIRE. I am also directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1172) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant-marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve, to report it adversely, and to ask that the bill be postponed indefinitely, for the reason that the bill just reported by me covers the same subject-matter and is substantially the same with a few important additions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1601) to amend the military record of John S. Evans;

A bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws;

A bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; and

A bill (H. R. 5474) to provide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul land patents, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2190) for the relief of the heirs of G. W. Ebert, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2191) for the relief of Anthony Malvin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PASCO (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2192) to confirm the Andrew Drouillard grant in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 2193) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Mitchell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2194) granting a pension to Mrs. Weltha Post Leggett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 2195) to remove the charge of desertion against Edwin Higgins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2196) granting a pension to William Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2197) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Hippler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2198) to increase the pension of James M. Derby, of Latrobe, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2199) to regulate the delivery of short-paid mail matter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 2200) granting a pension to William H. Morgan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2201) for the relief of the acting (volunteer) officers of the United States Navy in the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2202) to reorganize the line of the Army, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MCBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2203) for the relief of Charles H. Peirce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2204) for the relief of Henry Judge, of Ashland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2205) to pension J. E. Allen, of Company D, Second Regiment California Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 2206) to pension Josiah Biggs;

A bill (S. 2207) to pension John Hoffman for services in the Mexican war;

A bill (S. 2208) to pension Daniel Giles for services in Oregon Indian wars;

A bill (S. 2209) to pension James L. McKinney for services in Oregon Indian wars;

A bill (S. 2210) to pension Ezilda A. Magors, widow of John P. Magors, of Company D, Second Kansas State Militia;

A bill (S. 2211) increasing the pension of Jefferson Fueston, of Company M, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry;

A bill (S. 2212) increasing the pension of Melancthon McCoy, of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Illinois Infantry; and

A bill (S. 2213) to pension William Russell for services in Oregon Indian wars.

Mr. MCBRIDE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2214) for the purchase of letters patent of the Dickenson self-righting and self-bailing lifeboat; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2215) to amend "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2216) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Stevenson, of San Francisco, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2217) granting an honorable discharge to George S. Raymond; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2218) increasing the pension of Jackson J. Lane; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2219) to increase the pension of Henrietta A. Lewis, widow of Capt. R. F. Lewis, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2220) to pension Ellen C. Abbott, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Abbott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2221) for the relief of settlers on the Northern Pacific Railroad indemnity lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 2222) for the relief of William Burden, of Helix, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 2223) granting a pension to Riley W. Pierce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2224) to extend De Sales street, in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2225) for the relief of Col. and Bvt.

Brig. Gen. Henry L. Abbot, United States Army, and brevet major-general United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 83) directing and authorizing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to determine the cost of securing for the United States the channel in the Atchafalaya Bay, Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CANNON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4785) to incorporate the National University; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

LAWS RELATING TO NAVY, MARINE CORPS, ETC.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing the Compilation of Laws Relating to the Navy, Marine Corps, etc., be brought up from March 3, 1883, to March 3, 1896, and indexed; and when completed the Joint Committee on Printing shall report what number of copies of the same shall be printed and bound, the form of the same, and the proper distribution thereof; the cost of said compilation to be covered by appropriations to be reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

FUR SEALS IN BERING SEA, ETC.

On motion of Mr. MORGAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers called for in the resolution of the Senate adopted February 17, 1896, relating to the condition of the fur seals in Bering Sea and the North Pacific Ocean, and other matters relating thereto, be printed for the use of the Senate.

LEGAL EFFECT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution; which was considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and is hereby, directed to inquire and report to the Senate whether under the provisions of the river and harbor act, approved July 13, 1892, the resolution mentioned in the last paragraph of that law is required to be a joint resolution; and whether concurrent resolutions generally are required to be submitted to the President of the United States.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH J. TODD.

Mr. QUAY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the bill (S. 24) for the relief of N. C. Perkins, administrator of the estate of Joseph J. Todd, deceased, and the papers, vouchers, proofs, and documents pertaining to the claim of said Perkins, referred to in said bill, be transmitted to the Court of Claims of the United States for the findings of facts therein upon the following points:

First. Whether the estate of Joseph J. Todd has been settled, excepting the claim included in said bill, so that any amount that may be recovered therefrom will inure to the benefit of the heirs of such intestate, and if so, who are his heirs and what was the age of each at the commencement of the late war, A. D. 1861.

Second. What property, if any, was taken from the said N. C. Perkins, administrator, belonging to the estate of the said Joseph J. Todd, and used by the United States during the late war, and what was the value of such property in lawful money at the time it was taken.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 1601) to amend the military record of John S. Evans was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 5161) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (H. R. 5474) to provide for the extension of the time within which suits may be brought to vacate and annul land patents, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

JOSEPHINE FOOTE FAIRFAX.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous consent yesterday, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill, which was then under consideration in the morning hour, regulating marriages in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator permit me to bring up a small matter pertaining to morning business?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. I call attention to the bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax, which was passed yesterday. I do it for the purpose of asking unanimous consent for a reconsideration, in order that an annoying verbal error may be corrected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none; and the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed will be reconsidered, in the absence of objection. The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. HAWLEY. In line 7, after the words "United States," I move to strike out the word "Army" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONATION OF CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask unanimous consent to take up House bill 1785. I will state to the Senate that it will require probably not more than half a minute to dispose of it. It simply asks for a donation of a little condemned cannon and some cannon balls at St. Paul to a Grand Army post in Kansas, and they are anxious, if they can secure them, to have them before Memorial Day. The bill is reported favorably, and I am sure there will be no objection to it.

Mr. FAULKNER. I shall not object to the bill if there is no discussion upon it.

Mr. PEFFER. I am sure there will not be. If there is, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CULLOM. There is a bill, and this may be the one possibly, where two or three different localities have united in asking for the same thing.

Mr. PEFFER. No; this is a separate bill reported by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5359) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REGULATION OF MARRIAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill relating to the regulation of marriages in the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill indicated by the Senator from West Virginia, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1904) to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. HILL. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, line 3, before the word "person," it is proposed to insert the word "male"; and after the word "age," in line 4, to insert the words "and, if a female, under 18 years of age"; so as to read:

That if any male person intending to marry in the District of Columbia be under 21 years of age, and, if a female, under 18 years of age, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] has some amendments which he desires to offer to the bill. I should like to have them acted upon now, because, if they are adopted, it will necessitate some changes in the bill which I have prepared.

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend section 2 by striking out the word "That," at the beginning thereof, and inserting:

That marriages in the District of Columbia may be celebrated by the judge of any court of record or any justice of the peace.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the Senator use the word "solemnized."

Mr. HOAR. I use the word "celebrated" and not "solemnized" because it is a civil and not an ecclesiastical or religious ceremony.

"That marriages in the District of Columbia may be celebrated before the judge of any court of record or any justice of the peace." Then capitalize the "w" in the word "when," in line 2. After the

word "dollars," in line 7, I move to insert "to comply with the conditions of this act"; and after the words "District of Columbia," in line 9, I move to insert as a part of the second section what is now the third section, merely striking out the word "That" at the beginning thereof. I move to strike out the remainder of section 2, and with respect to that I shall make a motion as soon as this amendment is disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 2 strike out the first word "That" and insert:

That marriages in the District of Columbia may be celebrated by the judge of any court of record or any justice of the peace.

After the word "dollars," in line 7, insert "to comply with the conditions of this act," and after the word "Columbia," in line 9, strike out the remainder of the section and insert:

Marriages between persons belonging to any religious society which has no ordained minister may be solemnized by the person appointed and in the manner prescribed by and practiced in any such society.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That marriages in the District of Columbia may be celebrated by the judge of any court of record or any justice of the peace. When any minister or other person, appointed or ordained according to the rites and ceremonies of his church, shall, before the supreme court of the District of Columbia, produce proof that he is duly appointed or ordained as such, and that he is in regular communion with the religious society of which he is a member, and give bond in the penalty of $500 to comply with the provisions of this act, such court may make an order authorizing him to celebrate the rites of marriage in the District of Columbia. Marriages between persons belonging to any religious society which has no ordained minister may be solemnized by the person appointed and in the manner prescribed by and practiced in any such society.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. Then I move to insert what I send to the desk as section 3, which, with a few changes, is the language of the rest of the second section, just stricken out.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as section 3:

SEC. 3. That no one but a minister or other person authorized by this act shall hereafter celebrate the rites of marriage in this District, anything in any law now in force in said District to the contrary notwithstanding.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. In line 1 of section 6 it is necessary to make an amendment because of the one just adopted. I send the amendment to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend section 6 by inserting, after the word "person," in line 1, the words "who has executed bond under section 2 of this act, and is"; so as to make the section read:

That if any minister or other person who has executed bond under section 2 of this act and is authorized to celebrate marriages in this District shall fail to comply with the provisions of section 8 of this act, the condition of such bond shall be deemed to be thereby broken.

Mr. HOAR. Is that amendment necessary after the amendment just adopted, which provides that the bond shall be to comply with the provisions of the proposed act?

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator will read that section he will find that it provides when the condition of the bond shall be deemed to have been broken. I intend to follow that with an additional clause to be attached to that section. I will suggest the amendment to the Senator, and I shall offer it immediately after the adoption of the pending amendment. It is to this effect, that if a judge of a court of record or a justice of the peace shall fail to comply with the provisions of section 8 of the proposed act, he shall upon conviction be fined, in the discretion of the court, not exceeding $500.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not press the amendment. I think putting a penalty on a judge of a court of record if he does not do according to the law is a novel proceeding. It is not quite consistent with the dignity of a judge of the supreme court of the District of Columbia. If he does not comply with every condition in marriage, the penalty is impeachment, disgrace.

Mr. FAULKNER. No. The penalty would apply to his failure to comply with that provision of the eighth section which forbids him from marrying persons unless under a license. If any officer authorized to celebrate the rites of matrimony in this District feels disposed to run the risk of marrying parties without a license, when the whole of the proposed statute contemplates devolving upon the clerk of the court the entire inquiry as to the propriety and legality of a marriage before issuing the license, I think he ought to be subject to a fine. Certainly we could not allow magistrates in the District, justices of the peace, to have this power without imposing a penalty when we impose such a penalty on ministers and on all others who are invested and clothed with this authority.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. I offer an amendment to come in after the word "broken," in line 4 of section 6.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 6 it is proposed to insert:

And if a justice of the peace shall fail to comply with the provisions of section 8 of this act, he shall, upon conviction, be fined, in the discretion of the court, not exceeding $500.

Mr. PLATT. Is there a penal clause with reference to any other person—clergymen, for instance? As I understand the bill, clergymen are to give a bond and are liable upon their bond, but there is no penalty attached; they are not to be prosecuted in the courts. This seems to make a difference in that respect. Perhaps I have not understood the bill correctly.

Mr. FAULKNER. It does make a difference, because the clergymen are required to give a bond of $500, and the breaking of the condition of the bond is marrying persons without a license. The penalty is exactly the same as that imposed upon a magistrate if he violates the same provision.

Mr. PLATT. The magistrate does not have to give a bond.

Mr. FAULKNER. No, he does not have to give a bond. He is simply clothed with this power, but the penalty is fixed at the same amount if either one of them shall marry persons without a license.

Mr. PLATT. To whom does the clergyman give bond?

Mr. FAULKNER. To the United States; and the condition of the bond is that he will not marry persons without a license.

Mr. PLATT. Does the Senator suppose that if a clergyman should marry persons contrary to the provisions of section 8 and suit were brought against him upon his bond, there would necessarily be recovered the whole amount of the bond?

Mr. FAULKNER. I think so, under the sixth section.

Mr. PLATT. I have always understood that in cases of suit on penal bonds given to the Government judgment against the person whose bond is defaulted is not necessarily rendered for the full amount of the bond.

Mr. FAULKNER. The authorities could not ascertain the amount in any other way than that fixed in the bond, which is the penalty for a breach thereof.

Mr. PLATT. I venture to suggest that if there is a violation of the bond there never will be a judgment obtained against the person who violates the condition of the bond.

Mr. FAULKNER. I hope not. I hope there will be no occasion for it. I do not believe there will ever be occasion for it even in the case of a magistrate. I do not believe that any magistrate will marry persons without the authority of a license, and if he has the license he has no other responsibility under the proposed law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. In section 8, line 6, after the word "minister," I move to insert "or other person authorized to celebrate the rites of marriage."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "minister," in section 8, line 6, it is proposed to insert:

Or other person authorized to celebrate the rites of marriage.

So as to read:

And certificates of the officiating minister or other person authorized to celebrate the rites of marriage shall be numbered correspondingly and consecutively from 1 upward.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. In section 9, line 3, I move to strike out the word "ministers'."

The SECRETARY. In section 9, line 3, before the word "certificates," it is proposed to strike out "ministers'"; so as to read:

That the clerk shall provide a record book of his office, in which shall be filed in the order of their number the certificates upon their return to said office.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. In section 7, line 2, I move to strike out the word "condition"; so as to read:

That it shall be the duty of the clerk to examine and ascertain the full names, ages, color, whether married previously or single, whether related or not, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. In the same section, line 8, I move to strike out the word "condition."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. I offer the amendment that I send to the desk, to be numbered section 10.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, to be numbered section 10, as follows:

SEC. 10. That if the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia shall neglect or refuse to comply with the provisions of this act, he shall, upon conviction, be fined not less than $25 nor more than $500, in the discretion of the court.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE],

whom I see now in his seat, has some doubt as to the proper construction of section 4. As the views of the Senator from Mississippi and those of the committee are in full accord, I send to the desk a substitute for section 4. I move to strike out section 4 and insert what I send to the desk. It will be satisfactory to the Senator from Mississippi.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 4 and insert:

SEC. 4. No marriage heretofore or hereafter solemnized shall be deemed or adjudged to be invalid, nor shall the validity thereof be in any way affected, on account of any want of authority in any person solemnizing the same if consummated with a full belief on the part of the persons so married, or either of them, that they were lawfully joined in marriage.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER. I wish to inquire of the Senator who has charge of the bill whether there is anything in any of the original provisions of the bill or in the amendments which would make unlawful a marriage solemnized in any other way than by the methods provided in the bill?

Mr. FAULKNER. No; under the decisions of the courts I am satisfied that although the requirements of these sections should not be complied with it would not invalidate a marriage, because there is no provision in the proposed act or any section of it which invalidates a marriage by reason of the failure to comply with any one of the provisions. The Supreme Court has passed upon that question very fully, and has held that if there is no such provision in an act, although the requirements of the act are not complied with, it does not invalidate the marriage.

Mr. PEFFER. I know that among certain classes of our people, especially among the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, they have a method of solemnizing marriages among themselves without any special ceremony. I think that is provided for by one of the provisions in the bill.

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes; that is fully provided for.

Mr. PEFFER. It frequently happens that persons ignorant of the law contract marriages, or at least think they do. Such cases are probably covered by the amendment suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr GEORGE]. With the further explanation of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], I am satisfied.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to move to amend by proposing a section to follow section 4, as follows:

SEC. —. No marriage shall hereafter be solemnized in this District to which any citizen of a foreign country shall be a party until a minister or consul representing such foreign country in the United States shall certify that the conditions to the validity of the marriage of the laws of such country have been complied with.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, if he will permit me, that if he will examine the amendment submitted by me yesterday he will find that what he proposes is not necessary. I have examined into the question to which the Senator refers, and——

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from West Virginia had better hear me in favor of the amendment before he objects to it.

Mr. FAULKNER. I did not suppose the Senator had seen the amendment already proposed to the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I have. I have seen it with special reference to this point. That amendment simply adds to section 7 of the bill a requirement that the clerk shall ascertain whether all the requirements of the laws relating to marriage in the country of which he or she is a citizen have been complied with. But it does not provide at all that anything shall happen if the clerk finds the fact to be one way or the other which would not happen in the reverse case. The Senator by his amendment merely imposes upon the clerk the duty of ascertaining whether the requirements of the foreign law have been complied with.

I propose to go further and to provide, not as affecting the validity of the marriage, if it has been actually performed and consummated, leaving that to the forepart of the section, that the magistrate or minister shall not go on with the marriage without the certificate of the consul. I should like to have read, for I think the reason may be stated more compactly in that way, a communication made to me by Mr. Wilson, formerly consul at Nice, stating some very curious facts that have come to his knowledge.

We want to protect American girls who are attractive by reason of their beauty or accomplishments or the possession of a fortune from the rapacity of adventurers, whether titled or untitled, belonging to foreign countries. As the law exists at present, for instance, no person in a foreign army can contract a lawful marriage with an American girl without the assent of his own government. In France and in some other countries no person under 25 years of age can contract a lawful marriage without the assent of his parents. No person over 25 years of age can contract such a lawful marriage without notice to his parents, if they be living, to give them an opportunity to file objections, though their consent is not necessary.

So a person of that character can come here and contract a marriage with an American woman, take her home, and although he may have dwelt here with her as her husband for ten years, she can be turned out and the marriage is absolutely null and void there. It is carried so far that in one case, which is stated in the document that I have just sent to the desk, a German lived here with a lawful American wife for eight or ten years, had several children, then went home and lived with her in Germany as his wife for a little while. Then he married another woman, his American wife being living. The American marriage was held void.

Then he died, and there was a contest between the American wife and the German wife in your State, Mr. President, the State of Illinois, as to which was entitled to administer upon and succeed to the estate as wife. The Illinois court was compelled to hold that the question of the lawfulness of the marriage was settled by the law of the place where they had been living together, and in Germany the American marriage was held void. So our court, though the marriage was perfectly valid according to our law, was constrained to follow the decision of the German court.

I should like to have the statement, which is very brief, read.

Mr. FAULKNER. Before that is read——

Mr. HOAR. Let it be read. I want to have the two things go together.

Mr. FAULKNER. I think the Senator has stated all that is in the paper.

Mr. HOAR. Let me have it read, so that the two things will get together in the RECORD.

Mr. FAULKNER. I want to get through with the bill by 2 o'clock.

Mr. HOAR. I have no doubt; but these foreign adventurers will not get through their marriages before 2 o'clock. I want to see the matter carefully protected. Let the paper be read. It is very short.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary proceeded to read the paper.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from West Virginia is anxious to get through with the bill before 2 o'clock, and the rest of the paper, the substance of which I stated, may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The paper is as follows:

Senator HOAR:

I address myself to that section of the proposed marriage law introduced by Senator FAULKNER which relates to licenses to marry foreigners in this country or this District.

The evil sought to be corrected by this proposed section (which I suggested myself to Senator FAULKNER) arises out of the following conditions:

The requisites of a valid marriage are not the same in Germany, France, and, possibly, other countries, as they are in the United States. Possibly they may not be exactly the same in England as in the United States. For example, a deceased wife's sister might make a valid marriage in the United States and which might not be valid in England. In Germany no man in the army may marry without the consent of his Sovereign. In France no man under 25 may marry without the consent of his parents, and if over 25 he may not marry without giving his parents notice thereof, to the end that they may make objection if they desire. There are many provisions of the marriage laws of these countries which are directory only, and it makes no difference in the validity of the marriage whether they are observed or not; but the foregoing are fundamental and are absolutely requisite to the making of a valid marriage and one which will be recognized by the laws of these countries, whatever ceremony may have been performed, and however legal it might have been in the country where performed.

So true is this that a marriage ceremony might be performed in the United States by an archbishop or cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, one which would be recognized as valid by the Pope of Rome, and yet it would be void, or at least voidable, when contested in the courts of either of the countries mentioned, and possibly of others. To such extent is this true that a cause célèbre in Illinois may be cited in illustration: A man born in Germany attained about his majority owing military duty, emigrated to Illinois. He settled there, bought a farm, married a wife, reared a family of children, and lived there for twenty-five years, growing quite well off, and having considerable landed property. At the end of twenty-five years he returned to Germany, there became enamored of a woman, and sought her in marriage. The return to his domicile of origin, together with the German laws against expatriation, coupled with the fact of his unperformed military duty, made it comparatively easy, when in accordance with his desire, for him to regain his citizenship in his own (German) country. This once established, he commenced proceedings in the courts of that country for a divorce from his Illinois wife.

It does not appear that he proceeded secretly, or without her knowledge, and, indeed, there was no necessity for it, for the law of his country was all on his side. The facts were undoubted, he owed the military service, and whatever pretended marriage he had made was without the consent of his Sovereign or superior. The divorce was granted and he married his German wife, lived with her for some time, had children, then died. His German wife was appointed administratrix of his estate in the jurisdiction of his domicile at the time of his death. Armed with this authority she went to Illinois and demanded to be appointed administratrix of the estate there. The Illinois wife resisted the application, and the case was taken to the supreme court of the State, which decided that the decedent had become domiciled in Germany, that the German courts had full jurisdiction over both the divorce and the administration of his estate, and that their decision upon these two questions was binding upon all other courts, especially those of Illinois, and so they decided in favor of the German wife, and the Illinois wife was driven out from her home and left penniless.

This is only one illustration. There are hundreds of cases which have happened showing the inequality and iniquity growing out of such proceedings. We are to be thankful that every foreigner who goes to another country and there marries a wife is not a villain, but there are enough of them to make this an evil requiring correction. A Frenchman who, under 25 years of age, marries an English or American girl without the consent of his parents, or, if over 25, without notice to them, can bring his wife to Paris, walk into his own or his father's residence, and at the door can turn his wife and children away as vagabonds and dissolute persons, and if she or they shall claim the

man as husband or father the law of France against la recherché de paternité prohibits any investigation, and if they ask for support or maintenance they can be arrested as blackmailers.

To such an extent has this been carried—and only a few cases are sufficient—that England and France, for the purpose of correcting the evil, have entered into a convention by which, under the decree of the French Government and the notification by Jules Ferry, President, all consuls of France on duty in England were directed to examine, upon the proper application of any French citizen proposing marriage in England, whether the requisite of French law had been satisfied, so that the marriage when made in England and in accordance with English law would be held valid in France. Under this convention these void or voidable marriages of French citizens made in England have ceased practically.

It is to bring about substantially this condition of affairs that the particular section of the bill introduced by Senator FAULKNER in relation to marriages in the District of Columbia was introduced, and this is the evil sought to be corrected thereby.

The Congress can not accomplish it in the same way as was done by England. To make a treaty or convention is within the jurisdiction of the Executive only, and it appears as though the only method for the legislative bodies to act is (1) by educating the people and calling their attention to the condition of affairs, so that parents and friends of brides can see that the necessary steps under foreign laws have been taken, to the end that the marriage made within the District and valid according to our laws shall be equally valid and binding in the domicile of the husband or the country to which he may belong; (2) by providing that the license shall not be issued or the ceremony performed until the requisites of the foreign law to make a valid marriage shall have been complied with. The section in question seeks to accomplish it by the latter method, while the first method of relief will go out of the discussion.

But the section proposed by Senator FAULKNER, while eminently good so far as it goes, will not accomplish the desired end. It takes cognizance of the conditions and seeks to remedy them by requiring the oath of the foreigner proposing marriage that all the legal requirements of his country have been complied with. This, however, will be of no avail, because: (1) The marriage does not become invalid nor in the slightest degree affected until after the parties shall have departed this country and established themselves in their foreign country. In fact, so long as they reside in this country the marriage is valid and binding, and no prosecution for perjury would lie. It is only after they shall have returned to their own country that it becomes necessary, and then it is unavailing. (2) The foreigner married here, and who has taken this oath here, may remain in this country in quietness and peace a happily married man until the statute of limitation against the perjury committed at the time of his marriage shall have expired, as in the case of the Illinois man, many times over.

Therefore I propose that the case requires an additional remedy, something beyond simply the oath of the proposed foreign husband. To demand his oath is all right; it would have a deterring effect, but it is not sufficient, and the necessary amendments should be made by which some officer—either the licensing officer or the officiating clergyman—should have the right and authority to examine the bridegroom under oath and to ask questions such as might be deemed necessary in order to satisfy him that these legal requirements had been complied with. The object of this is to prevent the issuance of the license and the performance of the marriage ceremony until it shall be known with reasonable certainty that the marriage about to be celebrated, and which is valid and binding upon the wife, wherever she may live, is equally binding upon the husband when he shall return to the country of which he is a citizen or subject.

Yours, very truly, THOMAS WILSON.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am satisfied——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, he suggests instead of the amendment prohibiting the solemnization of marriage the amendment should provide that the clerk shall not issue the license.

Mr. FAULKNER. That the clerk shall not issue the license. In other words, the theory of the bill is to have all the evidence in the validity of the marriage in the clerk's office. The amendment that I submitted yesterday and which was adopted was suggested to me by the gentleman who has suggested the same thing to the Senator from Massachusetts. I thought I had made the provision sufficiently stringent to bring that to the attention of the clerk, and hoped then to call the attention of the State Department to the necessity of entering into such an arrangement with England and Germany, those two countries especially, as England has done with France, in reference to the certificate necessary to show the right of a native of either of those countries to enter into the contract of marriage.

Mr. HOAR. I have corrected the amendment according to the Senator's suggestion. Let it be read again.

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes; let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a new section, after section 4:

No license for any marriage shall hereafter be issued to which any citizen of a foreign country shall be a party until a minister or consul representing such foreign country——

Mr. HOAR. It is not necessary to read the whole of it unless some one desires it. That is the only change. Instead of addressing the prohibition to the minister, it is addressed to the clerk in issuing the license, and the minister of course can not perform the marriage without the license.

Mr. FAULKNER. I should like to hear the whole of it read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the remainder of the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

Until a minister or consul representing such foreign country in the United States shall certify that the conditions to the validity of the marriage of the laws of such country shall have been complied with.

Mr. FAULKNER. I see no objection to that amendment. It is exactly in accordance with the rule adopted between England and France, as has been suggested.

Mr. CALL. I should like to hear the amendment read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be again read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert a new section, to follow section 4, as follows:

No license for any marriage shall hereafter be issued to which any citizen of a foreign country shall be a party until a minister or consul representing such foreign country in the United States shall certify that the conditions to the validity of the marriage of the laws of such country shall have been complied with.

Mr. CALL. That seems to me to be a very dangerous amendment. It is a limitation upon the right to marry, and prevents the marriage of a foreigner in this country until he shall have complied with the laws of his native country. For instance, if he were a soldier in the German army and not properly discharged, and should escape here, it seems to me it would be quite a hardship to say that he should not marry in this country because the law of Germany forbids a soldier not properly discharged and escaping from the army from marrying there.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, this provision does not make the marriage void at all. It only prohibits the minister from solemnizing it until this has been done; and without such a provision, if the man still retains his foreign citizenship and takes his wife back to his native country, she goes back as a concubine and not as a lawful wife, although she may believe herself lawfully married according to our law. It is only to protect our citizens against adventurers.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask that the numbering of the other sections from 4 down be changed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALES AND PROCEEDS OF SALES OF BONDS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution as to sales and proceeds of sales of bonds, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday, may go over until Monday, retaining its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PEFFER. I give notice now of an amendment which I shall propose when the resolution comes up. I shall move to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert the following as a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts:

That a committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the Vice-President, whose duty it shall be—

First. To investigate and report generally all the material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

Second. To investigate and report specially what amount of available funds, classified, was in the United States Treasury and on deposit in other places, subject to the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the bonds were sold or offered for sale; whether there was or was not coin enough on hand to meet all coin obligations of the Government due at the time said bonds were sold or when they were offered for sale; what obligations were due at that time and the amount of each, stated separately; what was the reason for any unusual withdrawal of coin from the Treasury shortly before bonds were sold or offered for sale, if such unusual withdrawals were in fact made, and by what persons or classes of persons and for what purpose or on what account such withdrawals were made; who purchased the bonds, in what amounts, and where, whether in the United States or in foreign countries, and in what proportions, and from what persons or classes of persons the gold was procured with which to pay for the bonds, what the bonds sold for, and what was the market price of our Government bonds at the time, and what effect the bond sales had on the credit and business of the people of the United States.

Third. To investigate and report as to the manner of disposing of said bonds, by what authority, and what contracts, advertisements, or proposals were made by the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto; what agreements or contracts, and whether oral or in writing, and whether publicly or privately, were entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury and any other person or persons with respect to the sale and purchase of the bonds and what profits were made by the purchasers; whether any officer of the Government, or any person or persons for such officer, and on his behalf, and in his personal interest, and with his knowledge or consent, entered into any contract, agreement, or arrangement, directly or indirectly, with any person or persons, partnership, corporation, company, or syndicate, for the purpose of affecting the price offered or to be offered for said bonds or any of them, with the intent and expectation to receive commission or personal reward by reason of such contract, agreement, or arrangement; whether such contract or agreement had any and what effect on the prices offered for the bonds, what the effect was, and who, if any person, profited by it, and to what extent.

DISTRICT JAIL WALL.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1780) to provide for the erection of a wall around the jail of the District of Columbia. It will take but a few moments, and it is a very important measure to the District.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was in line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary"; so as to read:

That the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended, under the direction of the Attorney-General, in the erection of a brick or stone wall to inclose the grounds upon which the jail in the District of Columbia now stands, including the purchase of material and the employment of such skilled and other labor as may be necessary for the purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the word "purpose," in line 10, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That one-half the moneys so appropriated shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED ORDNANCE.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. 1865) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls in their respective Departments. It will lead to no debate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, after the word "Department," in line 10, to insert:

And the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are each hereby authorized, in their discretion, to loan or give to soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, and municipal corporations, condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls which may not be needed in the service of either of said Departments. Such loan or gift shall be made subject to rules and regulations covering the same in each Department, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Maine that the words "Soldiers' Homes" be put into the bill as an amendment.

Mr. HALE. I do not know but that that is covered by the phrase of the bill; but there is no harm to be done by the insertion of those words, and I do not object.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to state to the Senator from North Dakota that the other House has passed a bill in respect to the distribution of cannon balls, and there is a general law which authorizes the Secretary of War to furnish guns to the Soldiers' Homes. The Ordnance Department have suggested an amendment to the bill so as to authorize the distribution of cannon balls to the Soldiers' Homes. I have been authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back the substitute which the War Department has furnished, and within a day or two the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have no objection to this bill going through without the amendment I suggested if the Senator from Illinois thinks he will be able to have the bill passed which he has in charge.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT SMITH AND WESTERN COAL RAILROAD.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent to call up for consideration at this time the bill (S. 1617) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. COCKRELL. Instead of considering the Senate bill I ask that the bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, may be taken up in its place and considered. The bill is on the table.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. House bill 4153 is in the precise language of the Senate bill, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, except as to two provisions. One simply provides that a bridge across a short stream that runs out from the river may be built, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and the other provides that the whole line of the road shall be located and approved by the Secretary of War before any work shall be begun. These changes have been submitted to a decided majority of the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and they approve of them, because the House bill reduces the number of feet given to the railroad company as the right of way, and also for stations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the resolution reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] from the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to war in Cuba.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope, by unanimous consent, that resolution will be temporarily laid aside until this bill can be passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill (S. 1617) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5359) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the unfinished business be now proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution reported by Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, February 5, 1896, as a substitute for the concurrent resolution reported January 29, 1896, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], on behalf of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to interpose his friendly offices with the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to offer that as a substitute for the resolution reported by the committee; so it is the first question to be put to the Senate.

Mr. CALL. I understand it is proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania to offer another resolution as an amendment. I desire to be informed on that point.

Mr. CAMERON. That may or may not come later on. All that I shall propose to-day is the resolution which has just been read as a substitute for the resolution of the majority of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the recognition of independence of Cuba or according belligerent rights, as may be the result of this consideration of the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, depends rightfully upon the established policy of this Government, upon the condition of the war in Cuba, and the capacity of the people there to assert and maintain their independence. Some other considerations naturally and properly enter into the question. The duty of the United States to interpose in a territory immediately adjacent to her own and with which her people not only now have but must in the future have the most important relations will be determined properly by a consideration of the fact whether or not the interests of civilization, of humanity, the suppression of cruelty and bloodshed, and destruction of property of the most extreme and reprehensible character, are not proper subjects to influence the action of this body and of the Government of the United States.

These considerations all unite in demanding from the United States not only the recognition of the war in Cuba as one between belligerent powers and according belligerent rights to the people of Cuba, now having established an independent government and proclaimed it, but that our Government should recognize the independence of that island.

I will state the facts in regard to the case. The provinces of Spain throughout the American Continent of North and South America during a series of years have asserted their independence and thrown off their allegiance to the Spanish Government, leaving alone the Island of Cuba and an adjacent island subject to the dominion of that Government.

From 1816 until the present time the United States have been appealed to by the people of the different Spanish colonies; first, to recognize them as belligerents, and then to recognize their independence. In every instance of the vast colonial possessions of Spain upon the American Continent the policy of that Government, unfortunately, has provoked a profound discontent, which has resulted in organized revolution on the part of their people. I shall not detain the Senate by reading the different citations which are before me from the several Administrations in power at different periods of time, but with the leave of the Senate shall insert them in the observations which I shall make upon this subject.

Those citations may, however, briefly be stated thus: The United States in reply to the different appeals from the Governments which had overthrown the Spanish dominion—from Chile, Peru, Bolivia, the United States of Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico—in all those cases the Administration of the United States has affirmed the right of the people to assert their independence and our sympathy with them, and that so far as could be done within the established law of nations they should be recognized as independent republics, and that in the meantime they should have belligerent rights, as Mr. Monroe and his Secretary of State declared, and that free access to all opportunities to purchase anything which could be purchased by any other nation should be accorded to their people struggling for independence.

Until the present Administration, I affirm—having read the history of those several contests—there has not been a single instance in which belligerent rights, with the full and free opportunity of purchase of everything that any other nation might purchase—for that is the language used by Mr. Adams in his correspondence with the agents (not recognized as ministers, but with the agents) of those foreign governments—that every right possessed by a belligerent nation, and the right of purchase freely, without limitation, of munitions of war, and, using the expression, that everything that could be purchased by any other nation, was accorded to them. We know the result of those struggles.

Now, take the instance of Cuba. Our diplomatic history is full upon that subject. From the period shortly preceding the year 1823, up to the present time, revolt after revolt has occurred in the island of Cuba. Our Government, recognizing in its correspondence the extreme disorders in the government of Cuba and the right of the people to establish their revolution, but adhering to the principles of neutrality, and being restrained by the consideration of the peculiar institution, as stated in Mr. Everett's letter, here before me, existing in the Southern States, and the institution of slavery existing in Cuba, and the effect which would be had upon the slave States by the recognition of the independence of Cuba or the disturbance of the colonial dominion of Spain upon this large part of the population of the Southern States, but also considering the importance and the absolute intention and policy of this Government, forbade any acquisition of this island by any foreign country. The right of the Cuban people to assert their independence and the sympathies of the people of the United States with that effort is stated fully and continuously from the days of Mr. Monroe to the present time.

Mr. President, what have we at this time? From 1868 to 1879 the revolt continued. In 1879, not suppressed by violence, after being maintained for ten years with armed forces, a compromise was effected, by which the people of Cuba were promised autonomy and self-government. They were promised a relief from the taxation which covers more than 48 per cent of the entire production of that island, which effectually would crush and destroy the means of subsistence of any other people than those living upon the extremely fertile lands of Cuba. No Cuban is permitted to hold important office. Vast sums of money are paid as rewards for oppressive and cruel exercise of the power of taxation over the people of Cuba, as stated in the manifesto which they have put out. I shall refer for a single moment to this statement:

> At the office of the minister of "Ultramar" (of the colonies), who resides in Madrid, and to whom $96,800 a year are assigned from the treasury of Cuba—

That is the salary of one officer residing in Spain—

> at that office begins the saturnalia in which the Spanish bureaucrats indulge with the riches of Cuba. Sometimes through incapacity, but more frequently for plunder, the money exacted from the Cuban taxpayers is unscrupulously and irresponsibly squandered. It has been demonstrated that the debt of Cuba has been increased in $50,232,500 through Minister Fabie's incapacity.

That is a picture of the administration of that island of 1,600,000 people. I do not desire to speak in terms of harsh and improper censure of Spain. This paper continues:

> At the time this minister was in power the Spanish Bank disposed of twenty millions from the Cuban treasury, which were to be carried in account-current at the disposal of the minister for the famous operation of withdrawing the paper currency. Cuba paid the interest on these millions, and continued paying it all the time they were utilized by the bank. Minister Romero Robledo took at one time (in 1892) $1,000,000 belonging to the treasury of Cuba from the vaults of the Bank of Spain and lent it to the Transatlantic Company, of which he was a stockholder. This was done in defiance of law and without any authorization whatever. The minister was threatened with prosecution; but he haughtily replied that if prosecuted all his predecessors from every political party, would have to accompany him to the court. That threat came to nothing.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator permit me to inquire from what he reads?

Mr. CALL. I read from the manifesto put forth by the Cuban government in making the declaration of their independence.

Mr. MORGAN. Has that paper been sent by our Government to Congress?

Mr. CALL. Oh, no; that paper has not been sent us. This is a public manifesto published by the Cuban government, and is not an official document. It is signed by Enrique José Varona. I suppose that he has official connection with the Cuban government.

> In June of 1890 there was a scandalous debate in the Spanish Cortes, in which some of the frauds committed upon the Cuban treasury were, not for the first time, brought to light. It was then made public that $6,500,000 had been abstracted from the "Caja de Depositos," notwithstanding that the safe was locked with three keys, and each one was in the possession of a different functionary. Then it was known that, under the pretext of false vouchers for transportation and fictitious bills for provisions during the previous war, defalcations had been found afterwards amounting to $22,811,516.

That is presented for consideration as a justification and vindication of the action on the part of the Cuban people, an action which has been continuous, beginning in 1868, in consequence of the refusal to grant to the Cubans any kind of influence in the imposition of the taxes upon themselves, until the taxing of the Cuban people has grown to be, under the influence of those methods, so oppressive as to deprive the great mass of the people of power to procure the ordinary necessaries of life and to place the island, with the exception of a few large estates, in a complete condition of poverty; and that the richest island in the world.

> But the naked figures of the Cuban budgets and of the Cuban debt tell very little in regard to their true importance and signification as machines to squeeze out the substance of a people's labor. It is necessary to examine closer the details of these accounts and expenditures.
>
> Those of Cuba, according to the last budgets or appropriations, amount to $26,411,314, distributed as follows:

General obligations	$12,884,549.55
Department of justice (courts, etc.)	1,006,308.51
Department of war	5,918,598.16
Department of the treasury	727,892.45
Department of the navy	1,091,969.65
Government, administration	4,035,071.43
Interior improvements (Fomento)	746,922.15

> There are in Cuba 1,631,687 inhabitants, according to the last census, that of 1887. That is to say, this budget burdens them in the proportion of $16.18 for each inhabitant. The Spaniards in Spain pay only 42.06 pesetas per head. Reducing the Cuban dollars to pesetas at the exchange rate of $95 for 500 pesetas, there results that the Cubans have to pay a tribute of 85.16 pesetas for each inhabitant; more than double the amount a Spaniard has to pay in his European country.

We can form some idea of the condition of the people from that statement.

This revolt was brought about by the intelligent and educated Spaniards who live in Cuba, natives of Cuba, and I undertake to affirm that no country, no period of time, presents a record of more distinguished ability, more heroism, more patriotism, more self-sacrifice and courage than that which is presented by the effort of the people to establish their independence. For ten years up to 1868 and 1870 they maintained the struggle. Hundreds and thousands of them were put to death, the women outraged, the children slaughtered, and authentic accounts in our own records here and by our own officials are presented to us for the truth of those statements.

This disorder and this oppression and this cruelty in the administration of the island continued until last year. Our Government, under General Grant, not only demanded but implored, desired, and suggested in every form of diplomatic intercourse certain reforms in Cuba to the Spanish Government, but finally the promises, under the seal of Martinez Campos, were denied. The record in this book shows how they were denied; how this continued imposition grew and grew, until it has resulted in taxation more than twice as great upon each inhabitant of the Island of Cuba as that imposed upon the subjects of Spain in Europe.

These people again declared their independence, again assembled and proclaimed a provisional constitution similar to our own, again assembled in arms, and last summer commenced what may be considered a continuous revolt, as was the case in the other South American Republics.

This correspondence shows that the agent of Venezuela informed the Government of the United States that the Spanish Government maintained a great army in Venezuela during the whole period of their controversy, and this armed force was still maintained at the time when the Government of the United States recognized their independence. So also with Chile; so with Peru; but these colonies had met in a congress and proclaimed their independence, and defended it for a period of time similar to that of the revolution of 1868 in Cuba, with the single exception that the people in Cuba laid down their arms temporarily under the promise of autonomy of self-government, of practical independence, subordinated to Spain by an authority like the Canadian

Government and Great Britain, of a nominal connection between some of its departments. With that single exception the cases are alike in the Spanish South American colonies and in Cuba. The Spanish forces were defeated time and again, but they still, at the period of the recognition of their independence by Mr. Monroe, and the sending of a minister to them, maintained armed forces, still asserted the sovereignty and dominion of Spain over these South American Republics, which had erected, preserved, and maintained a government of their own.

I shall not detain the Senate by reading at length from the diplomatic reports which I have here before me, and which I may print for the information of any who may desire to read them, but I will now look at the status of the war in Cuba to see whether or not, as asserted by Mr. Fish, the longer preservation of the colonial relation between Spain and Cuba, and the sovereignty of Spain over that island, can be preserved—whether the independence of that country is not, as stated by him ten years ago, an inevitable fact.

If that be true, what motive of policy can exist that our Government should permit the destructive, cruel, and bloody war to continue, when, without offense to the law of nations and the declarations in all our diplomatic correspondence, we may rightfully recognize the independence of the government of Cuba established by the Cuban people.

Let us see what is the status of this war. I will read from the report made to Congress by the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the House of Represenatives. Mr. Pulaski F. Hyatt, United States consul at Santiago de Cuba, under date of May 4, 1895, in the beginning of this struggle, writes as follows:

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Santiago de Cuba, May 4, 1895.

SIR: I have the honor very respectfully to report that there arrived at this port during the present week about 2,000 recruits for the Spanish army, making in all about 10,000 that have been landed at this port alone during the past five weeks.

On April 25 a battle occurred near —— between Colonel Bosch, commanding 450 Government troops, and Gen. José Maceo, commanding 650 insurgents. The Government forces were driven back into town with considerable loss. General Maceo later gave permission to Colonel Bosch to gather up the dead and wounded.

On May 1 a fight occurred near Santa Ana with about 300 men on each side. No particular advantage seemed to have been gained by either party. Both sides are reported to have lost from 10 to 15 killed.

During the past week about 100 young men have left Santiago to join the insurgent forces. Many of these young men belonged to the better families of the town, which gives a new phase to the uprising.

It is my judgment that both sides are about as well prepared for the contest as they are likely to be in the near future. The good name of Gen. Martinez Campos adds strength to the Government side of the question, but the insurgents nevertheless show no signs of weakening.

I am, etc.,

PULASKI F. HYATT, *Consul.*

On the 11th of May Mr. Hyatt says:

Monday night the rebels attacked Cristo, a town 10 miles distant, on the Sabinilla and Maroto Railroad, derailed an engine, and burned two bridges. The road is operated and owned mostly by American citizens. Martinez Campos has recommended Government aid to this road for the purpose of extending the same and furnishing employment to the many men who will soon be thrown out of employment by the shutting down of sugar mills, and it is feared that without work the men will drift into the rebel army. Martinez Campos's proposition is that Spain shall loan the railroad company $20,000 per month while the road is building, which shall be gradually returned after the road is completed. An agent of the company has gone to the States to consult with the stockholders.

The Government commenced holding back blasting powder from the Paragon Iron Mining Company (American) to an extent that crippled mining operations. The reason given was that the powder might fall into the hands of the rebels and be used for war purposes. Mr. Ziegenfus, the superintendent, informed the Government officials that if he could not have powder enough to keep going he would close the mines, and it was for them to consider whether they wanted these men turned loose without employment. This had the desired effect, and blasting powder is now handed out freely.

Friends of the insurrection claim that they are as far advanced now at the end of three months as they were at the end of three years in the former rebellion. They claim now to have 10,000 men under arms in the province of Santiago and to have 4,000 more doing effective work.

Morlot Lacret and Roloff el Polaco, two chiefs of the former rebellion, are reported to have landed on Wednesday at Portillo with arms and ammunition for the insurgents.

An effort is now being made to get resident volunteers to enlist on the side of the Government, with what success I am unable to say.

On the 18th of May he says:

On Sunday morning last a deserted schooner without name was discovered near this place, which is supposed to have landed men and munitions of war for the insurgents. A similar case is reported to have happened near Manzanillo a few days earlier.

The uprising at the extreme eastern end of the island and around Baracoa is reported to be general.

On Monday, the 13th, 400 men are said to have left Holquin in a body to take up arms against the Government.

Perhaps the most sanguinary battle that has taken place up to the present time occurred on the 13th and 14th instant, near Guantanamo. The Spanish authorities claim that with 400 men they put to rout the enemy, 3,400 strong, inflicting severe loss on the rebels.

The rebels claim that there were over 2,000 Spaniards engaged in the first day's battle, and that they punished them severely, driving them into the town and inflicting a loss of over 200 in killed and wounded, including among the killed the commander, Colonel Bosch, and several other officers, while their own loss was insignificant; but finding that on the second day the Government forces had been strengthened, they thought it prudent to retire.

And the statements from this consul go on up to the present time, showing almost every day a battle between the insurgent forces and the armed and regular forces of Spain, and they exhibit the fact that in all these cases he reports victories on the part of the insurgent forces, contrary to the reports which we see in the newspapers of Spanish engagements, and he reports that the people of Cuba are unanimous that in these different contests they have maintained by force of arms their superiority and their control of the island. These facts are to be found in this diplomatic correspondence of the consul of the United States at Santiago de Cuba.

Mr. President, if this be so—and that is the information we have from a reliable authority, from our own consular agent, giving dates, giving numbers, and giving the circumstances that surround the case and confirming his statements—I ask the question, Spain having acknowledged the belligerent rights of the Southern Confederacy, and England having acknowledged the belligerent rights of the Southern Confederacy in its very inception, we having acknowledged the sovereign right of the new Government of France in the very first days of its existence, having these examples before our eyes of the action of our own Government in recognizing the independence of the revolted Spanish colonies, what reason can we now give for withholding our recognition of the independence of Cuba, when we see that blood is running from the cruel and brutal outrages committed upon the people of Cuba for the purpose of suppressing by cruelty, and not by force of arms, what? Their aspirations for freedom under the lessons which we have taught and the advice which we have given to them.

What grounds of public policy are there to be considered in this matter? Can Spain preserve her dominion of Cuba? We have said for many years that she can not. Is it to her interest that she should continue this terrible war? Is it to our interest, as a matter of policy, that Cuba should be destroyed and that reprisals of blood and murder, the shooting of prisoners captured in war, and the killing of people who were found away from their homes shall be continued? I call attention to the recent order of the Spanish general, with power of life and death over every human being in that island, for the summary shooting of all Cubans found away from their homes without a pass or a license or a permit, his proclamation of death to be inflicted by his subordinates upon suspicion alone of any kind of complicity, of any kind of sympathy, with the rebellion and the attempt to establish the independence of Cuba.

Mr. President, this is the result of our action. We proclaim that if there be any shipment of arms for the purpose of aiding the insurgents they shall be arrested by our people. We proclaim the utmost rigor, not only in the detention of vessels and expeditions which may be openly ascertained and proclaimed to be for the purpose of aiding the insurgents, but in every possible method of inquisition where they sail for another country, for another port, and have on board munitions of war of any kind, we take all the circumstances surrounding the case to prove that their destination is to the Island of Cuba, and we are waging this war ourselves against the Cuban people by these acts of ours of extreme and severe exercise of the power to prevent aid and sympathy and active assistance to them.

I have made a very brief statement, Mr. President, and I do not propose to detain the Senate for any great length of time; but I do affirm that no argument has been made, and, in my opinion, no argument can be made, against the passage of a resolution not only recognizing the belligerency, but that which would be very well to accompany it and in harmony with it, recognizing the absolute independence of the government of Cuba.

It has been said, first appeal to Spain. Why? General Grant did that; Mr. Fish did that. Here is the correspondence. Mr. Fish, through our minister to Spain, said to Spain in regard to Cuba, "We can not permit any other country to own and possess Cuba. The policy of the United States demands, because of its proximity and its commercial relations and its relations to the military defense and to the sanitary conditions of this country, that we should exercise our power to prevent its transfer to any other government; and it is impossible that you can maintain your Government over those people for any great length of time. Why not recognize the fact and accept the friendly offices of the United States for mediation, send no more troops there, stop these unheard-of atrocities which shock the conscience and sentiment of the American people and of the civilized world?" What was the answer Spain gave, and gave under that enlightened general who has been removed because he said, "If you want the atrocity repeated of 300 students shot and murdered in cold blood because they would not renounce their devotion to the independence of their native country, you must find some other person than I to do it"? Under this enlightened, this humane man's administration she promised to the Cuban people that if they would lay down their arms under the mediation of the United States they should have independence. But Spain said to this Government,

"It is not your business. We will not recognize your right to interfere. Spain will agree with you that she will moderate and ameliorate the conditions of war and grant reforms to Cuba, but she will not, and does not, recognize your right to mediate or interfere in the affairs of Spain."

Now, Mr. President, what reason is there for our appealing to Spain? The act of recognition, says Mr. Monroe, and so say all our Presidents down to Mr. Buchanan, and so said General Grant, is not an act of war. We did not consider Spain as making war upon us when she recognized the independence of the Confederate States and accorded to them belligerent rights. We did not consider it an act of war when England accorded belligerent rights to the Confederate Government in the very first days of its existence. Why not, then, pass not only this resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the substitute resolution for belligerency, but also pass a resolution for the complete independence of Cuba and neutrality between these contending powers? That is what I desire to be done, and that is what I shall ask to be done before this debate is ended and this resolution is voted upon.

Mr. CAMERON Mr. President, the views which I have presented to the Senate for the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations contain the reasoning on which, in my opinion, its proposed action should be founded. I have nothing to add to that statement. It is intended to recall our Government to the old and established policy of the United States. The last of our Presidents who had to deal with the subject of Cuban revolt was General Grant. At a later period I had the honor of serving as a member of General Grant's Cabinet, and I feel that I have the right, and perhaps the duty, of asserting a policy which he strongly held.

For my own part I regard the question of belligerency as a false issue—a mistake, into which the friends of Cuba should not fall. If Spain wishes to impede or delay effective action on our part, she will encourage us to waste our energy and our initiative in struggling with the legal difficulties that involve this question of belligerency, which, when stripped of all its popular notions, is at most an empty, or perhaps a mischievous, legal form.

I object to it, in the first place, for the same reasons which caused General Grant to reject it in 1875, because it is offensive to Spain and delusive to Cuba. The contest is no longer one of belligerency but one of independence.

In the second place I object to it because it concedes to Spain the belligerent right of searching our ships on the high seas, and seizing them whenever they have anything on board which can be considered contraband of war. You will observe that the resolution proposed by the majority does not mention the rights of belligerency on the high seas, but it confers them nevertheless.

I object to it in the third place because it imposes belligerent duties as well as belligerent rights and relieves Spain of all further responsibility for the destruction of American property in Cuba by transferring that responsibility to the insurgents. The insurgents hitherto have been alone obliged to destroy property for military objects, and the belligerent duty will work to their injury alone.

For my own part, I wish the Government to act. I want to see the chronic misery of Cuba ended. I know that the course I favor was the fixed policy of the Republican party of the United States and of the American people. The course I prefer is, as I believe, the true expression of public feeling, which is unanimous in demanding action in favor of freedom. I do not wish or intend to antagonize the action of the committee in its assertion of the fact that the Cubans are belligerents—a fact which hardly needs discussion. The true question is whether the Government had best satisfy itself with the assertion of that fact or whether it should do more.

For such Senators as wish to affirm more strongly their loyalty to the professions and traditions of the American people, I shall, in a few minutes, offer a substitute for the concurrent resolution.

It was my intention to make only a few brief remarks in reference to belligerency. I think, however, that it would not be amiss to refer to the views of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which the condition of Cuba for the last few years is very faithfully set forth.

So long ago as 1875, Mr. Cushing, then minister to Madrid, communicated to our Government a large amount of evidence from Spanish sources showing the demoralization existing in the administration in Cuba. The Spanish journals of that date openly informed the central government that war in Cuba could never be ended until the vices of the ultra-marine administration were corrected and its moral tone raised. Spain was exhorted to make one supreme effort for the pacification of Cuba and its moralization.

Mr. Cushing said:

> The journals of all shades of opinion speak of the official corruption and peculations of the public employees in Cuba as a feature of the situation not less calamitous than the insurrection.

He remarked that the burden of taxation had become intolerable, aggravated as it was by the frauds and wastes committed by almost everybody connected with the collection or expenditure of the public moneys; that the abuses of administration, of which so much was being said at that time, were old, chronic, deep-rooted, and impossible of eradication under the colonial régime.

To quote his language:

> It would seem that each of the ephemeral parties on attaining power, with a crowd of eager partisans behind it like troops of howling wolves, shakes off as many as it can upon Cuba.

Notwithstanding that the public press did not cease to advise the Government that the immorality of the public administration of the island offered a vast field to censure, nothing was done to improve its condition. It was thought by the central government that it was only necessary by force to save Cuba to Spain. It was common remark, however, that the Government ought to sustain two campaigns in Cuba—one against insurrection and the other against corruption. Said Mr. Cushing:

> So merely mercenary and so regardless of duty and the public weal are many of the public officers who go out to the island as to cause the saying to become current that on embarking they leave all sense of shame behind them in Cadiz.

And he observed that all testimony was unanimous as to the corruptions and the embezzlements of the administrations of Cuba.

The testimony of Mr. Cushing is of the most convincing character, as he has never been accused of being unfriendly to Spain. That he did not draw a too highly colored picture of Spanish misrule is shown by the declaration of the minister of transmarine affairs at Madrid, in an official paper quoted by Mr. Fish in 1874. This paper states:

> A deplorable and pertinacious tradition of despotism which, if it could ever be justified, is without a shadow of reason at the present time, intrusted the direction and management of our colonial establishment to the agents of the metropolis, destroying, by their dominant and exclusive authority, the vital energies of the country and the creative and productive activity of free individuals. And although the system may now have improved in some of its details, the domineering action of the authorities being less felt, it still appears full of the original error, which is upheld by the force of tradition, and the necessary influence of interests created under their protection. A change of system, political as well as administrative, is therefore imperatively demanded.

Mr. President, the Spanish Government to-day in Cuba is of the same character as it was when Richard Henry Dana visited the island in 1854, "an armed monarchy encamped in the midst of a disarmed and disfranchised people; an unmixed despotism of one nation over another." Dana warned the public against the testimony of Americans and other foreigners engaged in business in Cuba as to the condition of affairs there. He said:

> Of all classes of persons, I know of none whose situation is more unfavorable to the growth and development of sentiments of patriotism and philanthropy and of interest in the future of a race than foreigners temporarily resident, for purposes of money-making only, in a country with which they have nothing in common in the future or the past.

We might well consider that statement in connection with our own country.

> This class is often called impartial. I do not agree to the use of that term. They are indeed free from the bias of feeling or sentiment, but they are subject to the attractions of interest. It is for their immediate advantage to preserve peace and the existing order of things.

The condition of Cuba had not improved prior to the present war, as is shown by a report of our consul-general at Havana to the State Department in 1885. This states that the entire population, with the exception of the official class, was living under a tyranny unparalleled at this day on the globe. Our consul-general at that time said:

> There is a system of oppression and torture which enters into every phase of life, eats into the soul of every Cuban, mortifies, injures, and insults him every hour, impoverishes him and his family from day to day, threatens the rich man with bankruptcy and the poor man with beggary. The exactions of the Spanish Government and the illegal outrages of its officers are in fact intolerable. They have reduced the island to despondency and ruin. * * * The Government at Madrid is directly answerable for the misery of Cuba and for the rapacity and venality of its subordinates. * * * No well-informed Spaniard imagines that Cuba will long continue to submit to this tyranny, or at least that she will long be able to yield this harvest to her oppressors. Spain cares nothing whatever for the interests, the prosperity, or the sufferings of her colony. The Government does almost nothing to ameliorate any of the evils of the country. The police are everywhere insufficient and inefficient. The roads are no roads at all. Every interest which might enrich and improve the island is looked upon by the officials as one more mine to exploit. * * * Cuba is held solely for the benefit of Spain and Spanish interests, for the sake of Spanish adventurers. Against this all rebel in thought and feeling if not yet in fact and deed. * * * They wish protection from the grasping rapacity of Spain and see no way to attain it except by our aid.

In 1875, when the situation was very far from being so serious as it is now, President Grant, after long consideration of the difficulties involved in public action, decided against the recognition of belligerency as an act which might be delusive to the insurgents and would certainly be regarded as unfriendly by Spain. He decided upon a middle course. He proposed to the Spanish Government a sort of intervention which should establish the independence of Cuba by a friendly agreement. In doing so he not only necessarily recognized both parties to the conflict as on an equal plane, but he also warned Spain that if such mediation should not be accepted direct intervention would probably be deemed a necessity on the part of the United States.

Spain preferred to promise to the insurgents terms so favorable as to cause for a time the cessation of hostilities. Since then twenty years have passed. The insurrection, far from having ceased, has taken the proportions of a war almost as destructive to our own citizens as to the contending parties. The independence of Cuba was then regarded by the President of the United States as the object of his intervention, and has now become far more inevitable than it was then. Evidently the Government of the United States can do no less than to take up the subject precisely where President Grant left it, and to resume the friendly mediation which he actually began with all the consequences which necessarily would follow its rejection.

Mr. President, if the substitute, which is in the nature of a joint resolution, is passed by Congress and signed by the President, and if Spain gives it no attention, at an early day I shall offer a resolution for the immediate recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I united with the rest of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with a single exception, in reporting the concurrent resolution which is now before the Senate. I will say, however, with perfect frankness, that I for one should be very glad if the Senate should see fit to go further in this direction, for I believe that the time has come when the United States should use their good offices to bring to an end the deplorable condition of affairs which now exists in the Island of Cuba. In my opinion the course which would meet with universal approbation of our own people and command the respect of the world would be to offer our good offices to mediate between Spain and the Cubans in order to restore peace and give independence to the island which Spain can no longer hold.

I think there are very few matters which are of more immediate importance to the people of the United States than this, not merely because their sympathies are engaged, but also because in the condition of that island and in its future are involved large and most serious interests of the United States.

When all the Spanish colonies, under the impulse of our Revolution and of the still greater movement of the French Revolution, finally broke away from the mother country, Cuba alone adhered to the Spanish cause. Among all the Spanish-American colonies Cuba was the Abdiel, "among the faithless, faithful only he." Her reward was the title of "Faithful Cuba," and that was the only reward she ever received. There was no change in the Government of Spain as applied to the inhabitants of that island. Oppression continued; they were plundered by corrupt officials; they were thwarted in their efforts toward public education, and they were used only as a source from which Spain and Spanish officials could draw a revenue, legitimate or illegitimate.

At last such oppressions brought revolution. The Cubans rose and rose again. The last revolution before the present one, with which we are all familiar, began in 1868. It endured for ten years. It was subdued, or, rather, it was brought to an end, only by the solemn promise of the Spanish commander pledging the faith of Spain to give to the Cubans those rights and privileges to which they felt they were entitled and for which they had fought.

The moment the war of 1868 came to an end those promises were cast aside. They were all disregarded, punishment was meted out to those who had been engaged in insurrection, and the old system went on with all its injustice, with all its oppression, with all its dishonesty. Such a course could have but one result. The Cubans prepared for another revolution, and just a year ago it began. It began in the eastern part of the island with a small band of 500 men. In the vast wilderness of lying bulletins that come from Spanish sources it is very difficult, and it is not worth while, perhaps, to try, to trace the details of the battles which have been fought. But there are certain great facts which there is no mistaking. Those men who started so feebly a year ago in the eastern part of the island have swept over the island from one end to the other. The 500 have grown until to-day even the hostile accounts represent them at 45,000 in the field.

We know that the railroad lines are cut; that the telegraph wires are down; that every report of a Spanish victory which comes to us in the newspapers is followed by the statement of a fresh insurgent advance. We know, as a matter of fact, that the whole of that island to-day, except where the Spanish fleets ride at anchor and where the Spanish armies are encamped, is in the hands of the insurgents. We know that they have formed a government; that they have held two elections; that every officer in the army holds his commission from the civil government which they have established. We know the terms of the provisional government, and in the presence of these facts, and of the fighting that those men have done, I think it is not unreasonable of them to ask some recognition at the hands of the people of the United States. They have risen against oppression, compared to which the oppression which led us to rebel against England is as dust in the balance, and they feel that for this reason, if no other, they should have the sympathy of the people of the United States.

Martinez Campos, the ablest general in Spain, has been recalled because he failed to put down the insurrection—recalled when the insurgent troops had been actually in the suburbs of Habana—and in his place has been sent a man whose only reputation known to the world is that of the most cold-blooded brutality in the last war for liberty in that island. That is the actual condition of Cuba to-day, speaking broadly and without reference to the details of actions or skirmishes.

Now, Mr. President, the question arises, and I think the time has come and more than come to decide it, What are the duties of the United States in the presence of this war? What action should we take in regard to a condition of affairs which lies right at our threshold. We have heard a good deal in some of the recent debates of the ties of kindred, of our gratitude to other nations with whom we happen to be in controversy, and of how much consideration we should show for the nations of Europe in regard to matters where the interests of the United States are involved. Whatever may be said as to our relations to some other countries, I think the relations of this country to Spain offer no ties of gratitude or of blood. If that for which the Spanish Empire has stood since the days of Charles V is right, then everything for which the United States stands and has always stood is wrong. If the principles that we stand for are right, then the principles of which Spain has been the great exponent in history are utterly wrong.

Among the people who first settled in the United States, whose blood flows in American veins to-day, were to be found Hollanders, who, weak in numbers, but strong of heart, there among their dikes on the borders of the North Sea, first made head against the oppression of the Spanish Empire. Mr. President, in your own State of Delaware [Mr. GRAY in the chair] the first settlers were the men who had followed the "Lion of the North," the Protestant champion, when he stayed the oncoming of Spain and Austria on the plains of Germany. The great English-speaking people who settled here and who largely outnumber all others are the descendants of the men who stood with Drake and with Hawkins, of that small band of English Protestant seamen who curbed the power of Spain in the days of her greatest authority, and whose guns in the English Channel "pealed the Armada's knell." In my own portion of the country are the people who draw their blood from those who followed Blake into the Mediterranean, from the Ironsides of Cromwell, of whom it has been written that even the "banished cavaliers felt an emotion of pride when they beheld a brigade of their own countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before them in headlong route the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage through a counterscarp which had been pronounced impregnable by the greatest of the marshals of France."

Such are the men, such are the races which have done most to settle and build up the United States. It is from those people that we derive all that we hold dear and all in which we most believe, and they fought their way to liberty against the power and bigotry of Spain, which was then the great force of the European world.

Come down, Mr. President, to a later time. Come down to the first decade of the century. The great empire of Charles V and Philip II still preserved the outward seeming at least of being what it once had been. Those were the days before the Spanish colonies had broken away. Those were the days before French armies had marched up and down throughout the length and breadth of the peninsula. Though rotten to the core, the shell of the great Empire still remained; Spain was still accounted one of the great powers of Europe. We were a young nation just struggling to take our place in the great family of nations in those days of difficulty, when the world was convulsed by the Napoleonic wars, and when our own situation was filled with danger.

Turn to the correspondence of the Spanish minister Yrujo under Mr. Jefferson's Administration and read there the friendship of Spain for the United States. Come down to a still later time, when war broke out between the two sections of this country. England, to whom we are now told, we should feel a most intense gratitude—England was the first to thrust her hand into the gaping wound in our body politic and try to rend it still further asunder. France followed, and then Spain. Less than three months after Sumter came the recognition of Spain to the Southern Confederacy.

No, Mr. President, we owe Spain nothing. We have the right to look at this thing purely from the point of view of the interests of humanity and the interests of the United States. There are no ties, no obligations, no traditions to bind us.

Now turn to the other party in this conflict. Turn to the Cubans battling for their liberties. I think, Mr. President, that even the most bitter opponent of the Spanish-Americans would admit that free Cuba, under the constitution which now exists, would be an immense advance in civilization, in all that makes for the progress of humanity, over the government which Spain has given to that island.

The Cubans offer a free press and free speech. Both are suppressed there by Spain. Spain closed a Protestant chapel in the city of Matanzas. The Cubans by their constitution guaran-

tee a free church in a free state. They guarantee liberty of conscience. Those are things in which Americans believe, and the Cubans, whatever their faults or deficiencies may be, stand also for those principles.

Our immediate pecuniary interests in the island are very great. They are being destroyed. Free Cuba would mean a great market to the United States; it would mean an opportunity for American capital, invited there by signal exemptions; it would mean an opportunity for the development of that splendid island.

Cuba is but a quarter smaller than the island of Java, and the island of Java sustains 23,000,000 people. Cuba has a population of a million and a half, and she is one of the richest spots on the face of the earth. She has not grown or prospered, because the heavy hand of Spain has been upon her.

Those, Mr. President, are some of the more material interests involved in this question, but we have also a broader political interest in the fate of Cuba. The great island lies there across the Gulf of Mexico. She commands the Gulf, she commands the channel through which all our coastwise traffic between the Gulf and our Northern and Eastern States passes. She lies right athwart the line which leads to the Nicaragua Canal. Cuba in our hands or in friendly hands, in the hands of its own people, attached to us by ties of interest and gratitude, is a bulwark to the commerce, to the safety, and to the peace of the United States.

We should never suffer Cuba to pass from the hands of Spain to any other European power. We may dismiss that aspect of the subject. The question is whether we shall permit the present condition of affairs to continue. The island to-day is lost to Spain. They may maintain a guerilla warfare for years. They may wipe out every plantation and deluge the island in blood. I have here the proclamation of General Weyler. I have analyzed it paragraph by paragraph. No more bloody code was ever put forth. The life of every inhabitant in that island, peaceful or warlike, is placed at the disposition of the commander of the Spanish forces. Everyone who falls into his hands is absolutely at his mercy. He can condemn them to imprisonment or to death. They must all have passes, and they must get new ones, and if they fail to get them in eight days they are liable to go to prison or to the scaffold.

The people in the country are to be driven into towns where the Spanish troops are, under penalty, if they refuse, of being seized and conducted to prison and perhaps to death. All judicial authority is vested in the commanding general and his associates. The plan is a plan of desolation and extermination. Spain may have it in her power to prolong the agony until the island is a solitude, and she then may be able to call it peace. But, Mr. President, that is the only result.

Spain may ruin the island. She can never hold it or govern it again. Cuba now is not fighting merely for independence. Those men are fighting, every one of them, with a price on their heads and a rope around their necks. They have shown that they could fight well. They are now fighting the battle of despair. That is the condition to-day in that island. And here we stand motionless, a great and powerful country not six hours away from these scenes of useless bloodshed and destruction.

I have spoken of our material interests. I have referred to our political interests in the future of Cuba. But, Mr. President, I am prepared to put our duty on a higher ground than either of those, and that is the broad ground of a common humanity. No useful end is being served by the bloody struggle that is now in progress in Cuba, and in the name of humanity it should be stopped.

We have had a good deal to say in this Chamber and elsewhere about Armenia. We know very well that Armenia is far beyond our sphere of influence or of action. We know that, as a matter of traditional policy and as a physical matter of distance, we can not interfere in the affairs of Turkey or stay the massacre of her subjects. The words we utter on Armenia are mere words, the words of sympathy, and that is all. We can not support them by deeds. The slaughter in Armenia has been going on now for many months and has involved massacres which can not be equaled in extent unless you go back over three hundred years to the period of religious wars in Europe, and those wars shook the whole of Europe from the center to the circumference. To-day those massacres go on in Armenia, and the civilization of western Europe has stood by paralyzed and helpless. It has not been able to do one single thing to check it. With millions of armed men, with hundreds of great ships, it has stood by and allowed the Sultan to wreak his will on those helpless people. England, to whom Turkey owes her very existence as a nation among nations, has not stirred. The recent utterances of Lord Salisbury in regard to Armenia can only be described as pitiful. His words would have been impossible from an English prime minister in the time of Chatham, or of Canning, or of Palmerston.

But, Mr. President, Lord Salisbury obeys a stronger force, a mightier will, than his own. In the last resort, the power which controls in Europe and in England is the great power of money and of the money lender. The money lenders do not care how many Armenians are butchered; the Armenians are not nominated in the bond; but they care very much that nothing shall be done to disturb or jar anything, that nothing shall be done to disturb values; and they fear that if England moved to rescue the wretched Armenians values might be disturbed and Ottoman bonds decline. There is England with the greatest fleet of modern times, that great flying squadron, which she mobilizes with such wonderful speed. It has remained in the English Channel and furnished pictures for the illustrated newspapers. It has not been seen or heard in the sea where Blake and Nelson fought their battles, and yet England is more responsible than any other country for the existence of Turkey. To-day the world of western Europe and the world of America is looking to Russia, that country so recently emerged from barbarism, that country which is semi-Asiatic, to save those Armenians, and wipe out Turkey, that blot on modern civilization.

Now, Mr. President, we have right here an Armenian at our own doors. In Cuba there is useless bloodshed, brutality, cruelty, and destruction of life and property—all the horrors that can accompany a savage war which is not submitted to the rules of civilized warfare. Is our civilization in the United States to break down as the civilization of western Europe has broken down before Armenia? I do not believe it to be possible. Of the sympathies of the American people, generous, liberty loving, I have no question. They are with the Cubans in their struggle for freedom. I believe our people would welcome any action on the part of the United States to put an end to the terrible state of things existing there. We can stop it. We can stop it peacefully. We can stop it, in my judgment, by pursuing a proper diplomacy and offering our good offices. Let it once be understood that we mean to stop the horrible state of things in Cuba, and it will be stopped. The great power of the United States, if it is once invoked and uplifted, is capable of greater things than that.

Mr. President, we have a movement in favor of peace and arbitration recently set on foot by some distinguished and very wealthy and eminent citizens of the city of New York and other great cities of the country. They are influenced beyond any question by devotion to the divine principle of "peace on earth and good will to men." I can not suppose that for a moment they mean to confine their opposition to war merely to wars in which we are engaged. They must be opposed to all wars; and they are, I take it, but an expression of the general feeling of the American people that the mission of the great Republic is one of peace.

Therefore, Mr. President, here is a war with terrible characteristics flagrant at our very doors. We have the power to bring it to an end. I believe that the whole American people would welcome steps in that direction.

Recognition of belligerency as an expression of sympathy is all very well. I think it is fully justified by the facts in Cuba, but I should like to see some more positive action taken than that. I think we can not escape the responsibility which is so near to us. We can not shrug our shoulders and pass by on the other side. If that war goes on in Cuba, with the added horrors which this new general brings with him, the responsibility is on us; we can not escape it. We should exert every influence of the United States. Standing, as I believe the United States stands, for humanity and civilization, we should exercise every influence of our great country to put a stop to that war which is now raging in Cuba and give to that island once more peace, liberty, and independence. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me, I wish to state that two Senators on the other side of the Chamber—one the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]—expressed a desire to participate in this debate, and I, perhaps injudiciously, said that this matter would probably go over until to-morrow, and that it could not be finished to-night. I hope that that understanding will be had, so that no motion will be made to adjourn over until Monday, in the hope that to-morrow we may be able to dispose of the resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. I am quite content with that arrangement.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not want Senators who have gone away to be misled by anything I have said.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this is an occasion which requires from Congress and the President the utmost degree of deliberation and circumspection. Great events may hinge upon our action here, events of great magnitude, considered with reference to the national expenditures of money and lives in the possible occurrence of war.

In the opening of my remarks I wish to say that after a calm and almost a reluctant examination of this very serious situation, I believe the possibilities of a war with Spain growing out of our action ought to be discarded from our consideration, as affecting our action, because we shall not give to Spain any just cause of offense in anything that we may do, whether it is the recognition of the belligerency of Cuba or whether it is the recognition of

the independence of that Republic. We can neither abate nor avoid nor run away from duties that are incumbent upon us by considering what impression they may make upon any other country, provided the motive of our action is such as is required and justified by the demands of our own country by its historical facts and the reminiscences, traditions, and sentiments of our people.

We have not heretofore occupied, nor do we now occupy, an inimical position toward the Government of Spain. I do not use the word hostile, because there is nothing approximating that thought in our present attitude or in our past history, except upon occasions when we have had cause of special complaint against her or she against us. We do not occupy now a position that is even inimical to Spain, and yet it must be admitted that Spanish monarchy is not a form of Government, or that it has ruled in its colonial possessions in Cuba, or elsewhere in South America, when it had sovereign powers on this hemisphere, in a way, that is agreeable to our people. We do not, of course, admit that the Spanish monarchy, in its rule of its colonies, had the approbation or the affectionate regard of the American people in the past, or that it is likely in the future to meet with the approbation of a Government like that of the United States, and of people such as we have. We have our own institutions, our own surroundings, our own destiny, and our own means of accomplishing that destiny under the providence of God, and our responsibility as a nation is to the Great Ruler of Events, and secondarily to the opinion of the other nations of the earth.

So, in the consideration of this question, I hope it will be perfectly understood that the Committee on Foreign Relations, whose resolution I have the honor to advocate at this moment, have not been animated in the slightest degree by any sense of wrong or injustice intentionally done by the Spanish Government to the Government of the United States now or heretofore. There is nothing in our action that partakes in the least degree of retaliation. Our action is controlled, as far as we are able to shape it, entirely, as I have remarked, by the consideration of what is due to our own Government and our own people under a very peculiar relation that we hold to the government and people of Cuba.

In the consideration of this question the Committee on Foreign Relations have found themselves able to separate themselves entirely from all considerations except those which I have indicated as the basis of our action. When this Congress met, petitions and memorials from different persons and communities, from societies and legislatures of the States, flooded in upon the Senate and upon the House. They reached the table of the Senate and were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations until they amounted to a great number.

The pressure of these various proceedings on the part of the people of the United States was very heavy upon both Houses and doubtless upon the Executive also. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not desirous of repressing or resisting these demands from the people of the United States, have still felt that the gravity of the occasion required them to give a very careful investigation to the whole question as far as we were in the possession of means to understand it. I must confess that the information which we possess on that subject is not perhaps official. It is in a large sense accurate; in my opinion, it is altogether credible. Yet it has been gathered from various sources, an important part of it from certain persons delegated by the government of the republic of Cuba to visit the United States and to present to the Executive and to Congress a full statement of the actual situation in Cuba, both as to civil affairs and the military situation.

After patient examination of these various documents and comparing them with such information as we could gather from the statements in the public prints, to which credit was given by the press and the United States almost without dissent, the committee feel that they have reached a ground upon which they can stand firmly in presenting for the consideration of the Senate the action that is proposed in the resolution which has been presented to the Senate in behalf of the majority of that committee.

I think the demands of duty have been growing more serious upon the committee, as they have upon the Senate and upon the country, from day to day by a fuller and a better understanding of the actual situation as between Cuba and Spain. Surrounded as that island is by the Spanish navy and under the censorship exercised over all communications which have been permitted to come to the United States, it has only been occasionally that we have had the means of access to those private sources of information from which, after all, we can derive the truest view of the real situation in Cuba.

This embarrassment has retarded the committee in its action very properly; but we have not come before the Senate without being persuaded, fully persuaded, that we have quite sufficient information of an authentic and reliable character upon which to base the report that we have made.

Before going into the argument of that report I wish to make some statements in regard to the law upon this question. I would begin, Mr. President, by defining what is a state of belligerency when it is recognized by one government in favor of another, and what are the consequences of it. When any insurrection has grown to the magnitude of a public civil war and has so impressed itself upon other nations of the world as to convince them that they would be justified in recognizing the existence of a civil war it then becomes the privilege and, in the Christian sense and in the sense of modern international law, the duty of civilized governments to recognize the state of belligerency as existing.

No nation can proceed against its own people in such a way as to hold them amenable to the pains and penalties of felony or piracy or ignominious punishment after those people, animated by a desire for liberty, have concentrated their efforts in the assemblage of large masses for the purpose of achieving liberty and independence, and have so far been able to concentrate and organize their power as to present important armies in the field of military exploit, such armies organized regularly under military law, divided into corps and other subordinate divisions of an army, reaching down to the company organization, and controlled by supreme military authority, as the ruling power and law of these collections of armed men are capable of conducting war and are entitled to the recognition that is accorded to regular armies in the laws of nations. When these things have attained to that degree a man engaged in those ranks by enlistment changes his character from that of a felonious rebel or insurrectionist into the higher character of a soldier, and the civilized nations of the earth feel it incumbent upon them, in honor and in duty, to recognize that man as a soldier, entitled to the protection of the laws of civilized war. This is a direct purpose of the resolutions under discussion, and it has every sanction of justice and benevolence.

It must be remembered, Mr. President, that armies are composed, after all, not of officers alone, but of soldiery as well. They are led and commanded by officers, but the soldiers do the marching, bear the guns, do the fighting, fill the graves and the hospitals, and when they are captured fill the prisons.

It must also be remembered that governments de facto exist and are recognized the world over, and have been recognized for many ages, and that governments de facto, whether they are considered in the military or in the civil sense, while they have rule and supremacy in a certain area of country, have the right to demand the services of the people over whom they are instituted and to impose duties upon them to the extent of enlisting them in the armies, to the extent of taking their property for military purposes or Government purposes, and even to the extent of commanding their allegiance and their support; and that the civilized nations of the earth extend to people thus put under the dominion of de facto power the correlative right of protection in their persons and property, without being held liable criminally for their acts of obedience to that Government.

That is the same law, sir, that applies in civil and military establishments, and where any body of citizenship have collected together and armed and organized themselves into a military power, and they have dominion over a given area of country, the people who are within the influence of that dominion are justified, under the laws of nations everywhere, in rendering obedience and even support to that power. When a man enlists in an army thus constituted, which has the power of supreme authority in his vicinity, and he puts upon himself the insignia of a soldier, and takes his arms and makes his enlistment and swears his allegiance to the flag that is over him, as he can be compelled to do by a power that he can not resist, that man's character, in the eye of the laws of nations, changes from the private rebel or insurrectionist into that of a soldier, and he has the right to the protection that the laws of civilized warfare give to soldiery. The world has too much need of the services of the soldier to permit that service to subject him to the penalties of infamous punishment when he is captured in open war.

What is the consequence of the position I have just been attempting to discuss, if it be true? It is, of course, that a Cuban taken in arms, under the existing state of affairs in that island, is not amenable to trial and execution, we will say, by drum-head court-martial or by any summary proceeding, or any other proceeding. He can not be justly considered as being a felon—a man who has compromised his relations with his former Government to that extent that he is entitled only to bear the ignominy of a felonious conviction, with imprisonment for the remainder of his life, and his children doomed to follow him in wearing this stained garment of reputation.

This is the condition that Spain imposes upon native citizens who resist tyranny, in obedience to God, rather than endure it through fear of terrible personal sufferings. Driven to war by relentless oppression, the world is asked to deny them the rights that belong to armies in the field, because Spain chooses to denounce them as robbers.

If the Government of Spain could make up its mind to recognize the existence in Cuba of an insurrection, if they please to call

it such, which has reached the proportions of a general civil war with organized armies, by that act they would place themselves in line with the opinion and conduct of other Christian powers and they would concede to the soldiery who might be in the Cuban army the rights of belligerency, just as was done during the period of the civil war in the United States. Neither party suffered from that course of civilized warfare. But Spain obstinately refuses to do this.

Is there any doubt, Mr. President, can there be any doubt, that the war in Cuba has attained to that magnitude in which it becomes the duty and the wisest policy of Spain to make this acknowledgment in behalf of the Cuban insurrectionists? There can be no doubt about it.

The President of the United States, in his last annual message to the Congress, describes this as a bloody war, a public war, no longer a mere insurrection, no longer a mob or an embroilment of citizens without organization, for the purpose of wreaking some revenge or for the purpose of displacing some officer who may be offensive to them in the civil or military government of Cuba; nothing of that kind. It is an open, public war, and the fact is so plain, so manifest, in the history of which we are perfectly cognizant, that the question does not admit of debate.

We, therefore, in the progress of our consideration of this question, can advance to that ground with absolute confidence that this is a public war, and that in this public war it is the duty of Spain to make a concession in favor of the other belligerents to the effect that the people who are engaged in that army by regular enlistment are soldiers and shall have the treatment of soldiers.

If Spain should do such a thing as that, Mr. President, that would be a recognition by the Sovereign of the belligerent rights of these people who are fighting against her flag and fighting for their independence; and in that view there would be no occasion, certainly no necessity, for the Government of the United States, or any other Government, to interfere for the purpose of securing to the soldiery in those armies the benefits, whatever they may be, of civilized warfare. Spain has not done this; Spain does not intend to do this. Spain fills to repletion her prison in Africa with persons captured out of the army of the rebels; she fills Morro Castle, Puerto Cabanos, and all other prisons of which she has the control with these victims caught from the other army, who are taken when caught, and by a summary process are condemned to life servitude in these terrible prisons, if, indeed, they are permitted to live.

If we are ever called in question for making a humane declaration in favor of these victims, we shall be, fortunately, supported by an array of facts that will call forth the sympathies of all Christendom. As the action we propose is based on justice and our regard for human rights, our sympathy for the oppressed needs not to be justified, at this time, by a recital of all their wrongs and sufferings.

Spain inflicts upon them penalties under the name of law which their crimes would not deserve, even if they were individuals engaged separate and apart, or in little squads, in insurrection against the Government of Spain; but being soldiers, and having enlisted in a place and at a time and under circumstances and for purposes which recommend them to the fair and favorable consideration of mankind, it becomes the duty of the civilized governments of the world, so far as they are able to effect or accomplish anything in that direction, to say to Spain: "We recognize the belligerent rights of the people under arms in that country who call themselves citizens of the Republic of Cuba."

I trust that I have brought out in this way, in rather simple form, the real ground upon which the United States and every other country has the right to intervene to the extent, at least, that this resolution proposes. It is in behalf of mercy; it is in behalf of justice; in this particular case it is in behalf of liberty, and, more than that, it is in behalf of the kind of liberty which we enjoy; it is in behalf of that kind of liberty where the people themselves furnish the governing power and where they dispute the right of monarchy to govern them at will and pleasure. So there is everything in the situation of the case which is attractive to the American people to induce us to occupy that ground which is justified, not merely by our predilections or our sympathies, but that ground which is justified by the laws of warfare; modern, civilized war, as it is described in the books on international law.

I therefore assume, Mr. President, without stopping to debate it particularly, that the Government of the United States has the right, and that it is our duty, and that it accords with our sentiments, and that it justly stirs the blood in our veins when we make this declaration and say to Spain: "You have long enough lacerated these people in your efforts to destroy them under the plea of quelling insurrection. Now they are entitled to belligerent rights, and we intend, so far as we are concerned, to give them that recognition by expressing our opinion here that they are so entitled; and when we have made that recognition we intend to be bound hereafter, just as we have been in the past, by our own laws and also by the laws of the nations of the earth—the international law—to maintain perfect neutrality between these recognized belligerents, doing no favor to either that is not permitted by the laws of war, by international law, and denying to neither of them the privileges which they have the right to enjoy as belligerent powers." That is our attitude.

I now come back to the first proposition with which I started out: Can Spain rightfully assume that in our taking that course on an occasion like this, there is any menace against her or any act which is inimical to her dignity and power, her jurisdiction, or her sovereignty? No; and if she desires to take offense where none is intended, and none is really given, all that we can say is, "You will have to take offense; but we had rather that you would take offense at our attitude as a Government than that the God of nations and the human family should take offense at our silence and our indifference in the presence of this wrong. We have got to choose an attitude here which you have forced upon us by your misgovernment in Cuba, or otherwise we shall not take that position which is becoming to a great Republic and an honest, upright, and courageous people; and, having taken that attitude without enmity toward you, if you choose to embroil us on that account, why, simply we can not help it. You embroil us, if you ever do so, because we do our plain duty, and no more.

We must determine for ourselves whether it is just that we should accord, on our part, and under our laws, the rights of civilized warfare to a great body of people in Cuba who have resisted the whole power of Spain for more than a year and increase in numbers and military strength with every day that passes.

I now come to the consideration of what would be our position when we recognize the belligerency of the Cuban Republic, for that is what I style it, that is what they style it themselves, and I think, before I get through with my argument, I shall show that they have ample reason for calling themselves, with proud satisfaction, the Republic of Cuba, for, if it be not now a republic in full development and in the majesty of power which it seems destined to enjoy some day, it may be another Moses in his basket among the bullrushes, and after a while it will come to light, and the world will rejoice in the presence of that new republic.

We have a number of remarkably stringent statutes upon our statute book for the protection of other countries surrounding us, by enforcing upon our people the doctrines of international law, which are called neutrality. One who reads our statute book and compares it with that of almost any other country in the world, I think, will be surprised at the stringency with which we guard against the interference of our people in any war which may take place in any country foreign to us. We have had on both sides of us nations which we have been compelled to protect by these statutes—Canada on the north, Mexico on the southwest, and more particularly Cuba on the south. This code of laws, strong and urgent and stringent as it is, was never suggested to the Congress of the United States by the enmity of our people toward any other nation in the world.

It is not our inherent trouble, it is not the drift of our people in the direction of maraud and robbery and interference with foreign Governments which has caused this legislation to be placed upon the statute book. We have a conservative people, a law-abiding, lawmaking, law-loving people; and when you place a question of foreign relations or foreign troubles or difficulties before the mind of an American you always find him looking at it with cool circumspection, ready to participate when duty demands it, but not ready to participate as a mere filibusterer or as a mere aggressor upon the rights of foreign people. That is not a characteristic of our people that these statutes were put upon the statute book to hold in check or to correct. If we had been as insular as Great Britain, we should have needed none of those statutes with which to control our people. These laws have been put upon our statute book for the protection of our neighbors.

It has been, I think, only on one occasion, or perhaps two, that we have had any necessity for resorting to them in reference to our relations with Canada. We have had more frequent necessity to appeal to those laws in our relations with Mexico, but a still more frequent and still more painful necessity of appealing to them with reference to our relations with Cuba. This graduation of the necessity we have been under of applying those laws is a sufficient indication of our appreciation and that of our people at large of the characteristics of those Governments.

People who conduct good government have the friendship of the American people, while those who rule tyrannically incur their displeasure.

Canada is self-governing; she has a race of people very much like ourselves, very close akin to us. Mexico differs from Canada in that respect; and in consequence of some misfortunes, which crept into her constitution, and which she has only recently gotten rid of, Mexico has been so often in such a state of turbulence that it was necessary that the Government of the United States should exercise extraordinary supervision over her own

people to keep them from going down there and participating in the insurrections and rebellions which have so often occurred.

When we get to Cuba, Mr. President, an island which is accessible only by the sea, guarded by a great monarchy, our people, when they have invaded, or attempted to invade that island, have not gone there for the purpose of robbery. They have not gone there because they wanted to impose our institutions upon Cuba. Very few Americans, indeed, even the wildest of them, and in the most exaggerated condition of what I might call their covetousness of power and wealth, have ever thought about going to Cuba for the purpose of acquiring it and annexing it to the United States. While our people desire the independence of Cuba, very few of them desire its annexation.

Why is it, then, that we have had to keep these laws on the statute book, and that every time an outbreak has occurred in Cuba the first thing which has been done by the President of the United States was to issue a most radical proclamation, warning our people and forbidding them in the strongest possible manner from going into the Island of Cuba and from violating our laws intended to prevent them from doing so. What has caused this? It has been, on every occasion, some wrong done by Spain to the Cuban people, the recognition of which we could not shut out from our own consciences and our own hearts. We have stood here as a guard, as a picket post, as an outline of defense of the Monarchy of Spain through the medium of these laws and the proclamations of Presidents of the United States for very nearly a century, during which period of time five great insurrections or revolts have occurred in Cuba.

What has it cost us thus to guard a people whose resentments have been so justly excited, but are reluctant to interfere with foreigners or with foreign Governments? What has it cost us to keep in check and hold down the Cuban refugees who have come to the United States from time to time, driven out of the islands by the stress of persecution? Think of the lives of American citizens that have been sacrificed; think of the men who have been leaned up against adobe walls before sunrise in the morning and shot to death by Spain because, following their sympathies, they felt that they could go to Cuba and give a helping hand to their relatives, their own blood kindred, in the Island of Cuba, who went there, as Lopez did, for the purpose of relieving his own relatives from these barbarities.

What has it cost us? In money, Mr. President, a very large sum; in blood, a very great treasure; in anguish of feeling, an unutterable thing; in national distress, great discomfort; in our commercial relations with Cuba, and even with other parts of the earth, immense losses; in the honor of our flag, frequent searches and visitations, outrageous wrong, which we have put up with for the time being rather than to resent, because we preferred peace to war, although there might have been an occasion when we should have been entirely justified in going to war. That is what it has cost us; that is what it is costing us now. The record of our losses and of our sufferings and of our wrongs, wrongs to our own people which have been inflicted upon them through the cruelties of Spanish dominion in Cuba, is a record which, if it were written up consecutively, would astonish the world.

Mr. President, if the Island of Cuba were as close to Great Britain as it is to the United States and the same wrongs had been done there that have been perpetrated against our neighbor, who can fail to understand what would have been the fate of Cuba? Great Britain would have absorbed her a century ago or more. She would have said to herself as she has said in respect to Ireland, but with extreme injustice with regard to Ireland, "You have a rich country that we need; you have a people who are incapable of self-government, refractory, turbulent, and rebellious, and the best thing that Great Britain can do is to take you into the Kingdom and govern you, discrown your king, hang your martyrs, break down your constitution and the traditions of the past, and take you into our lordly bosom." If Cuba had occupied the geographical relation to Great Britain, France, or Germany that she occupies to the United States, long ago she would have disappeared from the list of Spanish colonies, and she would have belonged to some great ruling, energetic, Christian power.

Mr. GRAY. Does the Senator from Alabama like our policy better?

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Delaware asks me if I like our policy better. I like it better, provided that our temporizing is not to be protracted until Cuba is destroyed and until our self-respect is gone. I think there is a moment of time—perhaps that moment has arrived—when we have to determine that question for ourselves. Perhaps the moment now is when the American people ought to say to themselves: "It is high time that those people in Cuba had a government under which they could at least exist."

Now, our attitude toward Cuba and toward Spain has been one entirely innocent. It has been forbearing; it has been just and upright, and there is no ground for accusation against us. The only ground of accusation that exists in regard to our attitude toward Spain and Cuba is that we have forborne to do perhaps in the past what we should have done, to the great wrong of the people of Cuba and particularly to that large and respectable class of people who have been driven by those revolutions into the United States seeking hospitality.

I wish to speak a moment about those people who have come to the United States under the invitation of this Government upon its doctrines of expatriation and of naturalization. They have in good faith united in our citizenship; they have adopted our flag as the flag of their country; they have sworn allegiance to the Constitution of our country, and when war has prevailed here, or the exigencies of the Government have demanded any other great sacrifice, they have come along as willingly as any of us, and have contributed to the power and the honor and the glory of the United States. As citizens in time of peace the Cubans, who, perhaps, mostly reside in the larger cities of the United States, have been citizens of eminent respectability and propriety of conduct.

I do not remember any Cuban who has been called to account in the courts of the United States or elsewhere for disloyalty to the Government of this country. They are not to be accounted among the rabble or the outcasts of society. Many of them have transferred their property to this country, what remnant of it was left, and have started in upon business engagements here of an honorable character. Many of them have left behind the titles that they wore under the Spanish Monarchy and in Cuba, and have cheerfully abandoned the distinctions which made them prominent among their own class of people in order to accept the plain equality of the democracy and the republicanism of the United States. They have come in great numbers, and not one of them has set his foot upon these shores who has not had extended to him a hand of welcome and a heart beating with cordial regard, for this is the land of the persecuted refugee. It is a land to which all the oppressed of the earth may come with perfect assurance that when they have planted their feet upon our soil they have got home to the land of liberty.

These people have come in great numbers. Some of the most eminent men, not politically, but in science and in business and in law, are found among the Cuban circles who have been driven out of Cuba and who have taken refuge in the United States. I have great respect for them. Martin Kozsta had no firmer hold upon the heart of Daniel Webster than a man like Menocal has upon my heart to-day. When those people have ventured to go back to their own country occasionally they have been subjected to violence and imprisonment and confiscation and the like by the Spanish Government out of a spirit of mere anger, resentment, and retaliation. That is not among the least of the evils that we have had to put up with or overlook on behalf of the Cubans who have been here.

To-day Spain has more animosity toward us on their account than on account of everything else. These men can traverse this country from one end to another; they can raise money for the relief of the people of Cuba; they can send it to them. They can discuss the situation in Cuba with perfect freedom. They can discuss and understand the restrictions of our laws upon them and render cheerful and perfect obedience them. But the Spanish Government regards the liberty that we have accorded to them in holding their meetings and conventicles and in passing their resolutions or adopting their programmes in behalf of the people of Cuba as an offense that is intolerable to the mind and heart of a Spanish ruler. For that reason they, of course, grow more and more angry toward us continually, and that is the true ground of the opposition of Spain to the United States.

Spain would be the best friend to us that we have in the world if whenever a Cuban refugee undertakes to land in one of our ports we should drive him back to the sea and tell him to seek a home elsewhere. But we open our doors to him; he comes in here, and when he gets here he comes, it is true, as an enemy of Spain, but Spain becomes our enemy because we tolerate in our midst somebody who does not happen to like her. That is the situation. We give no encouragement to any ill feeling toward Spain, but accord to our citizens, native or adopted, the right to love Spain or to abhor her according to their free will. Justice, as it is enforced by public opinion, will temper such feelings, but force can not crush them out.

Now, Mr. President, these laws to which I have referred, after we have passed the concurrent resolution, will remain precisely what they are now. They will not be changed in the least, nor will any other law of the United States be changed, although there will be a new application of some of the international laws to a situation created by this act of recognition. That is all. The laws will not be changed anywhere, but a new application of them will thus be made.

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Does the Senator understand that the passage of

the pending concurrent resolution by the two Houses without its sanction by the President amounts to anything? Does he understand that it amounts to a recognition of belligerent rights?

Mr. MORGAN. I think it does, if the concurrent resolution is adopted. I do not deny the delicacy of that question, nor do I deny the fact that we have never settled it by a statute in the United States. That question is left open simply as a constitutional question, and the measure of the rights of Congress and of the President of the United States in respect to it is found only in the Constitution. What the proper interpretation of that instrument is as bearing upon the particular right or matter that the Senator from Connecticut suggests is something not really necessary in this debate, because the form of the resolution is not such as to evoke the question.

Nevertheless, if it becomes necessary, or if the Senate of the United States desires to pass a resolution of the actual recognition of the independence of Cuba on this occasion, then we would have to give consideration necessarily to the question whether a recognition by a concurrent vote of the two Houses would be a full recognition or whether the President of the United States must participate in the act before it becomes a full recognition.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator from Alabama have any doubt that the passage of such a resolution as he has indicated, recognizing the independence of this assumed republic, would result immediately in a suspension of friendly diplomatic relations, the withdrawal of the Spanish minister, with the near probability of being involved in hostilities? Does not the Senator think that such a resolution would be a distinctive act in the direction of a probable war?

Mr. MORGAN. I remarked in the opening of my speech that this question had grown upon us, that we had approached it, I confessed I approached it, reluctantly because of its magnitude, because of the ultimate consequences that might follow it, and I think I will take the liberty of saying to the Senate what I said to the Committee on Foreign Relations on that question when this matter came up.

Mr. HALE. I am sure we will be glad to hear the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. Here was a great mass of petitions and memorials to which we had to make some answer. We had to report them back adversely and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the question, or else we had to do something in the direction at least of the recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cubans. How far we should go was, of course, a matter left for after consideration.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Alabama has yielded to other Senators, and I should like to ask him a practical question. Suppose the pending resolution is passed by the concurrent action of the two Houses, not going to the President, what right or duty appertains to an American citizen after its passage which does not appertain to an American citizen before its passage, and what right belongs to a Cuban insurgent after its passage that he did not possess before?

Mr. MORGAN. It is a part of my duty, before I can lay this matter properly before the Senate, although it may require some prolixity of speech to do so, to take up the question suggested by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and also the one suggested by the honorable Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. I do not think I made myself exactly clear. The question which I wish to have answered is, whether the passage of this resolution by the two Houses of Congress, without the action of the Executive, amounts to according to the insurgents or patriots, as they may be called, in Cuba belligerent rights?

Mr. MORGAN. That will depend on the wording of the resolution. The question put to me by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] involves the very consideration of the question whether——

Mr. PLATT. If I may be permitted still further, we understand that when the President, under such circumstances, issues a proclamation of neutrality, which is the ordinary form in which belligerent rights are accorded, certain rights attach to the people who are struggling, and certain obligations attach to the United States.

Now, what I wish to know is, whether those same rights attach to the Cuban people and the same obligations attach to the people of the United States and the Government of the United States upon the passage of this resolution just as if it were an Executive act, performed by the President.

Mr. MORGAN. I can not leave the floor without answering, if I am able to do so, the questions propounded by each of the honorable Senators.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the Senator from Florida will let me go on without further interruption, inasmuch as I have before me a large field of questions to answer.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator from Alabama will preserve the distinction between the question asked by my colleague and the one asked by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. MORGAN. The question propounded to me by the colleague of the honorable Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is the one I propose to answer first. I was proceeding to do so by a statement of the attitude which I held on this question when it was first presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

When the petitions had to be considered and had to be reported adversely, with a request that we might be discharged from their further consideration, or else we had to take the other side of the question and find that we could and should pass a resolution in some form recognizing belligerency in Cuba, I said to the Committee on Foreign Relations: "I contemplate war at the end of any resolution that we pass in that direction, not that it would be just, not that there would be the slightest excuse for it, but because Spain is in such a condition, her animosities against us are so excited, her jealousy and her pride are so extreme, and I will add also absolutely inexcusable in the light of reason, that I feel that it makes no difference what steps we take, Spain will make it the occasion of belligerent action toward us." I therefore accepted the situation, whenever I took a step in that direction—it made no difference how long or how short it was—that it would ultimately result in war.

I said then, and I repeat, that I believe Spain to-day would be under obligations to us for giving her a cause of war in regard to Cuba. Why? Because Spain knows just as well as the rest of mankind knows that the fetters with which she has bound Cuba since Columbus made the discovery of it, and particularly in the last century or century and a half, have corroded until they are rusting off the limbs of those people. They have got to be inconvenient in the respect of the civilized world.

To give an illustration of it I will say there was a certain sort of shackle in use at the time when Christopher Columbus was occupying the Spanish provinces that he discovered here. The shackles were particularly heavy, and were worn upon the limbs of Spaniards when they were in durance under the law, military or civil. A very eminent Spanish artist painted Columbus as he was wearing those shackles when he was being taken from the Island of Cuba back to Spain to answer for imaginary offenses. He was taken back a prisoner upon a Spanish ship to answer at the Spanish court for supposed offenses against the Crown of Spain. The shackles were painted there.

That picture was brought here to be exhibited at the World's Fair in Chicago, and the men who controlled the exhibitions from the Government of Spain refused to let the picture go on exhibition unless the artist would paint out the shackles. Why? Because it was an evidence of what barbarism existed in Spain at the time when Columbus was taken and put on that ship. He painted them out. The picture went back to Cuba, and the friends of this artist rose upon him and denounced him for his cowardice. He admitted it, but said: "Who is not a coward who stands in front of the Monarch of Spain? Give me a brush and I will paint them back." And he did, and there they are now, but they are only in paint.

Now, the very shackles that Spain has laid upon the limbs of the Cubans have become disreputable even in the contemplation of Spain herself, but her pride causes her to hold this poor slave by the throat. She can not consent, with her imperious and monarchic ideas, to lift her bloody hands from the neck of this victim and accord to that poor slave the rights of man, sanctified in the name of constitutional liberty. She can not afford to do it, and she is not going to do it, and yet she can not hold Cuba. If this revolution does not free the Cubans from the grasp of Spain the next one will, or the next.

The revolutions have gone on now during all of this century, increasing in proportions and in power, each one making a step further in the direction of this happy release. There will be one more if this does not succeed, or one more if that does not succeed, and Cuba will come forward, amidst the paeans of the nations, free, sovereign, and independent. Spain knows it. Spain feels it. She is bound to recognize it. She would rather lose Cuba at the point of the sword when in conflict with the United States than to have us pay for it or to have those Cubans achieve their independence. She would thank us to take it off her hands with the point of the sword.

That is the reason why I say I have believed that any step in this direction would only anticipate the results that are bound to come in a very short time when Spain will find herself dismantled of her colonial strength on the American Hemisphere, as she has heretofore been by the combination of the great republics from Mexico to Patagonia from 1810 to 1830.

Spain has had no real, legitimate right to hold the province of Cuba and deny to her a voice in her own government after Mexico and Venezuela and Colombia and the South and Central American States were free. If Cuba had been occupied by people who in their hearts were as free and as strong as the people

of Mexico, or the Central Americans, or the people of Colombia, or the Venezuelans were at the time they declared their independence, it is impossible to conceive that Cuba would have remained in the clutches of Spain. Why did she not? It was because at the time the revolutions took place in the other countries around Cuba she was dominated by a very few men who had their large plantations filled with slaves. She had no free population and none that were capable of aspiring to liberty at that time.

Mexico, when she achieved her independence, and every State down to the Antarctic Ocean, declared in their original constitutions, and held to their declaration irrevocably, that slavery should never exist in those countries. All declared it. Cuba could not make that declaration. She did not have the people. Her population were not up to the idea because the vast mass of her people then were slaves, else at the time these other Republics escaped from bondage to Spain Cuba would have released herself.

Now the situation is different. Now the slaves have been emancipated. The ten years' war of which we have been speaking here to-day was chiefly for the emancipation of those slaves. The very men emancipated at the end of that war have become soldiers in the Cuban army. They are fighting for higher liberties and to increase the standard of that liberty so that it shall amount to the right of self-government. That is the situation.

Therefore I hope the Senator from Maine will understand that in all I have done about this Cuban imbroglio I have acted with great reluctance. I have acted with the reluctance of a man who with his associates is compelled to take a very important position, what under ordinary circumstances might be called a very hazardous position, in the contemplation of actual war, without giving any just cause of offense to Spain. I have acted in full view of the fact that at the beginning of this controversy it was our business to discount the future, and to draw our sword and lay it upon the table and say to Spain, "If you want to take it up, take it up."

Mr. President, I think it is incumbent upon me as the Senator in charge of this measure on behalf of the committee to enter somewhat more fully than I have been able to do this afternoon upon a consideration of the facts, particularly those that relate to the organization of the Republic of Cuba and the progress of the war. I feel that I am scarcely able—I have had a very hard day's work—to complete this task this evening.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator is going to yield the floor for to-day——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORGAN. I am perfectly willing to yield for to-day.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator is desirous to continue another day, as he has intimated, I should like to call his attention to what I had in mind when I put him the question before. No man can read the story of a Spanish war against anybody without having his whole nature stirred by the emotions which were so eloquently uttered by my colleague. No American, no decent man on the face of the earth can help that feeling. But after all, when the Congress of the United States is to do something on such a matter with such consequences as the Senator conceives, we ought to do it with a full comprehension of what we are about, and we look to the great committee of which that eminent Senator was so long chairman, and of which he is now so influential a member to instruct us practically and exactly in what we are doing.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] in his very quiet speech (but into which a great deal of meaning was crowded in a very few sentences) said that this declaration, supposing it takes effect, according belligerent rights to the Cubans, is to have two effects, and two only. One is that it gives Spain belligerent rights at sea, so that not merely being at war in putting down a rebellion that is a little too strong for the constable, but being at war with another power which we have admitted is an equal power to her in the rights of war, she may search our ships under the right of a belligerent, under certain circumstances, at sea. Of course such a right would also belong to the Cubans, but they have not got any ships and it is valueless to them. Next, as I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania, he said the further effect is to release Spain from any obligation for injuries caused to the very large property of the numerous American citizens in Cuba.

Mr. MORGAN. After the declaration.

Mr. HOAR. After the declaration. The Cuban belligerents can not pay for such injuries if they inflict them, and they never would be expected to do it hereafter if they gained their independence.

Mr. TELLER. The Cubans are as able to do so as Spain.

Mr. HOAR. Whether they are as able as Spain or not is another question. So she is released, because this happened to our citizens in a war and not by acts of lawlessness in a country with whom we are at peace. Now, those two things the Senator from Pennsylvania——

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I wish the Senator from Colorado would pardon me.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HOAR. No; I do not want to answer a question; I want to put one.

Mr. TELLER. Very well.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Pennsylvania said with great force that those are the two things which are to come from a recognition of belligerency. Now, is there anything else which is to come from it?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; one very important matter.

Mr. HOAR. Is there anything which is going to do those Cubans, those insurrectionists, any good? I do not speak now of an expression of good will, but I speak of the practical result. What help is it to be?

In the next place, the other question which has arisen in my mind—and it has also occurred to several other Senators—is, what is the effect on the obligations, duties, or rights of an American citizen, or on the obligations, duties, or rights of a Cuban insurrectionist of a recognition of belligerency by two Houses of Congress not signed or agreed to by the President of the United States?

In putting these questions I am not expressing my own opinion. I put them as a learner, and I put them with a very earnest desire to agree with the Senator from Alabama and those of his colleagues who have spoken on this subject. I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to them now, so that when he goes on, if he thinks they are worth dealing with he may do so. They are things that are, in my mind at least, points for instruction.

Mr. MORGAN. I will interpose a very brief answer.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Allow me to answer the one put to me by the Senator from Massachusetts, and then I will hear the Senator's.

Mr. TELLER. In this connection I wanted the Senator from Massachusetts to add the further question whether the recognition on our part of belligerent rights changes the obligations of Spain with reference to, say, our own people who may be there. Is it not a question of fact to be determined, whether it is flagrant war or not?

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Alabama——

Mr. MORGAN. I can not afford to yield to the Senator from Florida—I am something more than a mere target for interrogatories.

Mr. CALL. In this connection I think the Senator from Alabama would like to read what I have in my hand here.

Mr. MORGAN. I have my own answer, which I will undertake to give in a very few words, with a view of elaborating it when I next take the floor; but I want now to present my answer in a few words to the Senator from Massachusetts, which he has courteously asked me for.

The last question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts he will find answered in the form and language of the resolution which we have reported. It is fully answered in the form and language of the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

As to the preceding question, as to the right of search, I will state that the right of search exists on the part of any country that is engaged in open war with an adversary. If the Spanish Government found that an American ship was destined for a Cuban port, it would have the right, outside of the 3-mile limit, to make a certain search of that ship.

Mr. HOAR. In case of war?

Mr. MORGAN. In case of a recognition of belligerency, as if they were at war. Now, what would that search be? It would be controlled by two things. Spain would have a responsibility about that search; she must make no mistake about it; just as a private man can not arrest another one for felony, and if he is mistaken about it he can not escape damages. There is more than that about it. We have got our own statutes here for the protection of our customs. We send ships out by our statutes 12 miles to sea to examine and search ships that are destined for ports in the United States, and that is considered to be not only a civil remedy, but a very excellent one, for protection against smuggling. Spain would have the belligerent right, under the laws of nations, to send her ships out and search our ships or any ships destined to Cuban ports, if you please, and see whether they were carrying contraband of war. If they are found not to be carrying contraband of war they are not amenable to arrest, yet the search may be rightful under the laws of war.

Now, another element comes in there which I beg to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, and that is the reason why I am making these remarks now, for I want to call that Senator's attention to our treaty relations with Spain. Under

the treaty of 1795, a general treaty of commerce which is now in full force in the particular to which I am alluding, there is a restriction put upon her right of search of our ships in time of war. It does not make any difference who the war is with, whether with one of her own provinces or some foreign country. What is that restriction? It is that she shall not approach an American ship nearer than within gunshot, and there she shall stop and call the American ship to stop and send a boat out with not more than a definite number of persons—I think it is three or four—to examine the cargo of that ship to see whether or not there is anything contraband upon it.

Now, that treaty obligation remains, our treaty obligations with Spain remain, notwithstanding we may recognize the belligerency of the Cubans. That same treaty of 1795 outrode her recognition of the Confederate States and is still valid. It had no impression on it. So there it stands and regulates, so far as Spain is concerned, as between her and the United States, her right of search. That is now the limitation which is placed upon it by the treaty as well as by the international law, and that, I think, is an answer to the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I am afraid I did not quite make my question clear. My question was not whether the right of search was a severe, onerous one or not. My question was whether the recognition of belligerency did not give it to Spain, whatever it was, and she did not have it without——

Mr. MORGAN. It certainly has not.

Mr. HOAR. And what else it gave to anybody. That is, what is there, except the sentimental side of it, by which a recognition of belligerency operates, except to give two things to Spain? One is the right of search, which she had not before, and the other the exemption from the obligation for her mischief done on the Island of Cuba to our citizens' property, which she might, as the Senator from Colorado well suggests, be responsible for in a clear case of flagrant war.

Mr. TELLER. She might escape responsibility.

Mr. HOAR. She might escape responsibility. In other words, if we go to Spain and say, "Mr. Atkins's sugar plantation, worth $250,000 or $1,000,000, was destroyed in the Island of Cuba, and your police and authorities did not protect it as you should; now pay up," Spain would have the right to say, "You have admitted yourself a condition of things which exonerated me from any obligation to protect that property"; while, if we do not declare the belligerency, it is a question of fact to be inquired into hereafter.

Mr. TELLER. She would have to prove it.

Mr. HOAR. She would have to prove it. What I want to know is not the extent of these two rights—I think we all probably understand those—but whether there is anything else under the sun that this resolution is operative to produce, supposing it to be binding on the Government of the United States without the assent of the President. That is my question.

Mr. MORGAN. There is one thing: At the present time, while that island is held by Spain to be in insurrection, she can prohibit the entry of our vessels into the island, and she can punish our people if she finds them there trading with these belligerents, and the laws of the United States would prohibit our people from trafficking with the people of Cuba in articles of contraband. We make the declaration of neutrality, and our people using these articles as merchandise and for mercantile purposes, powder, shot, cannons, wagons, or what not, would have the perfect right to leave our shores and proceed to Cuba and trade with the Cuban rebels if they can escape the blockade and escape detection, and Spain could not do anything with them. Spain could not arrest our people after they had gone in there and sold the product, whatever it might be.

In other words, the declaration of neutrality between these two powers, or assumed powers, would give to the people of the United States the free right of traffic, subject only to be caught by Spain. That is a very great advantage. It is not an advantage that I would give to the rebels in Cuba at all if they were a mere set of insurrectionists and the question was how much money we could make out of them, but it is an advantage which when moved by my sympathies I would not withhold from them.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator is very kind; but if he will permit me once more, it seems to me that the question I asked goes deeper than all these questions as to what the rights of the parties would be after belligerency. It is whether the passage of this resolution in itself amounts to according belligerent rights. If it is a mere resolution of sympathy, we might do that by saying that the two Houses of Congress sympathize with the Cuban patriots in their efforts to establish the independence of Cuba. Now, if it means only that, it is one thing. If it means that we, the two Houses of Congress, can by this action, in fact, recognize on the part of the Government of the United States the belligerency of those parties, then it is a very much more serious thing.

Mr. MORGAN. I will refer the Senator again to the language of this resolution, which has been very carefully drawn. If he will refer to that language I think he will discover that the action of the House and Senate, if the resolution shall be adopted just as it is, amounts to an absolute and irrevocable declaration in favor of belligerency and neutrality, and in favor of the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. PLATT. Then the question arises whether the two Houses can do that?

Mr. MORGAN. Then that would be a question as to whether the two Houses in passing a bill have the right to instruct the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to see that its will in regard to war is executed, and that would throw it back to where I suggested when I first set out—to a question which, not being regulated by statute, as it ought to be regulated by statute, is a question which must look for its solution alone to the Constitution of the United States; and there is no other source of law or power and no regulator in that case except the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to say that I think there is, to say the least, very great doubt as to whether the action of the two Houses alone can change in any sense our relation with other countries.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps the Senator from Connecticut will be prepared to admit that there is still greater doubt as to whether the action of the President of the United States, Congress being in session, can change the relation of the people of the United States to Spain. There might be still greater doubt. It is a question, after all, that has to be settled, I will remark again, by a proper consideration of the bearing of the Constitution of the United States upon it; and there is no other law that controls it.

Mr. FRYE. What is the Senator's own opinion?

Mr. MORGAN. My opinion is that Congress has the perfect, independent, absolute right to make this recognition of belligerency or a declaration of independence, and if it is necessary to enforce it by any military movement at sea or on land, it has the right to command the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to go on the field if it is necessary and in person to see to the execution of that order. That is my opinion. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not understand, after the Congress of the United States declares that war exists between this country and Spain, for instance, that the President of the United States by vetoing that declaration can make it peace.

Mr. PLATT. There is no doubt but that Congress can declare war. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MORGAN. If it can, then there is great doubt whether the President, by vetoing that declaration, can make it peace. It is either peace or war, the one or the other. But I never have thought that the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States could refuse to go into the field and lead the armies because he did not want to fight, if we ordered him to do it. I never have thought that. This resolution, however, is in such form that if it is passed, the President of the United States will be required to communicate to these two Governments, and then the subsequent question may possibly concern us no more. I do not know.

Mr. PLATT. But this is not a declaration of war.

Mr. MORGAN. No; it is not a declaration of war. There is no war in it.

Mr. PLATT. It is a declaration that war exists somewhere else.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right; and all that Congress can do is to declare that war exists. Congress can not make war by joint resolution, nor can Congress and the President make war by joint resolution. War is first of all a legal situation; secondly, it is belligerency. It divides itself into two separate and distinct parts. One gives an attitude to the people and Government of the United States, and the other gives an attitude to the Army of the United States.

When Congress is said in the Constitution to have the power or the right to declare war, it means that Congress has the right to put the people of the United States and its Government in the attitude of war, and to make the laws of war applicable to this people. That is what it means. But a declaration of war, broadly considered or narrowly considered, when it is announced by the Congress of the United States, is the declaration of an existing status; that is all. We do not create it; we declare its existence. Now, if Congress can declare war and declare that it exists in the United States, it can declare it exists anywhere else, and the relations of this Government toward that foreign country where war exists must be governed by the laws of nations as they apply to war. That is the whole matter as I understand it. Our declaration does not create a war, does not create belligerency; it merely recognizes a certain condition which we decide to be a condition of war.

More than that, it would be very improper for the Senate of the United States to consider this question in the light of its being a

war measure, in any other sense than as merely giving us an opportunity for determining what are our own powers as compared or contrasted with those of the President, for the reason that there is nothing done in this resolution, nor will anything be done in a declaration of the independence of Cuba, if such a resolution should pass, that has in it one breath of war. When the independence of the United States was recognized by Holland and by Belgium and by France in the revolutionary times, that was not considered an act of war, nor did that declaration make any of those governments an ally of the United States. France went further. She declared our independence and made herself an ally by assisting us.

France came into our war by an act of her own and in the contribution of ships and soldiers and money; but these other governments, recognizing our independence quite as fully as France had done, committed no act of hostility toward anybody by the declaration, nor do we. We did not get into a war with Spain when we recognized the independence of Mexico or any of the South American States. There was no partisanship on our part at all, no inclination toward partisanship or an affiliation or an alliance with them, but an act of simple right on our part, prompted by motives which were honorable to our country and designed for purposes which were countenanced in international law.

I am now ready, Mr. President, to yield to an adjournment.

Mr. CALL. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD the interpretation and construction which the Government of Spain places upon the according of belligerent rights to the Cuban government, which is very important.

Mr. GEORGE. Have it read.

Mr. CALL. I will read it. It is a translation from inclosure No. 2611 in the correspondence of the Department of State transmitted to the House of Representatives by the President:

[Remarks of Mr. Canovas.]

The following extracts from an interview held by one of the editors of the Heraldo, of Madrid, with the head of the Government are worthy of being known:

INTERNATIONAL LAW.

In our country, Mr. Canovas remarked to us, there is but little attention given to the study of international questions.

International law springs from the mutual convenience of nations, and there being no code or tribunal for the submission of international questions, there remains no other remedy for their settlement between governments than the guidance offered by already established precedents.

It was because of this, on settling the affair of the *Allianca*, the pamphlet of Mr. Castro was ordered to be published, in which all the opinions of the most eminent publicists are recapitulated. From those opinions a perfectly clear and exact theory was obtained for the treatment of this question. If there is anything to the contrary, then let it be explained.

After much discussion and the exposition of all kinds of opinions, the question was at last reduced to possible and rational terms.

On the Heraldo saying that the moment has arrived to consider if it would be better to maintain the actual state of things or recognize the belligerency of the insurrection in Cuba, so as to apply all the rights of war, it thereon presents a question that perhaps has occurred more than once to my mind. The Government has no need to vacillate in this, since the country does not vacillate. The Cuban insurgents are nothing more than rebel and robber bands, and Spain will never recognize that right in them.

What is it that is wished should it be recognized?

Is it not known that from the moment of their recognition they could send out vessels upon the ocean under the flag of the lone star, raise funds in foreign countries, move about with a freedom that otherwise they could never enjoy, and that they would even carry on privateering?

On reaching this point Mr. Canovas made us a minute exposition of analogous cases; he reminded us of the recognition of belligerency of the Southern States by several European powers during the war of secession against the North and the complaints created by the piratical ship *Alabama*, to the extreme of the claiming of an indemnity from Great Britain, the country in which she was constructed.

Mr. Canovas then summed up his views as follows:

The state of belligerency not being recognized, Spain not consenting to a declaration of war, then, within the limits of international law, the right of visit and search of vessels can not be practiced, for they being the prolongation of the frontiers and territories of the nations to which they belong, that can not be done either within or without jurisdictional waters, even in cases of the transportation of arms, because the rights of commerce can not be interfered with without breaking the ties binding nations together.

And it is so much so that when a British vessel came to our coasts with a cargo of arms during the Carlist war, and it was proposed to search her, the protest had scarcely been commenced before she was permitted to discharge them, and they would have been sold on land if there had been anybody to buy them.

And the same thing occurred to us in Jolo, where Great Britain and Germany made us understand obligations of this nature, and Spain found herself compelled to pay several indemnities in the times of Martos and Ullos.

Are more cases needed?

Then there is the affair of the *Virginius*, where we were obliged to return the hulk, declare her an illegal prize, and give satisfaction, and I myself had occasion to express this opinion to Mr. Castelar, then at the head of the Government, when he thought it convenient to consult me, though I was then the leader of the Alfonsine party in opposition to the Republic.

No one should proceed lightly, nor be carried away by the impulse of the moment, when his country has before it such a contention as the one now confronting Spain.

What can be demanded is the exhibition of the crew list, and the exaction that vessels can only come to anchor in the ports of entry.

Therefore, this basis being once established, it may be asked:

Then, of what service is it for us to spend money for the construction of vessels in foreign countries to guard the shores of Cuba?

The Government thinks night and day about everything affecting that national problem. Those vessels have a purpose, and they will accomplish it.

The coasts of Cuba will be guarded by a combined movement that will offer every guarantee.

There will be a fixed inner line of guard by means of pontoons situated in all the bays and places where vessels can reach, and another outer line, in constant movement.

The first will be well armed, to prevent smuggling, and the second will not be very far off, so as to aid the others quickly when necessary, these being of rapid speed.

As the vessels engaged in the free-carrying trade can only practice it in regular ports of entry, it will there be ascertained by their manifests and inspection of cargoes of what the latter consist, and in case they should attempt to land them to other places they will be considered as common smugglers and prosecuted as such before the courts, in conformity to law.

There is no need either to exaggerate or to unhinge things.

THE CUBAN PROBLEM.

When we said to Mr. Canovas that a system of home rule like that of Canada was going to be asked for Cuba, a waggish smile came over his face, and then he remarked:

"Day and night I occupy myself with this affair, under all the aspects it now has or may have in the future. I do not lose sight of, nor should the country lose sight of, the Cuban problem, which, besides the gravity it has for us in the order of politics and economics, the attention of Europe and America is fixed upon us, watching the manner and facility with which we are preparing the materials for the campaign, with observance of the course it takes, and if to the present they have had only cause for admiration, we must endeavor that they have none for censure in the future.

"The new expeditionary troops are arriving there; 25,000 men will go, and as many more as may be necessary.

"It is not only intended to advance upon them, but also to pen them up and settle the island by departments. Force is not only needed to fight and conquer, but also to occupy the recovered territories, that the evil may not reproduce itself with new demands on the resources of Spain.

"Of one thing I am certain, and that is, the nucleuses of the insurrection once vanquished, our credit will recover its wings and free itself from present embarrassment, because a nation that gives such great proofs of vitality can not less than inspire exceptional confidence in foreign countries."

What about the elections?

"Oh, do not speak of them now. The Government has other things of more pressing importance to attend to.

"We have not decided upon the month for them to take place, but it can be said with certainty they will not be held till next year. About next February we will talk about them. Both Castelar and Moret are agreed to this, though the latter advocates the meeting of the present Cortes, even only for a few days, to comply with the constitutional precept and for the approval of the budget, and so as not to have to occupy themselves further with the budget until the Cuban question is definitely settled.

"Neither is it good for the country nor its institutions to agitate public opinion by electoral excitement at a time when we should all give preferent attention to what is passing in Cuba."

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to make a suggestion to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I understand he desires to speak more at length on this subject.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] also desires to speak. These questions are important, but they are tedious, and I would inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether it would not be expedient to suspend the discussion and to pass a simple concurrent resolution declaring that it is the sense of Congress that the Cubans have just cause for revolution, that they have the universal sympathy of the people of the United States, and that we hope they will achieve their independence; and thereupon, Mr. President, having passed that resolution, resume this discussion and carry it on while the Cubans are fighting, with their lives in their hands, to achieve their independence, in achieving which they are not likely to get, I am sorry to say, much help from the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. If we adopt the declaration of the Committee on Foreign Relations it will cover all the Senator desires, and a little more.

Mr. CHANDLER. When shall we get the opportunity to do so?

Mr. MORGAN. So far as I am concerned, if the Senator wants to take a vote he can have it at this moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I ask unanimous consent for a vote upon the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the vote may be now taken.

Mr. GRAY. I object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator from Delaware will allow me, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution unqualifiedly recognizing the independence of the Island of Cuba.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, it is manifest that the subject brought before the Senate by the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations is exciting interest and deserves careful consideration. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has made an interesting speech this afternoon, which he wishes to conclude, and there may be something else to be said by Senators in regard to the general subject of the recognition of the belligerency of Cuba or on the adoption of the committee resolution before action is had upon it. I therefore suggest, inasmuch as time for consideration is sometimes all important where a question of such moment as this is under consideration, that the Senate, when it adjourn, adjourn to meet on Saturday at 12 o'clock, the ordinary hour, when we are to have the pleasure of hearing the President pro tempore of the Senate read the Farewell Address of Washington, and that will necessarily take over the

speech of the Senator from Alabama until Monday and such other speeches as are to be made at that time. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn until Saturday at 12 o'clock.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. PLATT. Say that "when the Senate adjourn."

Mr. GRAY. I will modify my motion, and move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to say that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] specially requested that that should not be done, as he had promised certain Senators who desire to speak that they should have the opportunity to-morrow.

Mr. GRAY. I will state to the Senator from Florida that I make this motion after conference with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Ohio expected it. All he wanted to accomplish was that there should not be a vote to-night, because he had assured certain Senators on the other side of the Chamber that that would not happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware, that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I submit an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending resolution when it shall be in order, to come in at the end of the resolution. I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, Mr. BLUE, and Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the pension appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. BRICE were appointed.

Mr. KYLE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Saturday, February 22, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 20, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions (H. R. 3537) has come back from the Senate with amendments. I desire unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

I also wish unanimous consent of the House, if that request is granted, to have an order made that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make a report from the committee?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as the bill has been referred to the committee, that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and the course he has suggested be taken.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I make that request.

Mr. ERDMAN. Reserving the right to object, I desire to know what the amendments are.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The Senate has made three amendments to the bill; the first is as to the wording of the language in reference to the time when the payment of pensions shall begin, which is immaterial; the next is in reference to the amount of appropriation for examining surgeons. The House appropriated $750,000, the evidence before the committee being that only $729,000 had been expended during the preceding fiscal year, and the Senate has added $50,000, making $800,000 in all. They have also added $2,760 to the item for rent of the agents' pension offices. These are the only amendments.

Mr. SAYERS. I would ask the gentleman if the only material amendments are not those affecting the amounts of the appropriations?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all.

Mr. LACEY. Were there not some amendments of general legislation as to the methods in the office?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No, sir; none except those that I have mentioned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes thereon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, Mr. BLUE, and Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I also desire an order that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The SPEAKER. The bill has already been printed, as the Chair is informed.

FOREIGN TARIFFS.

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCCALL] presents a privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to employ an expert or experts for the purpose of investigating the subject of foreign tariffs, with the view of ascertaining and reporting to the House what countries, if any, impose prohibitory or discriminating duties upon the products of the United States when imported into such countries, or subject such products to burdensome regulations or intentional overvaluations; and also for the purpose of inquiring into the effects of the commercial arrangements with foreign countries entered into after October 31, 1890, upon the trade with such countries, and the effect of the subsequent abandonment of such commercial arrangements upon that trade. That there be, and hereby is, appriated out of the contingent fund, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of such services and for such other expenses as are incidental to such investigation, the sum of $1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS, ETC., BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate resolution, at the request of the Committee on Agriculture. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins was read at length.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of that resolution.

RAILROAD COMPANIES IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. PENDLETON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5672) to grant to railroad companies in Indian Territory additional powers to secure depot grounds.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill. Before the completion of the reading,

Mr. STEELE said: Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of that bill. There is too much of it to consider by unanimous consent.

LIEUT. COL. W. A. JONES.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1821) to reopen and adjust the account for service of Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they hereby are, directed, on application being made by Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, or his legal representatives, to reopen, adjust, and pay his claim for longevity service in the United States Army, in accordance with the law applicable thereto as construed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the report may be read, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. DENNY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1821) to reopen, adjust, and pay the account for service of Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, having duly considered the same, do hereby report said bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

This is a claim for longevity pay for service in the Army. It appears that the Treasury officials for quite a time construed the act of Congress providing that an officer of the Army should have an increase of pay for each five years of service in the Army in such manner as to apply only to service of commissioned officers; but after many years the Court of Claims held that it applied to the service of enlisted men and of cadets at West Point, and this decision was confirmed by the Supreme Court. It was thus fully settled that this class of officers, as a result of the aforesaid ruling of Treasury officials, had not been paid for their services the full amount intended by the longevity law. At this point the Second Comptroller of the Treasury took the stand that the accounts for service of these officers had been settled and closed, and that he could not reopen them without authority of Congress. For this reason those officers, who have thus been deprived of pay justly due them, have been forced to go before Congress for redress, as granted in the bill in this case, if passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

An amendment proposed by the Committee on Claims, to strike out the word "claim," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the word "account," was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLETCHER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO SIT.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That permission is hereby given the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to sit during the sessions of the House during the remainder of the session of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ANNEXATION OF A PORTION OF ARIZONA TO UTAH.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a memorial from the State legislature of Utah, and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ALLEN] asks unanimous consent for the reading of a memorial. Does the gentleman desire to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know what the nature of the memorial is. I should like to hear a statement of it.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not care to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I shall not interpose any objection, probably, if the gentleman will state what it is; and I want to say that I have stood here in my place and objected to printing these memorials and petitions in the RECORD; but, as I have stated on a former occasion, the other body in this Congress day by day print from three to six of these memorials and petitions, and if they will not protect the RECORD it seems to me it is not incumbent upon me to do it. Therefore I shall not object. I want to state that, so that others may object if they see fit to do so.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not insist that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that it be read to the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The memorial praying that a portion of Arizona which is north of the Colorado River be annexed to the State of Utah was read.

Mr. PERKINS. Do I understand that this is offered to be printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. PERKINS. It is read, then, for the information of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman wants it referred to what committee?

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. To the Committee on Territories.

The SPEAKER. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Territories.

DEPOT GROUNDS FOR RAILROADS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill H. R. 5672.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas again asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill recently objected to, which will be again reported to the House.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5672) to grant to railroad companies in Indian Territory additional powers to secure depot grounds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any railroad company operating a railroad in the Indian Territory may acquire the right to use such additional ground as may be necessary for railway purposes at stations now existing, or for the establishment of new stations or depots, by making it appear to the Secretary of the Interior that such additional ground is necessary for railway purposes, and that the convenience of the people and the public interests will be promoted thereby: *Provided*, That the lands so acquired shall be subject to all the conditions and limitations as to use as are the lands for right of way and station purposes, as contained in the original acts, respectively, granting the companies rights of way through the Indian Territory.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior may, when convinced that such application is proper, and after allowing opportunity for all parties in interest to be heard before him, grant the use of such additional lands held by the Indians in common as may be necessary for depot purposes; but before taking possession of and using such lands the railroad company shall deposit with the treasury of the tribe to which the lands belong compensation in cash at the rate of $25 per acre: *Provided*, That if such tribe shall not be satisfied with the compensation herein provided, and the same can not be amicably determined, the amount to be paid by such railroad company to such tribe and the necessity for such taking shall be ascertained in the same manner as is prescribed by section 3 of this act with respect to compensation to be paid individual occupants on any land so taken: *Provided further*, That before taking possession of and using such additional lands the railroad company in interest shall file a map of definite location of the same with the Secretary of the Interior, which map shall be subject to the approval of such Secretary.

SEC. 3. That when lands desired by a railroad company under the provisions of this act are held by individual occupants according to the laws, customs, and usages of any of the nations or tribes through whose lands the road is constructed, full compensation, in addition to the compensation to be paid the nation or tribe herein provided for, shall be paid to such occupant for all property taken and damage done by reason of the occupancy of the lands by the company for station purposes; and where the compensation can not be agreed upon between the company and the occupant, the company may apply to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall thereupon appoint three disinterested referees, who, before entering upon the duties of their appointment, shall take and subscribe, before competent authority, an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appointment, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award. In case the referees can not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award. Either party dissatisfied with the finding of the referees shall have the right, within ninety days after the making of the award and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to the United States court for the Indian Territory in and for the district wherein the land sought to be so taken may be situate, where the case, both as to the necessity for the taking as well as the amount of damages, shall be tried de novo. When proceedings have been commenced in court and the court has determined the necessity for such taking, the railroad company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then to have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of such depot with the necessary tracks. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each day they are engaged in the trial of any case submitted to them under this act, with mileage of 5 cents per mile for each mile actually traveled. Witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed by the court, and all costs, including compensation of the referees, shall be made a part of the award and be paid by such railroad company.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PENDLETON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

ISSUE OF ORDNANCE STORES AND SUPPLIES.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair desires to lay before the House a request for change of reference of the bill (H. R. 1674) for the issue of ordnance stores and supplies to the State of Nebraska to replace similar stores destroyed by fire from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Militia. The change is made at the request of both committees.

There was no objection.

BRINGING DESTITUTE AMERICAN CITIZENS FROM MEXICO.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a change of reference of the message from the President, dated January 27, 1896, asking for an appropriation to reimburse certain railroads for services for bringing home several hundred destitute American citizens. As it calls for an appropriation, it should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6249) making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6249.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy the attention of the committee for a few minutes only——

The CHAIRMAN. The first thing in order will be the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy the attention of the committee for a few minutes only to explain in a general way the features of the bill making appropriation for the Indian service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897. When the bill is read by sections its various provisions that are not fully understood by the committee or by the House myself or my associates upon the committee will be glad to fully explain as they are reached. The bill, as a whole, Mr. Chairman, appropriates one hundred and thirty-two thousand and some odd dollars less than the appropriation bill last year. It appropriates also $119,000 less than the estimates of the Department for the present fiscal year. The total amount proposed to be appropriated by the bill is $8,630,955.17. Of this amount $2,000,000 is composed of items not current expenses of the year, so that the real amount for the current expenses is six million five hundred and ninety-seven thousand and some odd dollars. The various sections of the bill appropriating for current expenses, salaries, and the like, appropriates $738,000; for fulfilling treaties, $4,593,000, and for miscellaneous support, in which is included only those items which are absolutely gratuities on the part of the Government, $611,000. The incidental expenses are $84,000. The apppropriation for the support of the schools, which is, in part, as you all know, a gratuity, is $365,000. The miscellaneous items, which I will not now explain in detail, amount to $388,000.

In the construction of the bill it has been found expedient to drop two agencies which have heretofore been appropriated for. Those agencies, as the committee understands, I assume, are dropped by Executive order, requiring no statutory provision. The committee have also added one additional agency. The Lower Brule Agency, in South Dakota, which has formerly been under the Crow Creek Agency, is made a separate agency, but it involves no additional appropriation. The Crow Creek agent has heretofore received $1,800 per annum, and his clerk at the Lower Brule, $1,200. In this bill we cut the salary of the Crow Creek agent to $1,600 and add $200 to the salary of the clerk at the Lower Brule, where we establish the new agency.

In the last two Indian appropriation bills the salary for Indian inspectors has been fixed at $2,500. The Revised Statutes, section 2044, provides for a salary of $3,000 a year for these inspectors. I take it that when we, in violation of the statute, appropriate a less amount for the salaries than is there provided for, the person who holds the office has a claim against the Government for the balance. With that idea in view, we have in this bill appropriated $3,000 for the salary for each of these gentlemen, which is in accord with the statutes of the United States covering that question.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman—but I will wait until the gentleman concludes his remarks.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will be glad to yield to an interruption, so as to explain any feature of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understood the gentleman to say that the bill carries an increase of the salaries of Indian inspectors.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is an increase from the last appropriation bill, which in violation of the statute decreased the salary to $2,500, and we simply follow the statute.

Mr. DOCKERY. If it does not interrupt the gentleman, will he please state how many increases of salary are carried in the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Outside of the school department there are no increases in the salaries provided. There are increased officers provided—for instance, superintendent of irrigation—but for no stated officer outside the superintendent of schools is the salary increased in this bill. There is the case of these inspectors, but in that increase we simply follow the statute.

Mr. DOCKERY. Have you decreased the salary in any case?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir; except one or two—two or three school superintendents. The entire list of school superintendents has been revised. Some of them have been increased slightly—$200 or $300; others are decreased, so that in the entire list the increased amount of salaries is $1,100 only.

Mr. DOCKERY. Did I understand the gentleman to state that the reason why these salaries were increased was because the statute fixed them at the amount carried in this bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. As to inspectors, certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understood him to say also that in the event of a failure to appropriate the full amount fixed in the statute the officers whose salaries were decreased would have a right to go to the Court of Claims and recover.

Mr. SHERMAN. I assume that they would.

Mr. DOCKERY. On that point the gentleman is doubtless familiar with the practice of the House in respect to such cases, because since the Forty-fourth Congress a large number of salaries have been appropriated for below the statutory limit. The gentleman understands, I suppose, that the possibility of the suits to which he refers has been obviated by a provision in each bill that the salaries carried in that bill shall be in "full compensation" for the services rendered. Now, rather than increase salaries, it seems to me that the gentleman should insert that proviso, which would obviate the danger of any claim against the Government, while the salaries would be appropriated at the amounts fixed by the law when these gentlemen accepted the offices.

Mr. SHERMAN. Most of the gentlemen who occupy these positions now were appointed when the salary was $3,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. When were they reduced?

Mr. SHERMAN. They were first reduced in the last Congress. I think the statute fixing the salaries was passed in the seventies or possibly in the eighties, I do not remember exactly; but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to change these salaries at all the proper course would be not to take any particular officer by the throat and say to him, "You must take this or nothing," but to amend the statute fixing the salaries.

Mr. DOCKERY. But the gentleman knows that as a matter of practice that is very difficult to do. Independent legislation is difficult to be had here.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman recognizes that fact, I think, from one or two provisions which I see further on in this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. DOCKERY. Now, I desire to ask my friend for information whether he is familiar with the reasons which induced the last Congress to decrease these salaries?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not. I never heard any special reason assigned for the reduction other than the desire of the former chairman of the committee for economy, and I will say to my friend further, that the reduction did not meet the approval of the Department.

Mr. CANNON. In a case of this kind, where the Democrats, having full possession of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, fixed the pay of these inspectors at $2,500 a year, does he think it good policy, during this Democratic Administration at least, for us to come in and insist on increasing that pay from $2,500 to $3,000? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer my friend that I think it is good policy at all times, regardless of what party is in power, to be fair and reasonable.

Mr. TAWNEY. And honest.

Mr. SHERMAN. And to enact such legislation as we believe will be for the benefit of the service.

Mr. CANNON. Has my friend any information which would lead him to say to the House, from his own investigations, that these inspectors are not receiving pay adequate to their services when they receive $2,500 a year with all expenses paid?

Mr. SHERMAN. Other than the opinion of the Indian Bureau I have none. I base my judgment upon the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. If this Republican House fails to increase these salaries $500 a year for each of these officials, are we liable to lose the valuable services of these Democratic inspectors? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Very frankly I will say to my friend I think we are not.

Mr. CANNON. Well, as we have a great and good Democratic President who approved the act decreasing the salaries of these officials to $2,500, I suggest to my friend whether it is not of doubtful propriety for us to thrust this increase upon them.

Mr. SHERMAN. The committee have taken a different view from that of my honorable friend from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. As I understand the chairman of the committee, the salary in these cases is restored in accordance with the recommendation of the Department, regardless of the politics of the individuals who hold the offices.

Mr. SHERMAN. Most certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. And in proposing this legislation, you are proposing it in the interest of the country and not in the interest of any political party.

Mr. SHERMAN. Most certainly; and in accord with the statutes of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. I think if we could cut these salaries one-third we would be doing well. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether it contains any provision to pay the expenses of the commission of citizens constituted by the act of 1869. I do not observe any such provision in the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will come to that in a moment. Mr. Chairman, the following section also provides, in reference to the inspectors:

That the accounting officers of the Treasury be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to settle claims of Indian inspectors for traveling and other expenses heretofore incurred while on duty in Washington under orders of the Secretary of the Interior, where such claims have been disallowed or suspended by the said accounting officers: *Provided further*, That the sum expended for this purpose shall not exceed $1,000.

Heretofore inspectors have been ordered to Washington by the Secretary and kept here by his orders, and the accounting officers of the Treasury have refused to audit their accounts for expenses. The Secretary asks, therefore, that a provision be inserted in this bill allowing him to adjust the accounts of these officers who have heretofore come here and stayed here on his order, so that they may be paid.

Mr. DOCKERY. In that connection, I wish to call the attention of my friend to the language of the proviso, and to suggest to him whether, in the event that this policy should be deemed a wise one, it might not be well to state that this allowance is made notwithstanding the act of August 5, 1882; because under that act it is unlawful for the accounting officers to pass these accounts. I merely submit this suggestion for the gentleman's consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the gentleman is right about that; and when we reach that provision I believe it would be well to make such an amendment as he suggests.

In answer to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], let me state that the committee deemed it wise to omit the appropriation of $4,000 for the expenses of a commission of citizens to be present at the opening of the bids and to assist in the examination of goods furnished under the bids accepted. The idea of the committee was this: In another portion of the bill we appropriate $40,000 to pay for the services of experts in various lines to examine first the samples submitted, and then to examine the goods to see whether they are equal to the samples. It seemed to us that the real object of this commission of citizens was to relieve the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of a part of his responsibility. It seemed to us that it was not our duty thus to relieve him. The committee has confidence in the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, believing that he is qualified to discharge the duties of his office in the interests of the public service, and that he needs no commission of citizens to watch over him to see that he executes the law. We believe we should not give him a commission to share with him the responsibility. It is his duty to accept all the responsibility assumed by him in entering upon his duties. Those were the reasons which impelled the committee to leave out that appropriation of $4,000.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether this commission has not been established by law, whether it is not now in existence under the law, and whether what is now proposed is not simply a failure to appropriate for a commission already provided for?

Mr. SHERMAN. This is a commission provided for by law, but its members act without compensation. They can adjust this matter for themselves under the general law if they desire.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. But I understand this is a general commission already established——

Mr. SHERMAN. That is true.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. The members of the commission have never been paid anything. It was established under the recommendation of President Grant in 1869. The appropriations which have heretofore been made have provided simply for the payment of the expenses of the commission.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a correct statement; but the conditions which existed in 1869 are quite different, I think, from those existing now. The members of the commission act without compensation, at any rate. The appropriation heretofore made provided simply for reimbursing their expenses. The members of the commission can act under the general law if they so desire.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Would not the action proposed by the committee practically legislate the commission out of existence, by not making the appropriation to pay their expenses?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it would.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think it would be better in this case, as was suggested in a similar case yesterday, to bring in a separate bill repealing the law establishing the commission rather than to strike it down by refusing to make the appropriation necessary to sustain it? An attempt similar to this was made in the last Congress to strike down the Civil Service Commission by refusing to make appropriations for it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I do not think these are parallel cases. This is a commission whose members serve gratuitously, and the matter of an appropriation to provide for their expenses is really a bagatelle. Let me say, however, that the failure to appropriate does not of necessity strike down the commission, the members of which I assume are philanthropic men; otherwise they would not care to act at all.

Following the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the committee has made provision in the bill for a superintendent of irrigation. Considerable money is appropriated directly in aid of irrigation on the various reservations, and certain funds belonging to different tribes are now being expended in furtherance of that object. It seemed to the committee wise, as recommended by the Secretary, that a competent and skilled head of that division should be provided for to see that the large sum of money appropriated for that purpose is judiciously expended. The recommendation of the Secretary was for a considerably larger sum than that appropriated by the committee in the bill. We believed that for a less sum than he recommended we could at least make a trial.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is there anything in the law at present which provides for an officer of that kind?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; it is new legislation.

The bill also provides (and this is also new legislation) an appropriation of $3,000 for a digest of the Indian laws and the decisions of the courts in reference to Indian matters. There is no such book now in existence; and the committee has been more or less embarrassed by the absence of such a work. We believe that the business of our committee would be very much expedited by having the laws, the treaties, and the decisions collated and properly published in one volume. Hence the recommendation of the Secretary for an appropriation of $5,000 has been accepted to the extent of providing an appropriation of $3,000 for a digest of this kind.

I have already suggested the change which has been made in the appropriations in reference to superintendents of schools. The general policy of the Government, as declared by acts of Congress heretofore, to do away with sectarian schools, has been followed by the committee in framing this bill. This policy was inaugurated in the first session of the Fifty-third Congress; and the Secretary of the Interior was asked to make a report as to the advisability of dispensing at an early day with the contract schools, otherwise known as sectarian schools. The Secretary, in obedience to that law, did make a full and exhaustive report, in which he stated (to put it briefly) that the contract schools could be done away with; that he believed it would be wise to adopt that course; and that they could be finally disposed of, he thought, within five or six years.

Following that suggestion the House last year provided that in making contracts with the existing schools the Secretary should be limited to 80 per cent of the contracts of the previous year; that is, the fiscal year 1895. In this bill we follow that precise line by providing that the Secretary may make contracts not to exceed 60 per cent of the amounts of the contracts for the fiscal year 1896.

Mr. GRAFF. Just there, will the gentleman permit me to ask how much was appropriated or expended for the year 1895 on contract schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. About a half million of dollars. I have not the figures before me and can not give the exact amount, but it is approximately that.

Mr. HOPKINS. And the present appropriation, as I understand it, is 60 per cent of the amount of the appropriation for 1896 for that purpose?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, that is correct. So that if this policy is pursued in the future for five years, at the expiration of that time there will be none of these contract schools in existence.

Mr. HOPKINS. You do not mean five years from now, but from the time that policy was inaugurated?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, from the time the policy was inaugurated. It will be three years from now. At the expiration of this time we will have none of these contract schools.

Mr. GRAFF. So that, if I understand the gentleman, the amount expended this year, or to be expended for that purpose, will be about $300,000?

Mr. SHERMAN. Something like that. It may not be quite so much, but in the neighborhood of $300,000.

Mr. GAMBLE. If the gentleman will permit me, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs states that the amount will be about $299,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. I supposed in the neighborhood of $300,000. He states in his report that for the fiscal year 1895 the amount applied for this purpose reached $463,505.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is for 1895.

Mr. GAMBLE. Yes, for 1895, and this fiscal year $370,796. Then, with the 20 per cent reduction this year, ending June 30, 1897, it would make the amount $299,000, in round numbers.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the correct amount.

Mr. GRAFF. Can the gentleman state what proportion of the $500,000 expended in the fiscal year 1895 was for sectarian schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. All of it.

Mr. GAMBLE. I think not all.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, practically all of it.

Mr. GAMBLE. There were contracts entered into with the public schools, as the gentleman will remember, to a limited extent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, to a limited extent; but practically all of that amount was applied to the sectarian schools.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not count Lincoln School and Hampton Institute in that category?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; they are covered by special appropriations, and are not touched by this proviso.

Mr. GRAFF. Is it not true that since the adoption of this 20 per cent provision—the annual reduction of 20 per cent on the appropriations of the preceding year—all the schools of this character, practically, have voluntarily withdrawn any requests for aid except one or two of them?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I will say to my friend that anyway a single sect controlled practically most of the schools in the first place—a large majority of them at all events. In applying the money under the reduction of last year, as shown by the Secretary's report, he did not make a horizontal reduction of 20 per cent in every school, but he did in certain schools, exercising his discretion with reference to others; but the schools which have been reduced as a rule said, voluntarily, that "if we are to be reduced 20 per cent each year until we are wiped out altogether, we are ready to quit now," and the contract ceased, accordingly, at that time.

Mr. GRAFF. Did they not continue to educate the Indian children, however, without any appropriation from the Government after that?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that is not the case. While it might have been true in some instances, it was not generally the case.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. In three cases the report of the Commissioners shows that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made arrangement either to rent the buildings or buy them outright, and the Government, in these instances where that proposition was accepted, has run the schools itself. That was about all that voluntarily gave up, and they passed under the control of the Government.

Mr. HOPKINS. As the gentleman has referred to the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with regard to these sectarian schools and the need of providing some means of education for the Indian children, I would like to know what percentage of the schools have been discontinued and replaced by Government or public schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. If my friend would look at the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, pages 10 and 11, he will find a full statement of the facts in reference to the 20 per cent reduction, and he will find on page 11 the names of the schools which have been discontinued as contract schools under the operation of that provision of law. They amount to five in number.

Mr. HOPKINS. Where these schools have been discontinued, have Government schools taken their place, or have these children been transferred to other sectarian schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Commissioner says that these buildings are sold or rented to the Government for Indian school use. That is, where the contract system has been abandoned in these particular schools, either the Government has purchased or leased the same building and continued the education—I assume of the same scholars—at the school.

Mr. GRAFF. It is probably true, is it not, that 95 per cent of this sum appropriated to sectarian schools would go to one sect?

Mr. SHERMAN. A very large per cent would practically go to one sect; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GAMBLE. I think the Commissioner's report for 1895, on page 13, discloses the amount that goes to the support of schools, and, as indicated by the gentleman from Illinois, some of the sects have withdrawn from asking any further support.

Mr. SHERMAN. If my friend from Illinois will take the trouble to send for the Commissioner's report, he will find on pages 10, 11, 12, and 13 a full statement in detail of the facts about which he makes inquiry.

The treaty provisions with the Indians are, of course, carried out in full. That is a matter over which the committee have no power whatever. They must fulfill the treaty provisions to the letter, and the only place where any latitude is given in the amount appropriated is where a treaty provides for the furnishing, not of so much money, but of so many blankets, so many barrels of flour, so much meat, and so forth, and of course the amount in such cases must of necessity be regulated by the current price of the commodities which the treaty provides shall be furnished.

Under the Sioux treaty the sum of $75,000 has been ordinarily appropriated, and $75,000 was appropriated last year, but there has been an accumulation for some years, so that there is upward of $40,000 now in that fund, and on the Commissioner's suggestion we reduced that appropriation this year to $25,000, the accumulation being sufficient to make up for the difference. Otherwise there are no changes in treaty stipulations.

In reference to the schools at Carlisle, Pa., and Lawrence, Kans., the committee changed the phraseology of the bill so as to provide for maintenance of so many children, and for repairs of buildings, and so forth, such and such an amount, and the support for the children not to exceed $167 each. The reason for this is that in these two schools, perhaps because they have a very large number of pupils, it is possible to support pupils for less money than it is in some of the smaller schools, and where the superintendent is given authority, as we have given it to him in this bill, to use this fund for the support of so many children and for his repairs and improvements, he finds it possible to keep his buildings in repair without asking us specifically for an appropriation for that purpose. In neither case do we appropriate for that purpose. The legislative provisions of the bill, which do not appropriate any money, are set out on the last page of the report.

The most important of these, perhaps, is the first, which provides that the child of an Indian mother and a white father shall be entitled to tribal relations, shall inherit as of the mother. The law now provides that the child of an Indian father and white mother follows its father, and the committee saw no reason why the same privilege should not be accorded to the child of an Indian mother and a white father.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before the gentleman reaches that, I should like to have him explain a little more fully than I find stated in the report the clause relating to the claims of the Ogden Land Company to certain real estate in New York.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will do that. Over one hundred years ago the tribes of Indians occupying the Allegany and Chautauqua reservations, and other reservations, made what is variously called a deed or a lease—it is a provisional deed—to the Ogden Land Company that conveyed a fee to the Ogden Land Company, subject to the perpetual user of the tribes so long as they maintain tribal relations. That, the Secretary says, and I have so stated in my report, has been a constant source of annoyance to the Department. These lands are located in the midst of a busy community. Upon the lands there are to-day existing villages, some of them with a population of over 5,000 inhabitants. These lands are held under leases from Indians. Now, the desire of the Department has been to dispose of this claim of the Ogden Land Company and to allot the lands in severalty and to open them up for the progress of civilization. The lands are fairly worth to-day, on an average, from $40 to $50 an acre. The same claim to certain lands situated in Niagara County—the same title of the Ogden Land Company in the lands of the Tuscarora Indians in that county—was purchased forty years ago, and for that the Government paid $10 an acre.

The Secretary, in his first report to the Fifty-third Congress, stated that $10 per acre, which is the claim of the Ogden Land Company, would not be an excessive claim. The question of title has been raised here in former Congresses. The legislature of the State of New York and the courts of the State of New York have held that the Ogden Land Company did have a valid and existing lien on this property. The Secretary, after the passage of the last year's act, submitted the question of title to the Department of Justice. At the time this report was written the report of the Department of Justice had not been made. I understand this morning that the report has been received from the Department of Justice at the Indian Office, and that that report states that the Ogden Land Company have a valid lien upon this land. In order to dispose of that land, so that we may open up this land in

severalty to the Indians and purchase whatever that interest may be, last year the Secretary appointed a commissioner, Mr. Garrett, of Philadelphia, I think, who has had negotiations with the representatives of the company, and the fact has been demonstrated that that title can now be purchased at $5 per acre.

Mr. HOPKINS. I want to ask the gentleman why the Government of the United States should buy this land?

Mr. SHERMAN. How else will we get it?

Mr. HOPKINS. Is not this Indian tribe that controls the land able to remove that cloud themselves?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think they are neither able nor desirous of doing it.

Mr. HOPKINS. How does it affect the interests of the United States Government? As long as they hold their tribal relations this company has no right there, as I understand.

Mr. SHERMAN. No.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is only after they break up their tribal relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. They can not allot these lands in severalty while this claim of the Ogden Land Company exists.

Mr. HOPKINS. I know; but has the Government of the United States any control of the matter while the Indians continue in their tribal relations?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Secretary says it has. He says it is a serious hindrance to the prosperity and advancement of the Indians themselves.

Mr. HOPKINS. What sort? Does he cite anything except the bare statement?

Mr. SHERMAN. This is what he says:

It is a most serious hindrance to the prosperity or advancement of the Indians, and an endless amount of trouble and annoyance to the Department. In order to carry out the policy of the Government to allot lands in severalty to these Indians with a view of their eventual absorption into the body politic, it is absolutely necessary to extinguish the claim of said company to the land in question, and, in my opinion, that should be done at once.

Mr. HOPKINS. As I understand the gentleman in charge of the bill, this contract with the Ogden Land Company was made nearly a century ago?

Mr. SHERMAN. I so understand.

Mr. HOPKINS. Does the gentleman know what action, if any, has been recommended by previous Secretaries of the Interior?

Mr. SHERMAN. None other than I have given; that was taken, as I said a moment ago, in 1857, where precisely the same condition existed with the Tuscarora Indians, over in Niagara County, and on that recommendation that title was bought at $10 an acre. The land was less valuable then, and very much less than the lands in question.

Mr. HOPKINS. This Ogden Land Company is a corporation, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. I believe it is a New York corporation, although I may be mistaken. It think it is perhaps a copartnership. If my friend, Mr. HOOKER, were here he could tell us definitely.

Mr. HOPKINS. It could not have continued as a copartnership for one hundred years.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I am mistaken about it. My impression was that it was a copartnership, but doubtless I am mistaken. It is a corporation, I suppose.

Mr. HOPKINS. What I was getting at by this inquiry is to find out the personnel of the company, who they are, and where they reside.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know.

Mr. HOPKINS. And whether they are instrumental in seeking the influence of the Secretary of the Interior, or whether this comes from sources friendly to the Indians themselves.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can not tell the gentleman. I do not know where it emanates from. I assume that the statement of the Secretary emanates from himself, that this title of the Ogden Land Company stands as a barrier to the general policy of the Department. I presume there is no one in the country more anxious to have the Indians take their land in severalty with a view to their absorption into the body politic than the present Secretary, and I presume it emanated from him with a view that these Indians may become citizens eventually and be absorbed in the body politic.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. How many acres are there of these lands?

Mr. SHERMAN. Fifty thousand acres.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then it will cost $500,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; $250,000. We only suggest in our bill to give $5 an acre, although, as I said, forty years ago $10 an acre was given for lands that were of less value, and the Secretary states that $10 is not an exorbitant amount; but the Commissioner has had certain negotiations with them and they will accept $5 an acre.

Mr. HOPKINS. I would like to get at the fact upon that proposition, and I will ask the gentleman if the report of this Mr. Garrett is available, so that the members of the House can get it and learn the facts upon which he makes this recommendation to the Secretary?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Garrett has made no written report. He has consulted with the parties—I do not know who they are—representing this company; and the Secretary has advised me in a personal interview that such negotiations have been had that he is satisfied that the lands can be purchased for $5 per acre. Of course, if they can not this provision will not amount to anything and will do no harm to the Government.

Mr. HOPKINS. My inquiry is directed to this point: That we, as legislators, ought to have an independent judgment on this subject over and beyond the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior; and I find nothing in the report on which to base such judgment except the bare statement that this purchase is desirable.

Mr. SHERMAN. That it is desirable for a particular reason, which is stated, the reason being that we desire to divide up these lands in severalty and to give to these Indians citizenship, thereby absorbing them into the community at large and at the same time throwing open valuable lands to settlement.

Mr. HOPKINS. There may not be any difference between us as to the advisability of doing away with the tribal relation and dividing in severalty the territory now controlled by this tribe; but there may be considerable diversity of sentiment as to the amount, if any, that we should pay to this land company. Now, if all the facts were spread before us we might agree that $5 per acre is a reasonable sum; or, on the other hand, it might appear that in equity this company is not entitled to a dollar, and therefore it may not be advisable for this Congress to appropriate even the minimum sum of $250,000 which is recommended.

Mr. SHERMAN. The House will have before it the opinion of the Attorney-General as to the title to these lands before it is called upon to pass on the question.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Does the claim of the Ogden Land Company cover the whole of this 50,000 acres?

Mr. SHERMAN. It does.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Does it cover the land on which this town has been built?

Mr. SHERMAN. It does.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that under the act of March 2, 1895, the Attorney-General has inquired into the title to these lands, and has made a report which has not yet reached Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. The report is to be sent in to-day. I have not seen it, but I understand that it is a report which states that the Ogden Land Company has a title.

Mr. DOCKERY. There are 50,000 acres of land involved?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. Did the United States ever own these lands, so that it could part with them?

Mr. SHERMAN. These were Indian lands before the Constitution of the United States was adopted, as I understand.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is it not true that the title to these lands was in controversy between the States of New York and Massachusetts?

Mr. SHERMAN. If that is true it is news to me.

Mr. DOCKERY. Was it not in controversy in 1786, and is it not a fact that by some arrangement the title or the sovereignty over these lands passed to the State of New York?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not so understand the matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOPKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 121) calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in relation to the harbor at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4960) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ask the House to concur in the amendments made by the Senate in the diplomatic and consular bill, all of

those amendments having been sent to the committee by the Secretary of State and considered by the committee before the bill went through the Senate, but after it was presented here. The amendments are not numerous or extensive. They are a provision relating to the salary of the consul at Cape Town, in Africa, a provision making him a consul-general with salary of $3,000 instead of $2,000; setting apart $10,000 for the inspection of consulates, and a provision for an additional secretary of legation to Liberia, at $1,500. The remainder of the bill is unchanged, and I now ask that the House concur in the amendments.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I unite with my colleague, the chairman of the committee, in asking concurrence in these Senate amendments. They have been fully discussed by the members of the committee and I trust the House will concur.

Mr. CANNON. The amendments had better be read.

The amendments were read, as follows:

Page 3, after line 17, insert "For secretary of legation to Liberia, $1,500."
Page 3, lines 21 and 22, strike out "seventy-seven thousand five hundred" and insert "seventy-nine thousand."
Page 12, line 19, after "Singapore," insert "Cape Town, Africa."
Page 12, line 20, strike out "thirty" and insert "thirty-three."
Page 13, line 4, strike out "two" and insert "six."
Page 13, line 6, strike out "twenty-one" and insert "seventeen."
Page 14, line 16, strike out "Osaka and Hiogo" and insert "and Osaka and Hiogo."
Page 16, line 21, strike out "Cape Town (Africa)."
Page 21, after line 2, insert "Inspection of consulates: To provide for the expenses of an inspection of consulates to be made by officers of the Government, such officers not to receive any compensation in addition to their regular salaries, which shall continue to be paid to them during the period of their employment in this special service, $10,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take the last amendment first—this provision for an inspection of consulates—$10,000, to be immediately available. Who is to have that job?

Mr. HITT. This is to provide for expenses to be incurred in the performance of this duty by officers of the Government who are salaried and who are to be detailed to inspect these consulates throughout the world. The provision will not add to the number of salaried officers now employed, but will require those who are detailed for the purpose to perform additional duty and to incur additional expense. The amount asked for was $20,000, and $10,000 is the amount given.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that; but who is to have the trip around the world with his expenses paid?

Mr. HITT. This will not be an inspection of the body of the consulates by any one man. It will be an inspection, for example, of the consulates in western Europe through one of the consuls-general there in obedience to the orders of the Department. Again, in Asia there will be another man, a man who is already in the service of the Government and who will receive no additional pay.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that. For instance, the consul at Liverpool or at London desiring, for the good of the service, to go over to Paris or to Vienna or down to Rome, he is detailed for that purpose, and he draws his regular salary, and this appropriation pays his expenses. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HITT. The consul sent on this service would receive the expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of this duty.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that; but it is also the expenses of his trip. Is not that the case? Or perhaps my friend is not informed about it specifically.

Mr. HITT. I know that the men are not now named, nor are they designated in anybody's mind, because they are numerous; they are scattered here and there——

Mr. CANNON. Is this a new line of expenditure?

Mr. HITT. It is, except that it has been followed in the cases of some individuals who have done this duty under direction of the State Department. It is not a new project. It has been recommended by a series of Secretaries of State.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Allow me to put a question on this point to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]. Is it not true that for several years we have been asked to recommend an appropriation of not less than $20,000 at any one time for the inspection of consulates? It has been understood that it was very necessary that this inspection should be made. But at this time we have only put in the bill an appropriation of $10,000, and it is understood that this service is to be rendered by men who are already in office.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend from Kentucky allow me a moment? Many years ago, about the time of my first entering on public service here, Bishop Newman was appointed an inspector of consulates; and he went all around the world, making subsequently a report that was wonderfully valuable. It is the only report covering the inspection of consulates that I have ever seen that was of any value. I recollect very well, however, that at that time one or two political campaigns were largely conducted upon the "extravagance" of appointing an officer to go around the world inspecting these consulates.

Now, I can see the propriety, if not the necessity, of taking somebody that has no official connection with the Department of State, a person of sufficient intelligence and industry, and sending him to make the inspection of consulates. But, although I do not profess to have full knowledge on this question, if I were going to make a guess, I would guess that this $10,000 would be expended to pay some consul already in Europe to take a trip down the Mediterranean (if he be in service in the northern part of Europe) to inspect the other consulates. I think that would be a good thing for the man detailed on that duty, if he wanted to go down to southern Europe to see the blue skies and enjoy the bright sunshine, but it would be a poor thing for the public service.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. But there is nothing in this appropriation which indicates that any consul already in Europe will be appointed to inspect the other consulates.

Mr. CANNON. Such a one can be appointed, can he not?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. But the expenditure of this appropriation is left to the Secretary of State——

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. And he, I have no doubt, would select good men.

Mr. CANNON. He would select somebody in the consular service, would he not?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. In my opinion, he would not select any man now in Europe or in the consular service. I do not think he would.

Mr. HITT. One of the chief purposes of such inspection, after the detection of frauds or irregularities, is to produce uniformity in the methods of doing business and to enable the Department itself to know the details of the work in these offices by other means than upon information furnished by reports of interested parties. To send an officer in whom the Department has confidence to inspect the consulates of China and the East is considered to be a matter of importance; and there is not now a dollar available for any such purpose.

At a time when I was necessarily made somewhat familiar with duties of this kind, a consul stationed on the western side of South America, remote from inspection, had gone on making fair reports until by accident a means was found to have him visited by an officer who could be trusted. Then it was found that all the accounts of the officer were frauds; that his boarding bills were manufactured; that he had been robbing the Treasury to the extent of thousands of dollars. And it took but one hour's work of a skilled consular officer to discover all that. Now, these reports are of considerable importance to the public interest, aside from that of the Treasury.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that "one swallow does not necessarily make a summer." I have no doubt the case he speaks of was as he states it. The point I was trying to make in my criticism was that when you take the Department of State with its organization here in Washington, and then take the consuls in the service of the Government throughout the world, it would not be very good policy to set one consul after another. I make this remark with all due respect to the Department of State and its service, which I think is in the main of a very high order. Yet I have a suspicion, if not actual knowledge, that the ordinary service under that Department is a little Schleswig-Holstein affair, where the rule is "tickle me and I'll tickle you." [Laughter.] And I would rather have one tour of inspection by a broad, liberal, well-informed man not connected with the Department than to have this $10,000 appropriation run a dozen years, to be utilized by sending one consul to investigate another. That is all I desire to say about this matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any item that exists with reference to our consular service of greater interest and importance than the adoption of such a provision as that incorporated in this bill by the Senate, to provide for such an inspection of our service as is proposed here.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just spoken, says that one swallow does not make a summer. I admit that; but I would like, for the information of the House, to give my own experience on this subject. When I had the honor to be appointed as minister of the United States to Brazil I visited every consulate on the coast from Para to Santos, and the result was such that on returning home I felt it incumbent upon me to call the attention of the public to the facts, and prepared an article, which was published in the North American Review shortly after, giving a history of the investigation made at that time and of the circumstances attending it, as well as the facts that were ascertained by the investigation. It called public attention to the conditions existing.

So far as the point of the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, that an outside inspection would be better than by some one who is entirely familiar with the customs of the service, I think the statement of fact refutes itself. It is absolutely necessary to have some one who has a technical knowledge of the duties of a consul. It is necessary that he shall have experience in the preparation of papers, in the transaction of the business of the consulate, and in the consideration of the many affairs which come before

that official. It is also necessary that he shall have some general knowledge of the country in which the consulates are located, and therefore, with all due respect to the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois, I am satisfied that an inspection by any man who is not familiar with the details of the service would neither be satisfactory nor efficient. Such an inspection could not be as valuable to the Department as that made by a man who is selected under direction of the Secretary of State, a man who has had practical experience in the workings of that branch of the public service, who is able to determine that the consul is performing his duties, who can ascertain that the papers being prepared are properly prepared and are duly filed, and who can comprehend, in a word, all of the manifold duties required of a consul.

It is absolutely necessary, if we wish to extend our foreign commerce, to have accurate and reliable information from all of our consuls abroad, and they should be kept up to their duties. The Department should have proper knowledge that suitable persons are occupying these responsible positions as agents for the Government. For these reasons I feel satisfied that the inspection here suggested will be for the good of the service, and I hope the House will so understand and will adopt the Senate amendment. I think it will be a very serious mistake to reject it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the honorable gentleman in charge of this bill to the necessity of an amendment, if not now at least in some other bill, in reference to the provision which appropriated $20,000 for preparing, printing, publishing, and distributing, under the Department of State, consular and other commercial reports.

There are now two or three clerks, as the gentleman knows, employed in that work under this provision. Under a recent decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, however, their accounts can not be allowed. By an oversight, I understand, the Senate failed to amend the paragraph to allow $2,500, or something like that, for clerical services. I merely suggest it to the gentleman, so that it may be remedied on some other bill.

Mr. HITT. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I was assured by the Senate Committee on Appropriations this morning that it would be attended to in a forthcoming bill.

I ask a vote on the motion I have made.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HITT to concur in the Senate amendments, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have fully explained the provisions of the bill——

Mr. DOCKERY. Before the gentleman concludes, there is a point to which I wish to ask his attention.

I understand that the report of the Attorney-General, to which he refers, is to the effect that the Ogden Land Company has some title.

Mr. SHERMAN. I so understand.

Mr. DOCKERY. Under the act of March 2, 1895, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to enter upon negotiations for the purchase of the land?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. Now, then, this paragraph in the bill and the report of the Attorney-General simply raise the question as to the propriety of the United States making the purchase. In other words, it is a legislative provision submitted for the consideration of this body, and if no point of order is interposed of course the body will consider it on its merits.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it is not susceptible to the point of order. It is in furtherance of former legislation.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, we will see the gentleman about that later on. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, if that is to be insisted on, I would like to say a word to my friend from New York. I understand that there are some 50,000 acres of this land owned by these Indians in the State of New York, and worth probably $100 an acre.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; worth about $50 an acre.

Mr. CANNON. Well, away back before the formation of the Constitution of the United States there was some arrangement made with these Indians and the Ogden Land Company, I believe.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; it was after the adoption of the Constitution. I have a statement here. If the gentleman cares to have me make it, I can show him what the title has been right down through from the time it was owned by the aborigines until now.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it seems to me that if this is to be insisted on—although I must say I think it is subject to a point of order—if it is to be insisted upon, it seems to me the more information we have about it the better.

Mr. SHERMAN. If my friend from Illinois will permit me, I expected at the time this item was reached in the bill to give a full explanation about it, much more full, of course, than I am giving now. I did not intend to say anything about this provision except in a general way, any more than I did about any other provision of the bill. I have said all I care to say, Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the bill. One or two members of the committee desire to take part in the general debate, and I should like to fix a limit to the general debate.

Mr. CONNOLLY. This is a proposition, as I understand, to appropriate $250,000 for the purpose of extinguishing a lien upon these lands. Is that the proposition?

Mr. SHERMAN. To buy the title, whatever that title may be.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I find that in the last Congress an arrangement was made for the purpose of ascertaining what that lien was.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. What it amounted to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. That was referred to the United States attorney for the northern district of New York eight months ago.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No report seems to have been had yet.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that whatever report the United States district attorney made he made but a short time ago, and that the Department have made their report this morning. I have not seen it, but will simply state that I understand the report to be that there is a title in the Ogden Land Company. Certainly if there is no title in the Ogden Land Company, if I am mistaken about that, then this item may go out on my motion.

Mr. PEARSON. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I should like to ask him if he can give the committee any information as to how much money would be required to procure, either by lease or purchase, the school buildings that are now used in these contract schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will say to my friend from North Carolina that I do not know whether these buildings can be procured at all or not. I presume some of them could not be had. I imagine that to erect school buildings which would take the place of all these contract schools would require perhaps from a million and a half to two millions of dollars.

Mr. PEARSON. The gentleman knows that we have already acquired certain of the schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. And we have acquired them from nearly every denomination except one?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. Now, has any effort been made looking to the obtaining of the title to such schools, either by lease or otherwise?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think not; but I will say to my friend that I have an idea, obtained from a semiofficial source, that these schools perhaps would not be sold to the United States, and to erect schools to take their places would involve appropriations running somewhere from one to two millions of dollars, I should suppose.

Mr. GAMBLE. Anticipating that such an interrogatory might be propounded, I had occasion to confer with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and submitted to him this proposition:

> If all contracts by the Government with sectarian or other schools were at this time terminated, what appropriation of money by the Government would be necessary to construct or purchase suitable buildings and sites, with equipments, to adequately and sufficiently supply the service equal to that before the discontinuance of any of the contract schools under the law of 1895?

That was before there was any reduction in the general appropriation bill. To that the following response was given:

> If the contract-school system were abolished and the Government forced to care for the 4,000 children now being educated therein, it would require at least 20 boarding-school plants with capacity for 200 pupils each. To construct and equip these plants would cost not less than $60,000 each, or a total of $1,200,000. This estimate is based upon the actual expenses of this office in constructing such schools.

That answers the interrogatory of the gentleman.

Mr. SHERMAN. That answers very clearly the interrogatory which I answered in a very general way.

Mr. HERMANN. If the chairman of the committee will permit me a moment, as I did not have the pleasure of listening to his opening statement or general explanation of the bill, I desire to ask him whether he has touched upon a very grave subject now troubling the Interior Department in the government of the Indians as to the administration of the lands which have been allotted and set apart to them in severalty. Under the laws, as now construed, those lands are not subject to taxation and will not be until the end of twenty-five years, during which they are under the control of the General Government, and at the expiration of which the title will be in the Indians. In the meantime, however, improvements are made on these lands, within the limits of these allotted lands, and yet I state it as a fact that the county and State authorities have no power to levy an assessment and collect any taxes upon them. I wanted to know whether the honorable gentleman in the statement of his bill has touched upon that point.

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill does not touch upon that matter.

Mr. HERMANN. Then I will offer an amendment so as to bring the matter up during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would like to know of my colleague, Mr. WILSON, how much time he desires to occupy?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I should think about forty minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all general debate on the bill be closed in one hour and thirty minutes, at 3.30, one hour to be given to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] and forty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. LITTLE. I suggest to the chairman that the time be not limited, as other gentlemen may want to participate, as the debate has begun.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, we will have ample opportunity while the bill is being considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LITTLE. I have no objection personally.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed at half past 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill be closed at half past 3. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered by the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield for an hour to my colleague, Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, one year ago I had the honor of addressing myself to the condition of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, which adjoins my State upon the west. At that time I tried in my humble way to make known to Congress and the country the conditions that existed there, which, in my opinion, demanded the prompt and speedy action of Congress.

As to the bill under consideration, its provisions, in the main, meet my approval; but I can think of no better place or time than upon the consideration of this bill to give my ideas of what should be the course of the Government toward these people. Back more than thirty years ago the Government guaranteed to the Five Civilized Tribes by treaty a government of a republican form, to be administered by themselves. The conditions that surrounded that country at that time no longer exist. Then they were an isolated people. Now the conditions are entirely changed. Upon the east is the populous and progressive State that I have the honor in part to represent upon this floor; south and west of it is the empire State of Texas, and west and north of it are the States of Colorado and of Kansas.

In this Territory there are Indians to the number of 50,055, members of the respective Five Tribes, or five self-called sovereignties of that Territory. There also lives in the Territory a colored population amounting to 18,636; also, there is a population of white people, excluding that number who are termed intruders, approximately more than 300,000 people. These Indian governments, that were intended to be isolated, have been unable to meet the resistless force and power of the progress of civilization. Its walls have been broken down and great railroads have been built through its territory. Young cities are springing up all over that country, without government and without any protection for the people.

The Government also supplies that country with a postal service, having, I believe, more than 300 post-offices in that Territory. There are 40,142 square miles embraced within its domain. There is much of it rich and fertile soil and of unlimited resources in point of mineral wealth—coal abounds in unlimited quantities. These lands originally were given by treaty to the tribes, not to the individual Indians, but given to the tribes to be held by them for the use and benefit of the members of the tribe, each of them to share and share alike in its blessings and in its profits; but, sir, to-day, when we look at that country, we witness a different spectacle. As I had the honor to announce in my former speech, and I reiterate it and defy contradiction, there is one tribe alone owning 3,000,000 acres, where 61 of its citizens have in their possession over 1,250,000 acres of land that is of right the common heritage of these people. This condition exists more or less in all these tribes. These are largely whites, or men in whose veins white blood predominates, many of them adopted citizens by marriage. They have absorbed the country to the detriment of the people to whom the United States guaranteed it in their treaties; and these same people, when you talk about changing their form of government, at once call your attention to the sacredness of these treaties.

I had not intended to discuss at length at this time that branch of the question, but to call the attention of this House to the fact of the absolute necessity of the strong arm of the Government being stretched out over that people in order to protect, not only property, but human life. In 1892 the Senate sent a committee to that country headed by Hon. HENRY M. TELLER, a Senator from Colorado. That commission reported the conditions existing there, and urged the necessity of Congress speedily dealing with the question, not only for the protection of human life, but for the protection of the Indians in their property rights. Later on, in 1893, I think, what is commonly known as the Dawes commission was organized, consisting of ex-Senator Henry M. Dawes, A. S. McKennon, and Major Kidd. They went to that country and spent a year within its boundaries. They talked to its plain people, they talked to the Indians, they talked to the colored population, they informed themselves of the conditions as they existed, and they reported those conditions to Congress. They urged that it was necessary, in order not only to secure the rights of these Indian people, but to protect the lives and families of the law-abiding white citizens in that Territory, that Congress should act promptly.

The delegations claiming to represent these tribes made war upon that report and denounced it as false. They went to the President of the United States with charges that Major Kidd, of that commission, was especially prejudiced against the Indians, and asked the appointment of another. The President, in response to that appeal, willing to give them every possible showing, had Major Kidd transferred to another department and substituted in his stead General Armstrong. General Armstrong, born in the Indian country, his life almost spent in that service, was put on the commission at the special request of the Indians as their friend, as a man in whose judgment and wisdom they could trust. Ex-Congressmen Cabaniss and Montgomery, with whom gentlemen here are well acquainted, were also added to the commission.

Every one of these gentlemen went upon that commission prejudiced in favor of the position that had been assumed by the representatives of the Five Tribes; they have confessed it openly and will confess it now. They went on that commission believing that the Dawes report was a mistake, that it was made with a wrong idea of the then existing conditions. They visited that country by direction of the President and spent considerable time there. They endeavored to negotiate with these people to improve the existing conditions, and they came back not only indorsing the former reports, but saying that the condition of things in that Territory were far worse than as described in that report, and they urged upon Congress the most radical legislation looking to the uprooting of these little tribunals and governments in that Territory that are upheld by the strong arm of fear and by public plunder.

They found the fact to be that the little Indian courts there, intended for the protection of the people, had become machines to intimidate and rob them. Thus we have these three unanimous reports made by men who have gone and investigated the situation on the ground, and as Senator Dawes said this morning in a speech before the Committee on Indian Affairs, either these reports are correct or the men who represented the Government upon these several commissions were ignorant or dishonest, and I think no man can well question that proposition. Of the men who are sent here to represent these Indian tribes I know many personally. I have no quarrel with them. They are prompted only by that law which rules the human heart and which so operates that when you get your hand into the public crib somebody else will have to take it out other than yourself. [Laughter.] These little Indian governments are ruled and maintained by the men who have that country in control, not by the common Indian. He is off in the valleys or upon the mountain sides.

In this connection I want to read a statement, made by the head of the delegation, showing how the great chief of the Cherokee Nation respects the findings of the honorable men who went out there as Commissioners to represent this Government and, after proper investigation, made their report to Congress. In a letter to the New York Sun, under date of January 22, 1896, he says:

> The Dawes Commission visited the Indian Territory last year, remained at comfortable hotels on the railroads where noncitizens reside and control the business, and the newspapers published there took the statements of our enemies and made a report containing statements wholly at variance with the truth. They picture us as a lawless band of robbers, corrupt in every department, which I desire to brand as a lie "as false as h—l."
>
> Thanking you again in behalf of the Five Tribes in the Indian Territory,
>
> S. H. MAYES,
>
> *Principal Chief, Cherokee Nation.*
>
> WASHINGTON, *January 22, 1896.*

This is the polished language of the chief of one of these great governments we are asked to maintain. This is the character of the arguments with which he meets the statements of these public officials whose lives are known to be without blemish and whose abilities have been acknowledged throughout the nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no contest with this great chief, but I propose to introduce witnesses to this Congress who will not only vindicate the reports of these Commissioners, but will show that they have not told half the truth. I announce it here as a fact that since the 4th day of last March, when Congress adjourned, there have been, approximately, 280 murders committed within the boundaries of that Territory. That number may not strike gentlemen here very forcibly, but it is a regiment of people who, in one Territory, in less time than one year, have gone down in death either in personal conflict or by the assassin's bullet. If I desired to occupy your time I could name 260 of these victims, names culled from the various newspaper reports, taking no account of the great number of cases in that country that never find

their way to the newspapers, making an aggregate approximating—I do not know how to approximate it, but, to say the least of it, a number appalling to every man who respects social order, the rights of property, and the sacredness of human life.

I read now from the Teller report, page 12, and I wish that members desiring information upon this subject would secure this document. It is Senate report 377, second session Fifty-third Congress:

Instances came to our notice of Indians who had as high as 100 tenants, and we heard of one case where it was said the Indian citizen, a citizen by marriage, had 400 holdings, amounting to about 20,000 acres of farm land. We believe that may be an exceptional case, but that individual Indians have large numbers of tenants on land not subdued and put into cultivation by the Indian, but by his white tenant, and that these holdings are not for the benefit of the whole people but of the few enterprising ones, is admitted by all. The monopoly is so great that in the most wealthy and progressive tribe your committee were told that 100 persons had appropriated fully one-half of the best land. This class of citizens take the very best agricultural lands and leave the poorer land to the less enterprising citizens, who in many instances farm only a few acres in the districts farthest removed from the railroads and the civilized centers.

As we have said, the title to these lands is held by the tribe in trust for the people. We have shown that this trust is not being properly executed, nor will it be if left to the Indians, and the question arises, What is the duty of the Government of the United States with reference to this trust? While we have recognized these tribes as dependent nations, the Government has likewise recognized its guardianship over the Indians and its obligations to protect them in their property and personal rights.

The treaty and the patents under which these people hold title convey the land to the tribe for the common benefit of all the Indians, share and share alike.

Mr. KEM. Does the gentleman know how many of these persons whom he speaks of as Indians are not Indians in fact, but merely such by marriage into the tribe?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not. There is quite a number, however, of that class. They are not only a large class, but an influential class.

Mr. KEM. Are they not the class of people with whom most of this trouble originates?

Mr. LITTLE. As to this land trouble, yes, sir; they and the progressive mixed bloods. I will come to other troubles directly.

Mr. KEM. Is not the land trouble at the bottom of all the other troubles to a great extent?

Mr. LITTLE. I think that the land trouble contributes largely to the difficulty. But there are a number of other causes in operation. The real trouble, let me say to my friend, is that there is no common government over this country; there is no uniform system of laws; there is no flag to which the American citizen or the Indian can look for common protection.

Whether the chief to whom I have referred calls that manner of appropriation of lands which belong to all the people of his tribe in common robbery or legitimate speculation, I leave him to decide. I will only say if it is honest for one citizen, either by blood or adoption, to acquire a large number of separate holdings in this way when many other members of the tribe are deprived of a home—if that be honest, then I have been erroneously taught as to what honesty is.

We believe that may be an exceptional case—

This refers to that case of a single individual holding 100 farms.

Mr. KEM. Will the gentleman permit me a moment right here? Do not the Indians have some sort of government or laws of their own?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEM. Does not their law prohibit this sort of holding?

Mr. LITTLE. No, sir. They claim the right under their laws, in open violation of their treaties——

Mr. KEM. Then this is one cause of dissatisfaction on the part of the Indians?

Mr. LITTLE. Dissatisfaction arises because of the fact that these men who are in control of the government have possession of these large quantities of property to which they are not entitled; and by their influence, I may say by threats, by intimidation, by the free use of money, they are enabled to control the government there absolutely, and do so in open violation of the rights of their own people.

Mr. KEM. When the gentleman speaks of "these men" he means men who have married into the Indian tribes.

Mr. LITTLE. Not altogether; in part; but also the progressive class of Indians, mostly of the mixed blood.

Mr. KEM. I understood the gentleman to say that those were the class of men that used or ruled the government.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; in connection with the progressive class of Indians. The men who control the landed interests of the government control the government.

Mr. KEM. Your theory, then, is that the Indian is not capable of governing himself?

Mr. LITTLE. He is not able to do so alone; but the Government can aid him. His government has passed out of his hands and gone into the hands of these merciless speculators.

Mr. KEM. Well, he is not capable of establishing or organizing a government for himself.

Mr. LITTLE. No; but this Government is capable of giving him a government along with the white people who live there. A large number of the Indians are individually capable of self-government; but there is this little, weak, trembling organization of five sovereignties in one Territory, enabling certain rulers to control the conditions absolutely and to rule the ordinary Indian by inspiring his prejudice against any progressive movement looking to the recognition of the rights of all the people. The gentleman will hear from me further on that point when I reach other lines in the argument.

Mr. KEM. Will the gentleman permit another inquiry?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir; I am glad the gentleman is seeking information.

Mr. KEM. I am seeking information, and I want to ascertain whether the great difficulty, as I said awhile ago, does not arise, after all, from these white men who have married into the Indian tribes and are Indians only by virtue of the law.

Mr. LITTLE. But there are plenty of Indians among those five tribes that are as intelligent as anybody. Many of these, as well as the white adopted citizens, have managed by their shrewdness to outwit their companions; they have got that country fenced up in a large measure so that the Indians can not obtain the land to which they are entitled. Take the instance which I cited a few moments ago, where 61 of these leading men hold more than 1,000,000 acres of land under fence. They are collecting rent for those lands and putting the money into their own pockets, while it is the duty of the Government to see that the Indians of the tribe at large, who are the wards of the Government, shall enjoy not only the country but its products. I protest against permitting a few men to absorb the wealth that belongs to the Indians of that country. This defenseless people must be rescued from the corruption and tyranny of these petty governments or else we must permit the treaties intended for their protection to be made the instruments of their oppression.

Mr. TALBERT. As to the evils which you complain of, do you seek to remedy them by amending this bill or must it be done by other legislation?

Mr. LITTLE. We propose to do it by other legislation pending before the proper committees of the House.

Mr. TALBERT. Not in this bill?

Mr. LITTLE. No; by independent legislation.

Mr. KEM. I trust the gentleman will inform us as he goes on what remedies he proposes.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir; I will do so; or, if I should omit it, I trust the gentleman will remind me of it at the conclusion of my remarks. But I might say here that there should be an independent and impartial tribunal established to determine the rights of citizenship in these tribes. Provision should be made for surveying and laying out town sites and affording a government for the towns. The lands should be allotted in severalty to the Indians, guarded by judicious legislation, and a territorial government should be at once established suited to the conditions there, efficient and strong enough to maintain the peace and order of that country.

I now read from the same report, and upon the same page:

It is apparent to all who are conversant with the present condition in the Indian Territory that their system of government can not continue. It is not only non-American, but it is radically wrong, and a change is imperatively demanded in the interest of the Indian and whites alike, and such change can not be much longer delayed. The situation grows worse and will continue to grow worse. There can be no modification of the system. It can not be reformed. It must be abandoned and a better one substituted. That it will be difficult to do your committee freely admit, but because it is a difficult task is no reason why Congress should not at the earliest possible moment address itself to this question.

This is the language of Senator TELLER, chairman of the committee, who went personally and viewed the existing conditions in that country, and the entire committee give this as their deliberate judgment.

Mr. KEM. Now, in that connection, is it your opinion or do you know whether the majority of these Indians are favorable to the change suggested there?

Mr. LITTLE. My opinion is that the majority of them, surrounded as they are, claim to oppose to it. I know that many of them favor the change and would to-day openly revolt against their tribal government, but are held back through fear and intimidation.

Mr. KEM. But are the majority opposed to the change in the landholding system—these large holdings?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir; I have no doubt of it.

Mr. KEM. Well, the object of this proposition, as I understand it, is to get matters arranged so that this change could be made with reference to the Indians.

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly; and put the lands where they belong—under the treaty stipulations.

Mr. KEM. Let me proceed a moment with my question. And you say that the Indians object to the large holding?

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. Why, then, do they not agree to the Dawes proposition, which seems to be in accord with their sentiment?

Mr. LITTLE. There is a difference between the Indians and the official rulers of the governments there in reference to what is the proper thing to be done. The big men, as they call them, tell the poor full-blood that the Government wants to steal their country, and the poor creature believes and consents to their further extortions and robberies.

Mr. KEM. But I am talking now of what we ought to do and what the Indians want to do themselves. I understand that they favor doing away with these land holdings, which have become very objectionable, as you say, and yet that a majority are opposed to the Dawes proposition to do the very thing which they are in favor of.

Mr. LITTLE. So far, let me say to the gentleman, as there has been an open expression of opinion concerning this matter, I think it is the fact that the majority are opposed to any radical change in the governments; and, mind you, an Indian in that country, a member of one of these tribes, who advocates or petitions any officer or any country or any government outside of his own tribe does so at his own risk, really at the peril of his life, and several of the tribes have passed laws making it treason for any one of their number to advocate the allotment or the change of their land tenures.

Mr. KEM. That has been done, then, by the Indians themselves?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; by the Indians themselves.

Mr. KEM. And done through their own governments?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir; by their own governments, and they are the governments of which I am speaking, that ought not to be allowed to exist for a moment.

Mr. KEM. Has there ever been an expression on the part of the Indians in such a way as to indicate the true sentiment of the Indians—the majority of them—with reference to their wishes in regard to this matter?

Mr. LITTLE. None, except through their national councils, and they have been as much against this as you might expect, and they will continue to be against it. It is a condition that exists among them, and to one who is not familiar with the character of the Indian it would be difficult to explain the reason why. But it is a condition that Congress ought to give time and attention to at once, and correct these evils and this great injustice to these people, who are the wards of the Government.

I read now from page 17 of the last report of the commission appointed to negotiate with these Indians, which appears in Senate Document No. 12, first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress:

If the end of government and the administration of justice is the protection of the life and liberty and property of the citizen, then the governments and courts of these nations are a failure, for they afford that protection to neither. They are powerless to these ends, and the victims of this misrule are helpless sufferers at the mercy of the malign influences which dominate every department and branch of the governments as administered here. It matters little, except as to the character of the remedy, whether this failure and misrule arises from impotence or willful and corrupt purpose, the evil consequences are incalculable and its continuance unjustifiable. It is no less true now than when the commission reported last year that "all of the functions of the so-called governments of these five tribes have become utterly unable to protect the life or property rights of the citizen. Their courts of justice have become powerless and paralyzed. Violence, robbery, and murder have become almost of daily occurrence, and no effective measures of restraint or punishment are put forth by these governments and courts to suppress crime. Railroad trains continue to be stopped and their passengers robbed in the very presence of those in authority. A reign of terror exists, and barbarous outrages almost impossible of belief are enacted, and the perpetrators hardly find it necessary to shun daily intercourse with their victims."

The United States district court at Fort Smith, Ark., has been given jurisdiction in the Indian Territory only over crimes committed by an Indian upon a white man or by a white man upon an Indian. Of all crimes committed by Indians upon Indians the Indian courts still have sole jurisdiction. In this limited jurisdiction of the United States court the present able and upright judge has, since his appointment in 1875, sentenced to death on conviction in his court 153 persons, and there are to-day in the United States jail at Fort Smith under sentence of death appealed on questions of law 26.

I may add that since the publication of this report there are to-day between 30 and 40 murderers in this prison under the same conditions; that is, under sentence of death.

Mr. KEM. But would that not lead to the belief that these offenders were being punished?

Mr. LITTLE. If you will wait you will see fully the exact condition. Of course the Territorial jurisdiction of this court extends over only a part of this country.

Of these, 20 have been convicted the present year, the largest number in any one year. There are now under indictment for murder and awaiting trial 13 others, and several are in jail awaiting examination. There is also a United States court at Paris, Tex., having similar jurisdiction in the Indian Territory, the records of which show that since 1890 there have been 22 sentenced to death for murders committed in the Territory, and there are now under indictment 128, nearly all of whom are eluding arrest. How many murders in addition to these have been committed by Indians upon Indians, of which their courts have exclusive jurisdiction, there is no record available, but there is good reason to believe that they exceed these numbers. Reliable newspapers and individuals who have endeavored to obtain accurate information as to the prevalence of crime in the Territory agree in the statement that up to November 1 there had been 257 murders committed in the Territory since the last adjournment of Congress. Of course there have been many others not thus ascertained. If other crimes have in any degree a proportion to that of murder in the Territory the condition must be appalling, and can not fail to call loudly for a remedy.

I now read from a newspaper published by a citizen of the Indian country at the town of Vinita, known as the Indian Chieftain, and I call the especial attention of my friend to it. This is under date of February 13, 1896. It says:

THE DAWES COMMISSION BILL.

In this issue is printed the Dawes bill, or the bill prepared by the commission that bears the name of the venerable statesman of Massachusetts. It is sweeping in its provisions and will about wipe up the tribal governments in this Territory if it becomes a law. A howl of rage will now go up from monopolists and "Indians for revenue" throughout this country, and the little puny 2 by 4 newspapers that are subsidized by the above-named class will spew their venom far and wide. But the ultimate result will be the same, for Congress will pass this or a similar measure before the summer solstice. There are some things about this proposed Dawes bill that a great many Indian citizens will object to, but there are also many things about the present tribal governments that a great many people object to and are sorely displeased with, so it is at least a stand off in that particular. To recite the causes that have led up to the sending of the Dawes commission here by the United States Government would fill a good-sized book, but that there were causes and sufficient reasons for the action of the United States Government needs no demonstration.

The Dawes bill has been prepared and introduced largely for the benefit of the Indians of this territory, and whether they ever see it that way or not makes very little difference at this stage of the game. Congress could do no wiser thing than send the Dawes commission here with full power and authority to settle the whole thing. Under the provisions of the bill a great, and it may be a dangerous, power is delegated to a few men; but somebody must be clothed with authority sooner or later to do this very thing; and Senator Dawes and his colleagues are better prepared to do it than any like number of men in the United States. If the commission has misrepresented the Indians it has been largely the fault of the Indians themselves in not furnishing them with correct information. The truth is, if the commission had known some things that are true as regards the methods of some of our officials it would have made a report that would have "astonished the natives," for we all know that they didn't tell half that might have been told.

The reason the Government proposes to allot the lands of the Five Tribes is because a few of their citizens are monopolizing the country to the exclusion of the younger and poorer members of the tribe, and they refuse to remedy the evil or curb the monopoly themselves. The cattlemen and the officeholders have "had a picnic" out of this country about long enough, and the Congress of the United States has at last heard the cry of those who have been imposed upon so long, and the day of reckoning is near at hand. The "swan song" of the two classes mentioned will never mislead Congress more, and to make a long story short, the Chieftain, as one whose interest is here alone, and as a citizen whose welfare is inseparable from that of other citizens of the Cherokee Nation, states most emphatically that it is in favor of the Dawes bill, with some few amendments, becoming a law, and would rather trust the notorious and much abused Dawes commission than the Cherokee national council any day in the year.

For years the capital of this nation has been a veritable sink hole of official venality. Citizenship in this nation has been bought openly from mercenary councilors, and occasionally a circuit judge takes a hand in selling out his country. Corruption at Tahlequah has assumed every form that will yield plunder, and good citizens have stood aghast at the saturnalia of corruption that is apparent on all sides. The boodlers have from time to time pooled their issues in the great spoils, and the courts, along with the council, have been perverted for money, and the channel of justice turned into cesspools of bribery and a menace to the liberties of the people and a travesty upon jurisprudence. Last session of the national council witnessed the sad spectacle of a judge of one of the largest circuits in the Cherokee country accepting money from claimants to citizenship, and sneaking around and buying votes of senators and councilors enough to secure their admission to citizenship, and at the same time pocketing a five-hundred-dollar fee himself. Shame! Shame! And yet men of this ilk tell us the country is safe, and that the Dawes commission has been guilty of unpardonable mendacity.

Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing to find a man, whether a citizen by blood or adoption, who has the courage to speak the truth about his own government and people. This is a paper published in that nation by a citizen making these declarations in the very teeth of these people, and they have stood undenied up to this time.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Is it the gentleman's intention to discuss the removal of the "intruders"?

Mr. LITTLE. Not particularly on this occasion. I am addressing myself to the large number of whites, some 250,000, who are not embraced in the class known as intruders.

Mr. PICKLER. In the last Congress this matter of the removal of the intruders came up again. The Government has several times fixed a date for the removal of these intruders, as the Indians call these white men.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to know whether the Government has done anything to carry out that, and whether these Indians in the Indian Territory do not make as an excuse for not acceding to the request of the Dawes commission that the Government does not carry out its agreement as to putting these intruders out of the Territory, as it has long promised the Indians to do?

Mr. LITTLE. I shall be glad to address myself to that after I have finished this, if my time has not expired. I now send to the Clerk's desk to have read an article, published by a native Cherokee Indian, addressed to the Muldrow Register. That will shed some light upon the question which the gentleman asked me.

The Clerk read as follows:

A CHEROKEE INDIAN ON MONOPOLY.

[T. D. Lee in Muldrow Register.]

I wish to say something through your paper to my dear Cherokee people, the full bloods and the half-breeds who have no land nor no homes here in their own country. The intruder question is a big thing and making a good deal of noise. We are told that the intruders are all to be put out after January.

That's all right, and good as far as it goes, but what is it likely to amount to? The monopolists have it all figured out to bid in the intruders' improvements, so that won't make it any better for Cherokees who have no land.

Some of our leaders make a great fuss and blow about the intruders robbing the poor Indians of their lands, when they know as well as any body that some of our own people are robbing us a good deal worse—even ten to one—those fellows who are "Indians for revenue only," many being white men who have married Cherokee women and white Injuns. A few of this kind of people have gobbled up most of the best land in this nation, fenced it in with wire, and pasture many thousands of Texas cattle at big profit, and pay not a cent of taxes on the land.

This class of people, who are called Cherokee citizens, rob us of ten times as much land as the intruders. Now, if we are robbed in this way what's the difference who robs us? This everlasting talk of putting out the intruders, and then doing nothing, is getting so old and stale it makes me tired to hear it. Better say less and do something. If the bosses want to help the people why don't they handle those robbers who come under Cherokee laws and make them give up those many thousand acres that belong to others? There has been lots of talk about doing this, but it has never been done. It appears that the cattlemen and the "Indians for revenue only" have too much money to have any such thing happen.

Some of those fellows who are making such noise about putting out the intruder robbers have robbed their own people worse than the intruder, and were the cause of getting many of the intruders into this country as a money-making scheme. This can't be denied. Before we make such a howl about the intruder robber let us sweep our own dooryard.

I see no good for the poor Cherokees in putting out the intruders if our rich men are to buy up their places. Just as well let the intruders stay here. The best way I can see out of this difficulty we are in is for all the land to be divided between the Cherokee people, so that each person may have what belongs to them, and no more. Then the intruders would have to go, and the land robbers give up what didn't belong to them. This would bring our home robbers to time and others also.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, it will be seen by this article that if the so-called intruders are put out their improvements will be sold and bought by the same men who now have the country in their hands. It will add much to their holding, but the homeless Indian and colored citizen will be in no wise benefited.

Mr. Chairman, I now desire to have read a petition of 520 native Cherokee Indians, all Indians by blood or adoption of that tribe, which was presented at the last national council of that nation and received no consideration, and which gave to them no beneficial results. I ask the Clerk to omit the names, there being so many that I can not consume the time of the House in having them read, but permit me to say that I find among the names the brother of this chief who so bitterly attacks the commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

PETITION.

TO THE HONORABLE COUNCIL OF THE CHEROKEE NATION: We, the undersigned citizens, beg leave to call your attention to the deplorable and unsatisfactory condition of our public domain—with which you are familiar—and ask that you enact such law or laws as will correct this condition. A portion of our citizens through the connivance and financial assistance of noncitizens have managed to monopolize our entire public domain, under various pretenses of law. Thousands of our citizens are to-day without homes, and there is no land left upon which they can make homes. Our entire country is wired in, and anyone desiring to travel across the country a few miles is necessarily forced to go, in many instances, 10 miles around in order to reach a place only 3 or 4 miles away. In most places in the nation the noncitizens on land claims outnumber the citizens, west of Grand River, in Cooweescoowee and Delaware districts, it is the exception to the rule to find a citizen on a claim; the noncitizens will outnumber them 100 to 1. There is nothing thought of one man in this portion of country claiming from five to twenty farms. And in most instances these farms perhaps consist of 10 acres in cultivation and from one to five thousand acres in grass land for hay to cut and ship out of the country for speculation. These noncitizens claim to be leasing this land from citizens. And in most instances when a noncitizen once gets to be a leaseholder he then commences to lease to other noncitizens on his own account. Hundreds of leases are held by noncitizens emanating from another noncitizen. Thus our entire public domain is absorbed, and they even go so far as to sell the unfenced quarter for hay purposes for shipment. This condition of affairs has been productive of a great hardship to a large portion of our citizens; they realize that they are entirely deprived of homes and privileges on the public domain, while the few citizens, together with noncitizens, are monopolizing all of their rights. Even hay and wood are denied them.

Heretofore we have endeavored through our councilors and senators to obtain relief, but so far these land monopolists have been able to thwart us in our design and with money have defeated us in this our right. We are perfectly aware of the fact that these transactions with noncitizens are without the semblance of law to protect them under the Government. And the courts of the United States in this Territory have decided that they have no status under the Arkansas statutes. The Interior Department has long since decided that even our council had no right to lease land. And surely such a right can not be delegated to a citizen.

In view of all these things, we, as law-abiding citizens, once more ask for relief at your hands. We view our own council as the proper place to make our wants known and obtain redress for our wrongs. And we trust that our appeal will not be in vain.

We are fully determined to have redress. We can no longer suffer our rights and the rights of our families to be trampled upon by monopolists and ignored by our officers. We ask you for relief once more, and trust you will not ignore our request. We would regret very much to be driven to the necessity of appealing to the United States Government for relief, but the duty we owe ourselves, our wives, and children will impel us to this course as a last resort to obtain our rights. We ask your consideration of this subject at this assembling of council; and if not complied with this petitition will surely be forwarded to the Congress of the United States, asking them for the relief our own government has for many years steadily refused us.

We, your petitioners, will ever pray.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to read from a personal petition which I received from 40 citizens residing in and near the town of Antlers, in the Choctaw Nation:

We, the undersigned residents of the Choctaw Nation, do by these presents represent to your honor the deplorable condition of affairs in this Indian country. One of our neighbors, a worthy young man, was foully murdered by two full-blood Indians, and many threats against the white people of murdering and violence are to be heard upon every hand. Even one Choctaw preacher is now openly advocating a war of extermination of the white men, and we sincerely believe, from this murder that has just occurred at our door and their maneuvering, that they fully intend to carry out these threats; that under the present state of affairs here there is neither protection to life nor property. Therefore we sincerely beg of you that you urge Congress to give us a different form of government that will at least give us some protection for our lives. We are peaceable and by consent and invitation of these Indians hold leases.

I will state at this point that these are farmers who hold farms which they have leased from citizens of the nation.

We have always observed their laws and paid our permits, and now feel justified in demanding at least some protection from the United States Government. A martial law would be far preferable to the present farce of law.

I will read at this point a description of the murder referred to in this petition. It shows that it does not grow out of personal enmity or malice, but out of race prejudice:

MURDERED BY CHOCTAW BOYS—LEE CRUMM SHOT, SCALPED, AND OTHERWISE MUTILATED, AND THEN ROBBED.

ANTLERS, IND. T., *January 2.*

Lee Crumm, white, was murdered 2 miles from here by two Choctaw boys, aged 12 and 16. They shot him on Sunday, injuring him badly. On Monday they went back, scalped him while still alive, and cut off his ears. Then they cut his throat, gouged out his eyes, slashing his cheeks, and robbed his dead body. When arrested both confessed, explaining that United States laws were no good, and that they had decided to kill a white man.

This petition and the peculiar character of this tragedy warn us, Mr. Chairman, that there is a ceaseless conflict going on in this country—one that I firmly believe will result in open warfare before the close of this year, if Congress neglects to take aggressive steps to prevent it. They prefer martial law to present conditions, and I agree with them, for if these conditions continue it will take a standing army to keep the peace.

Now, I also desire to call attention to a murder committed only a few weeks ago, simply to give some indication of the general character of these crimes, between two and three hundred of which have occurred in this territory in one year. This occurred within a few miles of the border:

DOUBLE MURDER NEAR MULDROW.

Rev. Lacey Laskey, a full-blood Cherokee preacher, and another Indian, named Mack Glass, were shot and killed by some unknown persons last Friday night at the home of Mr. Laskey, about 10 miles northeast of this place, when James Laskey, a son of the preacher, was also shot, and is reported in a critical condition. The parties who came in for the coffins on Saturday report that the killing was done by two men, supposed to be Indians, who are still at large.

It appears that the motive of the killing was robbery. Glass, who was reported to have quite a sum of money, was met by the two men, who demanded his money. He told them that his money was at Mr. Laskey's house, to which the parties went. While searching the house for the money Mr. Laskey, his son, and Glass made resistance, which resulted in the shooting and killing. One of the robbers was shot, but how bad is not known. He dropped his gun and left it where it fell. Mr. Laskey was highly esteemed among all classes.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know whether or not these whites who were murdered were of this intruder class?

Mr. LITTLE. They were not—not the ones concerning whom I have read.

Mr. PICKLER. In that petition you have read you say that the Indians have taken the law into their own hands. Are not they there referring to the intruders, as they are termed.

Mr. LITTLE. No, sir. This refers to white people who are there lawfully at the invitation of the Choctaws and comply with their laws.

Mr. PICKLER. I fully agree that some other kind of government ought to be given there. The United States must furnish a government. But I would like to hear the gentleman, if he has any information, as he in all probability has, with reference to the removal of the intruders. He will remember that Congress provided that these intruders—these white men that have gone in there—should be removed, and that Congress provided for their removal March, 1894. Now, they were not removed. The Government failed to remove them in accordance with its treaty with the Indians; and in the last Congress we extended the time, saying that these intruders might remain there until January 1, 1895. Now, I want to know what the Government has done to carry out the treaty with these Indians; and if it has not done anything, if that is not a source largely of the trouble in the Indian Territory—that these Indians claim that the Government will not remove these intruders as they have agreed to do—and that they have now taken the law into their own hands, and if the present Administration is not to be criticised for not carrying out these laws.

Mr. LITTLE. The Government did agree to put out that class of people known as intruders, when it was ascertained how this agreement was being abused, and that it was about to result in great wrong to many thousands of people. The Secretary declined to enforce the order until Congress had an opportunity to establish an impartial tribunal to determine who were intruders; and I most heartily commend him for it. He acted with justice and human-

ity. I submit the following extract from the last report of the commission, at pages 15 and 16, which fully justifies the course of the Secretary:

CHEROKEE CITIZENSHIP.

Citizenship in these nations has been left by the National Government entirely under the control of the authorities in the several existing governments.

The citizenship roll of the Cherokees has dealt with a larger number than any of the others, affecting, as it does, all North Carolina Cherokees who desire to become a part of the nation, and a more liberal policy of adoption by intermarriage and otherwise than exists in the other tribes.

A tribunal was established many years ago for determining the right of admission to this roll, and it was made up at that time by judicial decision in each case. Since that time and since the administration of public affairs has fallen into present hands, this roll has become a political football, and names have been stricken from it and added to it and restored to it without notice or rehearing or power of review, to answer political or personal ends and with entire disregard of rights affected thereby. Many who have long enjoyed all the acknowledged rights of citizenship have, without warning, found themselves thus decitizenized and deprived both of political and property rights pertaining to such citizenship.

This practice of striking names from the rolls has been used in criminal cases to oust courts of jurisdiction depending on that fact, and the same names have been afterwards restored to the roll when that fact would oust another court of jurisdiction of the same offense. Glaring instances of the entire miscarriage of prosecutions from this cause have come to the knowledge of the commission, and cases of the greatest hardship affecting private rights are of frequent occurrence. This practice is persisted in in defiance of an expressed opinion of the Attorney-General of the United States forwarded to this nation on a case presented that it was not in their power to thus decitizenize one who has been made a citizen by this tribunal clothed by law with the authority. There is no remedy but an interference of the United States.

The "intruders' roll" is being manipulated in the same way. This "intruders' roll" is the list of persons whose claim to citizenship is denied by the nation, and who, by the agreement in the purchase of the "Cherokee Strip," the United States are to remove from the Territory by the 1st of January next. This roll is now being prepared for that purpose by the Cherokee authorities in a manner most surprising and shocking to every sense of justice, and in disregard of the plainest principles of law. The chief assumes to have authority to "designate" the names to be put upon the intruders' roll, and names are, by his order, without hearing or notice, transferred from the citizens' roll to that of intruders, so that, on January 1, 1896, the United States will be called upon to remove from the Territory, by force if need be, thousands of residents substantially selected for that purpose by the chief of the nation. It has been made clear to the commission that the grossest injustice and fraud characterize this roll.

Persons whose names have been upon the citizens' roll by the judicial decree of the tribunal established by law for that purpose for many years, some of them for twenty or more, persons who have enjoyed all the rights of citizens, unquestioned by anyone until distribution per capita of the strip money, have been by the mere "designation" of the chief stricken from the citizens' roll and put upon that of intruders, with notice to quit before January next. Children of such parents, born in the nation, now of age, with families and homes of their own, are receiving this notice to leave forever all they have earned and the homes they have built for themselves, and this at the will of the chief alone. If the United States Government removes such persons it will become a participant in this fraud and injustice, for which ignorance alone can form any excuse. The commission feel it a duty to call attention to these facts and invoke the direct intervention of the Government to prevent the consummation of this great wrong.

Mr. PICKLER. Is not that made an excuse?

Mr. LITTLE. That is the excuse of the Cherokees.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. It is not the excuse of any of the others. Now, I want to give you the history of a gang of outlaws that prospered in that country for ten days. I do this with great regret, because it is no pleasure to depict this condition; but I want to impress upon Congress the absolute necessity of preserving the right, the integrity, and the virtue of the people of that country.

Mr. PICKLER. You can not say too much in that direction.

Mr. LITTLE. What I want to do—if I have the power and the ability to do so—is to let this nation know the evil conditions existing there, to the end that people may be inspired to do something to save these people, the Indians and whites, the intruders and nonintruders, all alike. Now, listen to this. None of those that I have read occurred out of the intruder question exclusively. Now I want to speak of the Buck gang, which was fully equal to or worse than any gang that ever existed there, and give a brief history of their crimes which occurred in ten days. The Buck gang sprung up suddenly near Hope Mulligan, and flourished about ten days; but during that ten days they made a criminal record that equaled that of the Dalton gang, or the Starr gang, or the Cook gang, during the length of time they flourished. Now, these three gangs referred to here, in addition to the Buck gang, were lawless marauders, who swept that country with terror, who robbed many people, murdered many people, and robbed trains, until the express companies withdrew from the Territory.

This started Sunday, July 28.

THE RUFUS BUCK GANG—FOUR YOUNG FELLOWS WHO WILL HAVE TO ANSWER FOR RAPE, MURDER, AND ROBBERY.

The Buck gang sprang up suddenly near Ocmulgee, flourished about ten days, and were taken in, but during that ten days they made a criminal record that fades the Dalton gang, the Starr gang, or the Cook gang, considering the length of time they operated.

They started out on Sunday, July 28, by killing a negro deputy marshal at Ocmulgee. Rufus Buck himself is said to have done this job. After this Rufus Buck, Sam Samson, Meoma July, Lucky Davis, and Lewis Davis started out raiding through the country, terrorizing every section they visited. Four of them met Mrs. Wilson, who was moving from one farm to another with two wagons. Her 14-year-old son and a young man who was with her were made to drive on with one wagon, while they kept the woman and the other wagon. They made her get out, and each one of them assaulted her, after which she was allowed to go her way.

Five of them a day or two later went to the house of Mr. Hasson, between Duck and Snake creeks, and after forcing the lady to prepare dinner for them, and partaking of it, all five of the scoundrels assaulted her, tying her down with a rope. They then amused themselves by making Hasson and another man who was present fight each other and dance, shooting around their feet to make them move lively.

They met a man named Shafey on Berryhill Creek, 8 miles from Ocmulgee, robbed him of his horse, saddle, and bridle, $50 in money, and a gold watch. They then discussed the advisability of killing him, and took a vote on it. Three of them voted to let him go, and he was allowed to depart on foot.

They robbed a stock man named Callahan, even taking his boots, and then shot at him, one ball grazing his ear. At the same time they shot a negro boy who was with Callahan. He is said to have since died of his wound.

They visited the home of Gus Chambers, on Duck Creek, 10 miles from Sapulpa, to steal some horses after night. Chambers made a fight, and they filled his house with lead, but hurt no one. They got one horse.

They robbed Norberg's store, near McDermott, and also Orcutt's store, in the same locality. The next day after the Norberg robbery, Capt. Edmund Harry, of the Creek Light Horse, with Light Horsemen Tom Grayson, George Brown, and Skansey, accompanied by Deputy United States Marshals Sam Haynes and N. B. Irvin, run on to the outlaws while they were dividing their plunder, and after a fight in which some 200 shots were fired, all the outlaws surrendered except Lewis Davis, who escaped during the fight. Deputy Marshals Ledbetter, Tolbert, Jones, and Wilson were hot on the trail of the outlaws, and got to the scene of the fight a few minutes after the surrender.

Lynching was freely talked of, and the citizens would certainly have been justified in putting an end to the whole gang; but being assured that the scoundrels would be turned over to Judge Parker's court, the officers were allowed to bring them in alive, and arrived here with them Sunday. They also brought in Albert Stake, who is charged with being implicated in the Garrett murder, but was not with them in the other depredations.

They will be indicted and tried during the present term of court. Buck is part Uche; Samson and July are Indians, while Lucky Davis is a negro.

This gang, Mr. Chairman, in this short period is not only evidence of the outgrowth, but the natural growth of the conditions existing in that country. If I had the power of speech to depict it, I think it could be made so plain that every man would respond to the voice of these commissioners who have gone down there in person and looked into those conditions with a view to correct them. There are, first, five paltry governments claiming to be sovereign in this Territory, held, as I say, together by the power of public plunder. Not only that, but there are within that country 250,000 white people who are not regarded as intruders; who have gone there on the invitation of the Indians, and have leased their lands, paying their permits; who are there to-day without the benefit of law or of schools. And not only that, but 1,500 up to 8,000, the number not known, of a class known as intruders. That is a class that claim to be Cherokee Indians by blood, and that the tribes deny that right. He claims his citizenship, which is denied him, and is therefore classed as an intruder; but no man is classed as an intruder in their country who does not claim to be a citizen. These people Congress by a treaty agreed to put out on the 1st day of January. They declined to do so, the reason for which I explained a moment ago. Whether that is right or not I shall not now further discuss, but I want to go on along this line——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Arkansas be extended until he concludes his argument.

The CHAIRMAN. How much additional time does the gentleman from Arkansas desire?

Mr. LITTLE. Not very much.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for twelve minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Will that extend the time for general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not.

Mr. WASHINGTON. It will in effect, though.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request and ask that the time of the gentleman from Arkansas be extended twelve minutes, and also that the time for closing general debate be extended for twelve minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. LITTLE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will read an article from a paper published in the city of Fort Smith, which gives some idea of the conditions prevailing in that country.

Just what this Western country is coming to and what is to be the ultimate result is a thing that puzzles one's mind nowadays. Only a few days since 32 prisoners were taken to the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., and the jail, which had been taxed beyond its capacity, was somewhat relieved. It was thought there would be sufficient room for the remaining ones during the next few weeks, but in this calculation there was a mistake, for every day since the trip to Kansas deputies have arrived with other prisoners, and the number registered on the docket each evening has been steadily increasing. Cells which it was thought would not be used to accommodate more than two people have been made to hold three, and with no prospect of another exodus to the pen for nearly two months the outlook is not promising for the comfort of the inhabitants of Uncle Sam's brick building. Deputies armed with writs have been and are in the saddle and pursuing men for various crimes, and if the record for the past week is maintained there will not be more than room enough in the jail to turn around. On Thursday there were 14 arrivals, on Friday there were 6, and yesterday capped the climax, when 16 were brought in. Fortunately 5 of these last were released on bond; but when the jail doors closed at 6 o'clock there were 228 on the inside, or 4 more than when the trip to Leavenworth was made.

How to account for the increase of crime is the point that is left to the reader to determine.

Now, I want to say to this House that with the conflict of jurisdiction in the courts there, with the thousands of white people in that Territory without law or government, we can not expect or hope anything else than for raid after raid to follow. Remember that the children of these 250,000 white people have not the benefit of public schools, or of any education except such as their parents may be able to give them, and yet they must furnish the blood for that country; and must it be the progressive, educated American citizen's blood, or must it be the poisoned blood of the criminal? In the face of the history of this country, I tell you we can not afford to stand still when we witness cases like that which I cited awhile ago—the Buck case—where both these inoffensive and virtuous women died from the outrages committed by these criminals and outlaws. Remember, too, that these outlaws are not confined to the Indians; many of them are white. They are made up of the lowest of all classes of people. Whenever a crime is committed anywhere throughout the United States the outlaw flies to that country, and as these Indian governments are not able to protect themselves or their people, I say it is our duty to see that that Territory is made, not a nesting place for criminals, but the home of a happy and progressive citizenship.

Now, I am asked what ought to be done, and I have no hesitancy in saying that this Congress ought to put a government over that Territory of sufficient strength to maintain property rights and protect human life. In the petition that I read a few moments ago, 40 citizens in one neighborhood say to you: "Give us martial law if you can not give us anything else." Men stickle over "treaty obligations." Sir, I ask you, is not the blood of the citizen, is not the protection of our women, of higher importance than treaty obligations, which have but the binding force of statutes? I am sick of this sentimentality. It would have done thirty or forty years ago.

I agree with you that a treaty, like a statute, must be maintained when rights of property have been vested under it. I do not want you to violate it. I do not want a cent's worth of the property of the Indians. I want it distributed according to the provisions of the treaties, but I do want a government there which will protect all the people in their property rights and in their lives. If you will examine these treaties you will find that in every one of them this Government reserves the right and power to protect life and property in the Territory. We have put courts out there with three Federal judges in their respective districts, yet the conditions have grown worse. The courts have been as efficient as they could be with their limited number of deputies; they have done all they could; but their dockets are overburdened. The dockets of the courts at Paris and Fort Smith are groaning under the burdens resting upon them. And, Mr. Chairman, you may put a Federal court in every township in that country, yet if you leave these conflicting interests standing you will not protect human life.

If you want a man to love a government he must have some interest in it. There you have 250,000 people without the right to vote, without a sense of allegiance to the government under which they live, and that government has no power over them. Those are the conditions existing there, and in the name of the blood of 300 men in that country, murdered in the past year, I appeal to you as the lawmaking power of this Government to extend its strong arm over that part of the country. I have lived upon that border all my life. I have gone to school with these Indian boys. I have courted, if you please, the Indian girls. [Laughter.] I know these people. Many of them I regard highly. They are a good people, as a rule, but, like average human nature, when they get the reins of government in their own hands they are grasping and disposed to use it for their own profit.

In addition to this I might say that I know many of the white people in that Territory, and out of the 250,000 a large majority are good, honest, law-abiding people, many of whom were unfortunate and whose homes were sold under mortgage in Kansas or Louisiana or Texas or other States, who were invited into the Indian Territory by these lease laws and have leased these farms and are living upon them. Those men are entitled to protection. The idea of the United States, broad and great, the proudest Government on earth—the idea of such a Government sitting here with a Territory within its borders as large as Indiana without the national flag! Five little, tottering, lean, crippled governments claiming to be sovereign, higher than our flag.

I beg you to take hold of this question with courage. Do justice to every Indian. I say this Congress ought to put its hands upon the throats of these men who have absorbed the lands of that Territory, and should distribute them justly among the Indians as the treaties provide. [Applause.] When men come to you arguing that existing conditions ought to be maintained, ask them, "How much land have you?" or "How much land have the men who sent you here?" That is what is the trouble—the unjust and unequal distribution of the land.

I am glad, sir, that on this question, nonpartisan as it is, we may look higher than partisanship. This is a question that appeals to us all, to our integrity, to our pride and self-respect as members of a great nation. We can not shut our eyes to the existing conditions. It is the cry of the Armenian at our own doors. Delegates from some of these Territories may deny those conditions; but every commission we have sent out to that country establishes the fact. I have read papers coming from the people there. Sir, I have a detailed list of eleven murders which occurred in the Cherokee Nation during last Christmas week; yet they were not enough to attract public attention. A little Territory, not much larger than an ordinary county, has eleven murders committed in one week, and it scarcely attracts the notice of the press.

My friends, I feel profoundly in earnest about this matter. I feel that upon the action of this Congress rest the lives of these people, the hopes of their children, the personal safety of their women. We can not shut our eyes to the facts as they present themselves. It is too late to discuss how they got there, whether they had a right to go there or not. Certainly their children are not responsible for being there. It is our duty to meet the existing conditions and to afford relief.

This Congress ought to establish an impartial tribunal to make a valid roll of those Indians. Those who are not entitled to be on that roll—who have absorbed the property of the Indians by bribery or fraud—ought to be stricken off the roll. Indians who claim that they have been denied their rights ought to be heard. They ought to be permitted to establish those rights if they can. When that is done the lands ought to be surveyed. They ought to be allotted in severalty among the Indians under such restrictions as Congress in its wisdom may deem proper. Sir, there are towns after towns, having not less than 5,000 inhabitants, that are now without government, without law. They are simple monuments of the progressive spirit of the average American. Yet they are without corporation laws, without health laws. There are no restraints except such as may be agreed to by common consent. Shall we act promptly, fearlessly, and give relief, or shall we stand still and let these appalling conditions continue? [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, for quite a time after the beginning of this session it was a mystery to me why I had been placed on the Committee on Indian Affairs. I had not requested the appointment. I knew very little about Indians, and I knew very little about the Representatives in Congress who are in the habit of speaking for the Indians. It only now begins to dawn upon me, as the weeks go by, that the Speaker of this House possibly did fairly well in putting on that committee some gentlemen who come from sections of country a little farther east than that of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE], who has just addressed the committee.

While I am not disposed to take issue with him in regard to the reforms which are necessary in the Indian Territory among the five tribes that inhabit it, I will say that the Indian has not been heard in this House and has no representative here. When the time comes to discuss the proposition to reform the government of the Indian Territory, then it is possible such a discussion may be had on that question as will not only fairly represent the white man's side of the controversy, but also that of the red man.

It is true there are many white men in the Indian Territory; but they are all volunteers in that country; they were not compelled to go there; they went there hoping that they might better themselves; and now being there, they want to reform that government so as to protect themselves possibly more than those who own the Territory, and are justly entitled to fair treatment on the part of this Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Indian appropriation bill is fair and just, and that it will meet very little opposition in this Committee of the Whole. I think the appropriations made in it are those which have generally been made by previous Congresses. The appropriations which have been made for the schools are not so large as they have been in former years.

APPROPRIATIONS TO SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with those who are opposed to appropriations of public funds to be used in sectarian schools or other institutions of a denominational character. I am of the opinion that all public moneys should be expended under the direction of the Government through duly authorized officials. The argument against withholding appropriations to sectarian organizations is that the Government has not suitable schoolhouses and homes for the classes who are to be provided for out of public funds, and therefore we must either abandon the homeless and dependent children or turn them over to these sectarian organizations. That, Mr. Chairman, has been the argument for many years, and yet provision has not been made for them in Government institutions.

I am pleased to be able to say that this Indian appropriation bill carries only 60 per cent of the amount appropriated for contract schools in 1895, and provision is made for conducting Indian schools under Government supervision. If Congress shall steadily adhere to this policy the time will be short when the Government will be prepared to educate and provide for all who have just claims

to share in the appropriations. If I could have my way I would dispense with appropriations for contract schools entirely. There is no necessity for continuing to make appropriations to denominational schools any longer than is required to provide schools and homes for these wards of the nation. There should be no delay in providing such institutions.

Only a few days ago this House struck from the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia certain appropriations to quite a number of sectarian organizations. I voted to discontinue these appropriations, not because I wanted to discontinue such relief as is necessary and proper for the homeless and destitute children of this District, but because I think the time has come when we must take a decided stand against placing the public money in the hands of those who control its disbursement through sectarian schools and other denominational organizations. If it is necessary to have buildings for the use of these children they should be provided. But they will not be provided so long as Congress listens to the persuasive appeals of those who have heretofore had the use of the public funds in their denominational work.

Mr. Chairman, I am not to be deterred from my duty because of the charge made upon the floor of this House that this movement is the result of an agitation begun by the A. P. A. organization. I am not advised whether that organization has been instrumental in awakening public sentiment upon this question or not, but if it has I think it deserves credit for it rather than condemnation. It is also charged by the opposition to this policy that it is a crusade against the Catholic Church. Why that construction should be put upon it I can not understand, unless it is because that church has had a disproportionate amount of the public funds at its disposal.

It can not be denied that the Catholic Church has done much for the relief of the poor and suffering—and the same may be said of other churches—but it is equally true that as a church it does not have much regard for other denominations and other forms of worship. It will not intrust the early education of the children of its members to the public schools. And doubtless, as is most natural, from their standpoint of duty, their desire is to inculcate their religious doctrines into the minds of the children placed under their management. It may be urged that the same may be said of other churches as to those under their charge. If so, that does not constitute an argument in favor of confiding public money to sectarian organizations.

No, sir; it will not suffice to turn me against the principle which I am advocating, concerning the policy of the Government with reference to sectarian schools and organizations, to declaim against the American Protective Association because of its position concerning this question. On the contrary, I welcome the support of all men and all organizations in this effort to reform the administration of the public funds. I believe it will afford larger liberty of conscience and at the same time, under moral and religious supervision of Government officials, without reference to sect or denomination, accomplish more for the youthful inmates of our institutions, and the principles of our Government will find a deeper footing and a firmer lodgment in the hearts and minds of not only the beneficiaries of the Government's bounty but of the great body of the people of this free and independent Republic.

One of the cardinal principles of this Government is the separation of church and state, and I am unwilling to disregard that principle, although I may incur the displeasure of those who are interested in and seek to divert the public funds to the support of sectarian institutions. [Applause.] It has been said that the Government can not build the necessary schoolhouses now because there is no money which can be applied in that way.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should inaugurate a policy which will raise money to do that and many other things which would better the condition of the American people. If this House and the Senate and the President would give to the country a proper tariff law there would be enough money for all purposes, and there would be no deficiencies. I believe this House is to some extent responsible for the position we occupy before the country to-day. I voted for the very inadequate tariff bill which passed this body, but which is now tied up in the Senate. But it would not afford much protection to my constituents.

M'KINLEY AND PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, I read in a newspaper recently that the great champion of the protective-tariff idea in the United States had recently taken backward steps on the tariff question. I deny that, Mr. Chairman, and in refutation of the false assertion I will send to the Clerk's desk and have read some remarks made by Mr. McKinley in his recent speech in the city of Chicago before the Marquette Club.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I object to being interrupted. I do not want my time to be exhausted. I ask the Clerk to read the article I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects to what?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I have a right to have the article read.

Mr. BENNETT. I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman can have the extract read as part of his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think the Chair has made a mistake; the caucus does not begin until 8 o'clock to-night. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I ask the Clerk to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against bringing politics into this Chamber. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. What point of order does the gentleman make?

Mr. BREWSTER. That this article that the Clerk is reading is not germane to the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk then resumed and concluded the reading of the extract, as follows:

PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

The question of the continuance or abandonment of our protective system has been the one great, overshadowing, and vital question in American politics ever since Mr. Cleveland opened the contest in December, 1887, to which the lamented James G. Blaine made swift reply from across the sea—

[Great applause.]

and it will continue the issue until a truly American policy, for the good of America, is firmly established and perpetuated. The fight will go on and must go on until the American system is everywhere recognized, until all nations come to understand and respect it as distinctly and all Americans come to honor and love it as dearly as they do the American flag.

[Applause.]

God grant the day may soon come when all partisan contention over it is forever at an end!

[Renewed applause.]

It may be asked what the next Republican tariff law will provide. I can not tell you. I can not tell you what the schedules and rates will be, but they will measure the difference between American and European conditions, and will, moreover, be fully adequate to protect ourselves from the invasion of our markets by Oriental products to the injury of American labor, and will in no case be too low to protect and exalt American labor and promote and increase American production.

[Great applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINSMORE. Will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I have no time; I must be excused.

Mr. DINSMORE. It is a mere inquiry.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I hope the Chairman will get order. I wish to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply had that slip read for the purpose of showing to this Congress, and to the country, that this great representative of American protection has taken no back ground. [Applause.] Furthermore, gentlemen, whatever may be said by politicians on that great question, here or elsewhere, whether it comes from Eastern States where we have some free-trade Republicans, or whether it comes from the North, South, or West, one thing is sure, the people of this country want genuine, old-fashioned, Republican, protective-tariff legislation, and I think this House should pass such a bill. [Applause.] Away down in the hearts of the Republicans of the United States protection is deeply rooted and firmly established as the great and overshadowing economic question of vital importance to the languishing industries of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a good many points to discuss that are pertinent to this Indian question. [Laughter.] But in the brief time allotted to me I shall have to pass them. I wanted to talk on the Monroe doctrine. I wanted to show how this country, under the leadership of one of the great Presidents, had taken a position which established, at least so far as this country is concerned, a policy which is necessary for the aggrandizement of American institutions and for the growth of this great Republic.

First, we had the trouble with Great Britain and Russia in the extreme north. They wanted to enlarge their possessions in North America. In 1823 a similar question arose between the Allied Powers of Europe and the United States concerning the revolutionary subjects of Spain in South America. These aggressions of European powers led to the declaration of the Monroe doctrine. This doctrine, briefly stated, was that the United States would not interfere with European provinces in this hemisphere, but would interpose to prevent the overthrow of governments which had been recognized by this Government, and also declared that European nations would not be permitted to establish new governments or acquire new possessions upon American soil.

Now the matter is before us again, arising out of this Venezuela question; and I am thoroughly convinced that the Monroe doc-

trine applies to the controversy between Great Britain relative to the true line between British Guiana and Venezuela. How does the Monroe doctrine apply to this controversy? Because England claims territory which is disputed. If she may, by reason of her superior power, take forcible possession of that disputed territory, which may not belong to British Guiana, she may thereby enlarge her possessions on American soil. That is directly in violation of the Monroe doctrine. It is true that Great Britain claims the disputed territory, but shall the matter be decided by Great Britain as the sole arbiter of a dispute in which she is interested? I think not, and while, as General Sherman once said in my presence, "War is hell," I say, notwithstanding all that, if it becomes necessary for this country to uphold the Monroe doctrine and maintain her credit here and throughout the world we had better have war, with all its cruelties, than to suffer humiliation and dishonor or lower the American standard upon land and sea. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss the pension question briefly in connection with this bill. [Laughter.] I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that during the past year there were 39,185 new pensions granted and 103,355 rejected. I should think the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] would be satisfied with that kind of an administration of the Pension Office; about three times as many pension claims rejected as were allowed. I have not time to discuss the policy of the Pension Office, but I here and now desire to say that I think the office is illiberal and unjust in its treatment of the valiant and patriotic men who carried the flag of the Union triumphantly through four years of cruel and bloody war. [Applause.]

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I have no time for questions.

THE MONEY QUESTION.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to pay these great appropriations, and place this country on an easy footing, we must have some money, and I should like to discuss the currency question in connection with the free coinage of silver.

Mr. BURRELL. Take up the service-pension bill and speak about that.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I can not take more time at present.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. DE WITT] offered a very considerate proposition with regard to the coinage of silver. I submit that it would be well for every free-coinage man, and every man in this country who favors bimetallism, to consider that proposition and see whether it is a good one. But I have a proposition which I am going to submit. It is the act of July 14, 1890, except no coin is to be issued, but notes are to be issued and redeemed in bullion.

I send the proposed measure to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SILVER BULLION REDEMPTION FUND.

A bill providing for the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of United States Treasury notes redeemable in bullion.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, not exceeding $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment of such purchases of silver bullion Treasury notes of the United States to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury in such form and of such denominations, not less than $1 nor more than $1,000, as he may prescribe, and a sum sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 2. That the silver bullion which shall be purchased under the provisions of this act shall be kept in the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of redeeming the Treasury notes issued in accordance with the provisions of this act; and said Treasury notes shall be redeemable on demand in silver bullion, purchased under the provisions of this act, at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States where there is silver bullion kept for that purpose; and the holder of any Treasury note issued pursuant to the provisions of this act, upon surrender thereof to the Secretary of the Treasury, in sums of $50, or any multiples thereof, shall receive in exchange or payment therefor silver bullion equal in market value, on the day of surrender, to the amount expressed on the face of the note or notes surrendered; and when surrendered such notes may be reissued. But no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion purchased under this act and then held in the Treasury purchased by such notes; and such Treasury notes shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, and shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues; and when so received may be reissued.

SEC. 3. That the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the requirements of existing law and the regulations of the mint service governing the methods of determining the amount of pure silver contained, and the amount of charges or deductions, if any, to be made.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury, or some competent person to be appointed by him, shall daily ascertain and fix the market price of silver bullion which shall be purchased under the provisions of this act, and the price so fixed on each day shall be the maximum price at which bullion may be purchased or paid in redemption of notes, but if during the day the market price declines from or is less than the price fixed for such day, then purchases and redemptions may be made at the market price without reference to the price fixed for that day.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim originality for the thought expressed in this proposition, for it has been discussed before.

If such a bill as the one which I have submitted should be enacted, I believe it would create a currency which would be safe, and, instead of depending upon gold for its parity, would always be worth in gold the face value of the notes issued in pursuance of its provisions. Every dollar represented in a note would be worth a gold dollar's worth of silver bullion, and upon demand therefor the Secretary would exchange a dollar's worth of bullion for each dollar so represented. This would make the redemption of these notes rest upon a silver redemption fund, consisting of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act. The form of the statute is like the act of July 14, 1890, and differs from that act principally in providing for the redemption of the notes in silver bullion instead of coin, which, under that act, was construed to mean redemption in gold.

I do not know that the proposed measure will meet the approval of ultra free-coinage advocates, but it ought to be acceptable to the real friends of bimetallism. It would doubtless help to sustain the price of silver by making a greater demand for its use, and in a way that would not give it a fictitious value. The limit of the amount which might be purchased is not very material, and perhaps might as well be left out, because the plan would be entirely safe to any extent of operation without possible loss to the Government unless its operation should tend to depreciate silver. Such a result is improbable, and if it ever should transpire that the price of bullion should decline a little I think the necessity for some additional redemption fund would warrant Congress in taking a little risk of possible loss from a decline in the value of bullion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Are not the silver certificates as good as gold?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. The gentleman asks me if silver certificates are not as good as gold. They are, because when the United States declared that gold and silver metals should be maintained on a parity these certificates became as good as gold, because they are based on gold. All of our paper currency, including $333,456,236 silver certificates, $141,092,280 Treasury notes under the act of July 14, 1890, and $346,681,016 greenbacks now in circulation, is based upon gold. And it may be said the national-bank notes, amounting to $207,368,028 on November 1, 1895, are included. I think to a great extent they are included, because they are redeemable in lawful money, and lawful money is payable in gold. Of course they have the additional security which the bonds deposited for their redemption gives them. But, nevertheless, whoever has national-bank notes may, by demanding their payment in greenbacks and Treasury notes, procure such paper as will be redeemed in gold.

This is too great a draft upon the gold in this country. Our supply of coin is as follows: Gold coin, $564,132,920, and gold bullion, $53,945,262; silver coin, $500,548,489, and silver bullion, $125,078,608. But of these metals $646,179,727 are held in the Treasury, and held there as basic money, and upon which the credit of our paper currency depends. And therefore indirectly every national-bank note may be used to get gold.

Mr. HYDE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I do not think I can yield, as I have very little time. If it is a short one I will yield; but when we strike a Western man we do not know where he will end. He often injects a silver speech into his question.

Mr. HYDE. Is a silver certificate now, or has it ever been, redeemed in gold or anything but silver?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. There is nothing redeemed in silver in the United States. No paper currency is redeemed in silver. I admit that the Secretary of the Treasury has discretion to pay in either coin. But by the act of July 14, 1890, and again by the law of 1893, repealing in part the act of 1890, it is declared to be the policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity, and the only way to accomplish that is by paying our paper currency in the most valuable coin. If that policy had not been followed, silver coin would have depreciated, as would any currency redeemable in silver.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not the law say the two metals?

Mr. HYDE. Is it not a fact that they are redeemed in gold, and the law says they shall be redeemed by the silver in the Treasury?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. The law does not so require; of course they would redeem them in silver if the holders wanted silver. If the holder of paper currency will take silver the Secretary of the Treasury will give it to him if there is any silver coin which can be used. But, of course, nobody is going to take silver in preference to gold, when gold is of more value; he will take gold every time, if he has use for coin, except in small amounts.

Mr. HYDE. Can he get gold for silver certificates to-day?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I can not discuss the matter fully with the gentleman. I think I have answered correctly. If they are redeemed at all they are redeemed in gold.

I furthermore say the silver of this country is also dependent, to a large extent, upon gold, and how is it so? Silver is a legal tender except where it is otherwise expressly stipulated in the con-

tract, and in all business transactions it may be exchanged for lawful money, and with the lawful money the former silver holder may go to the Treasury of the United States and get gold. There is not a dollar of currency, other than gold, which does not derive more or less standing because it may be used, directly or indirectly, to procure gold. I have no doubt the credit of our silver coin is greatly sustained because there is substantially a limited coinage of that metal. I do not like this condition of finances, for I think it unduly enhances the value of gold.

We need the use of more silver currency, not only for circulation, but for redemption purposes, and if you free coinage gentlemen will get rid of your delusion—one that you will never be able to impose upon Congress—and accept a dollar for a dollar's worth of silver, instead of asking the Government to stamp and declare legal tender a piece of silver worth much less than a dollar, you will find much support from the older States. This country wants gold and silver, but it wants both on a parity.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I will.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Are you expressing the views of your candidate for the Presidency on the financial question of this country? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I simply say this: That the candidate to whom the gentleman refers stands upon the national platform—for bimetallism; and the way to accomplish it is to make both metals of equal value, so that neither will depend upon the other for its value. In this way we may have bimetallism. Under free coinage at 16 to 1 the coins would not circulate side by side owing to the great disparity in their values. Bimetallism requires both to circulate. [Applause.]

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state whether any silver certificate has ever been redeemed in gold?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Well, I simply use the reports coming from the Department. I say that the $333,000,000 silver certificates now outstanding are classed along with the paper currency, which is redeemable in gold. You will find that statement in the report of the Director of the Mint.

Now, gentlemen, I have discussed this Indian appropriation bill in all fairness [laughter] and without consuming any more of your time——

Mr. HARDY. I move that the gentleman may be granted ten minutes longer.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I am obliged to the gentleman from Indiana, but do not ask any further time. All I ask of gentlemen is that they will seriously consider the arguments I have made in favor of this appropriation and allow me to print so much of my speech as I have not had time to deliver.

Mr. HARTMAN. Are there any more barrels to your shotgun—anything about the Cuban question?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that if there are any they would not do as some other gentlemen's do—fire nothing but wind. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. General debate, by order of the committee, is closed, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department for the year ending June 30, 1897, and fulfilling treaty stipulations for the various Indian tribes, namely——

Mr. DOCKERY. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask permission of the gentleman in charge of the bill to submit an amendment, to come in after the word "Department," in line 6, "in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "Department," add the words "in full compensation for the service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the Yankton Agency, S. Dak., $1,600; in all, $85,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriations shall not take effect nor become available in any case for or during the time in which any officer of the Army of the United States shall be engaged in the performance of the duties of Indian agent at any of the agencies above named: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may devolve the duties of any Indian agency upon the superintendent of the Indian training school located at such agency, whenever in his judgment such superintendent can properly perform the duties of such agency. And the superintendent upon whom such duties devolve shall give bond as other Indian agents.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 6, strike out lines 19, 20, and the words "in which," in line 21, and insert "no" before "officer," in line 21.

Mr. SHERMAN. I reserve the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. Make your point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. The point is that the amendment changes existing law.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to provide that no army officer shall be detailed as an Indian agent.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the existing law provide that officers may be detailed to that duty?

Mr. PICKLER. The appropriation bills passed from year to year have generally contained that provision.

Mr. SHERMAN. All the appropriation bills that I have seen have included that provision, so that the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota would change the law as it exists.

Mr. PICKLER. I think it is a question, Mr. Chairman, whether when you simply make a law from year to year in an appropriation bill it can be regarded as the "existing law."

Mr. BOWERS. There is no question about it. The gentleman knows that the provision in the appropriation bill says that "hereafter" it shall be lawful to make these details.

Mr. PICKLER. Who has the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BOWERS. I have it; at least it looks as if I had. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman in charge of the bill makes the point of order, I will not press the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to decide the point by his recollection of the existing law. The recollection of the Chair is that the appropriation bills have provided by positive enactment that army officers may be detailed for this purpose, and, with that recollection, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the Chair will pardon a suggestion, suppose there was no appropriation bill passed this year, would there still be in existence, as a result of last year's appropriation bill, a law authorizing the detail of these officers; or did the operation of that appropriation bill end absolutely with the fiscal year to which it applied? That is the real question here, and while I take no sides on the particular point at issue, the question I have presented strikes me as an important one. To illustrate, there is a limitation put upon the expenditure of a given appropriation in last year's bill, that it shall not be used for this purpose or that it may be used for that purpose; now, is that the "existing law," so that the appropriation bill passed this year can not make a different limitation? That, it seems to me, is the real question, and the only important one here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that the appropriation bill of last year, according to his recollection (which seems to be confirmed by the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs), contained a positive enactment that army officers might be detailed for this duty. Now, if that be so any provision which repeals or modifies that statute is a change of existing law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Chair is undoubtedly right if there is a statute in existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that he was deciding the question upon his recollection, and it seems to be conceded that that recollection is correct.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But gentlemen here are now contending that there is no existing law on the subject except what appears in the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I am quite certain of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The recollection of the Chair is that the provision was made in the appropriation bill, but made as a positive enactment. The Chair may be wrong in his recollection, and if he is he trusts that some gentleman will correct him.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw that amendment, and move to strike out lines 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, down to the word "*Provided*" and to insert this language: "No officer of the Army of the United States shall be engaged in the performance of the duties of Indian agent at any of the agencies above named." That is merely stating the same proposition in a different form.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order on that.

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to have a vote of the House on this proposition. I believe it is a good proposition. The question has been discussed a good deal from time to time, and I think that during all the time I have been in Congress the provision for the detail of army officers has been made only in the appropriation bills. The gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] suggests that the provisions in appropriation bills have provided that this authority to detail officers to act as Indian agents should continue "hereafter." From year to year that provision has been repeated in the appropriation bills; but I do not think that it operates beyond the end of the year, because, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], it is clear that if no appropriation

bill were passed this year there would no longer be an "existing law" on this subject.

I believe that this amendment is in order. I believe that the provision which has been referred to is merely one which appears from year to year in the appropriation bill. If it is the existing law, why does the committee insert it in this bill? Why is it continually repeated from year to year?

This case is not like other cases—for instance, one which we had the other day—where there is a conflicting provision in the Revised Statutes. At least, according to my memory, this provision is not in the Revised Statutes, but is simply carried in the appropriation bills from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman noticed the language of the proviso? It is that this appropriation shall not be available where an officer of the Army performs the duties of Indian agent. It is in that way a limitation upon the appropriation.

Mr. PICKLER. In that case is not the argument so much stronger to show that it is not a provision of existing or continuing law? It is merely a limitation upon an annual appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that the proviso interferes at all with the existing law. If the Chair is right in his recollection of the facts, the amendment proposed is a change of existing law the same as the other proposition. The recollection of the Chair is quite clear that there was quite a struggle in the House over changing the law in this respect, so as to allow army officers to act as Indian agents; that the provision was enacted after a long debate.

Mr. BOWERS. If I may be allowed a minute, I think I can state the facts in regard to this matter very briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. PICKLER. I presume I must do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOWERS. This provision, which was inserted in an appropriation bill in the Fifty-second Congress, was written by myself. It was offered by me as an amendment; and I think it was included in a single line, something like this: "*Provided*, That hereafter the President of the United States shall detail army officers to perform the duties of Indian agents so fast as vacancies occur."

Mr. PICKLER. That is permanent law.

Mr. BOWERS. That is the whole provision. As has been stated, the proposition was debated for some time; but it was debated longer after it passed than before—some men in Congress were so much surprised about it. The discussion of the matter occupied the Senate about two weeks.

The provision has not been in any appropriation bill since that time, nor was it in any previous bill. It has never been repeated in any appropriation bill; but, as I have said, it is as much the statute law to-day as any law on the books. The gentleman from South Dakota knows it. He makes this fight—I am perfectly willing he should make it—"for the benefit of whom it may concern," every time this bill comes before the House. But we all understand the question. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman should make as good a fight as he can.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I am for this proposition every time it comes before the House, because I believe in it. We have 25,000 Indians in my State—more than in any other State, I believe. We have seven of these agencies, and we know something of this Indian business. As I said yesterday, we know that as a rule civilians are the proper persons for administering the affairs of the Indian agencies. The political party appointing an Indian agent is responsible for that officer, the officer is responsible to his party, and thus we have better service. An army officer (while I have no objection to him in his own line) is out of his line of business when acting as an Indian agent. He does not take the same interest in such matters that a civilian does. He has not so much at heart the interests of the Indians, their education and civilization. It is the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and of everyone that has had anything to do with the investigation of this question that civilians are the proper persons to act as Indian agents. I am opposed to army officers being detailed for this purpose, because such a practice is against the best interests of the Indian service.

I do not undertake to say what was the language of the provision which was inserted in the Indian appropriation bill. It may have been what the gentleman from California has stated; I do not remember the language. But my proposition was that it was simply a provision in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over until a later stage in the consideration of the bill, so that we may find out what the law is on this subject. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] in charge of this bill any objection to that?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not. If there is any question about the facts on which this point of order rests, I do not care to have the Chair run the risk of passing upon the question on an erroneous statement of fact. I do not think, however, there is really any question about the fact——

Mr. BOWERS. There is not. In a moment I will get the record.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to passing over this paragraph informally and going on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the pending paragraph be passed over informally with the point of order pending. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of five Indian inspectors, at $3,000 per annum each, $15,000.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the clause just read providing for the payment of five Indian inspectors. I do not know whether the House is aware of the fact, but my experience is that these five Indian inspectors, attached to the Secretary's office, are used solely by him, or very largely at least, as his political body guards.

They have been sent into Oklahoma Territory during the past three years to work up a sentiment, if such a thing were possible to be done, in favor of the present Secretary of the Interior. At the present time there are two of these inspectors in Pottawatomie County, Okla., and they have caused more trouble with the settlers there than Hoke Smith ever did during his entire administration. It is true that we have been plundered through the course of the Secretary of the Interior, but we overlook all that sort of thing out there.

Now, there are men out there threatening to eject men from farms on which they have built houses, on which they have lived for years, and on which they have planted orchards. Under the system now in operation these men are to be ejected from their homes, and this is done under the statement that they were not paying rent enough to the Indians.

It is well known, Mr. Chairman, to everybody who lives in the West that cash rents in the semiarid regions are almost unknown. The only form of rent, where a man rents the farm at all, is that form in which he pays a percentage of the crops. These inspectors are demanding more rent now per acre in that region of country in some cases than the lands could be sold for. I have appealed to the Indian Office and insisted that a change in this respect was necessary; that something should be done toward righting these people; but, as usual in this Administration, a deaf ear is always turned to the appeal of the poor settler.

I would offer an amendment for the appointment of competent inspectors, if any are to be appointed, were I not well aware of the fact that the standard of efficiency under the present Secretary of the Interior is so low that a man who never saw a farm in his life would be as capable, and more so, than some of the men who are sent out among us to transact farm business for the Indians. For that reason I know it would be absolutely useless to offer such an amendment. And therefore I think the House is justified in refusing to continue the five Indian inspectors, who are, as I have said already, mere personal guards of the Secretary, traveling through the country for no other purpose, but causing ruin wherever they go.

I trust that the House will refuse to indorse the action of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and refuse to permit the present Administration to continue this force in existence, and thus demonstrate that Congress at least has some interest in the welfare of the white men who have been placed at the political mercy of Hoke Smith, and that these men shall not be turned loose to defraud them as they have been defrauded in the past.

I move to strike out that provision of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Oklahoma is rather more enthusiastic than earnest in his declarations.

Mr. FLYNN. Give us a vote upon it and you will see.

Mr. SHERMAN. I hardly think the Secretary of the Interior needs or desires any defense from me in reference to his Indian policy at least. But I disagree with the gentleman from Oklahoma entirely when he says that the only use of these inspectors under this or any other Administration is to act as political emissaries of the Secretary of the Interior. I think that they are a valuable part of the Indian service, and I am surprised that the gentleman makes the amendment here. He did not give us any notice in the committee of his desire to do so, and I hope that it will be voted down.

Mr. FLYNN. The reason I did not do so in committee was because I did not have the petition of 500 of the taxpayers of Pottawatomie County, Okla., asking the removal of these men from the Territory.

Mr. DOCKERY. This, I believe, Mr. Chairman, is a motion to strike out the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to strike out the lines which have just been read.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to perfect the paragraph before the motion to strike out is submitted to the committee, and in order to do so I move to amend by striking out the words "three thousand," in line 11, and inserting "two thousand five hundred." I

also move to amend by striking out the words "fifteen thousand," in line 12, and inserting "twelve thousand five hundred" instead, so as to make the total correspond with the change suggested in the preceding line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was read.

Mr. DOCKERY. I only desire to say this to the committee—to both sides of this Chamber—that these inspectors have heretofore received $2,500 per annum.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this a proposition to increase the salary?

Mr. DOCKERY. It is a proposition to increase each salary $500.

Mr. CRISP. I will ask the gentleman if the law does not fix the salary?

Mr. DOCKERY. It is fixed by statute.

Mr. CRISP. Then, how does this change the law? The salaries were cut before to the present figure, but contrary to law.

Mr. DOCKERY. I wish to say in answer to the gentleman from Georgia that this does increase the salaries, because the current law, which is the law for this year, fixes the amount at $2,500 for each of these inspectors.

Mr. CRISP. But the statute creating the office fixes the salary at $3,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is true. And I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, that since the Forty-fourth Congress, a Congress memorable in the history of the party to which I belong, more than one hundred salaries carried in this and other bills have been fixed below the statutory limit.

Now, I do not know any gentleman connected with this service. I have no interest whatever in this paragraph, but it did occur to me that these gentlemen, having accepted these positions at $2,500, ought to continue to discharge the duties of their positions, and their successors could very well afford to accept the offices at the same compensation.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, just a word. Of course I appreciate the efforts of my friend to protect the Treasury, but still, in his zeal, I think he has been a little misled about what has taken place as to these officers. The statute provides that the salaries shall be $3,000, and that is the statute under which they accepted the office, and there has always been $3,000 appropriated for them except in the last two bills.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is right.

Mr. CRISP. The last two bills reduced the amount to $2,500; so that so far from accepting the office at $2,500, they accepted it at $3,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. But was not the salary $2,500 when these present officials were appointed?

Mr. CRISP. Three thousand dollars.

Mr. DINGLEY. But had it not been fixed at $2,500 in the appropriation bill?

Mr. CRISP. No; it has only been $2,500 in the last two bills. These gentlemen came in three years ago. When they were appointed the salary was $3,000. It seems to me, so long as that is the salary, we ought to appropriate for it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has correctly stated the facts. The present inspectors, with possibly one exception, were appointed when the salary of the office was $3,000. It has been that all the time until the last Congress—the last two bills—and then it was cut down to $2,500. Now, the mere fact that my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] suggests that somebody else may fill these positions for $2,500 is, I think, no argument. I have no doubt that scores of men can be found in the district of the gentleman from Missouri—I know it is so in mine—who would gladly come here to accept and fill our places for much less salary than we are receiving. I think somebody struggled pretty hard to do it for the present salary in the gentleman's district at the last election, and I have no doubt somebody will do it this fall in his district and in mine. I think that is no argument whatever; but when the law fixes a salary I do not believe—and this House declares in its rules that it does not believe—in the policy of changing existing law in an appropriation bill. I do not believe it is proper, when the statute of the country for fifteen years has fixed a salary, that we should arbitrarily cut it down in an appropriation bill.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask the gentleman if these inspectors are not allowed $4 per day for subsistence and mileage in addition to this?

Mr. SHERMAN. There is an allowance for actual expenses while traveling.

Mr. BARRETT. It is fixed at $4 a day, is it not?

Mr. LACEY. They may commute it.

Mr. HOPKINS. They have to pay that out.

Mr. LACEY. They get the $2,500 net. They have their living and traveling expenses paid at the rate of $4 per day, besides the salary.

Mr. PEARSON. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee which is existing law, this salary of $2,500 a year as it is now or the original law of $3,000 a year? Which is existing law, the law as it stands to-day or the law before it was changed?

Mr. SHERMAN. The law has not been changed, I will say, if the gentleman is addressing his question to me. The law still says that the salary shall be $3,000 a year, but the last Congress, led by our—I was about to say parsimonious—economical friend from Indiana, Mr. Holman, appropriated only $2,500 for the salary.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman should say "economical Congress," not "economical friend from Indiana." The gentleman from Indiana is not present to defend himself.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not think the gentleman from Indiana would attempt to defend himself against that charge if he were here. I think he would rather applaud me for saying that. In the last Congress the amount appropriated was $2,500, and unless this provision which the gentleman from Missouri now incorporates into the bill was in the last bill—and I do not remember whether it was or not—they would still have the right to recover their $500 in the Court of Claims.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] will prevail. I understand it is to decrease the salary as proposed in the bill from $3,000 to $2,500 of five inspectors.

First, upon the merits. Twenty-five hundred dollars salary for an Indian inspector is, in my judgment, sufficient, when it is recollected that transportation and subsistence are paid outside of the $2,500. That is a much better salary than most Government officials receive, including Representatives and Senators.

Now, so much for the merits of the proposition. For two years past the appropriation has been $2,500 a year for these inspectors. They have not suffered. I know of no reason why in the present condition of the Treasury this side of the House should fall over itself to increase this amount to these employees, especially against the protest of most of the other side. It is true the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] favors the increase; but when he had the honor to preside in the last Congress, with the great power of the Speaker, I take notice that the salary of these inspectors was fixed at $2,500 a year by his own political friends.

Now, one word further, because we ought to be consistent. In 1875, under the lead of Mr. Randall, in a Democratic House, in the legislative bill, a substantial copy of which I hold in my hand, after a contest of three months, salaries were reduced all along the line below the amount fixed by the Revised Statutes; and every item of these——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to my colleague——

Mr. CANNON. In a minute.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to my colleague that that was done long before the last Congress; all the way up since the Forty-fourth Congress?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; and from that time to this the salaries as they were fixed below the salaries fixed in the Revised Statutes have continued; and there are between 100 and 200 salaries in the legislative bill, now on the Calendar, below the compensation fixed by the Revised Statutes, and have been for twenty years. Now, then, if we are to follow the example and recommendation of the committee upon these inspectors, later on, when we call up the legislative bill, the next one to follow this bill, to be consistent, we should force upon our Democratic friends in office between one and two hundred increases upon this legislative bill.

For one, in the present condition of the Treasury, I will not vote for it. I believe that I have as much disposition to compensate a public servant up to the full value of his service as anybody; and without any desire to follow in the footsteps of anybody claiming to be in favor of cheeseparing, upon the very merits, I will not vote for this increase, but will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, to keep the salaries at what they now are. I hope this side will follow along that line. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two. I am very sorry that I can not agree with everything that has been said by my honored colleague from Illinois. I have no personal acquaintance with any person whose salary is affected by the motion made by the gentleman from Missouri, so that I can not be charged with any personal or selfish motive. I do know that when this matter was investigated and this office of Indian inspector was created the parties having this matter in charge, knowing the amount of responsibility that would be thrown upon these men, fixed the salary at $3,000, and that that salary has been maintained from that time to the present. Now, since these men who are to be affected by the motion of the gentleman from Missouri were appointed, under the leadership of Mr. Holman of Indiana, their salary was cut down in the last appropriation bill to $2,500, being $500 less than allowed by law, $500 less than they had

a right to expect when they received their appointment from the present Administration.

I do not sympathize with those gentlemen who say that this is a matter among Democrats and that if a Democrat sees fit to make a motion to cut the salaries down we as Republicans will follow such leadership. These men are officers of the Government of the United States, in the discharge of their duties. They are discharging them as American citizens and as officers of the Government of the United States, not as Democrats nor as Republicans. The question for us to determine here to-day is not the personnel of these men, but whether or not a mistake was made by our predecessors in office when they created that office and fixed the salary at $3,000. We follow the leadership of the men who have charge of this in committee, the gentlemen representing the Committee on Indian Affairs, who have made the statement——

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Do you think it is the duty of this side of the House to increase something over a hundred salaries that have been reduced for nearly twenty years below the amount allowed by statute and increase the salary of those officers something like $100,000?

Mr. HOPKINS. I do think it would be the duty of this House to pass upon that question, if that were before us; but it is not.

Mr. SAYERS. But it will be before the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS. One gentleman at a time. I can be happy with either if the other will keep quiet. That question is not before the House. Now as to the point made by my colleague, that the salaries fixed by the Forty-fourth Congress have been followed since by the House. Every officer represented in that bill when he received his appointment did so with the full knowledge that the salary had been reduced to the amount that is now represented in the bill. But the case is different here. So far as these inspectors are concerned, when they received their appointments from the President of the United States their salary was $3,000; and there would be just as much justice in the Congress fixing the amount of your salary at $4,000 instead of $5,000 as it is for you, by your vote, to say that these inspectors shall get $2,500 instead of $3,000 each.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You are fixing——

Mr. HOPKINS. You have the brute force to do it, as this House has the brute force to reduce your salary to $4,000; nevertheless you accepted your present position under conditions where the law said you were entitled to receive $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You are trying to fix a precedent here to base other cases upon, but we do not propose to fix that precedent.

Mr. HOPKINS. What I was about to remark, Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted by my friend on the other side of the aisle, was that the Committee on Indian Affairs when they had the subject under consideration had the Commissioner and other experts before them, and I understand from the chairman of the committee that the opinion of the Department is that these salaries ought to be restored to the amount fixed by law.

Mr. NORTHWAY. They wanted the restoration last year, but they did not get it.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, do two wrongs make a right?

Mr. NORTHWAY. No.

Mr. HOPKINS. If an injustice was done last year I see no reason why it should be continued this year. We all know, from the trend of public sentiment, that the personnel of these offices will be changed, and that men of a different political faith will be put in these places, and I do want to set a precedent, so as to make these men understand that, regardless of political affiliations, this House will do justice by them. If these salaries are too high as fixed by law, let us pass a bill to reduce them; but let us not attempt to do it in this manner, after men have accepted the offices with the understanding that the law of the country will be observed by the Congress of the United States and that appropriations commensurate with the salaries fixed by law will be made.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to my friend from Illinois that it is suggested on this side of the House that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] had these salaries reduced in order to meet the increase in the purchasing power of money, estimating that $2,500 now would be more than equal in purchasing power to $3,000 at the time the salary was fixed by law. [Laughter.] But, seriously speaking, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], who last addressed the House, is a perfectly sound one. If a statute of the United States fixes a salary, Congress may appropriate less than the salary as compensation for the services, but it can not do so without violating the law or without taking advantage of the fact that an appropriation bill, affecting, as it does, so many interests, may be approved, when, if a special statute reducing the salary had to be considered on its own merits, it would not receive favorable consideration; and the fact that these officials have received less than their proper salaries for two years is no argument, to my mind, why they should not receive their entire salary for the next fiscal year, especially as in this case the salaries were fixed, not only by statute, but also by the appropriation bill at the time these men were appointed to office.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1100) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds;
A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Robert Kiracofe;
A bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Ella D. Cross;
A bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine;
A bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Towne;
A bill (S. 878) granting a pension to Jared S. Chamberlain;
A bill (S. 625) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon;
A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Morris;
A bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Shubael Gould;
A bill (S. 1276) granting a pension to John L. Britton;
A bill (S. 1291) granting an increase of pension to Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton;
A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Lue R. Brown;
A bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Mary E. Sessions;
A bill (S. 1149) granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott;
A bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber;
A bill (S. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;
A bill (S. 1511) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Stewart Whiting;
A bill (S. 804) granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Carroll Poe;
A bill (S. 1215) granting a pension to Ellen Kingsley;
A bill (S. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Kimball;
A bill (S. 905) granting a pension to Mary W. Keefe;
A bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Charles Williamson;
A bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to John Nichols;
A bill (S. 522) for the relief of George Hughes, of Portland, Oreg.;
A bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Joseph R. West, brigadier and brevet major-general United States Army Volunteers;
A bill (S. 1631) granting a pension to Emeline Filgate;
A bill (S. 1787) granting a pension to Nancy T. Duncklee;
A bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus C. Ingalls;
A bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Bradford;
A bill (S. 651) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham;
A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Rhoda Chick;
A bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Ellen Ewing, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Ewing;
A bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams;
A bill (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland;
A bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Hans Johnson;
A bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Catherine Smith;
A bill (S. 705) granting a pension to Emily B. Muncey;
A bill (S. 246) granting a pension to Nancy Carson Blunt;
A bill (S. 247) granting a pension to Wallace McGrath;
A bill (S. 719) to restore a pension to Harriet M. Knowlton;
A bill (S. 819) granting a pension to Catherine O'Leary;
A bill (S. 1493) granting a pension to Mary Clare Kelly;
A bill (S. 826) granting a pension to Caroline Reed;
A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to William T. Walker;
A bill (S. 893) for the relief of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings;
A bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to George C. Abbey;
A bill (S. 996) to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll;
A bill (S. 1323) granting a pension to Maria Somerlat, widow of Valentine Somerlat;
A bill (S. 1189) granting a pension to Eliza Sandford;

A bill (S. 1621) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley;
A bill (S. 1128) granting a pension to Isabella Morrow;
A bill (S. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany;
A bill (S. 1924) granting a pension to Carrie L. Yeaton;
A bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Mary Newman;
A bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Caroline Stockton Brown;
A bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Mallery;
A bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Marion McKibben;
A bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Fannie Moale Gibbon;
A bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax;
A bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Philbrook, widow of Alvah Philbrook, major of Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers;
A bill (S. 1945) granting a pension to Joseph Porter;
A bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bull;
A bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to John B. Meigs;
A bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet;
A bill (S. 1790) granting a pension to Mrs. Hypolite Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased;
A bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles;
A bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel;
A bill (S. 1342) granting a pension to Lena D. Smith;
A bill (S. 568) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann M. Madden; and
A bill (S. 646) for the relief of Francis Brown.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take issue with the gentleman from Illinois in his contention that there is an obligation on the part of Congress to continue unchanged the salary of any officer of this Government except in such instances as are prescribed by the Constitution. I understand the gentleman to insist that because three or four years ago these inspectors were each paid $3,000 per annum, that therefore it would be a violation of the law and of sound morals and good conscience to decrease their salaries during their term of office. Mr. Chairman, I deny that there was any such contract entered into, either expressed or implied, between the Government and these gentlemen when they were appointed inspectors. The trouble in the way of the House about decreasing or increasing the salaries of these and similarly situated officials is that the rules of the House, if invoked, prevent such action. Where an appropriation fixing the salary of any officer for a particular year is made by Congress, such an appropriation is as much law to that extent as the original statute.

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment at that point?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. BOATNER. Have not the courts held that where the appropriation is less than the amount of the salary fixed by law the officer may sue and recover?

Mr. SAYERS. The courts have held that where a provision is found in an appropriation bill that the appropriation made to cover a salary in such bill shall be accepted in full payment of all services, such an appropriation is valid and binding, and the official can not go into court and obtain a judgment against the Government for a larger amount than was appropriated in the bill.

Mr. HOPKINS. But suppose the party declines to accept that appropriation and sues for his salary?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my colleague [Mr. SAYERS] that the court only decided that that was true where the appropriation bill itself provided that the acceptance of the sum appropriated should operate as an acquittance of the Government.

Mr. SAYERS. That results not only from the acceptance of the sum specified in the bill, but also from the provision in the bill that the amount appropriated shall be accepted in full payment of the salary; and I am informed that this bill now under consideration contains such a provision.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with my colleague as to the merits of the proposition, but if the officer does not accept the amount appropriated in the bill he can go into the Court of Claims and recover the entire salary.

Mr. BOATNER. Did not the court first hold that where the appropriation made was less than the salary fixed by law, the Government still owed the officer the balance, and did not the Appropriations Committee then insert the words "to be in full compensation," so as to meet that decision of the court?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. BOATNER. So the Committee on Appropriations admit having, by the mere force of those words, extorted from the officeholder the difference between the amount of his salary as fixed by law and the amount appropriated to pay him.

Mr. SAYERS. No; not extorted. They did not extort anything. They merely said, by law, that the amount appropriated was sufficient.

Mr. FISCHER. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to hold that an appropriation for a certain amount made in the bill of one year fixes that as the amount of the appropriation for the same purpose every year thereafter?

Mr. SAYERS. No; it only fixes the amount for the year for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. FISCHER. I understood the gentleman to argue that because $2,500 was appropriated for this purpose last year we might not appropriate a larger sum this year.

Mr. SAYERS. I do not take such a position, but I insist that in this case we should be careful as to the precedent we set.

Mr. FISCHER. Suppose you should get $10,000 of appropriation for one of your rivers or harbors this year, would that bar you from asking a larger sum next year?

Mr. SAYERS. Not at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, do I understand that gentlemen on the other side are here asking for increase of salaries? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] is probably "counting his chickens before they are hatched." [Laughter.] His whole argument seems to be based upon the hypothesis that the Republicans are going to carry the election next fall——

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, no.

Mr. SAYERS. And he wishes his political friends, who, he thinks, are going to hold these positions, to get $3,000 instead of $2,500.

Mr. HOPKINS. That imputation is unworthy of the gentleman from Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there were nothing else involved in this proposition than the simple question of the salaries of these inspectors I should not say a word. But the question raised on the proposition to increase the salaries of five Indian inspectors $500 each reaches much further than these officials. There are not less than 200 officials provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and other appropriation bills whose salaries as fixed by law are from $500 to $2,000 more per annum than the amount which has been appropriated for them during the last two, five, ten, fifteen, and in some cases twenty years. The salaries of nearly all the officials of the Government were determined by laws passed either during the war or in the years immediately succeeding, when we had a depreciated currency and the cost of living was very much greater than it is now, and when the standard of salaries was consequently higher. Now, instead of having changed those laws, they being multitudinous in number, various Congresses, ever since 1874, have gone on gradually reducing the salaries of officials in appropriation bills to amounts believed to be consistent with the duties to be performed and with the conditions and cost of living since we came back to specie payments.

Now, it seems to me that for this House in Committee of the Whole to start out upon the basis assumed by this amendment, that because the law on the statute book, which has not been repealed, provides for a salary of $3,000—I am not certain that it does, for I have an impression that the salaries of these officials were originally fixed by an appropriation bill, but, however that may be, it does not affect the argument—it seems to me that if we are going to concede the argument that we ought not on an appropriation bill to appropriate any less sum for the salary of any official than what is fixed as his salary in the statutes, we are immediately brought to the necessity, if we are to be consistent, of practically increasing the salaries of more than 200 officials of the Government beyond the amounts paid during the last five, ten, or fifteen years, and beyond the amounts fixed in the pending legislative bill, which is soon to come up.

In casting my eyes over that bill, without examining it carefully, I have noticed at least 20 officials whose salaries for several years have been annually carried in the several appropriation bills at a lower figure than that provided by the statute, officers who have gladly accepted as their compensation the amounts thus appropriated, not one of whom has resigned because of insufficient salary. Now, I hope that in this year of our Lord 1896, with this Government borrowing money for the purpose of paying current expenses, gentlemen in the majority in this House do not propose to set the example here (because if it is to be done in this case, then in justice it must be done in the case of all the other of these officials) of practically increasing the salaries of the officials of this Government beyond the salaries of the past two or more years, especially as in this case, where the salary of $2,500 and $4 per day for expenses is ample and no facts have been presented to show otherwise. In view of the condition in which we find our-